



The hard sell:

EU communication policy and the campaign for hearts and minds



The hard sell: EU communication policy and the campaign for hearts and minds

December 2008

Open Europe
7 Tufton Street
London
SW1P 3QN
www.openeurope.org.uk

Research by Dr. Lee Rotherham and Lorraine Mullally
Edited by Lorraine Mullally

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	11
1. “Communicating Europe”: The EU’s biased information campaign	14
2. Funding the cheerleaders: Paying NGOs, think-tanks and lobby groups to promote the EU	49
3. Buying loyalty: Promoting European citizenship and a common European culture to engender support for the EU	75
4. Investing in the long-term: Targeting young people	94
5. Conclusions – EU propaganda: Why does it matter? What’s the alternative?	118
6. Annex: The EU’s €2.4bn propaganda budget broken down	134

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The European Union spends billions of euros a year promoting itself and its central aim of 'ever closer union'. In 2008 alone it spent €2.4bn at the very least – more than Coca Cola spends each year on advertising, worldwide.¹

By promoting its policies, actions and principles, the EU serves to justify its own existence and, crucially, to cement the European Commission's view that continued European integration is the best, or even the only, future path for progress.

It does this in a number of different but interrelated ways, all of which received a boost following the French and Dutch rejections of the EU Constitution in 2005.

1 "Communicating Europe": The EU's biased information campaign

Firstly and most obviously, the EU publishes classic promotional material, such as booklets, adverts and films, all under the guise of providing 'information'. Examples include the publication "How the European Union works", which describes why the EU is "a remarkable success story,"² or the pamphlet "Better off in Europe" which says the EU "is delivering a better life for everyone" and describes the single market as "a winning formula."³ Another is the 'EUtube' film and website: "Europe and You in 2007 – a snapshot of EU achievements".⁴

The openly stated aim of the EU's "Information and Communication Strategy" is to "boost awareness of the Union's existence and legitimacy, polishing its image and highlighting its role."⁵

The Commission actually admits that its information about the EU has a slant. It believes that "Neutral factual information is needed of course, but it is not enough on its own... Genuine communication by the European Union cannot be reduced to the mere provision of information."⁶ Indeed sometimes the message is subliminal, found in, for example, sentences such as "If you are lucky enough to be a citizen of the EU".⁷

The EU has a sophisticated network of information outlets to distribute its literature and branded merchandise, and also spends money organising tours and open days for visitors to the EU institutions. It also makes the most of its capacity as a grant-giver, obliging recipients to adorn project communications with the EU flag or even commemorative plaques.

It has its own polling arm – Eurobarometer – which it uses to manipulate public opinion, and even its own broadcast channels, and means for influencing the internet and the wider media, such as training and prizes for journalists.

The Commission has even used its various 'information' tools to help support pro-integration campaigns in national referendums on EU issues, as was seen in the recent Lisbon Treaty

1 Coca Cola 2007 Annual Report http://www.thecoca-colacompany.com/investors/pdfs/10-K_2007/Coca-Cola_10-K_Item_07.pdf
2 http://ec.europa.eu/publications/booklets/eu_glance/68/en.pdf
3 <http://ec.europa.eu/publications/booklets/move/56/en.pdf>
4 http://ec.europa.eu/snapshot2007/index_en.htm
5 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2002/com2002_0350en02.pdf
6 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2002/com2002_0350en02.pdf
7 <http://ec.europa.eu/publications/booklets/others/65/en.doc>

campaign in Ireland. As well as the Commission President visiting Ireland to urge a 'yes' vote ahead of the vote⁸, after the referendum, the Commission leaked briefings to the press on two occasions – firstly to wrongly suggest that 40 percent of people had voted 'no' out of ignorance,⁹ and subsequently to argue that the Irish press had been overly influenced by British 'eurosceptic' newspapers – both clear attempts to delegitimise the result.¹⁰

“Neutral factual information is needed of course, but it is not enough on its own”

The European Commission has in the past insisted: “It has been the long standing policy of the European Commission not to interfere in internal elections or referenda in Members States... The provision of such information is not intended to influence political decisions or electoral contests.”¹¹ But this is clearly not the case.

2 Funding the cheerleaders: Paying NGOs, think-tanks and lobby groups to promote the EU

Secondly, the EU provides huge amounts of funding to outside organisations which support and promote its objectives.

On the one hand, it funds organisations which openly admit to a central aim of promoting the EU and its core objective of 'ever closer union', such as the European Movement, the Union of European Federalists or the Youth of the European People's Party. The European Movement, for instance, which says it seeks to “transform the relations between the European States and its citizens into a Federal European Union,”¹² received €2.5 million in EU funding between January 2005 and October 2007 alone.¹³

On the other, under cover of the otherwise laudable aim of consulting 'experts' and reaching out to 'civil society', it pours money – often indirectly – into NGOs, think-tanks and lobby groups which can be relied on to support the EU's existing or potential role or approach in policy areas as diverse as energy, education, and foreign policy. They might do this by organising events, attending meetings at the EU institutions, publishing research and reports or lobbying decision-makers for an increased EU role in a certain area.

It is not always clear which organisations receive EU funding, or how much, and this makes it doubly concerning. For instance, when Foreign Secretary David Miliband announced in Parliament that a number of influential NGOs and charities supported the EU Lisbon Treaty in an effort to convince MPs to also do so¹⁴, it was only after the vote in Parliament that it emerged that the organisations he cited receive EU funding.¹⁵

Because of opaque funding streams and a lack of easy to access information, it is extremely difficult to put a figure on exactly how much money the EU spends funding outside organisations which promote the idea of European integration. It is certainly tens of millions a year. Christopher Heaton-Harris MEP has estimated that it is “well over £1bn”.¹⁶

8 See <http://www.euractiv.com/en/future-eu/barroso-courts-irish-ahead-eu-treaty-referendum/article-171741>

9 See http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_300_full_en.pdf and <http://www.openeurope.org.uk/commissionpoll.pdf> 10 <http://www.irishtimes.com/focus/2008/lisbondocument/index.pdf>

11 http://www.bcc.ie/decisions_details/Mar%202007/288.06%20289.06%20290.06%20Mr.%20A%20Coughlan%20Summary%20Complaint.doc

12 <http://www.europeanmovement.org/history.cfm>

13 The exact sum is €2,552,005. European Parliamentary Question 4449/07 to 4455/07: Summary of Payments by Legal Entity 2005-2006-2007

14 21 January 2008, Hansard, Column 1241

15 Combination of two answers: <http://www.ireland.com/focus/2008/eu-payments/agora.pdf> and Written Answer from the Commission 21/02/2008, following Written Question P-0389/08 by Dan Hanan

16 <http://conservativehome.blogs.com/platform/2008/08/chris-heaton-ha.html>

3 Buying loyalty: Promoting European citizenship and a common European culture to engender support for the EU

Thirdly, and underpinning the initiatives detailed above, the EU has a robustly funded policy of promoting a common European citizenship and culture, particularly among young people. Specific lines in the EU budget show that more than €34m was dedicated

“For citizens to give their full support to, and participate fully in, European integration, greater emphasis should be placed on their common cultural values and roots”

to “Fostering European Citizenship” in 2008 alone, and a further €62m was spent on “Developing cultural cooperation in Europe.”¹⁷

“The Treaty establishes citizenship of the Union... It is an important element in strengthening and safeguarding the process of European integration”

The very candidly stated aim of this is to generate support and justification for European integration. As the 2006 decision on the “Europe for Citizens” policy notes: “The Treaty establishes citizenship of the Union... It is an important element in strengthening and safeguarding the process of European integration.”¹⁸

Likewise, the EU’s €400 million Culture Programme states that: “For citizens to give their full support to, and participate fully in, European integration, greater emphasis should be placed on their common cultural values and roots as a key element of their identity and their membership of a society founded on freedom, equity, democracy, respect for human dignity and integrity, tolerance and solidarity.”¹⁹

The EU’s efforts to promote EU citizenship include funding for everything from ‘town twinning’, to ‘active European remembrance’ to “high visibility events such as commemorations, awards and Europe-wide conferences etc.”²⁰

The policy involves emphasising the EU’s ‘symbols’, such as the flag, the anthem, the motto and the euro, as well as lavish celebrations of ‘Europe Day’ and occasions such as the 50th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome – which cost millions of euros.

All of this is seen as crucial to engendering a feeling of ‘belonging’ in EU citizens, which in turn is designed to make them more supportive of the EU. As the French Europe Minister Jean-Pierre Jouyet said recently: “Symbols are necessary for Europe... they are the way to reach full European consciousness for the people. There is no identity without symbols.”²¹

“Symbols are necessary for Europe... they are the way to reach full European consciousness for the people”

Some of the things the EU funds under the Culture and Citizenship banner sound innocuous enough, but research into the objectives behind them shows that the main aim of the projects is specifically to promote the EU.

17 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/budget/data/P2009_VOL4/EN/nmc-titleN16E0D/index.html

18 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:378:0032:0040:EN:PDF>

19 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32006D1855:EN:HTML>

20 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/budget/data/D2008_VOL4/EN/nmc-titleN16E0D/index.html

21 Speech at the European Commission conference “35th anniversary of the Eurobarometer”, Paris, 21 November 2008

The EU-funded practice of town-twinning, for example, is seen by the Commission as an opportunity to hold public meetings to “reinforce the participants’ commitment to European integration”, by “sharing the experience of concrete benefits of European integration at the local or individual level.”²²

Promoting a common European culture involves yet more funding for outside organisations, such as the European Union Choir, or the Union des théâtres de l’Europe, for example, whose “objective is to contribute to the construction of the European Union through culture and theatre”.

It also involves funding for the ‘Capital of Culture’ programme, celebrations and pro-EU events marking the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue, and funding for European film producers and networks. In 2008, it even involved sponsoring a “Marathon for a United Europe” for young people.²³

4 Investing in the long-term: Targeting young people

Indeed young people are the prime target for many, if not even most, of the EU’s campaign for heart and minds. In a document called “Building our common future”, which argued that “The European Union must continue down the path of integration, and avoid the trap of unwieldy inter-governmentalism,” the Commission stated that “It is above all through the involvement of young people that Europe will assure its future.”²⁴

The plethora of initiatives aimed specifically at children and young people are highly dubious, and provide some of the most blatant examples of EU propaganda.

The Commission believes that “Particular attention should be given to young people and the education sector as a channel for helping people to learn about the European Union.”²⁵ This wouldn’t be a problem if the EU’s ‘information’ did not read like one-sided campaign material.

“It is above all through the involvement of young people that Europe will assure its future”

Cartoon and animated publications such as ‘Captain euro’, and booklets like “Let’s explore Europe”²⁶ give an over-simplified and one-sided account of the EU’s actions in a given area, and engender the view (in some cases more subtly than others) that the future can only be safeguarded by a strong EU and by moving away from a focus on the nation state.

There is a specific and deliberate emphasis on education. The EU targets schoolchildren with initiatives such as ‘Spring Day in Europe’, celebrations of ‘Europe Day’, funded visits to the EU institutions, and posters advertising school milk subsidies.

There is the €885 million Youth in Action programme, for example, which “funds projects which are designed to encourage a sense of active European citizenship in young people”²⁷ and

22 http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/action1/measure11_en.html

23 <http://www.britishcouncil.org/greece-sport-marathon-for-a-united-europe.htm>

24 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2004:0101:FIN:EN:DOC>

25 http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2002/com2002_0350en02.pdf

26 <http://ec.europa.eu/publications/young/letsexplore2008/en.pdf>

27 http://ec.europa.eu/youth/youth-policies/doc28_en.htm

initiatives such as “Schools celebrating Europe”, described by the Commission as “an opportunity to communicate about what the EU has achieved so far.”²⁸

The EU also invests heavily in higher education courses that specialise in ‘European integration’ studies through the Jean Monnet programme, as well as funding institutions that essentially train students for jobs in the EU civil service, such as the College of Europe. There is even a European Youth Parliament, described by its organisers as “bringing the European dream to the hearts and minds of young Europeans.”²⁹

5 EU propaganda: Why does it matter? What’s the alternative?

The EU spends billions of euros every year promoting the EU and the concept of European integration because its leaders recognise that creating support for the project is the only way to ensure it can continue.

The series of recent ‘no’ votes to the EU Constitutional Treaty, and falling support for the EU across Europe have shown that there is a significant and growing gap between the EU institutions and its citizens.

But instead of confronting the EU’s enormous and very real problems – such as the waste, corruption, lack of accountability and transparency, over-regulation, and poorly designed trade, aid, regional and environment policies – the EU chooses to throw huge amounts of money into what are essentially propaganda exercises.

There is a clear consensus within the EU institutions that if only people knew more about the “benefits” of the EU, then they would be more supportive of it. As the former President of the European Parliament and MEP Nicole Fontaine said in the aftermath of the Irish ‘no’ to the Lisbon Treaty, “We have a communications problem... We haven’t explained enough the benefits of European construction... We have been too modest.”³⁰

It is true that people generally know very little about the EU, and the impact it has on citizens – and this has got to change. After all, the EU is now said to be at the root of an estimated 50% of our national legislation – at least – and affects almost every area of our daily lives.³¹

In an ideal world we all need to know what the EU is doing, and how it works. But so far, the European institutions have on the whole proved an unsuitable vehicle for providing that information.

Over the years, the EU’s ‘Communication Policy’ has become less and less about giving people the facts, and more and more about selling the EU’s policies and promoting the concept of EU integration. Not only that, but the vast resources poured into the EU’s culture and citizenship activities are also used as a propaganda tool, as are some of the grants available to outside organisations through other areas of the EU budget.

There are several, important reasons why all of this matters and should be of concern to the public.

28 http://www.europeanschoolnet.org/www/en/pub/eun/portals/spring_day.htm

29 http://www.eypej.org/docs/2007_EYP_Annual_Report.pdf

30 Speech at the European Commission conference “35th anniversary of the Eurobarometer”, Paris, 21 November 2008

31 Government Written Answer, January 2006 <http://www.parliament.uk/commons/lib/research/notes/sn1a-02888.pdf> Other estimates suggest the proportion is higher, such as that of the German Ministry of Justice which suggested it was closer to 84%: <http://www.openeurope.org.uk/analysis/herzog.pdf>

Why does it matter?

A Much of it is subtle enough to pass under the public radar and not be considered advertising

One of the most worrying things about EU propaganda is that so much of it has been dressed up as something altogether more worthwhile – and therefore unidentifiable as advertising and promotion.

While the EU's communications and information budget is relatively simple to isolate, because most of it operates from DG Communications, the funds spent promoting the EU through culture and citizenship initiatives are not only less easy to identify as bias, but they are also less easy to quantify.

In this sense, the EU's huge yearly budget for promoting European citizenship and culture is arguably the worst kind of propaganda. Some might call it 'soft' propaganda, since it operates on a subconscious level. But this makes it all the more insidious as a taxpayer-funded public project.

B The Commission pretends to be listening, but is selective about who it listens to

Particularly since the series of 'no' votes to the EU Constitution, the Commission has talked continuously about "giving the EU ears", listening to citizens and getting them involved in the process – which is clearly to be welcomed.

And yet the few times when citizens in their millions have genuinely been involved in having a say on the EU – the referendums in Ireland, Denmark, France and the Netherlands – EU leaders have sensationally ignored the wish of citizens to reject further EU integration.

The problem with the types of "listening" initiatives that the Commission advocates is that these are not realistically going to be taken up by most people – simply because they are not open to, nor targeted at, the mass of citizens. Instead, they target a minority of interested specialists and supporters – often the kinds of "civil society" organisations which, as well as receiving EU funding, usually also have an agenda to promote it.

C Funding for outside organisations skews the debate

The EU's propaganda – and in particular the outsourced propaganda that results from the EU funding outside think-tanks and NGOs which share its vision – matters because it artificially skews the debate on the EU. Interest groups should be able and free to promote the EU if that is what they believe in, but there is no justification for giving them taxpayers' money to do so.

This gives them an unfair advantage over those trying to put forward a different argument. It is not in the public good for groups on one side of the argument only to be heavily supported by public funds, because it ends up stifling debate, and prevents citizens from seeing both sides of the argument fairly.

This is essentially a constraint on democracy – a huge and concerted campaign to stifle real debate about the future of the EU. The Commission is only interested in debating one side of the argument – it is willing to accept an 'exchange of views' only to the extent that this takes place solely within the parameters of an acceptance that EU integration is to be broadly supported.

D The EU and its advocates deride opponents

It also matters because the EU and its strongest advocates are so vociferous in their attack on critics of the EU. Instead of being viewed as a legitimate element of a democratic debate, criticism of the EU is invariably derided as 'anti-European propaganda'. Meanwhile, the EU enjoys a substantial yearly budget to promote itself in often subtle ways which go unnoticed as propaganda, yet which cost taxpayers billions of euros a year.

E EU advertising falls short of UK Government standards

The EU and its strongest supporters show a fundamental failure to understand the difference between providing information about the EU, and promoting its 'benefits'. They simply refuse to separate the two concepts.

As EU Communications Commissioner Margot Wallstrom says: "The issue is not just one of redressing ignorance and indifference per se: it is about serving the needs of healthy democratic debate, and ensuring that people have the facts they require – and are entitled to... a sustained effort must be made to explain the benefits that the European Union brings to each Member State in a much more effective way."³²

While it is true that people do not know enough about the EU, it is wrong to claim that telling people more about the benefits of the EU is a sufficient solution to this knowledge gap.

The EU's biased information campaigns should be of grave concern to taxpayers in member states, particularly in the UK where there are clear rules on government public information campaigns in order to ensure that taxpayers get value for money and that their money is not used for propaganda purposes.

"a sustained effort must be made to explain the benefits that the European Union brings to each Member State in a much more effective way"

In the UK, the Government is often criticised for spending taxpayers' money on what is billed as 'information', but which looks more like the government selling its political message. For example, the Labour Government was strongly criticised for its 2001 election campaign, which was accused of using taxpayers' money to explain how the party had brought certain people benefits while in government. If the public find this unacceptable, then they should also be concerned about the Commission's free reign to promote itself and its political message of 'ever closer union'.

F In times of economic down-turn the EU can ill-afford to be wasting money on expensive advertising

The EU's total propaganda spend amounts to more than €2.4 billion a year – at the very least. That is more than Coca Cola spends on advertising each year – worldwide.³³

This means that UK taxpayers are losing around €240 million a year to EU propaganda, given that average UK contributions make up around 10% of the yearly EU budget.³⁴

³² Speech, 24 May 2005 <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/05/296&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

³³ Coca Cola 2007 Annual Report http://www.thecoca-colacompany.com/investors/pdfs/10-K_2007/Coca-Cola_10-K_Item_07.pdf

³⁴ The EU's Financial Framework for 2007 to 2013 is €864.169bn: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0152:FIN:EN:PDF> The UK's contribution over the seven-year period is €89.95bn (£71bn. gross, after abatement): <http://www.openeurope.org.uk/research/budget07.pdf> (Source: Written Answer, 9 Jan 2006. Past figures from Pink Book 2005 table 9.9)

By comparison, in 2007/2008, the UK Government spent around £190 million on advertising in press, TV, radio and digital media advertising, out of the Central Office of Information's £392 million budget.³⁵

Because of the nature of EU advertising, most people will be unaware that on top of this UK Government advertising, there is a parallel level of propaganda simultaneously operating at the European level, which they are also paying for through their taxes.

Even in the good times, all this is a waste of money. But at a time of recession, EU governments can ill-afford to be wasting money on biased publications and campaigns and propping up hundreds of think-tanks which exist to campaign for more EU integration.

G A distraction from the EU's real problems

Depending on how one views it, at best, all of this is an enormous waste of time and money – an ineffective and vain attempt to engender support for something about which people on the whole care very little. At worst, it is a deeply sinister EU propaganda campaign which will in the long run eliminate naysayers, undermining democracy and stopping people from having a truly independent view about the EU.

Somewhere in between, is probably where the main point lies. The wider problem is that this 'information' and 'citizenship' drive is a dangerous distraction. EU leaders misguidedly think that all they need to do to solve Europe's problems is to "explain it better", to close the "perceived" gap between citizens and the EU, rather than the real gap that is often caused not by public "misperceptions" of the EU, but by a genuine realisation that it is fundamentally undemocratic and unsuccessful in so many of its key policies.

Regardless of whether any of these efforts actually achieve their aim of convincing people that the EU is successful and positive, spending time and money on spin leaves fewer resources available for the reform of its policies and processes that the EU so badly needs.

H Storing up problems for the future

The other, illogical thing about the EU's propaganda drive is that it threatens to backfire in the long term and alienate people all the more.

The falling popularity of the EU across Europe, not to mention the rejections of the Constitutional Treaty in France, the Netherlands and Ireland, point to deep dissatisfaction with the EU and the direction it is taking. Ignoring this sentiment in favour of a contention that people simply do not know enough about the EU to be grateful for it, is a mistake, which will serve to further discredit the EU in the long run.

What's the alternative?

Taxpayers' money should not continue to be spent on biased EU information campaigns and efforts to engender EU culture and citizenship for the purpose of promoting European integration.

35 COI annual report <http://www.coi.gov.uk/documents/coi-annualreport2007-8.pdf> See also Telegraph, 10 November 2008

There is clearly a strong case to be made for improving citizens' knowledge of the EU, but this can be done without resorting to propaganda. There are also several key ways in which the EU could improve its image with the public, to an extent that expensive propaganda never can.

A Stop propaganda spending by cutting back the EU budget

Future EU budget agreements should concentrate on scaling back spending on these initiatives.

Because of its clear mandate to promote the EU, the European Commission's DG Communications department should be scrapped, saving more than €200m a year. Other Commission departments responsible for policy areas could continue to have modest budgets to publish literature and information for journalists, while a budget should also be kept for broadcasting 'raw' events such as meetings of the European Parliament, and press conferences etc for public channels. A separate department dedicated purely to communications as currently exists, is superfluous.

Likewise, the EU's €1.5 billion yearly budget for 'Education and Culture'³⁶ should be dramatically scaled back, scrapping expensive campaigns to "foster European citizenship" and other initiatives which exist for the purpose of promoting the EU.

The EU's various budgets for outside organisations must be reviewed and dramatically cut back. All funding for think-tanks and groups which actively promote EU integration should be ceased. If their views represent public opinion then they will find private funders who share their views and are willing to make up lost Commission funds.

All the remaining EU-funded organisations should be listed online on a clear and easy to access website, with details of the funds they receive and how the funds were spent. The granting of taxpayers' money to outside organisations must be made more transparent.

B Improve citizens' interest and understanding of the EU by promoting transparency and genuine debate

In terms of improving the flow and quality of information to citizens, this could be achieved by on the one hand, improving EU transparency – allowing journalists, MPs and the general public better access to documents and meetings during the legislative process – and on the other, improving national parliamentary scrutiny of EU decision-making, which would also serve to improve media coverage and therefore citizens' understanding of the issues.

There should also be a clear set of binding guidelines for EU literature and campaigns, upheld by a small, independent body seeking to ensure that EU taxpayers' money is not used to 'sell' EU policies or ideas, but to publish neutral information which genuinely seeks to keep citizens informed of the facts.

Likewise, national governments must do more to ensure that teaching about the EU in schools is more neutral and balanced. There is a clear argument to be made for improving children's understanding of the EU, but this must not be allowed to become a one-sided propaganda exercise that focuses only on the "benefits" of European integration, as it clearly has.

³⁶ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/budget/data/D2008_VOL4/EN/nmc-titleN16E0D/index.html

Finally, the EU must be more open to the idea of directly consulting national populations about the issues that affect them. EU politicians talk endlessly about wanting to “listen to citizens”, but are increasingly hostile to the idea of giving people a say on EU issues through national referendums. This is because they fear a growing tendency to reject further EU integration, as seen in the recent French, Dutch and Irish ‘no’ votes.

But in fact, if EU leaders are serious about wanting to engage citizens more in the EU process and improve their knowledge and understanding of the EU, as they claim they are, then they should make far more use of referendums, not less. Research shows that voters’ lack of information about the EU is a result of too little, rather than too much democracy.

According to polls taken in countries that have held referendums on European integration, such as Ireland, France and Denmark, respondents could answer twice as many questions correctly about EU institutions as could respondents from Germany, Italy and Belgium – countries that had not held referendums on the EU. In fact, a representative sample of Danish voters during the 1992 referendum campaign on the Maastricht Treaty showed they actually knew more about the treaty than the average backbench MP.³⁷

There also needs to be more respect for the results that referendums deliver. The EU could dramatically improve its reputation with the public by genuinely listening and respecting ‘no’ votes as well as the ‘yes’ votes. It is simply hypocritical if, on the one hand, the Commission talks continuously about wanting to listen to citizens, and on the other, EU leaders simultaneously ignore votes they dislike in order to press ahead with their agenda for ‘ever closer union’, in which they so passionately believe.

³⁷ “Can we trust the people? Voter competence and European integration” by Professor Matt Qvortrup
<http://www.iwantareferendum.com/publication/qvortrup.pdf>

Introduction

“From my involvement in the campaign for European Monetary Union, I was struck by the huge amounts that the Commission spent to promote monetary union. In this regard, it is no accident that monetary union carried the day in the face of negative attitudes that were present from the very start of the campaign... Hardliners argue that taxpayers’ money should not be used to finance propaganda, and that is certainly a position adopted by the eurosceptics. I do not believe that the Commission should be too concerned about this. We need to invest if active citizenship is to become a reality”

Fernand Herman, President of the Belgian branch of the EU-funded Union of European Federalists³⁸

“Europe is suffering from a very serious problem with its citizens, and the problem is not ready to disappear either. It is not as simple as what is commonly termed as the democratic deficit – I think it is nonsense to speak about a democratic deficit because we do have our institutions in place – but it is, I fear, a basic problem which is a reality of our life today. Most of our fellow citizens in Europe do not feel they belong to Europe in the same way that they feel they belong to their towns, regions or countries. They do not feel they are European citizens. The problem is not rooted in Europe’s institutions or procedures. The only way we can resolve the question is to change people’s mindset”

Pascal Lamy, former EU Commissioner and President of EU-funded think-tank Notre Europe³⁹

“We have a communications problem... We haven’t explained enough the benefits of European construction... We have been too modest”

MEP and former European Parliament President Nicole Fontaine⁴⁰

The EU has been promoting itself and its central objective for “ever closer union” for many years. Some of its bigger campaigns have been the promotion of the euro, and the promotion of EU enlargement to Eastern and Central Europe. Less high-profile ‘information’ campaigns, targeting the general public and especially young people, have also been going for a long time.

However, the 2005 French and the Dutch ‘no’ votes to the EU Constitution proved a catalyst for a new era of propaganda which saw the launch of several huge new campaigns – from ‘Europe for Citizens’ and ‘Youth in Action’ to ‘Speak up Europe!’ and ‘Communicating Europe in Partnership’.

When voters rejected the Constitution, the European Commission began to look in on itself and to question where it had gone wrong. But instead of realising that citizens had rejected the idea of more EU integration because they were unhappy with the way the EU operates – its lack of transparency, problems with fraud and corruption, its bloated and unaccountable institutions, its failing trade and agriculture policies, and its tendency to over-regulate – Europe’s politicians decided that the problem was simply that citizens didn’t know enough about the EU and didn’t feel ‘European’ enough.

³⁸ http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/archive/forumtranscrip_en.pdf

³⁹ http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/archive/forumtranscrip_en.pdf

⁴⁰ Speech at the European Commission conference “35th anniversary of the Eurobarometer”, Paris, 21 November 2008

They decided the EU hadn't been sufficiently vocal about its achievements and kick-started a huge and multi-faceted campaign to "inform" people about the EU and its policies, to "involve" them in the process, and to "foster active European citizenship", activities which would eventually win people around to the idea of EU integration.

They began to describe the problem as "the communication gap" between the EU and its citizens.⁴¹ As the former President of the European Parliament, MEP Nicole Fontaine said in the aftermath of the Irish 'no' vote to the Lisbon Treaty, "We have a communications problem... We haven't explained enough the benefits of European construction... We have been too modest."⁴²

At no point did any of the EU's leading politicians stop and consider the possibility that the rejection of the EU Constitution was a call for real change, or an objection to the gathering pace of integration of the previous ten or twenty years. In fact, some of them actually said that the votes were a call for more Europe, not less. Belgian Prime Minister Guy Verhofstadt, for example, said: "I believe that the citizens' doubts and uncertainty, as for example reflected in the two referendums, actually constitute a plea for more Europe, a strong Europe, and not for less Europe."⁴³

Several initiatives were launched, many of which were continuations of previous programmes feeding into the overall aims of the EU's 2002 'Communication policy'.

Ahead of a review of this policy in 2005, the UK House of Commons EU Scrutiny Committee revealed that it had existing reservations about the EU's 'communication' policy and sought assurances from the Government, warning that "information and communication activities must not degenerate into propaganda for particular institutions or the EU generally. What is needed, as we said in our Report of 23 June 2004, is a strategy which identifies and then concentrates on those EU issues that really are uppermost in citizens' minds."⁴⁴

"We have a communications problem... We haven't explained enough the benefits of European construction... We have been too modest"

But instead the propaganda machine went up a gear. The Commission embarked on a comprehensive policy of 'explaining the benefits' of the EU to citizens, while at the same time stepping up its campaigns to promote EU citizenship and a common EU culture – which it believed would play a crucial role in securing future support for the project.

This pamphlet will look at the dozens of different ways in which the EU uses taxpayers' money to promote European integration. The EU has many campaigns running at the same time which all aim to promote the EU – either directly and sometimes quite candidly through biased publications and funding for pro-EU think tanks; or less directly and sometimes more subtly through efforts to create a common European culture and citizenship, as well as initiatives in schools and universities.

41 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2006:0035:FIN:EN:PDF>

42 Speech at the European Commission conference "35th anniversary of the Eurobarometer", Paris, 21 November 2008

43 Speech at the London School of Economics, 21 March 2006

44 <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200304/cmselect/cmeuleg/42-xxxiv/4213.htm>

Some are short-term efforts, usually lasting for one budget period of 7 years, while many are lengthy programmes which have been running for years – such as the town twinning scheme, or the Jean Monnet programme for sponsoring university studies in EU integration.

The EU's propaganda effort can be broken down into four main activity areas, which all overlap:

- 1) "Communicating Europe": The EU's biased information campaign
- 2) Funding the cheerleaders: Paying NGOs, think-tanks and lobby groups to promote the EU
- 3) Buying loyalty: Promoting European citizenship and a common European culture to engender support for the EU
- 4) Investing in the long-term: Targeting young people

A final section will explain why all this actually matters, and propose some ideas for reform, while a breakdown of the main propaganda budget lines can be found in the annex.

1

‘Communicating Europe’: the EU’s biased information campaign

“Neutral factual information is needed of course, but it is not enough on its own... Genuine communication by the European Union cannot be reduced to the mere provision of information”
Commission Communication on an Information and Communication Strategy for the European Union⁴⁵

“The European Union has grown up as a political project but has not found a place in people’s hearts and minds. The White Paper is the Commission’s proposal to respond to this challenge and to lay the foundation of a European Union Communication Policy”
Margot Wallstrom, EU Communications Commissioner⁴⁶

“Following the rejection of the Nice Treaty in 2001, Ireland knows only too well the importance of communicating Europe. After the French and Dutch rejections of the Constitution, all of Europe knows it now. This campaign will help not only inform people of the different information sources available but will also show the benefits of EU membership”
Charlie McCreevy, EU Internal Market Commissioner⁴⁷

“A sustained effort must be made to explain the benefits that the European Union brings to each Member States in a much more effective way. It is not merely a communication issue, it is a raison d’être of the European project. Effective communication by the EU should therefore be seen primarily as a public-service duty”
Margot Wallstrom, EU Communications Commissioner⁴⁸

For 2008 alone, the EU had a €206.6 million budget set aside purely for “Communication”, run by the European Commission’s Directorate-General for Communication, which employs around a thousand people.⁴⁹ This is three times the budget dedicated to tackling fraud, and two and a half times the size of the Commission’s budget for negotiating international trade on behalf of 27 member states.⁵⁰

The overall objective of the department is “to inform the media and the public about European Union activities and policies, to inform the Commission, the media and the public about trends in public opinion in the Member States.” As we will see, this information is far from neutral.

In addition to this, all of the other Commission departments (or DGs) also have communication units, plus budgets for ‘information activities’, ‘communications’, ‘publications’, or ‘promotional material’ relating specifically to their subject area. Much of this can fairly be described as propaganda, since it offers only limited and biased information and seeks to promote the EU and its activities. Some of the budget lines are fairly explicit in this objective.

45 2 October 2002 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2002/com2002_0350en02.pdf

46 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2006:0035:FIN:EN:PDF>

47 Mr. McCreevy made this statement during the launch of a ‘Europe Direct’ campaign in his home country, Ireland: http://www.bcc.ie/decisions_details/Mar%202007/285.06%20286.06%20287.06%20Ms.%20P%20Mckenna%20Summary%20Complaint.doc

48 <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/05/296&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

49 Statistical Bulletin of the Personnel of the Commission, July 2008

50 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/budget/data/AP2009_VOL4/EN/index.html

For example, the Commission budget title “Economic and Financial Affairs” contains a €7.7m budget line “intended to cover the funding of priority information measures on Community policies on all aspects of the rules and functioning of EMU, of the benefits of closer policy coordination and structural reforms and to address information needs of citizens, local authorities and enterprises in relation to the euro.”⁵¹

In addition to the Commission’s promotional spending, the other EU institutions also have substantial budgets for ‘information’, such as the Committee of the Regions, for example, which spends around €1.6m a year on publications and “dissemination of information”.

However it is impossible to put a figure on how much is spent on information, either for the Commission or other institutions, since the budgets for information are usually merged in with other activities in the overall budget.

The EU is fairly open about its objective to use the communication budget to promote the EU. As well as clues in the breakdown of the EU budget, there is also a wealth of evidence in the Commission’s policy papers that the objective of the EU is not merely to provide information to citizens and the media about the EU, but to influence their perception of the EU by giving all information efforts a slant.

The UK Government’s influence in this is minimal. As the Europe Minister once admitted: “The FCO has not given any detailed input into information or publicity materials produced by the EU Institutions.”⁵²

1 The EU’s Communication Policy - a mandate for bias

After the Irish ‘no’ to Nice: “Fighting ignorance and apathy” with non-neutral information

The Commission first mooted the idea of a comprehensive ‘Communication policy’ in 2001, following the rejection of the Nice Treaty in Ireland. A Commission paper on “A new framework for co-operation on activities concerning the information and communication policy of the European Union” read:

“The result of the recent Irish referendum on the Nice Treaty makes it more necessary than ever to bring together all participants in the effort to provide information about the European Union.”⁵³

A subsequent paper in October 2002 established “an information and communication strategy for the European Union.” This talked explicitly of the need for a communication campaign based on non-neutral information which would win the public over to the EU.⁵⁴ It said:

“The time is now right for a coherent and comprehensive information and communication policy for the European Union which will improve public perceptions of the Union and of its role... if the institutions were to be brought closer to the public, there would have to be concerted action by the institutions and the Member States to win it over to the Union’s main objectives.”

51 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/budget/data/P2009_VOL4/EN/nmc-titleN10A78/nmc-chapterN10C48/index.html#N10C48

52 PQ 133092, Hansard 23 April 2007, col 912W

53 June 2001 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2001/com2001_0354en01.pdf

54 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2002/com2002_0350en02.pdf

It talked about “the ignorance, particularly among young people, not only of what the Union has achieved but also of how it operates and what its real powers are.” It continued:

“The public is aware that it is poorly informed on Europe. It is only too ready to blame not only the media and national authorities, but also the European institutions, for the perceived ignorance or prejudice. Fighting ignorance and apathy is now a must for the European Union... The ignorance or lack of understanding typical of the public’s relationship with the European Union is not inevitable. It is due largely to the complexity of the European process but also to the absence of an EU information and communication policy on the part of both the European institutions and the Member States.”

“The main point is to improve popular perceptions of the Union or, in short, to boost the general awareness of the European dimension of citizenship”

“A genuine information and communication policy was the main prerequisite for the development of better governance in Europe... a sharing of responsibility between the Union and the Member States must prompt each partner to develop a more coherent and more confident information and communication policy which will allow Europe and the individual Member States to rediscover a sense of oneness and of belonging to the same community.”

“Neutral factual information is needed of course, but it is not enough on its own... Genuine communication by the European Union cannot be reduced to the mere provision of information.”

“The main point is to improve popular perceptions of the Union or, in short, to boost the general awareness of the European dimension of citizenship.”

“The European Union must develop a genuine teaching function in relation to its role and tasks... the European Union must take a more didactic stance on its policies in order to meet the needs inherent in better governance.”

The paper advocated “general information aiming to boost awareness of the Union’s existence and legitimacy, polishing its image and highlighting its role”, and said: “To improve its communication capacity on this basis, the European Union must begin by gradually developing the means of controlling its image.”

An objective was identified “To improve perceptions of the European Union, its institutions and their legitimacy by enhancing familiarity with and comprehension of its tasks, structure and achievements and establishing dialogue with the general public.”

€5.9 million was devoted to the objectives outlined in the paper over a 4-year period.

After the French and Dutch ‘no’ votes: highlighting the “tangible benefits” of the EU in order “to earn people’s interest and trust”

However, this policy of targeting people’s perceived “ignorance” of the EU with the use of targeted information and the EU playing a “didactic” role of educator did little to close the very real gap between the people and the EU project. To many people’s surprise, the EU Constitution was subsequently rejected in 2005 in referendums in France and the Netherlands – two of the EU’s founding and traditionally very pro-EU members. Once again, the reaction to the vote was

that better “communication” – in other words more promotion of the EU – rather than better policies and processes, was the answer.

Immediately after the ‘no’ votes the Commission came up with an “Action Plan to improve communicating Europe by the Commission” in July 2005. Its main objective was “to ensure more effective communication about Europe supported within the Commission by a modern and more professional approach across all departments.”

It was clear that the idea was to spend even more money to actively promote the EU. It said, “By working and planning together, the various Commission departments will improve the communication and image of this institution and of the European Union as a whole.”⁵⁵

It stated explicitly that information on the EU must be weighed in its favour: “Communication is more than information... It is not a neutral exercise devoid of value, it is an essential part of the political process.”

It identified a number of problems with past communication and information campaigns, criticising the fact that “current campaigns focus on the political elite and media and fail to portray the benefits and consequences for day-to-day life in a direct and understandable manner” – clearly an intention to do just that from now on.

It outlined a number of ideas “to earn people’s interest and trust”, and said that “EU policies and activities, as well as their impact on everyday lives, have to be communicated and advocated”.

One of its objectives was identified as “Describing the tangible benefits of EU policies through short, simple introductions to key Commission proposals, in a layman’s summary”, and “Becoming more professional in communication through specific training and recruitment of communication specialists.”

“Communication is more than information... It is not a neutral exercise devoid of value, it is an essential part of the political process”

Ironically – given the failure of EU leaders to properly heed the French and Dutch ‘no’ votes – under the section on “listening”, the paper noted that “Europe’s citizens want to make their voices in Europe heard and their democratic participation should have a direct bearing on EU policy formulation and output”. As became clear in the subsequent years, EU leaders had no intention of giving any real meaning to this statement, proceed as they did with the rejected Constitution by renaming it the Lisbon Treaty, and attempting to circumvent the subsequent Irish ‘no’ vote.

“the appointment of a Vice-President responsible for Institutional Affairs and Communications Strategy has emphasised the European Commission’s desire to achieve results in this sphere”

The new life that was to be breathed into the EU’s communication effort around this time was symbolised by the appointment of a Vice-President of the Commission responsible for Institutional Affairs and Communications Strategy – a post taken by Margot Wallstrom. As the paper noted, “the appointment of a Vice-President responsible for Institutional Affairs and Communications Strategy has emphasised the European Commission’s desire to achieve results in this sphere.”

55 <http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/2/2005/EN/2-2005-985-EN-F-0.Pdf>

Rather than just providing information, the idea was clearly to manipulate the type of information the Commission planned to 'communicate': "The intention is to focus resources on communicating better on fewer subjects and approaching as many EU citizens as possible."

Indeed the whole paper reads like a political campaign strategy. One stated objective is "Presenting a single face – Presentation and visual communication in all policy areas will evolve towards a unified Commission presentation to enhance recognition and avoid confusion in all material addressing and visible to the general public. Slogans and symbols should be simple and repetitive."

The paper states that Commission officials are its "ambassadors", and that the Spokesperson's Service under the political authority of the President of the Commission should engage in a "more systematic rebuttal of false claims" about the EU in the media.

It said: "A particular emphasis should be put on cooperating with well-known personalities ("ambassadors"), from the cultural, business, sport or any other areas of interest to target audiences."

It stated that 'communication' had to underpin everything the Commission does: "When proposing the 2007 budget the European Commission will take account of the fact that communication is an inbuilt cost in all activities. It is not enough simply to adopt a law: it needs to be communicated in the language the citizens understand."

Controversially, the paper also mooted the idea of Commission officials doing internships "in businesses or civil society organisations in Member States in order to enhance understanding in their areas in preparing and communicating policies."

Other specific proposals for achieving the objectives of the White Paper will be looked at in subsequent sections of this paper, such as those on influencing the media.

€231.9 million was dedicated to carrying out the tasks identified in the Action Plan for the period 2006 to 2013.⁵⁶

"Slogans and symbols should be simple and repetitive"

'Plan D'

Following the Action Plan, the Commission launched its campaign 'Plan D for Democracy, Dialogue and Debate' in October 2005, for which it allocated around €15 million in 2005/2006 alone.⁵⁷

Perceiving a gap between the EU and its citizens, the plan was "intended to involve citizens in a wide-ranging discussion on the European Union – what it is for, where it is going and what it should be doing." The aim was "listening better", "explaining better" and "going local" to engage European citizens. It included ideas such as regular visits by Commissioners to member states and a 'European Citizens' Project'.

It was described as "a listening exercise so that the European Union can act on the concerns expressed by its citizens", but it was also clearly stated that "The objective of the Commission is to stimulate this debate and seek recognition for the added value that the European Union can provide."⁵⁸

⁵⁶ <http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/2/2005/EN/2-2005-985-EN-F-0.Pdf>

⁵⁷ €9 million was initially allocated in 2005, and in 2006 the Commission supported a Parliament proposal to make an extra €6 million available http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/wallstrom/pdf/communication_planD_en.pdf

⁵⁸ http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/proposals-plan-d_en.pdf

Indeed the idea was less about listening to what citizens really wanted, than persuading them about the benefits of the EU. Three themes were recommended, including:

“Feeling towards Europe and the Union’s tasks: Building on previous achievements and the concrete benefits brought to them in their daily lives by the Union (e.g. food safety, Erasmus, single currency, consumer protection, internal market), the debate could consider what people think should be done at local level and what they see as the future role for the Union, including developing an area of justice, freedom and security or dealing with climate change and natural disasters.”⁵⁹

“The objective of the Commission is to stimulate this debate and seek recognition for the added value that the European Union can provide”

It said: “The initiative of the Commission seeks to inspire EU citizens to become politically active in the debate on the future of Europe; to publicize the added value that the European Union brings; and to encourage government, political parties and opinion formers to place the issue of Europe at the forefront of public consciousness.”⁶⁰

Much of the initiative was about organising “debates” on Europe in the different member states – however, as of May 2008 there was still no information on the website about which organisations actually benefited from the money.

Part of the exercise involved EU Communications Commissioner Margot Wallstrom launching a blog and occasional webchats to “listen” to citizens. A recent webchat which the *Telegraph* commented on allowed 15 guests to join in. Three of them worked for *cafebabel.com*, a Commission funded think-tank; one of them worked for Margot Wallstrom herself; one of them worked for the Commission-funded European Movement; one was the Vice-President of the Young European Federalists (also funded by the EU); one described himself as “Long-time federalist and ex-coordinator of the YES Campaign”; another worked for EU’s Publications Office in Luxembourg; and four were activists from the heavily Commission-funded NGO ActionAid, who said: “From the perspective of the Southern hemisphere, there is a regret that there is not a stronger Europe to counter-balance US hegemony.”

Finally, there was Reijo Kempinnen, head of the European Commission’s delegation to the United Kingdom. Mrs Wallstrom asked him: “Reijo tell us the true attitude of the people in UK towards the EU”, to which he replied: “Margot, honestly, I believe most Brits are just closet europhiles who do not simply know that it’s alright to come out.”⁶¹

All of this was designed to be the Commission’s contribution to the ‘period of reflection’ called for by member states following the no votes. But rather than actually listening, the idea was to convince people of the benefits of the EU so that they would accept further EU integration. Part of the strategy involved repackaging the EU Constitution to look more like just another Treaty and bringing it back two years later for parliamentary ratification.

Specifically, Plan D involved six projects co-funded by the Commission. These were:

“**Tomorrow’s Europe**”. Billed as “the first Europe-wide Deliberative Poll”, this was a three-day meeting of 362 citizens from all 27 EU countries who discussed the future of the EU. It was run

59 http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/wallstrom/pdf/communication_planD_en.pdf

60 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=2005&nu_doc=494&lg=en

61 20 April 2008 <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/migrationtemp/1508259/Plan-D-For-Democracy.html#continue>

by Notre Europe – a strongly pro-integration organisation whose slogan is “Thinking a United Europe”.⁶² It was paid more than €849,000 for this project in 2006 alone.⁶³

“**European Citizens Consultations**” is described as “the first-ever pan-European debate involving citizens from all 27 Member States to debate the future of the European Union across the boundaries of geography and language.” It was run by the King Baudouin Foundation in Belgium,⁶⁴ which was allocated more than €1.89 million in 2006 alone.⁶⁵

“**Speak up Europe!**” is a campaign that was “conceived by the European Movement International and its partners.”⁶⁶ It apparently “seeks to collect opinions and concern of the European citizens on a range of topics”, but in practice one of its main components is an animated website called “What has Europe ever done for us?”, which lists the EU’s achievements (see below for more details). The European Movement was paid more than €719,000 for this project in 2006 alone.⁶⁷

Running until the end of 2007, the campaign involved 300 events across the EU, with online forums and multimedia content, plus on-line polls, questionnaires, pre and post-debate voting and on-line chat rooms. However, questions have to be asked about the balance of the exercise when the final “evaluation meeting” of the project was held by the Young European Federalists.⁶⁸

The final report of the exercise claimed that “More citizens thought the EU was more efficient than their national governments. A vast majority thought that the EU should acquire new competences or areas of policy.”⁶⁹ In fact, independent opinion polls suggest the opposite is true – a poll of French and Dutch voters in May 2006, for instance, found that, given a choice, a majority of people in both countries would prefer the EU to have less powers than it currently does, and only 18% in France and 15% in the Netherlands wanted to give the EU more powers.⁷⁰

“Thinking a United Europe”

“**Our message to Europe**”, run by the German organisation Deutsche Gesellschaft, was a similar initiative involving events, opinion polls and films.⁷¹ Deutsche Gesellschaft was paid €250,000 for the project in 2006 alone.⁷²

The “**Our Europe**” project, run by the European House (Europa Haz) in Hungary, is described as follows:

“The project pays special attention to inform general public on the impact of various EU policies on citizens’ everyday life and at the same time provokes discussions through which citizens can voice their concerns, opinions and proposals on European issues, thereby narrowing the gap, building bridges between citizens and Europe. The various project elements respect the national

62 <http://www.notre-europe.eu/en/>

63 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/grants_2006_comma2.pdf

64 <http://www.european-citizens-consultations.eu/2.0.html>

65 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/grants_2006_comma2.pdf

66 http://www.speakupeurope.eu/fileadmin/files_speakupeurope/pdf/speakup_campaignbriefing.pdf

67 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/grants_2006_comma2.pdf . See Part Two for details about the European Movement.

68 [http://www.speakupeurope.eu/5240.html?&tx_ttnews\[tt_news\]=1394&tx_ttnews\[backPid\]=5149&cHash=4a7cff4b8a](http://www.speakupeurope.eu/5240.html?&tx_ttnews[tt_news]=1394&tx_ttnews[backPid]=5149&cHash=4a7cff4b8a)

69 http://www.speakupeurope.eu/fileadmin/files_speakupeurope/pdf/finalreport.pdf

70 Polls by BVA and Maurice de Hond: <http://www.openeurope.org.uk/media-centre/pressrelease.aspx?pressreleaseid=18>

71 <http://www.deutsche-gesellschaft-ev.de/our-message-to-europe/>

72 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/grants_2006_comma2.pdf

characteristics but at the same time go beyond a national vision and underline the importance of the European added value of the common 'European project'".⁷³

Europa Haz was paid more than €254,000 for the project in 2006 alone.⁷⁴

The "Radio Web Europe" project, run by Italian organisation Cenasca Cisl, has a multimedia website featuring short films such as "United we are strong", interviews with MEPs and "young Europeans" ("Never too young to be European!").⁷⁵ Cenasca was paid more than €556,000 for the project in 2006 alone.⁷⁶

According to the Commission, "overall approximately 40,000 people took part in the six transnational Plan D projects in person and hundreds of thousands are estimated to have participated virtually via the Internet. The civil society organisations managing the projects served as multipliers and disseminated the views expressed by citizens through their political and media networks, at different stages of the projects."⁷⁷

But what real difference did it make to the EU's outlook? The EU establishment continued to ignore the views of millions of people who had voted no to further EU integration. Millions of euros were spent "listening", but there has been no discernable change in the way the EU operates. Clearly the crux of the EU's communication policy and Plan D was trying to persuade them to like the EU, rather than genuinely listening to citizens.

"United we are strong"

The Commission concluded that "The Plan D civil society projects showed that participatory democracy can usefully supplement representative democracy."⁷⁸

'Replace' may be a more accurate word than 'supplement', given the clear and deliberate desire to move away from referendums we have seen since the series of 'no votes in France, the Netherlands and Ireland. As Irish Europe Minister Dick Roche said in the aftermath of the Irish 'no' vote to the Lisbon Treaty "the first thing to learn about referendums – is to avoid them."⁷⁹

Post Plan-D: developing a "European public sphere" to ensure "support for the European project"

Mid-way through the Plan D campaign, the Commission produced another White Paper on EU Communications Policy in 2006.⁸⁰

Acknowledging that much of the Commission's efforts on 'communications' had hitherto "remained too much of a 'Brussels affair'", it proposed "a fundamentally new approach", including "genuine dialogue between the people and the policymakers and lively political discussion among citizens themselves", with people having "fair and full information about the European Union" and confidence that their views and concerns "are heard by the EU institutions." It said that "Communication should become an EU policy in its own right."

73 http://www.ourdebate.eu/index.php?oldal=hirek&id_hirek=38

74 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/grants_2006_comma2.pdf

75 <http://www.radiowebeurope.eu/uk/home/>

76 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/grants_2006_comma2.pdf

77 http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/wallstrom/pdf/com_2008_158-4_en.pdf

78 http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/wallstrom/pdf/com_2008_158-4_en.pdf

79 Speech at the European Commission conference "35th anniversary of the Eurobarometer", Paris, 21 November 2008

80 http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/madrid/pdf/white_paper.pdf

Free and fair information sounds like a great idea, but unfortunately, the White Paper went on to explain that the underlying objective of all this was not in fact to give people more information for the sake of it, but to ensure “support for the European project.” It said: “The European Parliament, Member States and the representation of European citizens have a special role to play, as peoples’ support for the European project is a matter of common interest.”

The paper identified “a sense of alienation from ‘Brussels’”, and said that “One reason for this is the inadequate development of a ‘European public sphere’ where the European debate can unfold.” There was no mention of the need for more accountable and democratic institutions and policy-making procedures through reform, just meaningless proposals for a “web-based citizens’ forum”, “improving civic education”, and “new meeting places for Europeans.”

“Communication should become an EU policy in its own right”

One welcome proposal, however, was: “The three main institutions could also consider organising joint open debates to complement Parliamentary debates, taking questions from the public or from journalists”, but this idea has so far not seen the light of day.

€1.28 million was earmarked for the implementation of the ideas set out in the White Paper, for 2006 alone.

This was followed up by yet another paper in October 2007 called “Communicating Europe in Partnership”, which discussed possible improvements to this plan, including a proposal for “an Inter-Institutional Agreement on Communicating Europe in Partnership.”⁸¹ Its premise was that “the EU value added is significant but not easy to communicate.”⁸²

Again it spoke of the need for “full and comprehensive information on the European Union” and involving citizens “in a permanent dialogue”. Both are laudable aims, but neither have been achieved.

The cost for the programme for 2008 would be around €88 million, drawn from existing budgets.

“the EU value added is significant but not easy to communicate”

The paper noted that “information on the EU seems disorganised, dispersed and difficult to understand”, which is a valid observation, but went on to state: “EU issues are mainly seen through national lenses and rarely presented in a trans-national context, despite the fact that many practical challenges faced by citizens can only be solved at European level.”

The focus of the new strategy was the “development of a European public sphere” through “promoting active European citizenship”, which, it was hoped, would help to win people round to the EU.

Some of the specifics of the Paper, such as a proposal for the Commission to provide “audiovisual information, education,” and, curiously, “entertainment on European affairs,” will be discussed

81 In the end the proposal for an Inter-Institutional Agreement was dropped, following objections from the UK and other member states, plus the Council’s Legal Service, that there was no legal base for it. (Scrutiny docs “Communicating Europe”

82 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2007/com2007_0568en01.pdf

in the relevant sections below.

The Paper also revealed that the Commission was planning to promote the Lisbon Treaty – it said it would “launch a follow-up communication to Plan D, as well as a new set of Plan D civil society projects, with the overall objective of supporting the ratification process for the Reform Treaty and increasing participation in the 2009 European Parliament elections.”

It rightly said: “There is a desire for a more open debate, where citizens express their opinions in order to influence the decision-making at EU level.” One wonders why, then, EU leaders spent 2007 trying to avoid further referendums on the EU Treaty.⁸³

‘Debate Europe’

‘Plan D’ officially ended in June 2007 when the European Council agreed on a mandate for a new intergovernmental conference, which led to the Lisbon Treaty. It then moved into a second phase – called “**Debate Europe**”, for which the EU budgeted €2 million for 2008.⁸⁴ The total budget is €7.2 million⁸⁵, but as pointed out by the Government when it looked at the proposal, it is not clear whether this is in addition to or part of the wider €88 million budget for ‘Communicating Europe in Partnership.’⁸⁶

The Commission’s proposal for Debate Europe stated: “Plan D focused on the “debate and dialogue” part of the process. The follow up to Plan D will take this process one step further and focus on ‘D for democracy’.”⁸⁷

The idea was to take the process of ‘citizen dialogue’ a step further, focussing on enabling citizens to articulate their wishes directly to decision-makers and making better use of the media – particularly the internet – in the process. There is also much emphasis on the involvement of the other institutions, including programmes such as officials and MEPs visiting their old schools and universities.

The idea “is to strengthen plan D in preparation for the European elections in June 2009.”⁸⁸ It mainly consists of an online discussion with European Commissioners through which people can deliver their views on the future of Europe.⁸⁹ It also includes “pan-European public consultations; online networks bridging the divide between European and national politics; exhibitions, debates and seminars hosted by the EU in capital cities, and promotion among internet users of the online forum Debate Europe.”

NGOs and think-tanks like those involved in Plan D are to be funded to run similar projects, and at the time of writing a call for proposals was underway. (Judging by the recipients of funds from previous campaigns, it is likely that the usual pro-integration groups will be selected to run the campaigns – see below for more).

When the Commons EU Scrutiny Committee debated the proposal for Debate Europe in June 2008 it held it under scrutiny pending further information. It suggested the Commission had not

83 For more on this, see “E-who? Politics behind closed doors”, by Bruno Waterfield <http://www.manifestoclub.com/files/EU%20Essays.pdf>

84 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/prog2008_en.pdf

85 http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/wallstrom/pdf/com_2008_158-4_en.pdf

86 <http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm200708/cmselect/cmeuleg/16-xxiv/16xxiv06.htm>

87 http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/wallstrom/pdf/com_2008_158-4_en.pdf

88 http://ec.europa.eu/news/eu_explained/080402_1_en.htm

89 http://europa.eu/debateeurope/index_en.htm

displayed a clear enough intention to consult groups which may not agree with it on Europe's future – both in the Debate Europe plans and the previous 'Communicating Europe in Partnership' policy. The Clerk of the Committee wrote:

"In considering the Commission's related Communication on 'Communicating Europe in Partnership', the Committee has been concerned that the playing field be level, so that funding is available to enable the discussion of competing 'visions' of how the EU should develop, and not just those endorsed by the Commission. This applies equally to the 'Debate Europe' project. I suggest that the Committee asks the Minister how this is to be guaranteed".⁹⁰

The Commission responded by saying: "In no way is it [Debate Europe] designed to promote the Commission's 'vision' of the EU. Abiding to the Commission 'vision' of the EU is neither a selection nor an award criterion."⁹¹

However, a closer look at the proposed activities under the programme reveal that Debate Europe aims "to reinforce the Commission's efforts to explain the added value of EU policies to citizens".⁹² It even concludes that "Public support for the EU can only be built through lively and open debate and by getting citizens actively involved in European affairs."⁹³

The paper also identifies a need to promote active European citizenship in order to "empower citizens", which will also be discussed in Part Three. It says: "This is one of the central objectives of the Commission's communication policy: to empower citizens, by promoting active European citizenship."

The Government has also expressed reservations about the Commission's approach to engendering support for the EU – suggesting that the Commission has not been focussed enough on the importance of making sure the EU actually adds value for citizens.

It told the Committee that while it supported the Commission's proposals in the White Paper:

"We believe that the key issue of public support for the EU is not solely dependent on dialogue, debate and improved coordination on EU Communications. We believe an important factor is to ensure that the EU is focussed on delivery and adding value for citizens. This helps the UK and other Member States to underline the value of EU Membership in areas of interest to the public."⁹⁴

"Public support for the EU can only be built through lively and open debate and by getting citizens actively involved in European affairs"

After the Irish 'no' to Lisbon – more of the same

Despite all these stated efforts to improve the EU's ability to "listen" to citizens, and all of the millions of euros spent creating projects to show they were listening, the EU once again spectacularly failed to live up to its word when it refused to accept the result of the Irish referendum on the Lisbon Treaty in June 2008.

90 10 June 2008

91 <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200708/cmselect/cmeuleg/16-xxxi/16xxxi04.htm>

92 http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/wallstrom/pdf/com_2008_158-4_en.pdf

93 http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/wallstrom/pdf/com_2008_158-4_en.pdf

94 <http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm200708/cmselect/cmeuleg/16-xxiv/16xxiv06.htm>

More than 53% of people in Ireland – the only country allowed a referendum on the text – voted against the Treaty, and the only independent pan-European poll of voters in all 27 member states suggested that 16 other countries would also have voted no if they had been given a chance in a referendum.⁹⁵

But instead of accepting the vote and abandoning the Treaty, as they should have following the French and Dutch no votes in 2005, EU leaders immediately met in Brussels to try and find a “solution” to the “problem” of the Irish ‘no’ vote. Comments from nearly all EU leaders, plus the Commission, revealed that none of them had the slightest regard for the democratic process which had returned an answer they did not want to hear.⁹⁶

“One of Europe’s main problems is that we have not transformed our common values into a sort of citizenship, a European consciousness”

To take just one example of many, the leader of the SPD party in the German Bundestag said: “We think it is a real cheek that the country that has benefited most from the EU should do this. There is no other Europe than this treaty. With all respect for the Irish vote, we cannot allow the huge majority of Europe to be duped by a minority of a minority of a minority.”⁹⁷ Commission President Jose Barroso said: “The Treaty is not dead. The Treaty is alive, and we will try to work to find a solution.”⁹⁸

Indeed, immediately after the ‘no’ vote the message from the Commission and its supporters was just more of the same: that the vote was the result of a communication problem – rather than a fault with the EU itself – its policies, its processes and its lack of accountability. The Commission showed a total unwillingness or inability to recognise that ‘communication’ is not a sufficient solution to growing dissatisfaction with the EU, and may indeed even be part of the problem.

Nowhere was this more in evidence than at a European Commission conference on the ‘35th anniversary of the Eurobarometer’, (the EU’s in-house polling arm) in November 2008. Former President of the European Parliament and MEP Nicole Fontaine summed up the overriding view of the participants when she said: “We have a communications problem... We haven’t explained enough the benefits of European construction... We have been too modest.” French Europe Minister Jean-Pierre Jouyet said, “One of Europe’s main problems is that we have not transformed our common values into a sort of citizenship, a European consciousness.”⁹⁹

Reporting on an event in the European Parliament, EU-funded news service Euractiv said: “In the aftermath of the Irish ‘no’ to the Lisbon Treaty, European institutions are yet again confronted with their failure to communicate the benefits of Europe with citizens, Commission Vice-President Margot Wallström and Parliament Vice President Alejo Vidal-Quadras told EurActiv on two separate occasions.”¹⁰⁰

Indeed the response of Margot Wallstrom, EU Communications Commissioner, to the Irish ‘no’ vote was: “We can’t get a quick fix. We have to invest in the long term. We need to consider new methods, like citizen consultations, and the creation of media networks.”¹⁰¹

95 TNS poll for Open Europe, March 2007: <http://www.openeurope.org.uk/media-centre/pressrelease.aspx?pressreleaseid=31>

96 For a comprehensive list of examples, see “EU Phrasebook: 27 Ways to say, No Doesn’t Really Mean No”, by Josie Appleton, Manifesto Club

97 Irish Times, 14 June 2008

98 Press conference, 14 June 2008

99 Speech at the European Commission conference “35th anniversary of the Eurobarometer”, Paris, 21 November 2008

100 <http://www.euractiv.com/en/future-eu/top-eu-officials-ask-capitals-boost-communication/article-173848>

101 <http://www.euractiv.com/en/future-eu/top-eu-officials-ask-capitals-boost-communication/article-173848>

Spanish MEP Alejo Vidal-Quadras, the Vice President of the European Parliament, who also chairs the Parliament's working group on communication, responded saying Europe is faced with "an endless communication problem." Attaching great importance to MyParl – "a project creating a web space where European parliamentarians and national parliamentarians can interact, exchange views and debate", he said:

"I think (MyParl) is a promising project. Anything that can contribute to creating new spaces of interaction between the national level and the European level, to make people aware of the importance of European integration project, on the influence of the European institutions work on their lives, all this is essential."¹⁰²

"We have to invest in the long term. We need to consider new methods, like citizen consultations, and the creation of media networks"

Improving the EU's 'communication policy' is not the sole concern of the European Commission. The European Economic and Social Committee has also offered its views on how to sell Europe better. In a July 2008 paper, it proposed:

"making available to Member States a common core of knowledge on the European integration process and its values and achievements. This should be identical for all, translated into every language and endorsed by the European Parliament. Whilst intended primarily for the civic education of pupils, it should take a form that can also be used by multipliers such as teachers, journalists, local elected politicians and members of civil society. The opinion also proposes making coverage of Europe a public service obligation for audiovisual media, considering European affairs as internal affairs rather than external or international ones and making good use of sports events, national festivals and Europe Day to speak about Europe."¹⁰³

2 EU communication policy in practice

A Biased promotional leaflets and websites

The Commission says that one of the central objectives of its communication policy is "empowering citizens by giving them access to information so that they may be in a position to hold an informed debate on EU affairs."¹⁰⁴

But the information available tends overwhelmingly to concentrate only on the benefits of the EU, constantly emphasising the 'success stories' with almost no mention whatsoever of any downsides or shortcomings. For this reason, the EU's information campaign reads like pure propaganda.

Indeed anyone wanting to find out about the EU can easily find whole swathes of leaflets, booklets, cartoons and websites purporting to provide information about the EU but which also – in the most part – serve to promote it. Significantly, many of these are aimed specifically at children and young people, which will be addressed in more detail in Part Four. There is a common theme running through them all – that the EU is a success story across a wide variety of areas.

102 <http://www.euractiv.com/en/future-eu/top-eu-officials-ask-capitals-boost-communication/article-173848>

103 <http://www.eesc.europa.eu/activities/press/cp/docs/2008/communique-presse-eesc-069-2008-EN.doc>

104 http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/wallstrom/pdf/com_2008_158-4_en.pdf

To cite some of the subheadings of the leaflet "Panorama of the European Union" and other publications, these successes are invariably and repeatedly listed as: "Peace and stability", "Bringing Europe together again", "Safety and Security", "Economic and Social Solidarity", "Identity and Diversity in a globalised world", "Values", "Fewer frontiers, more opportunities", "Going abroad to learn", "a greener Europe", "equal chances", "freedom, security and justice for all", "jobs and growth", "exporting peace and stability", "promoting the common interest," "The rule of law", "Getting value for your money", "A stable currency", and "Lending a helping hand".¹⁰⁵

Whole websites are used to advertise the literature, and there is almost no mention at all of any of the drawbacks of the EU activities, or a sensible argument about any of the EU's failings or any mention of the wide differences of opinion on the EU and its policies.

The website "Celebrating Europe! The 50th Anniversary of the Treaty of Rome"¹⁰⁶ publicises many of these publications in one place, and provides a good snapshot of some of the key literature and webpages used to promote the EU.

As there are far too many examples to list here, below is a selection of some of the most illuminating ones. Many publications are directed firmly at children and young people, and are looked at in Part Four instead.

"What has Europe ever done for us?"¹⁰⁷ Part of the 'Speak up Europe' campaign, run by the European Movement under the auspices of 'Plan D for Democracy', this animated website features a short clip in which a man asks "What has Europe ever done for us?". He is bombarded with answers from a chorus of people shouting "peace", "the single market" and so on. A list of things includes "Cheaper and better phone calls", "Regional Funds" and "A healthier Europe." A "What can I do?" page on the site encourages people to link to the site with logos.

The website explains:

"To show the benefits of the EU is no easy task. We rarely see the immediate results of actions taken at the EU level, and most of them are presented from a national perspective. This has meant that the EU has sometimes in the past been blamed for the outcomes of certain actions, but almost never praised for others. The idea behind the animation 'What has Europe ever done for us?' is to tackle this lack of visibility concerning the results of EU action... The main achievements of the EU are thus presented as a good teaser for the debates."

"Better off in Europe – How the EU's single market benefits you"¹⁰⁸ begins: "This booklet describes some of the many benefits EU citizens enjoy. It is delivering a better life for everyone." It continues:

"All EU citizens benefit from efforts to make the single market an area of freedom, justice and security... Simple overall regulations are in place to protect customers and businesses." It says: "A winning formula: The idea behind the single market is simplicity itself... It is the basic recipe for prosperity." The pamphlet goes on to list many benefits of the single market, in a tone which is far from neutral, and without mentioning a single drawback. Without any

105 http://ec.europa.eu/publications/booklets/eu_glance/60/en.pdf and http://ec.europa.eu/publications/booklets/eu_glance/69/en.pdf

106 http://europa.eu/50/index_en.htm

107 <http://www.whathaseuropedone.eu/>

108 <http://ec.europa.eu/publications/booklets/move/56/en.pdf>

explanation, it claims: “The European Commission reckons that the single market has added more than €800 billion to EU prosperity and created 2.5 million jobs.”

“**50 ways forward – Europe’s best successes**”¹⁰⁹ is a booklet and internet site that:

“If you are lucky enough to be a citizen of the EU”

“aims to show you – in an attractive and entertaining way – how people in Europe, and beyond, have benefited, and will continue to benefit, from European co-operation... Once you start browsing through the booklet, you may well be surprised at the range of success stories. And, let’s not forget, these are only a small sample. You can find out, for example, how millions of young people now study abroad, how ‘.eu’ is building a new European identity on the internet, or what Europe has done to help bring down the cost of air travel. There is a story about how European police catch more criminals by co-operating better, how we are producing cleaner cars and even why travelling with your pets is easier now.”

One section begins with the subliminal message: “If you are lucky enough to be a citizen of the EU...”

“**The EU – What’s in it for me? A no-nonsense guide for UK citizens to what the European Union delivers**”¹¹⁰ is a booklet specifically targeted at UK citizens to explain the benefits of the EU and is distributed by the UK office of the European Commission. The title speaks for itself.

“**Europe in 12 lessons**”¹¹¹ is written by Pascale Fontaine, former assistant to Jean Monnet, and the slant is obvious throughout. It is particularly explicit in some sentences, such as: “Ordinary people need to know ‘who does what in Europe’. Only then will they feel that it is relevant to their daily lives, vote in European elections and support the idea of European integration”, and “The old saying ‘unity is strength’ is as relevant as ever to today’s Europeans. But the process of European integration has not smothered the different ways of life, traditions and cultures of its peoples. Indeed, the EU makes its diversity one of its key values.”

It uses emotional language to promote the EU, such as:

“The European Union is a pact between sovereign nations which have resolved to share a common destiny and to pool an increasing share of their sovereignty. It touches on things that Europeans care most deeply about: peace, economic and physical wellbeing, security, participatory democracy, justice and solidarity. This pact is being strengthened and confirmed all across Europe: half a billion people have chosen to live under the rule of law and in accordance with age-old values centred on humanity and human dignity.”

On enlargement, M. Fontaine notes: “The EU welcomed this chance to help stabilize the European continent and to extend the benefits of European integration to these young democracies.” It argues that “a common EU criminal justice policy is required”.

“**Key facts and figures about Europe and the Europeans**”¹¹² opens with: “The European Union – a success story.” It says “The European Union needs no introduction. Over half a century, it has

109 <http://ec.europa.eu/publications/booklets/others/65/en.pdf>

110 <http://ec.europa.eu/unitedkingdom/pdf/webversion.pdf>

111 http://ec.europa.eu/publications/booklets/eu_glance/60/en.pdf

112 http://ec.europa.eu/publications/booklets/eu_glance/66/en.pdf

brought political stability and economic prosperity to its citizens. It has created a frontier-free single market and a single currency, the euro. It has reunited a fractured continent." A section on whether or not people in the EU think their country has benefited from the EU is titled: "Reaping the benefits."

"How the European Union works – your guide to the EU institutions"¹¹³ picks up the usual familiar themes, by kicking off with: "Family squabbles and occasional crises are what make the news headlines, but away from the cameras the EU is actually a remarkable success story."

"Family squabbles and occasional crises are what make the news headlines, but away from the cameras the EU is actually a remarkable success story"

"Travelling in Europe 2008"¹¹⁴ begins with: "Europe: a continent with thousands of years of history, a rich cultural heritage and some of the world's most breathtaking scenery. So much for the traveller to discover and explore and all made much easier thanks to the European Union (EU)."

"Troubled Waters".¹¹⁵ As part of its campaign material for the 2004 elections, the European Parliament published a comic called 'Troubled Waters' in which a fictitious MEP Irina Vega goes about negotiating legislation to safeguard drinking water. The propaganda is subtle, but it is there. For instance, acknowledging the controversial fact that the

Parliament has two meeting places, the heroine remarks: "I seem to spend my whole life on the train between Brussels and Strasbourg, but I'd hate to have to choose between mussels and chips and Strasbourg onion tart."

"The EU at a glance"¹¹⁶ is a website looking briefly at a range of areas in which the EU has competence. One part asks: "what results so far" has the EU achieved, and lists "Frontier-free travel and trade, the euro (the single European currency), safer food and a greener environment, better living standards in poorer regions, joint action on crime and terror, cheaper phone calls and air travel, millions of opportunities to study abroad ... and much more besides."¹¹⁷

Rotating messages on the homepage read: "Did you know that EU regional aid has raised the living standards of the poor regions in Europe?"; "Did you know the EU has made Europe the world leader in using and making mobile phones, thanks to its common technical standards?" and "Did you know that the EU has ensured that there has been no war between its members for the last 60 years?"¹¹⁸

"The European Union aims to be a fair and caring society"

Its section on "Key facts and figures about Europe and the Europeans" states: "The European Union aims to be a fair and caring society, committed to promoting economic prosperity and creating jobs by making companies more competitive and giving workers new skills."

113 http://ec.europa.eu/publications/booklets/eu_glance/68/en.pdf

114 http://ec.europa.eu/publications/booklets/eu_glance/72/en.pdf

115 <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/elections2004/ep-election/sites/en/infotainment/>

116 http://europa.eu/abc/index_en.htm

117 http://europa.eu/abc/panorama/index_en.htm

118 http://europa.eu/abc/index_en.htm

The section on “The budget of the European Union: How your money is spent”, reports that:

“Using only 1% of its overall wealth each year, the EU is building our common future and assuming global responsibilities. The focus of spending decisions is on meeting the challenges of the modern world to our society in the interests of a better life for the citizens of the EU. The money is primarily spent, therefore, on reducing income and social disparities across the EU, promoting the mobility which open internal borders make possible, on freedom, security and justice within the EU’s external borders, and on reinforcing the EU’s cultural diversity. Significant sums are also spent outside its border because the EU’s economic and political weight in the world confers global responsibilities.”¹¹⁹

“far from being an ivory-tower institution cut off from the world around it, the EU is in fact very close to its citizens”

“In practice, most of the money is spent in the member states, and, far from being an ivory-tower institution cut off from the world around it, the EU is in fact very close to its citizens... The EU touches our lives in ways we now take for granted. They include low air fares, cheaper phone calls, cuts in car prices and borderless travel across much of the European continent. We also have the EU to thank for a cleaner environment, safer food, the right to healthcare when we travel and a single currency for nearly two-thirds of the EU’s citizens. Many of the achievements result from the economies of scale and greater efficiency that can come from pooling resources in order to create more and better jobs, and preserve our way of life for ourselves and future generations.”¹²⁰

B Promotional films on “EUtube”

In addition to the wide range of literature and websites full of publications, the Commission even has its own channel on You-Tube, called EUtube¹²¹, which it launched in June 2007. The Commission uses it to post promotional films about the EU, of which there are now over a hundred.

They all carry the EU flag in the bottom left-hand corner. Examples are:

“**Back to School**” is a poignant film about “A young boy [who] goes back to school in a poor region of Cairo, with the support of funds from the European Commission, as part of the EU’s European Neighbourhood Policy.”

“**Bringing space down to earth!**” promotes European space applications, including Galileo. The film begins with an incredulous person driving accidentally down a dirt track because their GPS has failed.

“**Youth in Action – Get Involved!**” promotes the EU’s “Youth in Action” programme (see Part Four). It is in the style of a music video, featuring young people in shades and leather jackets dancing and rapping in the streets and in metro stations, whilst waving EU flags. The main verse of the song is “This one’s for youth in action, you gotta be involved, be a part of it.”

“**Building a citizens’ Europe**” promotes the concept of European citizenship, and also specifically promotes the EU’s “Europe for citizens” programme (see Part Three). It gushes that the

119 http://europa.eu/abc/budget/index_en.htm

120 http://europa.eu/abc/budget/use/administration/index_en.htm http://europa.eu/abc/budget/future/index_en.htm#build

121 <http://uk.youtube.com/user/eutube>

programme “Will enable dedicated Europeans to build bridges for meeting other dedicated Europeans. Europe is as strong as the engagement of its citizens.”

“**One day at the DG Commission**” is a collage set to music of a busy day in the department. The irony is hard to miss when the movie jumps to a person in the “strategic planning” meeting asking “Is there any imaginative way that you could think that we could help you to better promote this particular policy?” The reply: “Audiovisual material, internet, Europe Direct?”

The controversial “Filmlovers will love this!” promotes the EU’s MEDIA programme (see Part Three), along with many others. It is a three minute series of clips of people having sex, ending with the words “Let’s come together... Millions of cinema lovers enjoy European films every year... Europe supports European films.” It carries a picture of the EU flag and MEDIA logo. The Commission was delighted with the publicity it generated – receiving more than 7.1 million hits on EUtube.¹²²

Other titles speak for themselves: “50 years of EU in the world”, “European films – what a joy!”, “Europe and You in 2007 – a snapshot of EU achievements”, “Jingle 1957 – 2007: Together”, “Celebrating 40 Years of European Customs Union,” and “Healthcare without borders”.

C “Information networks”

The Commission funds a range of so-called ‘information networks’ in the member states. These help to spread the EU’s message far and wide – distributing the promotional material like that mentioned above to as wide an audience as possible.

The Commission believes that:

“Local-level relays are the cornerstone of decentralised information policy. Their job is to convey the information in line with everyday reality and the local economic context. These relays are grassroots information centres par excellence. They are managed directly by their host bodies (regional or local authorities, public or semi-public bodies etc.). The Commission does not have any responsibility for their day-to-day management, but provides a grant and contributes to technical and documentary assistance on the basis of an agreement signed with the host body. While respecting the relays’ autonomy, initiatives and diversity, the Commission nonetheless ensures that a certain uniformity is retained and their shared identity safeguarded (shared logo).”¹²³

In this context, uniformity means a guarantee of sending out the right message.

The EU’s main information networks are:

i *Europe Direct*

The aim of Europe Direct is “to provide European citizens with a service close to home allowing them: to receive information from the Union on its positions, policies, actions, programmes and financial aid offered by it.”¹²⁴

122 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=koRIFnBIDH0&feature=related>

123 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2001/com2001_0354en01.pdf

124 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/ed-relays-decision_en.pdf

Members of the public can call a free telephone number from anywhere in the EU and ask for information about the EU. They can also use email, contact an operator online, or visit a Europe Direct information centre. The type of information they provide includes “general information about EU matters,” as well as “practical information on dozens of subjects,” including “how to get your qualifications recognised or how to complain about unsafe products”. It also offers “advice to help you overcome practical problems with exercising your rights in Europe.”¹²⁵

All this is relatively innocuous as far as measuring propaganda goes. However, after calling the number and requesting information, the caller is then sent an email which, in addition to the required information, provides a link to a website promoting the Lisbon Treaty and the line: “Treaty of Lisbon – Taking Europe into the 21st century.”

Europe Direct came under fire for biased political campaigning following a series of radio adverts in Ireland, which former Green MEP Patricia McKenna said were “political in content and character... extremely biased and one-sided, and aimed either in whole or in part to influence public opinion in relation to the ongoing public debate on the European Union”. The adverts ostensibly aimed to raise the profile of the Europe Direct information provider, but were reported to the Irish Broadcasting Complaints Commission.¹²⁶

“this campaign will help not only inform people of the different information sources available but will also show the benefits of EU membership”

The European Commission strongly denied the charge, saying, “To describe the message as propaganda is... unfounded.” But the BCC found that the adverts did break Irish broadcasting regulations. It ruled: “the majority of advertisements in the campaign promoted the EU... The Commission [the BCC] was of the view that overall the advertisements of the campaign advocated and promoted EU membership and therefore, were directed towards a political end. Such advertising is prohibited.”

It noted that “while they may be factual in nature, they also contain positive messages about EU policy. They are not solely informational in nature. They advocate positively various EU policies and in the main, promote membership of the EU.”

The BCC further judged that “the EU can be considered a political ideal, and therefore advertisements directed in favour of, or promoting, such an ideal may be considered to be political”.

It didn’t help the Commission’s case that the Irish Commissioner Charlie McCreevy had launched the programme by saying, “this campaign will help not only inform people of the different information sources available but will also show the benefits of EU membership”.¹²⁷

In 2008 the budget for Europe Direct is €10.8 million, plus a further €3.53m for the operation costs of its contact centre, under a different budget line.¹²⁸ Before Bulgaria and Romania joined the EU in January 2008, there were 450 Europe direct relays in 25 member states.¹²⁹ Of the €10.8 million, €759,300 goes to Europe Direct outlets in the UK.¹³⁰

125 http://ec.europa.eu/europedirect/index_en.htm

126 http://www.bcc.ie/decisions_details/Mar%202007/285.06%20286.06%20287.06%20Ms.%20P%20Mckenna%20Summary%20Complaint.doc

127 http://www.bcc.ie/decisions_details/Mar%202007/285.06%20286.06%20287.06%20Ms.%20P%20Mckenna%20Summary%20Complaint.doc

128 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/prog2008_en.pdf

129 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/ed-relays-decision_en.pdf

130 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/ed-relays-decision_en.pdf

An example of UK hosts of Europe Direct, which receive the funding, is Ashford Borough Council, which received a total of €72,000 for 2006¹³¹.

Under the new "Debate Europe" campaign a "second generation" of Europe Direct Centres is to be launched in 2009, under the plan of "Going even more local". Responding to news of this, then Europe Minister Jim Murphy said that he "would be interested to see a full list of proposed expansion sites in 2009", and "would welcome an explanation of how the new sites were selected and how they will add further value."¹³²

The Commission's 2005 "Action Plan to improve communicating Europe" revealed that a "Substantial marketing campaign will be pursued to promote Europe Direct."¹³³

ii Eurodesk

Eurodesk is the Europe-wide network which provides young people and those who work with them with information on European opportunities and funding. Its main aim is to encourage the 13-30 age group to be mobile and to take advantage of the European programmes available to help them to do so. In the UK, Eurodesk is delivered through a partnership between the British Council and YouthLink Scotland.

There are 31 participating countries, over 900 regional and local access points, and a Brussels-based research and co-ordination unit. The project also has the support of the European Commission, including funding through the Youth in Action programme and inclusion in the Commission's strategic thinking on information for young people.¹³⁴

The service itself is laudable – however it also helps to act as a conduit for advertising EU initiatives. For example, the website reads: "Did you know that Europe Day is on May 9th and 2008 is the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue and European Youth Week is the first week in June."¹³⁵

As well as answering enquiries and giving advice on possible funding, Eurodesk also "produces information materials specifically for young people."¹³⁶

Indeed the material related to the Eurodesk is not always simply about youth opportunities. For example, one of its partners, Young Scot, explains on its website that the EU "is a family of European countries, working together for peace and prosperity... The EU is based on co-operation, and it promotes unity whilst also preserving diversity, so not every country has to be the same." It tells young people: "Everything that happens in the European Union has an impact on your life or the way you will live in the future. It's up to you to take full advantage of what Europe has to offer you..."

One section, called "What does the EU do for young people?" explains: "You can benefit from the EU - you just need to know how!" Throughout the site are links to the Commission's 'information' websites and pamphlets referred to above.¹³⁷

131 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/grants_2006_uk.pdf

132 <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200708/cmselect/cmeuleg/16-xxiv/16xxiv06.htm>

133 <http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/2/2005/EN/2-2005-985-EN-F-0.Pdf>

134 <http://www.eurodesk.org.uk/Default.aspx?pid=2>

135 <http://www.eurodesk.org.uk/Events/Default.aspx?pid=27>

136 <http://www.youngscot.net/services/index.asp?id=221&SR=53&ssnb=8>

137 <http://www.youngscot.org/channels/europe/>

In a section on the euro, it explains, “if you are planning a trip to any of the countries listed above then you just need to get euros. If you are going from one country to another then you can still use the same coins. That’s the beauty of it.”¹³⁸

iii Other information networks

In the past the EU has also provided heavy funding for ‘Info Point Europa’ and ‘Carrefour’ offices throughout Europe. In 2003, €5.83 million was given out to the offices across the EU. In the UK, there were six, which received a total of €120,000¹³⁹.

The Commission also manages a significant number of information and assistance networks covering specific policy areas, such as EURES, ERA-MORE, SOLVIT and the Euro Info Centres and Innovation Relay Centres).¹⁴⁰

D Advertising the EU through grants

Much of what the EU does involves redistributing EU funds to projects, programmes and initiatives in EU member states and abroad – whether they be regional development projects, agricultural support, research, infrastructure projects in developing countries or subsidies for cultural projects such as support for film makers.

In order to promote the EU, all recipients of EU funds are required to advertise the fact that their funding has come from the EU, as a condition for receiving the money. This involves using the EU flag on billboards, posters, communications and even commemorative plaques.

Since grants are awarded within a number of diverse fields, the specific conditions that need to be fulfilled to receive a grant vary from one field to another.

For the EU’s ‘cohesion policy’, for example, billboards identifying EU co-funded projects, displaying the European flag, are obligatory.¹⁴¹ There are even rules on the exact shades of blue and yellow to be used.¹⁴² Beneficiaries are also required to hold yearly “major information activities” to promote the EU’s role in the project.

As Education and Learning Wales (ELWa), a recipient of EU regional funds (European Social Fund) writes:

“One of the conditions of receiving ESF [European Social Fund] support is that the projects promote the fact that they are supported by ESF. This means that there is a requirement on ELWa and all our work-based learning providers to promote on all occasions the fact that work-based learning is funded by ESF. It is a condition of ELWa funding that providers adhere to this and checks will take place throughout the contract period to ensure that this takes place. Providers will be expected to use the ESF logo on all marketing and publicity activity that relates to work-based learning activity. This includes posters, adverts, application forms, beneficiary forms.”¹⁴³

138 <http://www.youngscot.org/channels/europe/?ss=297&s=51&sr=73>

139 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/grants_2003_pressa2_fr.pdf

140 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2007/com2007_0568en01.pdf

141 <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/08/1103&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

142 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2006/l_371/l_37120061227en00010163.pdf

143 http://www.elwa.ac.uk/doc_bin/workbased%20learning/wbl_styleguide_wba.pdf

In the External Relations field (which covers the EU's activities outside its borders), there is even a "Communication and Visibility Manual for EU External Actions", which details the "compulsory requirements" for recipients of EU grants to not only advertise the origin of the funds, but to promote the benefits brought by them. It notes:

"The manual mainly covers the written and visual identity of the EU. It sets out requirements and guidelines for briefings, written material, press conferences, presentations, invitations, signs, commemorative plaques and all other tools used to highlight EU participation. In addition, it offers tools designed to enable the development of a dynamic communication strategy that will highlight the achievements of EU support."¹⁴⁴

It regulates the use of press releases, leaflets, brochures, newsletters, display panels, commemorative plaques, banners, vehicle panels and promotional items.

To take one example of the kind of requirements involved, under the section on "permanent commemorative plaques" detailing the EU contribution to a project, the guidelines state:

"As part of the opening ceremony of permanent structures erected with EU funding or cofunding, contractors, implementing partners or international organisations should place a permanent plaque in the most visible part of the building, such as the main entrance or in front of the building. When appropriate, the plaque could contain the following sentence: 'This [name of the structure] was funded by the European Union' with the EU flag placed underneath it."

E Manipulated opinion polling - Eurobarometer

The EU Commission spends around €25 million a year gathering public opinion on its policies, mostly through its 'Eurobarometer polls'.¹⁴⁵ "Understanding European public opinion" in this way is deemed by the Commission to be a key element of the EU Communication Policy.¹⁴⁶

Trying to gauge public opinion is one thing, but the Commission's strategic use of the polling is often far more political – in fact, the questions asked and the manner in which the results are presented expose the Commission's role as a campaign group. It effectively uses its polls as a democratic mandate justifying EU action in a particular policy area – whether it be mobile phone roaming charges, obesity or climate change.

During the debate on the EU Constitution in the Netherlands in 2005, EU Justice Commissioner Franco Frattini told Dutch MPs that "in the latest Eurobarometer opinion poll, Dutch citizens are in the absolute first line of European citizens in all countries asking for more Europe," calling upon The Hague to agree to give up its veto on justice matters.¹⁴⁷

"in the latest Eurobarometer opinion poll, Dutch citizens are in the absolute first line of European citizens in all countries asking for more Europe"

144 http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/documents/communication_and_visibility_manual_en.pdf

145 Antonis Papacostas, Head of Unit, Public Opinion Analysis, European Commission. Telephone conversation with Open Europe on 16 September 2008.

146 http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/madrid/index-2.html

147 EUobserver, 22 November 2006

As a piece in *The Economist* on this subject recently reported:¹⁴⁸

“To some officials, supportive opinion polls offer a form of quasi-democratic mandate. One Brussels official admits that his commissioner ‘absolutely’ uses poll data to browbeat reluctant governments, in private and in public.”

“The commission is notorious for only asking questions to which it wants answers (Eurobarometer data must be published within two years, unlike national polling which is often kept secret). In an infamous incident last year, the commission trumpeted a poll showing 80% support for the European satellite navigation system, Galileo, and 63% support for spending billions on it, though only 40% of respondents had heard of Galileo before they were telephoned for the survey. Polls on sensitive subjects such as racism or religion are routinely neutered, to avoid questions that might reveal differing degrees of tolerance in EU nations.”

Indeed there are several examples of how the Commission has manipulated these polls in order to promote its own cause. It even admits doing this. During a May 2005 speech EU Communications Commissioner Margot Wallstrom talked about the need to “Listen to people via opinion-formers and stakeholders - particularly civil society and Parliamentarians - and by carefully exploiting our opinion polls.”¹⁴⁹

Taking the most recent Eurobarometer as a case study, we can see how this is achieved. The poll aimed to gauge Europeans’ attitudes to global climate change. Respondents were first asked to say which of a number of global threats they deemed to be the most important, (placing climate change in second place). They were then asked how serious a problem they believe it to be, on a scale of one to ten. Next, they were asked how well informed they felt about climate change, and then, about their attitudes to the impact of it and different ways of fighting it. Then, they were asked whether they thought each of the EU, governments, citizens, and industry were doing too much, about the right amount, or not enough to fight climate change. A total of 58% responded that the EU is not doing enough about climate change.¹⁵⁰ This was then used as a mandate for a hugely integrationist programme of EU measures on climate change, which is very much the EU’s new focus moving into 2009.

Following the ‘no’ vote on the Lisbon Treaty in Ireland, the Commission ran a Eurobarometer poll to try and find out why people voted ‘no’. But instead of publishing the results for all to see on its public website, it first leaked the results to selected newspapers. It issued a note which said that 40 percent of those who had voted no did so because they did not understand the Treaty.¹⁵¹ This led to headlines such as “Irish voters failed to understand the Treaty”, as ran by the *Times*, which naturally reported that “40 per cent blamed the fact that they did not understand the treaty”.¹⁵²

However, when the results finally did appear in public a week or so later, they showed that the Commission had hugely overblown the results – there was a huge discrepancy between the Commission’s original claim to the press that 40 percent had said they did not understand the Treaty”, and the actual results which showed that just 22 percent had voted no out of a lack of

148 *The Economist*, 21 February 2008 http://www.economist.com/world/europe/displaystory.cfm?story_id=10727874

149 <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/05/296&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

150 http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_300_full_en.pdf

151 <http://www.openeurope.org.uk/commissionpoll.pdf>

152 8 June 2008 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/ireland/article4160252.ece>

153 http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_245_en.pdf

knowledge/familiarity with the Treaty.¹⁵³ But thanks to the Commission's misleading media manipulation, by that stage, the narrative that a large proportion of people had voted no out of ignorance was already well established. This carried with it an implication that the verdict was therefore not valid.

The Commission has also been known to delay publication of its polls depending on the political climate. For instance, it once delayed publication of a study which indicated a major drop in public support for an EU role in energy (a flagship Commission strategy), which, as the *EUobserver* reported at the time, "highlights the European Commission's strategic use of its Eurobarometer surveys in promoting key policies."

The poll found that only 39 percent of respondents believed the EU level to be more appropriate to take energy decisions than the national level - compared to 47 percent measured the year before. The more favourable earlier poll was published swiftly after the fieldwork was done, and was also personally presented by the EU Energy Commissioner and accompanied by a press release stating "European citizens in favour of a European Energy policy, says Eurobarometer survey."¹⁵⁴

Analysing Eurobarometer surveys is regarded as the core element of the EU's new "listening process", which was outlined in the "Action Plan to improve communicating Europe by the Commission" following the no votes in July 2005.¹⁵⁵ At a conference to celebrate the 35th anniversary of the Eurobarometer in Paris in November 2008, EU leaders called on the Eurobarometer to be used even more as an "extensive, strategic tool."

The Commons EU Scrutiny Committee, in response to the Commission's October 2007 paper and the proposals therein for an improved communication policy, asked the then Minister for Europe, Jim Murphy whether, under the proposals it would be possible for a private organisation to apply for and obtain funding to carry out their own assessment of public opinion, including via a national referendum on Treaty changes.

Mr. Murphy replied saying, "We have consulted the European Commission's polling secretariat, who confirmed that Eurobarometer surveys are carried out exclusively for the European Commission and that they do not fund private organisations to carry out their own assessments of public opinion."

F Funded visits to the EU institutions

Every year the Commission spends taxpayers' money paying for trips for groups of people to the EU institutions in Brussels and Strasbourg. Students in higher education are particularly encouraged. This is clearly all about PR.

The Commission boasts: "Tens of thousands visit EU institutions... You may not think of the European Commission as a tourist attraction, especially in the summer when sundrenched beaches beckon. But 43,000 people visited the EU's executive branch in Brussels last year."¹⁵⁶ It promises that "general presentations by the commission's visitor service will certainly improve your EU IQ." Given the pro-EU bias of the publications office, it is a safe bet to assume these presentations will also be one-sided celebrations of the successes and benefits of the EU.

154 *EUobserver*, 22 November 2006

155 <http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/2/2005/EN/2-2005-985-EN-F-0.Pdf>

156 http://ec.europa.eu/news/eu_explained/080811_1_en.htm

There is even an EU Open Day, inviting people, young and old, to “Come and visit the EU institutions – you may find out it’s not all complicated laws and bureaucracy.” People working in the Commission are there “to guide you and explain what they do. They will have concrete examples of what is done with EU money and the kind of results achieved... Outside the Berlaymont, you can find activities for children. There will be music and face-painting, a mini-farm with animals and rides in a horse-drawn carriage, as well as presentations of new technology in agriculture.”¹⁵⁷

“Come and visit the EU institutions – you may find out it’s not all complicated laws and bureaucracy”

The European Parliament also runs a visits programme aimed specifically at school children called ‘Euroscola’, with the objective of “Raising the awareness of youth about the impact of Europe on their future.”¹⁵⁸

G An EU ‘Internet Strategy’

In addition to EUTube and the EU’s other internet broadcast sites, the EU makes extensive use of its huge and unwieldy internet site – Europa – to convey its message, which costs €3 million a year to run.

As well as being used for general and professional information for those with an interest in EU affairs, the Commission openly admits that part of Europa’s objective is to “communicate the views of the Commission to the widest possible audience” and to “help create a sense of European community as a supplement to the national sphere.”¹⁵⁹

But the EU is not content just using its own site to spread its message. It increasingly looks to influence the content of outside websites.

The Commission’s ‘Communicating Europe in Partnership’ paper said that:

“The EU needs to strengthen its presence on the web beyond EUROPA. The Commission wishes to encourage the development of a network of civil society and private or public sector websites which promote contact with or between European citizens by supporting websites that devote particular attention to European affairs and stimulate debate on EU policy issues. The Commission itself should also be more involved in interviews and participation in discussions in other sites.”¹⁶⁰

As part of this programme, in December 2007 the Commission presented an “Internet Strategy” paper. Reflecting on “the increasing importance of social networks on the Internet” and their ability to spread information, it proposed ways for the EU to start using the internet to help spread its message. It stated that:

“studies into electronic campaigning in France in the run-up to the referendum on the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe in 2005 suggest that the absence of the ‘establishment’ in the Internet debate may have contributed to the ‘no’ vote. Many political parties have now realised that the Internet can no longer be neglected in terms of public relations and

157 http://ec.europa.eu/news/eu_explained/080604_1_en.htm

158 <http://www.welcomeurope.com/default.asp?id=1300&idnews=453&genre=0>

159 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/internet-strategy_en.pdf

160 http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/wallstrom/pdf/COM2007_568_en.pdf

campaign activities; and to shape the political agenda and public opinion.”¹⁶¹

It stressed that “Beyond EUROPA, the Commission must have more impact on the way EU matters are handled on other sites,” signaling an alarmingly intention to try and influence content on external websites.

“the Internet can no longer be neglected in terms of public relations and campaign activities”

Following this, in the aftermath of the Irish ‘no’ vote to the Lisbon Treaty, in September 2008 the Commission leaked what it called an “unofficial” briefing note to the Irish media, in which it attacked the increasing use of the internet and complained, again, that blogging had been a cause of the no vote.

It said: “The internet has allowed increased communication between citizen groups away from Government and traditional media dominated sources... Blogging is also seen as an anti-establishment activity. Few Yes campaigners came out with forceful counter arguments or were inspired to do so...Because of the many different sources of No campaigners on the internet, classic rebuttals is made impossible.”¹⁶²

Even more alarmingly, in September 2008 the European Parliament’s Culture Committee voted for a report which proposed that the EU should regulate blogs. Some of the suggestions in the report include: making it impossible to blog anonymously; making significant bloggers declare their interests; forcing bloggers to give a right to reply to people that are criticised in a blog post; introducing a code of conduct for the private-user-generated content and a system of royalties for such content; and encouraging bloggers to publish their “aims and background.”¹⁶³

There have been suggestions that the Commission may be working on something similar.¹⁶⁴

The report was initiated by Estonian Socialist MEP Marianne Mikko (who, on a light side note, happens to have a degree in journalism from the Soviet Union, gained in 1984), who has said she believes that bloggers need to have:

“some credentials, a quality mark, a certain disclosure of who is writing and why. We need this to be able to trust and rely on the source... It is clear that a Harvard professor of international relations is likely to treat, for instance, the Middle East peace process or European integration in an educated and balanced manner. The same trust cannot be put in a radical high school student from Gaza or a Eurosceptic who has never been out of his village.”¹⁶⁵

‘Myth Rebuttal’

The 2005 White Paper from the Commission – “Action Plan to improve communicating Europe by the Commission”¹⁶⁶ promised that “A more efficient and coordinated and timely rebuttal function will be developed. It will also take into account false claims made on the internet. It needs to be actively co-ordinated between spokespersons, Representations and DGs to ensure early alert and rapid reply and consistency.”

161 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/internet-strategy_en.pdf

162 <http://www.irishtimes.com/focus/2008/lisbondocument/index.pdf>

163 http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2004_2009/documents/pr/712/712320/712320en.pdf

164 <http://henrikalexandersson.blogspot.com/>

165 EUobserver, 27 June 2008 <http://euobserver.com/871/26407>

166 <http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/2/2005/EN/2-2005-985-EN-F-0.Pdf>

Indeed as the Commission's December 2007 "Internet Strategy" explained, EU staff are now "empowered to explain EU policies and help rectify mistakes, and to redress negative publicity or speculation surrounding the EU and its activities."¹⁶⁷

One recent example of this 'rebuttal' work in action is the blog of the Head of Media at the UK office of the Commission – called "Talking about the EU", for which she is paid to monitor comments made on other blog sites and refute any 'euomyths' she comes across.

For example: "I also followed up a comment written on Mark Mardell's blog about the healthcare plans, when someone wrote that 'Not once in their 50-year history has the EU Commission ever proposed to return a power previously acquired by them back to the democratic arena of the nation-state'. Not true. The marketing standards for fruit and veg is a recent example."¹⁶⁸

Much of the rest of the blog is very difficult to justify as an effective use of taxpayers' money. Drawing on just one of many irrelevant entries, the author writes:

"Got the new housemate coming in to sign his lease as well; I signed mine last night. I also found out yesterday that I will complete my house purchase in France on Tuesday - had to do a power of attorney for my father to sign the 'acte authentique' as it is called because I wasn't going to be able to get away. So home-ownership is but a few days away. And if you're wondering where all the hayfever whinging has gone, I have fabulous new pills which actually WORK! They're called Aerius, prescription only and I cannot recommend them highly enough. The beneficial side-effect is that they really don't mix with alcohol, so I've stopped drinking. It's worth it to be able to function as a human being for most of the week!"¹⁶⁹

One Commission webpage, "The EU and you – getting the facts straight" reports that "If some headlines about the EU seem too bizarre to be true, it's perhaps because they're just that – more fiction than fact."¹⁷⁰

H Targeting the media and journalists

In its 2006 White Paper on EU Communication Policy the Commission argued that European citizens should have "common information" provided by the media. It said:

"European citizens need access to a steady flow of common information if they are to see the European dimension of common issues. This is where pan-European media and the specialised press have an important role to play. But European issues also need to be discussed in the national and local context. Some of this would flow naturally from a greater commitment on the part of national and local politicians and institutions; but it also needs the proactive involvement of the EU institutions, not least to put European policies in a local context."¹⁷¹

In 2005 EU Communications Commissioner Margot Wallstrom said: "I am very interested to build a strengthened public sphere in Europe, and media is a cornerstone of it."¹⁷²

167 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/internet-strategy_en.pdf

168 <http://euonym.wordpress.com/2008/07/07/chirpy-chirpy-cheep-cheep/>

169 <http://euonym.wordpress.com/2008/07/02/your-right-to-get-treatment-in-another-eu-country/>

170 http://ec.europa.eu/news/eu_explained/080821_1_en.htm

171 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2006:0035:FIN:EN:PDF>

172 <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/05/296&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

Indeed the Commission's approach to the media has often exposed it as a proactive political campaign group.

As well as the debacle over the leaked and falsely spun Eurobarometer results to the press (see above), following the 'no' vote in Ireland to the Lisbon Treaty, the Commission leaked another unofficial document to the media which suggested that the vote was a result of "A growth in readership and distribution of Eurosceptic British press" in Ireland.¹⁷³

With no mandate at all to comment on the content of national newspapers, nor to try and influence the ongoing and somewhat sensitive debate on the Treaty in Ireland, the Commission said:

"Since 2002 we have seen an increase in UK with 'Irishised' editorial of titles. 41% of all Irish people read one or more of the following; the Irish Sun, Irish News of the World, Sunday Times, People, Irish Mirror, Sunday Mirror, Daily Mail and Mail on Sunday. These have proven to be significant opinion formers which in general have been more Euro-hostile."

In a quite extraordinary attempt to influence future reporting on the EU, the Commission also (wrongly) claimed that "the editorial [has] been largely critical of Europe" and that "it is rumoured that it has been refusing contributions from staff that are pro-Europe".

Responding to questions about the note from Open Europe, the Commission's DG Communication said it was "not an official document", but a "routine" note produced by the Commission's representation in Ireland which was meant for "internal" use. They were "surprised" to see it reported in the Irish Times, but "didn't see anything controversial in it."

It is extremely worrying to see the Commission issuing strongly partisan briefings to the media, and then getting away with it by denying full responsibility. This is a far cry from the neutral information we should expect from a public body.

It also fiercely contradicts the Commission's claim that it does not interfere in referendums. In the past it has insisted: "It has been the long standing policy of the European Commission not to interfere in internal elections or referenda in Members States... The provision of such information is not intended to influence political decisions or electoral contests."¹⁷⁴

Broadcast

The EU uses various audiovisual tools to transmit its message. In addition to EUTube, it funds an EU news channel called Euronews, and also has its own broadcast service Europe by Satellite (EbS).

As of September 2008 there is also Europarl TV,¹⁷⁵ a channel exclusively for the European Parliament which is estimated to cost €9 million per year plus €1 million for marketing.

The Parliament says it wants to improve public access to the debates, which is obviously to be welcomed, but the official tender documents of the channel reportedly state that "The European Parliament will define the editorial line of the channel." There is obviously a big problem if

¹⁷³ <http://www.irishtimes.com/focus/2008/lisbondocument/index.pdf>

¹⁷⁴ http://www.bcc.ie/decisions_details/Mar%202007/288.06%20289.06%20290.06%20Mr.%20A%20Coughlan%20Summary%20Complaint.doc

¹⁷⁵ <http://www.theparliament.com/latestnews/news-article/newsarticle/eu-parliament-tv-channel-set-to-go-online/>

millions of euros of taxpayers' money are set to be spent on a channel whose editorial responsibility lies with a public EU institution. As Dutch social-democrat MEP Thijs Berman told the ANP news agency: "Only an independent editorial team can make lively and interesting programmes."¹⁷⁶

The EU already spends €10.8 million a year funding Euronews, which recently also began to broadcast in Arabic.¹⁷⁷ The channel "aims at presenting international information from a European point of view, and focusing on the role of the EU."¹⁷⁸

Euronews is not a neutral broadcaster. In fact the head of the channel, Philip Cayla, recently used his position to promote the Lisbon Treaty in an interview with the Warsaw Business Journal. He said:

"The fact that we are going to have a real president, a permanent president of the continent, will be a particular achievement I think. A prominent representative for foreign affairs, I think, will change the face of Europe, especially in the eyes of the rest of the world... Today we have Commissioners, we have members of the European Parliament, but we have no real leader in fact. An EU president will be a real leader and will change the face of Europe."¹⁷⁹

Europe by Satellite, meanwhile, broadcasts live press briefings, speeches and selected meetings so that journalists can receive information first hand – which is to be welcomed.

All of this is run by the EU Commission's "Audiovisual Service", whose tagline is "Sharing the sights and sounds of Europe". It seeks to "offer video, photo and sound coverage of European news" and also "provide assistance for journalists wishing to cover EU subjects." It claims to supply "unbiased and reliable news services to broadcasters, news agencies, written press, and anyone who seeks to spread information on the activities carried out by the European Commission and other EU institutions."¹⁸⁰

But the Commission's definition of unbiased is clearly not everyone's, as demonstrated by the examples of the EU's written publications as detailed above.

Only a click away from this promise to provide "unbiased" coverage the Audiovisual Service hails on its website "the era of peace, security, prosperity and solidarity of the European Union today." Referring to the Commission's "extensive library of audiovisual documents in existence on the construction of the European Union," it adds: "This is part of Europe's living memory available not only to journalists, but also to anyone wishing to view the key moments of Community history."¹⁸¹

Moreover, the Commission's own policy papers show that the idea is clearly not just to provide information to broadcasters but to promote the EU. In 2005 the Commission's White Paper on improving communication policy promised: "DG Communication will explore with broadcasters and production companies genuine formats to promote the idea, values and benefits of Europe. The opportunity to engage into new programme formats will be investigated."¹⁸²

176 <http://eux.tv/article.aspx?articleId=19838>

177 http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/wallstrom/pdf/sec_2008_506-2_en.pdf

178 <http://ec.europa.eu/avservices/about/index.cfm?sitelang=en§ion=about&page=euronews>

179 14 April 2008

180 <http://ec.europa.eu/avservices/about/index.cfm?sitelang=en§ion=about&page=mission>

181 http://ec.europa.eu/avservices/about/activities_en.cfm#video01

182 <http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/2/2005/EN/2-2005-985-EN-F-0.Pdf>

A 2006 paper proposed a European Programme for Training in Public Communication, and revealed that the plan was not merely to increase the amount of information available to the media, but to start manipulating it. It said:

“The EU institutions should explore with a wide range of media players how to better provide the media (pan-European, national and local) with material which is relevant for them, with a view to adapting the information to the needs of different countries and segments of the population.”¹⁸³

“TV and radio spots are also broadcast in the context of information campaigns promoting specific EU policies”

An October 2007 White Paper went even further, admitting that: “TV and radio spots are also broadcast in the context of information campaigns promoting specific EU policies.”¹⁸⁴

In theory, Europe by Satellite could appear to be neutral, as it broadcasts raw material such as live events and speeches, with editorial left up to the channels that pick it up and use it. But in practice, the Commission is able to exert control over what goes on there. It can, for example, choose to stage its own mini press conferences, hand-picking the journalists it wishes to ask the questions.

“the audiovisual media should aim at supplying information that is attractive to users, promotes active European citizenship and contributes to the development of a European public sphere”

In a speech in May 2005, EU Communications Commissioner Margot Wallstrom revealed that from then on: “Commissioners will be available on a regular basis for informal ‘fireside chats’ in a relaxed situation in the EC studio, taking questions from four or five TV journalists. The programmes will be broadcasted through satellite and the Internet.”

These efforts are set to expand in the future. Over the last year or so the Commission has sought to expand its influence on the broadcast media, believing that “One of the factors currently constraining a citizens’ debate on the European Union is the very limited coverage of EU information in the audiovisual media.”¹⁸⁵

An April 2008 paper from the Commission called “Communicating Europe through audiovisual media” said: “better use of the audiovisual media should aim at supplying information in a form that is attractive to users, promotes active European citizenship and contributes to the development of a European public sphere... Increasing EU-related cross-border programmes will contribute to the development of a European public sphere as well as to mutual understanding.”¹⁸⁶

Indeed the explicit motive behind increasing audiovisual coverage of EU affairs is not to provide information for its own sake, but to help create a “European public sphere”, which, as we will see in the next chapter is deemed to be a key method of fostering support for EU integration.

Alarming, not content with providing “audiovisual information” the 2007 White Paper also talks about the Commission providing “education and entertainment on European affairs as part of public

183 http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/madrid/pdf/white_paper.pdf

184 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2007/com2007_0568en01.pdf

185 http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/wallstrom/pdf/sec_2008_506-2_en.pdf

186 http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/wallstrom/pdf/sec_2008_506-2_en.pdf

service missions across the EU Member States.” The idea of the EU using taxpayers’ money to broadcast what it deems to be ‘entertainment’ in an effort to increase support for European integration seems like a wholly unjustifiable stretch outside of its remit.

In December 2007 the Commission set up a network of 16 radio stations which will receive €5.8 million per year over five years to produce and broadcast 4,221 hours of EU programmes per year. Like Euronews, the network will in theory have “full editorial independence,” but even with the best intentions, it is difficult to believe that this could truly work in practice, given that the Commission also promotes meetings with editors and provides funding for journalists (see below). Since the end of 2005 the Commission has been organising “informal meetings” between EU leaders and TV and radio journalists.¹⁸⁷

In April 2008 the Commission laid out proposals for creating a European TV network, estimated to cost €8 million in its first year in 2009. The Commission also plans to begin producing its own video material – using a €1.8 million budget to make its own documentaries and clips with a view to “illustrating or explaining EU policies to the wider public.”

There have also been suggestions for a “European audiovisual agency”, from the European Economic and Social Committee, in order to “put right the media’s failure to make people aware of Europe”¹⁸⁸, and Margot Wallstrom used a roundtable of journalists organised by the European Federation of Journalists to ask them whether they thought “we should have a dedicated European TV channel? A European radio station? A EU newspaper or magazine?”¹⁸⁹

She has talked about the need for “effective communication by the EU” to be seen “primarily as a public-service duty”, saying “The European Commission will encourage the development of networks of TV and radio stations with a European public service mission.”¹⁹⁰

As well as funding channels and networks from the central communication budget, the Commission also provides funding for TV broadcasts through its decentralised representations in the individual member states. In 2006, for example, the Cypriot delegation spent €325,000 on TV broadcasts “informing the citizens on European matters”¹⁹¹. €769,000 went to three television companies in Belgium,¹⁹² and €670,000 went to French television companies, to cite just a few.¹⁹³ €150,000 even went to a newspaper in Malta.¹⁹⁴

In Britain, the BBC has also received EU funding, which is particularly controversial given that the national public broadcaster has been formally criticised on a number of occasions for being insufficiently impartial in its coverage of EU affairs.

In a written answer in January 2008 the Government revealed that the BBC had taken out £141 million in low-interest loans from the European Central Bank, and that, in addition, it had received £1.4 million in grants over the past five years. This is interesting because as the *Sunday Times* reported, the EIB has described itself as “an autonomous body set up to finance capital investment furthering European integration by promoting EU policies”.

187 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/communication_com_en.pdf

188 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2006:318:0163:01:EN:HTML>

189 <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/05/296&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

190 <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/05/296&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

191 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/grants_2006_cyprus.pdf

192 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/grants_2006_belgium.pdf

193 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/grants_2006_france.pdf

194 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/grants_2006_malta.pdf

The BBC said the loans were to its commercial arm (which mostly seemed to go to BBC World) and a spokesman said: "There were no editorial obligations whatsoever attached." Of the grants, he admitted: "The BBC occasionally receives some EU funding in relation to specific educational or research and development projects."¹⁹⁵

An independent inquiry in 2005 said the BBC must make its coverage of Europe "more demonstrably impartial". It found no evidence of deliberate bias, but said there was a "widespread perception" of "certain forms of cultural and unintentional bias". The inquiry said it had found an "institutional mindset" at the BBC when it came to the EU and a tendency to "polarise and over-simplify issues". The report concluded: "Whatever the cause in particular cases, the effect is the same for the outside world, and feels like bias." It added: "The problem of ignorance among BBC journalists on the EU issue must be addressed as a matter of urgency."¹⁹⁶

Training for journalists

For many years the Commission has contributed to journalists' – and also editors' – training in EU affairs.

Recipients, which have been awarded varying amounts for a range of projects, include the European Journalism Centre at Maastricht (EJC), l'Association pour la formation au journalisme européen in Bordeaux, la Fondation journalisme en Europe in Paris and the European Journalists' Association.¹⁹⁷

"the training of journalists and editors should remain near the top of the agenda"

"Local and regional media should be trained and given the opportunity to present the impact of the European integration process to their audiences"

The Commission's 2002 paper on a 'Communication Policy for Europe' said that "the training of journalists and editors should remain near the top of the agenda,"¹⁹⁸ and following the French and Dutch no votes in 2005, the Commission decided that "Training for journalists on EU affairs will be stepped up to respond to increasing requests and needs."¹⁹⁹ It added: "Special attention will be devoted to accommodating student journalists in the Commission's programme of internships."

A Commission staff working document said: "Local and regional media should be trained and given the opportunity to present the impact of the European integration process to their audiences."²⁰⁰

According to the website of the European Journalism Centre, in the past 15 years more than 9,000 journalists have participated in its training programme. It "offers short, intensive seminars for journalists across Europe and beyond" and the idea is "to give media professionals the background information and the tools to understand the mechanisms, the impact and the challenges of the European integration process."²⁰¹

The EJC works in partnership with the European Journalism Training Association, whose main aim is "to stimulate European cooperation in journalism education." It receives funding for projects

195 Sunday Times, 27 January 2008
196 BBC online, 30 January 2005 http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/4213089.stm
197 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2001/com2001_0354en01.pdf
198 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2002/com2002_0350en02.pdf
199 <http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/2/2005/EN/2-2005-985-EN-F-0.Pdf>
200 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52007SC1265:EN:HTML>
201 <http://www.ejcseminars.eu/index.php/about-us>

from the European Commission, as well as from education programmes such as Socrates, Leonardo, Tempus and Erasmus Mundus, which will be looked at in Part Four.²⁰²

It also partners with the Association of European Journalists, which: “was set up in 1961 in the then six EEC-countries and was founded by 70 journalists, convinced by the need for European integration in a democratic way who believed in the potential of journalism to promote European harmony. For that reason they were determined to defend the freedom of information and freedom of the press in Europe.”²⁰³

It is a member of the European Movement, which, as we will see in the next section, received more than €2.5m from the Commission between 2005 and 2007, with much of it no doubt filtering through to its member organisations. A recent newsletter read:

“As journalists and as people committed to the European integration process I think we have good reasons to feel satisfaction this year: after a long period of uncertainty and pessimism as a consequence of the failed constitutional referenda in France and The Netherlands, the Treaty of Lisbon, recently signed by the heads of government of the 27 member states allows us to observe the future less fretfully.”²⁰⁴

The UK section of the AEJ says it is “independent” and “self-funding”, but in the following sentence reveals: “We arrange for leading newsmakers from across Europe to give briefings to us about once a month, over lunch at the office of the European Parliament in London.”²⁰⁵

Just over €1 million is set aside in the 2008 budget for “Training seminars for journalists”, and €550,000 for “Exchanges with the media”.²⁰⁶

The Commission also hosts meetings between editors and Commissioners. A recent Commission working paper laid plans for “Regular information exchange with editors”, called for “Commissioners accompanied by journalists”, and observed that “The President speaks more frequently to editors and the individual spokes have generally increased their focus on editors”.²⁰⁷ Other Commission plans have talked about “The possibilities of inviting journalists and/or photographers to accompany Commissioners in their work.”²⁰⁸

Prizes for journalists

The EU also issues prizes for journalists, in a clear attempt to influence the industry. For example, 2008 saw the first European Parliament prize for Journalism, which was awarded in October 2008 “to journalists who have made an outstanding contribution to clarify major issues at European level or have promoted a better understanding of the institutions or policies of the European Union.”²⁰⁹

The EU also issues prizes for journalists via the UACES-Reuters ‘Reporting Europe’ Lecture and Awards Ceremony. In 2008 the awards went to the BBC’s Alan Little for his piece The Road to

202 <http://www.ejta.eu/index.php/website/about/>

203 <http://www.aej.org/index.php?page=about-the-aej>

204 <http://www.aej.org/index.php?page=newsletter>

205 <http://www.aej-uk.org/>

206 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/prog2008_en.pdf

207 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52007SC1265:EN:HTML>

208 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/communication_annex_en.pdf

209 https://www.eppj.eu/EPPJ_en.html

Rome, which was broadcast on Radio 4 and on the World Service, and which was described as “a programme of great interest and subtlety, challenging Euro-myths from both pro- and anti-EU perspectives while succeeding in making the EU a human interest story.”

Although the award apparently “acknowledges high quality, informed journalism on any aspect of the EU from either a positive or critical perspective during 2007,”²¹⁰ is it right that journalists – particularly BBC journalists who must be independent and neutral – receive financial and prestigious awards from a political body? There could be some significant subconscious propaganda value in such awards.

I EU merchandise

Like a multinational company, the EU also has its own branded promotional goods which it distributes free to members of the public – particularly to teachers for their schoolchildren.

All EU institutions have free merchandise available. The UK Office of the European Parliament, for example, says on its website: “We send out more than a million items annually, including brochures and promotional items, such as balloons, pens and maps. A lot of material goes to MEPs’ constituency offices, schools and colleges.”²¹¹

“We send out more than a million items annually, including brochures and promotional items, such as balloons, pens and maps”

Many of the EU’s different programmes and projects have their own, specifically branded material. For example, advertising the Commission’s Audiovisual Service involved “Development and production of a series of promotional materials (Press kits, Letter paper, Standard pens, Light pens, Note pads, Lanyards, Cotton bags, USB sticks, Fruit sweets).”²¹²

A 2002 report on the results of the European Year of Languages 2001 revealed that the European Commission had “produced and distributed about two million promotional items (posters, tee-shirts, postcards, pens, pencil boxes, notepads, balloons, plastic bags, mouse mats). There were materials suitable for most target groups, with a strong emphasis on children.”²¹³

The EU even dished out canvas briefcases with logos on the front for its public event “35th anniversary of the Eurobarometer” in Paris in November 2008.

J Other examples of advertising and promotion

The EU ran a particularly robust PR campaign in the run-up to the 2004 enlargement of the EU to ten new Eastern and Central European countries. It involved activities in both the existing member states and the prospective ones.

For example, it spent £500,000 hiring a PR agency to “inform the German public on a broad basis about EU enlargement.” It involved an EU ‘Infobus-Tour’, which went around 60 towns, particularly within the former East Germany, in order to “convince Germans of the benefits of European Union enlargement”, according to *PR Week*.²¹⁴

210 <http://uaces.org/ReportingOnEurope.htm#2007Little>

211 http://www.europarl.org.uk/publications/pdf/EuroP_A5.pdf

212 http://www.media-consulta.com/fileadmin/content/MediaLibrary/PDF/DG_Comm_camp_engl_screen.pdf

213 http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/pdf/doc615_en.pdf

It also gave £200,000 in grants in the UK in 2003 alone “to fund promotional activity surrounding EU enlargement”.²¹⁵ Some of the type of organisations that received the funds are looked at in Part Two.

The Diversity Truck Tour

In addition to the EU Info Bus, which continues to operate in neighbouring EU countries such as Albania²¹⁶, another example of the EU’s “mobile information service” efforts is the “For Diversity, Against Discrimination” Truck Tour, which the EU has run every year since 2004.

A huge yellow truck tours EU countries, bringing “information about EU anti-discrimination laws to people all over Europe by stopping in different towns and cities for a day of activities in which visitors are invited to participate... These include debates, quizzes, karaoke, plus performances from local singers and musicians.”

In 2008, the truck stopped at “a wide range of events including music and cultural festivals, employment fairs, universities, as well as youth and sporting events in 10 EU countries.”

The Commission says that the 2007 Truck Tour alone reached 3 million people, many of them schoolchildren.²¹⁷

Activities include: the Ability Park, where participants are invited to “Navigate this wheelchair obstacle course to better understand the problems faced everyday by disabled people”; the Diversity Song Contest and the Diversity Game Show.²¹⁸

In-flight magazine ads

The European Commission also runs traditional publicity campaigns to raise the profile of EU bodies and agencies. For example, one campaign, launched in December 2006 and called “Whatever you do, we work for you”, served to promote the EU’s plethora of agencies, which “provide services, information and know-how to the EU Member States and their citizens.”²¹⁹ The EU set up a website and even placed adverts in in-flight magazines on large airlines.²²⁰

214 21 March 2003

215 Pr Week, 8 November 2002

216 http://www.delalb.ec.europa.eu/en/audio_visual_library/european_weeks/2008/02_mayeu_info_bus_in_durres_0

217 http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/eyeq/index.cfm?cat_id=TT

218 <http://www.trucktour.info/index.php?language=en>

219 http://ec.europa.eu/europedirect/docs/newsletter/newsletter_8_en.pdf

220 http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/attachements.cfm/att_34062_EN_Drugnet55.pdf

2

Funding the cheerleaders: Paying NGOs, think-tanks and lobby groups to promote the EU

“There are those who say that the Commission can only fund purely information-related activities. This misses the point. To achieve greater citizen involvement in European life, it will be necessary to go beyond merely providing them with information. It is essential that Europe’s citizens are well informed on matters such as the proposed Constitution and elections to the European Parliament. That is more than just about supporting the activities of a think tank. The average elector will not be prompted to vote in a European parliamentary election because of some theoretical discussions emanating from a think tank. Consequently, the Commission will have to accept that it will have to fund movements which encourage citizens to play an active role in European life”

Fernand Herman, President of the Belgian branch of the Union of European Federalists²²¹

Every year the EU gives away hundreds of millions of euros in grants to organisations which promote its aims. Many of them are think-tanks and NGOs which exist to promote EU integration quite directly, championing the EU as a success and calling for a stronger, more centralised EU.

Others are interest groups and representative organisations which have wider interests but lobby the EU to represent these interests when shaping policies, or call for the EU to play a greater role in a certain area. By paying them grants, the EU arguably influences them and leads them to produce what is often then wrongly termed “independent” advice and input into EU policy. Some organisations do both of these things.

The EU says it funds outside organisations as a way of “reaching out to civil society”²²² claiming it uses them to consult, gather information about what citizens want and input it into policy. But in reality, with so many of the recipients of EU money supporting and even promoting the EU, this is just a clever method of outsourcing its propaganda effort.

In some cases the funds are extremely difficult to trace, making this is an effective way of promoting the EU without really being seen to do so. It is a far more subtle strategy than those detailed in the previous chapter, and one which the EU rarely finds itself having to justify, because it remains, for the most part, beyond the range of the public eye.

Like the Commission, the UK Government has also tried to use this fact to its advantage. Back in 2005, when the UK was planning to hold a referendum on the original version of the EU Constitution, the Government said that “not a single penny” of EU money would be spent promoting the EU Constitution in Britain, and very publicly told the Commission not to spend any of a dedicated €8 million (£5.5 million) budget.²²³

But as the *Times* pointed out, the Commission had already spent large amounts promoting the Constitution through its opaque system of EU grants, and would continue to fund its general “information” campaigns about the EU in Britain.

221 http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/archive/forumtranscrip_en.pdf

222 <http://blogs.ec.europa.eu/wallstrom/call-for-action-3/>

223 The Times, 18 February 2005

For example, it gave €10,551 to Hull University to “raise awareness and understanding” of the Constitution, and €25,000 to Liverpool Hope University College, to help school pupils and students to find out about the Constitution. It gave the Foreign Policy Centre €38,318 for a conference on the Constitution, and €48,601 to the Institute for Citizenship in London to hold a series of seminars on it.

It also paid €18,233 to Europaworld, a non-profit company in Wales, to set up a website to educate people about the Constitution and send information to secondary schools.²²⁴

The advantages can also work in the other direction, with NGOs and charities being upheld as independent supporters of EU policy, without the public realising that they have an interest, since they are funded by the EU.

During the 2008 parliamentary debate on the Lisbon Treaty in the UK, Foreign Minister David Miliband, in an effort to garner support for the Treaty in Parliament, announced that it was not just the Government that was in favour of the Treaty, but a whole range of NGOs. He said: “The NSPCC pledged its support, as have One World Action, Action Aid and Oxfam... Environmental organisations support the treaty provisions on sustainable development and even the commission of bishops supports the treaty. This is a coalition, not of ideology, but integrity”.²²⁵

However, it turned out that at least four out of the five groups mentioned are funded by the EU²²⁶ – some very heavily – and most of them also get bungs from the British Government. As Daniel Hannan MEP pointed out: “Hardly surprising, then, that they should dutifully endorse a treaty supported by their paymasters.”²²⁷

According to a written answer by the Commission, in 2007 alone ActionAid, the NSPCC, One World Action and Oxfam received more than €43 million between them.²²⁸ Oxfam alone received €33.6m – at the very least.²²⁹ Previous data shows that Oxfam received a total of €72 million between 2005 and 2007.²³⁰ ActionAid received €5.5m in 2007, bringing its total in the three years between 2005 and 2007 to more than €11m.²³¹ One World Action received €2.4m, and the NSPCC received €1,480.²³²

It is extremely difficult to put a figure on exactly how much in total the EU spends funding outside organisations. The main problem is that funds for organisations are scattered throughout the various headings of the enormous EU budget. Every policy area the EU is involved in involves some grantmaking to outside organisations – whether it be Communication, External Affairs, Employment and Social Affairs, or Education and Culture – for the purposes of carrying out work that promotes the EU agenda.

224 As a side point, since it relates to UK Government money rather than EU money, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office also set up an “EU Constitution Team” with a budget of £613,000 for 2004–05, plus staff costs of £542,819 for the same period. In a written answer the Government confirmed that the Team’s programme budget was being used to pay the costs of “agencies for partnership marketing”:

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200405/cmhansrd/vo050315/text/50315w17.htm> Elsewhere, it confirmed that the Team had held meetings with Britain in Europe – the pro-euro lobby group which no longer exists:

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmhansrd/vo050606/text/50606w01.htm>

225 21 January 2008, Hansard, Column 1241

226 The fifth – the Bishops’ organisation – is strongly suspected of receiving EU funds but it has not been possible to prove. The Commission has said that it “cannot exclude” that it may have received EU funding in the past (See below)

227 <http://conservativehome.blogs.com/platform/2008/05/dan-hannan-mep.html>

228 Written Answer from the Commission 21/02/2008, following Written Question P-0389/08 by Dan Hanan

229 In its answer the Commission pointed out that its statistics don’t include “structural funds via calls for tender managed by Member States’ authorities or grants under indirect centralised management”.

230 Combination of two answers: <http://www.ireland.com/focus/2008/eu-payments/agora.pdf> and Written Answer from the Commission 21/02/2008, following Written Question P-0389/08 by Dan Hanan

231 Combination of two answers: <http://www.ireland.com/focus/2008/eu-payments/agora.pdf> and Written Answer from the Commission 21/02/2008, following Written Question P-0389/08 by Dan Hanan

232 In December 2007 the NSPCC issued a statement welcoming the Lisbon Treaty and calling for “speedy ratification in all member states.” It later withdrew the statement, admitting it had gone too far for a non-political charity. However, nobody there was disciplined and the charity’s chief executive, Dame Mary Marsh, whose name the statement was in, said she could not remember saying or authorising the statement (Mail on Sunday, 19 October 2008)

After asking a series of questions to the Commission about EU funding for outside organisations, Christopher Heaton-Harris MEP estimates that EU money going to organisations which promote the EU amounts to “well over £1bn”, and that £250m is spent on NGOs with “very strong political and policy agendas.” However, he acknowledges that this is likely to be a huge underestimate, because it accounts only for those organisations which the Commission has answered specific questions about. Many grants are paid out from obscure budget lines hidden deep in the EU budget.²³³

Another problem with trying to work out just how much is spent and what on is that many organisations receive funds not directly from the EU, but through a complicated funding network whereby EU funds trickle down to them away of the public eye.

A typical example is the European Movement, which seeks to “contribute to the establishment of a united, federal Europe”. It is an international organisation which has branches in 42 European countries. The UK branch vociferously claims it does not receive any funding from the EU institutions, but no doubt must see some of the millions of euros paid to the International branch directly from the EU each year.

Likewise, (though in a sense in an inverted fashion), the UK-based ‘Coalition for the Reform Treaty’, described as “a network of organisations and individuals advancing a positive view on the proposed EU Reform Treaty” and which campaigned in favour of the Lisbon Treaty during the run-up to ratification in the UK, makes no mention of any EU funding on its website. However, a closer look at its 15 constituent members shows that at least 6 of them receive EU funding.

These are: the Global Public Policy Institute, whose website reveals: “GPPI has received grants from the European Commission”²³⁴; the Jean Monnet Association, whose website says it gets “permanent funds for the administration and programmes of the Hougarray House, provided by the European Parliament, the European Commission and Association membership fees”²³⁵; Demos, which runs a project called ‘Children of Europa’,²³⁶ which is part-funded by the European Cultural Foundation, which receives EU funding (through the TACIS IBPP Programme)²³⁷; the European Movement (see above); the Foreign Policy Centre, which received, for instance, €38,318 from the Commission in 2003 for a “private, high-level, 2-day conference event in July 2004 concentrating on the foreign and security aspects of the draft Treaty for a European Constitution” and 4 publications²³⁸; and the Federal Union, which is the UK section of the heavily-funded Union of European Federalists (see below).

Some of the nine other members of the Coalition could well be the recipients of EU funds. One is Policy Network, whose honorary Chair is former EU Commissioner Peter Mandelson and whose Vice Chairs include Roger Liddle, former advisor to Commission President Jose Barroso and Maria João Rodrigues, Special Advisor to the European Commission; another is the Jean Monnet Circle, which has no website but whose name would suggest a strong correlation with the EU; and another is the European League of Economic Cooperation, which is closely linked to the International European Movement, and celebrated its 60th anniversary in the European Parliament in 2006.²³⁹

233 <http://conservativehome.blogs.com/platform/2008/08/chris-heaton-ha.html>

234 <http://www.gppi.net/research/>

235 <http://www.jean-monnet.net/usmain3.html>

236 <http://www.demos.co.uk/projects/childrenofeuropa/overview>

237 <http://www.eurocult.org/about-us/our-funders/>

238 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/grants_2003_uk_fr.pdf

239 http://www.elec-lece.eu/B2RA06_E.htm

So taxpayers' money has been used to promote the EU Lisbon Treaty in the UK by a coalition which makes no mention of its EU funding.

Incidentally, an ICM poll in November 2004 found that 71% of people think the Government should not be allowed to spend taxpayers' money promoting the EU Constitution.²⁴⁰ No doubt they would feel the same about the EU spending taxpayers' money for the same thing.

Another problem with trying to find out who gets what and why is that information is very difficult to locate, and what information is available is scant and incomplete. Through the use of questions asked of the Commission by Members of the European Parliament, and the use of scattered sources listing recipients, it has been possible to put together a list of some of the organisations the EU is funding.

The list is by no means exhaustive – there are hundreds, probably thousands – of organisations on the EU payroll. For the sake of space only a small minority are listed here. There are far less here than we know about, not to mention all those we don't know about. The list is mostly restricted to UK or Brussels-based organisations, but similar organisations exist in every country throughout the EU.

Figures for how much has been received are minimum amounts, since they refer to amounts received from those particular projects we have been able to locate, or from single institutions, such as the Commission, when in fact they may also receive funding from other institutions such as the European Parliament. The amounts cited are there to prove that these organisations, which often describe themselves as 'independent', in fact receive EU money.

There is an astonishing number of organisations campaigning in favour of EU integration and supporting the EU's aims and objectives, which are on the EU payroll, year after year. Below is a list of just a few examples of the types of organisations involved, divided very roughly into those that seek to promote EU integration in general, and those that are paid to lobby the Commission on more specific policy issues.

1 Groups paid to promote the EU

The European Movement

The EU's funding of the European Movement is one of the most blatant examples of the outsourced propaganda effort.

The most recent available figures show that the European Movement received more than €2.5 million in EU funds between January 2005 and October 2007.²⁴¹ For instance it received a €56,359 grant under the "Europe for Citizens" project 2007-2013.²⁴²

The organisation exists to promote the idea of an ever closer union, and is very open about this. Its website states:

"Since 1948, the European Movement has played an essential role in the process of European integration by exercising its influence on European and national institutions. It fought in favour

²⁴⁰ <http://www.openeurope.org.uk/media-centre/article.aspx?newsid=368>

²⁴¹ The exact sum is €2,552,005. Parliamentary Question 4449/07 to 4455/07: Summary of Payments by Legal Entity 2005-2006-2007

²⁴² Action 2, measure 3

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/selection_action32.pdf

of the direct election of the European Parliament by all European citizens, in favour of the Treaty on the European Union and also for a European Constitution. Its objective was to transform the relations between the European States and its citizens into a Federal European Union."²⁴³

"Since 1948, the European Movement has played an essential role in the process of European integration by exercising its influence on European and national institutions"

Over the years, its Presidents have included such European luminaries as Paul-Henri Spaak, Robert Schuman and Valery Giscard d'Estaing. Its current President is Pat Cox, a former President of the European Parliament, and one of its Vice-Presidents is Jo Leinen, a high-profile Member of the European Parliament.

Extraordinarily, despite this, and despite receiving millions of euros worth of funding over the last few years alone (it would be interesting to know how much it has received since its creation in 1948), the EM's website states: "The EMI is independent from governments, European institutions and political parties."²⁴⁴

The European Movement in turn funds other organisations which exist to promote the EU. One such organisation, which is now defunct, was Britain in Europe, the UK campaign group in favour of the euro and the EU Constitution (see below).

It is represented in 44 European countries and regroups 23 international associations. The UK branch shares the same objectives as the international movement. Its website states:

"European integration is necessary to enable effective solutions to be applied to common problems.... A politically united Europe is needed to sweep aside the petty tribalism that has historically, at the very least, been an obstacle to progress or, at its worst, has led to bitter conflict and a catastrophic loss of human life. Europe must be united as a region of law, justice and democracy, equipped with the institutions capable of achieving these ends."²⁴⁵

Meanwhile the website of the Irish branch reads:

"The European Movement Ireland (EMI) is an independent, voluntary membership organisation that works to publicise the work of the EU, and Ireland's role in it... We aim to show that Ireland's place should be at the heart of Europe and it benefits us to be there."²⁴⁶

"You know, the European Union is like dry Weetabix. You know it's good for you, but it's just tough to get through. The EU permeates so many areas of daily life in Ireland, from the coins in your pockets to the bus that gets you around the place, to preventing people putting horse meat in your sausages without telling you. It is pretty mundane stuff, but like gravity, you'd only start missing it if it wasn't there."²⁴⁷

"You know, the European Union is like dry Weetabix. You know it's good for you, but it's just tough to get through"

243 <http://www.europeanmovement.org/history.cfm>

244 <http://www.euromove.org.uk/index.php?id=6451>

245 <http://www.euromove.org.uk/index.php?id=6455>

246 <http://www.europeanmovement.ie/>

247 <http://www.europeanmovement.ie/campaigns.php>

One of the Irish European Movement's most recent publications, released during the Lisbon Treaty referendum campaign, was a highly emotive mock tabloid spread inviting readers to "imagine a future where there is no EU".

Pointing out that the demise of the EU would mean the loss of the right to live, work and vote in 27 other countries, it also ran headlines such as "Farmers and shoppers fight pitched battles in Dublin streets over farm solidarity tax"; "Government collapse"; "Tariff war breaks out in Europe"; "Flooding in Europe"; and "European countries beg US & India at US-India-China trade talks". Clearly, the message, though satirical, was one of total failure and chaos in a world without the EU.²⁴⁸

While it is clear that the national branches of the European Movement share the same objectives of promoting the European Union as the international branch, the funding channels between them are opaque.

The European Movement's branch in the UK states very clearly that it does not receive funding from the EU.

It says: "The European Movement is funded entirely by membership subscriptions and private donations. It receives **no** money from the British Government, from political parties, or from the European Union or any of its institutions (the Council, the Commission, or the European Parliament)." [bold emphasis in the original].²⁴⁹

However, a look at its accounts, registered at Companies House, proves that while the UK branch may not have been the direct recipient of EU funds, it has benefited from funds filtered down from the heavily-funded international branch. The accounts reveal that:

"In the course of the year, the European Movement published a number of news letters. Meeting and campaigns were organised at national and local level. In particular, following a successful bid by the International European Movement, a number of meetings by the branches but open to the public were held, partly funded by the European Commission under its 'Speak up for Europe' programme. The purpose of these meetings is to achieve wider understanding of areas of EU policy and action. These are continuing."

And in fact the UK branch has admitted to direct EU funding in the past. An archived version of its website states: "From time to time, it receives small grants from the European Commission for specific information projects - as distinct from its political campaigning - but such grants have never amounted to more than a small proportion of its income."²⁵⁰

Unlike the UK and Irish branches, the websites of many of the other sub-branches openly state that they receive Commission funding. The site of the Belgium branch lists the European Commission as one of its sponsors under the banner: "The European Movement Belgium thanks its sponsors for their support for a united Europe".²⁵¹

The European Movement also has a youth branch – the Young European Movement. Its website states: "The Young European Movement's main policy is to 'contribute to the establishment of

248 <http://www.europeanmovement.ie/doc/TheIrishStun12June2018.pdf>

249 <http://www.euromove.org.uk/index.php?id=6330>

250 <http://web.archive.org/web/20011109035333/www.no-euro.com/funding.html>

251 <http://www.mouvement-europeen.be/index.html?current=72&page=72&page2=72&lang=fr>

a united, federal Europe founded on the respect for basic human rights, peace principles, democratic principles of liberty and solidarity and citizens' participation'."²⁵²

Union of European Federalists

The Union of European Federalists received €354,681 between January 2005 and October 2007,²⁵³ and then another €137,000 in November 2007 under the "Europe for Citizens" programme.²⁵⁴ In previous years it has received automatic funding from the EU without even having to put in a bid under the Active European Citizenship programme.²⁵⁵ It is a political lobbying group that promotes the European project alongside other organisations such as the European Movement, of which it is a member.²⁵⁶

"The Union of European Federalists (UEF) is a nongovernmental and supranational organisation dedicated to the promotion of a democratic and federal Europe"

According to its website:

"The Union of European Federalists (UEF) is a nongovernmental and supranational organisation dedicated to the promotion of a democratic and federal Europe. It unites constituent organizations and federalists from 20 European countries and all age groups. It has been active at the European, national and local levels for now 60 years. Not being affiliated to any political party, UEF is an autonomous political movement. It cooperates with and seeks to influence European, national and local institutions, parties and associations. Among its supporters are decision-makers from a wide political spectrum, which allows the UEF to influence daily politics of the European Union more effectively."²⁵⁷

The **Federal Union** in the UK is one of its constituent members. It promotes the euro, the EU Constitution (Lisbon Treaty) and in general a stronger EU. It believes that:

"At the heart of the British attitude to Europe is a misconception. We know that our own political system is highly centralised, and we often assume that any European system must inevitably go the same way. But this is not the case. If the European Union continues to develop in a federalist direction, democracy will be strengthened and over-centralisation prevented, and not the reverse."²⁵⁸

"If the European Union continues to develop in a federalist direction, democracy will be strengthened"

As further evidence of how EU money trickles down to outside organisations, the Federal Union also used to be based in the same office as the UK branch of the European Movement, at 7 Graphite Square, London.²⁵⁹

252 <http://www.yem.org.uk/about.html>

253 <http://www.ireland.com/focus/2008/eu-payments/agora.pdf>

254 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/results_call_30_2007.pdf and http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/selection_action32.pdf

255 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/documents/legalbasis/legalbasis_en.pdf

256 <http://en.federaleurope.org/index.php?id=5047>

http://www.europeanmovement.org/all_members.cfm?start=21

257 http://www.federaleurope.org/fileadmin/files_uef/UEF_JEF_White_book_review_29_9_06.pdf

258 <http://www.federalunion.org.uk/europe/index.shtml>

259 <http://www.fedtrust.co.uk/default.asp?groupid=5>

260 <http://www.ireland.com/focus/2008/eu-payments/agora.pdf>

Young European Federalists

The Young European Federalists received €132,927 from the EU between January 2005 and October 2007.²⁶⁰ They took part in the Commission's 'Speak up Europe!' campaign which was part of plan D for Democracy, holding a meeting to evaluate the findings of the project. It is also a member of the European Movement.²⁶¹

"The aim of JEF is to work for the creation of a European federation"

Its mission statement reads:

"The Young European Federalists (JEF) is a supranational, political pluralistic youth organisation with about 25.000 members in over 35 European countries. The aim of JEF is to work for the creation of a European federation, as a first step towards peace and more free, just and democratic society. Our ideas are spread through international activities and youth exchanges, publications, public actions and co-operation with other youth organisations."²⁶²

A recent film by the Young European Federalists showed a group of young people dancing around in "Génération Europe" T-shirts and waving EU flags to the tune of "Breakfast at Tiffany's", with the original lyrics replaced with: "Some say, that we've got nothing in common... No cultural ties to build on... The project just can't work... Some say, nationalism will break us... Conservatives will fight us... But trust us we really do care... And we shout what about... Europe United... Peace and safety for all of the people... Democracy, freedom, subsidiarity... Federalism, the solution we've got."²⁶³

The Young European Federalists recently launched a 'yes' campaign for the Irish referendum on the Lisbon Treaty under the banner "European Youth for an Irish 'YES'", saying, "Following the negative referendum results on the Constitution and the political crisis that Europe was faced with it, JEF believes it is crucial to put the EU back on track on the road to unification and stabilisation."²⁶⁴

"JEF believes it is crucial to put the EU back on track on the road to unification and stabilisation"

The YEF has also called for a single EU Olympic team. In reaction to newspaper coverage of the proposal, the President of the YEF released an extraordinary statement saying:

"It's great to see that the British press have reacted so passionately to the proposed European Olympic Team, especially since this is the year that team GB finally showed the continent and the world that Britain is not only the heart disease, cancer and diabetes capital of the world, nor the couch potato Rupert Murdoch reading state that everyone makes it out to be. No! Brits really do love playing sports, and winning at them too!... It may be the case that team GB did better than usual in these Olympics. Perhaps they fed their athletes with Special K instead of the usual fried chips 'n egg. Mmmm, they're learning."²⁶⁵

261 http://www.europeanmovement.org/all_members.cfm?start=11

262 http://www.federaleurope.org/fileadmin/files_uef/UEF_JEF_White_book_review_29_9_06.pdf

263 Available here: http://www.bobpiper.co.uk/2008/05/pass_the_sick_bucket_1.php

264 <http://www.yes2lisbon.eu/>

265 25 August 2008 http://www.jef.eu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=515&Itemid=1

266 http://www.tepsa.be/Report%20of%20Activities%202006_GB26FEbfin%5B1%5D.doc

267 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/grants_2003_uk_fr.pdf

The Federal Trust for Education and Research

The Federal Trust is a member of the Commission-funded TEPESA²⁶⁶ (see below), and UACES. In 2003 it received £42,005 from the European Commission for a project called “Countdown to Enlargement.”²⁶⁷ It has also contributed to the Commission-funded project “Debating our Common European Future”, by arranging public lectures and debates and publishing pamphlets.²⁶⁸ It operates as a charity.²⁶⁹

Its website states:

“Since its establishment a central focus of the Federal Trust’s work has been on European studies, ranging from Britain’s relationship to Europe, to promoting democracy and effectiveness in the European Communities and now Union. The projects the Trust undertakes fulfil two basic aims: to conduct research on the European dimension of government and to enhance the debate on European integration.”

In 2006 the Federal Trust co-hosted a debate to mark the EU’s 50th anniversary ,with the European Movement and Chatham House, called “Europe, the next 50 years”, at which the speakers and panel were drawn exclusively from the Europhile community.

The speakers were Geoff Hoon (then Minister for Europe), Wolfgang Ischinger (German ambassador), Peter Sutherland (former EU Commissioner), Peter Mandelson (then EU Commissioner), Ken Clarke (pro-euro Conservative), and Charles Kennedy (now head of the UK branch of the European Movement). The panel were James Elles MEP, Lord Hannay (former Perm Rep to the EEC), Denis MacShane MP (pro-euro former Europe Minister), Philip Stephens (FT) and Richard Whitman (Chatham House).²⁷⁰

Britain in Europe

Founded in 1999, Britain in Europe campaigned in Britain in favour of the euro, and subsequently in favour of the European Constitution, until it was wound up in 2005 and its resources given over to the European Movement.

According to information Britain in Europe released about the names of individuals and companies from which it received donations of more than £5,000, the campaign was part-funded by the European Movement, which, as we have seen, receives around a million euros a year from the EU.²⁷¹

European Council on Foreign Relations

As its website reads, the European Council on Foreign Relations was launched in October 2007 “to promote a more integrated European foreign policy in support of shared European interests and values.” Its Chief Executive is Mark Leonard, author of 2005 publication “Why Europe will run the 21st Century”, described by the journal *Foreign Affairs* as “the most provocative and thoughtful book to celebrate the EU”.²⁷²

268 <http://www.fedtrust.co.uk/default.asp?groupid=6>

269 <http://www.fedtrust.co.uk/default.asp?groupid=1>

270 <http://www.fedtrust.co.uk/default.asp?groupid=9>

271 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Britain_in_Europe

272 <http://markleonard.net/books/whyeurope/>

273 <http://www.soros.org/about>

The European Council on Foreign Relations is part funded by the Soros Foundations Network, an international organisation founded and chaired by the billionaire George Soros, which received €225,451 of EU funds between January 2005 and October 2007 under the name the Open Society Institute, "a private operating and grantmaking foundation".²⁷³

The Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS)

Brussels-based CEPS receives an annual policy grant from the EU. Its website openly states that in 2007, 30% of its €6.1 million income came from contracts tendered by the EU institutions.²⁷⁴

"The world needs more of Europe and it needs more like Europe"

For example, it received a €119,341 grant in 2007 under the "Europe for Citizens" programme²⁷⁵, as well as €99,466 under the Commission's External Action budget²⁷⁶, and has been selected to receive a €120,000 grant in 2008.²⁷⁷

In a recent interview, CEPS Founding Director Peter Ludlow described CEPS as "part of the Brussels policy process."²⁷⁸ He said:

"The world needs more of Europe and it needs more like Europe... With the possible exception of Britain, where the political rhetoric is worse than ever, the European dimension is now so much part of the daily life of member state governments that ministers and officials know that they have no alternative but to make Europe work. The process of Europeanisation has furthermore become a hugely important catalyst of change in the member states. You can see this most obviously in the new member states, but the European dimension is also very important in the older member states."

Friends of Europe

This is by its very definition a pro-integration body which aims "to foster open debate on the future of Europe... to provide an open forum for debate for EU and national policymakers, NGOs, business leaders, media and civil society."²⁷⁹ It publishes the journal *Europe's World*, and holds frequent events at which key Commission personnel often speak.

The website states that the Friends of Europe are "completely independent and have no national or political bias". However it then goes on to say:

"*Friends of Europe's* activities are directed by a board of trustees that is truly European. Under the chairmanship of Viscount Etienne Davignon, one of the masterminds of European integration, the board is made up of men and women from different walks of life, who hold positions of senior responsibility in European affairs. They are men and women who have in common a commitment to the European project, and whose influence also spreads beyond the fringes of the EU."²⁸⁰

Viscount Etienne Davignon is a former Vice-President of the European Commission, and the 5 members of the Praesidium include Pat Cox, President of the European Movement

274 http://www.ceps.be/wAbout.php?article_id=1

275 Action 2, measure 1 and 2 call for proposals 12/06
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/selection_action2_12_2006.pdf

276 http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/grants/grants_awarded/beneficiaries_2007_en.pdf

277 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/results_call_30_2007.pdf

278 http://www.ceps.eu/Article.php?article_id=581

279 <http://www.friendsofeurope.org/Aboutus/tabid/592/Default.aspx>

280 <http://www.friendsofeurope.org/Aboutus/tabid/592/Default.aspx>

International and a former President of the European Parliament, who is also Managing Director of a company called European Integration Solutions; Jean-Luc Dehaene, an MEP and Vice President of the Convention on the Future of Europe, which drew up the EU Constitution; and former EU Commissioners Pascal Lamy and António Vitorino. Italian politician Giuliano Amato, who was Vice President of the Convention on the Future of Europe, is among the extensive list of Trustees, as is Peter Mandelson; Javier Solana; former EU Commissioner Michel Barnier; and MEPs Enrique Barón Crespo, Jean-Louis Bourlanges and Elmar Brok – to name just a few.²⁸¹

Between January 2005 and October 2007, Friends of Europe received €396,157 from the Commission.²⁸² It has also been selected to receive a Commission grant of €174,800 under the “Europe for Citizens” programme.²⁸³

The European Policy Centre

The European Policy Centre (EPC) in Brussels says it “is an independent, not-for-profit think tank, committed to making European integration work.”²⁸⁴

It received €389,876 from the Commission between January 2005 and October 2007. In 2008 it won a €150,000 grant from the Commission under the “Europe for Citizens programme”.²⁸⁵

The EPC’s Senior Executive Elizabeth Bisland told a conference in Brussels in 2005: “I will now turn to the criteria for operating grants. I will list these criteria because I think it is a matter of choice... Most importantly I think the themes they are working on have to be themes that are crucial to the realisation of the European integration process, for example the missions and values of the Union, the EU economic and social model.”²⁸⁶

Institute of European Affairs

The Dublin-based Institute of European Affairs, which also has a branch in Brussels, is a lobbying think tank and registered charity “established with the objective of identifying challenges posed by further European integration and evaluating strategic policy options. We seek to involve relevant stakeholders, policy-makers and opinion-formers in this process, enhance the quality of Irish policy formation, and inform public opinion.”

The tenor of its direction appears to be more integrationist than not. Over half of its honorary positions are held by serving and former Irish Commissioners.²⁸⁷

Evidence of where its allegiances lie can be found in its description of the Lisbon Treaty:

“The Treaty is to be the last institutional reform adopted by the European Union for some time, designed to prepare the EU and its Member States to collectively face future challenges, such as international terrorism and trans-border criminality, climate change,

281 <http://www.friendsofeurope.org/Aboutus/Whoware/PraesidiumTrustees/tabid/617/Default.aspx>

282 <http://www.ireland.com/focus/2008/eu-payments/agora.pdf>

283 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/results_call_30_2007.pdf

284 http://www.epc.eu/en/ae.asp?TYP=ABOUT&LV=224&PG=AE/en/direct_in&AI=1&see=n

285 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/results_call_30_2007.pdf

286 http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/archive/forumtranscrip_en.pdf

287 <http://www.iiea.com/aboutustest.php>

288 http://www.iiea.com/publicationxtest.php?publication_id=33

energy and food security, global poverty and stimulating growth and innovation in the Union's economy."²⁸⁸

Drawing on just one of its publications, it describes "the considerable extension of qualified majority voting" in justice and home affairs proposed by the Treaty as "a very important and welcome development."²⁸⁹

In 2007 the IEA received a €75,000 grant from the Commission under the "Europe for Citizens" programme".²⁹⁰

Trans-European Policy Studies Association (TEPSA)

The TEPSA network, established in 1974, is composed of research institutes specialising in European and international affairs, located in EU member states and candidate countries. "The aim of TEPSA is to provide and strengthen high quality international research on European integration in order to stimulate discussion on policies and political options for Europe".²⁹¹

"TEPSA prefers solutions that tend towards closer integration"

TEPSA says "It offers a problem-solving approach for those who want the EU to develop. While trying to be objective about the problems and realistic about the possibilities, TEPSA prefers solutions that tend towards closer integration, hence is more likely to identify them, and can be of more use than most other bodies to those in favour of such an approach."²⁹²

The website clearly states: "TEPSA benefits from the support of the European Commission." Its UK member is the Federal Trust for Education and Research.

It received €254,137 from the Commission between January 2005 and October 2007.²⁹³ It received a €100,000 grant under the "Europe for Citizens" programme in 2007²⁹⁴, and in 2008 will receive a €110,000 grant.²⁹⁵

"Hand in hand with the enlargement must go further integration. For us there is no alternative to European integration"

Youth of the European People's Party (YEPP)

This youth wing of the centre-right European People's Party in the European Parliament received €41,584 from the Commission alone in the two years 2005 and 2006.²⁹⁶ This is in addition to substantial funds it must presumably also receive from the European Parliament.

It is strongly in favour of further EU integration and exists to promote it. Its website states: "We believe in the European Union, as it stands for a future of freedom and security, progress, prosperity and solidarity... Hand in hand with the enlargement must go further integration. For us there is no alternative to European integration."²⁹⁷

289 http://www.iiea.com/images/managed/publications_attachments/1_Brosnan.pdf

290 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/selection_action2_12_2006.pdf

291 <http://www.tepsa.be/>

292 http://www.tepsa.be/Report%20of%20Activities%202006_GB26FEbfin%5B1%5D.doc

293 <http://www.ireland.com/focus/2008/eu-payments/agora.pdf>

294 Action 2, measure 1 and 2 call for proposals 12/06

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/selection_action2_12_2006.pdf

295 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/results_call_30_2007.pdf

296 <http://www.ireland.com/focus/2008/eu-payments/agora.pdf>

297 <http://www.yepp-online.net/content.php?hmlD=2&smID=28>

It also says it has a “mission to stimulate further integration in Europe.”²⁹⁸ The site’s homepage greets the reader with:

“Dear friends... The enhanced European integration and the vision for a powerful Europe established on democratic values and liberal principles were the source of the idea for a European political youth organisation, beyond the European borders, aiming to the communication and the exchange of different political and cultural experiences.”²⁹⁹

European Youth Forum

The Brussels-based European Youth Forum received more than €3.1 million between January 2005 and October 2007. It “represents and advocates for the needs and interests of all young people in Europe, through their positive and active participation” and “work[s] to deepen European integration while at the same time contributing to the development of youth work in other regions of the world.”³⁰⁰

At the 50th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome in 2007, the Youth Forum issued a declaration in favour of the recently rejected EU Constitution on behalf of “the young people of Europe.” It said:

“We, the young people of Europe, gathered in Rome on the occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the Treaty of Rome to pay tribute to and continue the vision of those who made it possible for us to grow up in an environment of peace and prosperity, democracy and rule of law. The European Union is where we live, study and work together; a place of equality, freedom, tolerance and solidarity; a process of integration which allows us to preserve our uniqueness and diversity; an area in which the local, regional, national and European realities coexist and cooperate for the sake of all of us; a space that will hopefully remain open to integrate its neighbours.”³⁰¹

European Policy Institutes Network (EPIN)

EPIN is a network of think tanks and policy institutes focusing on current EU and European political and policy debates aiming “to contribute to the debate on the Future of Europe through up to the minute, expert analysis and commentary and through providing easy access to understanding the different national debates.”³⁰²

According to its website:

“EPIN is a network that offers its member institutes the opportunity to contribute to the ‘European added-value’ for researchers, decision-makers and citizens. The network provides a platform for researchers and policy analysts to establish personal links, exchange knowledge and collaborate on EU-related issues. Members bring their national perspectives to bear on the issues tackled and through collaboration they contribute to establish a ‘European added-value’ (e.g. on EU communication, flexible integration). By doing so they strengthen a common European dimension in the national debates on Europe.”

298 <http://www.yepp-online.net/content.php?hmlID=2&smID=27>

299 <http://www.yepp-online.net/index.php>

300 <http://www.youthforum.org/>

301 http://europa.eu/50/docs/rome_youth_declaration_en.pdf

302 <http://www.epin.org/new/about>

Its homepage reveals that it receives funding through the Commission's "Europe for Citizens" programme 2007 – 2013.

Its 28 member think tanks include the Centre for European Policy Studies in Brussels, the Centre for European Reform in London, the Institute of European Affairs in Dublin, and Notre Europe in Paris.

It is not clear from the website whether or not funds that EPIN receives from the EU filter directly into the member organisations, but the website links to their research and homepages.³⁰³ The Centre for European Reform in London is a group concentrating on reform of the EU, but which is broadly in favour of EU integration, arguing, for example, in favour of the Lisbon Treaty – even after it was rejected by Irish voters in June 2008.³⁰⁴

European Citizen Action Service (ECAS)

This Brussels-based organisation received more than €3.3 million from the Commission between January 2005 and October 2007³⁰⁵, and also received €153,493 from the Commission in 2008 under the "Europe for Citizens" programme.³⁰⁶

Despite this, it claims to be "an international non-profit organization, independent of political parties, commercial interests and the EU Institutions." It says its mission "is to enable NGOs and individuals to make their voice heard with the EU by providing advice on how to lobby, fundraise, and defend European citizenship rights."

Among its objectives are "To inform citizens about the new Constitution and how it strengthens their European rights", and "To campaign for a genuine European citizenship."³⁰⁷

Citizens of Europe

Based in Berlin, "Citizens of Europe is a network of people from all over the continent." Its website says:

"We believe that European integration is both a fortunate reality and our future. While most discussions and activities still take place in national contexts, we work together on the fields of debate, culture and training in order to contribute to the development of a European civil society. Bringing Europe together is, for us, a matter of mental and cultural change rather than a technocratic process."³⁰⁸

"We believe that European integration is both a fortunate reality and our future"

It received €22,044 under the "Europe for Citizens" 2007-2013.³⁰⁹

European Trade Union Confederation

The European Trade Union Confederation received more than €4.8 million from the Commission between January 2005 and October 2007.³¹⁰

303 <http://www.epin.org/new/memberspubs>

304 See, for example http://www.cer.org.uk/articles/61_grant.html

305 <http://www.ireland.com/focus/2008/eu-payments/agora.pdf>

306 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/results_call_30_2007.pdf

307 <http://www.ecas-citizens.eu/content/view/full/13/61/1/2/>

308 http://panorama.citizens-of-europe.eu/?page_id=6

309 Action 2, measure 3

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/selection_action32.pdf

310 <http://www.ireland.com/focus/2008/eu-payments/agora.pdf>

Its website states: "The ETUC's prime objective is to promote the European Social Model and to work for the development of a united Europe of peace and stability where working people and their families can enjoy full human and civil rights and high living standards."³¹¹

John Monks, the General Secretary has been extremely open about the ETUC's role in promoting the EU more generally. He told a conference in Brussels in 2005:

"We are promoting Europe down those particular channels. We were the first to support the Constitution and we are campaigning for it"

"We spread a lot of information about what Europe is doing, and that gets multiplied through union channels down towards a reasonable proportion of our sixty million membership. We are promoting Europe down those particular channels.... We were the first to support the Constitution and we are campaigning for it. We want to make sure that the vision of Europe – the sense that Europe is something people really want to belong to because it is a unique part of the world, setting standards for ourselves which we then want to export to other countries as our model for development and our model of society – seems to me to be worth fighting for and worth being citizens of. That is the concept we should develop."³¹²

Many individual trade unions based in Europe receive substantial funding from the EU. Under the budget heading "Industrial Relations and Social Dialogue" for example, trade unions and other bodies representing industry received a total of €13.6 million from the Commission in 2007 alone.³¹³

Notre Europe

This Paris-based think-tank was chosen to run the Commission project "Tomorrow's Europe", budgeted out of the Plan D initiative.³¹⁴ It is not clear exactly how much they were paid for it.

With the slogan "Thinking a United Europe", it is strongly pro-integration. In the words of its President, former Commissioner Pascal Lamy: "Notre Europe has become one of the main centres of reference regarding European integration. It is run by a small team of researchers who concentrate on building Europe very much along the lines imagined by Jacques Delors."³¹⁵

This should not be confused with the **Our Europe** association, which was listed as a permanent beneficiary of EU funds under the 2004-2006 programme "Active European Citizenship". The reason was that: "The 'Our Europe' Association takes the form of a think tank of personalities representative of European society and the political, social, economic and scientific worlds to act as a marketplace for ideas promoting a closer European Union; as such, it pursues an aim of general European interest."³¹⁶

Robert Schuman Foundation

This is a Paris-based organisation which also operates out of Brussels. Its website says it "works to promote the construction of Europe both with regard to its ideas and in the field alongside the citizens themselves."³¹⁷

311 <http://www.etuc.org/r/2>

312 http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/archive/forumtranscrip_en.pdf

313 http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/calls/results/2007/vp_2007_001_en.pdf

314 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/grants/index_en.htm

315 http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/archive/forumtranscrip_en.pdf

316 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/documents/legalbasis/legalbasis_en.pdf

317 http://www.robert-schuman.eu/en/frs_fondation_robert_schuman.php

The donations page reads: "By supporting the Robert Schuman Foundation you help to carry on the work that is being accomplished daily to make Europe accessible to all and to enhance the emergent common European identity."³¹⁸

"Our aim is to encourage Polish citizens to actively participate in the process of unifying Europe"

The Polish Robert Schuman Foundation received €18,491 under the "Europe for Citizens" 2007 to 2013 programme,³¹⁹ and also partners with the European Parliament, suggesting some kind of funding from there too.³²⁰

Its mission statement says: "The Polish Robert Schuman Foundation is non-governmental, non-political organization. Our aim is to encourage Polish citizens to actively participate in the process of unifying Europe."³²¹

As an example of its activities, in May 2008 it held a series of "Polish European Meetings", with more than 40 "cultural and educational events on European issues" and a 'Schuman Parade', described as "the biggest and the most cheerful manifestation in support of a united Europe!". European President Hans-Gert Pottering took part.³²²

The Robert Schuman Foundation is not to be confused from the distinct **Robert Schuman House**, which, along with the **Jean Monnet House**, receives annual operating grants from the European Commission as part of its "action programme to support bodies working in the field of active European citizenship."

In 2005, for example, Jean Monnet House received € 255.000, while Robert Schuman House received € 128.000.³²³

As the EU writes in its Decision 2004/100/EC:

"The Jean Monnet and Robert Schuman houses are meeting places for the people of Europe, the aim being to set the pioneers and pioneering activities of European integration in the context in which two of the founding fathers of Europe lived and worked, and to provide information on today's and tomorrow's Europe; as such, these organisations pursue an aim of general European interest."³²⁴

Confrontations Europe

This French association received €150,000 from the Commission under the "Europe for Citizens" programme in 2007³²⁵, and €210,000 in 2008.³²⁶ It also received €171,000 in 2007 under the EU Social and Employment Affairs grants for "the promotion of industrial relations in Europe."³²⁷

318 <http://www.robert-schuman.eu/soutenez-nous.php>

319 Action 2, measure 3

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/selection_action32.pdf

320 <http://www.schuman.org.pl/modules.php?name=Content&pa=showpage&pid=597>

321 http://www.euroclubnetwork.eu/component/option,com_contact/task,view/contact_id,1/Itemid,51/

322 <http://www.schuman.org.pl>

323 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/organisations/call2005/documents/guidelines.0206/guidelinesb_en.pdf

324 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/civilsociety/decision_en.pdf

325 Action 2, measure 1 and 2 call for proposals 12/06

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/selection_action2_12_2006.pdf

326 Action 2, measure 1 and 2 call for proposals 30/07

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/results_call_30_2007.pdf

327 http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/calls/results/2007/vp_2007_001_en.pdf

Its stated aims include: “To develop a political Union and a European Constitution”, “To promote the development of a civil European society” and “To contribute to the development and the implementation of a social, economic and cultural European project.”³²⁸

La Maison de l’Europe de Paris

This ‘House of Europe’ received €44,233 under the “Europe for Citizens” programme³²⁹. It describes itself as a “House for European citizenship... working for an active and inclusive European citizenship”.³³⁰

This is just one of many in a network of Maisons de l’Europe. Membership of the network must agree to “promote the European idea.”³³¹ It is a member of the European Movement.³³²

Commission of Bishops’ Conferences of the European Community (COMECE)

This is a Brussels-based outfit whose objective is “to promote reflection, based on the Church’s social teaching, on the challenges facing a united Europe”.³³³

It is completely dedicated to the idea of a united Europe and to promoting that. To take just one example, in its contribution to the preparation of the Berlin Declaration in 2006 it wrote:

“Fifty years after the Treaties of Rome the European project will only succeed if the people of Europe develop both an appreciation for the European Union and a sense of active citizenship. The Berlin Declaration offers an opportunity to explain to EU citizens which values inspire and guide this project and which ambitions it pursues. If the EU leaders convey to the people a sense that they are promoters of, and beneficiaries in, a project which has made a historical and qualitative difference to their lives, they will foster European identity. And if people see that EU Institutions have improved their consultation methods and have become more transparent, this should contribute to a deepening sense of active citizenship.”³³⁴

“the European project will only succeed if the people of Europe develop both an appreciation for the European Union and a sense of active citizenship”

In its report, *A Europe of Values: the Ethical Dimension of the European Union*, COMECE wrote:

“The Community method is designed to achieve the common good rather than simply reconciling national interests. Therein lies its ethical dimension: the common good is greater than the sum of individual national interests.”³³⁵

As noted by Foreign Secretary David Miliband during a debate in Parliament (see above), COMECE also campaigned in favour of the Lisbon Treaty ahead of the Irish referendum in June 2008. In October 2007 it issued a press release which read:

328 <http://www.confrontations.org/spip.php?rubrique109>

329 Action 2, measure 3
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/selection_action32.pdf

330 <http://www.paris-europe.eu/spip.php?rubrique14>

331 http://www.maisondeleurope.org/PG_Membres.htm

332 http://www.europeanmovement.org/all_members.cfm?start=11

333 http://www.comece.org/comece.taf?_function=who&id=1&language=en

334 http://www.comece.org/upload/pdf/com_valeurs_061124_en.pdf

335 http://www.comece.org/upload/pdf/0703_values_EN.pdf

“The Reform Treaty, despite its shortcomings and complexity, represents a satisfying institutional solution for the enlarged EU; it introduces necessary reforms into the decision-making process that should allow European construction to continue in an efficient and just way.”³³⁶

COMECE is strongly suspected of receiving EU funds, but it has been difficult to prove definitively. Its website states that “COMECE is funded by the Bishops’ Conferences of the European Union”, but there is no readily available information about this body.

According to a written answer from the Commission to a question posed by MEP Christopher Heaton-Harris, “COMECE, the Commission of the Bishops’ Conference of the European Communities has not received any direct Commission funding from the Community budget.”

However, it goes on to say:

“The Commission cannot exclude that this organisation could have received such funding before 2005 and continues to mention it in its sources of revenue, either on its website or in other publicity material. This is mainly due to the fact that the Commission bases its research on the information available in the ABAC Contract database, which only contains information on contracts or grants awarded directly by the Commission since 2005, when this database first came online. In other words, the available information does not cover funding managed by Member States’ authorities under shared management nor funding under indirect centralised management, for example funding managed through National Agencies or through research consortia. The Commission cannot verify if other EU institutions gave funds to this association and invites the Honourable Member to contact each institution’s authorities directly.”³³⁷

An article in the German Law Journal appears to suggest that COMECE has received at least part of funds amounting to €40,000 a year³³⁸, but it is an ambiguous reference which requires clarification.

The European Parliament recently voted against an amendment which would have included religious groups like COMECE in its definition of lobbyists when it issued new transparency obligations for interest groups. Comece’s spokesperson Johanna Touzel claimed: “We work like lobbyists but we do not defend particular interests. We fight for the common good.”³³⁹

Another religious group which has also cannily avoided having to register on the lobbyists list – without justification – is EURODIACONIA, a Brussels-based federation of churches, welfare organisations and NGOs, whose aim is to promote “social Europe” by “influencing decision-making processes in the European institutions”.³⁴⁰ It received €31,417 under the EU’s “Europe for Citizens” 2007-2013 programme³⁴¹ and has also received other funding in previous years.³⁴²

European Cultural Foundation

This Amsterdam-based organisation lists the EU among its funders, and states on its website: “We are an independent organisation which helps the arts contribute to a strong, united and diverse Europe built on shared cultural values”³⁴³

336 <http://federalunion.org.uk/quotebank/wp-content/uploads/2007/10/comece-press-reformtreaty-071019-en.pdf>

337 30 September 2008, E-4720/2008

338 <http://www.germanlawjournal.com/print.php?id=668> November 2005

339 Le Figaro, 9 May 2008

340 http://www.eurodiaconia.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=41&Itemid=56

341 Action 2, measure 3 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/selection_action32.pdf

342 <http://www.eurodiaconia.org/files/AGM/Eurodiaconia%20annual%20report%202006%20lay-out.pdf>

343 <http://www.eurocult.org/about-us/>

Euroalter

Based in the Godmanchester in the UK:

“European Alternatives is a civil society organisation dedicated to promoting intellectual engagement with the idea and future of Europe... European Alternatives strongly believes in, and actively advocates, the necessity of a new trans-national politics... It is our belief that the contemporary project of European unification represents potential fertile soil for political innovation and vehement democratic participation. But Europe must be understood in its multifaceted political, cultural, and philosophical reality, and the European project cannot rest content with economic unification.”³⁴⁴

It received €24,352 under the “Europe for Citizens” project 2007-2013.³⁴⁵

Bürger Europas e.V.

Based in Berlin, Bürger Europas e.V. “is an independent non-profit association supporting the idea of European Integration”.³⁴⁶ It received €14,718 under the “Europe for Citizens” programme 2007-2013.³⁴⁷

Association des Etats Généraux des Etudiants de l’Europe (AEGEE)

The Brussels-based AEGEE “is one of the biggest interdisciplinary student associations in Europe; it is represented by 15.000 students, active in 232 academic cities, in 43 countries all around Europe.”

It aims “to promote a unified Europe without prejudices... [and a] European dimension in education.” The website notes that:

“In order to really promote international co-operation and avoid creating any physical or mental borders AEGEE does not recognize any national level or national administration in its unique organizational structure... The dream of Europe without borders has inspired and continues to inspire generations of students from the Caucasus to the Atlantic shores and makes AEGEE permanently developing.”³⁴⁸

“The dream of Europe without borders has inspired and continues to inspire generations of students from the Caucasus to the Atlantic shores”

It received €228,084 from the Commission between January 2005 and October 2007.³⁴⁹

Café Babel

Café Babel is an online magazine published by Babel International, which is designed to “stimulate and develop European public opinion”. In addition to blogs and forums, “At a grassroots level, the e-community is moderated by a network of local teams promoting the European perspective through debates, conferences and other physical initiatives.”

344 <http://www.euroalter.com/aboutus.html>

345 Action 2, measure 3
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/selection_action32.pdf

346 http://www.buerger-europas.de/about_en.htm

347 Action 2, measure 3
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/selection_action32.pdf

348 <http://www.karl.aegee.org/aeg-web.nsf/Full/About—About?OpenDocument>

349 <http://www.ireland.com/focus/2008/eu-payments/agora.pdf>

The website notes: "Together with an ever-expanding network of local offices across Europe, *cafebabel.com* can truly claim to be the voice of the 'euro-generation'." Among its "partners", Café Babel lists the EU Commission's DG Education and Culture and the European Parliament – an indication that it receives funding from these bodies.

Based in Paris in co-location with the Maison de l'Europe, the contact section shows that there are 13 staff running the site, each of which explain their enthusiasm for working for the group with straplines such as: "I've always had that European fibre. I've hit the jackpot to be a part of this breeding-ground for European construction."³⁵⁰

Some of the articles on the site are heavily biased in favour of the EU. A recent "report" in the aftermath of the Irish no, titled "Why 862, 415 Irish voted no to the Lisbon treaty" began: "The Irish response seems to have been motivated by a lack of knowledge on what the document was and by a fear of change. But perhaps Europe has not sufficiently proven its case?"

It went on to argue that:

"A loss of sovereignty, intrusion into issues such as abortion, military neutrality, immigration and nuclear power were themes harnessed by Sinn Féin, the only parliamentary party in favour of a no vote, as were the Libertas political group founded by Declan Ganley. The entrepreneur brags of having read the treaty and of fighting for a more democratic and transparent Europe."³⁵¹

"I've always had that European fibre. I've hit the jackpot to be a part of this breeding-ground for European construction"

Another one seemed to subtly imply that euroscepticism and racism are the same thing. The piece, about Italy's Northern League Party and reports of racism, barely mentioned the EU and yet its headline read: "After 100 days of Berlusconi, a Eurosceptic Italy."³⁵²

Institut fur Europäische Politik

The Berlin-based Institute for European Politics says it is "dedicated to the study of European integration", by which it means promoting the EU, as made clear by its position on the Lisbon Treaty, which it says "offers a good chance for strengthening the continuation of the long success-story of European integration in the future."³⁵³

As well as receiving funding directly from the EU under the Commission heading "Support for bodies active at European level in the field of active European citizenship", it is also a founding member of TEPSA and has been a member of the German European Movement since 1962, suggesting other, indirect funding from these EU-funded pro-integration bodies.

La Fondation Madariaga

Presided by the EU's High Representative Foreign and Security Policy, Javier Solana, the Madariaga Foundation was created in 1998 by the Alumni of the College of Europe "for insightful reflection and analysis into European issues." (See Part Four for more on the College of Europe).

350 <http://www.cafebabel.com/eng/about/contacts/>

351 <http://www.cafebabel.com/eng/article/25736/ireland-citizens-voice-talks-no-lisbon-treaty.html>

352 <http://www.cafebabel.com/eng/article/25852/northern-league-liga-nord-racist-party-italy.html>

353 <http://www.iep-berlin.de/index.php?id=638&L=1>

One of its aims is “to stir up the European citizen”.³⁵⁴ It states that “One way to stir up EU citizenship is to foster a robust political debate at the pan-European level so as to enhance the perception of a ‘European common good’ distinct from the sum of national interests.”³⁵⁵ It also says it wants “to promote the role of the EU as a leading global actor.”³⁵⁶

Following the Irish ‘no’ vote to the Lisbon Treaty, the Foundation’s Executive Director, Pierre Defraigne, a former senior official in the Commission, wrote a piece arguing that:

“Each national referendum on a European issue is flawed: it entrusts a single country with an excessive responsibility vis-à-vis their 500 million fellow Europeans, causing either inhibition or hubris among voters. People mix right and wrong reasons to say no and often do this in a contradictory way. They take the 26 other countries hostage to their whim. Eventually they do not bear the consequences of their choice... The Irish vote conveys two interesting messages: first, a majority of the young generation and 2/3 of the educated youth have rejected the Treaty. What do they know about Europe? What do they know about politics?”³⁵⁷

The Foundation reveals that “Representatives of European Union Institutions are regularly involved in MEF’s programme of activities, including conferences and working groups. The European Parliament, the European Commission and the Council of the European Union support and are involved in several projects of the Foundation.”³⁵⁸

In 2005 it entered into a partnership with the EU-funded Café Babel, sharing premises and “collaborating in the organisation of joint events.”³⁵⁹

Councils and regional development agencies

Various Councils across the UK have also been funded for projects with more than a hint of a pro-EU slant. For example, in 2003³⁶⁰:

Edinburgh City Council received €93,734 for an enlargement-focussed event called “NOW 25”, “to encourage debate about the issues and opportunities stemming from EU enlargement in Edinburgh and Scotland”. The project was run in association with the European Movement and Our Europe.

Northampton County Council received €32,689 for trips to Brussels for young people “who on their return will report on their visit and contribute to three European Awareness Day conferences/debates... reaching an anticipated global audience of some 400 young people. The conferences will have an enlargement theme, but explore other issues such as the Euro, security and immigration, and environmental policy.”

Yorkshire Forward (Yorkshire & Humberside Regional Development Agency) received €27,291 for a conference entitled “Europe Alive with Opportunity” “to raise awareness of the opportunities created by enlargement.”

354 http://www.madariaga.org/template_page.asp?pag_id=18

355 http://www.madariaga.org/template_subpage.asp?pag_id=18&spa_id=76&lng_iso=EN

356 http://www.madariaga.org/template_subpage.asp?pag_id=18&spa_id=77&lng_iso=EN

357 http://www.madariaga.org/template_news.asp?nws_id=63

358 http://www.madariaga.org/template_page.asp?pag_id=22

359 http://www.madariaga.org/template_page.asp?pag_id=22

360 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/grants_2003_uk_fr.pdf

The Isle of Anglesey County Council received €11,117 for “a series of seminars with secondary school children in Anglesey and Gwynedd to raise awareness about enlargement and to engage the students in discussions about their future in an enlarged Europe... A seminar to establish a dialogue about the benefits of enlargement took place with Anglesey County Council and Businessmen.”

Belfast City Council received €75,000 for a programme of information events called “Eyes on the New Europe”, “to raise awareness of EU enlargement”.

Similar events-based funding has gone to universities. See Part Four for more on this.

2 NGOs and other groups supporting the EU

In addition to the organisations which seem to exist to promote the EU, there are also hundreds of groups which use EU funding to lobby the Commission on other policy issues. They do not necessarily actively promote the EU in the way that the organisations listed above do, but use their influence to support the EU in all manner of policy areas from the environment to foreign policy, human rights, and education.

Providing funding for organisations which help the EU to develop policy and thereby acquire new and bigger powers in all manner of policy areas can therefore be considered as propaganda spending.

What is not clear, is to what extent the money spent on these organisations keeps them happy to support the EU in a particular area and/or to what extent their continued funding actually *depends* on them generally supporting the EU in the first place. The question is, how likely are these groups to provide advice and input that contradicts the Commission position?

Christopher Heaton-Harris MEP, who is on the European Parliament’s Audit Committee and who has spent many years trying to find out from the Commission which organisations it funds, sums it up as follows:

“The Commission pays money to hundreds of NGOs. The NGOs are pleased to accept the money. The Commission proposes a Directive in an area the NGO is active in. How, then does the NGO react if it does not like the Directive – does it bite the hand that feeds it?

Actually it is worse than that. In a number of cases the Commission will consult around a policy area in which it wants to take an initiative. It consults, amongst others, with NGOs it funds and has a relationship with. The Commission takes the advice of the NGOs and then decides to run a project that it puts out to tender. The NGOs the Commission consulted with bid and perhaps win the contract.

A self-fulfilling prophecy – and probably part of the explanation as to why we have so many new laws emanating from the Commission! (Farmers watch out – the Commission funds a number of groups that came together last year to form an organisation called “Pesticide Watch”. Anyone involved in agriculture will tell you what a dog’s breakfast the Commission is making of the “Pesticides Directive” and how it will hurt European farmers – and no one can work out where the support for the Commission’s proposals came from. Well, perhaps they were actually bought and paid for by the Commission itself!)”

The Commission knows this is slightly dodgy and this explains why invariably the funding for each individual NGO is hidden away – it is the devil in the detail of the Budget itself.”³⁶¹

Here are just a handful of examples of the kind of lobby groups that receive funding, of which there are thousands. Again, it is impossible to include all the groups involved, because of the scarcity of central information and the sheer number on the EU payroll. The European Commission has established a register of EU lobby groups, but it remains voluntary, meaning that out of around 15,000 lobbyists active in Brussels, only a handful have so far signed up.³⁶²

Again, the figures must be considered minimum amounts, cited just to prove that the organisations have been in receipt of EU funding. Most of the information comes from a Commission answer³⁶³ to a question asked by Christopher Heaton-Harris, and amounts refer to that received from the Commission between January 2005 and October 2007, unless otherwise stated.

SOLIDAR

This is a Brussels-based lobby organisation which calls for a more social Europe. Its website says: “At European level, SOLIDAR lobbies the EU Institutions for migrants’ rights and works closely with other NGOs as well as with trade unions, think tanks and international organisations.”³⁶⁴

However it is also very much committed to the idea of helping to develop a European citizenship, which, as we will see in Part Three, is central to the EU’s strategy of fostering support for EU integration. At a conference in Brussels in 2005, a representative of Solidar called Giampiero Alhadef said:

“We do feel that there is also a very important role for civil society in terms of creating a European citizenship and this concerns the role of education and information. Until we can actually do that we will not have a European citizenship; we will have instead a collection of people that feel themselves to be very much rooted in the national state and will not see themselves as European.”³⁶⁵

Solidar received €1,274,908 from the Commission between January 2005 and October 2007³⁶⁶, and later received a grant for a €142,267 grant under the “Europe for Citizens” programme.³⁶⁷

Climate Action Network Europe

This lobby group believes, for example, that “The existence of the EU emissions trading scheme (ETS) is a tremendously important achievement for European Climate Change policy.”³⁶⁸ It received €569,352.

361 <http://conservativehome.blogs.com/platform/2008/08/chris-heaton-ha.html>

362 <http://blog.brusselssunshine.eu/>

363 <http://www.irishtimes.com/focus/2008/eu-payments/agora.pdf>

364 http://www.solidar.org/Page_Generale.asp?DocID=13965&la=1&langue=EN

365 http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/archive/forumtranscrip_en.pdf

366 <http://www.ireland.com/focus/2008/eu-payments/agora.pdf>

367 Action 2, measure 1 and 2 call for proposals 30/07

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/results_call_30_2007.pdf

368 <http://www.climnet.org/EUenergy/ET.html>

European Environmental Bureau

According to its website, the European Environmental Bureau's "specific mission is to promote environmental policies and sustainable policies on the European Union level. Its members have joined because they are convinced of the importance of the policies of the European Union with regard to environment and nature conservation."³⁶⁹ It received €1,914,781.

The European Women's Lobby

This group "aims at promoting women's rights and equality between women and men in the European Union. EWL is active in different areas such as women's economic and social position, women in decision-making, violence against women, women's diversity etc. EWL works mainly with the institutions of the European Union: the European Parliament, the European Commission and the EU Council of Ministers."³⁷⁰ It received €2,377,910.

The European Council on Refugees and Exiles

This "promotes a humane and generous European asylum policy."³⁷¹ It received €1,969,521.

Eurochild

The aim of this Brussels-based network is:

'to promote the welfare and rights of children and young people' through:... monitoring and influencing policy development at the European level... influencing and making recommendations to international institutions such as the European Commission, the European Parliament, the Council of Europe and the United Nations."³⁷²

It received €636,815.

European Social Action Network

This aims "To encourage in Europe a coherent social policy based on the shared values of our members... To bring to the attention of European policy makers (at the Parliament and the Commission) contributions based on the expertise of our members."³⁷³ It received €353,988 in the two years 2005 and 2006.

European Students' Union

The European Students' Union describes itself as:

"the umbrella organisation of 49 national unions of students from 38 countries and through these members represent over 10 million students. The aim of ESU is to represent and promote the educational, social, economic and cultural interests of students at a European level towards all relevant bodies and in particular the European Union, Council of Europe and UNESCO."³⁷⁴ It received €323,259.

369 <http://www.eeb.org/mission/Index.html>

370 http://www.womenlobby.org/site/1Template1.asp?DocID=1&v1ID=&RevID=&namePage=&pageParent=&DocID_sousmenu=

371 http://www.ecre.org/about_us

372 <http://www.eurochild.org/en/about-us/who-are-we/index.html>

373 http://www.esan.eu/version_anglaise/top_menu/presentation/esan_in_short

374 <http://www.esib.org/index.php/About%20ESU/what-is-esu>

Federation of Young European Greens

This group “strive[s] for environmental and social justice.” It does this from its permanent office in the European Parliament, donated by the Green Group in the European Parliament³⁷⁵, and has also received Commission funding of €208,291 between 2005 and 2007 alone.

Confederation of Family Organisations in the European Union (COFACE)

Based in Brussels, this organisation believes “that the need for a European policy for families and children is overwhelming”, and calls on the EU institutions “to give European family and child policy a conclusive legal basis in the Treaty on Union”.³⁷⁶

“the need for a European policy for families and children is overwhelming”

It received €338,542 between January 2005 and October 2007³⁷⁷, and €33,043 under the “Europe for Citizens” programme 2007-2013.³⁷⁸

European Theatre Convention

This organisation’s activities include: “Lobbying and representation in European organisations (as the European Parliament and the Commission) for theatre in general and for its members in particular”. The website advertises EU initiatives such as the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue and the Scheme for Artist Mobility. As its website says, it does this “With the support of the European Community budget line ‘support to organisations who promote European Culture’”.³⁷⁹

European Youth Information and Counselling Agency (ERYICA)

This Commission-funded body “works to intensify European co-operation in the field of youth information work and services” and aims “to promote the establishment of a European arena in this field, especially by developing a European Network of youth information and counselling structures.” It is funded by the Youth in Action programme.³⁸⁰

CEEP

This is one of the Commission’s designated “Social Partners”, which it consults on legislation. For instance, it received an €84,000 grant in 2007 under the Commission’s ‘Industrial Relations and Social Dialogue’ budget line.³⁸¹

Its strong pro-EU bias is evident from the public reaction of its Secretary General to the Irish ‘no’ vote to the Lisbon Treaty. Rainer Plassmann sent a press release saying:

“The Irish NO is a stab in the back for democracy, subsidiarity, solidarity and stability within the European Union and not too conducive for economic growth and Europe’s position in a globalised world.

375 http://www.fyeg.org/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1&Itemid=2

376 <http://www.coface-eu.org/en/basic401.html>

377 <http://www.ireland.com/focus/2008/eu-payments/agora.pdf>

378 Action 2, measure 3 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compedia/documents/selection_action32.pdf

379 <http://www.etc-cte.org/>

380 <http://www.eryica.org/en/content/origin-and-aims>

381 http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/calls/results/2007/vp_2007_001_en.pdf

4 million Irish put the remaining 495 million EU citizens into trouble. Is that democratic? According to the present rules: Yes! Is that ingratitude or haughtiness? Those categories do not exist in politics. But the Irish might have only expressed what many other European citizens also feel. The “NO” is no wonder since an EU without a European press, without integrating personalities, without committed national politicians, in other words without a European identity, cannot be more than just an economic zone.

Should we say good-bye to the single market? No, but without the legitimating political instruments of the Lisbon Treaty it will be much more difficult to face and to mitigate the consequences of globalisation in Europe.

There is no alternative to the general approach of the Lisbon Treaty. Therefore, Member States and European politicians should not surrender to agony but go on designing European policy in the spirit of this Treaty, i.e. creating a climate of political and social progress and economic strength. Europe is, no doubt, a success story - and Ireland itself is proof of that.³⁸²

“The Irish NO is a stab in the back for democracy, subsidiarity, solidarity and stability within the European Union”

The European Network Against Racism

The aim of this lobbying network of European NGOs is to “Act as the voice of the anti-racist movement and formulate positions on EU policies related to anti-racism and anti-discrimination.” It is funded by the EU’s PROGRESS programme.³⁸³

Other examples of groups receiving EU funds, which may be worth further investigation are: International Lesbian and Gay Association (€1,538,825); European Disability Forum (€3,140,509); International Rescue Committee in the UK (€35,183,952); Climate Action Network Europe (€569,352); European Environmental Bureau (€1.9m); International Falcon Movement (Socialist Educational International) (€87,851); and Oxfam International (€85,391,890), including funding for Oxfam in the UK (€64,212,248) in Australia, Germany, the Netherlands (Oxfam Novib), Spain and Belgium (Oxfam Solidarity).³⁸⁴

382 http://www.ceep.eu/media/right/press/press_releases_2008/the_irish_no_the_end_of_the_european_idea

383 http://www.enar-eu.org/Page_Generale.asp?DocID=15278&la=1&langue=EN

384 <http://www.ireland.com/focus/2008/eu-payments/agora.pdf>

3

Buying loyalty: Promoting European citizenship and a common European culture to engender support for the EU

“The Treaty establishes citizenship of the Union... It is an important element in strengthening and safeguarding the process of European integration.... For citizens to give their full support to European integration, greater emphasis should therefore be placed on their common values, history and culture as key elements of their membership of a society founded on the principles of freedom, democracy and respect for human rights, cultural diversity, tolerance and solidarity”
Decision of the European Parliament and European Council establishing the programme ‘Europe for Citizens’³⁸⁵

“Providing information to citizens is important, but our aim relates to another aspect that is to reach citizens through, for example, promoting town-twinning arrangements involving exchanges of citizens. There was always a European interest underlying these types of activities”
Maria Louisa Anastopoulou, European Commissioner³⁸⁶

“The Commission must invest in civil society – in think tanks and programmes such as twinning schemes, which I think have proved their worth in the past. We must therefore ensure investment in the participatory society, which has a contribution to make to the construction of Europe”
Pascal Lamy, President of Notre Europe and former Commissioner³⁸⁷

In parallel with the EU’s strategy to ‘communicate’ Europe – which, as we have seen, in practice means telling people about the benefits of the EU – runs a desire to promote the idea of a European citizenship and a common European culture.

The EU spends millions of euros a year on a whole variety of initiatives aimed at making people feel like ‘European’ citizens, particularly cultural activities, and all of this can be counted as propaganda spending since it seeks to serve the underlying aim of fostering support for the EU – often very explicitly.

The EU’s programme for promoting active European citizenship has a clear objective “to promote and disseminate the values and objectives of the European Union,”³⁸⁸ and its ‘Europe for Citizens’ programme calls for an emphasis on promoting a common European culture as a vehicle for achieving such a feeling of citizenship.

It says:

“The Treaty establishes citizenship of the Union... It is an important element in strengthening and safeguarding the process of European integration.... For citizens to give their full support to European integration, greater emphasis should therefore be placed on their common

“The Treaty establishes citizenship of the Union... It is an important element in strengthening and safeguarding the process of European integration”

385 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:378:0032:0040:EN:PDF>

386 http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/archive/forumtranscrip_en.pdf

387 http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/archive/forumtranscrip_en.pdf

388 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/documents/legalbasis/legalbasis_en.pdf

values, history and culture as key elements of their membership of a society founded on the principles of freedom, democracy and respect for human rights, cultural diversity, tolerance and solidarity.”³⁸⁹

The ideal of European citizenship also helps to justify greater powers for the EU in general. As a 2002 Commission document on the EU’s “information and communication strategy” pointed out: “the area of freedom, security and justice will finally give full meaning to the concept of European citizenship.”³⁹⁰

The EU’s efforts to foster the idea of EU citizenship and common EU culture take many different forms, most of which are interrelated but are roughly separated here for ease of reading.

1 Promoting European Citizenship

A Europe for Citizens

The Europe for Citizens Programme has a €215 million budget for the period 2007 to 2013. According to the programme guide, the programme “materialises the legal framework to support a wide range of activities and organisations promoting ‘active European citizenship’, i.e. the involvement of citizens and civil society organisations in the process of European integration.”³⁹¹ Some of these organisations are listed in Part Two of this paper.

The 2007 to 2013 programme replaces the ‘Active European Citizenship’ programme which ran from 2004 to 2006,³⁹² and whose objective was “to promote and disseminate the values and objectives of the European Union.”³⁹³ Like its successor project, it also funded swathes of pro-EU bodies, including the Union of European Federalists, the European Policy Centre and the European Movement.³⁹⁴

Under this line, for example, trade unions were invited to apply for EU funding for projects which involve “reflection and discussion on the construction of the European Union and/or promoting and disseminating its values and objectives”.

Recipients were encouraged to make proposals relating to:

“the impact of the proposed new Constitutional Treaty; communicating the objectives of the Lisbon strategy and best practices among Member States to consumers, citizens and key stakeholders including trade union members; the production of trade union education and training tools to promote active European citizenship. (e.g. education materials, training modules, curriculum development strategies); or European values and objectives and their relationship to public services.”³⁹⁵

Indeed the Commission is explicit about the link it sees between promoting European citizenship and strengthening the case for common European policies. It says:

389 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:378:0032:0040:EN:PDF>

390 http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2002/com2002_0350en02.pdf

391 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/guide/documents/programme_guide.pdf

392 All details, including projects selected for funding, is available here: http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/programmes2004_2006.htm

393 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/documents/legalbasis/legalbasis_en.pdf

394 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/documents/legalbasis/legalbasis_en.pdf

395 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2004:252:0005:0006:EN:PDF>

“The Europe for citizens’ programme provides the Union with instruments to promote active European citizenship. It puts citizens in the centre and offers them the opportunity to fully assume their responsibility as European citizens. It responds to the need to improve citizen’s participation in the construction of Europe and encourage cooperation between citizens and their organisations from different countries in order to meet, act together and develop their own ideas in a European environment which goes beyond a national vision, respecting their diversity.”

“Intercultural exchanges contribute to improving the mutual knowledge of the culture and history of the European peoples. It brings our common heritage to the fore and strengthens the basis for our common future. Mutual understanding, solidarity and the feeling of belonging to Europe are indeed the building blocks for the involvement of citizens.”

The idea of the Europe for Citizens Programme is also clearly to help encourage others to eventually act as the EU’s mouthpieces in promoting it. According to the Commission: “The Europe for Citizens programme promotes active European citizenship. It addresses local authorities, civil society organisations and other stakeholders who are ready to develop activities providing the Citizens with opportunities participate in constructing Europe together.”³⁹⁶

One of the programme’s projects, for example, carried out in the Czech Republic, won an award from the EU because “The project participants spontaneously became “ambassadors” of Europe.”³⁹⁷

Indeed, in order to promote the programme, the Commission awards the ten best projects each year with the “Golden Stars of Active European Citizenship.” These projects, held up as prototypes for future projects, provide some of the best examples of the EU propaganda machine in action.

In the book of awarded projects, Jan Figel, EU Commissioner for Education, Training, Culture and Youth says:

“These projects show how important and necessary it is, for all generations and nationalities, to throw the spotlight on Europe, on our collective achievements and our common challenges. With their emphasis on dialogue, reflection and shared action, they exemplify a common consciousness grounded in European values.

The engagement of civil society organisations and local communities in constructing a ‘Europe of neighbours’ offers a counter-argument to the criticism we sometimes hear, of Europe as a technocratic, centralising undertaking. The projects bear witness to the emergence of a genuine political consciousness and a shared European identity. By getting actively involved in the debates and reflections about the EU, Europeans of all ages develop links - links between individuals, local civil society organisations, NGOs or with the representatives of EU institutions. These new bonds in turn spur people on to develop a European dimension to their civic engagement.

These ten projects have been identified by the European Commission for their innovative character, their enthusiasm, and especially because they offer such good examples for

396 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/citizenship/gold07_en.pdf

397 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/citizenship/gold07_en.pdf

potential project organisers. They epitomise a Europe which inspires, unites and spreads the message of tolerance and mutual understanding."³⁹⁸

One of the award-winning projects, run by German organisation Netzwerk Migration Europe had as its slogan: "Remember the past and learn from the history to build the common future." Others include: "Prepare the future by creating a sense of common belonging", "Together to celebrate Europe" and "Building common responsibility for Europe".

"Remember the past and learn from the history to build the common future"

The programme is made up of four strands, or 'Actions':³⁹⁹

Action 1: "Active citizens for Europe"

The main element of this programme is the town-twinning initiative.

Town twinning

The EU has been supporting town twinning projects since 1989, which have been run by the Council of European Municipalities and Regions since 1951. In 2003 an annual budget of about 12 million euros was allocated to about 1,300 projects.⁴⁰⁰

The practice is used quite openly as a tool to promote European integration and support for the EU. The Commission's website states that town-twinning

"encourages exchanges of experiences on a variety of issues of common interest, thereby raising awareness on the advantages of finding concrete solutions at European level... town twinning has a real potential to enhance mutual understanding between citizens, fostering a sense of ownership of the European Union and finally developing a sense of European identity."⁴⁰¹

Anders Knappe, Chair of the working group on twinning in the Council of Municipalities and Regions, is particularly keen to emphasise its use as a propaganda tool. He says:

"We have always considered town twinning to be the most concrete way of involving municipalities and their citizens in the construction of Europe... I have to say that I am sometimes confronted with people who are not convinced by the true advantages of the role of twinning in the European Union construction process. In a world where globalisation has affected our daily lives, where we can easily travel from one side of the globe to the other, where cultural differences are not as apparent as they once were, twinning is considered to be outdated by these people. It seems to me that the presence today of the representatives of all these European cities which the Commission has chosen to award with golden stars is an answer to these kinds of observations."⁴⁰²

"I have to say that I am sometimes confronted with people who are not convinced by the true advantages of the role of twinning in the European Union construction process"

398 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/citizenship/gold07_en.pdf

399 Recipients of the funds for each action can be found here: http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/index_en.htm

400 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Town_twinning

401 http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/action1/measure1_en.html

402 http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/archive/forumtranscrip_en.pdf

One town-twinning project which won a “Golden Stars of Active European Citizenship” award in 2007, was awarded the prize because “This project reveals that the European Union is a living example of sharing common history and dealing collectively with common challenges. This is especially important as many Europeans see European Union as a distant and centralized bureaucracy.”⁴⁰³

Another one, conducted by twinned towns Henef in Germany, Banbury in the UK, Le Pecq in France and Nowy Dwor Gdansk in Poland, was called “Europe Week” and its theme was “Together to celebrate Europe”.

Described as a “colourful, European week, during which one could see, feel, hear, debate and “practice” the EU”, it got local associations, school, institutions and businesses involved in 70 different events in one week, some of which “addressed specific target groups like young people, school children or artists.” There was a public debate with MEPs, and “Young people could discover the work of the European institutions through the role game in which they took the role of EU decision makers and negotiated a ‘chocolate directive’.”

According to the paper: “The Europe Week in Henef was visible for everybody: shops and house windows were dressed with EU themes and the local media showed a great interest in and provided lots of publicity for the celebrations.”

One strand of the town twinning scheme is a programme of funded citizens’ meetings, bringing people together from twinned towns. The Commission states clearly that: “Town twinning citizens’ meetings should reinforce the participants’ commitment to European integration.”

“Town twinning citizens’ meetings should reinforce the participants’ commitment to European integration”

It suggests a number of ways to do this, including “sharing the experience of concrete benefits of European integration at the local or individual level (impact of EU policies in societies, people’s wellbeing in Europe...)”, and “sharing in an open manner points of view, from a local perspective, on European history, in order to learn from the past and build for the future.”⁴⁰⁴

Action 2: “Support for active civil society”

This aspect of the programme involves extensive spending for think-tanks and organisations.

“With a view to supporting the dynamism of civil society in Europe, support is provided to concrete cooperation projects of civil society organizations from different participating countries, established at local, regional, national or European level. Those projects should raise awareness on the issues of common interest and on the concrete solutions that can be found through cooperation or coordination at European level.”⁴⁰⁵

This action is composed of three measures: structural support for think tanks, structural support for civil society organisations active at European level, and support to projects initiated by civil society organisations.

Some of the beneficiaries of this Action are listed in Part Two.⁴⁰⁶

403 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/citizenship/gold07_en.pdf

404 http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/action1/measure11_en.html

405 http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/action2/index_en.html

406 A full list of the projects funded under this Action can be found here: http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/index_en.htm#a2

Action 3: "Together for Europe"

According to the Commission, "This action aims at deepening the concept of 'active European citizenship' and at promoting its understanding all over Europe, therefore contributing to 'bringing Europe closer to its citizens', through three sets of measures."⁴⁰⁷

It involves "high visibility" events organised by the Commission, which are "substantial in scale and scope" and which "strike a chord with the peoples of Europe, help to increase their sense of belonging to the same community, make them aware of the history, achievements and values of the European Union, involve them in intercultural dialogue and contribute to the development of their European identity."

They include "the commemoration of historical events, the celebration of European achievements, artistic events, awareness-raising around specific issues, European-wide conferences and the awarding of prizes to highlight major accomplishments."⁴⁰⁸

This Action also pays for studies, surveys and opinion polls, and for "comprehensive information on the various activities of the programme, on other European actions related to citizenship and on other relevant initiatives... to be provided through an Internet portal and other tools."⁴⁰⁹

Action 4: "Active European Remembrance"

Under Action 4 of the Europe for Citizens programme, the EU funds projects helping to preserve the memorials associated with Nazi and Stalinist-era mass deportations, the former concentration camps and other extermination sites, as well as the archives documenting these events.⁴¹⁰

Remembering and commemorating the dead in order to remind people about the atrocities which helped bring about the EU is a worthy cause, and a good use of taxpayers' money. However, it is an uncomfortable discovery that a big part of the reason the EU does this is quite openly to promote European political integration.

The Commission says:

"The European Union is built on fundamental values such as freedom, democracy and respect for human rights. In order to fully appreciate their meaning, it is necessary to remember the breaches of those principles caused by Nazism and Stalinism in Europe."

"Citizens will engage in a reflection on the origins of the European Union, fifty years ago, on the history of European integration, which preserved peace among its members, and finally on today's Europe, thereby moving beyond the past and building the future. This action therefore will play an important role in nourishing the broad reflection on the future of Europe and in promoting active European citizenship."

It recommends that projects

"should analyse why and how the democratic principles and Human Rights were violated. This could lead to a reflection about the reasons for creating the European Union, and about

407 http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/action3/index_en.html

408 http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/action3/index_en.html

409 http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/action3/index_en.html

410 http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/action4/index_en.html

the values that are protected through the European integration process. Finally, thanks to a better understanding of the origins of European integration and of today's Europe, the project could engage in a reflection about the future of Europe."⁴¹¹

B Celebrating the EU with symbols of a united Europe

As part of its drive for a common European citizenship, the EU makes much of its 'symbols' – particularly the EU flag and the logo of the twelve gold stars on a blue background. French Europe Minister Jean-Pierre Jouyet believes that: "Symbols are necessary for Europe... they are the way to reach full European consciousness for the people. There is no identity without symbols."⁴¹²

"Symbols are necessary for Europe... they are the way to reach full European consciousness for the people. There is no identity without symbols"

In an effort to alter the appearance of the EU Constitution after it was rejected by voters in France and the Netherlands, the EU agreed to remove references to these political symbols from the text of what became the Lisbon Treaty. However, 16 countries signed a declaration attached to the Treaty which said that they would continue to use them regardless.⁴¹³

The President of the European Parliament Hans-Gert Pottering said "It goes without saying that the European Parliament will not give up these symbols but intends, on the contrary, to use and amplify the use of the anthem and the European flags."⁴¹⁴

Indeed the European Parliament, in particular, believes in "the importance of symbols for reconnecting the citizens with the European Union and for building a European identity which is complementary to the national identities of the Member States."⁴¹⁵

In a proposal to increase the use of the EU's symbols, the Parliament's Constitutional Affairs Committee wrote:

"Symbols are vital elements of any communication process, particularly in relation to the process of the public's identification of or with any social grouping or organisation, including political bodies. Indeed, symbols may be a decisive element for the public's emotional attachment to these organisations."

"Symbols convey an emotional image of the underlying values of the organisations they represent, they play a part in making abstract ideas intelligible, they facilitate communication and participation and they help to bring the organisations that they symbolise closer to the citizens, thereby contributing to their legitimacy."

The flag, in particular, is stamped on everything the EU does – from the films it subsidises to construction projects it funds. In fact, as a pre-requisite set into the conditions of the grant, some recipients must advertise the fact that the EU is the donor in order to receive the funding. (See above and Part One).

411 http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/action4/index_en.html

412 Speech at the European Commission conference "35th anniversary of the Eurobarometer", Paris, 21 November 2008

413 Telegraph, 11 December 2007 <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/1572225/Germany-seeks-to-enshrine-EU-flag.html>

414 http://vge-europe.eu/public/Lettre_P_ottering_juillet_2007.pdf

415 http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2004_2009/documents/pr/703/703557/703557en.pdf

As the Commission says: “The European flag is not only the symbol of the European Union but also of Europe’s unity and identity in a wider sense. The circle of gold stars represents solidarity and harmony between the peoples of Europe.”⁴¹⁶

“The European flag is not only the symbol of the European Union but also of Europe’s unity and identity in a wider sense”

As well as a flag, the EU has its own anthem, Beethoven’s Ode to Joy; its own logo, ‘Together since 1950’; and its own motto, ‘United in Diversity’. It even has its own equivalent of a ‘national’ day, called ‘Europe Day’, which is celebrated on 9 May each year and marks the anniversary of the Schuman Declaration, which led to the creation of the European Coal and Steel Community.

All of these are designed to ‘bring Europe closer to its citizens’ – in other words, to increase their attachment to the EU – especially Europe Day. As the Commission says:

“Today, the 9th of May has become a European symbol (Europe Day) which, along with the flag, the anthem, the motto and the single currency (the euro), identifies the political entity of the European Union. Europe Day is the occasion for activities and festivities that bring Europe closer to its citizens and peoples of the Union closer to one another.”⁴¹⁷

The European Parliament’s Constitutional Affairs Committee believes that:

“It would be hard to find such a well-known piece of music and poetry that would better symbolise the idea of European integration than this ode ‘to the unity of the human species transformed into the subject’, heightened by the exultant and sublime music of a composer who is one of the best symbols of European genius.”

They are also meant as symbols of “European success.” One of the Commission’s brochures, “50 ways forward” notes:

“What does 9 May mean to you? It’s Europe Day, and it is as much a symbol of European success as the European flag, the anthem, or even the euro. Europe Day is a time to celebrate peace, stability and citizenship.[...] In 1985, EU leaders decided to create me, ‘Europe Day’, to celebrate European togetherness and citizenship on 9 May each year. One perfect day.”⁴¹⁸

The day is celebrated across Europe, promoted on the one hand by the Commission through initiatives such as Spring Day for Europe in schools (see Part Four), which encourages teachers to mark Europe Day on 9 May, and also through the national governments – in the UK’s case the Foreign Office which holds events. The Commission also promotes the event through its funding to organisations like the European Movement, whose UK branch this year celebrated 9 May with a night of European cinema dubbed “From Europe with Love”.⁴¹⁹

The European Parliament writes:

“9 May has gradually been emerging out of the institutions and into the outside world through the organisation of shows, exhibitions and events such as open days when citizens

416 <http://publications.europa.eu/code/en/en-5000100.htm>

417 http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/9-may/index_en.htm

418 http://europa.eu/success50/xml/story_02_en.xml

419 <http://www.euromove.org.uk/>

can visit the European institutions and their offices in the Member States, acquire material for information and entertainment, etc., so that bit by bit it is becoming a holiday for European citizens. However, its deeper significance will only truly take root in the emotional memory of European citizens if the Member States themselves join efforts to this end, recognising Europe Day as a real European public holiday."⁴²⁰

There has even been talk of rebranding celebrities from around Europe into European icons of culture. In its December 2006 paper on "Making European citizenship visible and effective", the European Economic and Social Committee recommended suggested that:

"To promote a sense of European identity, celebrities from the world of sport or the arts could be presented in information campaigns as authentic "Europeans", using their personality to highlight this expression of identity. Similarly, one should also promote ambitious initiatives to develop European culture and promote its dissemination in the media."⁴²¹

"To promote a sense of European identity, celebrities from the world of sport or the arts could be presented in information campaigns as authentic 'Europeans'"

C Marking the 50th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome

In much the same vein as the Europe Day celebrations mentioned above, in 2007 the EU made a huge celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome, which was initially budgeted at €7 million.

A website dedicated to the year-long celebrations and called "Celebrating Europe!" was set up, which is pure propaganda. A page titled "What we are celebrating" explains why "we have a lot to celebrate", and featured articles explaining things like: "Entering into force on 1 January 1958, the Treaty of Rome laid the foundations of the modern EU. Primarily an economic organisation at its inception, the EU has evolved into a project to guarantee high levels of social protection for its citizens."⁴²²

There was a competition to decide on an official symbol for the anniversary celebrations, with entries from 1701 designers and design students from all EU member states. The Commission explained its choice of the winning entry, 'Together since 1957' written with letters in different fonts, saying:

"In line with the Commission's Plan D (Democracy, Debate, Dialogue), this logo gives a graphic interpretation to the voice of all Europeans, especially the new generations. These Europeans look for peace, stability and prosperity without taking anything away from their rights of individuality and diversity. The word "together" expresses in a simple and immediate way what was originally bound to the idea of Europe: not only politics, or money, or geographic boundaries, but most of all co-operation and solidarity."

Collectively the top three finalists were awarded €10,000.⁴²³

Examples of the EU-funded events to mark the anniversary in the UK include: a Primary School Birthday Card Competition, inviting children in Cardiff to design a birthday card for the EU; a

420 http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2004_2009/documents/pr/703/703557/703557en.pdf

421 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2006:318:0163:01:EN:HTML>

422 http://europa.eu/50/news/article/080102_en.htm

423 http://europa.eu/50/anniversary_logo/competition_en.htm

Primary School Postcard Competition in Northern Ireland; a photo competition called “What makes Plymouth a European city?”⁴²⁴, and many other similar initiatives designed to “celebrate” the EU.

There was also a two-week series of public lectures, discussions and art exhibitions called “London Festival of Europe”. One event that an Open Europe member of staff attended, called “The British media and Europe” had a panel made up of representatives from the Independent and the Guardian, neither of which take a critical line on the EU, plus other well-known pro-integrationists.⁴²⁵

Likewise, a conference at the FCO called “Reflections on European integration” gave a podium to a huge number of high-profile EU integrationists, including Peter Sutherland (former EU Commissioner), John Palmer (European Policy Centre), Lord John Kerr, Brendan Donnelly (the Federal Trust), Simon Tilford (Centre for European Reform), Elfriede Regelsberger, (Institut für Europäische Politik) Jean Monnet professors Simon Bulmer, Jo Shaw, Helen Wallace, Alan Dashwood, Knud-Erik Jørgensen and Jolyon Howorth; and two Commission representatives. Of the remaining eleven panellists, none are recognisable as critics of the EU.⁴²⁶

However the most high-profile of the anniversary events in the UK was a televised football match played at Old Trafford between Manchester United and an “all star Europe XI team”. Commission President Jose Barroso said:

“The best of European football will be on show at the “Theatre of Dreams” in Manchester next March, to mark the 50th Anniversary of the creation of the European Union. There is no better way to showcase the European Union at 50 than through Europe’s favourite sport that unites Europeans in a unique way, through a passion we all share and a language we all speak.”⁴²⁷

“There is no better way to showcase the European Union at 50 than through Europe’s favourite sport that unites Europeans in a unique way”

These kind of events were mirrored throughout all the EU countries. To give just a few examples⁴²⁸, France, among other things, broadcast a Franco-German love story called “How we hated each other”; organised a “European roller skate trip” across Paris; and hosted a journalism competition for students, inviting them to investigate “goals achieved as a result of the impetus given by the Rome treaty” to win the prize of a trip to Brussels, “the capital of Europe.”⁴²⁹

In Germany, the highlight was a huge all-night party, called Europafest, when 27 nightclubs hosting 27 bands from every member state stayed open all night, and a shuttle bus carried visitors from one stop to the next.

In Lithuania, the German Embassy organised an exhibition to “highlight the enduring relevance and importance of Europe.” It explained:

“Initially set up to end the frequent and disastrous wars between neighbouring countries, the EU has achieved significant results in many fields over the last 50 years. The EU is the world’s

424 http://europa.eu/50/countries/united_kingdom/index_en.htm

425 <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/pressAndInformationOffice/newsAndEvents/archives/2007/ContestedBorders.htm>

426 http://europa.eu/50/countries/united_kingdom/070323_en.htm

427 http://europa.eu/50/countries/united_kingdom/070313_en.htm

428 To see lists of all the events in all the countries, click here: http://europa.eu/50/countries/index_en.htm

429 http://europa.eu/50/countries/france/index_en.htm

largest free trade area, the largest community of exporters and the biggest contributor of development aid in the world. It has established common rules on product safety and consumer protection and promotes a large number of educational programmes. The EU is also very active in the environmental area, for example in promoting the use of renewable energy sources. The German Embassy wishes to use this exhibition to raise awareness about these important achievements."⁴³⁰

“European Commission delegations used the 50th anniversary to organize activities publicizing the European Union and its achievements”

As well as events, the 50th anniversary celebrations included “special publications and products”, quizzes and games, and reams of press releases and speeches. Other, related EU-funded anniversary celebrations include the 20th anniversary of ERASMUS.

The European Commission’s representations outside of the EU also took part in the 50th anniversary celebrations, using them as an excuse to promote the EU. The Commission’s website very candidly says:

“European Commission delegations used the 50th anniversary to organize activities publicizing the European Union and its achievements: conferences, seminars and other events portrayed the EU as a model for regional cooperation respecting national diversity and committed to democracy, human rights, the rule of law and good governance; cultural and sport activities involved young people, the media, and the wider general public.”⁴³¹

2 Promoting a common European culture

Closely related to the efforts to create a European Citizenship are the EU’s policies for promoting a common EU culture. The Commission clearly believes that: “respect for cultural and linguistic diversity and promotion of a common cultural heritage lies at the very heart of the European project.”⁴³²

A Culture Programme

The Culture Programme 2007 to 2013, dubbed by the Commission as “a serious cultural investment” has a budget of €400 million⁴³³, with around €45 million allocated for 2008. This includes “support for bodies active at European level in the field of culture”⁴³⁴, such as some of the organisations looked at in Part Two.

The Culture Programme succeeds the 2000 to 2006 programme, ‘Culture 2000’.

The explicit objective of the Programme is to promote the EU and engender support for EU integration – to improve the “external visibility” of the EU and to help convince citizens “to give their full support to, and participate fully in, European integration.”⁴³⁵

The Council decision which established the Culture Programme candidly states: “For citizens to give their full support to, and participate fully in, European integration, greater emphasis should

430 http://europa.eu/50/countries/lietuva/index_en.htm

431 http://europa.eu/50/around_world/index_en.htm

432 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2007/com2007_0242en01.pdf

433 http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/doc411_en.htm

434 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2006/l_372/l_37220061227en00010011.pdf

435 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32006D1855:EN:HTML>

“For citizens to give their full support to, and participate fully in, European integration, greater emphasis should be placed on their common cultural values and roots”

be placed on their common cultural values and roots as a key element of their identity and their membership of a society founded on freedom, equity, democracy, respect for human dignity and integrity, tolerance and solidarity.”⁴³⁶

It goes on to underline the propaganda value of the programme stating: “An active cultural policy aimed at the preservation of European cultural diversity and the promotion of its common cultural elements and cultural heritage can contribute to improving the external visibility of the European Union.”⁴³⁷

The aim is to heighten people’s “awareness of the common European cultural heritage they share.” It says: “Promoting cultural and linguistic cooperation and diversity thus helps to make European citizenship a tangible reality by encouraging direct participation by European citizens in the integration process.”

The Programme provides funding for cooperation between countries on cultural and artistic projects; support for European Capitals of Culture; funding for “organisations active at European level in the field of culture”⁴³⁸, including those acting as “European cultural ambassadors”; and support for “analysis and dissemination activities” helping to raise awareness of the Culture Programme.⁴³⁹

“Promoting cultural and linguistic cooperation and diversity thus helps to make European citizenship a tangible reality”

Some of the titles of the projects funded in 2007 include: “Plants and culture: seeds of the cultural heritage of Europe”, “Festival S.O.U.P.E. symbol of the opening and union of European people”, “European Culture Expressed in Agricultural Landscapes”, and “A Night of Urban Gypsies”.⁴⁴⁰

For “Organisations active at European level in the field of culture”, in 2007 the Commission gave away more than €6.8 million in grants to organisations such as the European Youth Orchestra and the European Music Office,⁴⁴¹ who put in bids for funding.

In addition, a list of 40 organisations automatically receives funding for the whole period without even having to put in a bid.⁴⁴² (Some also receive money separately from the European Parliament, such as the European Youth Jazz Orchestra,⁴⁴³ and the European Writers’ Congress, or from other Commission budget lines, such as EUnetART – the European Network of Arts Organisations for Children and Young People).⁴⁴⁴

Some are appointed “European Cultural Ambassadors” by the Commission, such as the Chamber Orchestra of Europe, which received €304,652 in 2007.⁴⁴⁵ Almost all of the organisations’ websites are splashed with the EU flag.

436 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32006D1855:EN:HTML>

437 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32006D1855:EN:HTML>

438 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/calls2007/results/call_22_2007/index_en.html

439 http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/doc411_en.htm

440 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/calls2006/results/documents/cult_com_%202007_strand1.2.1.pdf

441 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/calls2007/results/call_22_2007/documents/OCE_Selection%20results%20Publication.pdf

442 <http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32004D0792:EN:HTML>

443 http://www.swinging-europe.com/pdf/Annual-Report_2007.pdf

444 <http://www.eunetart.org/>

445 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/calls2007/results/call_22_2007/documents/OCE_Selection%20results%20Publication.pdf

The list of automatic recipients includes for example:

The European Union Choir (Les Choeurs de l'Union européenne), which was founded following the signing of the Treaty of Rome in 1958, and whose "mission is to promote Europe through music and music in Europe." Its website notes: "In the context of the recent celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Rome, the choir participated on 24 March 2007 festivities, held at the Brussels Atomium entitled "Stars of Europe", broadcasted in over 50 countries worldwide."⁴⁴⁶

Europa Cantat (European Federation of Young Choirs), whose statutes refer to its mission of bringing singers together from existing and future EU states "within the scope of European integration".⁴⁴⁷ It received €87,500 in 2007.⁴⁴⁸

The European Opera Centre (Manchester), which performed during the UK Presidency of the EU for the Culture Ministers and Foreign Ministers of the EU.⁴⁴⁹

The International Yehudi Menuhin Foundation, whose website says:

"One of the main interests of the foundation is to promote the values underpinning the European Union, and work towards an integrated Europe. Cultural exchanges and international cooperation have been pursued by the IYMF through different European projects, aiming to build bridges between cultures and countries in Europe, and to enhance the idea of a common European citizenship."⁴⁵⁰

"One of the main interests of the foundation is to promote the values underpinning the European Union, and work towards an integrated Europe"

Association Européenne des Conservatoires, Académies de Musique et Musikhochschulen (AEC), which "promotes the role of music and therefore music education as an outstanding example of non-verbal communication in the integration of Europe".⁴⁵¹

The Yuste Academy Foundation, which focuses on "bringing closer Europe and our region, Extremadura." It says:

"In our case, culture has been the way chosen to tighten the links between both realities... in this way progresses are made towards European integration on one of its strongest pillars –culture... The philosophy defended by the Yuste European Academy Foundation is embodied in this message: Maastricht's Europe represents a decisive moment of the European integration process, with an explicit declaration of the will to build the European Union, stating its double political and economic dimension and considering that both the common citizenship and the single currency have introduced two powerful motive forces. These forces would not be relevant if they were not considered together with other important elements, like culture and economic and social cohesion. In order to rise to the challenge of European integration, all economic and political objectives must be accompanied by an interest in making progress towards European cultural identity."⁴⁵²

446 <http://www.choeurs-union-europeenne.net/>

447 http://www.europacantat.org/conpresso/_data/EC.statutes.02.doc

448 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/calls2007/results/call_22_2007/documents/OCE_Selection%20results%20Publication.pdf

449 <http://www.operaeurope.org/site/programme.htm>

450 <http://www.menuhin-foundation.com/arts-for-europe/european-projects/intro.html>

451 <http://www.aecinfo.org/content.aspx?id=27>

452 <http://www.fundacionyuste.org/fundacion/objectives.htm>

European Forum for the Arts and Heritage (EFAH), which is a Brussels-based arts lobby group whose activity is “advocacy for culture in the EU.”⁴⁵³

Union des théâtres de l’Europe, whose “objective is to contribute to the construction of the European Union through culture and theatre, to develop a common cultural action which transcends language barriers in favour of a theatre of art considered as a federative instrument of poetry and fraternity between people.”⁴⁵⁴

Europa Nostra, the pan-European Federation for Cultural Heritage, whose website states: “Through its various activities, Europa Nostra seeks to highlight the importance of cultural heritage as a building block of European identity and as a contribution to the strengthening of the sense of European citizenship.”⁴⁵⁵

European Writers’ Congress (EWC), whose website states:

“The EWC champions the diversity of literatures while raising awareness for both the role of creators & culture for the EU’s Lisbon Agenda... The EWC defends the professional interests of its members’ some 60.000 members, all being protagonists of civil society at European and national level, in legal and political contexts, concerning cultural and social policy... And the EWC remains determined to raise and publicly present the commitment of some 60’000 professional writers and literary translators to shaping the profile of Europe via individual creativity and common elements of cultural policy within the diversity of expressions.”⁴⁵⁶

The European Network of Cultural Administration Training Centres (ENCATC), which hosts the Cultural Policy Research Award. One of its two published papers is “Why we need European cultural policies”, which “look[s] at possible future scenarios for EU involvement in the field of culture.”⁴⁵⁷

The Network of European Museums Organisations (NEMO), which lobbies the EU and provides information to museums on relevant EU legislation. Its publication “Europe through the Eyes of Museums” states: “Cultural heritage is at the heart of a closer union among the people of Europe.” It also receives funding from the EU Commission budget line “Subsidy to cultural organizations advancing the idea of Europe.”

Les Rencontres: Association of European Cities and Regions for Culture, which is described as “an open forum for debate and action, grouping together elected members from all levels of local government throughout Europe in order to actively take part in the setting up of European cultural policies.”⁴⁵⁸

“Cultural heritage is at the heart of a closer union among the people of Europe”

The European Music Festival – or Europamusicale, which is run by the European Cultural Foundation. The website states that this

“is contributing to building the European house. As an independent, international institution, it will promote cultural exchange in Europe. To do so, it has the European Music Festival EUROPAMUSICALE as its own measure, which supports the growing together of Europe by means of culture in a special way... The European Union to a great degree determines our

453 <http://www.efah.org/index.php?id=5&pagelang=en>

454 <http://www.ute-net.org/>

455 http://www.europanostra.org/lang_en/index.html

456 <http://www.european-writers-congress.org/>

457 <http://www.encatc.org/cpraward/publications/CPRA%202004%20N.Obuljen.pdf>

458 http://www.lesrencontres.eu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=17&Itemid=31

political, social and economic reality today. The already long-lasting process of the countries joining to form a united Europe is both contemporary and forward-looking.. Culture makes it possible for members of this society to actually experience the abstract entity of Europe, making it likeable. As members of an area of culture jointly inhabited and experienced, people feel at home in Europe with all their hearts."⁴⁵⁹

Funding is also open to other bodies fulfilling the objectives of the decision. Other cultural organisations receiving EU grants include, for example, the **European Union Youth Orchestra**, which in 2007 received €600,000, and the **European Union Baroque Orchestra**, which received €33,000 in 2003 for a "concert in London to coincide with the accession of the ten new Member States." It explained:

"The audience will largely consist of ambassadors, cultural attachés, FCO representatives, MPs, MEPs, journalists, representatives from the commercial and business sectors, UK-based music students and professional musicians. It will be combined with a fact-finding initiative for representatives of music conservatoires and arts festival directors of the ten acceding countries."⁴⁶⁰

"Culture makes it possible for members of this society to actually experience the abstract entity of Europe, making it likeable"

In 2007, the Baroque Orchestra received €332,246 under the Culture Programme, and is an "ambassador" for culture in Europe.⁴⁶¹

Another was Nisi Masa, a Paris-based "European network of associations" made up of "young professionals, students and enthusiasts with a common cause - European cinema." Part of the aim is "to foster European awareness through cinema".⁴⁶² It received €29,088 under the "Europe for Citizens" project 2007-2013.⁴⁶³

B European Capital of Culture

Each year the EU designates two European cities as 'European Capital of Culture.' The general aim is "to help bring European citizens closer together", and, the Commission explains, "One of the key objectives of the event is to foster the knowledge which European citizens may have of one another and at the same time to create a feeling of belonging to the same community."⁴⁶⁴

In 2007 alone, the Commission earmarked €1.5 million for each European Capital of Culture.⁴⁶⁵

C European Year for Intercultural Dialogue⁴⁶⁶

Each year the EU has a theme. 2008 is the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue, for which the Commission has earmarked €7 million. Part of this is dedicated to "information and promotion campaigns, particularly in cooperation with the media, at Community and national level to disseminate the key messages concerning the objectives of the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue."

459 <http://www.europamusical.eu/kulturstiftung.html?L=2>

460 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/grants_2003_uk_fr.pdf

461 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/calls2007/results/call_22_2007/documents/OCE_Selection%20results%20Publication.pdf

462 <http://www.nisimasa.com/>

463 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/compendia/documents/selection_action32.pdf

464 http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/doc435_en.htm

465 http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/doc441_en.htm

466 <http://www.interculturaldialogue2008.eu/>

2007 was the European Year of Equal Opportunities for All, 2006 was the European Year of Workers' Mobility, and 2005 was the European Year of Citizenship through Education. 2009 will be the European Year of Creativity and Innovation.

“intercultural dialogue is linked to a more political goal: creating a sense of European citizenship”

EU Education and Culture Commissioner Jan Figel has been open about the objectives of the European Year 2008.

He said: “There are plenty of good reasons why the Union should work on intercultural dialogue... Firstly, building Europe has always meant integrating histories, value systems, and world views. There is a strong sense in which our process of integration has always been a dialogue between cultures.”

He said the Year of Intercultural Dialogue would concentrate on “raising the awareness of European citizens and those living in the Union” of the importance of intercultural dialogue, “developing social and personal habits that will equip us for a more open and complex cultural environment”.

Both of these are laudable aims, but Figel also admitted that “finally, intercultural dialogue is linked to a more political goal: creating a sense of European citizenship.”⁴⁶⁷

Indeed the year’s website states: “Intercultural dialogue has an increasingly important role to play in fostering European identity and citizenship.”⁴⁶⁸

The year is marked by a number of events and projects at both European and national level. In the UK, for example, in 2008 there is a series of day-long ‘LoveDifference Festivals’ in London, Northampton and Bristol, which are clearly exercises in propaganda.

The official website notes that:

“With a political as well as cultural edge, the LoveDifference Festival is a long overdue, updated take on an old-fashioned debate to promote a new European ideal of culture, travel, youth and exchange. It pulls European discussion away from the grey corridors of Brussels into exciting fresh and young venues such as Cargo in London and The Fishmarket Gallery in Northampton. In the firm belief that cultural diversity is to be celebrated and cherished, LoveDifference Festival aims to promote the benefits and inspirations that a diverse and unique community can have. Creating a bridge for UK understanding of European cultures and arts, food and lifestyles, LoveDifference Festival is at the forefront of understanding across borders and The European Year of Intercultural Dialogue.”⁴⁶⁹

D MEDIA 2007

The EU’s MEDIA 2007 programme is a programme of support for the European audiovisual sector, which is worth €755 million over seven years (2007-13). It is the latest phase in the MEDIA programme, which has existed since 1991. It is candidly admitted that the objective underpinning the support is a contribution towards “the emergence of European citizenship”.

467 Speech at the “A Soul for Europe” Conference, Berlin, 17 November 2006
http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/figel/speeches/docs/06_11_17_Soul_for_Europe_Berlin.pdf

468 http://www.interculturaldialogue2008.eu/406.0.html?&redirect_url=my-startpage-eyid.html

469 <http://www.europe.org.uk/culture/events/view/-/id/654/>

The Council decision establishing the programme states that:

“The European audiovisual sector has a key role to play in the emergence of European citizenship because it is one of the principal vectors for conveying the Union’s common and shared fundamental social and cultural values to Europeans and especially young people. Community support is designed to enable the European audiovisual sector to promote intercultural dialogue, increase mutual awareness amongst Europe’s cultures and develop its political, cultural, social and economic potential, which constitutes genuine added value in the task of making European citizenship a reality.”⁴⁷⁰

The programme co-finances training initiatives for audiovisual industry professionals, the development of production projects (feature films, television drama, documentaries, animation and new media), as well as the promotion of European audiovisual works.⁴⁷¹

“The European audiovisual sector has a key role to play in the emergence of European citizenship”

According to the Commission, half of all European films in the cinema are shown with the support of the EU’s MEDIA programme. It supports the distribution of 9 out of every 10 feature films in Europe that are distributed outside their originating country, and 2.5 million cinema-goers watch over 15,000 European screenings in more than 100 festivals funded by MEDIA. Every year 300 new European film projects are supported by MEDIA.⁴⁷²

This fact is advertised using a whole series of short film clips such as the controversial “Film lovers will love this!”, which, as mentioned in Part One, features three minutes of people having sex and ends with “Let’s come together... Millions of cinema lovers enjoy European films every year... Europe supports European films” with a picture of the EU flag and MEDIA logo.⁴⁷³ Indeed the Media 2007 programme was launched amid controversy when the Commission showcased the film, among others, at the Berlin Film Festival.⁴⁷⁴

Many people will take the view that supporting the European film industry is a worthwhile EU cause, given the dominance of US-produced films on the European market. However, it is relevant to this paper insofar as it is also a convenient and effective way of promoting the European Union.

“Beneficiaries must clearly acknowledge the European Union’s contribution in all publications or in conjunction with activities for which the grant is used”

EU rules stipulate that:

“Beneficiaries must clearly acknowledge the European Union’s contribution in all publications or in conjunction with activities for which the grant is used. Furthermore, beneficiaries are required to give prominence to the name and logo of the MEDIA Programme on all their publications, posters, programmes and other products realised under the co-financed project. If this requirement is not fully complied with, the beneficiary’s grant may be reduced.”⁴⁷⁵

470 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32006D1718:EN:NOT>

471 http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/media/index_en.htm

472 http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/media/overview/clips/index_en.htm

473 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=koRlFnBIDH0&feature=related>

474 http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/media/overview/clips/index_en.htm See Sunday Times 1 June 2007

475 See here, for example: http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/media/producer/develop/slate1st/docs/1607/guidelines_en.pdf

The EU supports both production of films and also distribution – mainly through the EUROPA cinemas film theatre network which co-ordinates 685 cinemas in 42 countries based in the EU, the Mediterranean and Eastern Europe. The EU recently agreed to extend the network into 52 new countries including South Korea, Mexico, Brazil and the Palestinian Territories, under the EU's new €2 million Media International programme. Media International involves 18 international film cooperation projects, such as a €50,000 venture between the Belgian cartoon company 'Cartoon Connection' and an Argentine cartoon company 'Encuadre'.⁴⁷⁶

Separate from the MEDIA programme, the EU also promotes European cinema for the purposes of its own communication policy.

The European Parliament's Culture Committee, for example, has established the Lux Prize for cinema. Launching the prize, Gerard Onesta, Vice-President of the Parliament, described cinema as "A warmer, more direct way of communicating with citizens... a quality communication vector."

He said the aim of the prize was to pick a European film of the year, described as "a film which can identify the European in each of us... A common European identity... Sometimes within Europe we have difficulty in finding what unites us, and sometimes we need to use emotions as well as a way of contacting people... We're really trying to get out of this national approach."⁴⁷⁷

"Sometimes within Europe we have difficulty in finding what unites us, and sometimes we need to use emotions as well as a way of contacting people... We're really trying to get out of this national approach"

Other developments in this area are expected in the future. In December 2006 the European Economic and Social Committee recommended, in a paper titled "Making European citizenship visible and effective", that "The European Union should encourage the setting-up of a European film school and promote its own prizes, like the Oscars, to reward its best creative people and artists."⁴⁷⁸

E Euroglobe

The EU's Communication Policy agenda for 2008 involves spending up to €1.5 million on a project called 'Euroglobe'.⁴⁷⁹ According to the Commission, the project "promotes a European public space for debate, culture and study by means of cultural events for the general public."

The idea is that member states holding the Presidency of the EU organise events – such as theatre plays, music concerts, dance shows, TV shows and websites etc – that "maximise the influence of this Presidency; strengthen the feeling among citizens of this country that they belong to the EU and believe in its activities; raise their interest in current headline European issues and their knowledge of these, by using culture as the vehicle."⁴⁸⁰

Euroglobe has its own website, showcasing events taking place under the current, previous and next EU presidencies. The events taking place under the French EU Presidency in October 2008, for example, are themed "From Shakespeare to Euro Rap" and include events such as "Rap

476 European Voice, 27 August 2008 <http://www.europeanvoice.com/article/imported/2529august/international-film-projects-get-eu-funding/62050.aspx>

477 http://www.lux-prize.eu/prize/index_en.htm

478 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2006:318:0163:01:EN:HTML>

479 <http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/euroglobe/EuroGlobe-Call-EN.pdf>

480 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/prog2008_en.pdf

Freestyle – Europe: I have a dream”, “Poetry Slam competition – Europe: I have a dream”, and an “Open Stage” event called “Searching for the Soul(s) of Europe”.⁴⁸¹

F Other initiatives

The Commission’s DG Culture also funds “special annual events”, including, in 2006 for example, €1 million for an exhibition in Brussels “tracing the history of European integration” in celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome.⁴⁸²

€500,000 was given to finance “the organisation of cross-border venues in Augsburg, Salzburg and Vienna and to highlight the importance of W.A. Mozart’s work for music and European culture.”⁴⁸³

The EU also sponsored a “Marathon for a United Europe” for young people from across the EU in September 2008. Among the aims for the three-day event in Greece is to “promote and support European citizen ideals.”⁴⁸⁴

On the official website the Marathon is described as “a completely European event supporting in every way the harmonious and prosperous coexistence of young people under the EU umbrella.”

Outlining the objectives of the event, it says “All speakers, (Greeks and EU representatives) will point out EU policy and practices on the above mentioned points as well as their impact on the younger generation of European citizens.”

It continues:

“Marathon for a United Europe is an important event for it supports and promotes European efforts on unity and solidarity under the multicultural umbrella of European citizenship. The activities of these few days are designed to bring together the young people of Europe linking them with the past while pointing them to the future... Marathon for a United Europe” is a European event and the young people will be in a place where all 27 member states are present and equally represented. Spending a few days in this environment, will help them absorb the European spirit and its values of mutual respect and peaceful co-existence and they will understand what it means to be European.”⁴⁸⁵

“Marathon for a United Europe is an important event for it supports and promotes European efforts on unity and solidarity under the multicultural umbrella of European citizenship”

481 <http://www.euroglobe.info/en/the-program.html>

482 http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/doc592_en.htm

483 http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/doc589_en.htm

484 <http://www.britishcouncil.org/greece-sport-marathon-for-a-united-europe.htm>

485 http://marathonforaunitedeurope.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=50&Itemid=92

4

Investing in the long-term: Targeting young people

“It is above all through the involvement of young people that Europe will assure its future”
Commission communication “Building our common Future – Policy challenges and Budgetary means of the Enlarged Union 2007-2013”⁴⁸⁶

The EU concentrates much of its propaganda effort on children and young people. Targeting young people is the key part of a long-term campaign to foster support for the idea of European integration, and education is widely used as a method for selling it.

The EU identified the need to target young people many years ago, with the “Youth for Europe” policy launched in 1988, and the subsequent 1993 Maastricht Treaty which said the EU should “encourage the development of youth exchanges and of exchanges of socio-educational instructors.”⁴⁸⁷

However in the past few years the EU has raised its game with regard to young people, recognising that “It is above all through the involvement of young people that Europe will assure its future.”⁴⁸⁸

The EU has a sophisticated and multi-pronged approach to targeting young people, with ‘youth’ becoming an official part of the Commissioner for Education, Training and Culture’s portfolio in January 2007, despite the fact that, as the Commission elsewhere acknowledges, “youth policy falls under the remit of the Member States.”⁴⁸⁹

Notwithstanding this fact, the EU has a hefty budget for targeting youth, and several frameworks and strategies, even if there is so far no actual legislation in force.

The current approach has three main strands: “fostering young people’s active citizenship” through the Youth in Action Programme, the Youth portal, the European Center on Youth Policy and a so-called ‘structured dialogue’; “Social and occupational integration” of young people, through the European Youth Pact, which aims at improving education and training, employability and social inclusion; and the inclusion of a “youth dimension” in other policies.

These strands make up the EU Framework for European Cooperation in the Field of Youth, which aims to “promote, in particular, the participation of young people in civil life and civil society.”⁴⁹⁰

The 2001 White Paper which launched all of these initiatives, called “A new impetus for European youth”, reveals that the impetus behind the EU’s approach to youth policy comes not from a desire to help young people for the sake of it, but from an explicit desire to help create the notion of a European citizenship, which, as we have seen, has been identified by the Commission as key for its ultimate objective of securing support for EU integration.

486 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2004:0101:FIN:EN:DOC>

487 http://ec.europa.eu/youth/glance/glance5_en.htm

488 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2004:0101:FIN:EN:DOC>

489 http://ec.europa.eu/youth/youth-policies/doc26_en.htm

490 http://ec.europa.eu/youth/youth-policies/doc23_en.htm

The paper identifies an objective of “Getting young people more involved in the life of the local, national and European communities, and fostering active citizenship.” A key part of the White Paper’s objective is to involve young people in the decision-making processes of the EU, but with the explicit objective to develop young people in order to in effect use them to help the EU project succeed. It says:

“It is time now to regard youth as a positive force in the construction of Europe rather than as a problem”

“The European project is itself young, still forming and still being debated. If it is to make progress, it needs ambition and enthusiasm, and commitment on the part of young people to the values on which it is based... It is time now to regard youth as a positive force in the construction of Europe rather than as a problem.”⁴⁹¹

It also establishes a plan to use young people as a justification for European integration. It boldly states: “Young people in Europe subscribe to the same fundamental values as does the European Union. They expect the EU to be in a position to meet their aspirations.”

“This mass information exercise will require a coordinated approach, considerable resources and the involvement of young people”

The White Paper identified the need for an “information and communication campaign for young people”, using content “geared towards young people’s expectations”. It said that as regards information:

“it is important to reach the young people themselves if possible, but in any case those who come into contact with them in school, in clubs, in associations, etc. This mass information exercise will require a coordinated approach, considerable resources and the involvement of young people in devising and implementing these communication tools.”⁴⁹²

The main result of the White Paper was the Youth in Action programme, which was agreed in 2006.

Youth in Action

The Youth in Action programme runs from 2007 to 2013 and “aims to inspire a sense of active citizenship, solidarity and tolerance among young Europeans and to involve them in shaping the Union’s future.”⁴⁹³ Its main objective is “Promoting young people’s active citizenship in general and their European citizenship in particular.”⁴⁹⁴

It has a budget of €885 million over the seven years, and “funds projects which are designed to encourage a sense of active European citizenship in young people and encourage young people to become more involved in the democratic process at regional, national and European level.”⁴⁹⁵

“The aim of the YOUTH programme is to encourage young people to make an active contribution to European integration”

It is the successor to the 2000 to 2006 Youth Programme. According to the Commission, “The aim of the YOUTH programme is to encourage young people to make an active contribution to European integration.”⁴⁹⁶

491 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=en&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=2001&nu_doc=681

492 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=en&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=2001&nu_doc=681

493 http://ec.europa.eu/youth/youth-in-action-programme/index_en.htm?cs_mid=74

494 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/youth/documents/info_kit_0107_v02.pdf

495 http://ec.europa.eu/youth/youth-policies/doc28_en.htm

496 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=en&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=2001&nu_doc=681

The legal base for Youth in Action talks about bringing “citizens, and primarily young people, closer to the European design and the European institutions.”⁴⁹⁷

Among the objectives of the Youth in Action programme are:

“to promote young people’s active citizenship in general and their European citizenship in particular; to promote European cooperation in the youth field; giving young people and youth organisations the opportunity to take part in the development of society in general and the EU in particular; developing young people’s sense of belonging to the EU; encouraging the participation of young people in the democratic life of Europe; fostering the mobility of young people in Europe; and promoting the fundamental values of the EU among young people, in particular respect for human dignity, equality, respect for human rights, tolerance and nondiscrimination.”

The objectives of the programme are pursued through the following five actions:

- 1) **Youth for Europe**, which involves youth exchanges between different countries;
- 2) the **European Voluntary Service**, designed to “develop solidarity and promote active citizenship and mutual understanding”;
- 3) **Youth in the World**, which involves cooperation with countries outside the EU in order to “develop mutual understanding between peoples in a spirit of openness”;
- 4) **Youth support systems**, which involves funding NGOs and other organisations “active in the field of youth” in order to “promote the civil participation of young people at European level by supporting bodies active at European level in the field of youth”; and
- 5) **support for European cooperation** in the youth field (including “structured dialogue” between young people and youth workers and policymakers).⁴⁹⁸

The emphasis on the civic participation of young people suggests a desire not only to educate young people to support European integration, but to encourage them to be its future advocates.

“Making young people aware that they are European citizens is a priority of the Youth in Action Programme”

Indeed, the Commission writes that:

“Making young people aware that they are European citizens is a priority of the Youth in Action Programme. The objective is to encourage young people to reflect upon European topics including European citizenship and to involve them in the discussion on the construction and the future of the European Union. On this basis, projects should have a strong European dimension and stimulate reflection on the emerging European society and its values.”⁴⁹⁹

It notes: “The cohesion of the Union depends on actively engaging Europe’s youth in the European project.”⁵⁰⁰

497 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2006/l_327/l_32720061124en00300044.pdf

498 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2006/l_327/l_32720061124en00300044.pdf

499 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/youth/faq/objectives_en.htm

500 http://ec.europa.eu/youth/youth-in-action-programme/doc104_en.htm

In 2007 a 'European Youth Week' promoted the Youth in Action programme. On its website, the 'get informed' page links first to the heavily biased "What has Europe ever done for us?" website mentioned in Part One, and secondly to a page titled "Celebrating youth", which plugs the EU's White Paper on Sport and begins, "If it is still too early to dream about an united EU in sport for challenging with the other world's superpowers, the Commission just issued a document full of strategies, advices and proposals: will Member States get the challenge?"⁵⁰¹

There is also a link to "Our common future – European Youth Pact." The Pact was adopted by the European Council in March 2005 with an aim "to improve education, training, mobility, employment, and social inclusion of young people, whilst helping to achieve a work-life balance."⁵⁰²

European Youth Week 2008 involved projects such as "Perfecting young European Citizens through art", whose "main goal was to show all the opportunities that young people can have if they work together as one." The topic of one exchange under the programme was "softening differences (ethno-cultural, religious, personal or sexual, conceived by economical, geographical, social or cultural factors)".

It said: "The aim was to assist the participants in getting to know themselves and the others better and to help them to get over their stereotypes in order to build skills for co-operation in the name of a common goal."⁵⁰³ The propaganda value for the European Union - which aims to be a model of cooperation by eliminating differences in the name of common goals – is obvious.

Another project was a "Learn about your neighbours" event on the Isle of Wight. According to the description of the event:

"Students on the Isle of Wight possibly have less contact with their European peers than other young people of their age in this country. This can make them seem insular and anti-European. Our European Youth Week project aims to widen their awareness of our European partner schools and European students studying at our school, so that they feel more European."⁵⁰⁴

There is also a **European Youth Portal**, which not only offers young people information about studying, working and volunteering in the EU, but also includes links to the heavily biased 'information' about the EU referred to above, such as the EuropaGo! website, and the 'European Union at a glance' site, and links to organisations such as the European Youth Forum (see Part Two).

It also tells young people about their rights: "The rights of EU citizens are protected by the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, the purpose of which is to ensure that all the Member States and European institutions defend and promote measures for equality, justice, dignity and citizens' rights."⁵⁰⁵

It links through to an online **European Knowledge Centre for Youth Policy**: "A single entry point to get accurate and up-to-date research based information on the realities of young people across Europe."⁵⁰⁶

501 http://www.youthweek.eu/get-informed_en.html

502 http://www.youthweek.eu/our-common-future_en.html

503 <http://www.youthweek.eu/best-youth-projects/active-best-practise-projects-en/best-practise-bulgaria.html>

504 <http://www.eurodesk.org.uk/Special/Events.aspx?id=4>

505 http://europa.eu/youth/your_rights/index_eu_en.html

506 http://europa.eu/youth/news/index_2412_en.html

In terms of concrete actions, the EU targets young people in a number of ways. Firstly, as touched on briefly in Part One, it produces enormous amounts of literature, websites and other material aimed specifically at children and young people.

Secondly, it directs these and other initiatives directly at pupils and at teachers, by organising school initiatives and programmes, such as Spring Day for Europe and guided visits to the EU institutions.

Thirdly, it heavily subsidises university courses, professors and researchers pursuing the study of European integration. All of these initiatives fit into the overall aims of attempting to create a European public sphere and a European citizenship, as looked at above.

1 Biased publications and websites

Any teacher or young person can find a wealth of resources on the EU's Europa website designed and written specifically with children and young people in mind. The EU institutions, as well as the host EU 'information' points such as those mentioned in Part One, distribute huge amounts of literature and resources for teachers and young people alike.

The content is consistently and overwhelmingly pro-integrationist, presenting the EU as an unqualified success, with a clear aim to teach young people – both directly and with more subliminal messages – that a stronger EU is the answer to many of the world's problems.

For example, there is a whole section on the Europa 'Easy reading' page⁵⁰⁷ with a special section for 'young people', with links to booklets on every EU policy area in the 'Europe on the move' booklet series.

Some of the titles really speak for themselves. For example, the booklet on the topic of Competition is titled: "It's a better life – How the EU's single market benefits you," on Consumer Affairs it's "Your rights as a consumer – How the European Union protects your interests," and on External Trade it's "Making globalisation work for everyone – the European Union and world trade." There is also "Better off in Europe – How the EU's single market benefits you", "50 ways forward – Europe's best successes," and "Serving the people of Europe – What the European Commission does for you," to pick just a few.⁵⁰⁸

Specifically with teachers and their schoolchildren in mind, there are also wallcharts, posters, postcards and maps. The emphasis is on explaining the different 'successes' of the EU and how it reaches its decisions. The most critical it gets is an acknowledgment, on the wallchart "This is your Europe – the EU at your service," for example, that "the EU is complex and hard to understand. It is not always easy for 25 countries to agree on what to do," and "EU leaders have not been good at explaining what they do and why."⁵⁰⁹

There is no mention at all of the drawbacks of EU policies, such as higher food prices, import tariffs against poor countries, fraud, waste and corruption in the EU institutions, misdirected EU regional funds or the lack of democracy – all of which are also facts about the EU.

507 http://ec.europa.eu/publications/index_en.htm

508 http://ec.europa.eu/publications/atoz_en.htm

509 http://ec.europa.eu/publications/booklets/others/58/panorama_en.pdf

Below are some of the clearest examples of this propaganda in action.

Europa Diary

Now in its fifth edition, the “Europa Diary: Wise Choices?” is produced yearly by the European Commission’s DG Consumer Affairs and distributed to schools across the EU by the Generation Europe Foundation. For the 2008-2009 school year, more than 2.8 million copies have been distributed throughout the member states in all of the EU’s languages, and for 2009 a Serbian edition is under preparation.⁵¹⁰ The diary comes complete with a Teachers’ Guide, to help them make the most of it.⁵¹¹

In the UK, 230,000 copies of the 2007/2008 edition were distributed.⁵¹² The price per copy delivered to the schools was €1.67⁵¹³, bringing the total cost to more than €4.6 million for the 2008-2009 edition.

According to the EU Commissioner for Consumer Protection, who had a foreword in the 2207-2008 edition, the diary “provides practical tips and ‘know-how’ on becoming healthier, safer and more assertive as a consumer, by taking advantage of all the rights offered to you by the EU.”⁵¹⁴

The diary opens with an EU timeline, which starts out: “1946: The aim, in the aftermath of the Second World War, was to secure peace between Europe’s victorious and vanquished nations.” The entry for the year 2001 reads: “The Treaty of Nice was signed which brought further reforms to the EU institutions and reinforced fundamental rights, security and defense, and judicial co-operation in criminal matters.”

The main text of the diary opens with: “The European Union has grown a lot, not just in terms of geographic coverage, population and economic power but also in the number of ways that it touches on our everyday lives. This success has made the European Union much more visible to the general public.”

“EU membership has made it easier to travel, live, shop, work and study wherever we want in any EU Member State”

An interview with EU Communications Commissioner Margot Wallstrom reads: “What is the European Union’s single greatest achievement in the past 10 years?” to which she replies: “I think uniting many of the Eastern and Western countries is a great achievement, also the single market and having a single currency in many countries. The EU has improved the quality of people’s everyday lives.”

A section titled “What is the European Union” says:

“The European Union is a group of 27 Member States who have decided to share power in order to make their populations safer and wealthier. The system of government they have created is unique in the world. Most of the things you read or hear about the EU focus on big issues such as economic competition, but its work touches almost every aspect of our lives, from the quality of the environment around us to ensuring that we get a fair deal as consumers. And EU membership has made it easier to travel, live, shop, work and study wherever we want in any EU Member State.”

510 http://www.generation-europe.eu.com/drupal_prev_v1/about-ge/work-ge

511 http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/cons_info/cons_diary2007-2008/tk_uk.pdf

512 http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/cons_info/cons_diary2007-2008/nat_report_uk.pdf

513 http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/cons_info/consumer_diary_en.htm

514 http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/cons_info/cons_diary2007-2008/agenda_uk.pdf

A section on the Court of Auditors explains that “The European Union is funded by taxpayers’ money. Taxpayers have the right to know whether their money is being spent properly. The Court of Auditors, also based in Luxembourg, reviews the Commission’s accounts and publishes an annual report on the way money has been spent”. However it neglects to point out that the Court has failed to sign off the EU’s accounts for the past 13 years in a row.

Europa Go!

Aimed at 10 to 14 year olds, the strapline of this colourful website is “Learning about Europe can be fun!”⁵¹⁵ It shows a picture of a child’s bedroom with the EU flag on the wall, and has interactive games and quizzes for children as well as wallpaper downloads for desktops. There is a series of different quizzes on EU topics, including “Europe in Harmony,” “Game of Stars” and “The Euro Game.”

“Learning about Europe can be fun!”

The Euro Game quiz links to the Euro Kids’ Corner, which tells the story of the euro with a treasure island theme and challenges children to pit against each other in interactive games including “Coins and currencies – which country does each euro-coin design come from?”; “Banknote puzzle – put together the pieces of each euro banknote”; “Dive and count – can you add up?” and the “Euro quiz – test your knowledge of the euro”.⁵¹⁶

The quizzes are clearly intended to familiarise children with the currency, but the “learn” section of the site is about promoting the euro. As well as explaining what the euro is, how it was introduced and how coins and notes are made, it explains that “Using many different currencies within Europe made life more difficult and more expensive when moving between countries. Exchanging currencies cost money: trade was more expensive and travel cost more.”

“Using many different currencies within Europe made life more difficult and more expensive when moving between countries”

It goes on to talk about the benefits of the euro under “How does the euro help us?”, without a single counter-argument against it or in favour of national currencies. It is portrayed as a complete success:

“the euro is an everyday symbol of the economic integration of Europe into the single market and of the progress of European integration overall”

“Much of the good work the EU does is not always obvious - it is often hidden in legal documents and pages of reports. But the euro can be held in your hand – it is very real... the euro is an everyday symbol of the economic integration of Europe into the single market, and of the progress of European integration overall.”⁵¹⁷

In the past, now EU Trade Commissioner Baroness Ashton has justified spending EU money on these exercises by saying, “All our young people need to understand the workings of the euro if they are to travel within Europe. They need to know what a euro note looks like to ensure that they receive the correct currency and understand how it is used.”

This may well be true, but the above examples prove that the EU is unable or unwilling to inform people in a neutral way.⁵¹⁸

515 <http://europa.eu/europago/welcome.jsp>

516 http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/netstartsearch/euro/kids/index_en.htm

517 http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/netstartsearch/euro/kids/learn_en.htm

518 Hansard, 14 July 2003 <http://www.theyworkforyou.com/lords/?gid=2003-07-14a.710.0>

Let's explore Europe!

Aimed at 9 to 12 year olds, *Let's Explore Europe*⁵¹⁹, published in 2008 charts the geography and history of Europe as a continent, "our home", and its successes (e.g. "Some of the world's best planes are built in Europe" and "Europe's seaside resorts are great places for a holiday.").

Until about halfway through, the pamphlet is fairly harmless, apart from a few subtle endorsements of the EU's approach: "Europe had record-breaking hot summers in 2003 and 2006. Is this a sign that the climate is changing? Climate change is a world-wide problem that can only be solved if all countries work together"; and "We all need to do what we can to look after the countryside and keep it beautiful."

But after exploring the great European inventions and personalities, it notes that:

"Sadly, the story of Europe is not all about great achievements we can be proud of. There are also many things to be ashamed of. Down the centuries, European nations fought terrible wars against each other. These wars were usually about power and property, or religion."

"Could anything be done to stop these things happening again? Would Europeans ever learn to sit down together and discuss things instead of fighting? The answer is yes. That's the story of our next chapter: the story of the European Union."

"The EU tries to make life better in all sorts of ways"

Noting that what was needed was "a really good plan that had never been tried before," it goes on to chart the beginnings of the European Coal and Steel Community, which later became the EEC and eventually the European Union.

Covering "What the EU does," it says "The EU tries to make life better in all sorts of ways... the EU is doing all it can to create new and better jobs for everyone who can work. It helps people to set up new businesses, and provides money to train people to do new kinds of work."

It says the EU helps poor countries: "It also buys many things that those countries produce without charging customs duties. That way, the poor countries can earn more money." It continues:

"The European Union has brought many European countries together in friendship. Of course, they don't always agree on everything but, instead of fighting, their leaders sit round a table to sort out their disagreements. So the dream of Jean Monnet and Robert Schuman has come true: the EU has brought peace among its members."

"We are today's European children: before long we'll be Europe's adults. The future is for us to decide — together!"

"We are today's European children: before long we'll be Europe's adults. The future is for us to decide — together!"

519 <http://ec.europa.eu/publications/young/letsexplore2008/en.pdf>

What scorching weather!

With the more specific aim of convincing children that climate change is a fact, (and thereby implicitly justifying a role for the EU in combating it) the Commission's illustrated publication "What scorching weather!"⁵²⁰ is a children's story about a boy called Tom who sees a forest fire while out on his bike on a hot day and starts to worry about his friend, Lila the Fox.

A friendly fireman explains why the weather is so hot:

"You see, Tom, the problem is that the world is getting warmer. The climate is changing, so we're getting heat waves like this one. And storms, and floods, and all sorts of other natural disasters! The ice at the north and south poles is melting, and so are the glaciers on high mountains like the Alps. The melted water runs off into the rivers and down to the sea, so the sea level is rising. Some islands and coasts are likely to disappear under the water! At the same time, if the climate goes on getting hotter, some countries will become deserts!"

He goes on to explain that the problem is caused by greenhouse gases from cars, planes and factories. After the fire is extinguished, and Lila the Fox and her fox cubs have been saved, Tom and the fireman are presented with medals from the Mayor (who happens to be wearing a blue sash dotted with gold stars).

Tom says: "Mr Mayor, please take a look at these poor little fox cubs. They nearly died today... And it's all because of climate change! I think you should give these medals to people who are trying to save the earth!"

The fireman chimes in with "Mr Mayor, we're fireman. We were just doing our job. But we see that the earth is warming up. Today's forest fire was not a coincidence. We humans were probably responsible. The climate is changing!"

Captain Euro

In the late 90s a brand agency working for the EU created a superhero, Captain Euro, whose remit is to "defend the security of Europe and uphold the values of the Union." According to the animated website⁵²¹:

"Captain Euro is a diplomatic hero - the symbol of European unity and values."

"[He] plays a crucial role in the building of a European identity. His message is about protecting and nurturing European diversity and culture while creating a strong and powerful brand that unites us at European level."

"He's fun. He's friendly and he appeals to all Europeans because he's totally multicultural and non-political. In other words, he is a true European - through and through... Captain EURO is the super-hero of Europe. He's the protector of Europe who holds out for justice, who promotes peace and carries the message of goodwill around the world."

The website states "Everyone will want to identify with the Captain Euro brand. It brings emotion to the concept of a united Europe, adding value to products and services.... Captain Euro makes everyone proud to be European."

520 Also available online - <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/pubs/pdf/weather/en.pdf>

521 <http://www.captaineuro.com/>

Captain euro and his sidekick, Europa, “are the new ambassadors of global peace... solving problems and averting the threat of danger.” They even “represent Europe in the sporting arena too. Competing in a host of sporting championships and triumphing in the name of Europe.”

“Everyone will want to identify with the Captain Euro brand. It brings emotion to the concept of a united Europe, adding value to products and services. Captain Euro makes everyone proud to be European”

The chief baddy is Dr. D Vider, whose “evil” intention is “to divide Europe and create his own empire,” with the help of his son, who “is always crisply dressed in immaculate Saville Row of London suits.”

There are also some extraordinary old publications that are no longer available, including, **Let’s Draw Europe together** (the opening section of which was entitled “My country: Europe”) and classroom videos, including one which proclaimed that “to simplify things, they should make a Single Currency [so that] everyone is happy. See – it’s better this way.”

Another one no longer around is the infamous **Raspberry Ice-Cream War**, a comic book, which, as MEP Daniel Hannan has reported:

“tells the story of a group of intrepid youngsters who travel back through time to a land where there are still nations and borders. They explain to the ignorant inhabitants that, where they come from - the EU - frontiers have been abolished and, with them, every misery and misfortune that used to afflict mankind. The grateful natives agree to pool their sovereignty, thereby ushering in a period of cross-border trade and sustainable growth.”⁵²²

“to simplify things, they should make a Single Currency [so that] everyone is happy. See – it’s better this way”

2 Support for education

The EU also spends large amounts of money each year targeting children and young people through education. The underlying idea is to help promote European citizenship, which, as we saw in the previous section, is viewed by the EU as an essential means for fostering support for EU integration.

As the Economic and Social Committee recommended in a paper on “Making European citizenship visible and effective” in December 2006: “Ambitious initiatives should... be undertaken to consolidate European citizenship through education and training, not least about Europe. A common European core should be ensured at all levels of education: primary, secondary and university.”⁵²³

In terms of education, the EU’s central campaign for the period up to 2013 is the “Lifelong Learning Programme”, which supports education and training across Europe at a cost of around €1 billion a year.⁵²⁴

522 <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml?xml=/opinion/2006/08/05/do0503.xml>

523 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2006:318:0163:01:EN:HTML>

524 http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/doc78_en.htm

The Lifelong Learning Programme was called the Socrates programme before 2007. A full list of projects funded under Socrates, including Comenius, Erasmus, Leonardo etc can be found here: <http://www.isoc.siu.no/isocii.nsf> One Comenius project for example, undertaken by an Austrian school on the subject of European Identity, took as its premise: “To be European is not something one is born to be but a matter of education”. http://www.isoc.siu.no/isocii.nsf/DE_print/053ADEF3EE9491B3C1256DE2004C8FD5

This is divided up into four programmes – school education (Comenius), higher education (Erasmus), vocational training (Leonardo da Vinci) and adult education (Grundtvig). There is also the Jean Monnet programme which promotes the study of European integration in universities.

The Commission says the aim of the programme is

“to contribute through lifelong learning to the development of the Community as an advanced knowledge society, with sustainable economic development, more and better jobs and greater social cohesion. It aims to foster interaction, cooperation and mobility between education and training systems within the Community, so that they become a world quality reference.”⁵²⁵

These are laudable aims, as is the objective to advance student mobility and language-learning, such as through the Erasmus scheme.

However, the Commission goes on to explain that there is an underlying, wider purpose to funding education, which is “to reinforce the role of lifelong learning in creating a sense of European citizenship.”⁵²⁶

Indeed many aspects of the programmes serve to promote the EU, purporting to “make people more aware of Europe” but in practice offering children and young people only the ‘good news’ about the EU.

The most controversial aspects of the EU’s action in the area of education are its activities in schools, and the Jean Monnet programme for universities.⁵²⁷

A Propaganda in schools

Clearly the literature, websites and teaching materials mentioned above are key examples of how the EU targets children in primary and secondary education, since many of them are designed for use by teachers and pupils.

In addition to this, there are several other ways in which the EU concentrates on schools.

According to EU Trade Commissioner Baroness Ashton:

“The Government are committed to increasing the awareness of European and wider international issues in schools... From 1997 until December 2002, the European Commission subsidised—by 360,000 euros (approximately £250,000)—the provision of information to schools and some colleges in the UK through a network of European resource centres. The host organisations, mostly educational authorities but some colleges and a few universities, met the remainder of the costs by providing accommodation and staff resources.”

“Those centres played an important role in providing information to students and teachers, face-to-face and on the phone, as well as offering a range of materials including, for example,

⁵²⁵ http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/newprog/index_en.html

⁵²⁶ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=32006D1720

⁵²⁷ The more worthwhile aspects of the Lifelong Learning Programme have been excluded from the calculation of the propaganda spend – such as Article 15 02 03, “Cooperation with non-member countries on education and vocational training”, worth €6.65m in 2008, Article 15 02 23, “Erasmus-style programme for apprentices”, and Article 15 02 25, which allocates €17m to the European Centre for Development of Vocational Training.

the loan of European Treasure Chests. The Treasure Chest project, with financial assistance from Building Europe Together, was funded through the EU Prince Programme... Chests contain CD-Roms, books and maps about Europe. The project subsequently extended to the secondary sector"⁵²⁸

Comenius

The Comenius branch of the Lifelong Learning Programme, run by the British Council in the UK, "provides opportunities for schools and colleges to introduce or strengthen the European dimension in their curriculum."⁵²⁹

This involves school partnerships, enabling schools from across Europe to work together on joint projects (a project which will be rolled out to Local Authorities from 2009); in-service training for teachers in other European countries; and an assistants' programme which places trainee teachers in schools and colleges across Europe.

A look at the Comenius case studies shows that the project has provided school children with some valuable opportunities to work with other children around Europe, increasing their mutual understanding and even helping them to learn new languages, through both classroom work and visits and exchanges.

However, it is clear that the underlying theme is to promote the idea of 'Europe' as a concept to school children, linking it in with issues ranging from the environment, to energy supply, to diversity and equality. There is a subtle message running throughout the projects funded that Europeans generally work better "together" – helping to cement support for further integration, and, therefore, for the EU.

The leader of one project, for instance, on citizenship, diversity and equality, undertaken by a school in Cambridge in conjunction with schools in Italy, Sweden and Germany, wrote:

"We felt that the final year should be one of celebration of our sustained collaboration, of friendships made, of curriculum development, of the potential for Europe to create equality and harmony, and of the richness of diversity. We called the final year Celebrating Diversity, so we could demonstrate not only recognition of problems within Europe and its position in the wider global community, but the hope, even the conviction, that by working together we can create a better and more equal future."⁵³⁰

Another project, involving schools in Gloucestershire, Italy and Romania said its broad aim was "to enable the children to explore and engage in dialogue about their roles and responsibilities as citizens in their immediate community and as future adults in the European Community."⁵³¹

One project, called "The European Citizen - Thinking, Teaching and Learning for Europe", identifies its aims as to "develop a better understanding of living together as European Citizens and tolerance between nations; and embedding European Citizenship into the curriculum areas of all three schools."

528 Hansard, 14 July 2003

529 <http://www.britishcouncil.org/comenius-about-us.htm>

530 <http://www.globalgateway.org/default.aspx?page=1490>

531 <http://www.globalgateway.org/default.aspx?page=1491>

Its activities included the creation of a website called 'Europeans Working Together' and a visit to Poland "to celebrate Poland's entry to the EU."⁵³²

Another, called "Europe – United in Diversity", encouraged pupils to write letters describing their ideal European school to the EU Education Commissioner.⁵³³

In addition to these there are also broad-brush campaigns designed for promoting the EU in schools, which are distinct from the Comenius programme.

Spring Day in Europe

Spring Day for Europe is an annual, three-month campaign that takes place between March and June to engage school children in EU issues. It is part of the DG Communication's 'Plan D for Democracy' campaign (see Part One). There is a particular focus on 9 May, which, as we saw in Part Three, is 'Europe Day'.

As the website notes: "Spring Day for Europe was first launched in 2002 as a campaign to: raise awareness about the European Union, its citizens and institutions; promote European citizenship education at school through traditional and ICT curriculum-based activities."⁵³⁴

By 29 April 2008, 3000 schools from across the EU had signed up to take part.⁵³⁵ Schools are enticed to sign up to participate by the possibility to "Receive a digital certificate of participation signed by top-level EU decision makers."⁵³⁶

In addition: "A set of digital games are offered to support and make the teaching and learning of European topics more fun for students. The games are interactive and cover a number of thematic areas such as: European integration, citizenship, common cultural values and heritage, EU institutions, the EU and its citizens and EU treaties."⁵³⁷

The theme for 2008 is the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue, whose aim is "to promote intercultural dialogue and help raise awareness of cultural diversity with young people, as a major asset to our common European cultural heritage."⁵³⁸

In 2007 the theme was 'Together since 1957: Schools celebrating Europe.' As the Commission explains: "This anniversary is an opportunity to communicate about what the EU has achieved so far and to intensify the debate on the future of Europe, a future matching the needs and expectations of young generations."⁵³⁹

One element of Spring Day for Europe in 2008 is "Guess who is going back to school".⁵⁴⁰ The idea is to organise for a public figure "to talk about Europe and its role in intercultural dialogue."⁵⁴¹

532 <http://www.globalgateway.org/default.aspx?page=1481>

533 <http://www.globalgateway.org/default.aspx?page=2773>

534 <http://www.springday2008.net/www/en/pub/spring2008/about/glance.htm>

535 http://www.springday2008.net/www/en/pub/spring2008/news/press_releases/3000.htm

536 <http://www.springday2008.net/www/en/pub/spring2008/about/whyregister.htm>

537 <http://www.springday2008.net/www/en/pub/spring2008/about/whyregister.htm>

538 <http://www.springday2008.net/www/en/pub/spring2008/about/glance.htm>

539 http://www.europeanschoolnet.org/www/en/pub/eun/portals/spring_day.htm

540 Not to be confused with the separate initiative "EU Back to schools", which, the Commission explains, is "part of a communication effort of the European Commission, the European Parliament and national governments to better communicate Europe to young people. Prepared by the Commission and by the government of the concerned Member State, EU Back to schools has already taken place in Germany, Portugal, Slovenia and the Netherlands. Schools involved in this operation are strongly recommended to get registered in Spring Day for Europe in order to continue to reinforce their knowledge about the EU."
<http://www.springday2008.net/www/en/pub/spring2008/news/newsflash/backschool.htm>

As the website states:

“It has the purpose of inviting public figures and experts to visit schools and host debates that focus on the latest developments in the European Union. To date a large number of public figures, including EU Commissioners, Members of the European Parliament, state presidents and members of national parliaments have visited schools.”⁵⁴²

These are listed on the website and those visiting schools in the UK – such as Conservative MEP Neil Parish, Labour MEP Gary Tittley and SNP MEP Ian Hudghton – seem to suggest a degree of balance in this exercise, representing a range of views on the EU, both critical and pro.

However, some of the other activities teachers are encouraged to undertake with pupils are much less balanced and are clearly designed to convince schoolchildren about the need for EU integration.

“This anniversary is an opportunity to communicate about what the EU has achieved so far and to intensify the debate on the future of Europe”

One activity encourages children to interview “an MEP or another political figure” about their background in the context of the Year of Intercultural Dialogue. They are instructed to pick someone “that is important or has contributed to the development of Europe or intercultural dialogue.”⁵⁴³

Among its recommended resources for teachers, the website lists Debate Europe, EU Tube, and the hugely one-sided “EU at a glance” brochure which was looked at in Part One.⁵⁴⁴

As part of the 2007 Spring Day for Europe, the teacher resources recommended a quiz. With questions like “The EU Constitution aims at creating a more efficient and effective enlarged Europe, closer to the citizens, and representing Europe’s interests in the world. True or False,” the bias is evident.⁵⁴⁵

The Commission earmarked €500,000 for Spring Day in 2008.⁵⁴⁶

The initiative is coordinated by European Schoolnet on behalf of the European Commission.⁵⁴⁷ Created in 1997, European Schoolnet (EUN) is a consortium of 28 ministries of education in Europe. According to its website:

“Since its establishment, European Schoolnet (EUN) has been at the forefront in supporting the European dimension in schools. This goal is achieved through projects, competitions, activities, communication and information exchange at all levels of school education using innovative technologies.”⁵⁴⁸

Its proximity to the EU and its objective to promote the EU agenda is evident from its pledge “to maintain close links with the European Commission... and other European institutions like the European Parliament and the Committee of the Regions... as part of its efforts to contribute towards the attainment of European objectives for education and e-learning.”⁵⁴⁹

541 <http://www.springday2008.net/www/en/pub/spring2008/about/whyregister.htm>

542 <http://www.springday2008.net/www/en/pub/spring2008/news/newsflash/katedralskolan.htm>

543 http://www.springday2008.net/shared/app_uploads/springday/2008/guidelines/EN_guide_interview.pdf

544 <http://www.springday2008.net/www/en/pub/spring2008/resources/selection.htm>

545 <http://myeurope.eun.org/shared/data/myeurope/2004/docs/eu-const/abc.html>

546 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/prog2008_en.pdf

547 http://www.springday2008.net/www/en/pub/spring2008/news/press_releases/pr01.htm

Europe Day in schools

In April 2008 the UK office of the European Parliament circulated ideas for activities for teachers involved in Spring Day for "How to celebrate Europe Day". (See Part Three for more on Europe Day).

They included: "Set up a European café in school using Euros/European currencies and arrange a European lunch provided by the canteen or the children" and "Play maths games using the Euro and other European currencies or distances from one capital to another."

Another was: "Write a short story about Europe, what does it mean to you, which country would you like to know more about and why?" And "Young people are invited to express in a picture what they think about the impact of Europe in their region and how Europe begins first and foremost in their community."⁵⁵⁰

Despite all this, the Commission vehemently denies spending money promoting the EU in schools, but has been unable to properly refute the idea that it has a propaganda budget.

In response to an article in the *Telegraph* in 2002, which claimed that the EU was spending £150 million on pro-euro material for primary school classes, it wrote:

"Quite where Peterborough got the idea of a 'propaganda war-chest totalling more than £150 million' is unclear. A similar amount has been earmarked for a new communication strategy to improve public awareness of the EU across all 15 Member States, but the notion that any of this money is to be spent on distributing pro-euro material to primary school children in the UK is mendacious rubbish."⁵⁵¹

Likewise, now EU Trade Commissioner Baroness Ashton claims: "Teaching about Europe and Britain's relationship with the European Community is essential in the global community in which we live. It is not designed to encourage particular European views."⁵⁵²

School Milk Scheme

The EU provides subsidies for milk to be provided for school children through the EU School Milk Scheme, and has recently ruled that as a condition for receiving the milk, schools must advertise the role of the EU on big posters visible at the entrance to the school.

According to the Commission regulation, the justification for this is:

"Experience has shown that the beneficiaries are not sufficiently aware of the role played by the European Union in the school milk scheme. The subsidising role of the European Union in the scheme should therefore be clearly indicated in each educational establishment participating in the school milk scheme."

The regulation is very strict on exactly how the "European school milk poster" should look: it must be "A3 or bigger", with letters "1 cm or bigger", with the title "European school milk," and

548 <http://www.europeanschoolnet.org/www/en/pub/eun/about/euninfo.htm>

549 Work Programme 2007 <http://www.europeanschoolnet.org/shared/data/corporate/pdf/WP2007full.pdf>

550 <http://www.europarl.org.uk/outreach/factsheets-outreach/Factsheet03.pdf>

551 http://ec.europa.eu/unitedkingdom/press/press_watch/pdf/14.pdf

552 Hansard, 13 July 2003 <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200203/ldhansrd/vo030714/text/30714-22.htm>

the content must contain “at least” the following wording: “Our [type of educational establishment (e.g. nursery/pre-school/school)] provides dairy products subsidised by the European Union under the European school milk scheme”.

The regulation states that in addition, “It is recommended to emphasise nutritional benefits and nutritional guidelines for children.”

The poster must be “permanently situated at a clearly visible and readable place at the main entrance of the establishment.”⁵⁵³ Clearly the exercise is targeted at parents and other adults as much as it is the children.

What’s more, the details of the regulation reveal that the overriding aim of the provision of milk subsidies for schools is not to contribute to children’s nutrition, but to help advertise the EU. The regulation states that:

“Experience has shown monitoring difficulties as regards the use of subsidised milk products in the preparation of meals served to pupils. Moreover, this is not an effective way of attaining the educational purpose of the scheme. Therefore the preparation of meals should be restricted accordingly...Milk and milk products used in the preparation of meals shall not benefit from the aid.”

In other words, milk which cannot be seen and therefore easily identified and advertised as the result of EU funding is not eligible for the aid.

Targeting teachers

As well as providing teachers with guidebooks, literature and classroom materials to help them approach the subject of the EU, as detailed above, there is evidence to suggest that the Commission may be indirectly funding organisations such as the European Association of Teachers, which “aims to be an association for all teachers wishing to work together for the creation of a European Union.”

Indeed its website says it “Aims to widen the teachers knowledge of European issues and to show them the means and methods which can rapidly lead to the creation of a European Union.”⁵⁵⁴ It even came up with a “Manual to promote European Active Citizenship”.⁵⁵⁵ It is a member of the European Movement International, which suggests it may have received funding indirectly from the EU.⁵⁵⁶

An EU-wide history book?

Recently there have been moves towards common teaching of history in European schools. In 2008 the second volume of a joint Franco-German textbook was unveiled for pupils in the lower sixth⁵⁵⁷, after the German Education Minister, backed by the EU Commission, called for an EU history textbook to foster a “common cultural identity” across the EU. A spokesperson for the German Education Ministry said: “A common history book could contribute to a common European identity and knowledge about what is important for European culture and history.”⁵⁵⁸

553 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:183:0017:0026:EN:PDF>

554 <http://www.aede.org/index.php?id=Aims&L=1%20class%3DI%2Findex.php3%3FI%3D> http://www.aede.org/fileadmin/download/docs/citeuract_en.pdf

555 http://www.aede.org/fileadmin/download/docs/citeuract_en.pdf

556 http://www.europeanmovement.org/all_members.cfm

Germany and Poland are now working on a joint text aimed at 13 to 15 year olds, for publication in 2011.⁵⁵⁹

In 2006 then-Europe Minister Geoff Hoon proposed that children should be taught more about the EU, about what it does and what it means. However, he said explicitly that he wanted to go about this by teaching children about the “benefits” of the EU – about “free trade and cheap travel”, he said.⁵⁶⁰ This clearly goes beyond neutral information.

“A common history book could contribute to a common European identity and knowledge about what is important for European culture and history”

B The Jean Monnet programme - propaganda in higher education?

The EU also spends millions of euros a year funding higher education initiatives in universities. The main programme here is the Jean Monnet Programme for Understanding European Integration.

Launched in 1990, the Jean Monnet Programme for Understanding European Integration “stimulates excellence in teaching, research and reflection on European integration in higher education institutions throughout the world.”⁵⁶¹

It provides funding for students, researchers, professors and establishments operating in the “field of European integration”. Its budget for 2007 was €4.4 million.⁵⁶²

Currently present in 61 countries throughout the world, the programme has helped to set up around 3,000 teaching projects in the field of European integration studies, including 134 Jean Monnet European Centres of Excellence, 768 Jean Monnet Chairs, and 2,014 European modules and permanent courses. The Jean Monnet Action, as it is called, brings together a network of 1,500 professors, reaching audiences of 250,000 students every year.⁵⁶³

In the UK, there are currently 178 Jean Monnet projects in operation, including 14 Jean Monnet Centres of Excellence in the Universities of Bath, Birmingham, Cambridge, Essex, Glasgow, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Liverpool, Loughborough, Manchester, Newcastle upon Tyne, Sussex and Wales (Aberystwyth), and funding for courses throughout the UK in community law, European economic integration, European political integration and the history of the European construction process.⁵⁶⁴

The objectives of the programme are listed as:

“to stimulate teaching, research and reflection activities in the field of European integration studies; to support the existence of an appropriate range of institutions and associations focusing on issues relating to European integration and on education and training in a European perspective; to stimulate excellence in teaching, research and reflection in European integration studies in higher education institutions within and outside the Community; to enhance knowledge and awareness among specialist academics and among European citizens

557 Le Figaro, 9 April 2008

558 Telegraph, 22 February 2007

559 Le Figaro, 20 May 2008

560 Daily Mail, 2 August 2006

561 http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/doc88_en.htm

562 Bill Rammell, Secretary of State for Innovation, Universities and Skills, Written Answer, 2 May 2007 : Column 1766W

563 http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/doc88_en.htm

564 Bill Rammell, Secretary of State for Innovation, Universities and Skills, Written Answer, 21 February 2008 : Column 872W

generally of issues relating to European integration; to support key European institutions dealing with issues relating to European integration; to support the existence of high-quality European institutions and associations active in the fields of education and training.”

The study of European integration is a valid pursuit, given the importance of the EU in terms of its impact on national legislation. There is nothing wrong per se with funding courses to help students understand the complicated processes and politics of the European Union.

However, there is a problem if the people teaching and designing these courses – who are the ones which apply for and receive the funding – are not sufficiently impartial in their beliefs and their teachings. It would be speculative to assume that university courses on European integration – usually known as “European Studies” – are inherently biased in favour of the EU, and therefore help to generate graduates who actively or subconsciously support the EU.

This would require a detailed and enormous study into the content of courses, the quality of teaching, the details of the funding decisions, and the psychological impact on students.

However, even without speculating, there is evidence to suggest that this may in fact be the case.

A 2002 UACES briefing paper on the structure and content of European Studies courses for a Standing Conference of Heads of European Studies, which comments on the uninterrupted growth of European Studies degree programmes in the UK since the early 1970s, states (in a no doubt unintentional revelation) that such a growth “has run so curiously counter to the apparent ambient ‘Eurocepticism’ in British society.” This clearly suggests that the author believes the content of the courses to be capable as serving as some kind of antidote to ‘eurocepticism’.

It goes on to reveal that: “Many of the pioneer advocates of European Studies had a research interest in the EEC and usually, also, a conviction of the benefits that would follow British accession.”⁵⁶⁵

Furthermore, in a 2007 report titled “Jean Monnet: Success Stories”, the Commission, detailing the origins of the programme, writes: “The purpose was to stimulate universities throughout the world to explain the European Union model for peaceful coexistence and integration as well as European Union policies and external action.”⁵⁶⁶

It continues: “Jean Monnet professors all over the world greatly contributed to the European Union’s visibility in the world and to the better understanding of the European integration process as a model for peaceful cooperation.”

“Jean Monnet professors all over the world greatly contributed to the European Union’s visibility in the world and to the better understanding of the European integration process as a model for peaceful cooperation.”

Emphasising the potential of the programme to promote the EU cause even beyond its own borders, one Jean Monnet Chair of Law listed in Slovakia is quoted saying: “The Jean Monnet Action has been instrumental in the intellectual preparation of the Slovak Republic for EU membership.”

565 <http://www.uaces.org/SCHESEUStudies.pdf>

566 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/monnet/success-stories_en.pdf

Another, based in Lebanon said: “The Chair’s visibility has opened a key interest in a different study and knowledge of the European Union in Lebanon and in the Arab world, one which is based on values and achievements typical of European soft power.”

The booklet also lists the “numerous” Jean Monnet professors “who, on the basis of years of teaching and research, are entering public service to make a contribution to the European construction.” Among the ex-Jean Monnet Professors listed are 11 MEPs, two Commissioners, four judges at the European Court of Justice, and a President of the European Court of Auditors. There are also nine with jobs as high-level advisors to the EU institutions.⁵⁶⁷

While there is no conclusive evidence that the Jean Monnet scheme is definitely a tool for pro-EU bias across the board, it seems fair to conclude that a system of huge public funding from a body whose existence depends on the continuation of the European integration project is inherently flawed as a source of impartial information and teaching. Arguably, the system almost unavoidably attracts inherent bias however one teaches it – just as, say, Gender Studies, or Peace Studies might.

Support for the College of Europe and other pro-EU educational institutions

In addition to funding for European Studies courses in universities, the Jean Monnet programme also directly supports a number of institutions “pursuing an aim of European interest”, specifically the College of Europe in Bruges and Natolin, the European University Institute (Florence), the European Institute of Public Administration (Maastricht), the Academy of European Law (Trier), the European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (Odense), and the International Centre for European Training (CIFE) in Nice.⁵⁶⁸ These receive automatic funding without having to put in an application.⁵⁶⁹

These institutions provide an academic factory for an elite trained in ‘EU integration’, not unlike the French state-funded Ecole Nationale d’Administration, which churns out officials and bureaucrats and politicians trained in the art of government with a view to getting a lifetime’s job in the French government.

Indeed the College of Europe, for instance, is more than a university but a training ground for a job in the EU institutions. Its website describes it as “the world’s first university institute of postgraduate studies and training in European affairs,”⁵⁷⁰ and the alumni section of the site notes: “The primary goal of the College is to form competent and experienced Europeans.”⁵⁷¹

As the EU’s High Representative for Foreign and Security Policy Javier Solana says on the website: “The College of Europe has groomed successive generations of European leaders. From European institutions to government; from business to journalism, College alumni rank among the most qualified decision-makers”.⁵⁷²

EU Commission President Jose Barroso is quoted saying: “The College of Europe is not just a pole of academic excellence; it is above all a place of practical application – a rich source of tomorrow’s Europe.”

567 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/monnet/success-stories_en.pdf

568 http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/llp/jm/more/institut_en.html

569 http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/doc88_en.htm

570 <http://www.coleurop.be/template.asp?pagename=history>

571 www.coleurop-alumni.org

572 <http://www.coleurop.be/template.asp?pagename=introduction>

And EU Commissioner for Regional Policy Danute Hubner says:

“I have met people in their sixties who still love to talk about their year at the College of Europe. From now on you will never think in a purely national framework. As problems arise you will say to yourself ‘but what would my old French or German or Polish friend from the College of Europe think about this?’”

“I have met people in their sixties who still love to talk about their year at the College of Europe. From now on you will never think in a purely national framework”

These institutions therefore have immense propaganda potential justifying their EU grants. As Dutch Prime Minister Jan Peter Balkenende said when he endorsed the College of Europe:

“We have Europe. Now we need Europeans. Mr. Geremek, you are lucky because this auditorium is full of young Europeans. Europeans from different backgrounds and with different ideas about new ways of doing things. But united by their common interest in the history and future of the European community of values.”

Something of an indicator on the philosophy catered for at the College of Europe emerges from a recent product by its Alumni Association. Moving away from the standard alumni activities of organising reunions, setting up pub meetings, and exchanging information on births and marriages, these alumni have created an internet site to make children love Europe.⁵⁷³

Called “Children of Europe”, the aim is to get primary schoolchildren to make films on the subject of Europe. It begins: “Hello dear ‘Child of Europe’”, telling them:

“Thanks to Jean Monnet, there are no more wars nowadays in Europe but many things need still to be done to make everyone live happier! For this reason, I’d need all your ideas to put them on my website so they can be shared with other children in Europe. Come on, guys! Do you[r] best!”

The website notes that:

“Recent events, most notably the French and Dutch rejection of the Constitutional Treaty, have shown the widening gap between the European idea and its citizens, in particular the younger generation.... A small group of people, supported by the Alumni Association of the College of Europe, decided to ‘do something’ by targeting the younger generations, and in particular, schoolchildren in their last years of primary school. These children will tomorrow be ‘the new Europeans’ and they should have the chance to make the Europe, in which they live, learn, play, travel, discuss and dream, their Europe.”⁵⁷⁴

“These children will be ‘the new Europeans’ and should have the chance to make the Europe, in which they live, learn, play, travel, discuss and dream, their Europe”

Teachers are told in no uncertain terms what it is about: “It is organised in order to sensitize schoolchildren to the ‘European adventure’ and to fully participate in it.”⁵⁷⁵

573 <http://www.children-enfants.eu/En/>

574 <http://children-enfants.eu/En/content/view/19/32/>

575 <http://children-enfants.eu/En/content/view/18/31/>

Possible subject matter includes European values, “the main achievements of the construction of Europe”, and “beyond the frontiers”. Also the message that: “Since more than fifty years peace has reigned between EU countries. This has not previously happened. Just for this European cooperation can be considered a success. Never forget this when you think of Europe.”⁵⁷⁶

As for the International Centre for European Training in Nice, the Commission notes on the Jean Monnet funding website that “CIFE’s objective is to conduct education and training activities, studies and research concerning European unification, world unification, federalism, regionalism and changes within the structures of contemporary society.”⁵⁷⁷ It carries out long-term programmes such as MAs, EU evening courses, universities, seminars, conferences and publications, all with the help of EU grants.

Plans are afoot to go even further than this and create a ‘University of Europe’ for the “study and appreciation of the spirit and values of a united Europe.” The idea was proposed by the French Foundation for Political Innovation (Fondation pour l’innovation politique) in a paper which revealed that the French government had already taken part in discussions to set it up, ahead of the country’s EU Presidency from July 2008.

According to the proposal, the University, which would be paid for by the EU and run by the Commission, would “have its own European vision, offering training in the history of Europe and the European spirit.”

The paper talks about “Reuniting three fundamental principles: the spirit of Europe, Europe’s place in international competition and building a Europe of Knowledge” It would target “adults with significant professional experience who were looking to retrain or deepen their knowledge” of the EU, and students wanting to “gain an understanding of Europe’s history and an appreciation of the European spirit.”⁵⁷⁸

The Jean Monnet programme also includes support for other “European associations active at European level in the field of education and training.”⁵⁷⁹

These include, for instance, the European Network of Education Councils, which this year “wants to disseminate all documents, texts, studies...that are launched by the European Commission within the framework of the Lisbon process, the Bologna process, the Copenhagen process and Education and Training 2010,”⁵⁸⁰ or the European Parents’ Association, whose aim is “To pursue education policies at European level which will bring the highest possible quality of education for all our children.”⁵⁸¹

The Commission also funds Jean Monnet Conferences, which “aim to accompany the decision-making process and allow makers to benefit from academic reflection, to promote the interaction between the academic community, policy-makers and civil society, and to stimulate new thinking on a variety of policy issues,” and Jean Monnet Thematic Groups, which allow Jean Monnet professors to discuss topics with Commission officials and MEPs.⁵⁸²

576 <http://children-enfants.eu/En/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=26>

577 http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/llp/jm/more/institut_en.html

578 http://www.fondapol.org/fileadmin/uploads/pdf/documents/DT_Universite_de_l_Europe_Eng.pdf

579 List of those receiving funding for the 2008 to 2010 period available here: <http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/llp/jm/selected2807.pdf>

580 <http://www.vlor.be/webEUNEC/05action%20plan/Annual%20plan%202008.pdf>

581 http://213.10.139.110/epacontent/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=12&Itemid=27

582 http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/doc88_en.htm

Scholarships

As well as providing funding for the Jean Monnet Chairs and Centres of Excellence, the EU also now pays scholarships for citizens from outside the EU to study Masters in European Integration Studies.

In May 2008 the Commission launched a call to fund scholarships for citizens from the European Neighbourhood Policy countries or Russia, offering up to €20,000 per student per academic year. 150 scholarships are available, and, crucially, it is the European Commission which makes the ultimate decision on who to award scholarships to.⁵⁸³ The pilot project costs €2 million from the EU budget.

C Other initiatives aimed at young people

Other funding of educational establishments

It is not just the Jean Monnet programme which channels money to higher education bodies specialising in EU affairs. Evidence of grants made can be tracked down in other EU programmes and policies.

For example, the Centre for European Studies in Strasbourg has received funding under the 'Active European Citizenship' Programme (see Part Three) for "training in European affairs to civil servants"⁵⁸⁴, as has the College of Europe in Hamburg, and the European Institute for Advanced Studies in Management, the European Academy of Sciences and Arts, and the Intercultural Leadership School.⁵⁸⁵

The European Commission also funds the 'European Movement Training Academy', which offers courses to graduates, professionals, civil servants and business people to find out "how Brussels works." The fact that it was founded and is operated by the European Movement, whose objective is to promote "a united Europe" (See Part Two), suggests the content of courses is unlikely to be neutral.⁵⁸⁶

Universities have also been the recipients of event-based funding. In 2003, Liverpool Hope University received €25,000 for a series of debates for local school pupils and students to "discuss and debate issues such as the Lisbon Agenda and the creation of a more competitive Europe, and explore the concept of the rights and responsibilities inherent in the concept of European citizenship."⁵⁸⁷

The University of Hull received €10,551 in 2003 for a project which

"aims to raise awareness and understanding of the European convention and its potential impact on the Humber region of England. In particular, it will identify the specific elements that are of practical interest to EU citizens and local business and seek to demonstrate the link between future European integration and the development of key EU policies."⁵⁸⁸

583 http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/calls/1508/index_en.html

584 <http://www.cees-europe.fr/en/>

585 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/documents/legalbasis/legalbasis_en.pdf

586 <http://www.acad-emi.org/content.php?level1=1&mode=1>

587 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/grants_2003_uk_fr.pdf

588 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/pdf/grants_2003_uk_fr.pdf

ERASMUS

Distinct from the Jean Monnet scheme and also part of the Lifelong Learning Programme is the EU's ERASMUS scheme, which provides valuable opportunities for young people to spend time abroad studying by facilitating links with universities.

There is clearly nothing wrong with making it easy for young people and students to move around, work and study in other EU countries, and indeed a lot to be gained. This is one of the key ways in which the EU's free movement brings tangible benefits to many people.

However, there is perhaps something to be said for the propaganda value of the exercise, given the evidence that some parts of the project are aimed at promoting the idea of a united Europe.

The Erasmus Student Network which is paid for by the EU's Youth in Action Programme and which aims to "foster student mobility in Higher Education under the principle of SHS – Students Helping Students", has an underlying objective to work for "unity in diversity, diversity in the unity", and "love for Europe as an area of peace and cultural exchange".⁵⁸⁹

There is also a separate programme called Erasmus Mundus, which promotes intercultural cooperation in higher education with countries outside the EU, and whose aims include "to promote EU values"⁵⁹⁰ and "to promote EU external policy objectives."⁵⁹¹

European Youth Parliament

The EU also provides funding for the European Youth Parliament. The website of the international section of the European Youth Parliament, which also has branches in the member states, states that it

"encourages independent thinking and socio-political initiative in young people and facilitates the learning of crucial social and professional skills. Since its inauguration, many tens of thousands of young people have taken part in regional, national and international sessions, formed friendships and made international contacts across and beyond frontiers. It has thus made a vital contribution towards the uniting of Europe."⁵⁹²

The website of the UK branch says the EYP

"seeks to promote the European dimension in education and to give students in the 16-22 age group the opportunity to participate in a practical, positive learning experience. As the citizens of the future, the EYP experience encourages young people to be aware of the thoughts and characteristics of other nations, respect their differences, and learn to work together for a common good."

"The EYP has been instrumental in the establishing of European studies programmes, research libraries, databanks and exchange programmes - for both teachers and students

589 http://www.esn.org/esn_international/vision_mission_values.php

590 <http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/extcoop/call/index.htm>

591 http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/mundus/doc/com395_en.pdf

592 <http://www.eypej.org/?area=3>

- in more than 600 schools in Europe. Furthermore, in conjunction with the Heinz Schwarzkopf Foundation's 'Junges Europa' initiative, the Young European of the Year Award was established, with an annual prize of €5,000, which enables the winner to gain an even wider insight into Europe through the funding of a six-month traineeship for them in Brussels."⁵⁹³

In a foreword to the EYP's 2007 annual report, the Chairman of the Heinz-Schwarzkopf-Foundation, whose organisation runs the EYP said: "The EYP is a project for youth by the youth of Europe. We will continue our efforts in bringing the European dream to the hearts and minds of young Europeans."⁵⁹⁴

The report also confirms that the project is supported financially by both the European Commission and the European Parliament. The UK section also enjoys the support of the FCO.⁵⁹⁵

"The EYP is a project for youth by the youth of Europe. We will continue our efforts in bringing the European dream to the hearts and minds of young Europeans"

593 <http://www.eybuk.org/about.htm>

594 http://www.eypej.org/docs/2007_EYP_Annual_Report.pdf

595 http://www.eypej.org/docs/2007_EYP_Annual_Report.pdf

5

Conclusions - EU propaganda: Why does it matter? What's the alternative?

In the 'EUtube' film "Communicating Europe with Margot Wallstrom", the EU Communications Commissioner is asked whether or not the Commission's efforts to increase public knowledge about the EU amount to taxpayer-funded propaganda. She replies that all citizens have a right to know what the EU is doing and proposes to do.⁵⁹⁶

It is true that people generally know very little about the EU, and the impact it has on citizens, and this has got to change. After all, the EU is now said to be at the root of an estimated 50% of our national legislation – at least – and affects almost every area of our daily lives.⁵⁹⁷

In an ideal world we all need to know what the EU is doing, and how it works. But so far, the European institutions have on the whole proved an unsuitable vehicle for that information.

Over the years, the EU's 'Communication Policy' has become less and less about giving people the facts, and more and more about selling the EU's policies and promoting the concept of EU integration. Not only that, but the vast resources poured into the EU's culture and citizenship activities are also used as a propaganda tool, as are some of the grants available to outside organisations through other areas of the EU budget.

The EU's propaganda spend now amounts to more than €2.4 billion a year – at the very least. This is more than Coca Cola spends on advertising every year, worldwide, which amounts to \$2.7 billion.⁵⁹⁸

But why does it matter? And what is the alternative?

1 Much of it is subtle enough to pass under the public radar and not be considered advertising

One of the most worrying things about EU propaganda is that so much of it has been dressed up as something altogether more worthwhile – and therefore unidentifiable as advertising and promotion.

While the EU's communications and information budget is relatively simple to isolate, because most of it operates from DG communications, the funds spent promoting the EU through culture and citizenship initiatives are not only less easy to identify as bias, but they are also more difficult to quantify.

In this sense, the EU's huge yearly budget for promoting European citizenship and culture is arguably the worst kind of propaganda. Some might call it 'soft' propaganda, since it operates on a subconscious level. But this makes it extremely dubious as a taxpayer-funded public project.

The EU is spending hundreds of millions of euros every year on things which, ultimately, serve to persuade people to support the European Commission's vision of the world, thereby promoting EU integration. This is notwithstanding the fact that some of these activities may be

596 <http://uk.youtube.com/watch?v=wJlcpaFjIRs&NR=1>

597 Government Written Answer, January 2006 <http://www.parliament.uk/commons/lib/research/notes/snia-02888.pdf> Other estimates suggest the proportion is higher, such as that of the German Ministry of Justice which suggested it was closer to 84%: <http://www.openeurope.org.uk/analysis/herzog.pdf>

598 Coca Cola 2007 Annual Report http://www.thecoca-colacompany.com/investors/pdfs/10-K_2007/Coca-Cola_10-K_Item_07.pdf

things from which the public might reap reward – such as films, concerts or opportunities to mix with people from other European countries.

In fact, some of these initiatives, such as the otherwise innocuous sounding ‘town twinning’ initiative, are truly worrying because they so actively promote EU integration – and yet pass under the public radar because they are not, on the face of it, the kind of advertising that citizens living in a free society recognise as government advertising per se.

But the millions of euros spent trying to engender a feeling of ‘Europeanness’, a shared European culture whose future lies in acting together to face the challenges of the 21st century, helps to justify a stronger, more political EU.

2 The Commission pretends to be listening, but is selective about who it listens to

Particularly since the series of ‘no’ votes to the EU Constitution, the Commission has talked continuously about “giving the EU ears”, listening to citizens and getting them involved in the process – which is clearly to be welcomed.

Margot Wallstrom says: “The key point is how we can contribute to the creation of a real European public sphere and increase the awareness and the involvement of the citizens in what is decided at European level. There are many ways of doing so... I wish all citizens would commit themselves more to this democratic process.”⁵⁹⁹

Even after the Irish ‘no’ vote, she was still saying “You cannot impose citizenship on people - it must come from democratic legitimacy”.⁶⁰⁰

And yet the few times when citizens in their millions have genuinely been involved in having a say on the EU – the referendums in Ireland, Denmark, France and the Netherlands – EU leaders have sensationally ignored the categorical wish of citizens to reject further EU integration. Not only that, but Margot Wallstrom and the rest of the EU establishment has gone out of their way to delegitimise the verdicts, spinning that people did not truly know what they were doing, or even to skew the no votes to present them as calls for “more Europe... not less”.⁶⁰¹

Indeed Margot Wallstrom makes a lot of noise about wanting “to engage and involve citizens in a much more democratic way”⁶⁰², but has no time at all for what is arguably the ultimate means of asking voters what they think – a referendum. This is because she knows that the general public are likely to reject further EU integration if asked in referendums, (as evidenced by the only independent poll of voters across all EU countries, which found that 74% of people think that the EU should not acquire any new powers.)⁶⁰³ Despite the warm words from the Commission, there is no genuine desire to listen to real citizens.

The problem with the types of initiatives that the Commission advocates is that these are not realistically going to be taken up by most people – simply because they are not open to, nor targeted at, the mass of citizens. Instead, they target a minority of interested specialists and

599 2 January 2008 http://europa.eu/50/news/views/080102_en.htm

600 Speech at the European Commission conference “35th anniversary of the Eurobarometer”, Paris, 21 November 2008

601 For example, Guy Verhofstadt, Speech at the London School of Economics, 21 March 2006

602 Speech at the European Commission conference “35th anniversary of the Eurobarometer”, Paris, 21 November 2008

603 Across the EU as a whole, 28% think the EU should have more powers than it has now, and that more decisions should be taken at the European level. 23% think the EU should keep the powers it has now, but should not be given any more, and 41% think the EU should have less powers than it has now and that more decisions should be taken at a national or local level. Source: TNS poll for Open Europe, March 2007 <http://www.openeurope.org.uk/media-centre/pressrelease.aspx?pressreleaseid=31>

supporters – they are essentially ‘preaching to the converted’ by involving the kinds of “civil society” organisations we came across in Part Two which, as well as receiving EU funding, usually also have an agenda to promote it.

3 Funding for outside organisations skews the debate on Europe

The EU’s propaganda – and in particular the outsourced propaganda that results from the EU funding outside think-tanks and NGOs which share its vision – matters because it artificially skews the debate on the EU. Interest groups should be able and free to promote the EU if that is what they believe in, but there is no justification for using taxpayers’ money to fund them.

Groups which do not share the EU’s ‘vision’ suffer a double blow, in that, on the one hand, they tend not to be recipients of EU funds, and must therefore privately fundraise; and, on the other (and as a result of that need to privately fundraise) they find themselves in the minority and therefore less able to propel their views through the torrent of pro-integration propaganda that dominates the mainstream in Europe.

The lack of transparency about EU funding for outside organisations allows groups that are funded by the EU to misrepresent themselves as “independent”, and therefore to be taken seriously as neutral commentators. This means misleading the public. The UK Government’s efforts to convince MPs to vote in favour of the Lisbon Treaty by announcing that it had the support of a number of influential charities and NGOs, which turned out to be recipients of EU funds, is a case in point. (See Part Two).

How can an organisation that is funded by the EU, claim to be “independent”? It’s striking how many of them do.

The question is, why should taxpayers’ money be available to campaign groups such as this? It is perfectly legitimate – indeed welcome – for supporters of a united Europe to campaign in favour of their beliefs – especially at opportune moments in the debate.

However, it is unacceptable that they should benefit from public funds in order to do so, because this gives them an unfair advantage over those trying to put forward a different argument. It is not in the public good for groups on one side of the argument only to be heavily supported by public funds, because it ends up stifling debate, and prevents citizens from seeing both sides of the argument fairly.

EU leaders and Commissioners have free reign and a generous budget to visit schools and participate in debates across Europe – in a fashion which is unlikely to ever be picked up by the media as being biased or unfair. Not only that, but the Commission even pays outside organisations – who have even more freedom to do and say as they please – to promote EU policies beyond the public radar.

This is essentially a brake on true democracy – a huge and concerted campaign to stifle real debate about the future of the EU. The Commission is only interested in debating one side of the argument – it is willing to accept an ‘exchange of views’ only to the extent that this takes place solely within the parameters of an acceptance that EU integration is to be broadly supported.

The disparate amounts of private funds spent by independent organisations are dramatically dwarfed by the hundreds of millions of euros of taxpayer funds going into the varied and complex advertising methods of the European Union every year.

The gulf between the resources available to the established, taxpayer-funded campaign for a stronger EU, and the privately funded efforts of the handful of organisations and individuals trying to offer a different perspective, is truly staggering.

It is up to national governments to pull back funding from EU 'information' initiatives and allow such activities to take place at national level, where better scrutiny can be ensured, making for a fairer, more neutral and balanced debate.

4 The EU and its advocates deride opponents

It also matters because the EU and its strongest advocates are so vociferous in their attack on critics of the EU. Instead of being viewed as a legitimate part of a democratic debate, criticism of the EU is invariably derided as 'anti-European propaganda'. Meanwhile, the EU enjoys a substantial yearly budget to promote itself in often subtle ways which go unnoticed as propaganda, yet which cost taxpayers billions of euros a year.

The Commission-funded Young European Federalists, for example, campaigned in favour of the EU Lisbon Treaty in Ireland during the referendum campaign in 2008, while painting the 'no' campaign as propagandists. A press release read:

"Last night's opinion poll on the Lisbon Treaty referendum published in the Irish Times has placed the YES campaign down five points, trailing behind the NO vote which has almost doubled in support, gaining 17 points. The number of undecided voters remains high on 28%."

"'This race is wide open' commented Toni Giugliano - European youth for an Irish YES Co-ordinator. 'They are indeed worrying figures - a result of the NO campaign's propaganda which has undoubtedly had some effect on people's perception of the Treaty. On the other hand, these results give us the drive to fight back. We have all the winning arguments - it's a case of reaching out to people and making them aware of the wider benefits of this Treaty reform'".⁶⁰⁴

In the aftermath of the 'no vote' in Ireland, the government talked a lot about 'Europhobia', with Europe Minister Dick Roche repeatedly referring to supporters of a 'no' vote as 'europhobes'.⁶⁰⁵

Another example is the highly politicised message the Commission office in Ireland leaked out to the Irish media following the rejection of the Lisbon Treaty, which said that the "British media" was to blame for the vote. This was a clear attempt to discredit those newspapers which had run articles or opinion pieces which were critical of the Treaty.

Likewise, several prominent Members of the European Parliament began a smear campaign against Libertas, which was one of the leading groups calling for a 'no' vote, in a clear attempt to discredit the result. Libertas was publicly accused of being funded by the US intelligence services.

604 http://www.jef.eu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=502&Itemid=242

605 For example, speaking on a panel at the European Commission conference "35th anniversary of the Eurobarometer", Paris, 21 November 2008

Backed by Hans-Gert Poettering, President of the European Parliament, Daniel Cohn-Bendit, joint leader of the Greens/EFA group, issued a statement which said:

“We are awaiting confirmation of reports in the media regarding funding of Libertas’ campaign for a no vote to the Lisbon treaty in Ireland. If proved true, this would clearly show that there are forces in the United States willing to pay people to destabilise a strong and autonomous Europe. If this can happen for the treaty vote, it raises grave concerns for interference in next year’s European elections.”

“There is now a direct link between the Irish referendum, the US military and the Pentagon. I call on the authorities to probe the matter”.⁶⁰⁶

These allegations, coming from high-profile people within the EU institutions, managed to make the headlines and infiltrate the media, and, presumably the minds of voters.

But the institutions made no mention of the huge amounts of funding available to ‘yes’ campaigners – the money available to the European Parliament groups for ‘information’ activities on the Treaty, the information networks throughout the country, money given to pro-Lisbon thinktanks, etc – and where that came from. These had a prominent say in the campaign, but have remained beyond the public line of inquiry.

Because so many people are unaware of the extent of the EU’s funding for outside organisations, these types of activities are rarely considered to be an extension of the EU’s campaign strategy, and mostly go unnoticed.

The point is that while the EU itself and those organisations which are deemed to share its ‘vision’ remain free – and indeed are encouraged – to publicise their message wide and far, those organisations which do not necessarily share that vision are targeted and attacked for trying to do the same thing.

In the aftermath of the Irish referendum, when it started to become apparent that EU leaders did not want to accept the ‘no’ vote and were thinking about asking Ireland to hold a second referendum, Open Europe commissioned a poll of Irish voters, carried out by a well-known and reputable independent Irish polling company, which asked them whether or not they were in favour of a second referendum, and how they would vote in such a referendum.

Incensed by the results of the poll, which showed that the overwhelming majority did not want to have to vote again, and would vote ‘no’ by a greater majority than the first time around, the Irish government accused Open Europe of “outside interference” in some strong language in the media.⁶⁰⁷

Considering the extent of the European Commission’s involvement in the Irish referendum – the trip by President Jose Barroso to Dublin in the run-up to the referendum, the misleading leaked Eurobarometer poll of the reasons why people voted the way they did and the leaked note to the press blaming the British media (see Part One), not to mention the high-profile trips by other EU leaders promoting the Lisbon Treaty, such as German Chancellor Angela Merkel⁶⁰⁸ – the Irish

606 Irish Independent, 23 September 2008 <http://www.independent.ie/world-news/europe/eu-president-demands-probe-into-source-of-libertas-funding-1480303.html>

607 Europe Minister Dick Roche, for example, said Open Europe had a “europhobic attitude” live on national public radio Newstalk, 27 July 2008.

government's accusation of "outside interference" against an independent think-tank publishing a poll seems unjust.

Moreover, there is a deep problem when small, independent organisations are vilified for carrying out polling on EU issues, while the European Commission remains free and encouraged to spend €25 million a year on the highly skewed Eurobarometer polls, and to use them as a "strategic tool" to promote the EU across Europe.

5 EU advertising falls short of UK Government standards

The EU and its strongest supporters show a fundamental failure to understand the difference between providing information about the EU, and promoting its 'benefits'. They simply refuse to separate the two concepts.

As EU Communications Commissioner Margot Wallstrom says:

"The issue is not just one of redressing ignorance and indifference per se: it is about serving the needs of healthy democratic debate, and ensuring that people have the facts they require – and are entitled to... a sustained effort must be made to explain the benefits that the European Union brings to each Member States in a much more effective way."⁶⁰⁹

"a sustained effort must be made to explain the benefits that the European Union brings to each Member States in a much more effective way"

While it is true that people do not know enough about the EU, it is wrong to claim that telling people more about the benefits of the EU is a sufficient solution to this knowledge gap.

The EU's biased information campaigns should be of grave concern to taxpayers in member states, particularly in the UK where there are clear rules on government public information campaigns in order to ensure that taxpayers get value for money and that their money is not used for propaganda purposes.

Indeed the use of taxpayers' money for government publicity purposes is something the UK public has in the past been very vigilant about.

For example, in 2002, Tony Blair's Labour Government was strongly criticised by the BBC's Panorama programme for appearing to use public funds for what was essentially party political campaigning in the run-up to the 2001 General Election.

Television adverts ostensibly designed to promote the nursing profession and attract new recruits, for example, were criticised for simultaneously promoting the NHS. Sir Michael Partridge, a former Permanent Secretary at the DSS made an important distinction when he said:

"I think there is a clear line between adverts which tell the public something that they need to know and something they need to do, and an advert that simply says this is a government which has done splendid things for a certain group of people, and I think, if one thinks about

608 Irish Independent, 14 April 2008 <http://www.independent.ie/breaking-news/national-news/politics/merkel-in-dublin-to-push-for-yes-vote-in-lisbon-poll-1347012.html>

609 Speech, 24 May 2005 <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/05/296&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

it, the dividing line in one's mind is quite clear, and that goes of course to the content of the advert and the style of the advert as well as the timing." ⁶¹⁰

Tony Blair himself was extremely critical of the idea of using public funds to promote the then-Conservative Government's position in the late 1980s. In 1988 he complained to the Government about politicians who mask party propaganda as factual information.

He said:

"The government are not just giving the public the facts, they are promoting a particular Conservative Party view of areas of high political controversy. Now that's not just an abuse of the broadcasting service, it's an abuse of literally hundreds of millions of pounds worth of taxpayers' money. There are millions of pounds of public money being used to fund party propaganda."

Later he said: "You can see quite clearly that the purpose of this is not to give us, the public, the facts, but is to sell the government's political message and that's quite wrong."⁶¹¹

Why then, should the European Commission be allowed to get away with failing to concentrate on giving the facts and instead selling its own political message?

UK rules on government publicity and advertising stipulate that government publicity should be: "relevant to government responsibilities; objective and explanatory, not tendentious or polemical; not liable to misrepresentation as being party political; and conducted in an economic and appropriate way, having regard to the need to be able to justify the cost as expenditure of public funds."⁶¹²

The official conventions state that:

"It is right and proper for Governments to use Civil Service Information Officers and public funds and resources to explain their policies and to inform the public of the Government services available to them, and of their rights and liabilities, whether through direct contacts with the media or by means of publications, publicity or advertising and any public inquiry unit. These resources may not, however, be used to support publicity for Party political purposes: this rule governs not only decisions about what may or may not be published, but also the content, style and distribution of what is published."⁶¹³

If we equate the European Commission, with its own press and communications department, to the Government, for the purposes of comparing the rules with EU practice, clearly there is no "Party" political position to speak of. However, there is a "political" level to speak of, and, in its communications, the EU certainly does use public resources for political purposes. As we have seen, the content, style and distribution of what is published is also highly political, and therefore an unjustifiable use of public funds by UK official standards.

For example, it is one thing for the Commission to print leaflets which inform citizens of their rights under EU law – such as those that appear in airports within the EU, telling passengers

610 http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/audio_video/programmes/panorama/transcripts/transcript_26_05_02.txt

611 http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/audio_video/programmes/panorama/transcripts/transcript_26_05_02.txt

612 Government advertising – A review by the National Audit Office, April 2003 http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/gov_advertising.pdf

613 Guidance on the work of the Government Information Service, Cabinet Office, updated 3 May 2007
http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/propriety_and_ethics/civil_service/government_information_service/workgis.aspx

about their compensation rights in the event of delays etc. But it is quite another for it to print leaflets which argue that EU integration is a success that must be continued – such as some of the publications listed in Part One.

The rules also specify that “Subject matter should be relevant to Government responsibilities. The specific matters dealt with should be ones in which Government has direct and substantial responsibilities.”

It definitely can't be said of the Commission's advertising that it deals only with subject matters in which it has direct and substantial responsibilities. Much of the Commission's literature clearly advocates a greater role for the EU in policy areas where it does not currently have direct and substantial responsibilities.

For example, the Commission's promotional pamphlet “Europe in 12 lessons” states that “a common EU criminal justice policy is required”, and that “Sustainable development, population trends, economic dynamism, social solidarity and an ethical response to progress in the life sciences are issues that can no longer be effectively dealt with at national level”, implying that the EU does not at present but ought to take an active role in these areas.⁶¹⁴

The UK rules also state that it is not proper to “directly attack policies and opinions of Opposition parties and groups.” Clearly there is no equivalent of an ‘Opposition’ to the Commission in the party political sense, but there are plenty of examples of the EU attacking and denouncing groups which oppose the Commission's vision of Europe, as we have seen above.

The UK conventions state that citizens need to be informed of their legal entitlements and obligations, and the services available to them. They also state that the Government has a clear right to use publicity to encourage behaviour which is generally regarded as being in the public interest (such as crime prevention or road safety advertising), and that publicity may include leaflets, posters, TV commercials and so on.

However, the rules also acknowledge that “There may be some sensitivity where the matters publicised are the product of controversial legislation or potentially controversial policies... Care should be taken in such cases to present the information in a way that concentrates on informing the public about the content of legislation and how it affects them.”

Clearly the EU abides by no such rules. Much of what the EU does is, by its very nature, controversial, and yet is often presented – particularly to children and young people – in a non-neutral way which goes beyond informing the public about the content of legislation.

The publications listed in Part One and Part Four– such as those that talk about “The European Union – a success story”, are all examples. To take just one, the euro, which is highly controversial, is introduced to children as follows: “Using many different currencies within Europe made life more difficult and more expensive when moving between countries. Exchanging currencies cost money: trade was more expensive and travel cost more.” As we have seen, this particular publication goes on to talk about the benefits of having the euro, without a single mention of any of the drawbacks of a single currency.

614 http://ec.europa.eu/publications/booklets/eu_glance/60/en.pdf

Likewise, the EU Lisbon Treaty, and the Constitutional Treaty that went before it, was persistently presented by the Commission in emotional terms, while there has been little effort to explain how the Treaty affects the public. In fact, some senior EU officials, including the Irish Commissioner Charlie McCreevy, even admitted to not having read the full Treaty, despite championing it to impressionable voters.⁶¹⁵

We are not objecting to the need to inform people of their rights, legal entitlements and obligations under EU law, and the services available to them, nor to efforts to inform people about the content of legislation.

But where the use of taxpayers' money is concerned, it is fair for citizens to expect standards at EU level that are comparable to those at national level. The EU should therefore introduce clear and strict rules on the use of EU funds for information and communications, drawing on guidelines in place in the member states.

6 In times of economic down-turn the EU can ill-afford to be wasting money on expensive advertising

The EU's total propaganda spend amounts to more than €2.4 billion a year – at the very least. That is more than what Coca Cola spends on advertising each year – worldwide.⁶¹⁶

This means that UK taxpayers are losing around €240 million a year to EU propaganda, given that average UK contributions make up around 10% of the yearly EU budget.⁶¹⁷

By comparison, in 2007/2008, the UK Government spent around £190 million on advertising in press, TV, radio and digital media advertising, out of the Central Office of Information's £392 million budget.⁶¹⁸

Because of the nature of EU advertising, most people will be unaware that on top of this UK Government advertising, there is a parallel level of propaganda simultaneously operating at the European level, which they are also paying for through their taxes.

The Conservative Party has pledged to cut the budget of the UK's Central Information Office by half⁶¹⁹, but if they are serious about cutting down on Government advertising, then this must be matched by a commitment to work to dramatically reduce the EU's advertising budget – otherwise they will have done only half the job.

At the bare minimum, DG Communications should be abolished, saving €206m year, and the enormous budget for Culture, Education and Citizenship, from which many more, but less obvious propaganda campaigns are financed, must be stripped back.

Even in the good times, all this is a waste of money. But at a time of recession, EU governments can ill-afford to be wasting money on biased publications and campaigns and propping up hundreds of think-tanks which exist to campaign for more EU integration.

615 Irish Independent, 24 May 2008

616 Coca Cola 2007 Annual Report http://www.thecoca-colacompany.com/investors/pdfs/10-K_2007/Coca-Cola_10-K_Item_07.pdf

617 The EU's Financial Framework for 2007 to 2013 is €864.169bn: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0152:FIN:EN:PDF> The UK's contribution over the seven-year period is €89.95bn (£71bn. gross, after abatement): <http://www.openeurope.org.uk/research/budget07.pdf> (Source: Written Answer, 9 Jan 2006. Past figures from Pink Book 2005 table 9.9)

618 COI annual report <http://www.coi.gov.uk/documents/coi-annualreport2007-8.pdf> See also Telegraph, 10 November 2008

619 Guardian, 30 September 2008 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2008/sep/30/georgeosborne.economy>

7 A distraction from the EU's real problems

Some would argue that in spite of all the examples explored in this paper, the EU's propaganda effort is clearly not having much concrete effect, given the last three rejections of the Constitutional/Lisbon Treaty. Even in terms of just trying to make people feel 'European', it does not appear to be working particularly well. A recent poll of French people, for example, found that only 38 percent feel like European citizens, an increase of only one percent since the notion of European citizenship was first mentioned in the treaties in 1992.⁶²⁰

So depending on how one views it, at best, all of this is an enormous waste of time and money – an ineffective and vain attempt to engender support for something about which people on the whole care very little. At worst, it is a deeply sinister EU propaganda campaign which will in the long run eliminate naysayers, undermining democracy and stopping people from having a truly independent view about Europe.

Somewhere in between, is probably where the main point lies. The wider problem is that this 'information' and 'citizenship' drive is a dangerous distraction. EU leaders misguidedly think that all they need to do to solve Europe's problems is to "explain it better", to close the "perceived" gap between citizens and the EU, rather than the real gap that is often caused not by public "misperceptions" of the EU, but by a genuine realisation that it is fundamentally undemocratic and unsuccessful in so many of its key policies.

The Former President of the European Parliament and MEP Nicole Fontaine summed up the failure to understand this when she told a conference in November 2008: "We have a communications problem... We haven't explained enough the benefits of European construction... We have been too modest." French Europe Minister Jean-Pierre Jouyet claimed that "One of Europe's main problems is that we have not transformed our common values into a sort of citizenship, a European consciousness."⁶²¹

Throughout a full day of conference on the communication policy there was absolutely no acknowledgment at all of any of the EU's real and very pressing problems – no mention of people's feeling that the EU is undemocratic. No mention of the fraud, the waste, the lack of transparency. No mention of the problematic trade policy and unpopular CAP, or the fisheries policy which the EU Fish Commissioner himself as described as "morally wrong". No, the only thing wrong with the EU in the eyes of the Commission is that the people of Europe simply know nothing about it, and are therefore ungrateful for it.

This approach in itself compounds the problem, because it basically involves ignoring or even covering up the failures with spin – all paid for by taxpayers. As well as the obvious problem that 'papering over the cracks' entails, there is the additional truth that spending time and money on spin leaves fewer resources available for the reform of its policies and processes that the EU so badly needs.

And in fact it is actually even worse than that: EU leaders seem to regard improving *perceptions* of the EU – polishing its image – as even more important than improving its actual policies and governance. EU Communications Commissioner Margot Wallstrom recently confirmed that, in her eyes, communication takes priority over decent policymaking, when she said: "Europe has to reinvent itself – first by better explaining its continuing relevance to bemused or sometimes hostile electorates, and second by responding better to their visions for the future."⁶²²

620 Le Monde, 4 September 2008

621 Speech at the European Commission conference "35th anniversary of the Eurobarometer", Paris, 21 November 2008

It seems obvious that if the EU was more successful in its core objectives then it would not need so much spin – because people would see it for themselves. People should be able to feel the benefits of policies, without billions of pounds of their own money being spent forcing it on them.

8 Storing up problems for the future

The other, illogical thing about the EU's propaganda drive is that it threatens to backfire in the long term and alienate people all the more.

“Europe has to reinvent itself – first by better explaining its continuing relevance to bemused or sometimes hostile electorates”

The EU's popularity is in serious decline. The Commission's own Eurobarometer polls show that in the UK, for instance, the EU is in 2008 the most unpopular it has been in 25 years. At a high-point in 1991, 57 percent of British people thought the EU was broadly a good thing, compared to 13 percent who thought it was a bad thing.⁶²³ Now, only 30 percent think it is a good thing, compared with 32 percent who think it is a bad thing.⁶²⁴

The falling popularity of the EU across Europe, not to mention the rejections of the Constitutional Treaty in France, the Netherlands and Ireland, point to deep dissatisfaction with the EU and the direction it is taking. Ignoring this sentiment in favour of a conviction that people simply do not know enough about the EU to be grateful for it, is a mistake, which will serve to further discredit the EU in the long run. The EU seriously needs to address its problems head on, instead of investing in more and more spin to try and convince people that it is doing a good job.

The increasing focus on trying to create feelings of European citizenship and culture seems particularly misguided. There is much to be gained from cultural collaboration across Europe, for example – but using top-down initiatives to drive European unity is a mistake.

Using culture as a tool for EU propaganda is counter-productive. After all, cultural differences, are, amongst other things, an impetus for cross-border travel in the EU. People visit other countries to appreciate their cultural diversity. The EU claims to support cultural diversity, and yet in reality, its efforts to engender allegiance to the EU through its cultural programme threaten to weaken diversity by trying to instill a common mindset.

What's the alternative? Recommendations for reform

Taxpayers' money should not continue to be spent on biased EU information campaigns and efforts to engender EU culture and citizenship for the purpose of promoting European integration.

There is clearly a strong case to be made for improving citizens' knowledge of the EU, but this can be done without resorting to propaganda. There are also several key ways in which the EU could improve its image with the public, to an extent that expensive propaganda never can.

622 2 January 2008 http://europa.eu/50/news/views/080102_en.htm

623 http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb35/eb35_en.pdf

624 http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb69/eb_69_first_en.pdf

1 Stop propaganda spending by cutting back the EU budget

A Abolish the Commission's Communications department

Future EU budget agreements should concentrate on scaling back spending on these initiatives. Because of its clear mandate to promote the EU, the European Commission's DG Communications department should be scrapped, saving more than €200m a year.

Other Commission departments responsible for policy areas could continue to have modest budgets to publish literature and information for journalists, while a budget should also be kept for broadcasting 'raw' events such as meetings of the European Parliament, press conferences etc for public channels. A separate department dedicated purely to communications as currently exists, is superfluous.

Millions of euros a year would be saved by stopping the production of EU-branded merchandise, adverts, films, books, websites and events, which could be put to far better use in this time of economic downturn. There is simply no argument for the EU to be spending taxpayers' money on things such as free EU merchandise at a time when families are suffering in the recession.

B Scale back the EU's 'Education, Culture and Citizenship' budget

Likewise, the EU's €1.5 bn budget for 'Education, Culture and Citizenship' should be dramatically scaled back, scrapping expensive campaigns to "foster European citizenship" and other initiatives which exist for the purpose of promoting the EU.

The EU could slice millions of euros a year off its budget by scaling back the plethora of unnecessary and wasteful projects and events designed to encourage EU citizenship and a 'European public space'.

Particularly in these times of economic downturn, EU ministers must take a long, hard look at the hundreds of projects receiving EU funds which do nothing to promote jobs and growth but instead prioritise "fostering European citizenship". While it is not clear if these projects even achieve their aims, they should be phased out in favour of more meaningful spending programmes.

C Scrap funding for think-tanks promoting EU integration and publish clearer details of recipients

In terms of funding outside organisations, one solution to the current bias might be to try to ensure that a genuine spectrum of views on the EU and its policies were in receipt of the money. But this seems an impossible goal to set a public institution whose very existence depends on there being a case for "ever closer union" and therefore continued EU integration.

In any case, civil servants working for the EU – particularly the Commission – are unlikely to be able to exert truly independent judgment when their careers depend on the continuation of the project – however flawed it may be. Truly independent judgment in the allocation of grants seems an impossible ideal, however well meaning and reformist members and employees may consider themselves to be.

This means that the EU's various budgets for outside organisations must be reviewed and dramatically cut back. All funding for think-tanks and groups which actively promote EU integration should be scrapped. If their views represent public opinion then they will find private funders who share their views and are willing to make up lost Commission funds.

All the remaining EU-funded organisations, receiving money from whichever part of the EU budget, should be listed online on a clear and easy to access website, with details of the funds they receive and how the funds were spent. Currently some information on who receives EU funding is available, but it is far too sporadic and incomplete. Recipients should also be required to mention any EU funding on their own websites, which must be regularly updated.

In addition, lobby groups operating in Brussels must be forced to sign on to the Commission's currently voluntary register of lobbyists, which aims to improve transparency. There are an estimated 15,000-plus lobbyists in Brussels, many of which, as we have seen, receive EU funds to help them influence decision-making.⁶²⁵

2 Improve citizens' interest and understanding of the EU by promoting transparency and genuine debate

A Improve EU transparency

One of the biggest problems with the Commission's approach is that there is an inherent contradiction between supposedly wanting "the involvement of the citizens in what is decided at European level"⁶²⁶ and the fact that it is so difficult to find out what is actually going on during the legislative process.

Not only that, but the Commission even seems to think that it has a greater right to promote policies once they have already been agreed – at which point citizens or MPs have no power at all to influence them. The Commission has in fact hidden behind this contradiction to justify its propaganda.

During the hearing in Ireland when the Commission was reported to the broadcast regulator for its advertisements of the Europe Direct service (See Part One), the Commission representation in Ireland responded that:

"Most of the policies mentioned in the advertisements have drawn criticism from different sectors of society at one time or other. The essential aspect is that these are now well established policies, enshrined in European law, and are no longer contentious in the sense that they are in place and are being implemented. Informing citizens of the existence of laws that already exist cannot, at any stretch of the imagination, be considered as political. Neither can it be seen as trying to elicit support for such measures. Support is not necessary if such provisions already exist."⁶²⁷

625 For more information, see <http://blog.brusselssunshine.eu/>

626 Margot Wallstrom, 'Speak to the people!', 2 January 2008 http://europa.eu/50/news/views/080102_en.htm

627 http://www.bcc.ie/decisions_details/Mar_2007/285.06_286.06_287.06 Ms. P Mckenna Summary Complaint.doc

The last two sentences are particularly misleading because, as we have seen, the very explicit strategy of the EU is to communicate existing policies in order to solicit support, not for those policies per se, but for the institutional establishment which came up with them.

But the main point is that surely, if the objective truly were “the involvement of the citizens in what is decided at European level” then it would be better to publicise proposed policies, rather than those which have already been passed? This would give people – journalists, MPs, and possibly even interested citizens – the time and the information they need to respond to and have input into the policy process.

If the Commission truly does want to “engage better with citizens” it should begin by concentrating on making the EU more transparent, so that people – particularly journalists – can see for themselves exactly what is going on, rather than being fed spun information concentrating only on the “successes” of the EU.

Currently, it is very difficult for journalists (let alone the public at large) to get access to the bulk of the EU decision-making process, because proceedings, documents, agendas and outcomes of meetings are so often made secret.⁶²⁸ There have been attempts to improve this in recent years but the system on the whole remains woefully opaque. This leads to relatively poor media coverage of EU issues, which the Commission so often complains about.

In this respect, the EU’s efforts to increase broadcast coverage of “raw” meetings in the European Parliament, the Commission and so on, for example, are welcome – but only if the transmissions offer a true reflection of the institutions’ activities, and are not manipulated to offer only the information the ‘editors’ in the institution want us to see – as currently seems to be the case.

But even all this is very expensive. If the EU were actually ‘doing less but doing it better’, to borrow the Commission’s own motto, then all of this information and broadcasting wouldn’t be necessary in the first place.

B Improve national parliamentary scrutiny of EU legislation

Likewise, the “communication gap” between citizens and the institutions that the Commission constantly talks about is less a result of poor promotion of existing legislation, than the lack of input from national MPs and proper coverage in the media of the details of the legislation while it is being drawn up.

To improve citizens’ interest in and knowledge of the EU, they must be given a greater feeling that their elected members of Parliament are able to have a meaningful impact on EU legislation.

Currently, systems in place in the UK and elsewhere allow the Government to sign up to EU legislation in meetings in Brussels, without first having sought agreement from the national Parliament. Often Parliament isn’t even given time to discuss the issues, and even when Parliament specifically asks the Government for time to debate a new EU law, the Government can use an ‘override’ mechanism to avoid parliamentary scrutiny.

628 For more on this, see “E-who? Politics behind closed doors”, by Bruno Waterfield <http://www.manifestoclub.com/files/EU%20Essays.pdf>

To improve scrutiny, member states could take lessons from the Danish system of scrutiny, where governments get a 'mandate' from the European Committee before it can sign up to an EU proposal.⁶²⁹

Better national parliamentary scrutiny could help to change the whole culture of member states' relations with the EU for the better. Journalists often complain, (perhaps rightly) that it is difficult to make EU affairs "newsworthy".

Introducing the threat that a government might not be allowed to sign up to what it wants would certainly raise the level of media interest in EU business. That in turn could boost public interest and involvement.

C Establish a set of binding guidelines for EU literature and campaigns

The EU should implement a set of binding guidelines along the lines of the UK conventions for Government advertising and promotion, as seen above. The guidelines could be upheld by a small, independent body which seeks to ensure that EU taxpayers' money is not used to 'sell' EU policies or ideas, but to publish neutral information which genuinely seeks to keep citizens informed of the facts.

EU leaders must be made to make a clearer distinction between improving the flow of information to citizens, and promoting the 'benefits' of the EU. Currently, these two concepts are far too often taken to mean the same thing.

D Ensure teaching in schools on the EU is balanced

If people are to learn more about the EU then there is an argument for beginning that process in schools. The problem is, when this becomes a one-sided propaganda exercise that focuses only on the "benefits" of European integration – as it so clearly has.

National and local educational authorities must do their bit to ensure that teaching on the EU is fair and genuinely balanced.

The Government must publish its own literature on Europe, after consulting all sides of the argument, and leaving less room for one-sided Commission literature to dominate teachers' resources. Failing that, teachers must take responsibility and ensure that any EU-produced material they use is counterbalanced by genuinely independently produced resources, from sources offering a variety of different viewpoints.

Likewise, educational authorities and teachers should do much more to make sure that debates held in schools are balanced. Inviting an EU Commissioner to speak should be offset by a visit from someone who has criticisms to make about the EU, such as a business person.

E Hold more referendums on EU issues

Finally, the EU must be more open to the idea of directly consulting national populations about the issues that affect them.

⁶²⁹ For more on this, see here: <http://www.openeurope.org.uk/research/scrutiny.pdf>

EU politicians talk endlessly about wanting to “listen to citizens”, but are increasingly hostile to the idea of giving people a say on EU issues through national referendums. This is because they fear a growing tendency to reject further EU integration, as seen in the recent French, Dutch and Irish ‘no’ votes.

Irish Europe Minister Dick Roche, for example, said in the aftermath of the Irish ‘no’ vote that “the first thing to learn about referendums – is to avoid them.”⁶³⁰

But in fact, if EU leaders are serious about wanting to engage citizens more in the EU process and improve their knowledge and understanding of the EU, as they claim they are, then they should make far more use of referendums, not less.

Research shows that voters’ lack of information about the EU is a result of too little, rather than too much democracy. A 2007 report by Matt Qvortrup, Professor of Government at the Robert

Gordon University, found that citizens’ knowledge about politics is higher in countries that allow more citizen participation (e.g. through referendums).

“the first thing to learn about referendums – is to avoid them”

It found that according to polls taken in countries that have held referendums on European integration, such as Ireland, France and Denmark, respondents could answer twice as many questions correctly about EU institutions as could respondents from Germany, Italy and

Belgium – countries that had not held referendums on the EU. In fact, a representative sample of Danish voters during the 1992 referendum campaign on the Maastricht Treaty showed they actually knew more about the treaty than the average backbench MP.

Professor Qvortrup found that voters in Switzerland were more enlightened about the EU than were their opposite numbers in Germany, despite the fact that Germany is a founding member of the European Communities, while Switzerland is outside the EU. This is a more or less direct result of the frequent use of referendums in Switzerland.⁶³¹

However, there also needs to be more respect for the results that referendums deliver. In reference to the series of ‘no’ votes, former Commission President Jacques Santer recently claimed: “A referendum is good for democracy; it is not always good for a country. We need to make a distinction between democracy and what is good for the country.”⁶³²

“A referendum is good for democracy; it is not always good for a country. We need to make a distinction between democracy and what is good for the country”

The EU could dramatically improve its image and reputation with the public by genuinely listening to and respecting ‘no’ votes as well as the ‘yes’ votes. It is simply hypocritical if, on the one hand, EU leaders are talking continuously about wanting to listen to citizens, and on the other, they are simultaneously ignoring votes they dislike in order to press ahead with the agenda for ‘ever closer union’, in which they so passionately believe.

630 Speech at the European Commission conference “35th anniversary of the Eurobarometer”, Paris, 21 November 2008

631 “Can we trust the people? Voter competence and European integration” <http://www.iwantareferendum.com/publication/qvortrup.pdf>

6

ANNEX: Breakdown of the EU's €2.4bn propaganda budget

The information comes from the EU General Budget 2008.⁶³³

This €2.4bn estimate of EU propaganda spending is very conservative, calculated using only those budget lines which explicitly indicate their use for information or campaign purposes, or for the purposes outlined in the chapters above, such as for fostering European citizenship or promoting a common European culture.

The estimate should be regarded as an absolute minimum amount. On the one hand, where such spending has been included as part of many different objectives under a particularly big budget heading, these have been disregarded for the sake of fairness.

Indeed much of the funding that goes on propaganda is hidden deep inside the EU budget, under headings which do not suggest from their titles or descriptions that this is how the money will be used. This goes for many of the examples given in this paper.

One, for example, is the money spent on the Diversity Truck Tour. This is funded by the Commission's Employment DG under the Progress programme, which isn't included in our calculations because the line is very broad and described as covering "expenditure on technical and administrative assistance for the implementation of Community measures to achieve equality between men and women and tackling the particular needs of disabled people." (04 01 04 10)

Another reason why the amount should be regarded as a minimum is because often the amount shown is only part of the story for a particular project. One example is Eurobarometer. The table below, taken from the 2008 EU budget, suggests that €5.8 million was spent in 2008 on 'public opinion analysis', of which the Eurobarometer is a part. However, Antonis Papacostas, the European Commission's Head of Unit for Public Opinion Analysis told Open Europe during a telephone conversation that the figure is closer to €25 million a year.⁶³⁴ This was following a query about an article in the Economist which said the figure was €16.5 million in 2007.⁶³⁵

Other types of budget items have also been excluded for the purposes of remaining true to the strict aim to identify propaganda spending. Many of them involve huge spending which could be said to have propaganda value.

For the Commission's 'Communication' title, the entire budget is included, including the staff and running costs of the department, since the whole of this department could be scrapped if it weren't for the propaganda effort – which cannot be said for other departments which spend money on promotion.

632 Speech at the European Commission conference "35th anniversary of the Eurobarometer", Paris, 21 November 2008

633 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/budget/www/index-en.htm>

634 16 September 2008

635 21 February 2008 http://www.economist.com/world/europe/displaystory.cfm?story_id=10727874

Examples of the types of spending excluded from the calculations:

- **Vaguely defined expenditure on ‘information and publications’ and ‘studies and experts’.** The Commission alone in 2008 dedicated more than €86m for budget lines “intended to cover expenditure on studies, meetings of experts, information and publications directly linked to the achievement of the objective of the programme or measures coming under this budget heading.” This type of spending can be found for each of the Commission’s main policy budget headings. Because it is impossible to differentiate what was spent on “information and publications” and what was spent on the meetings of experts, these have been excluded from the calculations. This is in spite of the fact that these ‘meetings of experts’ could also be seen as having propaganda value, since they involve third parties from organisations such as some of those listed in Part Two. Also, several budgets covering general publications have been excluded, such as, for example, the €2m the European Parliament spends per year on “Digital and traditional publications.” Some of this money will be spent on the types of pro-EU publications looked at in Part One, but some seems to be dedicated to upkeep of the website and translation systems. Likewise, the European Parliament’s €15.4m budget for “Expenditure on publication, information and participation in public events” has not been included, because some of it is spent on updating the EU’s Legislative Observatory, which cannot be considered as advertising.
- **Money spent on visits to the European Parliament for young people.** In 2008 the European Parliament spent €28.5 million on group visits, including the ‘Euroscola’ programme for school children’. The aim of this is to bring students together “to learn about the European Parliament and discuss topical European issues.” The objective of the scheme is described as “Raising awareness of youth about the impact of Europe on their future.”⁶³⁶ Given the tendency for bias evident in other EU ‘information’ schemes, it may well be that this is used as an opportunity to ‘sell’ the EU to children. However, a lack of information about the programme means it would be speculative to assume that this is the case, so it is excluded from the estimate.
- **Costs of meetings of expert groups from the other institutions.** In addition to the first point, several other EU budget lines, particularly outside the Commission in the other institutions, pay for ‘experts’ taking part in EU study groups, workshops, committees, conferences, hearings etc. They also include money spent on external staff for research, and the costs of members of the institutions taking part in similar exercises. Again, many of the experts consulted will be lobby groups and NGOs such as some of those mentioned in Part Two. Costs may include travel expenses and the cost of organising the meeting etc. A rough calculation shows that the acquisition of expertise in this way amounts to around €158m a year, at least.
- **Entertainment and representation costs for members of the institutions.** For the European Parliament, for example, this includes costs of “items and medals for officials who have completed 15 or 25 years’ service” and “miscellaneous protocol expenditure, such as on flags, display stands, invitation cards, printed menus, etc.” In 2008 the EU budget for entertainment and representation amounted to around €82m.

636 <http://www.welcomeurope.com/default.asp?id=1300&idnews=453&genre=0>

- **Money spent on “Social contacts between Members of staff”.** Several budget lines are intended for “schemes to promote social contact between staff of different nationalities, for example subsidies to staff clubs, sports associations, cultural societies, etc”, and for “interinstitutional social activities.” The EU spends €850,000 a year on social contacts between members of staff just in the EU institutions outside the Commission.⁶³⁷ The Commission no doubt also carries out such activities, on a much bigger scale, but it is not possible to identify what it spends.
- **Generous perks, pensions and other payments and facilities offered to former members and civil servants of the institutions.** These arguably help to keep former employees and members from publicly denouncing the EU – helping the EU in its aim to “polish its image.” After all they would be extremely well-placed to do so if they felt that way inclined. The EU now spends almost €1 billion a year on pensions alone.⁶³⁸
- **Budgets for “information exchanges with national parliaments”, which include funded visits to the institutions.**

637 The European Parliament, Council, Court of Justice, Court of Auditors, Economic and Social Committee, the Committee of the Regions and the Ombudsman all have budget lines for this purpose.

638 http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget_in_fig/syntchif_2008_en.pdf

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Budget Code	Budget heading		Comments
3243	Visitors Centre	6,840,000	
3245	Organisation of seminars, symposia and cultural activities	2,093,000	Covers "the financing of cultural projects of European interest, such as the Sakharov Prize and the European Parliament Lux Prize for European Cinema."
3246	Parliamentary television channel (Web TV)	9,000,000	(Figure unavailable for 2008 so taken from 2009 preliminary draft budget)
3247	Expenditure on information about the Debate on the Future of Europe	500,000	
3248	Expenditure on audiovisual information	14,300,000	
400	Current administrative expenditure and expenditure relating to the political and information activities of the political groups and non-attached Members	51,660,000	Covers secretarial, administrative and operational expenditure, but also "expenditure on political and information activities conducted in connection with the European Union's political activities."
402	Contributions to European political parties	10,645,000	"Intended to finance, at European level, political parties which contribute to forming a European awareness and to expressing the political will of the citizens of the Union."
403	Contributions to European political foundations	5,000,000	"Intended to contribute to the financing of European political foundations, in order to assist European political parties in their work of political information and education."
440	Cost of meetings and other activities of former Members	130,000	Covers the cost of meetings of the association of former Members of the European Parliament, whose objective is "To use the experience of former members to strengthen parliamentary democracy and to serve European unity" and "To promote debate on the development of the European Union in the political field as well as in public opinion." ⁶³⁹
104	Reserve For Information and Communication Policy	9,300,000	
TOTAL		109,468,000	

COUNCIL

2213	Information and public events	1,198,000	Covers "assistance for audiovisual media covering the work of the institution", and "the cost of miscellaneous information and public relations activities" as well as "expenditure on publicity and the promotion of publications and public events relating to the institution's activities".
3312	Information and public events	50,000	
TOTAL		1,248,000	

639 <http://www.formermembers.eu/default.asp>

EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE

256	Expenditure on information and on participation in public events	187,575	Covers "the purchase and publication of works of general interest on Community law", but also "other expenditure on the dissemination of information and photographic costs, and contributions made for visits to the institution."
2741	General publications	1,427,977	Part of this covers "brochures produced by the Court for visitors".
TOTAL		1,615,552	

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE

1404	Graduate traineeships, grants and exchanges of officials	788,756	Covers travel and mission expenses for trainees, but also "the realisation of research projects in the fields of activity of the European Economic and Social Committee which are of particular interest for European integration; the cost of programmes to inform young people in the European spirit."
2600	Communication	654,000	Covers "information activities aimed at the general public or socio-occupational organisations, media coverage of conferences, congresses and seminars", and "the organisation and media coverage of major public events, cultural initiatives or any other of the Committee's various events, including the organised civil society prize."
TOTAL		1,442,756	

COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS

1404	Graduate traineeships, grants and exchanges of officials	440,000	Covers travel and mission expenses for trainees, but also "the realisation of research projects in the fields of activity of the Committee of the Regions which are of particular interest for European integration; the cost of programmes to inform young people in the European spirit."
2600	Expenditure on publishing, dissemination of information and participation in public events	450,000	Covers all communication and information expenses, "whether relating to the objectives and activities of the Committee, information activities aimed at the general public, cultural initiatives or any other of the various Committee events. It also covers all materials, and audiovisual services connected with these events."
2602	General publications	816,000	Covers "the Committee of the Regions' publication costs on all media to promote publications and general information; also distribution and publication costs for promotional and publicity purposes."
264	Expenditure on publishing, dissemination of information and participation in public events: information and communication activities	408,000	Covers "expenditure resulting from the political and information activities of Committee members in the exercise of their European mandate."
TOTAL		2,114,000	

COMMISSION

Title 01 – Economic and financial affairs

01 02 04	Prince — Communication on economic and monetary union, including the euro	7,700,000	Covers “the funding of priority information measures on Community policies on all aspects of the rules and functioning of EMU, of the benefits of closer policy coordination and structural reforms and to address information needs of citizens, local authorities and enterprises in relation to the euro.” Includes: “the development of communication activities at central level (brochures, leaflets, newsletters, Internet site graphic design, development and maintenance, exhibitions, stands, conferences, seminars, audiovisual products, opinion polls, surveys, studies, promotional material, twinning programmes, etc.), communication initiatives in third countries, in particular to point out the international role of the euro and the value of financial integration.”
----------	---	-----------	---

TOTAL	7,700,000
--------------	------------------

Title 02 – Enterprise

02 02 06	Pilot project — Regions of knowledge	100,000	Includes funding for “regional-level research with a view to promoting the integration of the regions of Europe.”
02 02 08	European Destinations of Excellence	2,500,000	“The aim of this initiative is to draw attention to the value, diversity and shared characteristics of European tourist destinations and to promote destinations where the economic growth objective is pursued in such a way as to ensure the social, cultural and environmental sustainability of tourism. The measure will also help European citizens to become better acquainted with one another.”
02 03 01	Operation and development of the internal market, particularly in the fields of notification, certification and sectoral approximation	14,500,000	Includes funding for “information and publicity measures, greater awareness of Community legislation.”

TOTAL	17,100,000
--------------	-------------------

Title 04 – Employment and social affairs

04 03 02	Cost of preliminary consultation meetings with trade union representatives	400,000	Covers “expenditure on preliminary consultation meetings between European trade union representatives with a view to helping them form their opinions and harmonise their positions regarding the development of Community policies.”
04 03 03 01	Industrial relations and social dialogue	15,350,000	Covers “the financing of the social partners’ participation in the European employment strategy.” Covers “grants for promoting social dialogue” and “support for industrial relations measures, in particular those designed to develop expertise and exchange of information on a European basis.”

04 03 03 02	Information and training measures for workers' organisations	16,400,000	Covers "information and training measures for workers' organisations, including representatives of workers' organisations in the candidate countries, deriving from the implementation of Community action on the social dimension of the internal market, including gender equality issues, and monetary union." Involves support for trade union institutes "which have been established to facilitate capacity building through training and research at European level, as well as to improve the degree of involvement of workers' representatives in European governance."
04 03 03 03	Information, consultation and participation of representatives of undertakings	8,100,000	Aims to promote particular EU Directives on European works councils etc, and "the setting-up of information and observation points on the premises of European social partners possessing the necessary expertise in the field of action covered by this item. The aim of such information points is to inform and help the social partners and undertakings to set up transnational consultation, participation and information structures, and to foster relations with the European institutions."
04 03 04	EURES (European Employment Services)	20,050,000	Includes "funding for promotion of EURES among firms and the general public."
04 04 01 02	Social protection and inclusion	28,030,000	Includes "raising awareness, disseminating information and promoting debate about the key challenges and policy issues raised in the context of the EU coordination process in the field of social protection and social inclusion, including among NGOs, regional and local actors, social partners, civil society and other stakeholders", and "developing the capacity of key EU networks to support and further develop EU policy goals and strategies on social protection and inclusion, through the development of community-based services and independent living."
04 04 01 04	Anti-discrimination and diversity	20,520,000	Includes "raising awareness, disseminating information and promoting the debate about the key challenges and policy issues in relation to discrimination and the mainstreaming of anti-discrimination in all EU policies, including among NGOs in the field of anti-discrimination, regional and local actors, social partners and other stakeholders; developing the capacity of key EU networks to promote and further develop EU policy goals and strategies."
04 04 06	European Year of Equal Opportunities for All in 2007	5,500,000	Covered measures "aimed at raising awareness of the need to work towards a more cohesive society that celebrates differences and respects the substantial EU acquis in equality and non-discrimination and at stimulating debate and dialogue on questions which are central to achieving a just society."

04 04 09	Support for the running costs of the Platform of European Social Non-Governmental Organisations	680,000	Covers "the running costs of the Platform of European Social Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs). The Social Platform will facilitate democracy in the European Union by promoting the participatory consistent involvement of social NGOs within a structured civil dialogue with the EU institutions. It will also provide added value to the EU social policy-making process and strengthen civil society within new Member States."
04 04 11	Pilot project — New employment situation in the health sector: best practices for improving professional training and qualifications of health care workers and their remuneration	1,000,000	Among other things funds "information campaigns."
TOTAL		116,030,000	

Title 05 – Agriculture and rural development

05 08 06	Enhancing public awareness of the common agricultural policy	7,000,000	
TOTAL		7,000,000	

Title 06 – Energy and transport

06 02 04 01	Internal market and optimisation of transport systems	6,000,000	Among many other things, includes funding for "promotion of Community approaches in international forums", and "awareness-raising and communication activities to promote the global approach advocated by the Community and publicise the trans-European networks in the Community and in Europe"
TOTAL		6,000,000	

Title 07 – Environment

07 03 02	Completion of Community action programme promoting non-governmental organisations primarily active in the field of environmental protection	200,000	Covers "payments in respect of commitments remaining to be settled from previous years and resulting from grants to non-governmental organisations (NGOs) primarily active in the field of environmental protection, towards their general running costs, annual work programmes and projects in order to contribute to the further development and implementation of EU environmental policy and legislation and to increase the participation of civil society in the environmental debate at European level."
07 03 06	Completion of awareness-raising and other general actions based on the Community action programmes in the field of the environment	6,000,000	Covers "payments in respect of commitments remaining to be settled from previous years and resulting from actions undertaken by the Commission to implement existing legislation, awareness-raising and other general actions based on the Community environmental action programme. Those actions include grants to projects and service contracts, workshops and seminars, as well as preparation and production costs of audiovisual material, events and exhibitions, press visits, publication and other dissemination and website activities."

07 03 07	LIFE+ (Financial Instrument for the Environment — 2007 to 2013)	248,094,000	Only partly relevant. Includes, among many other things, “support for independent and non profit-making non-governmental organisations (NGOs) which contribute to the development and implementation of Community environmental policy and legislation”, and “support for the Commission’s role in initiating environment policy development and implementation, through studies and evaluations, seminars and workshops with experts and stakeholders, networks and computer systems, information, publication and dissemination activities, including events, exhibitions and similar awareness-raising measures.”
----------	---	-------------	--

TOTAL **254,294,000**

Title 09 – Information society and media

09 06 01 01	Media 2007 — Support programme for the European audiovisual sector	93,794,000	See above. Supports “the transnational distribution of European works, to improve the circulation of non-national European works. For example: support cinema and video distribution of non-national European films; automatic and selective support for distributors of non-national European films, support for promotion kits, support to digitisation improve the promotion of European works. For example: ensuring access by professionals to European and international markets; ensuring access by the audience to works reflecting European cultural diversity”. Also covers support for “a network of information offices (Media desks) throughout Europe”.
09 06 01 02	Preparatory action on the implementation of the Media 2007 programmes in	2,000,000	Includes “support for the development of cinema networks” such as the EuropaCinema model in third countries.” States that “Cinemas in networks third countries should devote a significant share of their programming to European film distribution.”
09 06 02	Completion of previous media programmes	21,600,000	
TOTAL		117,394,000	

Title 13 – Regional policy

13 03 08	Completion of European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) — Technical assistance and innovative measures (2000 to 2006)	35,000,000	Includes expenditure for “information and publishing expenditure” and “contracts for the provision of services and studies, grants.”
TOTAL		35,000,000	

Title 15 – Education and Culture

Overall objectives of this Title include: “Reinforce European identity and solidarity and foster creativity by supporting cultural diversity and common values within Member States” and “Improve the basis for establishing solidarity between people in Europe through policy measures and direct support for activities aimed at encouraging and enabling active citizenship.”

15 01 04 14	Erasmus Mundus — Expenditure on administrative management	1,530,000	Includes expenditure on “information and publications.”
-------------	---	-----------	---

15 01 04 20	Visits to the Commission — Expenditure on administrative management	620,000	
15 01 04 22	Lifelong learning — Expenditure on administrative management	8,670,000	Includes expenditure on “information and publications.”
15 01 04 30	Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency — Subsidy for programmes under Heading 1a	19,982,000	Covers the operating costs of the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Agency, which manages the Youth, Culture, Media, Civil Society and Town-Twinning activities.
15 01 04 31	Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency— Subsidy for programmes under Heading 3b	9,327,000	Covers the operating costs of the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Agency, which manages the Youth, Culture, Media, Civil Society and Town-Twinning activities.
15 01 04 32	Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency — Subsidy for programmes under Heading 4	520,000	Covers the operating costs of the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Agency, which manages the Youth, Culture, Media, Civil Society and Town-Twinning activities.
15 01 04 44	Culture Programme (2007 to 2013) — Expenditure on administrative management	670,000	
15 01 04 55	Youth in Action — Expenditure on administrative management	780,000	
15 01 04 66	Europe for Citizens — Expenditure on administrative management	350,000	
15 01 61	Cost of organising graduate traineeships with the institution	6,664,000	Covers “in-service traineeships intended for graduates and is designed to provide them with an overview of the objectives set and the challenges faced by the European Union, an insight into how its institutions work and an opportunity to enhance their knowledge through work experience at the Commission.”
15 02 02 05	Erasmus Mundus	90,892,000	Includes “promoting the emergence of a clearly European system of higher education which is attractive both within the European Union and beyond its borders; fostering greater international interest in obtaining European qualifications and/or experience among graduates and highly qualified academics throughout the world, and more opportunities to obtain these qualifications; fostering more structured cooperation between the European Community and third-country institutions, and increased outgoing mobility from the EU as part of European study programmes; achieving a better brand image for European education, with a higher profile and easier access.”
15 02 09	Completion of previous programmes in the field of education and training	90,000,000	Covers the completion of actions supported before 2007 under the following budget headings: European integration in universities, College of Europe, European University Institute, Florence, European Law Academy (Trier), European Institute of Public Administration, Maastricht, Study and Research Centre, International Centre for European Training, European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education, strengthening of Community actions in the field of education, Socrates, Connect, e-Learning, promotion of European pathways in work-linked training, including apprenticeship, Leonardo da Vinci.

15 02 22	Lifelong learning programme	873,204,000	Covers Comenius, Erasmus, Leonardo da Vinci and Jean Monnet programmes.
15 02 30	Pilot project — European Neighbourhood Policy — Enhance education through scholarships and exchanges	2,000,000	Covers “scholarships for graduate students from European Neighbourhood Policy countries to follow courses leading to a degree of Master in European Studies.”
15 04	Developing cultural cooperation in Europe		
15 04 09	Completion of previous programmes/actions in the field of culture and language	13,000,000	Includes “subsidies for European interest organisations” and support for Framework programme in support of culture.
15 04 44	Culture Programme (2007 to 2013)	44,639,000	Includes “support for cultural cooperation projects in all artistic and cultural fields (performing arts, plastic and visual arts, literature, heritage, cultural history); promoting the European Cistercian Route in view of its importance for heritage protection and cultural exchanges; financing protection, conservation and restoration operations in respect of shared cultural heritage sites of European importance and Unesco-designated world heritage sites; multiannual cooperation focal points; annual cooperation activities; special actions with a European or international dimension; support for bodies active at European level in the field of culture, as well as actions supporting the preservation and commemoration of the main sites and archives associated with deportations, symbolised by the memorials which have been raised on the sites of the former camps and other large-scale sites of human suffering and extermination, and support for keeping alive the memory of the victims at these sites; support for work to analyse, collect and disseminate information in the field of cultural cooperation.”
15 04 45	Pilot project for artist mobility	1,500,000	
15 04 47	European Year of Intercultural Dialogue	7,000,000	Covers “information and promotion campaigns, particularly in cooperation with the media, at Community and national level to disseminate the key messages concerning the objectives of the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue; events and initiatives on a European scale aimed at promoting intercultural dialogue and highlighting achievements and experiences on the theme of the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue; events and initiatives at national level with a strong European dimension aimed at promoting the objectives of the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue; surveys and studies on a Community or national scale to assess and report on the preparation for, effectiveness and impact of, and long-term follow-up to the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue.”
15 04 48	Preservation of the historical finds of regional museums through the digitisation of their archives	500,000	Aims for “the preservation and conservation of the finds of regional museums through the creation of digital archives” and “wider dissemination of the rich cultural heritage and history of the peoples of the European Union through the exchange of digital data.”
15 04 49	Preparatory action — Fostering Baltic Sea regionalisation	1,500,000	Unclear why this is in here, but is deemed by the Commission to be part of the objective of ‘ Developing cultural cooperation in Europe’.

15 05 09	Completion of previous programmes/actions in the field of youth	18,801,000	Covers the completion of measures supported before 2007 under the following budget headings: Youth, pilot projects for participation by young people, sport: preparatory measures for a Community policy in the field of sport, European Year of Education through Sport; European Youth Forum, support for international non-governmental youth organisations.
15 05 55	Youth in Action	120,983,000	See above
15 06	Fostering European Citizenship		
15 06 01	Pilot project in favour of citizenship	148,857	
15 06 02	Completion of cost of organising graduate traineeships with the institution	560,000	
15 06 05	Visits to the Commission	2,080,000	
15 06 06	Special annual events	1,880,000	Includes 880 000 for the organisation of the '9th Winter Olympics for European Youth - Silesia - Beskidy 2009, and 1 000 000 as a contribution to the financing of the 'Marathon for a United Europe' to take place in Athens in summer 2008.
15 06 07	Pilot project — European political foundations	1,000,000	(2007 figure as 2008 is unavailable)
15 06 08	Erasmus public administration programme	1,000,000	
15 06 09	Completion of previous programmes/actions in the field of civic participation	885,335	Covers the completion of measures supported before 2007 under the following budget headings: "preservation of Nazi concentration camp sites as historical monuments, measures for civil society, 'Our Europe' associations, grants to organisations advancing the idea of Europe, associations and federations of European interest, European think tanks, support for the Jean Monnet House and the Robert Schuman House, town-twinning schemes in the European Union."
15 06 10	Amicus — Association of Member States Implementing a Community Universal Service	3,000,000	"The preparatory action should define a common framework for national civic services across the European Union, relying on the existing national civic service infrastructures and permitting the large-scale exchange of participants between EU Member States, leading to a truly universal European civic service. The service should be civic, i.e. civil or military. Each Member State would be able to choose the form of civic service. It should be open to young people, male and female, between 16 and 28 years old. This project would give tangible substance to the notion of European citizenship since it would provide an opportunity for the young participants to carry out part of their civic service in another country taking part in Amicus."

15 06 66	Europe for Citizens	26,424,000	Covers: "Active citizens for Europe, consisting of: town twinning, citizens' projects and support measures; Active civil society in Europe, consisting of: structural support for European public policy research organisations (think-tanks), structural support for civil society organisations at European level, etc., support for projects initiated by civil society organisations; Together for Europe, consisting of: high-visibility events such as commemorations, awards and Europe-wide conferences, etc., studies, surveys and opinion polls, information and dissemination tools."
----------	---------------------	------------	--

TOTAL **1,350,110,192**

Title 16 – Communication

The overall objectives of this Title are: "to inform the media and the public about European Union activities and policies, to inform the Commission, the media and the public about trends in public opinion in the Member States."

16 01 01 01	Expenditure related to staff in active employment of 'Communication, policy area: Headquarters	47,232,271	
16 01 02 01	External staff of 'Communication, Directorate-General: Headquarters	6,447,736	
16 01 02 03	Local staff of 'Communication, Directorate-General: Representation offices	16,000,000	
16 01 02 11	Other management expenditure of 'Communication, Directorate-General: Headquarters	3,487,253	
16 01 03 01	Expenditure related to equipment, furniture and services of 'Communication, Directorate-General: Headquarters	3,522,522	
16 01 03 03	Buildings and related expenditure of 'Communication, Directorate-General: Representation offices	25,073,000	
16 01 03 04	Other working expenditure	2,000,000	
16 01 04 01	Communication actions — Expenditure on administrative management	3,600,000	Covers "expenditure on studies, meetings of experts, information and publications."
16 02 02	Multimedia actions	22,200,000	Covers "general information operations concerning the European Union, for the purpose of making the work of the Community institutions more visible, the decisions taken and the stages in the building of Europe. They concern essentially the funding or co-funding of the production and/or dissemination of multimedia information products."

16 02 03	Information for the media	4,470,000	Covers "the European Union's communication-related expenditure. The aim of the communication activities is to provide target groups, mainly the media, with the tools for better understanding and reporting of topical issues." Includes €1,020,000 for training seminars with journalists, and €550,000 for exchanges with the media.
16 02 04	Operation of radio and television studios and audiovisual equipment	6,212,000	
16 03 01	Information outlets	15,300,000	Includes €10.8 million for Europe Direct, and €4.5 for "coordination and support activities for relays and networks."
16 03 02	Local actions	11,400,000	Covers "the European Union's expenditure on decentralised communication. The aim of local communication activities is in particular to provide target groups with the tools to gain a better understanding of burning topical issues." Included: €1,2m on "International Exhibition in Zaragoza", €3,85m on "9 May and other European events", €2,4m on "Seminars and conferences", €1.6m on "Other communication actions" (visits etc), €550,000 on Eurjus service, €1m on "Information centres connected to the Representations", and €800,000 on "promotional material". Objective is "To capitalise on special events, such as the anniversary of the Schuman Declaration (9 May), so as to increase the general public's knowledge of the Commission's activities." Potential beneficiaries are "Proactive civil society organisations on European issues." "The projects selected should contribute to better public awareness of the EU's role and action." In terms of grants in the form of prizes awarded in competitions the expected results are "Promotion and stimulation of the work and thought processes involved in building the Community or in European policies." "The Representations take part in numerous events in order to promote the European Union."
16 03 04	Specific actions on priority themes, of which PRINCE	12,830,000	Covers in particular activities such as: 'Plan-D for Democracy, Dialogue and Debate' . Includes €2m for Debate Europe, €500,000 for Spring Day, "Plan D will be continued on the basis of current results in order to encourage citizens to fully understand the content of European policy issues and thus enhance a feeling of European identity." Expected results: "The projects selected should contribute, through greater dialogue, to closer links between citizens and the institutions of the European Union, in particular through better knowledge of the Union's role and activities."
16 03 05	EuroGlobe	1,000,000	"Intended to continue the pilot project started in 2007 for a mobile Globe theatre aiming to foster a European public space for debate, culture and learning." Part of the objective is to "foster a better public understanding of the relevance of the European Union for culture and society in the Member States".

16 03 06	Pilot project — Pilot information networks (PINs)	1,500,000	
16 04 01	Public opinion analysis	5,800,000	Covers “the analysis of trends in public opinion, mainly by means of opinion polls (e.g. general-public ‘Eurobarometer, surveys, ‘flash, surveys, by telephone, of specific populations on particular subjects, at regional or national level, or qualitative surveys), together with quality control of these surveys.”
16 04 02	Online information and communication tools	10,880,000	Covers “on-line multimedia information and communication tools concerning the European Union, for the purpose of providing all citizens with general information on the work of the Community institutions, the decisions taken and the stages in the building of Europe. On-line tools make it possible to gather citizens’ questions or reactions on European issues.” Includes €3.5m for the operation of the Europe Direct contact centre, and €3.15m for the Europa site.
16 04 03	Targeted written publications	5,150,000	Covers “expenditure relating to the production for various target groups of written publications concerning the Union’s activities that are often distributed through a decentralised network.”
16 04 04	Written publications for general use	2,520,000	Covers “expenditure on issuing, in whatever medium, publications on matters of major topical importance relating to Commission activities and the work of the European Union, selected under the priority publications programme. The publications may be targeted at the teaching profession, opinion leaders and the general public.”
TOTAL		206,624,782	

Title 17 – Health and consumer protection

17 03 02	Community tobacco fund — Direct payments by the European Union	14,250,000	“This appropriation is intended to finance information activities under the Community tobacco fund.”
TOTAL		14,250,000	

Title 18 – Area of freedom, security and justice

18 04 05 04	European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights — Subsidy under Title 3	6,512,000	Includes “promotion and dissemination of information and awareness-raising activities to enhance visibility on fundamental rights.”
18 04 06	Fundamental rights and citizenship	12,000,000	Intended “to promote the development of a European society based on respect for fundamental rights as recognised in Article 6(2) of the Treaty on European Union, including rights derived from citizenship of the Union.”
18 07 03	Drugs prevention and information	3,000,000	Includes “support to the activities of non-governmental organisations or other entities pursuing an aim of general European interest regarding the general objectives of the programme under the conditions set out in the annual work programmes.”

18 08 01	Prince — Area of freedom, security and justice	7,814,000	Covers “priority information measures on Community policies.” Also covers “information measures in the field of justice and home affairs in relation to the establishment of an area of freedom, security and justice (internal web sites, public events, communication products, Eurobarometer surveys, etc.)” “This appropriation is intended to cover the funding of an awareness-raising campaign by the Commission, in cooperation with civil society, on EU citizens’ rights under Article 13 of the Treaty on European Union.”
----------	--	-----------	---

TOTAL **29,326,000**

Title 19 – External relations

19 05 01	Cooperation with industrialised non-member countries	24,870,000	Includes “the enhancement of awareness about and understanding of the European Union and of its visibility in partner countries.”
----------	--	------------	---

19 11 02	Information programmes for non-member countries	10,700,000	Covers activities such as the European Union visitors programme (EUVP), as well as “the production and distribution of publications on priority themes as part of an annual programme; the production and dissemination of audiovisual material; the development of information delivered via electronic media (the Internet and electronic message systems); the organisation of visits for groups of journalists; the organisation of visits for groups of representatives of civil society; the bulk purchase of promotional material to be made available to delegations; the support for the information activities of opinion leaders that are consistent with the European Union’s priorities; the coverage of Euronews in Farsi.” Also includes “decentralised measures carried out by delegations in non-member countries and vis-à-vis international organisations”, including “newsletters, websites, relations with the media (press conferences, seminars, radio programmes, etc.), information products (other publications, graphic material, etc.), organisation of events, including cultural activities, other activities.” Includes management of the ‘European Documentation Centres’.
----------	---	------------	--

19 11 03	Prince — Role of the European Union in the world	3,000,000	Covers “priority information and communication activities” in order to “Address a weak public perception of external assistance. The objective is to make clear that external assistance is an integral part of what the EU does and is one of the crucial policies that define the EU and its role in the world.” Includes “Information activities... on the aims and development of the common foreign and security policy.”
----------	--	-----------	--

TOTAL **38,570,000**

Title 20 – Trade

20 02 01	External trade relations, including access to the markets of non-Community countries	11,244,000	Includes the “development and implementation of a consistent and comprehensive communication and information strategy, promoting the Community’s trade policy and raising awareness on the detail and objectives of Community trade policy, both within and outside the EU.”
TOTAL		11,244,000	

Title 21 – Development and relations with African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States

21 01 04 04	Coordination and promotion of awareness on development issues — Expenditure on administrative management	204,000	Includes expenditure on “publication, production, storage, distribution and dissemination of information material, in particular via the Publications Office.”
21 08 02	Coordination and promotion of awareness on development issues	8,896,000	Includes “the financing of activities designed to draw attention to action by the EU and the Member States in the development field and to raise public awareness of development issues. Every activity financed under this article must include the following two components, which are complementary in the Commission’s view: an ‘information, component, designed to promote the various activities which the EU undertakes in the development aid field and the activities which it conducts in partnership with the Member States and other international institutions; an ‘awareness-raising, component, covering public opinion in the Community and in the ACP States (78 countries). These activities are targeted primarily at the young. An immediate priority of this component is also to raise public awareness in the Member States about the Community’s action in the development cooperation field. These activities consist mainly, though not exclusively, of financial support for schemes in the audiovisual, publications, seminars and events fields as applied to development, the production of information material, the development of information systems, and also the Lorenzo Natali prize for journalism in the development field. These activities are directed at public and private sector partners, and at the EU’s representations and delegations in the Member States, the accession countries and the ACP States.”
TOTAL		9,100,000	

Title 22 – Enlargement

22 02 07 03	Financial support for encouraging the economic development of the Turkish Cypriot Community	53,000,000	Includes, among several other objectives, “bringing the Turkish Cypriot community closer to the Union, through, inter alia, information on the European Union’s political and legal order, promotion of youth exchanges and scholarships”. Also includes expenditure on “information and publications.”
22 04 01	Prince — Information and communication strategy	5,000,000	Covers “the funding of priority information and communication activities on enlargement, mainly regarding Member States, including impact assessments and evaluation actions.”

22 04 02	Information and communication programmes for non-member countries	7,000,000	Covers "the funding of priority information and communication activities on enlargement mainly regarding candidate and potential candidate countries... Information and communication actions will be directed at the general public, relevant audiences, target groups, especially youth, media and the rural population, and will seek to enhance support among opinion leaders for enlargement as well as the association and stabilisation process. The aim is also to strengthen the EU's profile and political leverage in those countries and generate public support for the reforms process during the accession and pre-accession periods. The appropriations allocated will build on the strategy from the previous year and lessons learnt and finance activities such as management of information centres, organising information events, seminars and training, networking, media relations, research, studies and opinion polls, publications and Internet websites."
TOTAL		65,000,000	
Title 23 – Humanitarian aid			
23 01 04 01	Humanitarian aid — Expenditure on administrative management	9,600,000	Includes "expenditure on studies, information and publications; on public awareness and information campaigns; and on any other measure highlighting the Community character of the aid."
TOTAL		9,600,000	
TOTAL EU PROPAGANDA SPEND (€)		2,410,231,282	

About Open Europe

Open Europe is an independent, non-party political think tank which contributes bold new thinking to the debate about the direction of the European Union.

'Ever closer union', espoused by Jean Monnet and propelled forwards by successive generations of political and bureaucratic elites, has failed. The EU's over-loaded institutions - held in low regard by Europe's citizens - are ill-equipped to adapt to the pressing challenges of weak economic growth, rising global competition, insecurity and a looming demographic crisis.

Open Europe believes that the EU must now embrace radical reform based on economic liberalisation, a looser and more flexible structure, and greater transparency and accountability if it is to overcome these challenges, and succeed in the twenty first century.

The best way forward for the EU is an urgent programme of radical change driven by a consensus between member states. In pursuit of this consensus, Open Europe seeks to involve like-minded individuals, political parties and organisations across Europe in our thinking and activities, and to disseminate our ideas throughout the EU and the rest of the world.

Who supports Open Europe

Our supporters include men and women who run businesses operating in every industry sector and across the UK. All of them support Open Europe in a personal capacity. They include:

Sir Antony Acland

Former head of the Diplomatic Service

John Caudwell

Former Chairman & Chief Executive, the Caudwell Group

Sir Crispin Davis

Chief Executive, Reed Elsevier Group plc

Lord Derwent

Former Deputy Chairman, Hutchison Whampoa (Europe) Ltd

Judith Donovan, CBE

Chairman, DIY Marketing Ltd

Sir John Egan

Chairman, Severn Trent plc

Anthony Fuller, CBE

President, Fuller, Smith & Turner plc

Howard Giles

Chairman, Gilesport plc

Rupert Hambro

Chairman, J O Hambro Ltd

Michael Jackson

Chairman, Elderstreet Investments

Sir Martin Jacomb

Former Chairman, Prudential plc

Lord Kalms of Edgware

President, DSG International plc

Lord Leach of Fairford (Chairman)

Director, Matheson & Co

Sir Rocco Forte

Chairman and Chief Executive, The Rocco Forte Collection

Tim Melville-Ross, CBE

Chairman, DTZ Holdings plc

Lorna Moran, MBE

CEO, NRG Group

David Ord

Managing Director, The Bristol Port Company

Sir Michael Pickard

Co-Founder London First Centre

Lord Renwick of Clifton

Vice Chairman, Investment Banking JP Morgan (Europe)

Sir Stuart Rose

Executive Chairman, Marks & Spencer plc

Lord Sainsbury of Preston Candover

President, J Sainsbury plc

Derek Scott (Deputy Chairman)

Economic Advisor to the Prime Minister, 1997-2003

Lord Sheppard of Didgemere

Chairman, Didgemere Consultants

Michael Spencer

Chief Executive, ICAP plc

Tony Travis

Former Chairman, Travis Perkins plc

Sir Neville Trotter

Chairman, British-American Chamber of Commerce N-East

Monima Wardle

Managing Director, City Analytics

Sir Brian Williamson, CBE

Senior Advisor, Fleming Family & Partners

Simon Wolfson

Chief Executive, Next plc

Lord Young of Graffham, PC DL

Chairman, Young Associates Ltd

Contact Us

For more information about Open Europe please contact the team on 0207 197 2333 or email info@openeurope.org.uk, or write to us at 7 Tufton Street, London SW1P 3QN. To find out more please go to www.openeurope.org.uk.