
Challenges and Choices for the UK: The Europe Dilemma

Charles Grant

Director, Centre for European Reform

Jonathan Portes

Director, National Institute of Economic and Social Research

Daithi O'Ceallaigh

Co-editor, *Britain and Europe: The Endgame*; Irish Ambassador to the UK (2001-07)

Bruno Waterfield

Brussels Correspondent, *The Times*

Chair: Quentin Peel

Mercator Senior Fellow, Europe Programme, Chatham House

22 April 2015

The views expressed in this document are the sole responsibility of the speaker(s) and participants 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. The published text of speeches and presentations may differ from delivery.

Quentin Peel

Welcome to Chatham House. Welcome to what I hope will be a lively, informative and fun debate for the next hour. There's an awful lot to talk about and not very much time, so I'll try and be brief. I'm Quentin Peel, I'm Mercator Senior Fellow here at Chatham House, attached to the Europe Programme. I will try not to interfere too much but this is a subject on which I feel quite passionately, so I may.

It's on the record; we're not under the Chatham House Rule. You can participate on Twitter via #CHEvents. I'm happy to say I wouldn't have the first idea how to do that but some of you may.

We're here to talk about – it's one of a series of events we've had, looking at the challenges ahead after the elections for the next government, whoever it may be. This time we've called it 'The Europe Dilemma' – and dilemma it undoubtedly is. We're facing what, for me as a pensioner, is probably the most important and least predictable election I have ever known in my entire lifetime. It could decide the future of the UK in Europe and it could decide the future of the UK itself.

There's a very clear difference between Conservative and Labour on Europe. One party is offering a renegotiation and an in-out referendum, and the other is very clearly not offering that. So it is a decision, but it's a subject on which my fellow journalists and others don't seem to be paying very much attention. The rest of Europe, however, is watching with fascination and a certain degree of bafflement, because they're asking: what do the British want? Do they want real reform to make the European Union work better, or do they just want to repatriate powers to restore a sense of national sovereignty (whatever those powers may be)? I think the challenge ahead for the next British government is: can a British government, whether it's led by David Cameron or by Ed Miliband, produce a reform agenda that can both win the support of their European Union partners and persuade UK voters that Brexit (British Exit) is a bad idea?

So much for my thoughts. We've a splendid panel to debate the subject. On my left, Jonathan Portes, director of the National Institute of Economic and Social Research. A macroeconomist with a lot of expertise in labour market skills, migration, poverty, and international economic and financial issues. I think also Jonathan has just been appointed as a senior fellow in the ESRC Programme on Britain in a Changing Europe. So I'll probably ask Jonathan to go first and give a sort of macro focus on what the challenges are ahead.

I'll come then to Charles Grant, a familiar face also here at Chatham House. Director of the Centre for European Reform – director and indeed founder of the Centre for European Reform, a think tank which has done a wonderful job at actually keeping the subject of Europe very much in the debate here, and keeping a little sanity in what otherwise is a very insular debate. Charles, I'll also get to take a big view, but also to look at what the reaction to the British debate has been abroad.

Then I'll come to my friend and colleague Bruno Waterfield, who is correspondent in Brussels now for *The Times* but many of you may know him as having been the correspondent for the *Daily Telegraph*, to bring more of a Brussels perspective and perhaps slightly more Eurosceptic perspective than Charles.

Finally, I'll come to Daithi O'Ceallaigh, also a good friend. Former Irish ambassador to London but most recently the co-editor of this splendid book, *Britain and Europe: The Endgame*. I'm hoping Daithi will give us a non-British perspective on our own agonized debate.

Everybody is going to have a brief introductory statement, then we'll open it up for debate. Jonathan, over to you first.

Jonathan Portes

Thanks very much, Quentin, and thank you to Chatham House for inviting me. I will stick strictly to my five minutes and try to give a bit of an overview.

I think it's very interesting. If you look back five, six, seven years, UK politicians pretty much across the political spectrum – with the exception of the anti-Europe on the right and a much diminished minority on the left – had a very clear agenda for change in Europe, based on the same set of fairly standard liberal market principles that were applied to domestic policymaking. That agenda was around completing the single market, completing trade agreements and extra-EU trade agreements, reform and reduction in the Common Agricultural Policy, and defending the interests of the City. That was the agenda. We knew what we wanted in Brussels and that was what we set out to do, for better or worse. We made progress on some things and had setbacks on others.

Fast forward six or seven years on: what is our reform agenda in Europe now? Well, the prime minister made it very clear last week in his speech. He said: I'm going to go to Brussels and I'm going to come back with what we want on free movement and benefits. Actually, the Labour Party, although they're not seeking a formal renegotiation nor promised a referendum, have said pretty much the same thing. Their priority will be around renegotiating aspects of the benefit system for people moving here from elsewhere in Europe.

So I think that reflects quite a major shift in the UK's agenda. It has shrunk to this very narrow, inward-focused agenda. None of those other things – there's an occasional bit of lip service to the single market or external trade, and I'm sure there are civil servants (some of them probably in this room) who are beavering away on those issues, and good luck to them. But that is not where we are spending our negotiating capital. That's the first point I would like to make. That is a huge change.

The second point I'd like to make, following on from that, is that all three major parties, and presumably at least one (if not two) of them will form the next government, have essentially come to the following conclusions. Free movement of workers within the European Union is broadly a good thing economically: point one. Point two: the public don't like it. Point three: there's no prospect of renegotiating it in Brussels. Therefore, point four: what we will say is that we will make changes to the benefit system and this will somehow magically reduce the flow of people, even though we know and our civil servants are telling us that that is highly unlikely to be the case.

So for me, the big question is, in political economy terms: post-election, if all of those things happen (that is, there is some changes to the benefit system, probably quite sensible ones, but no particular impact on actual flows of people coming here to work), do the public conclude – and this applies, again, regardless of the nature of the government – well okay, you did some relatively sensible things within the limits of political reality and actually it's not so bad, so fine. Or do the public conclude: you lied to us again. You lied to us before, now you've lied to us again, and this just can't go on. I don't know what the answer is to that.

Finally, and looking at what the Future of Britain in a Changing Europe programme will look at, there are really some quite difficult and serious questions for economic analysis. The macroeconomic impacts of a possible Brexit quite rightly will form a very large part of the debate. But this is going to be a real challenge for people like me, for people like you, and for those trying to communicate to this public, because this is no longer primarily about trade in goods, certainly. My personal view, although we'll see what the analysis says, is that most conventional macroeconomic analyses of the impact of leaving the EU

on traditional trade barriers in goods and services – and hence, their impact on the economy – are actually going to come out with pretty small numbers. The big action is in much more complicated things. What will be the impact on the City? What will be the impact on multinational investment decisions? What will be the dynamic impacts on long-run technological progress and productivity? Those are much harder questions, but those are the questions which we need to give the public some answers to. I'll stop there.

Quentin Peel

Okay, Jonathan, thank you very much. I'm sure you may have provoked some of your fellow speakers to agree or disagree. Charles, do you agree with Jonathan on what is really going to be the core of the British focus, whether Conservative or Labour? Can they deliver it with their partners?

Charles Grant

Not with the way they're performing at the moment – no, they can't, whether they're Conservative or Labour.

Let me start with the big picture. The key thing for Cameron if he wins the election and tries to renegotiate is whether there's a new EU treaty coming down the road or not. Ever since his Bloomberg speech, he's said and his advisers have said that there will be, which gives him leverage in renegotiation. He can say: look, you need our signature on your treaty to safeguard the eurozone, so you better give us these concessions in return.

I've been saying for the last two years there isn't going to be a new treaty before 2017. I'm afraid, unfortunately for Cameron, I'm right. The reason there isn't going to be one is because nobody wants one except for the British. The Germans did want one until a while ago but even they've gone off the idea now, the reason being: if there was a new treaty, the French would undoubtedly insist, in return for greater fiscal discipline, more transfer payments, more mutualization of debt, more eurozone budget – something that they want (as the Germans see it) to get their hands on Germany's money. The German political class at the moment is in no mood to agree to transfer payments to the south of Europe or to the French, or to mutualization of debt. Therefore, the Germans at the moment would rather have no significant changes to the way the eurozone is governed at all. In the long run they'd say we could do it – have a bit of treaty change to do this, that and the other. But they're in no hurry at all. At the moment, they don't really want anything, and no other government wants anything either, because of the problems of referendums. So there isn't going to be a new treaty, which weakens Cameron's negotiating position.

A second point. If Cameron wins the election, what will he ask for? I think Jonathan has touched on this to some degree. I think there is going to be three main areas he'll ask for. The first, Jonathan has touched upon: benefits for migrants, particularly in-work benefits for migrants. A lot of what Cameron wants does require treaty change but some of it doesn't.

The second thing is safeguards for the single market, the relationship between the 19 countries in the eurozone and the 28 countries in the EU as a whole. Osborne has been particularly focused on this. There is a risk, at least in theory, that the eurozone countries will get together, caucus and impose their wishes on the wider single market. It hasn't happened yet but it might happen one day if there's much more convergence of thinking than we see at the moment in the eurozone. So you could talk about emergency breaks or double-majority voting or various structures you could create to reassure the British and the

Poles and the Swedes, and the others who are not going to join the euro for a long time, that their interests will be protected. That's a second area.

The third area of reform is the institutional balance. It's not just giving national parliaments a bigger say in policing subsidiarity, which obviously the British are concerned about. It's more the general picture that the Commission has become far too close to the European Parliament. It should be, according to the treaties, equidistant between the Parliament and the Council. It has become the creature of the Parliament. The *Spitzenkandidaten* system has reinforced that. Barroso, in his second term, was very much controlled by the Parliament. The governments don't like this, not in the British government, other governments too. There will be some British priority to get an institutional rebalancing and national parliaments could be part of that.

Then of course there's the Timmermans agenda on deregulation and digital single market and various other things the British would like. Trade agreements. But essentially, I think those three issues will be the main ones.

The trouble is, British influence is at an all-time low. This is my third point. I've never known Britain to have less influence in the EU, in the 27 years I've been covering it. Cameron doesn't have a great reputation with other governments. He's seen as a very transactional politician who does deals on particular subjects and then lets the relationship with the other government drop. He doesn't maintain relationships. He's seen as always giving in to short-term expediency, tactical politics, to buy off his Eurosceptics – rather like Ethelred the Unready kept on giving Danegeld to the Danes, saying: if I give you this Danegeld, will you go away and promise not to come back? The Danes always said yes and then the next year they came back and asked for more Danegeld. Such is Cameron's relationship with his party's Eurosceptics. He gave them the referendum on the EU but they came back and wanted more later.

British influence in the EU, you can measure it in all sorts of ways. The numbers of officials coming into the institutions has never been lower. Influence on foreign policy – a complete absence on the Ukraine diplomacy has been quite shocking to many people, particularly in Washington. In the External Action Service, no senior Brits in a senior position in the External Action Service. Britain is no longer one of the leading countries in shaping EU policy.

A fourth point and the final point. What do we need to do to become more influential? The first obvious point to make is Britain needs to work on friendships and relationships and alliances. So don't, as David Cameron did a couple weeks ago, write an article in the *Sunday Times* saying why we must avoid the economic disaster that is France. Don't give a budget speech, like George Osborne did, saying the French economy is a complete catastrophe, because if you win the election, you're going to have to get the French to help you reform the EU. So do think about relationships.

Do also think about leading. Britain would be more respected and have more influence in the EU if it led in areas where it has expertise, whether it's foreign and defence policy, energy and climate, trade in the single market. In all those areas, if Britain did take the initiative, others would respect it, look up to it, and sometimes follow it. But we lead much less than we ever used to.

Another tip: behave in a clubbable way. Clubs have rules and they have mores. Threatening other countries is not good with the EU's mores. So when, as Cameron did just before the appointment of Juncker – he said to another leader: if you force us to accept Juncker, I might recommend a no vote in a referendum, and then you'll be sorry. That kind of threat doesn't really go down very well and is actually

counterproductive. I hope Cameron avoids it. He can, on a good day, build up alliances and coalitions. He did this with the EU budget negotiations two years ago.

The most important piece of advice I have to Cameron is not to overbid. If he wins power after the election with a narrow majority of some sort, his Eurosceptics will be pushing him to up the ante and to go for more reform, more red lines, more things he has to achieve. But frankly, he's not going to achieve very much – partly, as I said at the start, because of the lack of treaty change. So my worry is if he goes for a huge list of demands, big demands, doesn't get them, he might almost be forced not to campaign for yes in the referendum. So my advice to Cameron is to be modest.

My very last point, back to treaty change, is: although I said there can't be a treaty change by 2017, what there could be is a post-dated cheque. You could have a political agreement amongst heads of government to change the treaties at some point in the future, when they get a chance. That's the best deal Cameron can get. It won't convince Nigel Farage or possibly the readers of the *Daily Telegraph* or the *Times* that that's a really good deal for Britain, but it is the best he can get. There is precedent: after the Irish voted no to the Lisbon Treaty, they got a protocol giving them certain things they wanted on abortion and neutrality and taxation, which was later added to the Croatian accession treaty. So there is a precedent for that. A British protocol would be much more controversial and more difficult to achieve than an Irish protocol or the similar Danish protocol in 1993, after the Danes voted no to the Maastricht Treaty. Nevertheless, it's not impossible, and that's the best deal Cameron can get, in my opinion.

Quentin Peel

Charles, thank you very much. Bruno, you're sitting in Brussels. Do you see the British and Cameron having mishandled things quite as badly as perhaps both Jonathan and Charles presented?

Bruno Waterfield

Yes, I do. I broadly agree with what Charles has said. But I just want to come at it sort of in a different way, to try and understand it. I'm not a policy person and I'm not a civil servant, thank god. I'm a political person. So when I'm looking at this and thinking about this – I've been in Brussels 12 years and a lot has happened over that period – I'm trying to understand what's the sort of moving cause, the sort of spirit, what's making this happen. So three points I'm going to try and look at. They're all related.

The first one, which I think is the most important one, is to understand that this is a debate that has a real objective character, a European objective character. It's not a product of British exceptionalism at all. It is very much a by-product of the common political culture that Europe's elites share, which is embodied very much in the European Union. I want to look a little bit at how that links into the whole discussion about treaty change and the problem of treaty change, and if I have time at the end, to look at why a Harold Wilson-style, 1975 replay in 2017, isn't going to work.

I really believe, and I think the last decade particularly has shown, that the European referendum debate just won't go away. The question, and the question of the EU, is an objective one. It's part of a germ of politics in Europe. In that sense, this election doesn't really matter. This objection will reframe how the debate plays out in the next five years – perhaps why it hasn't become central to the campaign.

For me, the whole question about the European Union raises questions about the constitution of politics, who politics is for, who takes part in it, who benefits from it. The question of what – or rather, who – institutions represent: a higher legal order embodied in the EU and other international treaties, or the

people and the nation? So in a sense it's about sovereignty. I see it very much as being about popular sovereignty, some of those tensions and debates – they're almost subterranean – that are being played out through the exhaustion of post-war politics, that are going on here.

If Labour win the election, I think it will merely postpone the question of a referendum. If Labour win, the whole issue of a referendum will loom even larger. Within the Conservatives, attitudes will harden. The 'Better Off Out' camp within Conservative backbenchers, which is already strong, will grow. Conservative right-wingers have few other articles of faith nowadays. So if Labour gets in, and Labour would not necessarily be without its upheavals on this – remember it was Tony Blair in 2004 who let the referendum genie out of the bottle with the constitution – so if Labour gets in, the whole referendum debate will be replayed in 2020, probably with a vengeance.

So beyond a contest between the Labour and Conservative parties, I'm really arguing that the EU has become bound up with the exhaustion of post-war politics and the populist sensibility – which I think is quite a positive one – that institutions of authority are closed to the public and are unrepresentative. That's not going to go away. Those trends are now well-established in European politics. They are here to stay. It's a European question.

I just want to give an example of how it's a European question, because it relates to the treaty change issue. For example, in the eurozone, without any treaty change, with a series of six-packs, two-packs and various other arrangements, national parliaments can no longer decide how to spend national wealth. We had Schäuble, the German finance minister, at the weekend in Washington, lamenting there was no troika to hand down dictates to the French parliament. People really believe that you can snuff politics out like that. Does anyone really believe that those kinds of arrangements embodied in the sort of dreary arrogance of Schäuble is tenable? Mario Draghi, the head of the ECB, is always boasting – he does it almost every week – that the euro and its policies are irreversible, but he also delights in making the point that the European social model is dead. That's a highly ideological closure of politics and people don't like it, and they shouldn't, because it goes against the grain of the whole democratic idea which is so central to European history.

I see the immigration debate, particularly in the UK, as being more along these lines. It's not really about racism or xenophobia in the sense that it was in the 1970s or the 1980s, when I was an anti-racist activist and there were fights on the streets and attacks on immigrants. Most mainstream parties, as Jonathan has noted, have used migration from the EU as an alibi for decline – the shortage of school places, labour on low wages – yet those parties elevate the question of whether people can come here or not as being above politics. They say: it's a treaty order, voters, we can't change it. It's not really surprising that voters want government to control the territory they've voted to administer. So it's not surprising that that sort of reinforces the discontent. I am for immigration but I'm not for the sort of pathetic, cowardly and undemocratic idea that a government is not allowed to control its territory because of some higher legal order.

So is Cameron's policy a muddle? Again, with Charles, I completely agree. The whole issue revolves around treaty change. Why can't Cameron get treaty change? Well, he's isolated. Part of the reason he's isolated is a structural and historical one: he's not in the euro and the European Union is very focused on the euro and the eurozone and the question of its survival right now and over the last recent period. That's affected Cameron. He's also broken one of the most fundamental sort of rules of etiquette – Charles posed it as sort of blackmail but actually he's done far worse than that. He's promised a referendum and that's the sort of ultimate social gaffe. Europe's political class have a fundamental objection to the very idea of

popular votes on the EU. We know why, we know the simple truth: they don't like referendums because they lose them.

That is the real hostility to treaty change at the moment, particularly with the French, who certainly don't want to hear anything about it in the run-up to presidential elections in France in 2017. You've got to bear in mind that the question of a referendum is potentially huge in France. It's potentially explosive. Remember back in 2005, when the French voted no to the EU constitution and then they got the Lisbon Treaty anyway, and no more votes. Because of comments by people like Schäuble, the question would become quite an issue within the ranks of the Socialist Party. The UMP, particularly under Sarkozy's leadership (if it ends up like that), is probably going to be far more Eurosceptic, probably for a treaty renegotiation. Le Pen is already calling for referendum.

So it's actually in a way, the fact that Cameron promised a referendum really underscores to everybody why they don't actually like the idea of treaty change. I'm sure we can talk about why a re-run of the Harold Wilson-style referendum in 1975 won't work. Britain is a very different country and a very different place than four decades ago. The age of deference to the grandees and the mandarins who lecture us all about EU membership are over, thankfully. Most importantly, Europe is no longer a place of progress, of technological and economic development, as compared to the Britain of the 1970s. If anything, it is the other way around. I'll finish there.

Quentin Peel

Thank you very much, Bruno. Daithi, Bruno's thesis is we're not being singular, insular and different. This is actually part of a Europe-wide trend. You sit in Dublin, you're a very close observer of Britain. I know in Dublin there's a very anxious debate about the prospects maybe that Britain might actually, in one way or another, leave the European Union, for a variety of reasons – not just economic but also political, also to do with Northern Ireland. But how do you see the British debate from Dublin?

Daithi O'Ceallaigh

I would disagree. I think the case here in Britain is exceptional. There is an exceptionalism on this island which is quite different to anywhere else in Europe.

I have to say, we view the prospect of a British withdrawal with horror, for many reasons. In the book, we argue that it is in Britain's interest, it's in Europe's interest and it's most certainly in our interest that Britain remain in Europe. The Irish government on several occasions have made very clear that they wish to see Britain remain in the Union. So I think overall, the view in Dublin and in Ireland is that Britain should remain in Europe.

An interesting aside: two days ago, Sinn Fein in Northern Ireland, when they were publicizing their election manifesto, echoed the call of the SNP in Scotland, that if there is to be a vote in Britain on membership of the European Union, then the vote in Northern Ireland should be treated in the same way as the vote in Scotland, which is a very interesting development on the part of Sinn Fein. But there is a strong view in Dublin that we wish to see Britain remain part of the Union.

I have to say, and I agree with what's been said earlier on: there's a great deal of impatience with the current British government and the way in which they've handled this issue over the last four or five years. The impatience has to do with really two factors. One, nobody knows exactly what Britain wants. Secondly, there's a sense in which before, for example, a Council meeting, a statement might be made

here that participation in the Council meeting is in relation to the statement that might have been made here in advance, and then after the Council meeting the British press is briefed in a particular way. If there is to be a successful negotiation, there has to be a sense of trust and there has to be a sense of confidence that if there is an agreement, that that agreement can then be made to stick.

I think we in Dublin feel that there will be a referendum here, one way or the other. Certainly, if the Tories are returned, there will be a referendum in 2017. But we do feel, and I would share the view that's been expressed, that were Labour to come back into power, there inevitably would be pressure on the Labour Party to at some stage concede a referendum.

We also think in Dublin that there will be treaty change. We accept, for example, that people do not want a referendum anywhere in Europe. We are the last ones to want a referendum because we've had half a dozen of them. We don't like them. We know that the answer which is given by the populists is frequently not the answer to the question which is asked. We're not too sure that it is the right form of democracy. The best form of democracy, in our view, is to elect a government and let them get on with things, and if you don't like them, throw them out at the next election. So we don't want a referendum, but we do feel in Dublin that at one stage or another, for one reason or another, there will be a referendum in this country.

Now, people in Europe are prepared to be helpful. If you look at the history of the European Union in the period in which Britain and Ireland have been in the Union, they have been helpful. The manner in which it works, where the final decisions are taken, is in the European Council, where the heads of government get together over dinner or in a room. They understand politics in a way, for example, that somebody like me, who is a civil servant – or journalists – do not understand politics. They understand the pressures that are on politicians. I think if you get to a situation where a British government can explain quite clearly to fellow European governments what they need in order to win a referendum, I think they would find European governments quite forthcoming.

I don't think that any of the reasons we have heard so far for a referendum, I don't think that any of these issues are issues to which solutions cannot be found. Charles, for example, mentioned the question of a protocol. There have been occasions where protocols for particular countries – like, for example, my own country – can work very well and people can get on with their business.

The third point I want to make is: what sort of other solution are we looking at? The book argues that there is a British – or, maybe even more succinctly, an English – exceptionalism, and that it has always been there from the very beginning. It relates to the fact that this is an island – off the mainland, if you want to put it that way – with a very particular history, very different to the history of most European countries, and with a very long tradition of parliamentary democracy which is exercised in Westminster.

We actually believe that there are two problems for Westminster at the moment. There is the question of sovereignty vis-à-vis the European Union, but there's also the question of sovereignty within the United Kingdom – be it Scotland or Wales or, indeed, Northern Ireland. The problem now at the present moment is that it's unstable, it's uncertain, and it's unpredictable. We think that we need some sort of solution over the coming years which provides stability for the relationship between Britain and the European Union, which will last for the foreseeable future, which will enable Britain to do what it needs to do and allow those who want to advance, to advance, as has happened in the past – if you like, a bespoke solution.

We think that we can find agreement on the single market. We think that we can find agreement on some form of an energy market which would involve security, within which you might be able to solve some of the problems involving borders. We think you can find agreement on things like a capital market, and that

in this overall structure, something can be found which will be acceptable here and which will settle this issue and provide some certainty for the foreseeable future.

I'm not going to talk, Quentin, because you asked me just to speak shortly, about the implications for Ireland and the implications for Northern Ireland.

Quentin Peel

I would like you to focus on it a little bit though, Northern Ireland. Yes, please, go ahead. Because it's something that doesn't come up in the debate in this country – what are the implications for Northern Ireland of a much looser relationship between Britain and Europe?

Daithi O'Ceallaigh

The issue simply in Northern Ireland is that you have a fragmented, divided community that is now living together and working together, and is only doing so because it's being managed and was put in place by the government in London and the government in Dublin acting together. So the first danger is that were Britain to leave the EU and Ireland to stay in – and I think Ireland probably would stay in, were Britain to leave – that that could change the relationship between London and Dublin and make it somewhat more difficult to carry out that joint stewardship of Northern Ireland, which in my personal view is going to take at least two to three generations.

Secondly, a big issue in this country is the question of immigration. Let's presume that Britain pulls out. Let's presume that the United Kingdom pulls out. One of the areas where you would have to institute border controls is on the only land border between the two countries, which is the border between Northern Ireland and the south. Equally, if over time there were differences in things like customs and tariffs, you might have to put in place again a customs border or whatever sort of border on that island.

The dangers are enormous. We have peace because there's an element in Northern Ireland that can look to the south – they're the nationalists. There's an element in Northern Ireland that's unionist and looks to this island. Any sort of border which makes that more difficult could just unleash the sort of difficulties in Northern Ireland which are not – they have not gone away. They don't like one another any more now than they did 20 years ago. But the two governments together have put in place systems which both sides can support and which over generations will lead to peace, and will lead to much better cooperation. We should not put those in doubt.

A prime example, Quentin, happened recently when unilaterally, on this side, there was a decision to pull out of things like the European arrest warrant. Suddenly they realized the implications. Most of you in this room will remember how difficult it was to extradite terrorists from my country to this country. It now happens willy-nilly under the European arrest warrant. Thankfully, the British came back into the European arrest warrant.

So it's terribly important, in our view, that people here in London who are making decisions in this area consider the implications to the west and also the considerations to the north.

Quentin Peel

Thank you very much. I think that's very helpful. I think it's a subject we should come back to here in Chatham House actually, the implications for the Northern Ireland peace process. I know Daithi was himself very much involved in the negotiations, the Good Friday agreement and so on.

Let's open this to the floor now, because you've had four very interesting and provocative presentations, and the situation is messy and unclear.