While the war in Ukraine continues and has become a crucial topic of debate in the European institutions, last week we witnessed a very dark page in the history of democracy in the Eurochamber.

The drama of a conflict in which human lives are at stake has not stopped the partisan pettiness of the political parties in the Parliament, unfortunately still committed to carrying out their senseless "cordon sanitaire".

On the 1st of March, the European Parliament met in an Extraordinary Plenary to vote on a resolution on 'The Russian aggression against Ukraine'. Despite the fact that the ID group had already participated in intergroup negotiations, it was excluded from drafting and signing the motion for a resolution.

The obstructionism of the left-wing groups has jeopardized the opportunity for all the political forces to stand united in denouncing the Russian aggression and supporting the Ukrainian people, with the explicit intention of casting a shadow over the position of Identity and Democracy.

With a sense of responsibility, we decided to be the ones to give a sign of unity regarding such a dramatic event, by voting in favour of the resolution in plenary.

War should not leave space for political squabbles, and we acknowledge the irresponsibility of such behaviour from other political groups.

As the ID Group, we will continue to work for diplomacy to take the place of bombs and destruction.

Marco ZANNI, President ID Group
On 1 January 2022, France took over the Presidency of the Council of the European Union. Emmanuel Macron is already seeking to use this presidency to further his presidential campaign. Yet his record is damning: he and his allies have turned Europe into Washington's backyard, Beijing's prey, Erdogan's doormat and Africa's hotel.

In a recent press conference, he announced that he wanted to push forward the European Pact on Migration. This Pact organises a real legal coup d'état since, under the guise of harmonising rules, the European Union is going to deprive nations of the right to define their own migration policy. This Pact will blur the notion of refugees and migrants, introduce family reunification extended to brothers and sisters, force countries to carry out forced relocations, restrict the possibilities of deportation, and encourage NGOs in their role as accomplices of smugglers.

Clearly, Emmanuel Macron wants to deprive States and peoples of the last of the rights they have left, that of deciding who enters and who leaves their country, whereas his priority should be to re-establish borders in France and to set up borders in Europe.

Will Europe still be Europe tomorrow if, as in Cologne, the muezzin's call sets the rhythm of the day? Will it still be Europe if, as in Belgian or Dutch cities, a majority of inhabitants pledge allegiance to the King of Morocco or to Sultan Erdogan? And finally, if, as in so many parts of France, another civilisation takes hold and with it a relationship to women that is foreign to us?

In five years at the head of France, Emmanuel Macron has allowed the authority of the state to be challenged, the sovereignty of the nation to be weakened, and the identity and freedoms of the people to be attacked. All that will remain of his promises of a new world are his bullying, his humiliations, his cynicism and his contempt, which will have contributed to making the people sad, to weakening their vital force, to making them doubt the future, to making them doubt themselves.

At a time when France needs to shine again to express its power, he has extinguished its light. How, with such a disastrous record, can he now pose as the unifier of Europe? Next April, all our European friends will observe the French presidential election with one hope, for France as well as for Europe: that Emmanuel Macron's mandate remains unique.
When interpreting the concept of the rule of law, the EU institutions have very wide discretionary powers

Gunnar Beck, 2nd Vice-President ID Group

The European Court of Justice ruled that the Commission can rightfully deny the disbursement of European funds based on the so-called rule of law criteria. Specifically, payments to Hungary and Poland may now be withheld because both states are accused of endangering the independence and impartiality of the judiciary. With its ruling, the Court redefines the rule of law in three ways:

First, the Court follows an ultra-flexible interpretation of the Treaties in contradiction to Articles 31 and 32 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. This means that the ECJ does not give priority to the wording, but often prefers other interpretation criteria which favour a more pro-EU integration result. The contracts are interpreted contrary to the wording. Right is what the judges say it is.

Second, there is no legal basis in the treaties for conditionality in the allocation of budget funds on the basis of a universal EU competence to enforce the rule of law. According to the principle of conferral, all competences remain with the Member States unless they have been expressly and exclusively transferred to the EU. The judiciary and even fundamental rights are not such subjects. It would seem that as of now, the rule of law is not exempt from the principle of conferral.

Third, the alleged breach of the rule of law concerns political control over the judiciary. Yet all that Poland is doing, is mimicking the German system, where constitutional judges are political appointees, judges can be members of political parties, prosecutors are bound by political directives, and the current president of the Constitutional Court is a former vice-leader of Mrs. Merkel parliamentary group. The Court has therefore officialised a double standard, where “new” Member States undergo stricter scrutiny than the founding Member States.

There is no legal basis in the treaties for conditionality in the allocation of budget funds on the basis of a universal EU competence to enforce the rule of law.
Energy prices spiked after the Russian aggression against Kiev, and Europe is facing the concrete risk of an energy crisis, which could blow up during the next winter, endangering our industrial capacity and social stability.

Nevertheless, this alarming and hateful aggression comes after a few months of price instability and increases, which have highlighted the complete inconsistency of the European energy policies realized until today.

First of all, Europe couldn't develop an energy mix autonomous enough to be able to resist such an external shock as the one brought up firstly by the pandemic and, lately, by the ongoing war.

Second, we should not forget that the current political agenda on the green transition has contributed to weakening our capacity to boost and renovate rapidly our energy mix in an autonomous way.

Even if we now bought LGN from other countries to replace Russian supplies, we would need plenty of time to build up the necessary infrastructures to transfer it into the distribution network.

As a consequence, we are urged by the events to change the timetable of the European green transition, rescheduling Europe's ambitions to come to terms with reality.

We are concerned that the majority of the Parliament would refrain from taking this strong decision, and that it will take a long time before they will understand how bad the situation is getting. The faster we act, the better.

We have years of mistakes and no concrete position on a common energy policy. It's time to take a step forward.
TOWARDS A BETTER SUPERVISION OF NGO’S

Hélène LAPORTE, French Delegation

On the pretext of defending civil society organisations supposedly at risk in the EU, this report actually promotes progressive associations. The stakes are high because the European Commission receives requests from a multiplicity of civil society actors on the issues in its portfolios.

More than 12,600 different entities are listed in the Commission's transparency register, each with a budget and staff dedicated to the interests they represent. There are almost 3,450 NGOs.

The intertwining of these organisations with globalist political currents is a widespread fact. In contrast to corporate lobbying, their influencing activities remain little or undocumented.

Notably, it is the NGOs themselves that sometimes claim their success. Their influence is such that their expertise is sometimes incorporated into certain portfolios - the example of Transparency International is one of the best illustrations.

The influence of NGOs in EU policy-making needs to be better regulated as a matter of urgency.

Among the improvements, it would be desirable to carry out a European audit on the influence of non-European foundations in order to know their legitimacy to influence the decisions that will apply to European citizens and to highlight the conflicts of interest between the proposals of certain NGOs and their founders.
States have always sought to attract immigrants with great wealth or special skills. Since citizenship is one of the core issues of state sovereignty, nation states must be allowed to decide on this freely and independently.

On the other hand, it is a completely different question whether persons who obtain residence rights or citizenship in one EU Member State should also automatically have access to other European Member States.

Here, too, each member should decide for itself. The Ukraine war in particular shows how problematic the extremely generous granting of citizenship and golden visas to Russian oligarchs was. The same applies to African dictators and Chinese party billionaires. Undesirables who have bought their way into the EU, as it were, should not enjoy freedom of movement. This would also drastically reduce the corruptive granting of citizenship to such persons as seen in some Member States.

Moreover, a distinction must be made according to whether the persons actually live in their new homeland or not. If they do, the freedom of movement of the Schengen area also applies to them.

The situation is different for purely financial investments, i.e. without permanent residence in the country. Here, freedom of movement could be linked to the sustainability of the investment and the long-term benefit for the labour market. The one-time acquisition of real estate or company shares should not justify freedom of movement. Investments in the preservation of historical buildings or in farms, for example, could be assessed differently.

There are numerous intelligent approaches here, which can also be staggered over time.

Since citizenship is one of the core issues of state sovereignty, nation states must be allowed to decide on this freely and independently.
DEMOCRACY NOT JURISTOCRACY

Tom VANDENDRIESSCHE, Flemish Delegation

European values are under attack. The executive branch puts pressure on the judiciary to achieve a political objective. Judges and executives seem closely related and belonging to the same political clique. The separation of powers is being undermined. The executive usurps powers it does not actually have. The democratic rule of law is being violated.

This summary does not relate to any ongoing situation in a Member State concerning the rule of law, but the very functioning of the current EU institutions and the consequences of the recent ECJ ruling.

Late February the ECJ cleared the way for the Commission to withhold payments to Poland and Hungary. When a Member State now does not meet the European imposed threshold of the “rule of law”, the Commission is free to financially blackmail Member States.

The infringement proceedings were initiated by the Commission on the basis of rulings by the Polish Constitutional Court. It wanted to financially punish Poland for allegedly interfering with the functioning of the judiciary. Poland could only avoid punishment by interfering with the workings of the judiciary. In order to impose the financial penalty, the Commission instructed its own judiciary to make an ‘independent’ judgment, curtailing the independence of the courts to achieve a political objective. The paradoxical nature of the request seems lost on the Commission.

This ruling highlights the ongoing trend within the European institutions: re-defining democratic principles in order to centralize power. By doing so, the institutions are rapidly degrading into a European superstate. In their lust for power, however, they seem to forget the core principle on which they are built: the principle of subsidiarity. The Commission can only act insofar as Member States agree. By forgetting their raison d’être, the logical conclusion is that national states will start to re-evaluate that right to exist.
WHERE IS THE TRANSPARENCY?

Harald VILIMSKY, Austrian Delegation

The President of the EU Commission, Ursula von der Leyen is apparently doing everything she can to ensure that her mobile phone communication with Pfizer boss Albert Bourla does not come to light.

The Commission's position is that short messages are "in principle excluded" from document collection. This has now also brought EU Ombudsman O'Reilly onto the scene, who sharply criticises this behaviour. She speaks of a "maladministration" and said that the "expectations of the Commission's transparency and administrative standards" had not been met.

The matter is exciting in any case: because of the text messages between von der Leyen and Bourla, the EU ordered 1.8 billion doses of the Pfizer vaccine in May 2021, 900 million of the current vaccine and another 900 million of a vaccine adapted to Covid variants.

Now Omicron is the dominant variant. This makes the 900 million of the current vaccine de facto obsolete. Too little efficacy against Omicron, and with the development of an adapted vaccine, which Pfizer has announced for March, only a slow seller.

We want a transparent EU administration, where everything is laid out on the table, especially in the case of such important and comprehensive contracts as the vaccine procurement.

The Commission has disclosed both the preliminary agreement and the purchase contract, but all the essential details are blacked out.

If transparency is considered so sacred and is constantly propagated, the EU Commission should also adhere to it.

It is not acceptable that such delicate transactions, involving millions of European taxpayers' money, are simply obscured. Particularly in this plenary week, this grievance should be clearly pointed out in the debate on transparency.

Harald Vilimsky, Head of Austrian Delegation - Freiheitliche Partei Österreich
ENERGY SELF-SUFFICIENCY IS ALSO DEFENSE SELF-SUFFICIENCY

Laura HUHTASAARI, Finnish Delegation

Due to inflation in the Eurozone, energy prices have gone up. The ECB is using the printer but there is no doubt that this will have an end.

Recent times have shown that energy supply is a very sensitive issue and things can quickly change.

Making the EU "greener" means that it is also more vulnerable, as the current political situation shows.

Therefore, the EU should postpone its objective to become "greener" and make sure that the economy does not suffer too much. Sudden shocks may change everything.

With regard to nuclear energy, it should be part of the palette.

Many countries need to rethink their strategies and it is correct to do so. In Finland, peat production and the use of peat for energy has been a big subject for discussion, and now everybody sees that those who have been in favour of diverse energy production have been right.

When a country is self-sufficient in energy it is stronger and can better defend itself.
We are concerned that the Court is pursuing a political programme for the further integration of Europe through judicial activism, whereby the Court is not interpreting the law as it is, but rather bending it to reach a pre-determined normative outcome in favour of its own political agenda.

Hungary and Poland brought a case before the Court asking for a judicial review of the legality of the regulation, but their respective cases were dismissed.

The ID Group has also tabled a resolution on this topic, expressing its concern that this regulation will be used for political purposes by the Commission to punish Member States that do not subscribe to leftist ideologies, just like article 7 proceedings are currently being instrumentalised for political purposes against Poland and Hungary.

We are of the opinion that the Court had to employ legal gymnastics to conclude that the implementation of this regulation would not result in a second punishment mechanism.
STOP THE UNFAIR RISE IN ENERGY PRICES DUE TO EU POLICIES!

CLICK HERE TO SIGN OUR PETITION

With its Green Deal, the EU will make energy prices even higher. Due to rising demand, prices are soaring and our external suppliers are taking advantage of it.

Our energy sovereignty is under threat.

We are waiting for the European Commission, who is so quick to give lessons to all Europeans, to explain to us how ordinary people will be able to heat their homes in the winter, or use their cars.

The EU Commission needs to drop its unrealistic and expensive plans!

Support us by signing this petition [here](#) and sharing it with your friends!
FOLLOW US ON SOCIAL MEDIA

Visit our website www.idgroup.eu and sign up to our Newsletter!
Defending the identity of peoples and the sovereignty of nations!

The Identity and Democracy group, founded in June 2019, has 65 members in the European Parliament, coming from 10 countries: Italy, France, Germany, Austria, Flanders (Belgium), Czech Republic, Finland, Denmark, Estonia, the Netherlands.
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