

# RUNNYMEDE GAZETTE

## EUROPEAN PLEBISCITE SPECIAL NO 2;

### EDITORIAL

A EUROPEAN SHANGRI-LA?  
THE BISMARCK MODEL  
DEMOCRATIC ARMAGEDDON

---

### CONTENTS

**THE DIEM25 MANIFESTO: “DEMOCRATIZING EUROPE” OR PERPETUATING THE DOMINATION OF THE EU ELITES?**

*Takis Fotopoulos; Global Research*

**THE EUROPEAN STABILITY MECHANISM (TREATY EXCERPTS)**

*European Commission*

**AFTER 2020, ALL EU MEMBERS WILL HAVE TO ADOPT THE EURO**

*Andrew Lilico; Daily Telegraph' via Sonya Porter*

**THE EURO AND THE LISBON TREATY**

*Chris Watkin: via Bob&Jane*

**IMF PLANS NEW ECONOMIC CRISIS BEFORE BREXIT VOTE**

*William F. Jasper; Wikileaks; via Sonya Porter*

**BBC BIAS, BREXIT, THE EU, BILDERBERG AND GLOBAL GOVERNMENT**

*Steven MacMillan; Activist Post*

**THE DESTABILIZATION AND FRACTURE OF THE EU: WILL THE EUROPEAN UNION SHARE THE SAME FATE AS THE SOVIET UNION?**

*Sputnik*

**EU MILITARY POLICE CARRY OUT ‘EXTREMELY WORRYING’ CIVIL UNREST CRISIS TRAINING**

*Vincent Wood; Express; via Vote Leave*

# EDITORIAL

## A EUROPEAN SHANGRI-LA?

### *THE DELUSION OF 'REFORMIST' MANIFESTOS*

Listening to the rhetoric emanating from many leaders of the Green Party and from many corners of the Labour Party most people might be left wondering why there is opposition to the EU at all. The EU is, in the words of Carline Lucas 'a wonderful noble cause'. Yes, there is a bit of untidiness here and there, and of course there have been a few little local difficulties over Greece, Spain, the Euro, austerity and so forth.

But all that can be easily 'reformed', so we have no need to worry our little heads.

So, from time to time over the past twenty years or more we are treated to 'manifestos', usually emanating from sources which self-define as 'Green' or 'Left' which promise us a European Shangri-La of peace, equality, prosperity and 'democracy'. Typically these productions float around for a while, come to nothing (and for very good reasons, which will become apparent anon), and dissolve into the ether to be recycled under a new title perhaps two or three years down the line.

The latest of these offerings is DIEM25.

The item by Takis Fotopoulos is one of the longest ever to appear in a *Runnymede Gazette*. No apologies are made; it is one of the most perceptive and intelligent demolitions ever of the delusions and the seductive cant and humbug which lie behind such 'manifestos' and of what the author describes as 'Left Globalisation'.

Previously, these editorials have remarked on the capacity of the EU, like the fakir's cobra, to hypnotize and ensnare many intelligent, well-meaning and politically well-educated people. Always the laudable objective conceals the globalised, corporate, neoliberal agenda. Fotopoulos takes us through the anatomy of this process. He says;-

*"To expect that the globalization process will itself create the objective and subjective conditions for a socialist transformation, as some 'Paleolithic Marxists' believe, or alternatively, that the creation of self-managed factories within the present globalized system will lead to a self-managed economy, as a variety of life-style "anarchists" suggest, is ... to connive at the completion of the globalization process, as planned by the elites. (...)  
"The EU is ... the main expression of neoliberal globalization in the European space."*

Fotopoulos presents a critique of representative democracy in its currently established form, comparing it with the Athenian concept;-

*"The former presupposes the separation of the state from society and the exercise of sovereignty by a separate body of representatives, whereas the latter is based on the principle that sovereignty is exercised directly by the free citizens themselves. (...)  
representative democracy is democracy made safe for the modern state. "*

Of Varoufakis, very much the moving force behind DIEM25, he says;-

*" ... his aim is purely to save the EU, (...) What he actually has in mind here is to deceive people into thinking that they are fighting for a conversion of the EU into a democracy through some sort of decentralization of power to the local, municipal, regional and national levels (in fact the EU is also supposed to encourage such decentralization!),*

*while of course the economic and political elites will continue to monopolize economic and political power, exactly as at present."*

And that the 'problems' with the EU are intentional and structural;

*" ... these crises are not 'external' to the EU crises, but have actually been created by the EU itself and its institutions (...) (The Eurozone is) ... a mechanism for the transfer of economic surplus from the less developed members of the Eurozone (eg. Greece, Portugal, Ireland and Spain) to the more advanced ones, particularly Germany."*

He calls for each country to create Fronts for National and Social Liberation;-

*" ... the anti-EU movement in Britain is actually a movement against globalization ... (...) Re-development based on self-reliance is the only way in which peoples breaking away from globalization and its institutions (like the EU) could rebuild their productive structures which have been dismantled by globalization."*

## **SUPRANATIONAL VERSUS INTERGOVERNMENTAL**

The intergovernmental model relies on states co-operating on an issue-by-issue, treaty-by-treaty basis. In that case the essential powers remain within national control with all matters remain answerable to each states' government, parliament and courts.

On the other hand, the supranational model imposes policies upon states top-down in such a manner as to place that policy beyond the purview of that state's parliament, government and courts.

Thus the supranational model is inherently oligarchic, elitist and undemocratic and, as such, is inherently and necessarily immune to any 'reform' which aims to rectify such flaws. As Janet Daley says in Brexit the Movie, the deliberate intention is to 'remove control of government permanently from the great mass of the people'.

In fact 'reform' of the EU would, in principle, be facile. Keep the Council of Ministers as an intergovernmental forum and scrap the rest. Perhaps we could keep a parliamentary forum, perhaps on the nominated model of the 1970's ... the more parliamentarians of different countries ... and not just the EU ... meet the better.

But such a reform is not on offer, never has been and never will be. The authors of such 'pseudo-manifestos' as DIEM25 know that. So the likes of Caroline Lucas, Jeremy Corbyn, Yanos Varoufakis, and many others of that ilk who have kissed the ring of globalised neo-liberalism ... and whilst having the effrontery to yap endlessly about 'empowerment', 'democracy' and 'localism' ... can make any number of empty promises safe in the knowledge their plans for de-privatisation, nationalisation, the re-merging of rail infrastructure and 'People's QE' and so forth will never be permitted by the EU.

Politics is a maze where nothing ever actually goes in the direction it seems to go. We must be constantly on guard.

## **THE BISMARCK MODEL**

The model for the construction of the European megastate follows closely on that adopted by Bismarck for the unification of Germany . There are some remarkable parallels;-

Zollverein ... moving covertly towards political union under the pretext of a

customs union. The process happens in measured stages, such as the Erfurt Union, and requires a merging and flattening out of local identities (Kulturkampf). At the centre is pseudo parliament, in Germany's case, the Imperial Diet later to become the Reichstag which ... significantly, like the present European Assembly ... could not initiate legislation. Meanwhile government was not dependent on a majority in this pseudo parliament, so votes for the SPD after 1890 could safely be ignored.

Against this background, the constituent states of the new German Federation were allowed to keep their local Monarchs, Grand Dukes and legislatures. Bavaria's Mad King Ludwig could go on spending ruinous amounts of money on his ridiculous toy palaces until he became such an embarrassment that he had to be bumped off. Indeed, the Bavarian and other monarchies did not finally abdicate until 1918. Some states were even allowed to keep some toy soldiers. All this presided over by an elite ... you couldn't make this up ... called the Junkers!

So until World War I fig leaves of local autonomy were preserved, but had been hollowed out to nothing. Sound familiar?

## DEMOCRATIC ARMAGEDDON

The last special edition explored both the outlet and mindset of the European nomenclatura, and also how this is reflected by the legal immunities whole rafts of this nomenclatura award themselves ... effectively placing, in direct contradiction to our own Common Law tradition, the state above law.

A reading of the immunity, secrecy and taxation clauses in the treaty establishing the European Stability Mechanism (ESM), is truly hair-raising. This is seriously scary stuff, depicting a profoundly totalitarian mindset. It epitomises to EU.

The treaty provides that the ESM shall “*enjoy immunity from every form of judicial process*”; and “*... immune from search, requisition, confiscation, expropriation or any other form of seizure, taking or foreclosure by executive, judicial, administrative or legislative action.*”; its archives and property and premises ... “*inviolable*” and “*free from restrictions, regulations, controls and moratoria of any nature.*”

Its Members or former Members, or anyone who has worked for it, “*shall not disclose information that is subject to professional secrecy.*” That blanket caveat seemingly covers anything and everything. We, the peasant hoi poloi, must not know what is being done in our name and with our money.

Those same people “*shall be immune from legal proceedings with respect to acts performed by them in their official capacity and shall enjoy inviolability in respect of their official papers and documents*” and shall also be subject to “*an internal tax ... on salaries and emoluments*” whilst the institution itself is also exempt from all taxation.

In short this body, with such vast and wide-ranging powers over the economies of the EU member states, is answerable to no-one, and is above any challenge or countermand. It is beyond the purview of any court, parliament or government, even the institutions of the EU itself. In every respect it is above any law.

Anyone tempted to vote for that, please get in touch.

*Frank Taylor*

# THE DIEM25 MANIFESTO: “DEMOCRATIZING EUROPE” OR PERPETUATING THE DOMINATION OF THE EU ELITES?

*Takis Fotopoulos; Global Research*

## *Towards a Democratic Community of Sovereign Nations*

In the midst of huge publicity, particularly by the mass media of the globalist “Left” (i.e. the Left that is fully integrated into the New World Order (NWO) of neoliberal globalization) such as The Guardian, Y. Varoufakis – one of the protagonists of the present economic, political and social Greek catastrophe – presented himself as the ‘saviour of Europa’, as he was described by another well-known member of the same “Left” in an article published (of all places!) in RT.<sup>1</sup>

In this article I will try, first, to examine the democratic credentials of this manifesto and, second, to explore its aims and strategy. Then, I will try to answer some crucial questions concerning the timing of this manifesto and who supports it. I will conclude with a proposal for a Democratic Community of Sovereign Nations, which, to my mind, represents a real option now vs. the pseudo-options offered by this so-called ‘manifesto’, which, indirectly has already been approved by the elites.<sup>2</sup>

## *The pseudo-‘democratic’ credentials of DIEM25*

Varoufakis begins his ‘manifesto’ by stating that “for all their concerns with global competitiveness, migration and terrorism, only one prospect truly terrifies the Powers of Europe: Democracy...for rule by Europe’s peoples, government by the demos, is the shared nightmare of the European elites.”<sup>3</sup>

Then he makes clear what he means by this when he describes in detail who these elites are:

- The Brussels bureaucracy and its lobbyists
- Its hit-squad inspectorates and the Troika
- the powerful Eurogroup that has no standing in law or treaty
- Bailed-out bankers, fund managers and resurgent oligarchies
- Political parties appealing to liberalism, democracy, freedom and solidarity
- Governments that fuel cruel inequality by implementing austerity
- Media moguls who have turned fear-mongering into an art form

As is obvious from this list, the EU elites are defined in purely political terms and, particularly, in terms of their power to manipulate ‘public opinion’ through the lack of transparency and the framework of secrecy within which mostly unelected EU organs dominate their ‘subjects’, i.e. the European peoples. In other words, the defining characteristic of the members of these elites is their political power, through which they can manipulate the European peoples to serve their aims.

What is NOT mentioned at all is, who the elites exercising economic power are and what their role is in manipulating the decision-making process of the EU. That is, there is not a single word about the Transnational Corporations, particularly those of European origin like the European Round Table of Industrialists, which consists of the main Transnational Corporations (TNCs) running the EU.<sup>4</sup>

Similarly, there is no mention of the various international economic institutions which are controlled by the Transnational Elite 5 (i.e. the elites that are based in the G7 countries), namely the EU, WTO, IMF and World Bank, and their role – behind the scenes – in determining the EU’s decisions (economic and political as well as cultural). In fact, the Manifesto does everything possible to stress the supposedly purely political nature of the “democracy” (which it mostly identifies with human rights!), as when it points out that “the European Union was an exceptional achievement...proving that it was possible to create a shared framework of human rights across a continent that was, not long ago, home to murderous chauvinism, racism and barbarity”. Even when the Manifesto tries to allude to economic elites, again it does not put the blame on the vastly unequal distribution of economic power on which the EU elites thrive, but on the unequal distribution of political power which, supposedly, makes it possible for the economic elites to exercise their power:

*“A confederacy of myopic politicians, economically naïve officials and financially incompetent ‘experts’*

*submit slavishly to the edicts of financial and industrial conglomerates, alienating Europeans and stirring up a dangerous anti-European backlash... At the heart of our disintegrating EU there lies a guilty deceit: A highly political, top-down, opaque decision-making process is presented as 'apolitical', 'technical', 'procedural' and 'neutral'. Its purpose is to prevent Europeans from exercising democratic control over their money, finance, working conditions and environment".<sup>6</sup>*

It is therefore clear that it is the inequality in the distribution of political power that is the cause of all evil in the EU. This is a conclusion which, at best, betrays a complete ignorance of what democracy is really all about and, at worst, attempts to deceive the victims of globalization in Europe as to the real causes of their present ordeal. Needless to add that Varoufakis, as the ex-Finance Minister of the Greek government, knows a few things about political deception, since this is a government of unprecedented political crooks – as they are referred to by most Greeks currently in open revolt against the government, making it difficult for Ministers and Syriza parliamentarians to go about on the streets and forcing them to resort to riot police units for their protection.

Yet Varoufakis has no qualms about discussing political deception, as when he emphasizes that “the price of this deceit is not merely the end of democracy but also poor economic policies”, by which he means – as he explains further on – the austerity policies implemented by the EU elites “resulting in permanent recession in the weaker countries and low investment in the core countries” (a misconception that I will consider below) and “unprecedented inequality”. So, we learn that the present unprecedented inequality is not the inevitable result of the opening and liberalization of markets implied by globalization, but simply the outcome of the ‘guilty deceit’ he describes, supposedly due to the ‘non- democratic’ character of the EU apparatus.

However, as I have tried to show elsewhere,<sup>7</sup> if we define political democracy as the authority of the people (demos) in the political sphere—a fact that implies political equality—then economic democracy could be correspondingly defined as the authority of the demos in the economic sphere—a fact that implies economic equality. Economic democracy therefore relates to every social system that institutionalizes the integration of society with the economy. This means that, ultimately, the demos controls the economic process, within an institutional framework of demotic ownership of the means of production. In a narrower sense, economic democracy also relates to every social system that institutionalizes the minimization of socio- economic differences, particularly those arising from the unequal distribution of private property and the consequent unequal distribution of income and wealth (as the old social-democratic parties used to preach). It is obvious that economic democracy refers both to the mode of production and to the distribution of the social product and wealth.

In this sense, the EU apparatus is not, and could never be, a democracy within an institutional framework that secures the unequal distribution of economic power, as the NWO of neoliberal globalization does. To put it simply, as long as a minority of people own and control the means of production and distribution, it is this elite that will take all important economic decisions, and not the political elite who crucially depend on the former for the funding of their expensive election campaigns, or for their promotion through the mass media which the economic elites also control and so on. Yet one of Varoufakis’s main supporters (and one of his political advisers when in government, presumably at the expense of the Greek people), James K Galbraith—a well-known member of the globalist “Left”—did not hesitate to compare how democratic the US Congress is in relation to the EU apparatus:

*“what struck me in particular from the standpoint of a veteran of the congressional staff was the near-complete absence of procedural safeguards, of accountability, of record-keeping, of transparency, and also the practical absence of an independent and sceptical press. These are the elementary functional components of a working democracy, and their absence is an enormous obstacle to the progress of democracy in Europe, and are therefore, an excellent place to begin”.<sup>8</sup>*

So, according to this criterion of democracy, which is also the Manifesto’s main criterion, the model for EU democracy should be the absolute degradation of any concept of democracy which US institutions in fact represent—whereby Congressmen and the President himself are elected according to how much support they can muster from the economic elites (funding, mass media support etc.)!

### ***The aims of “authentic democracy” and the strategy of DIEM25***

Having described this parody (or rather complete distortion) of the concept of democracy as “authentic” democracy, the Manifesto then proceeds to define, in chronological order, the aims of the DIEM25 movement.

#### **IMMEDIATELY**

The immediate aim is “full transparency in decision-making”, i.e. the publication of the minutes

of EU institutions, the online uploading of important documents, the monitoring of lobbyists etc. Any comments here would obviously be superfluous, as it is clear that the reason such a petty aim is associated with 'authentic' democracy is clearly to distract people from the real conditions which must be met for political power to be distributed equally among all citizens.

### **WITHIN TWELVE MONTHS**

The aim here is to address the ongoing economic crisis "utilizing existing institutions and within existing EU Treaties". The proposed policies, according to the Manifesto, "will be aimed at re-deploying existing institutions (through a creative re-interpretation of existing treaties and charters) in order to stabilize the crises of public debt, banking, inadequate investment, and rising poverty".

However, it can be shown that it is the EU institutions themselves that have created these crises, which therefore can never be 'stabilized' within the existing institutions and treaties. Thus it can be demonstrated that, since the present globalization developed under conditions of capitalist ownership and control of the means of production, it could only be neoliberal. It is the proliferation of multinationals (or Transnational Corporations -TNCs), from the mid-1970s onwards, which has led to the phenomenon of neoliberal globalization (no relation to the failed attempt at globalization in the early 20th century).<sup>9</sup> The vast expansion of the TNCs necessitated the opening and liberalization of markets for goods, services, capital and labour. The opening of capital markets was initially informally achieved by the TNCs "from below" (the Euro-dollar market, etc.) before being institutionalized, first in Britain and the US through Thatcherism and Reaganism correspondingly, and then through the IMF, the World Bank, the World Trade Organization and of course the EU, worldwide. Needless to say that when the economic mechanisms (i.e. economic violence) have not been enough to integrate a country into the NWO, the TE —i.e. the economic, political, media and academic elites based in the countries (mainly the "G7") where the large TNCs are headquartered (not in the formal legal sense),— has had no qualms about using brutal physical violence to incorporate them by force (e.g. Yugoslavia, Libya, Syria, etc.).

However, the opening and liberalization of markets brought about a structural change in the capitalist economic model, which most Marxists (I refer to the remaining anti-systemic Marxists—apart from some notable exceptions like Leslie Sklair—and not the pseudo-Marxists of the globalist "Left") have failed to understand. Hence, they cannot see the direct link between neoliberalism and the opening/liberalization of markets: it can be shown that the famous "four freedoms", i.e. the opening and liberalization of markets (for capital, goods, services and labour) that were institutionalized first by the EU Maastricht Treaty and those following it, were the ultimate cause of all the present EU crises (debt crises, rising inequality and unemployment as well as the refugee crisis).<sup>10</sup> In other words, these Marxists cannot see that throughout the pre-globalization part of the post-war period from 1945-1975, the capitalist development model was based essentially on the internal market.

This meant that the control of aggregate demand policies and especially fiscal policies (regarding taxation but also, more importantly, public spending (including public investment, social spending and the welfare state), played a critical role in determining national income and employment levels. In contrast, in the globalization era that followed with the opening and liberalization of markets, the basis of growth shifted from the internal to the external market. This meant that competitiveness became the key criterion for the success of a capitalist market economy and, consequently, the multinationals now play a key role in the growth process through the investments that they essentially finance, as well as through the expansion of exports that can be brought about by the installation of affiliates in a country. The EU is, of course, the main expression of neoliberal globalization in the European space.

In this context, it is not the austerity policies imposed by some 'baddies' in the political and economic elites that are the cause of the present low growth economy, just because they do not wish to adopt Keynesian policies to expand incomes and demand <sup>11</sup>. The austerity policies are simply the symptom of globalization in the sense that, if competitiveness cannot improve through more investment based on research and development, then, in case such investment is lacking, the alternative "cheap" way to achieve the same result is through the suppression of domestic wages and prices, by means of austerity policies of some sort. In fact, today it is not only naïve economists belonging to the globalist "Left" who support Keynesian policies, presumably because they still live in a nation-state time capsule where such policies and all its ideological paraphernalia are promoted, but even Nobel laureates in economics. Of course in the latter case one cannot talk about naivety but, rather, deliberate disorientation. For instance, Paul Krugman, in a recent article in the Guardian <sup>12</sup> – the flagship of the globalist "Left" – systematically attempts to bypass the crucial issues of our era and particularly globalization and its neoliberal ideology, preferring to concentrate instead on the austerity 'delusion' or 'obsession' of policy makers, particularly in the UK—conveniently 'forgetting' that these are also the EU's policies, as well as those of the US since Reagan. In other words, he ignores the fact that these are the policies of the Transnational Elite imposed, one way or another, on every country integrated into the NWO.

## **WITHIN TWO YEARS**

A Constitutional Assembly should be convened consisting of “representatives” from national assemblies (Parliaments), regional assemblies and municipal councils. The resulting Constitutional Assembly, according to the ‘Manifesto’, would be empowered to decide on a future democratic constitution that would replace all existing European Treaties within a decade. Here it is obvious that the author of the ‘Manifesto’ has no idea whatsoever about the meaning of classical democracy or the concept of demos which he so extensively uses, and yet he has no qualms about identifying representative “democracy” with classical democracy!

In fact, it was only during the sixteenth century that the idea of representation entered the political lexicon, although the sovereignty of Parliament was not established until the seventeenth century. In the same way that the king had once ‘represented’ society as a whole, it was now the turn of Parliament to play this role, although sovereignty itself was still supposed to belong to the people as a whole. The doctrine that prevailed in Europe after the French revolution was not just that the French people were sovereign and that their views were represented in the National Assembly, but that the French nation was sovereign and the National Assembly embodied the will of the nation. As it was observed:

*“this was a turning point in continental European ideas since, before this, the political representative had been viewed in the continent as a delegate. According to the new theory promulgated by the French revolutionaries ... the elected representative is viewed as an independent maker of national laws and policies, not as an agent for his constituents or for sectional interests”.<sup>13</sup>*

Actually, one may say that the form of liberal ‘democracy’ that has dominated the West in the last two centuries is not even a representative ‘democracy’ but a representative government, that is, a government of the people by their representatives. Thus, as Bhikhu Parekh points out:

*“Representatives were to be elected by the people, but once elected they were to remain free to manage public affairs as they saw fit. This highly effective way of insulating the government against the full impact of universal franchise lies at the heart of liberal democracy. Strictly speaking, liberal democracy is not representative democracy but representative government”.<sup>14</sup>*

The European conception of sovereignty was completely alien to the Athenian conception, where the separation of sovereignty from its exercise was unknown. All powers were exercised directly by the citizens themselves, or by delegates who were appointed by lot and for a short period of time. In fact, as Aristotle points out, the election by voting was considered oligarchic and was not allowed but in exceptional circumstances (usually in cases where special knowledge was required), and only appointment by lot was considered democratic.<sup>15</sup> Therefore, the type of ‘democracy’ that has been established since the sixteenth century in Europe has had very little in common with the classical (Athenian) democracy. The former presupposes the separation of the state from society and the exercise of sovereignty by a separate body of representatives, whereas the latter is based on the principle that sovereignty is exercised directly by the free citizens themselves. Athens, therefore, may hardly be characterized as a state in the normal sense of the word.

### **BY 2025: ENACTMENT OF THE DECISIONS OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL ASSEMBLY**

Therefore, the ultimate aim of the process envisaged by DIEM25 is PURE DECEPTION, and Y. Varoufakis has shown in his career as a Finance Minister that he is a master of this. He claims that the Constitutional Assembly (or ‘We, the peoples of Europe’ as he calls it, copying the American Constitution) will bring about the ‘radical’ change envisaged by the Manifesto. Yet the American case is hardly a model for democracy, as A. Birch pointed out: “the American Founding Fathers Madison and Jefferson were sceptical of democracy, precisely because of its Greek connotation of direct rule. This is why they preferred to call the American system republican, because “the term was thought to be more appropriate to the balanced constitution that had been adopted in 1787 than the term democratic, with its connotations of lower-class dominance.”<sup>16</sup>

As John Dunn aptly stressed while describing the aim of representative ‘democracy’: It is important to recognize that the modern state was constructed, painstakingly and purposefully, above all by Jean Bodin and Thomas Hobbes, for the express purpose of denying that any given population, any people, had either the capacity or the right to act together for themselves, either independently of, or against their sovereign. The central point of the concept was to deny the very possibility that any demos (let alone one on the demographic scale of a European territorial monarchy) could be a genuine political agent, could act at all, let alone act with sufficiently continuous identity and practical coherence for it to be able to rule itself.... the idea of the modern state was invented precisely to repudiate the possible coherence of democratic claims to rule, or even take genuinely political action.... representative democracy is democracy made safe for the modern state. <sup>17</sup>



Clearly then, what Varoufakis had in mind with his 'Manifesto' was simply to repeat the American Founding Fathers' deception and create another 'democratic' monster, like his beloved American one, in Europe! Unsurprisingly, he tries to hide the fact that what he talks about has nothing to do with classical democracy, despite the misleading terminology he uses (demos etc.). Thus, as he stresses, "we consider the model of national parties which form flimsy alliances at the level of the European Parliament to be obsolete". He then goes on effectively to negate this statement by saying:

*"While the fight for democracy-from-below (at the local, regional or national levels) is necessary, it is nevertheless insufficient if it is conducted without an internationalist strategy toward a pan-European coalition for democratizing Europe. European democrats must come together first, forge a common agenda, and then find ways of connecting it with local communities and at the regional and national level."* 18

It is therefore obvious that his aim is purely to save the EU, rather than democracy, as he knows very well that the process he suggests could never lead to a democracy from below. Such a democracy could only start from the local level and then local demoi could federalise into democratic regions, nations and finally a democratic Europe. Not the other way around as he deceptively suggests, particularly when we are talking about a continent which, unlike the USA, consists of a multiplicity of peoples with different languages, culture and history. Varoufakis states that:

*"our overarching aim to democratize the European Union is intertwined with an ambition to promote self-government (economic, political and social) at the local, municipal, regional and national levels; to throw open the corridors of power to the public; to embrace social and civic movements; and to emancipate all levels of government from bureaucratic and corporate power"* 19

What he actually has in mind here is to deceive people into thinking that they are fighting for a conversion of the EU into a democracy through some sort of decentralization of power to the local, municipal, regional and national levels (in fact the EU is also supposed to encourage such decentralization!), while of course the economic and political elites will continue to monopolize economic and political power, exactly as at present.

### ***Why such a manifesto now? The rise of the neo-nationalist movement***

One reasonable question arising with respect to the timing of the 'Manifesto' is why such a manifesto for the "democratization" of the EU should be necessary at this particular moment. Given that this is not really a manifesto for the democratization of Europe but, rather, an attempt to promote the EU, as we saw above, the motives behind this pseudo-manifesto are now clear. Particularly so if we consider that this is in fact the moment of truth for the EU, not just because of the refugee problem, but also because of the Eurozone crisis, the possibility of the UK exiting from the EU and so on. Yet all these crises are not 'external' to the EU crises, but have actually been created by the EU itself and its institutions.

The opening of the labor market within the EU and the removal of border controls through the Schengen agreement was one of the main causes of the refugee problem. However, a decisive role in this was also played by the EU elites, as part of the Transnational Elite, which destroyed the stable Ba'athist regimes in both Iraq and Syria, as well as the Libyan regime. The TE's sole aim here was "regime change", i.e. to integrate all these peoples who were resisting the NWO as they fought to maintain their national sovereignty.

Then, it was the institutions of the Eurozone itself which created the Eurozone crisis, the debt crisis and the massive rise in unemployment and poverty. As I have shown elsewhere, 20 these institutions were tailor-made to create a mechanism for the transfer of economic surplus from the less developed members of the Eurozone (eg. Greece, Portugal, Ireland and Spain) to the more advanced ones, particularly Germany.

Similarly, it is the resentment of the British people at the loss of their national sovereignty within the EU (despite the fact that the British elites are a constituent part of the Transnational Elite), which has led to a growing anti-EU movement in Britain that may well lead to a Brexit—an event which could have catalytic implications for the EU itself. This is particularly because, as the British elites themselves recognize, the anti-EU movement in Britain is actually a movement against globalization (a fact that the Globalist "Left" ignores), which could also explain the rise of the nationalist UKIP party:

*"The surge in support for UKIP is not simply a protest vote. The party has a constituency among those left behind by globalization... the globalization of the economy has produced losers as well as winners.*

*As a rule the winners are among the better off and the losers among the least affluent.”21*

The same process is being repeated almost everywhere in Europe today, inevitably leading many people (particularly the working class) to join the neo-nationalist Right. This is not of course because they have suddenly become “nationalists”, let alone “fascists” (as the globalist “Left” accuses them in order to ostracise them!), but simply because the present globalist “Left” does not wish to lead the struggle against globalization while, at the same time, the popular strata have realized that national and economic sovereignty are incompatible with globalization. This is a fact fully realized, for example, by the strong patriotic movement in Russia, which encompasses all those opposing the integration of the country into the NWO—from nationalists to communists and from orthodox Christians to secularists—while the Putin leadership is trying to accommodate both the very powerful globalist part of the elite (the oligarchs, mass media, social media etc.) and this patriotic movement.

But it is mainly Le Pen’s National Front party, more than any other neo-nationalist party in the West, that has realized that globalization and membership of the NWO’s institutions are incompatible with national sovereignty. As she recently stressed, (in a way that the “Left” stopped doing long ago!):

*“Globalization is a barbarity, it is the country which should limit its abuses and regulate it [globalization].”...Today the world is in the hands of multinational corporations and large international finance”...Immigration “weighs down on wages,” while the minimum wage is now becoming the maximum wage”. 22*

In fact, the French National Front is now the most important nationalist party in Europe and it may well be in power following the next Presidential elections in 2017, unless of course a united front consisting of all the globalist parties – with support from the entire TE and particularly the Euro-elites and the mass media controlled by them – prevents it from doing so. This is how Florian Philippot, the FN’s vice-president and chief strategist, aptly put forward the Front’s case in a FT interview:

*“The people who always voted for the left, who believed in the left and who thought that it represented an improvement in salaries and pensions, social and economic progress, industrial policies . . . these people have realized that they were misled.” 23*

As the same FT report points out, to some observers of French politics the FN’s economic policies – which include exiting the euro and putting up trade barriers to protect industry – read like something copied from a 1930s political manifesto, while Christian Saint-Étienne, an economist for the newspaper Le Figaro, recently described this vision as “Peronist Marxism”. 24

In fact, in a more recent FT interview Marine Le Pen, the FN president, went one step further by calling for the nationalization of the banks, in addition to an exit from the Euro (which, she expects, would lead to its collapse, if not to the collapse of the EU itself which she welcomes), while also championing public services and presenting herself as the protector of workers and farmers in the face of “wild and anarchic globalization...which has brought more pain than happiness”.25 By comparison, it never even occurred to Syriza and Varoufakis to use such slogans before the elections – let alone after the second general election when it fully endorsed all the EU elites’ and the Troika’s policies which, before the first general election, it had promised to reverse! Needless to say that Le Pen’s foreign policy is also very different to that of the French establishment (and of course that of the EU elites), as she wants a radical overhaul of French foreign policy in which relations with the regime of Syrian president Bashar al-Assad would be restored and relations with the likes of Qatar and Turkey which, she alleges, support terrorism, would be reviewed. At the same time, Le Pen sees the US as a purveyor of dangerous policies and Russia as a more suitable friend.

On top of all this, G. Soros (who is behind every ‘colour revolution’ on Earth with the myriad of NGOs etc. which he funds—it would not be surprising if we later learn that he is also funding the movement behind DM25)—has written an article also published by the flagship of the globalist “left”, The Guardian (which has repeatedly promoted Varoufakis massively) entitled, “Putin is a bigger threat to Europe’s existence than Isis”! 26

### ***The bankruptcy of the Globalist ‘Left’ and the ‘Manifesto’***

It goes without saying that this neo-nationalist movement, which is usually an explicitly anti-EU movement as well, is presently engulfing almost every EU country. The unifying element among the neo-nationalists is their struggle for national and economic sovereignty, which they rightly see as disappearing in the era of globalization. Although sometimes their main immediate motive is the fight against immigration, it is clear that they are misguided in this as they usually do not realize that it is the

opening up of all markets, including the labour markets particularly within economic unions like the EU, that is the direct cause of their own unemployment or low-wage employment. In other words, this is not a racist movement as such but a purely economic movement, although the Transnational and Zionist elites, with the help of the globalist “Left”, are trying hard to convert it into an Islamophobic movement—as the Charlie Hebdo case clearly showed—so that they can use it however they see fit in their support of the NWO. Inevitably, Islamophobic – if not racist – trends have also developed within some of these neo-nationalist movements. As we shall see in the last section of this article, this is one more reason why Popular Fronts for National and Social Liberation must be built in every country to fight not only the EU and the NWO—which is of course the main enemy—but also any racist trends developing within this new anti-globalization movement. This would also prevent the elites from using the historically well-tested practice of ‘divide and rule’ to create conflict between the victims of globalization.

This movement is embraced by most of the victims of globalization all over Europe, particularly the working class that used to support the Left<sup>27</sup>, whilst the latter has effectively embraced not just economic globalization but also political, ideological and cultural globalization and has therefore been fully integrated into the New World Order—a defining moment in its present intellectual and political bankruptcy. The process of the Left’s bankruptcy has been further enhanced by the fact that, faced with political collapse in the May 2014 Euro-parliamentary elections, it allied itself with the elites in condemning the neo-nationalist parties as fascist and neo-Nazi, while in extreme cases it has even consented to the use of blatantly fascist methods in order to suppress some of them (e.g. the Golden Dawn party in Greece).

However, today, following the successful emasculation of the antisystemic movement against globalization (mainly through the World Social Forum, thanks to the activities of the globalist “Left”),<sup>28</sup> it is up to the neo-nationalist movement to fight globalization in general and the EU in particular.

It is therefore clear that the neo-nationalist parties which are, in fact, all under attack by the TE, constitute cases of movements that have simply filled the huge gap created by the globalist “Left”. Instead of placing itself in the front line among all those peoples fighting globalization and the phasing out of their economic and national sovereignty, this “Left” has indirectly promoted globalization, using arguments based on an anachronistic internationalism supposedly founded on Marxism.

As one might expect, most members of the Globalist “Left” have joined the new movement to ‘democratize’ Europe, “forgetting” that ‘Democracy’ was also the West’s propaganda excuse for destroying Iraq, Libya and now Syria. Today it seems that the Soros circus is aiming to use exactly the same excuse to destroy Europe, in the sense of securing the perpetuation of the EU elites’ domination of the European peoples.

The most prominent members of the globalist “Left” who have already joined this new ‘movement’ range from Julian Assange to Suzan George and Toni Negri, and from Hillary Wainwright of Red Pepper to CounterPunch and other globalist “Left” newspapers and journals all over the world. In this context, it is particularly interesting to refer to Slavoj Žižek’s commentary on the ‘Manifesto’ that was presented at the inaugural meeting of Varoufakis’s new movement in Berlin on February 2016. This commentary was greeted enthusiastically by Varoufakis’s globalist “Left” supporters. Zizek began by blatantly attempting to deceive the audience with respect to Syriza’s rise to power. He talked about a ‘defeat’ but he added, “I don’t blame them, their situation was hopeless from the beginning”. Of course, he did not mention that the situation was hopeless only because SYRIZA took for granted what actually needed to be changed, if they were to realize their promises to reverse the austerity policies imposed by the Troika, to ‘tear up’ the Memoranda along with them, to stop privatizations and so on. That is, Syriza took for granted Greece’s membership of the EU and the Eurozone and, accordingly, never prepared for a “Plan B” so that, as soon as the European Central Bank began cutting off liquidity (which led to capital controls that still continue to this day), they could have re-introduced the drachma. Varoufakis, who was Finance Minister at the time, said that he “had it in mind” and that he discussed it with close associates, but of course he never thought to resign when he discovered that his “plan” was not accepted. Instead, he resigned (or, more likely, was forced to resign) only after the ‘defeat’ – as Zizek euphemistically called it – had become inevitable.

Zizek then launched a vitriolic attack on the rising neo-nationalist movement (as the entire globalist “Left” is currently doing, ‘inspired’ by Soros and other members of the TE):

*“Sometimes even if you rationally know the situation is hopeless you have to experience it. The lesson was a very important one of the defeat of Syriza, the lesson was the crucial step forward, the way to undermine global capitalism cannot be done at the level of nation states. There is a great temptation now all around Europe, a kind of neo-Keynesian social democratic nationalist temptation, the idea is since we live in a global market, and this means international relations are dominated by the logic of capital, the only hope is to return to a stronger nation state, with all this implies a certain level of*

*nationalism/populism and we establish again strong nation states which impose their own laws, regulate their own financial policy and so on and so on. That illusion has to be abandoned I claim. And this is why I think what DIEM is doing is strictly linked to the failure of Syriza...29"*

In fact, along the same lines the Manifesto itself stresses that, "Two dreadful options dominate: Retreat into the cocoon of our nation-states, or surrender to the Brussels democracy-free zone". Yet this is a pseudo-dilemma or, more to the point, a highly deceptive description of the actual choices involved, as we shall see in the next section which will present a real third option, unlike the "Manifesto". But before we do this, let us see the highly deceitful way in which Zizek attempted to justify the globalist "Left's" approach which is, in fact, a celebration of the NWO.

In his commentary at the DIEM25 meeting, he stressed that "our only hope is to engage in very concrete very specific acts, we have to choose very well our concrete act, our concrete demand... that is the art to demand something relatively modest, but if you follow to the end this demand, everything will fall apart. You open up the path to general rearrangement of social relations."

Of course, for anybody with an elementary knowledge of what is going on at present in Greece this can only be taken, at best, as a joke and, at worst, as a deliberate attempt to justify Syriza's criminal policies. These simply aim to execute every single order that comes from the EU (perhaps with some minor modifications accepted in advance by the Troika to create the pretence of negotiations) in order to satisfy the Transnational Elites' lenders as represented by the Troika. The aims currently pursued by the elites, according to the new Memorandum (perhaps the worst ever) signed by Syriza, include:

- the effective smashing of farmers' incomes with heavy taxation and the destruction of their pension system (they are presently blocking all the main roads and the "Leftist" government is using the special riot units to 'control' them)
- the actual pauperization of pensioners of all kinds (demonstrations over this issue are occurring daily in Athens)
- the sale off all social wealth, starting with seaports and airports etc.

It is clear now to everybody that Syriza's only aim is power for power's sake. No wonder that Greece, a country with a very strong Left tradition historically, may soon see the destruction of its Left movement altogether (given in particular the fact that KKE – the Greek Communist Party– engages in strong rhetoric not matched by its actions), with most people turning to political apathy. In fact the abstention rate in the last election, following the signing of the new Memorandum by Syriza, was at an all-time high!

Of course Zizek's stand on Syriza and the 'Manifesto' in general is far from unexpected. In advocating the need for a "big" socio-economic revolution within Arab countries (in contrast to his present position), he indirectly supported the campaigns for regime change in Libya and Syria. He also did this directly when he adopted the western propaganda that Libya and Syria were governed by "dictators" – not bothering (despite his high qualifications) to examine the history of these regimes, which were backed by strong national liberation movements and had really achieved significant social changes. Then, he celebrated the Ukrainian "revolution" in Kiev 30, together with the likes of Victoria Nuland and John McCain, fully revealing to which camp he really belongs. No wonder that he never proposed any concrete alternatives to the present system, as a system, but instead just promoted changes guaranteeing the protection of human rights—as every good supporter of the ideology of globalization does – or talked about communism as an abstract ideal without ever attempting to specify the preconditions for it, let alone any transitional strategy towards achieving it!

### ***Towards a Democratic Community of Sovereign Nations 31***

It is clear that the social struggle in the era of neoliberal globalization can no longer be just a struggle for social liberation, as obsolete Marxists still believe today and some Trotskyites have always believed. This becomes obvious when one considers the fact that, as soon as a country (not belonging to the Transnational Elite, i.e. mainly the "G7") is integrated into the NWO of neoliberal globalization, it loses every trace of economic and, consequently, national sovereignty, either because it has to obey the EU rules (in Europe) or the WTO and IMF rules (in the rest of the world), as well as the orders given by capitalist lenders, bankers and the TNC's executives, of course. This is why the struggle for social liberation today is inconceivable unless it has already gone through national liberation. The occupying troops that are now destroying and 'plundering' countries like Greece, Portugal, Spain, Argentina etc, as well as the weakest social strata in all countries, even the most economically advanced ones (with the full cooperation of small, local privileged elites which control the media, the political parties, the "Left" intelligentsia etc.), are not a regular army in uniform with lethal weapons of physical violence at their disposal. The occupying army today is an economic army in suits, possessing equally lethal

instruments of economic violence, as well as the means (the mass media and social media, NGOs etc) to justify it.

So, at this crucial historical juncture that will determine whether we shall all become subservient to neoliberal globalization and the transnational elite (as the DIEM25 Manifesto implies through our subordination to the EU) or not, it is imperative that we create a Popular Front in each country which will include all the victims of globalization among the popular strata regardless of their current political affiliations.

In Europe, in particular, where the popular strata are facing economic disaster, what is needed urgently is not an “antifascist” Front within the EU, as proposed by the ‘parliamentary juntas’ in power and the Euro-elites, also supported by the globalist “Left” (such as Diem25, Plan B in Europe, Die Linke, the Socialist Workers’ Party in the UK, Syriza in Greece and so on), which would, in fact, unite aggressors and victims. An ‘antifascist’ front would simply disorient the masses and make them incapable of facing the real fascism being imposed on them by the political and economic elites, which constitute the transnational and local elites. Instead, what is needed is a Popular Front that could attract the vast majority of the people who would fight for immediate unilateral withdrawal from the EU – which is managed by the European part of the transnational elite – as well as for economic self-reliance, thus breaking with globalization.

To my mind, it is only the creation of broad anti-EU Popular Fronts that could effect each country’s exit from the EU, with the aim of achieving economic self-reliance. Re-development based on self-reliance is the only way in which peoples breaking away from globalization and its institutions (like the EU) could rebuild their productive structures which have been dismantled by globalization. This could also, objectively lay the ground for future systemic change, decided upon democratically by the peoples themselves. To expect that the globalization process will itself create the objective and subjective conditions for a socialist transformation, as some ‘Paleolithic Marxists’ believe, or alternatively, that the creation of self-managed factories within the present globalized system will lead to a self-managed economy, as a variety of life-style “anarchists” suggest, is, in effect, to connive at the completion of the globalization process, as planned by the elites. Even worse, to expect that within the NWO institutions, like the EU, a ‘good’ EU and consequently a ‘good’ capitalist globalization will emerge at the end, as DIEM25, Syriza, Podemos and the like suggest, amounts to the pure disorientation of peoples which allows the plan for global governance to be fully implemented.

In other words, the fundamental aim of the social struggle today should be a complete break with the present NWO and the building of a new global democratic community, in which economic and national sovereignty have been restored, so that peoples could then fight for the ideal society, as they see it. The conditions of occupation we live under today mean that people resisting it have to make broad political alliances with everyone concerned who accepts the aims of a Popular Front for National and Social Liberation, particularly the basic aim of breaking with the NWO. Then, once the people of a particular country have broken with the NWO, they need to join with peoples from other countries who have already achieved their economic and national sovereignty and, together, form new economic unions of sovereign states to sort out, between them and on a bilateral or multilateral basis, the economic problems arising from trade and investment. Then and only then, the crucial issues of the form that a future society should take, and the strategy needed to achieve it, could be raised.

Therefore, the vital issue today, in the fight for the creation of a new democratic world order, is how we create this alternative pole of sovereign self-reliant nations, in full knowledge that the TE will use any kind of economic or physical violence at its disposal to abort any such effort, with all the huge means available to it. To my mind, under conditions of effective occupation, as many describe the present situation, this is impossible today without the creation of a Popular Front for National and Social Liberation (FNSL) in each country, allowing peoples to achieve their economic and national sovereignty as a precondition for social liberation.

The social subject of a mass popular front pursuing the aims I described above would be all the victims of neoliberal globalization: the unemployed and the partially employed, wage-earners on the very edge of survival (zero-hour contracts, occasional workers etc.), children without education who are ‘punished’ for being ‘unlucky’ enough to be born to non- “privileged” parents, as well as all those at the subsistence level (pensioners, the sick who lack medical insurance – amounting to one third of the population today – and others).

As far as the political subject is concerned, there are two possible options concerning the required Front for National and Social Liberation (FNSL): a front ‘from below’ or a front ‘from above’. The preferred option is of course the former, but in case this becomes unfeasible because the level of political consciousness of the victims of globalization and their will to fight is inadequate for this huge task, then the only other possibility is for existing political forces to take over the task of achieving sovereignty and self-reliance.

A FNSL 'from below' could be organized from among local assemblies, committees, groups and initiatives consisting of the victims of globalization (namely, the vast majority of the world's population) who ought to join as ordinary citizens, irrespective of party affiliations and ideologies or religious and other differences, as long as they share the ultimate aim of national and economic sovereignty. The intermediate target should be the exit from the international institutions of the NWO like the EU, so that the victims of globalization could escape the present process of economic catastrophe.

Then, once the people of a particular country have broken with this criminal "Order", they should join with peoples from other countries, also fighting for the same aims, to form new political and economic unions of sovereign Nations and the corresponding democratically-organized international institutions together, within a new international community of self-reliant nations based on the principle of mutual aid rather than competitiveness—the guiding principle behind the present criminal NWO. As long as the member countries share complementary production structures, the possibility of an involuntary transfer of economic surplus from some countries (usually the weaker ones, as is the case in the EU) to other countries in the Union can be ruled out. Therefore, a collective kind of self-reliance could be achieved within the economic area covered by such a union, which should be based on the sovereignty of each participating country.

In other words, a FNSL would function as a catalyst for fundamental political and economic change, which is the only kind of change that could get us out of the current mire, while also revealing the attempted deception by the globalist "Left", according to which we could somehow emerge from this catastrophe even without leaving the EU.

## Notes:

1 Pepe Escobar, "It takes a Greek to save Europa", RT, 11/2/2016, [https://---escape\\_autolink\\_uri:354b1acd8a011157ada7b290e8abb83d----edge/332169-europe-diem25-yanis-varoufakis/](https://---escape_autolink_uri:354b1acd8a011157ada7b290e8abb83d----edge/332169-europe-diem25-yanis-varoufakis/)

2 It should be noted that the 'Manifesto's' options were also approved, albeit indirectly, by George Soros, one of Varoufakis's strongest supporters, who stressed at the same time that "Putin's aim is to foster the EU's disintegration, and the best way to do so is to flood Europe with Syrian refugees." (G. Soros, "Putin is a bigger threat to Europe's existence than Isis", The Guardian, 11/2/2016 <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/feb/11/putin-threat-europe-islamic-state>)

3 Y. Varoufakis, A MANIFESTO FOR DEMOCRATISING EUROPE, February 2016

4 See the official site of the European Round Table of Industrialists <http://www.ert.eu>

See also the film by Friedrich Moser & Matthieu Lietaert, The Brussels Business : Who Runs the European Union? (2012) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h4C5SgeVK-Q>

5 Takis Fotopoulos, The Transnational Elite and the NWO as "conspiracies" The International Journal of INCLUSIVE DEMOCRACY, Vol. 10, Nos. 1/2 (Winter-Summer 2014)

6 Y. Varoufakis, A MANIFESTO FOR DEMOCRATISING EUROPE, op.cit.

7 Takis Fotopoulos, Towards An Inclusive Democracy, (London/NY: Cassell/Continuum, 1997), chs 5- 6

8 see unofficial transcript of DIEM25 speeches at [https://pad.riseup.net/p/DiEM25\\_Transcript](https://pad.riseup.net/p/DiEM25_Transcript)

9 See Takis Fotopoulos, Towards An Inclusive Democracy, (Cassell/Taylor & Francis, 1997).

10 See Takis Fotopoulos, The New World Order in Action: War and economic violence, from the Middle East through Greece to Ukraine (under publication by Progressive Press), Parts I & III

11 See Takis Fotopoulos, The New World Order in Action, op.cit. ch 6

12 Paul Krugman, "The austerity delusion", Guardian, 29/4/2015

13 Anthony H. Birch, The Concepts and Theories of Modern Democracy, (London: Routledge, 1993) p. 58.

14 Bhikhu Parekh, "The Cultural Particularity of Liberal Democracy", Political, Volume 40, Issue Supplement s1, pages 160–175, August 1992

15 According to Aristotle, "...I say that the appointment by lot is commonly held to be characteristic of democracy, whereas the process of election for that purpose is looked upon as oligarchic"; Aristotle, Politics, Book IV, 1294b, John Warrington, ed. (London: Heron Books)

16 Anthony Birch, The Concepts and Theories of Modern Democracy, o.p. p. 50.

17 John Dunn, "Conclusion" in. Democracy, the Unfinished Journey, 508 BC to AD 1993, pp. 247-48.

18 Varoufakis, A MANIFESTO FOR DEMOCRATISING EUROPE, op.cit.

19 ibid.

20 Takis Fotopoulos, "The real causes of the catastrophic crisis in Greece and the "Left", The International Journal of INCLUSIVE DEMOCRACY, Vol. 9, Nos. 1/2 (Winter-Summer 2013)

21 Editorial, "The People's Revolt", The Times, 11/10/2014

22 "Globalization is barbarous, multinationals rule world" – Marine Le Pen, RT, 10/1/2015 <http://rt.com/news/212435-france-pen-globalization-barbarity/>

23 Adam Thomson, "France's far-right National Front seeks voters from the left", Financial

Times, 4/1/2015

24 *ibid.*

25 Anne-Sylvaine Chassany and Roula Khalaf, "Marine Le Pen lays out radical vision to govern France", Financial Times, 5/3/2015

26 G. Soros, "Putin is a bigger threat to Europe's existence than Isis", The Guardian, 11/2/2016

27 Francis Elliott et al. "Working class prefers Ukip to Labour", The Times, 25/11/2014

28 Takis Fotopoulos, "Globalisation, the reformist Left and the Anti-Globalisation 'Movement'", DEMOCRACY & NATURE, vol.7, no.2 (July 2001) [http://www.democracynature.org/vol7/takis\\_globalisation.htm](http://www.democracynature.org/vol7/takis_globalisation.htm)

29 see unofficial transcript of DIEM25 speeches at [https://pad.riseup.net/p/DiEM25\\_Transcript](https://pad.riseup.net/p/DiEM25_Transcript). See also the video itself at [https://---escape\\_autolink\\_uri:2297d09cff07f3cd89a98abc256e6fd6---](https://---escape_autolink_uri:2297d09cff07f3cd89a98abc256e6fd6---)

30 See the "Open letter on the future of Ukraine", signed by scores of Zizek-type globalization intellectuals, politicians et al, which declares their admiration for the Ukrainian 'revolutionaries': "They defended their democracy and their future 10 years ago, during the Orange Revolution, and they are standing up for those values again today ", euobserver, 27/1/2014 <http://euobserver.com/opinion/122880>

31 This section is based on Part VI of the forthcoming book *The New World Order in Action: War and economic violence, from the Middle East through Greece to Ukraine*, op.cit.

# THE EUROPEAN STABILITY MECHANISM (TREATY EXCERPTS)

## *European Commission*

### **ARTICLE 32; Legal status, privileges and immunities**

3. The ESM, its property, funding and assets, wherever located and by whomsoever held, shall enjoy immunity from every form of judicial process except to the extent that the ESM expressly waives its immunity for the purpose of any proceedings or by the terms of any contract, including the documentation of the funding instruments.

4. The property, funding and assets of the ESM shall, wherever located and by whomsoever held, be immune from search, requisition, confiscation, expropriation or any other form of seizure, taking or foreclosure by executive, judicial, administrative or legislative action.

5. The archives of the ESM and all documents belonging to the ESM or held by it, shall be inviolable.

6. The premises of the ESM shall be inviolable.

7. The official communications of the ESM shall be accorded by each ESM Member and by each state which has recognised the legal status and the privileges and immunities of the ESM, the same treatment as it accords to the official communications of an ESM Member.

8. To the extent necessary to carry out the activities provided for in this Treaty, all property, funding and assets of the ESM shall be free from restrictions, regulations, controls and moratoria of any nature.

9. The ESM shall be exempted from any requirement to be authorised or licensed as a credit institution, investment services provider or other authorised licensed or regulated entity under the laws of each ESM Member.

### **ARTICLE 34; Professional secrecy**

The Members or former Members of the Board of Governors and of the Board of Directors and any other persons who work or have worked for or in connection with the ESM shall not disclose information that is subject to professional secrecy. They shall be required, even after their duties have ceased, not to disclose information of the kind covered by the obligation of professional secrecy.

### **ARTICLE 35; Immunities of persons**

1. In the interest of the ESM, the Chairperson of the Board of Governors, Governors, alternate Governors, Directors, alternate Directors, as well as the Managing Director and other staff members shall be immune from legal proceedings with respect to acts performed by them in their official capacity and shall enjoy inviolability in respect of their official papers and documents.

### **ARTICLE 36; Exemption from taxation**

1. Within the scope of its official activities, the ESM, its assets, income, property and its operations and transactions authorised by this Treaty shall be exempt from all direct taxes.

5. Staff of the ESM shall be subject to an internal tax for the benefit of the ESM on salaries and emoluments paid by the ESM, subject to rules to be adopted by the Board of Governors.

# AFTER 2020, ALL EU MEMBERS WILL HAVE TO ADOPT THE EURO

*Andrew Lilico; Daily Telegraph' via Sonya Porter*

*Political union in the eurozone is an economic existential necessity, not a re-negotiable ambition*

Recent events have made the British political commentariat more aware than before of just how committed European political leaders are to delivering political union in a Single European State.

It should now be clear that this is not the unlikely ambition of a few starry-eyed visionaries. It is the stated official goal of the Italian Prime Minister, the French President, the German Chancellor, the current and next Presidents of the European Commission, the President of the European Council, and just about every significant mainstream political figure in the Eurozone. It is also, according to a Eurobarometer opinion poll in 2013, the desire of 60pc of Eurozone citizens.

What may still be less clear to some in the UK is that in the Eurozone this is not seen only as a culturally and politically desirable objective. It is also regarded as an existential necessity, a sine qua non for economic prosperity, and the answer to Euroscepticism of the sort seen in the 2014 European Parliament elections. So when British politicians propose that EU political integration should slow or that the EU should prioritize some other objective (e.g. the Single Market), that is not merely seen as unattractive — it is impossible.

The reasons why are economic. As was widely discussed in the UK debate about the euro in the 1990s and early 2000s, to make a single currency such as the euro work, one needs an adequate combination of trade integration, similarity of economic cycles (so that one size fits all interest rate and exchange rate policies do indeed fit all), capital and labour mobility (to offset any asymmetries in economic shocks – that is, economic shocks hitting some parts of the Eurozone harder than others) and fiscal transfers (to compensate for any large or long-term differential performance that is not offset by capital and labour mobility).

The Eurozone has fairly good trade integration, some material differences in economic cycles (though not especially larger than the differences between regions within the UK or US), and fairly high capital mobility. But even when they occur at around the same time (so cycles are not out), economic shocks affect some parts of the Eurozone much worse than others (as we have seen in the Eurozone crisis). And, Ireland excepted, labour mobility is not particularly high (despite all the complaints about immigration in some Member States).

That means – as has been argued all along – that for the Eurozone to work over the longer term there will need to be much more significant fiscal transfers between regions.

The EU has a modest system of fiscal transfers (the structural and cohesion funds) but these are only of order €60 billion across the whole EU, much of which currently goes to non-Eurozone Member States. A country like the UK has internal fiscal transfers between regions (e.g. London to Liverpool) of some 3 per cent of GDP (more on some definitions). For the Eurozone, with its €9.6 trillion GDP, that would imply nearly €300 billion of fiscal transfers — several times the he current amount.

One option to make the Eurozone work without adding significantly to budgets would be for Member States to cease their own internal regional transfers, with funds instead going to create a system of centralized fiscal transfers, with a Eurozone treasury distributing funds. That may be more than is required, however. It could perhaps be adequate only to have around €100 billion extra distributed directly from the Eurozone. But even at only €100 billion, the Eurozone would still need an income stream to fund such transfers. The Financial Transactions Tax was intended to provide an initial funding stream for the Eurozone, but some other tax will in due course be identified. The key will be that such taxes will be imposed and levied directly by Eurozone tax authorities – not received as contributions from Member State treasuries. With its own tax stream, the Eurozone will



also be able to raise debt, and that debt can straightforwardly be backed by the European Central Bank (in a way that individual Eurozone Member State debt cannot).

As a body that raises taxes and debts and distributes hundreds of billions in funds, the Eurozone treasury will need to be politically accountable to those that pay it taxes. That will mean pan-Eurozone elections of politicians to oversee Eurozone tax-and-spend decisions. Greater tax-and debt-raising powers at Eurozone level will inevitably entail some limitations upon spending and debt-raising at Member State level. Furthermore, increased capital mobility also means greater financial linkages between banks. So if a bank becomes distressed in one Member State that has increasing implications for other Member States and for the functioning of the Eurozone payments system.

In the Eurozone, the lack of such mechanisms of fiscal transfers, banking system oversight, constraints upon Member State spending and debt-raising decisions, and the associated much deeper political union are seen as a key cause of the Eurozone crisis.

The Eurozone crisis, in turn, is seen as creating economic hardship and anxiety that has fostered Euroscepticism and in some cases racism and other forms of political extremism. If adequate economic mechanisms and political union are not introduced, it is believed that the Eurozone crisis will return and anti-European sentiment will (rightly) increase, ultimately destroying the Eurozone and the EU project as a whole. Banking union and constraints upon Member State budgets have been introduced. Even more political integration is on the way.

So in the Eurozone, the answer to increased Euroscepticism is not seen as any form of rowing back on integration. Quite the opposite — Euroscepticism has arisen because political integration had not proceeded rapidly enough. For the Eurozone and EU to survive at all, deeper political integration, including Eurozone-level tax and spending decisions and democratic mechanisms to oversee them plus reduced control over tax and spending decisions for Member State, are an existential necessity.

The only remaining question is whether this Single European State, formed from the Eurozone, will be something distinct from and alongside the European Union, or simply identical to or part of the European Union.

When the euro was first agreed, the UK and Denmark opted out. But at that stage that only meant they were not joining at the start. There was never intended to be any long-term form of EU membership that did not include euro membership. The UK did not say never to begin with, and all new EU members since the euro began in 1999 have had to commit to joining. Indeed, by 2020, all but five member states of the EU are due to be euro members and Poland is likely to join by then as well, leaving just the UK, Denmark, Sweden and Bulgaria outside. That means that at some point, perhaps shortly after 2020, with the Eurozone constituted as a confederate Single European State and wanting to use the institution of the EU as its institutions — the European Parliament as its confederation-level Parliament, the Commission as its civil service and so on — the residual nugatory non-Eurozone EU will have to be wound up.

The most likely course is for it to be fused together with the non-EU members of what is called the European Economic Area (Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein). The Single European State will set the rules for the Single Market, and the other members of the European Economic Area will be welcome to trade with each other and with the Single European State provided they abide by those rules.

This all means current debates about whether the UK will have a referendum and how folk will vote is of only passing significance. What counts fundamentally to whether the UK stays in the EU after about 2020 is whether there are any non-euro members of the EU at all, given the existential economic necessity of the Eurozone forming into a deeper political union. At present that seems highly unlikely.

*Andrew Lilico is the Chairman of Europe Economics*

# THE EURO AND THE LISBON TREATY

*Chris Watkin: via Bob&Jane*

**NB: UK is a Member State with a derogation ie. allowed to operate a currency outside of the Euro - Denmark is another, but:**

## **Article 140 1.**

*At least once every two years, or at the request of a Member State with a derogation, the Commission and the European Central Bank shall report to the Council on the progress made by the Member States with a derogation in fulfilling their obligations regarding the achievement of economic and monetary Union. These reports shall include an examination of the compatibility between the national legislation of each of these Member States, including the statutes of its national central bank, and Articles 130 and 131 of the Treaties and the Statute of the ESCB and of the ECB.*

*and:*

*. U 3. If it is decided, in accordance with the procedure set out in paragraph 2, to abrogate a derogation, Council shall, acting with the unanimity of the Members States whose currency is the euro and the Member State concerned, on a proposal from the Commission and after consulting the European Central Bank, irrevocably fix the rate at which the euro shall be substituted for the currency of the Member State concerned, and take the other measures necessary for the introduction of the euro as the single currency in the Member State concerned.*

*and:*

*After the Commission has delivered a recommendation and the Economic and Financial Committee has been consulted, the Council may, acting by a qualified majority, decide that the Member State concerned shall amend, suspend or abolish the protective measures referred to above.*

It has to be remembered that the whole objective of Maastricht and Lisbon is to harmonise all activities across the whole EU. The Qualified Majority Voting puts the UK at serious risk, within this environment as, basically, anything can be changed and altered in the Treaties to suit their requirements. Since the UK's record at achieving any change whatsoever, let alone the present efforts by David "Chamberlain" Cameron, is abysmal, I wouldn't place any bets on being allowed to opt out of the Euro for ever.

## IMF PLANS NEW ECONOMIC CRISIS BEFORE BREXIT VOTE

*William F. Jasper; Wikileaks; via Sonya Porter*

Will a major economic crisis hit us before June 23? A transcript of a telephone conference call among top International Monetary Fund (IMF) officials provides an alarming hint that the IMF may be getting set to pull off a destabilizing "event" in Europe that could cause global shock waves before that date. A new WikiLeak document released on April 2 points to a created crisis before June 23, when British voters go to the polls for the so-called Brexit vote, to decide whether Britain exits, or stays in, the EU. As we have reported previously, the globalist establishment at the IMF, European Commission, United Nations, World Economic Forum, Council on Foreign Relations, Brookings Institution, Peterson Institute for International Economics, and corporatist mainstream media have been in a frenzy to scare voters and stop the Brexit.

The recently leaked document is the purported transcript of a telephone conference call on March 19, 2016, among Poul M. Thomsen, a Danish economist and director of the IMF's European Department; Delia Velculescu, a Romanian economist and head of the IMF Mission to Greece; and Iva Petrova, a Bulgarian economist and IMF negotiator on the Greek debt crisis. These are the IMF's top technocrats dealing with the European Commission, the European Central Bank, and the Greek

government.

Bloomberg News reported on April 3 that the Greek government “said in an e-mail to reporters on Saturday that the leaks show that the Fund has been considering a plan to cause a credit event in Greece and destabilize Europe.” Greek Prime Minister Alexis Tsipras called on the IMF to replace its top officials in Greece, accusing them of a breach of trust that precludes continuing negotiations with them in good faith. In the conference call, Thomsen and Velculescu are clearly upset that Greek, German, and EU officials are catering too much to the political dictates of their domestic constituencies rather than following the lead of the IMF and sticking to its mandates on the Greek deal. They are worried that the Brexit vote may delay or even scuttle the IMF’s plans.

Here are some excerpts:

*THOMSEN: Well, I don't know. But this is ... I think about it differently. What is going to bring it all to a decision point? In the past there has been only one time when the decision has been made and then that was when they were about to run out of money seriously and to default. Right?*

*VELKOULESKOU: Right!*

*THOMSEN: And possibly this is what is going to happen again. In that case, it drags on until July, and clearly the Europeans are not going to have any discussions for a month before the Brexits and so, at some stage they will want to take a break and then they want to start again after the European referendum.*

*VELKOULESKOU: That's right.*

*THOMSEN: That is one possibility. Another possibility is one that I thought would have happened already and I am surprised that it has not happened, is that, because of the refugee situation, they take a decision ... that they want to come to a conclusion. Ok? And the Germans raise the issue of the management ... and basically we at that time say "Look, you Mrs. Merkel you face a question, you have to think about what is more costly: to go ahead without the IMF, would the Bundestag say "The IMF is not on board"? or to pick the debt relief that we think that Greece needs in order to keep us on board?" Right? That is really the issue.*

*VELKOULESKOU: Correct!*

The IMF transcript continues:

*VELKOULESKOU: When is that going to happen? I don't know, I am surprised that it has not happened yet ... I am hoping it's going to happen with these debt discussions that are starting in mid April.*

*THOMSEN: But that is not an event. That is not going to cause them to ... that discussion can go on for a long time. And they are just leading them down the road... Why are they leading them down the road? Because they are not close to the event, whatever it is.*

*VELKOULESKOU: I agree that we need an event, but I don't know what that will be.*

IMF Managing Director Christine Lagarde dismissed Prime Minister Tsipras’s concerns over the leaked transcripts, and instead attempted to turn the exposure into an indictment of the Greek government for allegedly violating the privacy rights of the IMF officials. “Successful negotiations are built on mutual trust, and this weekend’s incident has made me concerned as to whether we can indeed achieve progress in a climate of extreme sensitivity to statements of either side,” Lagarde said in a letter to Tsipras released by the IMF on April 3. “On reflection, however, I have decided to allow our team to return to Athens to continue the discussions... The IMF conducts its negotiations in good faith, not by way of threats, and we do not communicate through leaks,” Lagarde said in her letter. “Any speculation that IMF staff would consider using a credit event as a negotiating tactic is simply nonsense,”

Nonsense? For those who have been following the IMF’s destructive policies and the moves by globalist forces to transform the IMF into a “supersized” global Federal Reserve, it is not nonsense. The New American has reported in depth, for instance, on the IMF’s horrendous “bail in” scheme that stole the bank savings and checking accounts of the people of Cyprus, which is being proposed by the IMF as a model for a “one-off capital levy” (an IMF euphemism for a tax) of 10 percent on all savings worldwide. The pretext for such drastic measures is “to bring down public debt to pre-crisis levels.” However, Lagarde and her fellow globalists have no intention of reducing public debt and government spending. If proof of this is needed, simply look no further than Lagarde’s statements on March 31 and April 4 calling on governments to spend more on “public investment” for research and development to

boost business productivity. What this would amount to is more central planning and further transformation of the “capitalist” economies into corporatist/fascist economies, with more Public-Private Partnerships translating into more privileges and subsidies for the politically connected companies.

Lagarde has also repeated her charge that a vote in favor of the Brexit is considered by the IMF — in the words of the UK’s Independent, as one of the “immediate threats to the global economy.” The Independent reported on April 5:

*The head of the International Monetary Fund, Christine Lagarde, has put Britain voting to leave the EU in June's referendum among what she says are immediate threats to the global economy. The Brexit is “clearly part of the uncertainty we have at the moment” Lagarde said in an interview with Bloomberg Television in Frankfurt, noting the impact it may have on London's financial sector.*

In a matter of days (April 15-17), the IMF and World Bank Group will be holding their annual Spring Meeting in Washington, D.C. Congressional committees must call Lagarde and other IMF officials on the carpet to answer questions about the “event” talk concerning the Greek debt, and the repeated Lagarde/IMF threats and improper involvement in the domestic affairs of British voters regarding the Brexit.

## **BBC BIAS, BREXIT, THE EU, BILDERBERG AND GLOBAL GOVERNMENT**

***Steven MacMillan; Activist Post***

One of the BBC’s flagship news programmes has shown a “strong” bias towards Britain staying in the European Union (EU), a media monitoring group claimed last week. From the 13th of January to the 11th of March 2016, News-watch analysed 40 editions of the popular current affairs programme Newsnight. News-watch noted that 25 of the guests who appeared on the programme were in favour of Britain staying in the EU, compared to only 14 who advocated the UK leaving the union. The monitoring group noted that: “The former President of the EU Commission, José Manuel Barroso, and the former Swedish Prime Minister, Carl Bildt, have had the clear opportunity in main interviews to explain why leaving the EU would not be in the UK’s interest. There has been no balancing opinion from similarly weighty figures” who support Britain leaving the EU.

The BBC has always been the propaganda mouthpiece of the British establishment, yet many Britons still cling to the deluded notion that the BBC is an impartial news organisation. It is clear that the British establishment is desperate to keep Britain in the union, and this is reflected in the BBC’s reporting of the issue. A Brexit may prove to be the catalyst which encourages other countries to leave, triggering the collapse of the EU entirely. Unless the Western elite manage to roll a collapsed EU into a more globally integrated system, this would be a disaster for the globalists. If European nations regain control over their own affairs and resort back to national sovereignty, the agenda of the shadow elite in the form of destroying nation-states and building a global empire will be severely impeded.

The debate on whether Britain should leave or stay in the EU has been gathering pace in the UK for years, and the Prime Minister has finally set June 23rd as the date for the referendum. David Cameron is merely trying to appease some factions in Britain who are pro-national sovereignty and feel that too much power is concentrated in the bureaucratic, technocratic and largely undemocratic hands of the EU. One of the most pivotal speeches that Cameron has made on the EU in recent months, was not given at the House of Commons, but at the shadow British government: the Royal Institute of International Affairs (or Chatham House). The executive body of the EU – the European Commission – is a corporate partner of Chatham House. The majority of the major political figures in the West support Britain staying in the EU, including Barack Obama, Tony Blair and Peter Mandelson. This is because the EU is far more than just a union in Europe; it’s a stepping stone towards global government.

## ***The EU and Global Government***

The EU has always been a key part of the grander strategy by the global elite to destroy national sovereignty and bring in a world government, through eventually amalgamating the EU with other trading blocs. As Alan Sked, a Professor of International History at the London School of Economics and the original founder of UKIP (who has since criticised the party), notes, the EU was created by a Western elite who have been surreptitiously working to build a global government. Herman Van Rompuy, the former President of the European Council, even boldly proclaimed that 2009 was “the first year of global governance” (according to the translation). Van Rompuy added that “the climate conference in Copenhagen is another step towards the global management of our planet.”

The former President of the European Commission, José Manuel Barroso, gave a speech in 2014 at the Yale School of Management, titled: ‘The European Union in the New World Order.’ Barroso said that the world is largely in a state of chaos, but “out of all this chaos some kind of order will eventually materialise.” He added that a gap is emerging “within the global sphere between an increasingly interdependent and interconnected world which lacks the global governance mechanisms to manage that interdependence and interconnectedness.” In essence, Barroso deceptively argued that the world is in such a state of chaos (the majority of which is created by the Western elite) that we are in desperate need of greater “global governance mechanisms” (i.e. order) – stronger global governance is practically synonymous with global government, but at bare minimum it’s the final stepping stone towards fully certified global government.

Peter Mandelson, a former European Commissioner for Trade and British politician, said during a meeting at Chatham House in 2007 that he “sees the EU as Europe’s most promising means of engaging with and shaping globalization.” George Soros, the investor, billionaire and regime change extraordinaire, called the EU an “experiment in international governance.” Soros did state that the EU had “failed,” and that the surge in populism was threatening the union. But if the EU does completely disintegrate, the major danger is that the elite will push for further global integration as the solution.

## ***Bilderberg and the EU***

Founded in 1954, the Bilderberg group is illustrative of a shadowy network of super-elites who often make decisions in secret meetings that come to impact the lives of millions. The annual conference is attended by between 120 and 150 elites who meet to discuss global issues with a focus on North American and European challenges. It encompasses a range of individuals: from the heads of multi-national corporations to the leaders of nations; banking executives to media titans.

In 2009, WikiLeaks released a document which was reportedly the meeting report from the 1955 Bilderberg conference in West Germany. The document shows that the idea of creating the Euro was being discussed within circles of the Western elite as far back as 1955, concealed from the general public of Europe:

*A European speaker expressed concern about the need to achieve a common currency, and indicated that in his view this necessarily implied the creation of a central political authority.*

Interestingly, one general point of agreement in the conference was the shared notion that atomic energy could be the most pivotal issue that would increase cooperation:

*Throughout the discussion there was considerable emphasis on atomic energy as forming, perhaps, the most hopeful area in which integration could proceed.*

Three years later, the European Atomic Energy Community was established in 1958. Another conclusion of the meeting was that the European project was designed to eviscerate national sovereignty and achieve the “highest degree of integration” as quickly as possible:

*It was generally recognized that it is our common responsibility to arrive in the shortest possible time at the highest degree of integration, beginning with a common European market.*

In more modern times, Étienne Davignon, a former European Commissioner and an influential architect of European integration, revealed that the Bilderberg group helped create the Euro in the 1990s.

## ***The Global Shift***

In 2008, a book was published that is of critical importance in understanding some of the real forces that are driving the political and economic transitions in our world today. Written by David Rothkopf, a protégé of Henry Kissinger and an individual who belongs to numerous pre-eminent think tanks in the US (including the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR)), it was titled, *Superclass: How the Rich Ruined Our World*. Rothkopf argues that an infinitely small number of super-elites run the world, completely outside of any democratic process:

*A global elite has emerged over the past several decades that had vastly more power than any other group on the planet. Each of the members of this superclass has the ability to regularly influence the lives of millions of people in multiple countries worldwide... My researchers and I identified just over 6,000 people who qualify (from the Preface).*

Rothkopf continues, documenting the profound transition that has taken place in recent decades, from the nation-state towards a global state:

*But the center of gravity of elites has shifted. Today, the most powerful elites are global citizens tied more to international finance than national politics... If the richest and most powerful individuals in the world are now predominantly globally oriented, globally dependent, globally active, then an important shift has taken place in the world's balance of power – away from national governments and away from national interests narrowly defined (2009 edition: p.320).*

This shift away from the nation-state and national governments towards a new global order is the defining one of our time. "We are living in a period of global change that is deeper, faster and broader than we have ever known," was how Peter Mandelson articulated it in 2007. But this shift is not a coincidental one; it has been the objective of a cabal of international bankers who have been pushing for the creation of a "world system" for over a century. As the late Carroll Quigley – a historian and Professor at Georgetown University – wrote in his 1966 book, *Tragedy & Hope*:

The powers of financial capitalism had another far-reaching aim, nothing less than to create a world system of financial control in private hands able to dominate the political system of each country and the economy of the world as a whole. This system was to be controlled in a feudalist fashion by the central banks of the world acting in concert, by secret agreements arrived at in frequent private meetings and conferences. The apex of the system was to be the Bank for International Settlements in Basle, Switzerland, a private bank owned and controlled by the world's central banks which were themselves private corporations (1998 printing: p.324).

The push towards a new world order is going to continue to meet resistance however, as the Westphalian model of international relations – based on the principles of national sovereignty and the non-interference in the affairs of other states – has been the central model since the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. Furthermore, the fact that Russia is standing up for her national interests puts a significant spanner in the works of the Western elite.

*Steven MacMillan is an independent writer, researcher, geopolitical analyst and editor of The Analyst Report, especially for the online magazine "New Eastern Outlook".*

*"When the people feel they are being made subject to laws in which they feel they have played no part and taxes to which they have never consented, respect for both law and government is undermined. Our tradition for order and peaceful change is based not only on the character of our own people but on an enduring, if tacit, bargain between Government and governed that the former will play fair and will be scrupulous in how they deal with the people's rights. But if*

*Governments do not play fair, if they behave in a way people consider to be in itself unconstitutional, there is evidence enough in British history to show we are not a docile people but a very determined and fierce one indeed."*

**Peter Shore MP; Hansard; 15th February 1972**

# **THE DESTABILIZATION AND FRACTURE OF THE EU: WILL THE EUROPEAN UNION SHARE THE SAME FATE AS THE SOVIET UNION?**

## ***Sputnik***

### ***Financial Chaos and Debt Default in the European Union***

EU politicians and European heads of state are desperately looking for ways to save the European project, but a series of powerful anti-EU shocks, and growing public distrust makes a Soviet-style collapse seem almost inevitable, French economist Charles Gave suggests.

Beset by crises from all sides, from the prospects of a Brexit to the ongoing migrant crisis to a negative economic outlook, cracks have appeared in the EU project, France's Atlantico newspaper recalls. Speaking to the newspaper, Charles Gave, an economist and president of the liberal think tank Institut des Libertes, was asked why he believes the European Union project may eventually face the same fate as the old Soviet Union.

"The disaster of the quotations of European banks shows that something has gone terribly wrong," the economist warned. "I have never seen a scenario where the collapse of major European banks was not followed by a recession in Europe. So the answer to your question is simple: if a recession happens in Europe in 2016, the euro will not survive."

"For example," Gave recalled, "in Italy, bank debts already constitute 20% of GDP, and might cross the 30% or even 40% threshold, which is obviously not tenable. For years now, the euro has served as a financial Frankenstein: it is impossible to maintain a fixed exchange rate for countries that have such differing production capacities.

I wrote back in 2002 that the euro would lead to too many houses in Spain, too many officials in France and too many factories in Germany, and that Europe would fall under German influence, with Germany remaining the only country with a positive net balance.

*"As for the formation of a [single] European state," Gave noted, "France, Germany and Italy are real states – Europe is not. Europe is a civilization, not a state. The supporters of the euro have, for 15 years now, been killing the continent's economies, and if a recession begins in 2016, the European people will take the wheel away from those whom they did not elect – from [European Council President] Donald Tusk and [European Commission President] Jean-Claude Juncker. A union [in itself] does not necessarily indicate strength, because if that was the case, the Soviet Union would be the main world power..."*

Ultimately, Gave suggests,

*"strength lies in a competitive economy, and not in a bloated organization which no one wants – one which destroyed the fruits of the labours of the founding fathers of Europe. Schumann, Adenauer and Piux XII desired to establish a Europe based on diversity. The malefactors who created the euro want instead to create a European nation...and are responsible for the looming catastrophe on the horizon."*

# **EU MILITARY POLICE CARRY OUT 'EXTREMELY WORRYING' CIVIL UNREST CRISIS TRAINING**

*Vincent Wood; Express; via Vote Leave*

A Military police unit have carried out European Union-funded special training, ready to be deployed in the event of civil unrest or war.

The training, which took place in the German North Rhine-Westphalia province was designed to prepare troops as part of the EU's Lowlands Gendarmerie programme.

Breitbart London reported that the exercise was attended by 600 members of various European police and military forces, in a bid to prepare the united troops of the European Gendarmerie Force. The military police group is made up of seven European nations, including Spain, Romania, Poland and Germany, and aims to quell post conflict scenarios within EU member states.

The group's website reported that: "The aim of the [2016, April 15th] Comprehensive Live Exercise will be capacity building of police and gendarmes who will participate in international stabilisation missions and projects with a police component." It went on to describe the exercises carried out, including "carousel training, with attention being given to all policing skills, including community policing and social patrols, crowd and riot control, SWAT teams and forensic investigation".

European affairs spokesman for the German Government Andrej Huko asked to attend, but was blocked from coming close to the site. He claimed that the military force was preparing to shut down "political meetings" and "protests". He went on to argue that the, "militarisation of the police" is, "extremely worrying and contrary in Germany to the principle of separation of police and military".

It comes as fears rise that the European Union could form its own army, with one ex-commander of British troops in Afghanistan claiming it could undermine NATO and UK defences. Colonel Richard Kemp claimed Brussels' "ultimate plan" was to bring the national armies of the bloc's 28 member states under one umbrella.

The highly-criticised prospect of an EU army was re-energised in March 2015 when European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker called for an international force.

Politicians in the UK have since poured cold water on the idea, saying it would be undeliverable, would weaken Britain's standing in the world and would be blocked by the UK's veto powers. But Col Kemp, who formerly worked for the Joint Intelligence Committee, which advises the British Government on issues of national security, said: "If we left the EU, we would undermine the EU's ultimate plan of forming an EU army, and that is exactly what they are going to be doing."

**RUNNYMEDE GAZETTE EDITED BY:- FRANK TAYLOR.**  
**2 CHURCH VIEW, ST GILES TERRACE. CHETTON, BRIDGNORTH, SHROPSHIRE, WV16 6UG**

**Tel; (01746) 789326**

**[frankinshropshire@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:frankinshropshire@hotmail.co.uk)**