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Brussels continues to use the "rule of law" formula for political purposes.

The attack on the recent ruling of the Polish Constitutional Court is an example of this.

The Institutions forget a fundamental principle: European integration is achieved through cooperation between countries, not through force or blackmail, which instead of helping, fuel the clash.

It is the national constitutions that legitimize the existence of the European Union and its law, not the other way around.

The EU Court of Justice has jurisdiction to rule on the Polish judicial system only and exclusively in the areas covered by EU legislation, while the organisation of the judiciary and its reforms do not fall within the competence transferred from Poland to the Union.

In the last 30 years, the principle of subsidiarity has been trampled underfoot and it has been decided to force treaties and constitutions with extremely extensive interpretations, with the sole aim of forcibly pursuing European integration, sometimes bypassing national constitutional principles.

The case of Poland is the result of the pressure applied until today.

The EU's hard fist and threats now risk exacerbating the conflict and opening a legal and political Pandora's box.

Brussels, on the other hand, could do with a little self-criticism: as the experience of Brexit should have taught, questioning the principle of sovereignty of Member States leads the Union towards disintegration.

It is the national constitutions that legitimize the existence of the European Union and its law, not the other way around.
Once again, the Parliament seems to be more concerned about the welfare of migrants than the welfare of Europeans.

The debate on refoulements is now irrelevant because the principle of asylum has been misused.

We have forgotten the very definition of a refugee, which according to the Geneva Convention is "any person who has a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion".

Far from it, we welcome millions of migrants, under pretexts that have nothing to do with any "persecution".

As for the rejected asylum seekers, most of the time they are not sent back.

Asylum has simply become an easy immigration pathway.

Nations have the right to turn back illegal migrants to protect their borders and their people.

Even the European Court of Human Rights admitted this in a ruling about Ceuta and Melilla! This is the primary mission of a head of state. It is a sacred duty.
The Polish Constitutional Court has declared some EU laws as unconstitutional.

The judges in Warsaw clarified that the EU laws do not prevail over the national constitutions.

The European institutions just reacted aggressively and try, once again, to blackmail Poland with possible sanctions.

Such behavior is not acceptable.

The gradual transfer of national sovereignty to Brussels must be stopped.

As the ID group, we appreciate that Poland is defending its sovereignty, as well as its (democratically given) constitution, and is insisting on the compliance with the European treaties.

The EU has to accept this and it must recognise that the hearts of democracy and rule of law beat in the Member States, not in Brussels.

By the way, the Spanish Court stated, already in January 2020, that national laws stand above the EU laws.

But the European Commission never threatened the Spanish government, in contrast to the Polish one, with sanctions, cuts of funds or even exclusion from the Union.

Why? Because there is a socialist government in Madrid which fully shares the leftist agenda of the EU.

Another proof of the EU’s double standards and hypocrisy.

The gradual transfer of national sovereignty to Brussels must be stopped.

Jörg Meuthen, 2nd Vice-President ID Group, German Delegation - Alternative für Deutschland
Attending the EU observation mission in Iraq elections has been an honour and a great responsibility.

Together with six other colleagues from different political groups, we have been charged with the task of observing the general elections in Iraq, expressing an opinion about the voting process and its peculiarities.

The Iraq scenario is complex: the country is jeopardised by religious and tribal affiliations, local wars, and widespread corruption.

Moreover, the general elections that we observed - the fifth after the fall of Saddam Hussein’s regime - have been the result of a massive wave of protests, which took place in 2019.

In this election, the most voted party has been the Shiite religious party “Moqtada al-Sadr”, but it is important to underline that the political concept of “majority and minority” is not clearly recognised in Iraq as it is in our own societies.

Nevertheless, we welcome with cautious optimism the statements released by the Sadrist, that might open a season of moderation and peacemaking in the whole country.

Nowadays, helping Iraq consists of helping the local population as well as protecting a heritage of arts and values that are universally distributed.
On Thursday, 7 October, the Polish Constitutional Court ruled that certain articles of the European Union Treaty are not "compatible" with the Polish Constitution.

The European Commission, and even more so the political leaders of some European states, have cried out, complaining about this decision, and indicating that this was a first step towards the "Polexit", to finally reaffirm the primacy of European law over national rights.

This indignation is a legal and ideological farce.

Legal farce, because other countries have reaffirmed the primacy of their constitutions over European law, notably France until the end of the 1980s, and more recently Germany, with the ruling of the Court of Karlsruhe that the Recovery Plan was incompatible with its Constitution.

Ideological, because it is clear that any opportunity is a good one for Brussels progressives to make Poland pay for a policy they abhor: the defense of traditional structures, in the forefront of which is the protection of our borders and the promotion of the traditional family model.

The threat of European law is a denial of democracy, a coup d’état of the European judge on the very expression of a nation. No, the European Union has no vocation to impose its laws on a people who refuse them. No, Poland does not want to make a "Polexit" by recalling that it alone possesses the "competence of the competence", that is to say the right to choose what falls under its sole decision. No, the European Union cannot punish a country because it refuses to accept crazy progressivism.
The Treaty of Schengen stipulates that the external border ought to be protected.

Members of the Schengen Zone that share a border with a non-Schengen country are henceforth obliged to control and guard this border, for they are responsible for the entire Schengen Zone.

It’s therefore astonishing to note that each time a Member State fulfills this obligation, it is reprimanded by the European Union.

During the migration crisis of 2015 Hungary was denounced for its well-grounded approach and now Poland is awaiting the same fate.

Despite all the criticism from Brussels, it is abundantly clear that a solid border protection is necessary and effective to halt mass migration flow.

The autocratic leadership of Turkey and Belarus realize very well how destabilizing mass migration actually is to Europe, so they use it as a tool to weaken our position and to lever more power towards them.

That’s why we absolutely need to protect our borders at all cost. Be it with a border fence, with pushbacks or with both.

We need to stand firmly.

If the mass migration apologetics in Brussels do not allow for a grounded border protection, then the only conclusion to be drawn is that the Schengen mechanism should stop.

This would leave us no other option but to reinstall internal border controls.
The EU owes a lot to its member states and its citizens when it comes to migration policy and the protection of external borders. Instead of consistent repatriations and a strict "no-way" policy, it thinks "legal migration routes" should be found wherever possible. In view of the current situation in Afghanistan, Europe's states fear that scenes like those in 2015 could happen again.

In the context of these events, twelve EU states have written a letter to the Commission calling for the creation of appropriate border barriers. The EU would do well to contribute to their financing, because after all, such measures to protect the common external border benefit the entire Union in preventing illegal migration.

However, such border facilities also send a clear signal to criminal smugglers and migrants. Border closures do not change the basic problem that the EU's external borders are open to anyone who wants to apply for asylum.

Therefore, the EU will not be able to avoid changing the legal basis in such a way that the mass abuse of the right of asylum for the purpose of immigration, which has been going on for years, finally ends.

This can only mean that the Union must also have the means to close its borders and turn back migrants.

This is especially true when states such as Belarus or Turkey use migrants in order to put pressure on the EU or individual member states.

So far this year, 68 percent of asylum applications have been rejected. This means: no refugee status, no right to subsidiary protection, no humanitarian status - in other words, no right to be here. At the same time, deportations hardly work.

In the previous year, not even one fifth of the people who received instructions to leave the EU did so. Therefore, it is high time to end this asylum and migration disaster and seriously secure the external borders.
I fundamentally disagree with the arguments put forward by members of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety and the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development.

The farmer-to-consumer text is completely hypocritical since it recommends measures that would undermine the exact objectives it seeks to achieve.

For example, it talks about affordable food with minimal need for imports while protecting the environment in non-EU countries, and at the same time proposes measures that will reduce production, the need for long-distance imports and further destruction of natural resources outside Europe.

The report talks about preventing the depopulation of rural areas and rural development, while promoting pastoralism instead of intensive agriculture, which feeds significantly fewer people.

The report warns against reducing soil fertility while insisting on reduced fertilizer use and livestock farming. A large number of such examples can be mentioned.

The report operates with nonsensical terms such as "non-chemical pesticides".

The report suggests "that it is necessary to ensure that every agricultural worker is able to access official documentation on the type of pesticides used during his work", although it is nonsense to expect that a supported type of individual farmer can have universal training to assess documentation. And so on.
The ruling of the Constitutional Tribunal of Poland was a great victory for the supporters of independent nation states.

It is evident that in the constitution of a nation always has primacy, not EU law.

First of all, the EU treaties do not even mention the primacy of EU law.

The principle of primacy has been decided by the EU court itself.

Many countries in the EU are corrupt and have huge problems, but the EU is only using its energy to attack Poland and Hungary.

Poland has been under attack because it does not take the Euro currency, does not accept migrants from the third world and protects its borders.

The EU should focus on abiding its own rules, democracy and free market economy and not try to take power from the Member States.
States have the sovereign right to determine who enters their territory and who gets to stay.

This is one of the fundamental characteristics of statehood. This means that States are free to protect their borders and defend their territorial sovereignty.

Although the human rights of migrants need to be considered in this process, it is often forgotten that a State also has the responsibility to protect the human rights of its own citizens, and, as is the case with all rights, the rights of citizens and those of migrants have to be balanced.

A state’s first and foremost responsibility is to protect its citizens, as the citizens are the source of a State’s sovereignty.

If thousands of illegal migrants are allowed to enter a Member State, they have the potential to threaten the socio-economic and physical wellbeing and rights of the citizens of that country.

The reason why we have to rely on pushbacks, is because once these illegal migrants enter the territory of a Member State, it becomes extremely difficult to return them to their countries of origin.

The reality is that the EU cannot be a haven for each and every person who has the wish to come to Europe.
Turkey is still officially a candidate country to join the European Union.

It was an enormous mistake by the EU to accept that candidacy. First of all, Turkey is not a European country. It is also not a democracy: the Erdogan regime is persecuting minorities and violating the principle of freedom of speech. Moreover, as there are no more internal borders within the EU, the accession of Turkey would lead to a huge and uncontrollable migration flow towards Europe.

Making things even worse: Turkey is posing a threat to the security and sovereignty of EU Member States such as Greece and Cyprus. Erdogan is also supporting Islamist terrorist groups in Syria, Iraq, Nagorno-Karabach, Libya, etc.

The unacceptable provocations by the Erdogan regime should not be rewarded by continuing endless and pointless accession negotiations with Turkey. Therefore the Identity and Democracy Group (ID) in the European Parliament wants these negotiations to be put to an end. The ‘pre-accession’ money flow to Turkey should also be stopped.

Support the common sense position of the ID Group and sign the petition here!
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 70 members in the European Parliament, coming from 10 countries: Italy, France, Germany, Austria, Flanders (Belgium), Czech Republic, Finland, Denmark, Estonia, the Netherlands.