

**THE LISBON TREATY MEANS MORE WASTEFUL  
MILITARISATION AND SENSELESS WARS**



**VOTE NO FOR PEACE**

**For further information see - [www.irishantiwar.org](http://www.irishantiwar.org)**

<<http://www.irishantiwar.org>> or contact

Richard Boyd Barrett, Chair IAWM, Mobile 087 6329511

Michael Youlton, Co Chair IAWM, Mobile 086 8159487

Jim Roche, Steering Committee IAWM, Mobile 087 6472737

**VOTE**

**NO**

**to WAR  
NATO and  
the LISBON TREATY**



**DON'T BE FOOLED BY MEANINGLESS, NON-BINDING 'GUARANTEES'  
VOTE NO FOR A PEACEFUL, SOCIAL EUROPE**

**Irish Anti-War Movement**

**[www.irishantiwar.org](http://www.irishantiwar.org)**

## WAR, EU MILITARISATION, NATO AND THE LISBON TREATY

### The Lisbon Treaty:

- imposes more military spending by all EU member states
- allows former colonial powers to dominate EU defence policy
- reinforces EU-NATO links hence U.S. influence over EU foreign policy
- creates a new EU common defence policy that further undermines Irish neutrality
- obliges Ireland to aid and assist other EU countries in military conflicts
- will lead to more horrific wars such as those inflicted on Iraq, Afghanistan and Gaza

### The 'Guarantees'

The Government and other 'Yes' campaigners claim that the concerns of the 'No' side in Ireland have been addressed by the provision of 'guarantees' or 'assurances'. This is not true. These are just meaningless political promises that are not legally binding. Many on the 'Yes' side and European Leaders admit that the Treaty has not changed. Therefore we are being asked to vote again on the same issues that we have already rejected. The 'guarantees' are also vague - one notes that "*The Union's action on the international scene is guided by ... the principles of the UN Charter and international law*", but yet there is no UN mandate required by the Treaty for EU military intervention to occur.

We are also voting for our fellow Europeans who have been denied their right to vote on this Treaty.

None of the key issues of - the increased militarisation of the EU, the legitimisation of NATO as part of an EU defence policy, obligations by all EU states to increase military spending and the erosion of an active Irish neutrality - have changed since the Irish people first rejected the Lisbon Treaty.

### Implications of the Lisbon Treaty for those who seek a demilitarised and peaceful world

**Mutual defence clause:** through the Common Defence Policy (CDP) or Permanent Structured Cooperation (PSC) Articles 28A and 188R of the Lisbon Treaty clearly oblige all member states including Ireland to assist "by all means in its power" any member state that is attacked even if that member state is involved in illegal wars. These articles also ally Ireland with countries that have aggressive policies of 'first use' of nuclear weapons.

**More military spending:** the creation of the European Defence Agency (EDA), driven principally by the European Arms Industry, gives for the first time in any EU Treaty, formal constitutional status to a body whose main aim is to increase defence

budgets across the EU, ensure compatibility of weaponry among member states and plan for future resource wars and other military adventures. It will commit all EU states including Ireland to increased military spending: Article 28a could not be clearer on this issue - "*member states shall undertake progressively to improve their military capabilities*".

This serious undertaking of increased military expenditure required under Lisbon is in stark contrast with huge cutbacks in public services such as health, education and public transport as recession deepens across Europe.

**Closer links with NATO:** Article 27 legitimises NATO as part of the common defence of Europe for those member states that so choose and gives the US more influence over EU foreign policy. This constitutional backing for NATO implicates Ireland in immoral and illegal wars such as those in Iraq and Afghanistan. Ireland already has seven troops working under NATO command in Afghanistan and will be further sucked in to NATO's military activities if the Lisbon Treaty is ratified.

**EU Battle Groups:** the Lisbon Treaty creates a legal basis for these Rapid Reaction Forces and Article 28 greatly widens the range of tasks that they may undertake - all of which amount to making war. The terms *conscriptio* and *EU army* are irrelevant distractions. The fact is that, under Lisbon, EU Battle Groups will be legitimised to make war wherever they choose.

**Erosion of Ireland's neutrality:** by committing Ireland to increased defence spending and other acts of 'structural cooperation' with militaristic EU member states, the Lisbon Treaty further erodes Ireland's potential to be an active neutral state. Even if Irish troops do not participate physically in certain wars Ireland will be part of a planning and logistical process that contribute to such wars. Ireland has not taken part physically in the war in Iraq, yet it has legitimised it by facilitating US troops at Shannon Airport. The Lisbon Treaty will deepen Ireland's involvement in militaristic adventures. Ireland should promote peace and be against military aggression - it cannot do this being part of a militaristic structure.

### But can't Ireland 'opt out' of all this militarisation?

This refers to the so-called 'Triple Lock' mechanism that allows Ireland to assess which military operations it partakes of based on approval by the Security Council of the UN, agreement of Irish Government and approval of Dáil Eireann. This ignores the back door commitments allowed for in Article 28, it assumes that the UN Security Council has some credibility regarding making peace and also assumes that the Irish Government and the Dáil will vote for peace and not war. But the Irish Government has shown disdain for a peaceful approach in the past. It joined EDA in 2004 and the NATO dominated Partnership for Peace in 1999. It refused a Dáil debate on the use of Shannon Airport by the US military in 2003 and has since then assisted the Iraq war by allowing over 1.5 million US Troops to pass through Shannon. We should have no faith in the Triple Lock mechanism.