



CHATHAM HOUSE

Chatham House, 10 St James's Square, London SW1Y 4LE

T: +44 (0)20 7957 5700 E: contact@chathamhouse.org

F: +44 (0)20 7957 5710 www.chathamhouse.org

Charity Registration Number: 208223

Transcript

Launch of the Chatham House- YouGov Survey 2012

The Rt Hon Lord Ashdown of Norton-sub-Hamdon

Co-President, Chatham House

Baroness Neville-Jones of Hutton Roof

UK Government Special Representative to Brussels on Cyber Security

Jonathan Powell

CEO, Inter Mediate; Downing Street Chief of Staff (1997-2007)

Chair: Dr Robin Niblett

Director, Chatham House

11 July 2012

The views expressed in this document are the sole responsibility of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the view of Chatham House, its staff, associates or Council. Chatham House is independent and owes no allegiance to any government or to any political body. It does not take institutional positions on policy issues. This document is issued on the understanding that if any extract is used, the author(s)/ speaker(s) and Chatham House should be credited, preferably with the date of the publication or details of the event. Where this document refers to or reports statements made by speakers at an event every effort has been made to provide a fair representation of their views and opinions, but the ultimate responsibility for accuracy lies with this document's author(s). The published text of speeches and presentations may differ from delivery.

Dr Robin Niblett:

Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to Chatham House. There are some seats on the other side over there, there are some seats down here, I think we should...we should have plenty of room. Thank you very much for joining us today for this launch of the third Chatham House-YouGov survey on British attitudes to the UK's international ambitions, choices, and dilemmas, one might say, today.

This meeting, self-evidently, is not under the Chatham House rule; it is on the record. We are going to really have a conversation, I think, I am delighted that I could have three such interesting and experienced people to come and join us today for this conversation about the poll. Inevitably, as with polls and analyses, they are having to quickly run their way through them early this morning, or probably late last night, or one or the other, in terms of the data, but I wanted to say we have provided a... what I am going to call an 'early release version' of the poll, none of the data is changed, but there is a slightly tidier version up on the website, and hardcopies of that will be coming later with things like 'Lib Dem' hyphenated in the right place; but the data you have there before you is the data, as is the data and the analysis.

And in addition, up on the website, you will get a full set of the results in their raw form if you want to access them. And a little later on this afternoon, I suspect after about 2:30pm, there will be an interactive capacity on the website where you can go in and go through the questions and divide them up in different structures by age, gender, parts of the country, voting preference etc. So, hopefully you will be able to take not just what we say – either on this panel, or what we have written up in an analysis of it – but draw your own conclusions of what you think some of the main insights and conclusions are.

We are going to finish at 1:30pm on the dot. I am sorry we are starting just a couple of minutes late, but we do want to have a conversation on some of the main points with my guests here today, and then give a chance for some of you to maybe ask questions as well from the audience. So, please make sure your mobile phones are off that will help us all keep focused here today for our discussion. I have with me Jonathan – I think all three people are known to you here – but Jonathan Powell who was chief of staff to Tony Blair from 1995 to 2007, has served in the British diplomatic service prior to that, is now CEO of Inter Mediate, an NGO which is involved in some particularly interesting parts of the world on conflict resolution. Whenever I see you, Jonathan, you are just back from some difficult part of the world trying to see

if you can bring that to a sustainable conclusion. So, delighted to have you with us.

Lord Ashdown:

Can you help us with the Coalition, do you think? [Laughter]

Dr Robin Niblett:

Sorry?

Jonathan Powell:

Some things are beyond reach. [Laughter]

Dr Robin Niblett:

We also have with us Baroness Pauline Neville-Jones, I think again known to everyone here, a very distinguished career in the foreign service having served as political director, as chairman of the Joint Intelligence Committee, as deputy secretary in the Cabinet, and head of defence in the overseas secretariat. She was a member of the government as minister for security for the first year of the government, and is now the prime minister's special representative to business on cyber security. Amongst other things, was also very actively involved, and spoke here on at least two occasions, Pauline, with the whole conceiving of the Conservative Party's position on security going forwards, and some very interesting reports, which still make good reading, I might add, today. I am glad you could join us.

And Paddy Ashdown, who I should say most importantly is one of our three presidents of Chatham House, but I think known to everyone here not only for having been leader of the Liberal Democrats within parliament and now obviously in the House of Lords, but also played some very important international roles, the High Representative of the international community and the EU Special Representative to Bosnia and Herzegovina, amongst others.

But I should do less on the introductions, and get more to the conversation. And I think I wanted to touch on three points in particular here, and maybe I will kind of run along in this track, Jonathon, if you don't mind, and start with you. This is a pretty comprehensive survey, which is good and bad; bad in the

sense it is, you know, everyone is trying to pull out different messages from it. We will get to one of the main themes of this year's survey, which is Europe, in a minute.

But, I suppose a little bit as we have done in our analysis of the survey, we wanted to start just a little bit on British attitudes to where the UK is in the world, what are the main risks, fears in general that the country faces, and it is interesting to note that again this year – and this is obviously the third year we have done the survey – at the public level, it is a very defensive attitude to the world out there, it is fear about terrorism still, proliferation, cyber, organized crime. Second on the public level was financial instability, but it came down a little bit further on the list. On our opinion formers – and you will see on our survey here that we have a second track of opinion former views – there the financial crisis was very much at the top, worries about climate and energy, a far softer agenda, you might say, was there. From your experience from being in government and so on, is this just business as usual, or do you think in a way there is a greater feeling of uncertainty, insecurity that has permeating the country as a whole? And how does this tally with your period in government?

Jonathan Powell:

Well, I am on the whole fairly sceptical about polls on foreign policy because people don't usually pay a lot of attention to foreign policy, they very sensibly employ other people to do that for them. But I think this is an unusually interesting poll – I would recommend everyone to read it in full – it has got some very good questions and some interesting and slightly surprising answers.

You can tell when it was done, because... in the middle of the football, because Ukraine has gone from nowhere to the second most unpopular country in Europe [laughter], which I think will probably be reversed by next year. It does show that we are at least European in one respect, which is the great division between the elites and the public. If you look at the opinion poll on pretty much every subject, the elites, who are the second half of the poll and if you look at the bit towards the end there is a useful comparison at the end between the two sides, the elites are, for example, much more pro-European, they are against leaving the EU, whereas the public are for leaving it. On aid they take a different view, they see the financial crisis as the problem rather than terrorism. So, there is a definite distinction between elites and public opinion on foreign policy in this.

I do think the polls really are invaluable for people in government, they are the sort of positioning you need to work out where things are, but they are absolutely useless if you try and follow them in making your foreign policy. And the whole point about this poll, and particularly when we get onto Europe, is what we actually need is a bit of leadership on foreign policy. So, you start from where the opinion polls are, so you know where people are, but you offer leadership because you can change people's minds. That is the main thing that I would like to say about it.

Dr Robin Niblett:

Pauline, what do you think in that sense, some overview comments about the poll? I think it is interesting that... this is a government that has come in and talked very much about needing to be pragmatic, interest-based on foreign policy, distinctive maybe – to use the prime minister's phrase – because it is going to be very interest-based and thinking a lot about Britain's commercial needs *et cetera* internationally. I think it is interesting that the public certainly seem to agree with that interest-based approach. We have got kind of 47% of the public talking about British foreign policy should pursue Britain's national interests at all times, whereas it being based *in part* on ethical considerations was down at 37%. So, do you think that that interest-based approach that the government has come in with is one that you see reflected in some of the data you see here, and so on?

Baroness Neville-Jones:

Well, I am not sure which was around it is. I mean, I would be interested to see what the figures in previous polls showed about that particular discrepancy, or that particular difference was between ethics and interests. My suspicion is that the public think really it is interests, and probably steadily thought that it was interests.

One of the things I think is interesting about this is that on the whole, it seems to me, not to show much change, and I recognize these attitudes as I read them. I think that you made the point... you said it was a defensive attitude on the part of the public, I'm not sure that I would characterize it that way. I think that part of the interest-based approach is, well, you know, the first thing, the top thing that I want, you know, is to be safe at home. I want the country to be properly defended, which accounts for the respect for the armed forces, which is not the same as saying military intervention abroad is a good idea. I think also that experience of terrorism and, of course, what the government has

said about the top risks to the country. Now, you may say that government got it wrong, but I think there has been some resonance in the general public about that. Why they rate the financial... or why the general public rates the financial instability as less important I think is a good question. I think... personally, I think it is very serious and I think that, that may be a lack yet of real understanding of the extent and gravity of the crisis, and the extent to which the UK outside the euro, which I think a lot of people regard as a protection against it, only takes you a little of the way and thereafter you are subject to the affects of crisis, and indeed, we have one of our own. So, I think that has to do with... I'd be interested to know what the poll looks like next year when people have absorbed more.

The only other thing I would say about the poll is that I do think it would be very nice to get a question in about 'is the country moving in the right direction?' You know, that's an old American question, because... that tells you quite a lot about how people sum up the situation because while people say, 'this foreign policy hasn't made much difference', does that really mean they don't see any differences or is it... are they really saying, as they would in domestic policy, 'have things got better?' To which the answer is no, things on the whole are at best the same, in certain really serious respects they've actually gotten worse.

Dr Robin Niblett:

I think a very fair point on the 'right direction' question. As you say, that is very much used in the US polling in that sense.

Paddy, if I could turn to you for a second; what would be some of your main kind of opening takeaways?

Lord Ashdown:

Well, I am going to agree, if I may, with both my colleagues on the panel for a bit. First of all, Jonathan, he is absolutely right; if you treat polls sensibly, you realize you should not treat them as statics, you treat them as dynamics. Polls tell you where you are, they don't tell you where you can get to. I just wish that Tony Blair had had the same view when he was in Downing Street about some of the key things we used to argue about in 1997, I used to say to him time and again, 'But Tony, don't you realize, that is where you are now, what you can do is change that.' So, that is, I think, a very important point behind this poll.

The second thing is that let's accept it: we are now dealing with a deeply frightened, scared bloody stiff electorate, who can be surprised? The terms of our existence in the world have fundamentally changed against us; our economy is in a disastrous state; those whom we ought to be respecting to believe in the process of government of our country – and I don't just mean politicians, I also mean bankers and journalists – turn out to be charlatans. The world reminds me of a line from Larkin, which said, 'Britain', or actually it said, 'England: people with a cast of crooks and tarts.' Of course they are bloody frightened, and who wouldn't be in the circumstances?

And the big problem in the next election is that that is what you are going to be dealing with, beyond anything else you are going to be dealing with a deeply frightened electorate. And a frightened electorate capable of being frightened into some very uncomfortable places unless people make an attempt otherwise, and I want to speak in a minute about why they ought to be frightened about foreign affairs. I mean, my concern [inaudible] government's position – and I have the glorious ability to speak outside the government – I have very adequate... a very good foreign secretary, but a very conventional one, and a very conventional foreign office, and I think what you need now is some new thinking about the world, and I will touch on some of that in just a moment.

So, I'm not surprised that they are frightened, and they are going to go on being frightened doing things the way we have been doing them now; lack of imagination about what we should be doing, and lack of acting in a way that it generates trust, in those whom decisions affect, amongst the people...in the people who make them.

The third point, and it is Jonathan's and I will touch upon it briefly, is the elites. It is very remarkably, although I don't think it is new – Pauline has said it – that there is a gap between the wider public – as it were the people foolish enough to read *The Daily Mail* and *The Sun* – and what you might call the elites of the cognoscenti. Well, that is not surprising either because the elites have made a spectacular failure to even attempt to lead the public in the last five or ten years, for instance, about the issue of Europe. I am not at all surprised – in fact, I'm rather encouraged – that the figures in this poll aren't much, much worse in the complete absence of almost anybody in a senior position to argue the case for Europe, and the complete abdication, failure of leadership, in the face of the headlines of the popular press pointing in the opposite direction. And if you do that, you will get the elites saying, 'Look, I happen to know this is a jolly good thing,' but if they don't make an attempt to

persuade the public it is a jolly good thing you are going to get the find of gap that is illustrated here; not a good sign, by the way.

And the last one is the point about interests and ethics. Look, I think foreign policy always comes down to interests not ethics. There are times when the two will coincide, hooray, and that is a jolly wonderful moment when they do. But the bottom line is that it is always about interests, but I think you need to look at interests in a slightly longer-term perspective. There is also enlightened self-interest; why do you give aid? Because one of the drivers for war, from which we, as a medium-sized country will suffer more in the future is poverty, deprivation and hopelessness in the poorest world; that is in our interests. It is making that connection that matters.

But I want to come back to a central point that I will make in a minute – not now because we are on opening statements – it is this: that I think that we are coming in... remember the words of [Lord] Castlerough – or was it Canning, I can never remember [laughter], but I know the words, so what the hell, I'll pretend they are mine in a minute, if you're not careful – he used to say in the 19th century, a period of a multi-polar world – let's come back to that in a moment – a period of shifting alliances, of much more subtle foreign policy: Britain has fixed interests, but not fixed allies. [Actual quotation: Great Britain has no friends, only interests.'] And I think that is really crucial for a world...

Baroness Neville-Jones:

I thought it was [Viscount] Palmerston [UK prime minister 1859-1865].

Lord Ashdown:

If it was Palmerston even better because he was a Liberal. [Laughter] But I think that is the dominant feature of the world we are about to move into: a multi-polar world in which the era of permanent, fixed alliances is gone and we are going to have to start of thinking of foreign policy much more based on a subtle series of alliances to achieve particular interests, with some bedfellows you are not going to feel comfortable about with... about because they don't share out values. And if we had a foreign policy that addressed that, we would have one that seems to me a little more in tune with the times that these polls measure.

Dr Robin Niblett:

Well, just on that last point for a second, I think one of the stunning, kind of, figures in the poll, which appears later on is attitudes to: 'Which country is going to be the world's leading power in 20 years time?' Maybe, again, it is what you would expect, but to see that 47% saying that today the US is the world's leading power, China 29%, but in 20 years time, 46% putting China there and only 15% putting the US there, and how are we going to make the adjustment to that shift? And this is a public perception, not an elite perception.

Lord Ashdown:

May I chip in straight away and say that that judgment is wrong in two areas. First of all, I know a little about China since I studied Chinese when I was younger and I spent a bit of a...you know, part of my life learning about the culture and the history. Those that say China is there [indicates low] yesterday and straight line there [indicates high] tomorrow have completely missed a key point, which is China having liberalized their economy now has to liberalize their society, and that will be an extremely turbulent and disturbing period – it always have been in China's past – and will be, the signs of it are very evident. I think China will get to that position of superpower status, but I think that the graph looks much more like this than a straight line on.

My second point is the country that is dominant is, of course, important, but it is not as important as a really important fact: the last 50 years have been lived under a mono-polar system. All compass needles in the world, whether for or against, had to point to Washington [DC] as the definition of their position; for us it was in favour, for others it was against. In a mono-polar world bestrode by a single colossus, politics is fixed, alliances are fixed, that is what NATO...because there is only one thing that matters: it is your relation with the dominant superpower that, as I said, bestrides the world like a colossus.

If you are moving into a multi-polar world – and that is, I think the reality behind this, China, India, Brazil – you are moving, and I think Washington understands this better than London, then you are in a wholly different situation. You are in a situation that looks much more like Europe in the 19th century – hence the Palmerston/Canning/Castlerough quote – than the world in the last 50 years that we are used to. And increasingly we are going to

achieve Britain's foreign interests by making short-term alliances to achieve the things that we want.

Allow me to give two very simple examples, just very simple. One, answer this question anybody in the room who thinks they can: how many Chinese troops serving under a multilateral flag under the UN command in the world today, anybody know?

Audience Member:

Two thousand.

Lord Ashdown:

No. Actually, mostly people say 'none', but it is 3700 in the Congo and in Liberia where they are interested in preserving the peace. Are we interested in that, guys? Yes, we are. What is the largest naval contingent fighting the Somali pirates to keep the sea-lanes open today? The Chinese. Why? Because they want to keep the sea-lanes open for the same reasons as we do. Do we share a short-term interest in them? Yes, we do. Do we share values with them? No, we don't; and the luxury of a period in which we have alliances with those with whom you share values is over. That, I think, is the reality of foreign policy we have to address.

Dr Robin Niblett:

Sounds like the Coalition is well and truly together on—

Lord Ashdown:

—No, they are not—

Dr Robin Niblett:

—on interest-based foreign policy. So... well, I will hold that for a moment, then you can come back and disagree with me on that point in a minute. Jonathan, Tony Blair certainly struck me as somebody who ignored polls actually, rather than somebody who followed polls on foreign policy—

Lord Ashdown:

Ahh, yes.

Dr Robin Niblett:

But we can maybe come to that point, if you want, in a minute. More importantly, the question that Paddy raised as well about Europe here – I mean, we set a whole chapter aside on that this year for obvious reasons – but what is your take on the data that you saw in there? I mean, it is predictably, at a public level is sceptical about Europe and actually surprisingly in favour, or not surprisingly, quite strongly in favour of the referendum option and so on; but, what did you take away on the Europe side?

Jonathan Powell:

Yeah, I think the Europe part of the poll is actually the most interesting, and probably the most important too in that I think that our position on Europe is really grave, that we are sleep-walking into a once in a generation disaster from which I see absolutely no way back. The opinion poll shows very clearly that the public want a referendum. Both party leaders – the Labour party and the Tory party – want a referendum. The poll is absolutely clear, there is a large-ish majority for leaving the EU, if there is a majority... if there is a referendum, which neither party wants, but who is going to change that? Now, it is possible to change public opinion on a subject.

Again, if you look at the opinion poll, it is quite interesting, if you ask them what they like about Europe, what Europe should cooperate on, you get overwhelming answers on energy, counter-terrorism, migration, foreign policy, defence in the 70% range, they want the EU to cooperate on those things. If you ask them about the constitution, institutions, bureaucracy, of course, then the answer is they don't like Europe at all. I think this rather confirms my way that euro-scepticism while very wide, is rather shallow, and could be changed if there was proper leadership.

Now, Paddy has always pre-emptively criticized Tony Blair for not doing enough to sell Europe, and I think that is one of the mistakes that we made, we didn't do enough to sell Europe domestically, although we did take a leadership role in Europe, in a way that this government has not. We are affectively irrelevant in Europe at the moment, we are outside the discussion on the euro, and we have actually gone beyond irrelevance by taking shots at

the Europeans as they desperately scabble to save themselves, which is causing deep irritation amongst our allies. We are clearly not going to join the euro; the opinion poll shows that 2% of the public agree with me that we should join the euro and I think I know all of them personally. [Laughter] So, it is a fairly small number, and that is not going to change, but again, I think it is... the problem is more fundamental than that. The opinion poll shows that the option that the public want is a less integrated Europe, they either want a less integrated Europe or they want to leave Europe. That is over 50% of the public in those two positions. Now that is not on offer. What is going to happen... the only answer to the euro-crisis for the Europeans is greater integration, they have to have, if they are going to have a common currency, a common fiscal policy, they have to have a treasury, they have to have an economic government and that is the direction they are moving in, and there is absolutely nothing we can do to stop it. Indeed, David Cameron instead of vetoing it, opted out of it at the European Council in December. So, we are going to be faced by a Europe that our public doesn't like, and we are going to exclude ourselves from that.

Now, if you look at *The Daily Telegraph* and similar publications over the last several weeks, there have been a lot of articles singing the praises of Norway and the wonderful life that Norway has, and I would yield to no one in my admiration to Norway, but we aren't Norway; we don't have the oil, we don't have the high standard of living, and we are a large not a small country. But if we go to the position of Norway, we will find ourselves facing decisions that have been taken on everything from mobile phone technology to the regulation of banks over which we have precisely no say have to agree with and have to go along with.

So, if people are seriously worried about losing sovereignty, the single biggest way we could lose sovereignty is to put ourselves in the position of Norway, yet I see no way back for the government, or I fear the Labour Party, if it is going to take the position it has on this subject, and if the two party leaders are huddled together in the euro-sceptic position but not really wanting what is going to happen. And no one is speaking up for Europe, and no one is taking a leadership role, I really do worry.

Dr Robin Niblett:

You said that people want to cooperate with Europe, and I think this is the problem, the polling – as it did last year – shows high numbers in favour of cooperating on energy or immigration or organized crime or whatever, but this

business of a less-integrated Europe, one that cooperates but doesn't integrate is clearly the—

Jonathan Powell:

I don't think they mean that. My interpretation of what they mean by that answer is that they want Europe to be doing things, for example, is that they want Europe to be doing things on energy, they want Europe to be acting together on energy. What they don't want is endless discussion of institutions and constitutions and all the rest of it. They don't—

Dr Robin Niblett:

—But what if they weren't discussions about institutions but was the creation of institutions to work better on energy?

Jonathan Powell:

I think if you created an institution on energy, for example a common grid for Europe, they would be in favour of that.

Dr Robin Niblett:

That sounds like a physical institution rather than an agency that might—

Jonathan Powell:

It would have to be. You couldn't have a physical grid and not have it administered.

Dr Robin Niblett:

Okay, but then the administration becomes the complicated bit surely?

Jonathan Powell:

You have to ask more detailed questions, but my belief has always been that what people in Britain don't like is Europe being something that is done to them rather than something where they have a leadership role and a say.

Dr Robin Niblett:

Pauline, where do you come on this, because is a less integrated option one that can be negotiated? This government certainly seems to be leaning in that direction. Europe is changing, we need negotiate a different type of arrangement; is that a credible position?

Baroness Neville-Jones:

I find it very hard actually to know precisely where the government and the party I support really does stand on this. I think that... and it is not clear to me actually that the thesis is less integration, it is certain things that, particularly the Conservatives, find annoying, which include the social chapter, the feeling being not necessary to have all this dictated somewhere else. I think there is also something that is missing here, which I think does explain attitudes partly, which is ECHR. There is very, very strong dislike in this country of the verdicts and the area of competence of the European Court on Human Rights. It is not understood that this is not a central European institution, but of course it is the case now that you have to belong to it in order to be a part of the European Union, but I think it very strongly influences attitudes to the... to the EU.

I don't actually think, sadly, that clarifying that with the public will actually convert them. I think that... I belong to those who think it would be extremely foolish for the UK to start departing. I don't think the EU is perfect, I do think there are changes that could be made. I think when it comes down to it, it is going to be a pretty straight issue of do you campaign for continued membership, or don't you? We are going to have a referendum, I don't think there is any doubt about that, and we do require strong leadership, I don't think there is really any argument about that. And I think there will be cross-party alliances and cross-party... I mean, internal party splits, and I think that is what we are going to witness and that lies, some period...some time post the next election, I doubt it will be with the next election, but I think post the election. Now that makes charting the course for this country actually quite difficult.

Paddy made a point about diversification. With great respect, Paddy, the National Security Strategy written by the Coalition makes it very clear we are going into a multi-polar world, what is also says however is that alliances in such a world remain very important and actually the public agrees.

Lord Ashdown:

Well, I agree too.

Baroness Neville-Jones:

Yeah, right, but it isn't just a fixation on old policies, it is actually where do the bases of British alliances, British interests and British power lie? And I think that there is agreement between public and government. The area where there is, I think, real difference between, quotes, the 'elite' and the public, between the 'ruled' and 'ruling', is actually how we handle Europe, and it is the great elephant.

Lord Ashdown:

Well, not for the first time, the National Security Council has come to the right conclusion, but hasn't carried it through into government policy. Of course alliances are important—

Baroness Neville-Jones:

That is not true.

Lord Ashdown:

Well, let's not have... you and I can have a debate on this, and I'm happy to do it now.

Baroness Neville-Jones:

What do you think we are doing [laughter] in India and China at the moment, pushing the UK.

Lord Ashdown:

If we really want to have a debate about this, I am happy to do so because I think I can produce equal things on the other side to show how we are not.

Dr Robin Niblett:

Well, let's stick—

Lord Ashdown:

But back to the issue.

Dr Robin Niblett:

Exactly.

Lord Ashdown:

I think your question to Jonathan was extremely revealing. You are right, you can create almost kind of institution except a political one. You can create an infrastructural institution that shares energy, but you can't create the political institution because no one believes in politicians, nobody trusts politicians any longer, and that is our worry. I agree with Jonathan that we are sleepwalking into a disaster; the referendum will come earlier than any of us will want it to come, uncomfortably early, and I think it is almost impossible to win a 'yes' vote. And, by the way, I think his analogy of Norway is precisely right; 75% of European regulations have had to be adopted by Norway. So, Norway is out of Europe, but run by Europe. And those who argue this will give us greater sovereignty are simply not facing up to the facts, which is, true by the way, of our political class as well.

I want to make two points that I think are absolutely fundamental to this: the first is a revelation that I think is too little understood, and the second is a revelation for which there is no public support. The first is that at this age there is nothing that a nation-state can deliver that it wants to deliver for its citizens that it can deliver alone; not health with the threat of pandemic diseases, not crime with international crime, not your economy, not your jobs, not your environment, not your security. All of those things that we would like our citizens to have can only be delivered by working in concert with others because there is now an international quotient to every domestic policy, something that I think my simply has not yet properly hoisted on board, by the way, to be self-critical.

So, it is not your alliances, it is who you work with that matters, and we work with our neighbouring structure to work with, which is Europe. There are those who argue in Pauline's party [referring to the Conservatives], some very high up, that we should be using the Commonwealth because we all agree about the rule of law and a parliamentary system. You might as well say that you should have the Women's Institute governing Britain because we all agree about how to make jam. The fact of the matter—

Baroness Neville-Jones:

Are you talking about a poll, Paddy, or are you going to...come on.

Lord Ashdown:

Hang on, well let me come...the poll is relevant, Pauline, because we come back to this—

Baroness Neville-Jones:

No...

Lord Ashdown:

We come back to this, the second revelation in my view, which is this: in Europe we have to understand just how far the terms of trade have moved for us of our existence in the last ten years. There is no longer an American security guarantee in Europe, and we now have a United States looking west across the Pacific far more than it is looking east across the Atlantic. We have a United States that ceased to be our supporter in all circumstances, our defender of last resort. We have on our eastern border a highly assertive Russian leader prepared to use the Brezhnev doctrine where it suits him, look at Georgia, as an example, you have a rising China, a rising India, a rising Brazil. If we Europeans don't realize that the right reaction in these circumstances is to deepen the institutions of our defence, our foreign affairs, and our economy, we are bloody fools and the next decade is going to be much more difficult for us. But that fact is simply not understood out there, and certainly not supported.

Baroness Neville-Jones:

That is not about the poll.

Dr Robin Niblett:

And I think this is one of the areas where the differences between the general public and the opinion formers is starkest, where you will see very strong support for remaining inside the EU, for being an active member of the EU amongst the opinion formers and even, you know, Conservatives voting to remain a member of the European Union amongst the opinion formers over

the general public where you have got obviously a very large majority of Conservatives who want to leave. Interestingly enough even Liberal Democrats on this poll, 'I would vote to leave the European Union', it is in the main bit of data but it has got to be around 37-38% compared with 42% wanting to stay in. I think even there that level of scepticism has permeated in multiple directions.