

THE TULANE EUROPEAN AND CIVIL LAW FORUM

VOLUME 36

2021

A Valediction Forbidding Mourning¹

Ian Forrester*

Je vais vous parler de l'histoire, du droit européen, et de notre cour. Mon père est né en 1899 et a fait l'entraînement d'un officier d'artillerie mais n'a jamais été déployé en France. Un oncle a servi en Gallipoli. Un cousin est mort en Birmanie. Une histoire familiale assez typique. Nous avons tous rencontré ceux aujourd'hui fort âgés qui ont des témoignages étonnants de guerre et de conflit. Deux juges de la Cour de Justice ont constaté qu'ils s'opposaient lors de la même bataille en Italie pendant notre dernière guerre civile européenne. L'ancêtre d'un autre juge était soldat dans la bataille de Waterloo. Un collègue me disait juste après le référendum en 2016 que ses deux grands-pères étaient soldats sur les deux côtés lors de la Bataille de la Somme. Robert Schuman, fondateur, est né en Alsace-Lorraine, soldat allemand pendant la première guerre, français pendant la deuxième.

Si nous regardons les vieilles cartes, nous constatons dans quelle mesure les frontières et les drapeaux sont maintes fois changé. À travers les siècles, la Norvège et la Pologne ont disparu et, suite aux fortunes de la guerre, sont réapparues. La Croatie, la Macédoine et le Kosovo sont nés suite à la disparition de la Yougoslavie. La Serbie est un revenant. La Belgique elle-même est une création assez jeune.

Donc les rivalités nationales, la religion, les mariages princiers ont fait fluctuer nos frontières. Elles ne correspondent point à l'ethnicité, la race, la religion ou l'histoire. Aujourd'hui, les vecteurs modernes de crainte, de peur, de faim, et de haine ont évolué. Les manifestations sont différentes, mais ils existent et ils sont puissants: les réfugiés syriens, les radeaux quittant l'Afrique du Nord et l'invasion de l'Ukraine. Or, chaque

1. An address delivered by the Honorable Ian Forrester on February 6, 2020 on the occasion of his demission from office as judge in the General Court of the European Union.

* © 2021 Ian Forrester.

*adaptation de la carte était décidée à un congrès pour mettre fin à un conflit – 1648, 1715, 1756, 1815, 1871, 1919.*²

Each treaty (Westphalia, Utrecht, Paris, Versailles) contained promises of friendship and cooperation. Each treaty was succeeded by another war thirty to fifty years later. My father, a history teacher, would have expected conflict. And yet this wretched succession of events stopped, from the 1950s.

Born at the end of the war, I was a beneficiary of the new era. Little by little in concrete practical ways ordinary people got opportunities and lived year by year a little better. Europe became a continent where (almost) all states have promised equal treatment in the work place to men and women, safe and healthy norms for food and medicine and vehicles and water, access to healthcare, and pensions, not just to their own citizens but to the citizens of all the other states. And in the process eliminated military rivalry in Western Europe and created an area of prosperity which helped bring down the Berlin Wall.

Geography has given this continent wonderful richness and variety. Travel from Lisbon to Hamburg or Inverness to Dubrovnik and you will traverse extraordinary contrasts. We have 500 different cheeses; compare that to the meagre offering in the Walmart in Dallas! Languages, gardens, markets, cathedrals, small fields, wines, and feast days: all very inefficient; all very European. When I grew up the normal horizon was one country, one region. Today a university student in Liege will be looking at Bologna or Lund or Thessaloniki as a place to study or buy a

2. These opening lines of the address may be freely translated as follows:

I am going to speak to you of history, European law and our court. My father was born in 1899 and trained as an artillery officer but was never deployed in France. An uncle served in Gallipoli. A cousin died in Burma. A family fairly typical. We have all met quite old individuals who give remarkable accounts of war and conflict. Two judges on the Court of Justice have stated they opposed one another during the same battle in Italy during our last European civil war. The ancestor of another judge was a soldier in the battle of Waterloo. A colleague told me just after the 2016 referendum that his two grandfathers were soldiers on both sides in the Battle of the Somme. Robert Schuman, the founder, was born in Alsace-Lorraine and was a German soldier in the first war, a Frenchman during the second. Wars have marked our continent.

If we look at the old maps, we may note the degree to which the frontiers and the flags have many times changed. In the course of centuries Norway and Poland disappeared and, after the fortunes of war, reappeared. Croatia, Macedonia and Kosovo were born after the disappearance of Yugoslavia. Serbia returned. Belgium herself is a rather young creation.

Thus national rivalries, religion, and princely marriages have caused our frontiers to fluctuate. They do not at all correspond to ethnicity, race or religion. Today the modern vectors of apprehension, fear, hunger and hatred have evolved. The signs are different but they exist and are powerful: the Syrian refugees, the rafts leaving North Africa and the invasion of the Ukraine. However, each change to the map was decided by a congress to put an end to a conflict—1648, 1715, 1756, 1815, 1871, 1919. [Editor's translation]

house or work as a teacher or get married or open a business or retire one day. Same for his counterpart in Edinburgh, until the end of this year, at least. European law has opened up continental rather than national opportunities and expectations. That toothpaste cannot be squeezed back in the tube, I suspect.

Equally irresistible is the realisation that we are a highly regulated society and it seems inconceivable that that would change. Peace and geographic proximity offer opportunity; and compel cooperation. The challenges of refugees, of environment, of climate change, of fish conservation, of cross-border crime, cannot be dealt with unilaterally. Again, I don't think the process is politically reversible in terms of public expectation.

Was Europe perfect? Did its obvious blessings flow to everyone or just a lucky few? Well, political leaders rarely acknowledged benefits from European cooperation, and the genuinely difficult negotiations to reach a compromise were trumpeted as battles with the shifty foreigners (don't trust them) and the mad federalists who worshipped the single European light bulb. Any success was bad, either because our minister had been weak or because the deal matched a greater European agenda.

Add to those political misrepresentations complexity of the decision-making processes in Brussels and the creaky institutional architecture of the Union. I could not accurately describe the differences between Nice, Lisbon and Maastricht, and I suspect I am not alone, even in this room full of lawyers. And what good did these constitutional wonders do for the towns which had lost their traditional industries? So what happened then?

I cite a prominent politician:

When a community is going through some period of stress . . . they are historically far more likely to turn on scapegoats in their midst. Anxiety is transferred to some readily identifiable group: Jews, foreigners, homosexuals, gypsies . . . they become a catch-all explanation for everything that has gone wrong in a society. Your kids can't get a house? It's the immigrants. Can't get a job? It's the immigrants. Can't see a doctor in A&E? It's the immigrants . . . people are only too willing to project their anger on to a particular group, and some politicians, alas, are only too willing to assist.

Who said that? Boris Johnson.

It is evident that Brexit will not be an overnight constitutional event. Brexit will be a process lasting for some years, with frequent moments of drama as decisions on specific policies or concessions are coming close.

We have read the declarations of the leaders. What now? Even in the best of atmospheres, there is an immense amount to be settled if indeed the UK pursues diverging from EU norms as an affirmative political merit. That is a clear, even legitimate, political choice; but achieving it without too much damage will involve hugely delicate and likely prolonged negotiations. Some of the fields are of immense importance for daily life. The status of the 4 million European citizens living outside the land of their birth presents vital human questions. There is an immense difference between having a right and having a right to request the exercise of a discretion. Depending on a skeptical official's approval of whether you can stay, where you can work, what papers and other proof you need—these are real burdens, worst for the poorest, the least educated, the less confident.

The UK has particular grounds to be embarrassed, not least by the Windrush scandal. Lawful immigrants from the Caribbean of many years standing were deported because they lacked papers which were not legally necessary. Well-intentioned honest officials try to do the job of lawfully limiting the number of foreigners, and are calibrated so as to make it not easy. I was told, by a barrister, of a four year old child who received a stern communication saying that he had no right to remain and should leave the country inside a short period of notice. The decision was reversed on appeal. Such episodes do not confer confidence in the humanity with which the rules are applied.

Equally difficult choices are presented in the field of technical standards. For forty-seven years the UK has regulated collectively, pooling its sovereignty with its European partners in order to develop a competitive market that will favour innovation, risk-taking and the expansion of choice through competition, safety and prosperity. Regulation is an ongoing process as new techniques and products emerge. As we can't realistically have a parliamentary vote on each, the practice is expert advice, followed by adoption of secondary legislation. That can be criticised as obscure, undemocratic; and praised as efficient.

Saying that we wish in principle to have rival standards designed for only one country sounds to be on the wrong side of the slope of history. Yet that appears to be what is politically identified as a worthy goal, whereby the UK can prosper in its dealings with other third countries.

And finally, cross-border arrangements regarding police cooperation, child abduction, terrorism, European Arrest Warrants, and cooperation in civil justice: I cannot imagine not establishing cross-

border cooperation in these fields, but that will involve procedures governed by EU law. Criminal jurisdiction can't be based on an informal friendly deal. There will be important bridges to build. I don't see an obvious solution.

Various patriotic declarations about independence have been made over the last three years, and then abandoned. But for the moment we have to acknowledge the expression of a well-supported political wish to diverge. The subjects are of immense importance and affect literally millions of people. It would be a very grave matter if they were not resolved; the necessary texts will take a long time to emerge as the questions are legally and institutionally complex. But I do not believe that everything will be washed away.

January 31st was for me a day of sadness, not protest or rage or anger. The election in December delivered a popular mandate. But deeper, different damage had been done. Brexit politics have been poisonously confrontational and have made it almost acceptable to be skeptical about foreigners. Disagreement has been equated with disloyalty, dishonesty, and worse. Insults, verbal abuse, threats of violence, and real violence: a member of Parliament lost her life at the hands of a fanatic. The coarsening of public discourse in my country—and others—must be a dismay for all people of goodwill. I deeply deplore the warlike tones in which negotiations, speeches and dialogues about Brexit mechanics are reported. The UK is not at war with its twenty-seven partners.

I heard the new President of the Commission speak after her swearing in, with elegance, grace, clarity; and read with sadness how that same speech was presented in England as having been bellicose and inflammatory. There are immense, obvious, real political and economic challenges which diplomacy will have to bridge. I urge us all to refrain from presenting these as a prize-fight in which the winner knocks out the loser. This is a matter not just of aesthetics and good manners but real substance in that voters at war and voters at peace and their political leaders behave differently.

Now we here in the Court handle disagreement very well. I have seen fierce debates, impassioned exchange of ideas, the slow emergence of consensus on a text, multiple *délibérés* to reach consensus, as well as collegiality, sympathy, generosity, sympathy, solidarity. We don't have to please the voters or the press. But we are cautious. That leads to my recommendations.

Legitimacy

Especially when Brexit represents a manifestation of anger and hostility on the part of the unfortunate, and suspicions of privileged EU bureaucrats, our role is crucial. The legitimacy of the enforcement activity of the institution depends on the existence of effective, genuine, visible judicial review. That is elementary, fundamental, crucial. Without the court, the Commission's activity, no matter how skilled or well intentioned, risks being called arbitrary, illegitimate, unjust. Our contribution enhances, not damages.

In a democracy the public authority must sometimes lose in its own courts. We do not respect electoral or judicial systems which record success for the government 99% of the time. I absolutely reject the notion that finding against the Commission lowers public respect for the institution. To the contrary, the public is likely to be comforted by the fact that the institutional system involves robust quality control. Merely checking formal legality may not be enough. We should not believe that judicial setbacks weaken the authority of the entity.

Second Suggestion, As to Hearings

Each of the eleven UK members who served in Luxembourg from 1973 has been a former advocate, accustomed to the robust dialogue of the courts in the UK. We enjoy verbal gymnastics. Judges are accustomed to test propositions verbally by asking provocative questions. In my younger days appearing before the House of Lords was like a gladiatorial contest with extra beasts in the arena. It is not rude to challenge an advocate's approach to some question; it is a welcome manifestation of judicial alertness. I recollect sad hearings from the old times in Luxembourg when days of preparation and hours of pleadings elicited not a single question. Far from being offended or disturbed by the challenge the advocate will welcome the chance of identifying the problem on the judge's mind. So, I say, press counsel to address the doubts you have. Don't be shy. You think it is rude? Counsel thinks it stimulating. You are doing a valuable service. Second, you are not revealing prematurely your innermost thoughts; you are testing by hypothesis. Putting a question in debate does not mean you endorse or oppose it.

Simplicity

I respectfully suggest that we can write more simply, more directly, less perfectly legally complete and more factually vivid. Why is the loser losing? Why is the winner winning? Did we have doubts? Was it really as straightforward as the judgment suggests? Is there nothing in the opposing arguments which detained us? I submit that there is no harm in acknowledging the strengths and weaknesses on both sides. I have been looking at the judgments where I was *assesseur* or *rapporteur* and I fear most of them are longer than they need have been. Especially in *fonction publique* cases, where the litigants are often more in need of common sense and courteous listening than of subtle administrative law analysis, we ought to produce a text which the parties can read inside forty-five minutes. Once again, remember the words of Vice-Chancellor Megarry: the most important person in a court room is the one who is going to lose.

Scotland

Many of you have said “*L’Ecosse est notre espoir*” or have said you hope for Scottish independence. England and Scotland have been united politically since 1707, the crowns since 1603, and are deeply interdependent. So independence would be a most complex matter of disentanglement. Opinions are divided and we know from Brexit the tragically divisive nature of separate debates. But I think it rather plain that the position of Scotland was gravely neglected. Its citizens voted heavily not to leave the EU and it was promised a full part in the Brexit negotiations. What is certain is that Scotland’s government is dismayed by Brexit, wishes this institution well and sees itself as a small nation with a role to play in wider Europe. Maybe other structural architectural reforms may emerge as part of a broader response to Brexit.

In the hall outside sits a sculpture by Eduardo Paolozzi, entitled *Master of the Universe*. Like other important works of art, it contains echoes of past masterpieces, with eyes that recall Michelangelo’s *David*, and a posture that recalls Newton and William Blake, poet, artist and mystic. Paolozzi was born in Scotland, child of Italian immigrants. As a teenager he was briefly imprisoned as an enemy alien and his uncle and father were killed when the ship carrying other enemy aliens to Canada was torpedoed. A child of Europe, a child of Scotland, a child of wartime. The sculpture is a manifestation of the goodwill of the government of Scotland to this court and the Union which it serves. The

First Minister has said that she hopes it will be there when the Union returns to twenty-eight Member States.

I have received great kindness and generous collegiality here. We have great debates about the drafting of our judgments, yet the lunch is cheerful, the dinner plentiful and the coffee animated. The *référendaires* know the gossip far better than we do, and talented youth offers the best insurance against old age. Especially during the long drawn out miseries of Brexit, not once did I hear anything other than sympathy, support and hope. I was given a *sursis de déménagement* for the hideous task of tidying my room and will be physically here in February. During an illness, I was royally supported. I am profoundly grateful. If a political typhoon must engulf your country, this is a good place to watch the storm with friendly colleagues.

I enjoy reading the poets of the seventeenth century when the English language was in full reform influenced by Shakespeare and the King James Bible. John Donne served as the preacher of Lincoln's Inn where barristers train. He wrote a Valediction, Forbidding Mourning. Also that "every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less." The UK is bigger than a clod, but it is not being washed away. The worst will not happen.

I had hoped to end my professional career on a high, in this fascinating institution. That is not to be. I have no intention of retiring. John Milton, the seventeenth century poet and radical thinker wrote in *Lycidas*, a melancholy celebration of a deceased friend, a line which might apply:

"At last he rose, and twitched his mantle blue
Tomorrow to fresh woods and pastures new"

So now I go in search of "fresh woods and pastures new." And I look forward to the adventures, challenges, disappointments, and successes that European law can offer those who practise it. Where and how and what we will be at the end of the next ten years I do not know. But when I was asked if I wished to keep my *toge*, I said yes: maybe it will be needed again. *Peut-être on en aura besoin*. I thank you for your presence this evening.