

## BOOK REVIEW

# Immigration: the canary in the European coalmine

Christopher Caldwell's new book has attracted much media interest. *The Economist*, a very pro-immigration journal, concluded that "this is an important book as well as a provocative one: the best statement to date of the pessimist's position on Islamic immigration in Europe".

That such a clear, candid book is written by an American mainstream journalist is important in itself. The book is subtitled quite clearly *Can Europe be the same with different people in it?* and Caldwell says equally clearly, "the answer is no".

His main title, of course, echoes Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* and, like Burke, Caldwell looks to the long-term consequence of the phenomenon he characterises as Western Europe becoming "a multi-ethnic society in a fit of absence of mind". He views immigration in the way Burke saw the French republican revolution, as aggressive, dangerous and, ultimately, leading to violence. Much of his book centres specifically on the importation of Muslims, since he regards Islam as an anti-European culture. Like Burke, he believes the current population of a nation and its rulers are trustees, with duties both to their past and to generations yet unborn.

Caldwell starts by facing up to the fact that importing mass Third World labour was a disaster. "Europeans... overestimated their need for immigrant labour. The economic benefits immigration brought were marginal and temporary. They now belong to the past. The social changes immigration brought, however, were massive and enduring."

He shoots down the constantly advanced argument that the arrival of low-skilled immigrants is of benefit to European countries. He recites again the obvious fact that welfare states transfer benefits to low earners and demolishes again the idea that

### **Reflections on the Revolution in Europe: Immigration, Islam and the West**

*By Christopher Caldwell*

Allen Lane, Pbk 364pp 2009

Available from *The June Press*

Price £14.99 +p&p  
(see back cover)

ISBN 0713999365

immigration can support the ageing of Europe, by quoting the well-known estimate of the United Nations that to maintain the ratio of labour to dependants, Europe will have to import 701 million people by 2050.

Caldwell is clear that the peoples of Europe never wanted mass immigration. Why should they? Immigrant labour without capital increases the supply of labour and reduces wages.

He excoriates the political class from the 1950s to the present. In the beginning, in the 1950s and 1960s, "Those elites, to the extent that they thought about the long-term consequences at all, made certain assumptions; immigrants would be few in number. Since they were coming to fill short-term gaps in the labour force, most would stay in Europe only temporarily. Some might stay longer. No one assumed they would be eligible for welfare. That they would retain the habits and culture of southern villages, clans, market places, and mosques, was a thought too bizarre to entertain."

It is worth noting, however, that at least one politician was fully aware of the long-term consequences. Ian Gilmour, then editor of *The Spectator*, recorded an interview with Winston Churchill in 1955 when Churchill told him: "I think it is the most important subject facing this country, but I cannot

get any of my ministers to take any notice."

When the elites realised how unpopular mass immigration was, this did not change what became a rigid, almost sacred view. All that happened was the arrival of a panoply of suppressive efforts, including diversity training, ethnic quotas and vilification and muzzling of opponents.

The reality was that "for all the lip service paid to diversity, people tend to flee it" and "in no country in Europe does the bulk of the population aspire to live in a bazaar of cultures". Despite inflicting these pressures on the poorest natives, the political class was conspicuous by its absence in "diverse" residential areas or sending its children to "enriched" schools.

Caldwell estimates that most European countries will have an immigrant (plus descendant) population of between 25 per cent and 33 per cent by 2050. He points out that only one group is more favourable to immigration than the national political elites and that is the EU institutions.

Immigration is the canary in the coalmine. Caldwell says: "If Europe is getting more immigrants than its voters want, this is a good indicator that its democracy is not functioning". Indeed, the whole EU process is designed to put some policies beyond democracy. "European leaders have chosen to believe...that its immigration and asylum policies involve the sort of non-negotiable moral qualities that you don't vote on."

While approved political debate remains in a narrow range of opinion, nothing will change the political class until it loses a lot of votes. This is slowly happening and Caldwell's book, as *The Economist* noted, is a sign that Enoch Powell's arguments are becoming dangerously mainstream.

*Reviewed by Anthony Scholefield*

# EU 'not a significant world player'

President Obama's recent decision to abandon the "star wars" missile shield in Eastern Europe was, in part at least, an acknowledgement that American foreign policy is increasingly looking eastwards. It is in line with the President's desire to "reset" US relations with Russia, as acknowledged by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, and Russian delight at the missile announcement suggests that Moscow, too, is keen to forge a new transatlantic balance of power.

If such a fundamental change in the balance of East-West relations really does come about – and straws in the wind indicate that it well might – where does that leave the European Union on the world stage?

The answer is "nowhere", according to the prevailing view among an influential group of Russians.

"The European Union is growing weaker as an actor in foreign politics," says a report published last month for the Russian-US section of the Valdai Club, a heavyweight gathering of Russian academics, intellectuals and politicians set up to consider the development of their country and society. The report points to a "rapid shift of the centre of global politics from the Euro-Atlantic region to the Asian-Pacific" and concludes that the EU is being left behind:

"The EU common foreign and security policy is still in its infancy because of the diverging interests of

the European Union member states, and their reluctance to increase defence spending and shoulder responsibility for keeping up international peace and security. For this reason, the EU cannot be viewed as a significant player in the world's political and especially military-political arena.

"At the same time, China is developing at an unprecedentedly fast pace. Its foreign economic expansion is widening, its political influence is growing. The vector of the US main interests is also moving to the Asian-Pacific zone."

This dismissive view of the EU, needs to be taken seriously. The executive editor of the Valdai report is Sergei Karganov, chairman of the Presidium of the Council on Foreign and Defence Policy, and one of the authors is his director of research. What these men think is listened to in the Kremlin. Their report – "Reconfiguration, not just a Reset: Russia's interests in relations with the USA" – is a cogent and detailed blueprint for the creation of a wide community of domestic and international interests between Russia and the US.

Mr Obama has so far shown little interest in the EU's international pretensions and it is evident that the Russians care even less. As Nico Popescu wrote recently in the *euobserver.com* blog, "Russia's perception of an 'EU in decline'...is

not just arrogance. The EU itself has the foreign policy psychology (and instincts) of a small power. And Russia has the psychology of a great, even rising power...the EU's perceived irrelevance creates problems for the EU's partnerships in the region – with Russia and the Eastern neighbourhood countries."

Mr Popescu, research fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations in London, concludes: "In tough international environments, reputation is a foreign policy resource in itself. And EU's external reputation as a meagre foreign policy actor is a serious problem. EU's current mixture of self-congratulating views on the success of the 'European model' and half-hearted political investment in EU foreign policy is not enough to promote European interests and values."

With the US turning towards Russia and China, and now, as the G20 summit demonstrated, increasingly towards emerging economic powers such as India and Brazil, it seems the EU will have to embark on radical reforms if anyone else in the world is going to listen to it. Either that, or the member states will have to return to full-blooded independence in foreign policy, without the constraints imposed by the Brussels idea of "consensus".

## One thing Cameron *can* do about Europe

Now that the implementation of the Lisbon Treaty is inevitable, the Conservatives' policy of holding a referendum has a fatal hole in it. David Cameron's always forlorn promise depended upon ratification being incomplete by the time of the expected Tory victory at the forthcoming General Election. That will evidently not be the case.

If he does become prime minister, Mr Cameron could, of course, go for what

some would see as the nuclear option of a full-blown referendum on British membership of the EU, but that is hardly a possibility – it would blow the government apart. There is, however, one thing a new Tory government could do about Europe, *writes Anthony Scholfield*.

As the three main parties vie with each other to promise the most swingeing public spending cuts, with the least possible pain, in order to cut a

government deficit of £100-175 billion a year, none of them has mentioned the £16.5 billion paid to the EU (less the Fontainebleau abatement of £4.8 billion – net £11.7 billion). Mr Cameron can remedy this.

There is, in fact, good reason why the complete axeing of the gross contribution to the EU should be at the top of the list of spending cuts.

There are three points to make about  
**continued on page 6**

# LETTERS

Tel: 08456 12 12 65 Fax: 08456 12 12 75 email: [eurofacts@juneypress.com](mailto:eurofacts@juneypress.com)

## Sceptics must speak out

Dear Sir,

The re-launch of *eurofacts* provides sceptics with a welcome opportunity.

Just as the recession crept up unnoticed to deliver effects that will last for years, similarly party politics in Britain would seem to be generating a convulsion.

Voter disenchantment; Labour in complete exhaustion; Lib-Dem irrelevance; Conservatives in deep division between a confused front bench and a rank-and-file hoping for delivrance.

This is a moment for sceptics to say plainly and clearly what needs to be done in the interests of the country.

First, total extraction from the EU. There is no domestic issue that can be realistically tackled until Britain is released from the shackles of the EU. No political party will face up to this

either now or after the general election. Sceptics need to share views on this and possibly agree that a programme should be set out which could lead to the founding of a political movement able to tackle the complex tasks demanding attention.

This would be a movement that could welcome disenchanted members from existing parties as well as some of the many citizens who have given up on politics.

The re-launched *eurofacts* would seem to be a suitable forum in which to begin.

RALPH MADDERN  
Warwickshire

## Votes not required

Dear Sir,

The decision to ask the Irish to have a second referendum on the Lisbon Treaty because they voted NO first

time, shows how totally undemocratic the EU really is. Now they have voted YES, the EU accepts that vote as final: how very generous of them.

Next we see the prospect of Mr Blair becoming president of the EU.

A man who takes a country to war for his personal ideology is usually referred to as a "mad dictator", but in the eyes of the EU elite he is clearly seen as the kind of man the EU wishes to have as its leader.

Luckily for the EU, the democratic vote of its so-called "citizens" is not required. All that is expected of them is that they obey the rules of the EU elite.

History shows us that this form of "Communism" rarely lasts, but unfortunately it is the "citizens" who have to suffer until the democratic voice finally takes over, usually resulting in bloodshed.

RICHARD LONG  
London

## One thing Cameron *can* do about Europe

continued from page 5

British EU contributions. First, they have to be paid in euros. There is no question of Mervyn King printing some extra money and handing it out to the EU. It may be possible to pay British government liabilities in the UK in "funny money", but the EU demands hard cash.

Second, the headline gross contribution £16.5 billion consists of three parts. There is the abatement of £4.8 billion, which can be reasonably said to be a deduction from the gross. Then there is the part which is spent in the UK, about £5 billion. The rest, nearly £7 billion, is simply given to the EU and is a total loss to the British taxpayer.

Third, the £5 billion given back to the UK is spent on EU mandated activities. Some of these, such as EU promotion activities, are plainly wasteful, but

much goes to agricultural subsidy and various social programmes.

That some activities may be considered useful and others wasteful is irrelevant. The question from an accounting viewpoint is whether the gross (less abatement) or the net contribution is the correct figure to consider when assessing the taxpayers' EU burden and identifying the amount to be cut.

The answer is simple. In all aspects of government spending, cuts are considered in relation to what is spent. Secondary and tertiary effects are ignored.

After all, having found out that MPs' expenses include moat-cleaning and wisteria-cutting, the fact that cuts mean moat-cleaners and wisteria-cutters will see a fall in income, and even lose their jobs, is not a reason to continue paying MPs' outrageous expenses.

Quango employees or consultants

spend their incomes on all sorts of expenditure which forms the income of others. All parties are committed to cutting quangocrats and consultants but do not take account that those who receive their income from the expenditure of quangocrats or consultants will lose part of their income.

The same logic should apply to EU contributions. The yardstick on which cuts should be based is the gross contribution (less the abatement).

Certainly, some people in agriculture, some landowners, fake academics such as Jean Monnet professors, those engaged on EU-funded social programmes or promotions, will lose their income or their jobs.

It is impossible to take account of secondary or tertiary affects. The only figure that matters is what is actually spent by the government. Over to you, Mr Cameron.