

Dossier on the European Union

Richard B. Sorensen, www.unholygrail.net

Copyright © 2007, All Rights Reserved

April 13, 2020

We shall have World Government, whether or not we like it. The only question is whether World Government will be achieved by conquest or consent.

~ Paul Warburg

At the end of a century that has seen the evils of communism, nazism and other modern tyrannies, the impulse to centralize power remains amazingly persistent.

~ Joseph Sobran, columnist

Introduction to the European Union

Unlike the United Nations, which has no true authority of its own and is simply an association of sovereign nations, the member states of the European Union have all ceded to it increasing degrees of real power and control. To many, the European Union is a poorly understood organization of groups whose authority is seemingly confusing and redundant. These included the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council of Ministers, the European Commission, and other organizations with more specific functions, such as the European Central Bank, the Court of Auditors, the Court of Justice, and so on.

The Council of Ministers is the oldest and consists of EU ministers and insiders from the various states of Europe. There is no popular vote on these members and no term of office. This group is more-or-less the “senate” of the EU and approves legislation passed by the European Commission, but it can also introduce legislation of its own.

The European Commission functions as the “executive” branch of government and has a President chosen by the Council of Ministers who then selects twenty-five individuals to function as his or her cabinet, one from each member state in the Union. Each cabinet head or commissioner in turn is assigned to set and carry out policy in a specific area, such as law, human rights, energy, and so on, and each one presides over a large bureaucracy that carries out the commission directives. There is likewise no popular vote on commissioners, but they serve for a five-year term and must be confirmed by the EU parliament. Since the 1980s and the presidency of Jacques Delors, the President of the Commission has been considered to be the chief spokesman for the EU.

The European Council is another “executive” branch and consists of the heads of state of all of the member nations. The Council provides a forum for periodic summit meetings between the leaders. It has no executive or parliamentary powers but can exercise

enormous influence by virtue of the power of its members and their ability to affect policy, and the heads of state can in some cases veto actions they are opposed to.

The European Parliament consists of members who are elected from each member country and is the “house” of the EU. It is the most democratic of the EU institutions, but its powers are limited by the fact that the Council of Ministers has potential veto power over its decisions, and many laws are promulgated instead by the EU Commission. The parliament is the youngest of the EU institutions and serves to provide a patina of democracy over the whole.

Thus, the branches of the EU government are loosely based on the equivalents in the US constitution, and when the European constitution was drafted, there were abundant references to how Europe was “reenacting the Philadelphia constitutional convention of 1787.” However, the motivations of the Americans in 1787 and the Europeans in 2002 were, for the most part, exactly opposite from each other. Revolutionary War-era American leaders were highly suspicious of centralized power and carefully crafted a government of checks and balances between the branches. The US Constitution is a fairly terse 4,600 words in length. In contrast, the EU constitution is over 60,000 words, and was written for the most part by people who wanted to preserve and extend centralized power. Rather than serving as checks and balances, the branches of the EU serve to protect the supranational power of the other branches, and the constitution was written in bureaucratese and carefully crafted to promote a supranational government while attempting to conceal and minimize that fact. Following is a statement illustrating this, taken from the “Fundamental Principles” in the introduction to the European Constitution:

Under the principle of subsidiarity, in areas which do not fall within its exclusive competence, the Union shall act only if and insofar as the objectives of the proposed action cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member States, either at central level or at regional and local level, but can rather, by reason of the scale or effects of the proposed action, be better achieved at Union level.

The word “subsidiarity” above means that the EU can assume additional powers to those that it already has whenever it decides that an action can best be carried out at the EU level. In other words, the EU can arrogate to itself any powers from the member nations that it wants to take, and for which it can come up with a reason. It should also be noted in order to understand the above quote, that the politically correct and more warm and fuzzy term for EU “powers” is instead its “competencies.”

EU Expansion

The European Union is a growth industry with increasing employment opportunities; in addition to all of the ministers, legislators, and bureaucrats there are swarms of translators, bookkeepers, secretaries, support staff, administrative assistants, and security personnel, as well as hordes of lawyers, paralegals, and lobbyists. The EU has to maintain a huge translation staff in order to translate the mountains of information produced in one or more of the four main languages (English, French, German, and Spanish) into all of

the others spoken by the member nations. This is a Herculean task, often falling way behind. All of these government workers must be fed, clothed, and housed, and the EU has over seventy building in Brussels and many more in other European cities.

The European Parliament meets three weeks a month in its new \$750 million Brussels headquarters, and then in a perverse act of bureaucracy and politics (which was pushed through by France who insisted on having its own EU government center), the entire organization packs up and travels three hundred miles back and forth to its new \$400 million building in Strasbourg for the final week of each month. The construction cost overruns that occurred at Strasbourg were typical of the EU except when it was revealed that each office has a luxury shower costing \$12,000 each. But criticism of this was brushed aside and the EU rolled on. All of this must somehow be paid for through additional taxes and inflation imposed on European citizens, who must carry the weight of both the EU and their own country's government on their backs. To weary Europeans, already overburdened with taxes and regulations from within their home countries, the EU is often seen as simply more layers of red tape wrapped around the existing bureaucratic tarballs that they were already stuck in. The VAT (value added tax) was devised specifically to fund the EU, and it placed virtually all of the huge record-keeping burden on businesses. The standard VAT sales tax rate in Europe is 15% but may go as high as 25% on some types of goods.

With many skeptics wanting to dump it, the EU has had to work very hard to make itself relevant, which is a difficult task given that it requires European taxpayers to kick in more of their resources to pay for the privilege of having more government. The idea therefore was for the EU to enlarge itself so that it would become too big to stop.

Early EU History

According to its official history, the EU was formed out the ruins of World War II, in an effort to ensure peace and prevent the rise of another Hitler. But the real genesis of the European Union was World War I. During the hellish trench warfare of 1916, the French were being smashed to pieces by the vastly superior German artillery. The Germans could launch shells at up to seven times the rate of the French guns, many of which were leftovers from the Franco-Prussian war of 1870.

The 1870 Franco-Prussian conflict marked a sea-change in the way that war was conducted. Due to the new techniques in ordnance and artillery that had developed in that era, the fundamental character of war had permanently changed, from a test of men and resolve, to a battle between rival industrial systems. In the WWI trenches of Verdun, the French guns alone fired over twelve million shells, and the Germans many more; this war became the most violent and prolonged act of annihilation that the world had ever seen. Shattered by the obscene moonscape of destruction, disease, and dismembered body parts, French soldiers in 1917 had deserted the front en-mass, and it was only with great effort that the mutiny was suppressed, and the war continued. France did not have the raw materials or the manufacturing capacity to match Germany, and in desperation the government turned to the French industrialist Louis Loucheur and gave him near-

dictatorial powers in order to turn the tide. Loucheur organized French production, and more importantly, coordinated the massive shipments of material from Britain and America.

After the war was over Loucheur reflected on his experience and concluded that industrial organization was the key to winning any major war in the future. From that insight he developed an idea for preserving peace, which was to remove all corporate and national control over the industries which were critical to modern warfare, namely coal and steel, and vest hegemony over them in some type of “higher authority.”

Loucheur’s vision of a supranational organization was shared by other powerful and influential people. This had been the dream of Cecil Rhodes, the millionaire politician and DeBeers mining company founder, who also founded the Rhode’s Scholarship and the Round Table group in England in the 1890s to push this initiative. When Woodrow Wilson was elected US president in 1912, the insiders who stage-managed his election and controlled his presidency assigned Edward M. House, an Englishman from the Round Table group, to be Wilson’s handler and mentor. Under House’s influence, and against his own repeated promises and better judgment, Wilson brought America into WWI, saving France from certain defeat. The Round Table group was then reconstituted in England as the “Royal Institute of International Affairs” (the RIIA), and after the war House founded the Council on Foreign Relations (the CFR) as a matching organization in America with essentially the same purposes. It is a testimony to the power and influence of Edward House and his insider backers, that the US State Department has been dominated by internationalists with CFR and RIIA connections ever since his day, and down to the present.

The aftermath of WWI seemed to be an ideal time for starting an international organization dedicated to peace. The dream of Woodrow Wilson had been to form a “League of Nations,” the first international body in history, and in 1919 his dream was realized. Wilson was awarded the Nobel peace prize for his efforts, but the American people had largely been opposed to the war, and the Democrats were crushed in the election of 1920. The US Congress, reflecting American sentiment, refused to join the League and turned its attention back to domestic affairs.

It is at this point that Jean Monnet, the true father of European Union, began to emerge. Monnet was born in 1888 in Cognac, France, and was the son of a wealthy brandy maker. He dropped out of college to work in the family firm and got involved in the marketing and distribution aspects of the business, spending most of his time abroad. During World War I he worked alongside Loucheur to support the French war effort and convinced his liquor distribution contacts in North America to get involved in the lucrative business of transporting war material from America and Canada to France. After the war, Monnet concurred with Loucheur’s assessment of the need for a higher authority to prevent any nation from continuing to control its coal and steel industries. He became the Deputy Secretary General of the League of Nations in 1919, but he grew disillusioned and resigned four years later because he felt that the League was essentially toothless. The League required a unanimous vote of its council to take any action, and it did not have

any armed forces of its own, so it was limited to using the bully pulpit to settle disputes. Monnet believed that the only solution that would prevent future large-scale war was a “supranational authority” to which all countries would cede complete control over their coal and steel industries. This authority would then be run by men who would be committed to the world rather than to any individual nation. Thus, an embryonic New World Order would be formed whose sovereignty could later be expanded.

Getting sovereign nations to cede a critical part of their power to a third party was a highly delicate process requiring stealth, deception, and a very long-term focus. Some of the insiders who carried this out, including Jean Monnet, were high-minded men who believed that they were doing this for the good of humanity, and that the secrecy and duplicity involved were an unfortunate but necessary ingredient in accomplishing what they thought was best for the world; in other words, the end justifies the means. Therefore, it eventually became necessary to hide much of the actual history of the EU and develop an official hagiography to conceal many of the seamy details. In contrast to the EU’s own statements, it is clear that submerging the sovereignty of European nations into a union was conceived in the mind of Monnet and others long before WWII, which is the time frame indicated in official EU history.

... Supranational power is necessary. Goodwill between men, between nations, is not enough. One must also have international laws and institutions. Except for certain practical but limited activities in which I participated, the League of Nations was a disappointment.

Jean Monnet, reflecting on his experience from 1919 – 1922

Regardless of the official EU history, the organization came into being primarily through the tireless efforts of this man, who dedicated a large part of his life to fulfilling the vision that he had developed with Louis Loucheur during WWI.

Jean Monnet – “Mr. Europe”

Jean Monnet was a short, self-effacing, ideas man who was described as looking like Agatha Christie’s famous fictional Belgian detective, Hercule Poirot. He was the “ultimate insider” who for most of his career preferred to work in the background and have others lead and champion his ideas. He was never elected to public office, but nevertheless held many positions of great power and influence throughout his career. Monnet had a knack for making friends in high places and being in the right place at the right time, and he was very adept at developing plans and then convincing influential people to accept and eventually adopt his ideas as their own. As indicated above, his first experience doing this was during the crisis of WWI, when he sought out the French Prime Minister René Viviani and convinced him to strike a deal with Monnet’s North American shipping contacts. His career in politics spanned sixty years (1916 – 1976) and he eventually became friends with, or at least known to, virtually all of the movers and shakers of his day, including Charles de Gaulle, Winston Churchill, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy, and many others. Perhaps even more significant was his friendship and association with many of the internationalist members of the CFR and the RIIA, such as George Ball, John Foster Dulles, Dean

Acheson, Allen Dulles, George Kennan, John Maynard Keynes, and others. These associates, who were often behind the levers of political and media power in America and Britain, proved to be invaluable. Monnet and other internationalists struggled for over thirty years to achieve the goal of a supranational authority in Europe, and throughout that time Monnet's CFR and RIIA contacts provided favorable press reports, news coverage, insider influence, and even direct financial assistance.

Many were interested in creating a "United States of Europe" in the years following WWI, but although the countries of Europe endorsed this in principle, they each had their own concerns and reservations. Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg later joined together to form the "Benelux" group, but France was reluctant because the French wanted control of the whole. England, which had long been at odds with continental Europe, consistently refused to consider any type of supranational approach because it would involve the surrender of British sovereignty.

Then the Great Depression hit, and during those lean years between the wars, European internationalists were funded at times by grants from the Rockefeller and Ford foundations, and even from CIA and US State department foreign aid slush funds. Covert American funding for European integration movements continued until 1960.

Germany, the loser in 1918, had been humiliated and crushed by France after the WWI armistice, causing hyperinflation and severe depression in Germany. The democratic German Weimar republic went down in flames amid pictures of people carrying huge baskets of newly printed and still wet money in order to buy a loaf of bread. The country thus became a fertile breeding ground for would-be strongmen, with Hitler and his Brown-Shirts ultimately coming out on top. The German arms buildup in the late 1930s exposed the weakness of the League of Nations, and the League was completely discredited by the conflict that followed. The death of the League was the famous picture of Neville Chamberlain, the Prime Minister of England, getting off a plane and waving a piece of paper that represented the peace agreement negotiated with Hitler in which parts of Czechoslovakia were given away in exchange for peace. A year later Germany reneged on the agreement, invaded Poland, and World War II began.

France was quickly occupied, and it surrendered within a few weeks. The only resistance to the German army was put up by French forces led by the general Charles De Gaulle, who had to escape to England following the German occupation. Monnet was also in England, and he attempted to get De Gaulle and Churchill to sign a document that would create a joint French and British "nation" as the foundation for a new Europe. But to Monnet's disappointment, Philippe Petain, the head of the Vichy collaborationist regime in France, angrily rejected this proposal, preferring to deal with Hitler and the Germans instead. Monnet sensed that Petain was wrong, and that the future lay with America as it had in 1916. He therefore arranged to become an ambassador to the US and was sent there to persuade Roosevelt to enter the war so that America, in Monnet's words, "could become the great arsenal of democracy." After Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt responded with the American invasions of North Africa and Normandy, and the rest was history, with Germany eventually capitulating in 1945.

Monnet's objective down through all of these years was the surrender of national control over all European coal and steel facilities to a higher authority. The nations of Europe had formerly been unwilling to consider such a thing, but with WWII over and Germany in no position to protest, Monnet finally achieved his goal. He chaired the team that wrote and negotiated the Treaty of Paris creating the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), which was organized primarily to take control over the "Ruhrgebiet," Germany's industrial district where all of its weaponry had been produced.

After several more years of negotiations, six of the European nations finally signed the treaty – Benelux, France, Germany and Italy. On May 9, 1950, Robert Schuman, the Foreign Minister of France, gave a speech which later became known as the Schuman Declaration, in which he formally invited Germany to jointly manage their coal and steel industries. May 9 was officially declared as "Europe Day," and Robert Schuman was designated as the "Father of Europe." However, it is a fitting tribute to the secretive and deceptive nature of the EU that virtually all of the Treaty of Paris as well as the entire text of Schuman's speech were actually written by Jean Monnet, the real Father of Europe, who was appointed to be the first ECSC president in 1952.

However, Monnet's goals were much larger than merely controlling coal and steel. As he himself said, "Our community is not a coal and steel producers association; it is the beginning of Europe." Therefore, he immediately began pressing to expand the scope of his "high authority" over other aspects of government. New initiatives were quickly introduced for European defense (the European Defense Community – EDC), politics (the European Political Community – EPC), and the economy (the European Economic Community – EEC or the Common Market). The EDC and EPC were ultimately abandoned due to French intransigence, but the EEC, the most significant of the initiatives, was retained. This was another signal to Monnet that more deception was necessary in order to sell additional reductions in national sovereignty, and it took six more years of negotiations with the group of six until the Treaty of Rome establishing the EEC was finally signed in 1957.

Motivations of Member States for Joining the EU

Some find it difficult to understand why national leaders would want to surrender the sovereignty and independence of their nations to a larger entity which would have much less concern for their specific interests and problems. A large motivating factor was the appeal to politicians of place and position in a more powerful political entity; a second factor was the fear of tariffs and restraints on exports that a supranational entity could impose which could cripple and potentially destroy domestic industries; a third and potentially the most powerful reason was the atmosphere of *groupthink*, the sense of inevitability cultivated by the leadership, and fear of being marginalized and penalized by the group. But there were other factors unique to each country as well.

France had for centuries viewed itself as the ruling force on the continent and saw the EEC as a way to extend that rule over the rest of Europe and use the resources of others

to support the French lifestyle. In French eyes, the EEC was possible renewal of the Carolingian Empire and of Louis XIV, the Sun King.

Germany likewise saw itself as the ruling force on the continent. Since 1870 they had superseded France, and in their eyes, they had taken France's place as the dominant nation of Europe. They were the country in Europe with the largest population, the Deutch Mark was the strongest currency, the German Bundesbank was the largest bank, and they believed that their Aryan race, their superior productivity, and their strong work ethic entitled them to be the leader of Europe.

Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg were part of the "middle kingdom," the land between the great states of France and Germany, which had been the perennial battleground in the highly destructive Franco-German conflicts. Thus, there was a strong desire among these people to somehow contain and muzzle the aggressive tendencies of Germany and France. Belgium contained both French and German regions, and both identified with and feared the aspirations its powerful neighbors. Like France, the Belgian government had become very socialistic with a large welfare burden and correspondingly large budget deficits. It was said that the country was "heaven for the renter and hell for the entrepreneur," and with Brussels as the European capital, Belgium looked forward to having the EU pay its way.

Italy was a welfare state similar to France in Belgium, but its deficits were even larger due to endemic government fraud. Joining the EEC was therefore seen as a strategy to bail out the regime and support the Italian economy with other people's money. The country was divided between the more productive north, and the mafia-influenced and welfare-state south, and it was run from Rome by the forces of the Christian Democrat party from southern Italy. They kept the tax revenues flowing continuously in a southerly direction, building up tremendous resentments and secessionist impulses among northerners. Italians have had long and bitter experience with domination by "Christians" (both the Catholic Popes and the Christian Democrats), interspersed with flings of communism, so it was often heard on the street, "better to be ruled by Brussels than by Rome."

Spain was a poorer country than the others and saw the Common Market in a similar manner to Italy, as a means of enriching itself at the expense of others. Spain had large fishing fleets and was eager to exploit the rich fishing waters of the North Sea around the UK then controlled by England. Joining the EEC and getting the English barriers to these waters removed would enable the Spanish fleets to take over, which they eventually did, driving many small UK fishermen out of business.

Denmark, Norway, and Sweden viewed the EEC with suspicion, understanding that it was dominated by France and Germany, and would therefore be run primarily for the benefit of those two countries. The Norwegians were concerned about the potential rape of their fishing industry (which later happened to Britain), and they rejected EEC membership. The Danes and the Swedes joined the EEC but despite the support of their politicians and the media, the people ultimately rejected the monetary union which came

later. The Danes have a history of wariness toward politicians, and the government area in Copenhagen is known as “Radhus Placen” – “Rat House Place.”

Ireland had long been the stepchild of England and saw EEC membership as a way of asserting its independence, like a teenage son who was finally able to grab the car keys from an overbearing father. There were also many connections between Catholics in Ireland and on the continent, and Ireland was given many financial incentives to enter the EEC.

Britain was the most reluctant EEC member of all. It was historically one of the wealthiest and most powerful nations in Europe, and London was the largest European city, and a world center of finance. It therefore had the least to gain and the most to lose from EEC membership. Britain was in many ways much more in tune with America than with Europe, especially in its focus on free-market economics. Furthermore, England was the traditional enemy of France and later Germany, and therefore forces on the continent used the EEC to screw England whenever they could. English politicians would periodically attempt to do deals to diplomatically isolate France from Germany, only to find out later that the two countries had closed ranks against them. More so than any other European nation, Britain has born the brunt of the EU costs, with virtually no benefits whatsoever to show for it. For its troubles, its agricultural and fishing industries have largely been ruined, and it has gotten a huge new bureaucracy that is attempting to micromanage every aspect of the country as is common in France.

The Renewal of the European Empire of Charlemagne

Overarching the motivations of all of the above nations was a Vision of a Unified Europe, a reconstitution of the Holy Roman Empire of Charlemagne, which encompassed much of the territory of the above nations (except Scandinavia, and the UK). References to Charlemagne occur repeatedly, and it is no accident that the former name of the office structure housing the EEC Council of Ministers in Brussels was the “Charlemagne Building.” During one of the EEC summit meetings held later, Valery Giscard d’Estaing of France and Helmut Schmidt of Germany met at Aachen, the principal seat and the burial place of Charlemagne. The two leaders paid a special visit to the throne of Charlemagne and a special service was held in the Cathedral of Aachen. After the conference was over, Giscard remarked that “Perhaps when we discussed monetary problems, the spirit of Charlemagne brooded over us.”

The term “Europe” thus was often used in a quasi-religious way, as a modern-day successor to “Christendom” but without the Christianity which had been a part of the original. The concept of “Europe—the new Christendom” was very fluid, and the treaties defined it in such amorphous language that each region could interpret it differently, in the way that best suited their own biases. But for most, especially France, the Christian religious element was ripped out and replaced by secular humanism, and especially by leftist dreams of a communist/socialist utopia where the borders of the nation-states would disappear and everyone would somehow live in peace and prosperity, under the dominion of the *énarques*. They would be ruled over by a benevolent regime who would supposedly govern unselfishly for the benefit of all.

This is the dream of communism and the faith of socialism. It is a religion, and the religious nature of this faith in secular leftist politics is demonstrated by the fact that many stubbornly clung to their beliefs even in the face of the repeated failure of such politics to provide any of the above – neither peace, nor prosperity nor benevolent government. But people still believed and stubbornly clung to their faith, and men such as the Frenchman Jacques Delors, who later became President of the European Commission and the first to style himself as the President of Europe, exploited this undercurrent of leftist religious belief to advance the EU cause. He conceived of EU bureaucrats as being missionaries and soldiers in a crusade to conquer Europe, and shamelessly used EU tax monies to promote the organization, suppress dissent, and to hire educators as propaganda tools. He thus became the first “Pope of the EU.”

In Soviet Russia those with opinions in opposition to the Communist hierarchy, such as Alexander Solzenitzen, were considered insane lunatics and committed to gulag-style mental institutions. Europe was more civilized and did not take things to those extremes, but dissent was nevertheless considered unacceptable, and those expressing it were fired and suppressed. The EU, especially under Delors, went to great lengths to squelch dissent and to make sure that every conference, symposium, and educational event was dedicated to proclaiming the orthodox socialistic views held by the EU hierarchy.

England, the EU, and EU Law

In the period following the formation of the Common Market, England was undergoing a national identity crisis. It had just shed its colonial empire, the Beatles and teen rebellion were the new thing, and suddenly everything from the past seemed old fashioned and questionable. In this spirit of national doubt and questioning, Europhilic English politicians decided that the time was right, and they filed an application to join the EEC even though the English population had virtually no interest. The political cover for this was the fear that if England did not join it would somehow miss out and become economically excluded from the rest of Europe.

Monnet and other members welcomed the prospect of bringing England in the European fold, but the application was vetoed by Charles de Gaulle, the president of France. De Gaulle was an ardent French nationalist who had consistently opposed the unifying efforts of Monnet. He wanted a European Union with France at its head and was not yet prepared to allow the English to join and interfere with French efforts to control the EU.

De Gaulle had become president of France after the war in 1945 but had retired from politics in 1953. In the 1950s the French government had begun to socialize their economy to an even greater extent than in the past, and had granted huge subsidies to farmers, thus insuring a market for French produce at above-market prices. Unsold and high-priced agricultural products were piling up, and the subsidies were bankrupting the government. There were also serious political problems—the French colonies in Indochina and Algeria were revolting and threatening to send insurgents into France. In an atmosphere of deepening crisis, De Gaulle reappeared on the scene and offered

himself as the leader if the current government would grant him temporary dictatorial power to resolve the crisis. In 1958 he was elected premier, and he immediately rewrote the French constitution more to his own liking, thus ending the Fourth Republic of France and beginning the Fifth. De Gaulle withdrew troops from all of the French colonies, and over the next four years he settled the Algerian crisis and ended French colonial involvement, but at the cost of abandoning the French people living in Algeria.

By 1962 de Gaulle was finally prepared to turn his attention back to the economy where the most vexing issue was the large subsidies that had been granted to French farmers. But he rejected the thought of lowering subsidies and restoring a free market because he feared that it would cause a revolt and reduce his own party's political support, which came largely from the agricultural sector. Grasping for a solution, he began to rethink his opposition to Monnet, and to envision how in one stroke he could control the EEC, bail out French agriculture, reduce the financial pressure on the French government, and create a permanent subsidy to France from the other countries of Europe.

Therefore, De Gaulle's placed all of his focus on creating what became known as the "CAP" (common agricultural policy). This essentially amounted to the use of most of the EU tax receipts (around 90%) being given back to farmers in the form of subsidies and price supports for agricultural products. Since France had by far the largest number of farmers among the EU members, enacting de Gaulle's CAP program would mean that there would be a huge transfer of wealth, with the bulk of it going to France. De Gaulle knew that if England was a part of the EEC before the CAP was enacted the British would deny this proposal, and so he and President George Pompidou who followed him in 1969 consistently delayed and vetoed England's application to join until they could get the CAP in place in such a way that it could not be altered.

It took eleven years of contentious negotiations for France to get its way, but the French diplomatic énarques persevered. Free market economists were aghast at this huge socialistic money grab that was being forced down their throats, and finally the Dutch Agriculture Minister Sicco Mansholt, who ironically came from a socialist background, decided to try to turn back the tide. He attempted to cut subsidies, reduce the number of cattle, and lower price supports in an effort to improve productivity and competitiveness. However, thousands of farmers in Benelux rioted, several people were killed, and Mansholt's own life was threatened. The EEC members finally capitulated; in 1970 they passed the French-inspired CAP legislation in a document known as the Treaty of Luxembourg, and in 1971 it was ratified by all of the members.

At this point the French strategy with England did a 180-degree flip-flop – it was then essential to get England into the EEC as soon as possible so that English wealth would immediately begin flowing across the channel to France. It has long been said that George Pompidou was more "moderate" than Charles de Gaulle because after 1971 he finally supported England's EEC membership request, but the reality is that his policies and goals were exactly the same as de Gaulle's. In May of 1971 a summit meeting between Heath and Pompidou was held and the good feelings generated by this event were supposedly responsible for the thaw in Franco-British relations. But that was purely

theatre for the media. French resistance to England's EEC membership disappeared only when the CAP legislation was finally ratified. Pompidou's frown was then replaced by an eager smile and a *Oui Monsiuer!* The time had come for the shearing of Britain.

Unfortunately for England, the Prime Minister at the time was the internationalist Edward Heath, who was convinced that the long-term success of England lay in becoming an EEC member. Even though the British public at the time had virtually no interest in joining, Heath immediately made this a public issue and eventually staked his entire political future as well as that of England on EEC integration. As he looked into the television cameras in 1973, he lied to his entire nation:

There are some in this country who fear that going into Europe we shall somehow sacrifice our independence and sovereignty. These fears, I need hardly say, are completely unjustified.

Heath immediately got a taste of what was in store for England when the EEC members indicated what England's contribution to the budget would be. There was a phase-in period that would last several years, but England's contribution would eventually be 19% of the whole, with possible future increases, and 90% of this would go toward the CAP program. Thus, there would be a permanent net transfer of wealth from Britain to the EEC, and thus to France.

Another serious problem was that joining the EEC meant that England and the other applicants had to ratify and be bound by all of the accumulated law that had been passed, by this point over 13,000 pages, many of which had never been officially translated into English. This was known as the *acquis communautaire*, and accepting it was absolutely non-negotiable – once an EEC law was passed all of the member nations had to abide by it. One of the major activities of the EEC was developing laws to somehow equalize, control, and essentially micromanage all aspects of commerce for the sake of competitiveness, safety, union participation, women's rights, the environment, and many other contentious and contradictory issues. Also, as the trade barriers between member countries were removed and formalized in EEC customs law, European nations came up with other creative ways of protecting their domestic industries, and a large part of EEC lawmaking activity was related to simultaneously creating new barriers and to reining in protectionist attempts, with lobbyists for all sides fighting over and providing benefits to cooperative EU lawmakers. The number of EEC rules and regulations making up the *acquis* was exploding exponentially. James Callahan, an English representative to the EEC once remarked,

I remember one low point when nine foreign ministers from the major countries of Europe spent several hours discussing how to resolve differences on standardizing a fixed position of rear-view mirrors on agricultural tractors.

The French eventually wore Heath down; he had made promises and expended his political capital on integration, so eventually his instructions to his ministers were, "swallow the lot, and swallow it now."

One of the issues with the *acquis* that England swallowed and overlooked at the time, but that later came back to bite them very badly was related to fishing. This industry was a large part of the English economy, and the waters off England were some of the best fishing regions in Europe containing around 80% of the fish. The international Law of the Sea had been passed allowing each maritime country to extend its borders out to 200 miles from its coast, but under EEC law, other member countries had the rights to fish in the waters of any EEC member, right up to the beach. Thus, England's fishing resources were fair game once it became an EEC member, and this was to create huge problems in later years, and did great damage to England's fishing industry, especially from the huge fishing fleets of Spain. Norway discovered this issue and the fisheries minister resigned in protest. The Norwegians eventually voted down EEC membership and have never joined the EU, but England went ahead.

Even though England resisted monetary union, the country was still subject to all of the EU rules and regulations which had already been passed and were being made in Brussels at a furious pace. For many Brits their first real experience with the EU was when these regulations began to be enforced in the early 1990s by newly created organizations within the British government. One Englishman who ran a small garden center had for years been employing an unused quarry on his own land as a compost heap. He was informed by the authorities that under new EU waste regulations, his dead leaves and other composting materials constituted "controlled waste." Since he did not have a waste management license, he would have to hire a contractor to remove and dispose of the materials at a cost of £20,000, and he also faced prosecution for committing a criminal offence. Another man owned a butchery which had been a family business for 100 years. He was informed by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food that he must now make extensive structural changes to his facilities. If he did not comply within six months, he would lose his license and be forced to close the business. Although the butcher shop was just across the yard from his slaughterhouse, he would no longer be allowed to carry meat between the buildings unless he built a refrigerated tunnel between them. After considering the cost of this he decided that his only option was to close.

But the issue which most fully crystallized British hatred and opposition to Brussels was ironically the conversion to the metric system. An English fruit vendor was arrested and prosecuted for the crime of pricing and selling his bananas in pounds instead of in kilograms. This arrest made the front page headlines, and many stories began coming to light of how these and hundreds of other ridiculous laws, made by a distant, unfeeling bureaucracy that was completely out of touch with local conditions, and enforced in ways that often lacked common sense, were ruining the economy and killing small businesses. Furthermore, these businessmen had no recourse within the country, because local politicians had no right to challenge or modify the slightest part of any EU law.

Many of these regulations were not even coming from the EU itself, but from academic and environmental pressure groups, consultants, lobbyists, trade groups, and other NGO's (non-governmental organizations) all of whom were seeking to impose their own will and spin on Europe. At the time there were over 1,600 committees operating in Brussels, and over 170,000 lobbyists, and the numbers have since grown larger. All of these regulations

were supposedly vetted and passed by various organizations within the EU, but most were merely rubber stamped on the way to the Council of Ministers who only had time to review twenty percent or less of the new legislation – the rest was passed automatically. All of their meetings were confidential, and it was once observed that the only countries which were as secretive as the EU were Cuba, North Korea, and Iraq. By 1998 it was estimated that more than 3,000 ministerial meetings were being held each year (an average of 60 per week) in a vain attempt to keep up with the flood of new laws, many of which were not even translated in time for them to be properly reviewed. The “Common Market” which was supposedly a “free trade zone” was thus encumbered with thousands of rules, making it the most highly regulated trading zone on the planet. Far from opening markets, the laws served mainly to protect insiders, especially in France, who managed to create many regulations specifically designed to protect its own companies. The eyes of the people began to open and gradually the hatred of Brussels began to grow.

Veiled hostility between England and the rest of the EEC became more-or-less a permanent fixture. When Margaret Thatcher was elected to office in 1979, she spent five years trying to get a more equitable split on England’s budget contribution. At one point she even attempted the so-called “nuclear option” to get the English parliament to suspend EEC payments or even possibly to leave the EEC entirely, but there were too many Europhiles in the British government for the measure to succeed.

Despite the drain of the EEC payments, the later years of Thatcher’s time in office were ones of prosperity and growth in England as her attempts to privatize the economy and limit the power of unions began to pay off. The period of 1987-88 were the peak of Britain’s boom years, as the entire country became energized by the free-market initiatives that Thatcher had made. Over one hundred thousand new companies per year were being created in the period, far exceeding past numbers, and investors around the world began to pour resources into England, in an effort to join the action. But the final years of Thatcher’s term became grim, as the influence of Eurocrats in the British government had grown large and interest rates rose precipitously. Thatcher was by far the most effective opponent to the EU political machine, so funds from EU, CFR and RIIA-inspired sources began flowing into the political coffers of Europhilic British politicians in order to destroy the “iron lady” of England.

Thatcher was marginalized by the EU and the press, and became a minority of one, vainly trying to halt the runaway train of increased “competencies” for the European Union, and their desire to control everything—money, education, energy, communications, transportation, politics, law, defense, and foreign policy in the same ways that they had already gained control of national economies. In the media, England was often said to be “missing the train,” “traveling in the slow lane,” and many other clichés and metaphors, although it was never clear exactly what the bad consequences would be, and why it was so important to catch that train. During this time Thatcher made a famous speech in Bruges in 1988, noting that:

It is ironic that just when the countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, who have tried to run everything from the centre, are learning that success depends on dispersing power away from the centre, many in this [European] Community

want to move in the opposite direction. We have not successfully rolled back the frontiers of the state in Britain only to see it re-imposed at a European level, with a European super-state exercising a new dominance from Brussels... Europe will be strong precisely because it has France as France, Spain as Spain, and Britain as Britain, each with their own customs, traditions, and identity. It would be folly to fit them into some sort of identikit European personality.

Her speech ruffled many feathers, because this was exactly the intention of the EEC leaders, who at that time were pressing forward with monetary and political union. One of Thatcher's last and most powerful speeches was a literal prediction of what lay ahead for Europe and her feelings about it:

Mr. Delors said at a press conference the other day that he wanted the European Parliament to be the democratic body of the Community [in place of parliaments in the member states]; he wanted the European Commission to be the executive, and he wanted the Council of Ministers to be the senate. No! No! No!

The London *Sun* responded with the famous headline "Up Yours, Delors!" but led by the BBC media chorus, the tide had turned against Margaret Thatcher. She was done in by betrayals from her own ministers and she finally resigned in 1990. Two years later the French EU Commission President Jacques Delors, pushed through the Maastricht Treaty, which was the definitive step toward monetary union, as well as formally replacing the EEC with the European Union (i.e., the Common Market was replaced by a full-blown European government). Ironically, the EU federation was created on the same day that Boris Yeltsin dissolved the Russian federation and declared that "the Soviet Union had ceased to exist."

Margaret Thatcher's political party, the Tory conservatives, was effectively taken over by Europhiles, and the Prime Ministers who succeeded her – John Major and later Labour party leader Tony Blair – were both supporters of the European Union. Thus, like the CFR in America with their quasi-control and influence over US Republicans and Democrats, the EU effectively captured both of Britain's major political parties. English voters now have the unappetizing prospect of choosing between the EU-oriented Tory conservatives, and the more socialistic and union-oriented Labour liberals.

In the succeeding years England has slipped backward with higher prices, serious declines in agriculture, and a poor economic outlook. Large numbers of Englishmen are leaving the country, and many are moving to France, of all places. In spite of very high French taxes they are buying up French farms and real estate because they can get much better deals there than in England, as well as more CAP-based agricultural subsidies. Sir Nicholas Henderson, the British Ambassador to France, had this to say about his own country:

Our decline in relation to our European partners has been so marked that today we are not only no longer a world power, but we are not in the first rank even as a European one.

England was, however, assisted by the people of Denmark who have long distrusted even their own politicians. Despite the support of all of the main Danish political parties, the Danish people rejected the Maastricht Treaty after the government distributed 300,000 copies of it and the Danes saw how unreadable it was. Even the Danish Foreign Minister, Paul Schluter, admitted, "I don't understand it and I negotiated it." When the Danes voted *Nej*, shock waves traveled across Europe because if any member state failed to ratify a treaty, it had to be declared void. Portugal's Foreign Minister stated, "Either the Danes must be expelled from the Community or forced to reverse their decision." Years later the Danes again showed their common sense in the face of the combined Danish political and media establishment by rejecting the Euro.

Frantic EU leaders immediately began searching for ways around their own limitations which years before had been carefully inserted into the organization to prevent them from taking the very action which they took next. The answer, which naturally came from Jacques Delors, was in the principle of "subsidiarity" that allowed the Union to take any action it deemed to be prudent and necessary, even if individual member states rejected it. Thus, the EU shrugged off its own constraints, and the move toward a New World Order rolled on.

The EU and Military Issues

In 1991 Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait and the response was the Desert Storm action undertaken by the US and Britain. The EU was divided, and many insiders considered the organization to be weak and ineffective. As the Belgian Foreign Minister stated at the time, the EU was "an economic giant, a political pygmy, and a military larva."

Immediately following the actions in Iraq, another war in Europe was brewing. Yugoslavia was a country that had been created after WWII and had been held together under the iron fist of the communist dictator Josip Tito, who ruled from Belgrade, in the portion of the country known as Serbia. The Soviet Union was in the process of breaking apart, Tito had died, and the various regions of Yugoslavia who had suffered greatly under Tito's grip began to declare their independence. Croatia and Slovenia were the first to secede, and Slobodan Milosevic, the current dictator of Serbia sent in troops to crush the secession movement.

This was exactly the type of crisis that Delors and others were looking for – a heaven-sent opportunity to assume more powers (in EU-speak, to "increase Union competencies") in the area of political and military integration. The EU sent a negotiating team of three foreign ministers, led by Jacques Poos of Luxembourg, who said,

The hour of Europe has dawned... if there is one problem that can be solved by Europeans it is the Yugoslav problem. This is a European problem and it is not up to the Americans to resolve it."

The Slovenians initially greeted the EU negotiators with Europa flags flying, until the people found out what the agenda of these ministers actually was. The European Union, which for decades had been struggling to achieve a federal state, could not conceive of

why Slovenia, Croatia, and the others would want to break up the Yugoslav federation and become independent. The negotiators met with the Serb dictator Slobodan Milosevic in Belgrade, and Poos said in support of him, “the idea of national self-determination is a dangerous basis for international order.” The Luxembourg minister also scorned the idea that “tiny Slovenia” could survive on its own as a nation, even though its population was six times larger than Luxembourg.

Even more telling was that the European Union had just made a huge €700 million loan to Serbia, which Milosevic then used to buy weapons. The EU negotiators insisted that Slovenia and Croatia should revoke their declarations of independence as a condition for cease-fire with Serbia. But the Slovenians and the Croats instead began to burn the EU flags and use them to wrap their garbage. An eleven year war began, with thousands of Croats, Slovenians, Bosnians, and Serbs killed while the EU military observers observed, the EU politicians debated, the EU mediators mediated, and the EU negotiators negotiated, trying in vain to convince the peoples of the former Yugoslav republic that life would be better as a federation under Serb rule. EU intervention was thus a disgusting fiasco, and to the huge embarrassment of the European Union, they again had to be bailed out by the America. Countless atrocities were committed, especially by the Serbs, and the conflict continued until the US finally entered the war and brought peace soon afterward by bombing Serbia, arresting Milosevic, and putting him and several of his military leaders on trial for war crimes.

Although no one in the EU would admit it, the continuing war in Yugoslavia was a huge indictment of the European Union, whose main *raison d'être* was to prevent wars from occurring. Instead of preventing the Yugoslav war, the EU perpetuated it, and ultimately had to get outside help to end it.

EU Propaganda, Enlargement, and Control

It was at the beginning of the 1990s that the EU grew large and powerful enough to begin imposing its own will on its member states in Europe rather than having to continue to kowtow to national leaders. Jacques Delors had just succeeded in first marginalizing, and then with the help of EU-loving politicians in the British government, which he had helped to put in place, finally eliminating Margaret Thatcher, who had been his most intelligent and highly-placed critic. This gave Delors much cachet in France and elsewhere on the continent, and he immediately began looking for strategies to further centralize the EU and reduce the power of the member nations, who naturally were often in disagreement with what the central government wanted to foist on them.

Delors found it in a concept known as “regionalization,” which became the new EU buzzword, and a “Committee of the Regions” was formed. The stated goal of this effort was ostensibly to create more harmony among all of the diverse areas of Europe, but the real goal was to break down national sovereignty and the existing centers of power. They would be replaced by regions of the former countries which would then be less powerful and more amenable to EU control. The existing countries would remain on the map as before, but the national governments of the European nations would, in Delors’ plan, be

marginalized and replaced by balkanized “duchies.” To implement the plan, Delors authorized the local governments in each region to negotiate directly with the European Commission for access to government money, bypassing the national governments and pitting the regions against each other in a money grab at the EU trough. Almost overnight the number of lobbyists in Brussels increased ten-fold.

Over time Delors had packed the EU Commission with his own people until it became essentially a French socialist machine. He saw regionalization as not only destroying opposition to the EU in England but also reducing the influence of Germany, the perennial opponent of France, and possibly returning Europe to something more like the French-dominated power balance that had existed during the time of the Sun King Louis XIV, and prior to the unification of Germany by Bismarck. If German unification could be rolled back, and Germany transformed back into Bavaria, Burgundy, Pomerania, and a series of other regions, German influence could be muted, and France could reassert its historic role of European domination.

But with Euroscepticism abounding and hatred of the EU growing, even regionalization was deemed to be insufficient to develop a European conscience in the populace. The EU therefore created “Jean Monnet chairs” in 491 European educational institutions and financed 2,319 teaching positions for “Jean Monnet Projects” across Europe. These educators were challenged to come up with ways of promoting European integration and improving the EU’s public image. With the help of many of these academics, the EU Commission developed a White Paper in 2001 which contained a complex plan for winning the hearts and minds of Europeans.

The core of the plan was a concept known as “networking.” This involved working with churches (emphasizing peace), women’s groups (emphasizing feminism and female rights), unions (emphasizing benefits and reduction of corporate power), local authorities (emphasizing funding opportunities), etc. Each group would therefore receive a different EU spin, and the groups would then to be linked together to create pro-EU political pressure. All of this activity was to be funded by EU tax revenues.

Another proposal from the White Paper was “regulatory reform.” The EU Commission, along with its lobbyists and NGOs, was spending large amounts of time and energy passing huge volumes of regulatory law, but it was up to each country to implement and enforce that law. The existing regulatory bodies in each EU country, covering areas such as food safety, maritime activities, air safety, etc., were deemed to be too arbitrary and not strict enough about making everyone toe the EU line. Therefore “regulatory reform” was proposed, which involved setting up agencies in every country in order to remove regulatory enforcement from national control. The shell of existing regulatory organizations would remain in order to conceal this process from the populace, but the staff would be managed in such a way that they would be responsible only to the EU Commission, even though they worked directly in the target country. Thus, all of the EU laws would be fully implemented and enforced everywhere. A powerful side benefit of this process would be that the national governments would be responsible for paying the regulatory staff, and cost for this effort would thus be born by each European country

directly rather than the European Union itself. Therefore, each nation would be forced to pay for its own regulatory strangulation.

“Regionalization,” “networking,” and “regulatory reform” were to be followed up by “tax harmonization” a code word for implementing a Europe-wide income tax payable directly to the EU. This would provide vast new revenues that could then be used to further expand government influence and control. This has so far been rejected but is continually presented as a requirement for the proper functioning of the Union.

EU Embezzlement and Scandals

The explosion of regulatory legislation and lobbyists led to many huge multi-million-euro embezzlement schemes, which were developed by EU commission insiders who came up with many creative ways to siphon off funds and receive kickbacks. This had been going on for a long time, with the Commission stalling inquiries and stonewalling attempts at reform. Finally, Paul van Buitenen, a Dutch EU accountant, sent a 600-page document listing many EU financial crimes to the European Parliament in December of 1998, and others began coming forward with stories of corruption, mismanagement, and fraud. For example, the EU maintained a £2.7 billion overseas aid program which was rife with corruption. One EU-funded program to build roads in Cameroon had led to a partial felling of a rain forest designated as a world heritage site, with the mass destruction of wildlife and the bulldozing of villages. This was done through the collaboration of the Cameroonian government along with French logging companies, who had become adept at exploiting EU aid funding.

The call went out for reform and eventually the entire slate of commissioners resigned in 1999. But despite press coverage and repeated condemnation, the commissioners, including Jacques Santer, the disgraced Commission President who succeeded Jacques Delors, went on to take other EU jobs, and business more-or-less continued as usual. The Commission destroyed many incriminating documents, set up an anti-fraud unit as a bureaucratic smoke screen, and the unit served instead to muzzle the press and protect the EU from criticism. Mr. Buitenen, the whistle-blower, was suspended and reassigned at half of his former salary. The same situation was repeated several years later in 2004 by Marta Andreason, the EU Commission’s chief accounting officer. The Commission had historically hired individuals with little or no accounting skills, and Ms. Adreason was one of the first professional accountants ever hired. She noted that the computer systems created for the Commission had never been integrated with each other, in a planned effort at obfuscation. She also revealed that the EU Commission still relied on single entry bookkeeping allowing officials to transfer of large sums without leaving any corresponding ledger entries. Her final assessment of on the Commission’s financial operations were that it was “chronically sordid – an open till waiting to be robbed.” Marta Andreason was quickly fired. The Court of Auditors, which is the EU’s own body for policing its finances, has refused to certify the financial statements of the European Union since 1995.

Jules Muis, the former Director-General of the Commission's Internal Audit Service, wrote a scathing criticism of the EU after he retired. He indicated that the Commission still relied on non-qualified accountants who were unaware of normal accounting practices, allowing it to "get away with practices that breached its own law." He also said that the Commission operated a "perverse incentive structure that rewarded staff if they managed to avoid discovering financial malfeasance." Mr. Muis was threatened with retribution, and was told, "We have ways of breaking people like you."

Thus, critics of the EU must be prepared for personal ruin, as the organization now has the legal rights to take such actions. The EU Court of Justice has ruled that the Union is allowed to suppress the personal rights of any individual attempting to criticize it. Hans Martin Tillack, the Brussels correspondent of Germany's Stern magazine, was jailed for writing a series of articles exposing EU fraud, and the European Court brushed aside decades of precedent and case law to allow all of his records and notes to be seized in an effort to find his sources, the EU whistle-blowers, and to deal with them. After Bernard Connely's book, *The Rotten Heart of Europe: the Dirty War for Europe's Money* was published, he was fired, threatened, and blackballed by the EU. When he challenged this in court, the prosecutor indicated that criticism of the EU was akin to extreme blasphemy. In 2001 the court decided that the EU can lawfully suppress political criticism of its institutions and leading figures, and it upheld the firing.

The EU and the United Nations

It is ironic that so much trust is placed in international organizations such as the EU and the UN, and that many people see these organizations in a less negative light than they do national governments, especially that of America. Polls around the world have shown that large numbers of people will only support war if it is approved by the UN. But despite the appeal of the UNESCO propaganda with its children of all colors laughing and playing together, the reality is that UN is shamefully and disgustingly corrupt and is completely unworthy of trust.

UN officials are involved in drug-dealing in Cambodia; refugee extortion in Kenya; sexual slavery in the Balkans, and "Sex-for-Food" in Western Africa, where UN staffers on "peace missions" have routinely demanded the sexual favors of very young girls in exchange for the delivery of food, which was donated and paid for by the dues of member UN countries.

The antics of a US prison guard in the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq were front page news for weeks and led to calls for the resignation of Donald Rumsfeld, the US Secretary of Defense. Politicians such as Ted Kennedy made ridiculous statements, such as, "Saddam's torture chambers are now open under new management." But the systemic pedophilia that has occurred in a large percentage of UN missions goes almost completely unreported. Even Bill Clinton, with his cigars and his nubile intern in a blue dress, is a boy scout compared with the UN people. Didier Bourguet, a UN staffer in Congo and the Central African Republic, enjoyed many 12-year-old girls, and as a result he is now on trial in France. His lawyer excused his actions on the basis that he is simply

doing what other UN staffers do, and that a UN pedophile network is operating throughout Africa and Southeast Asia. There should be continuous world-wide calls demanding that the UN be de-funded and that the entire leadership be put on trial for crimes against humanity, but instead this is simply swept under the rug. Question: how can you rape and have sex safely with many underage girls? Answer: wear a blue helmet.

The genocide in Sudan is typical of the failure of the UN to achieve any meaningful results. While ten of thousands were killed and millions were forced out of their villages and into refugee camps by the forces of President Omar Hassan al-Bashir of northern Sudan, the UN did nothing except to send in study groups. The problem is that northern Sudan is Islamic, and its aggressive jihadist policies are supported by the entire Muslim bloc, who are a large part of the UN. Ironically, both al-Bashir of Sudan as well as Colonel Gaddafi of Libya have in the past been appointed as chairmen of the UN Human Rights Commission, and it was announced at one point that the presidency of the UN Conference on Disarmament would pass to Saddam Hussein in Iraq.

When the tsunami of 2005 hit Southeast Asia, rescue organizations such as World Vision and others from Australia and America were quickly on the scene, but the UN humanitarians were unable to arrive for weeks, and then spent their time holding press conferences about the need for more donations to UN humanitarian programs.

The Oil-for-Food scandal is another example of how the UN and its leadership has largely escaped the condemnation that it so richly deserves, and is a case study in how protected bureaucracies create guilt and compassion in western countries, and then use these emotions to crassly enrich themselves. Kofi Annan, the UN Secretary-General is from the Ashanti tribe, the ruling group in Ghana, West Africa. His son Kojo was earning a salary of \$30,000 per year, but somehow came up with a quarter million to invest in a Swiss football club through Iraq Oil-for-Food slush funds. Also involved was Kobina Annan, Kojo's brother, who is the Ghanaian ambassador to Morocco, with ties to a man who is being investigated for bribery involving a \$50 million UN building contract, and who coincidentally was also the son of the Ghanaian ambassador to Switzerland. Meanwhile, Secretary-General Kofi refuses to resign and insists that he is committed to reforming the UN, despite the fact that his brother, his son, his son's best friend, his former chief of staff, his procurement officer and the executive director of the UN's largest-ever aid program have all been implicated in the scandal. In another strange coincidence, many of the high officials in the Ghanaian government own or have directorships in companies with UN contacts, and ties to various UN programs. Paul Volker, the Oil-for-Food scandal investigator, who, to his credit, has brought some of this to light, has avoided a confrontation with Kofi, because Volker himself is a UN staffer. The UN is thus investigating itself. Annan has promised to bring "reforms," perhaps by replacing the Program Oversight Committee with the Program Oversight Committee Oversight Committee, but the reality is that the Oil-for-Food debacle *is* the UN – socialist utopians, bureaucratic embezzlers, and panders of guilt and anti-Americanism.

Even when scandal is not involved, actions taken by the UN have tended to make the world worse rather than better. Like the European Union and other globalists, the UN

leadership believes that they know how to run things better than anyone else. Ironically, the people who have been under UN wing the longest and where permanent UN agencies have been set up – the Palestinians and the inhabitants of Kosovo – are also the most comprehensively damaged people on the planet. Those societies have problems unrelated to what the United Nations has done, but UN involvement has resulted in the perpetuation of problems because UN policies treat the people of these countries like dependent children who are incapable of taking care of themselves and making their own decisions. For example, in the aftermath of the Hamas win in Israel and the cutoff of American aid, there have been frantic calls from the EU and the UN to send millions more in aid to the Palestinian government, because “Palestine is in danger of immanent collapse.” The reason that it is in danger of immanent collapse is that the Palestinian Authority has continually been given foreign aid, and the society has become dependent on EU and UN handouts, which have allowed it to focus Palestinian efforts on destroying Israel rather than creating businesses and building up Palestine.

The wreckage caused by the UN is not limited to politics. Its involvement in gender programs has typically provided a large platform for the most virulent feminists in the world, who are given public funds to promote their anti-family agenda, camouflaged by UNESCO propaganda.

Why is there such silence about the crimes and excesses of the UN, and why is there not a continual chorus of front-page articles demanding real reform? The answer is threefold: 1) the adversaries of the UN typically have much fewer resources and less access to public opinion; 2) the UN, like the EU, plays hardball with any insider who wants to defect and tell the truth, and therefore it is very hard to learn what is really going on; and 3) the press largely consists of left-leaning liberals who excuse UN actions and hesitate to criticize them, like the French communists who excused the excesses of Stalin because of their belief in the goodness of communism.

Despite the continual news reports about corrupt politicians in America, the truth is that there is much less government corruption in the US than in any other government entity. Is this because American politicians are somehow more moral than the rest of the world? No – it is because they are continually under the media spotlight, like a bug under a microscope, and the opposing political party as well as the media will savage them on any possible issue that can be dug up or invented. Contrast this with organizations such as the UN and the EU where there are positions of extensive power, access to substantial amounts of money, and very little accountability. Eventually there will be systemic and widespread corruption which will be carefully swept under the rug.

Eliminating Dissention

Like the UN, the European Union shook off criticism of its goals and has moved toward more centralized control. In 1998 the European Central Bank was formed, and it was given exclusive control over all monetary policy. Like other central banks it is completely independent of any nation and even the EU itself. It is run by a board of directors, and all of its meetings are secret. The following year the Euro was introduced, eventually

replacing the currencies of twelve European nations, as well as being informally used in other countries.

Billions have been spent by the EU on marketing and public relations to hide the above issues from the public. Anyone wanting to form a political party can do so, and plans call for the EU to provide cash to help launch these parties as long as the founders sign a statement agreeing to a large number of EU policies and principles. Conversely, the EU can eliminate any party that it deems to be out of accord. In 2004 the Vlaams Blok, a Flemish nationalist group founded in 1977 and dedicated to controlling immigration and getting Belgium out of the EU, was accused of racism and declared to be a “non-party” and a “criminal organization” by the Belgian courts. The reason for this action was that support for this party was growing faster than any other; it had captured 25% of the Flemish votes, more than any other party, and held eighteen seats in the Belgian parliament. In disbanding the party Frank Vanhecke, a MEP and a Vlaams Blok Party leader made the following statement:

The consequences of the conviction are, however, serious. According to the law, every member of our party or everyone who has ever cooperated with it, even if he has not committed any crimes himself, becomes a criminal by the mere fact of his membership of or his cooperation with our party. The Ghent verdict... serves as an efficient means to suppress [unwanted political] groups or societies, as the lawmaker intended. I thank those who founded our party in 1977 and all who have supported it in the past 27 years. They have fought the good fight. I thank our one million voters. They deserve a democracy. Belgium does not want to grant them one, but we will. Today, our party has been killed, not by the electorate but by the judges. We will establish a new party. This one Belgium will not be able to bury; it will bury Belgium.

The EU marketing and PR efforts are therefore like putting lipstick on a pig, because the entire tenor of the European Union is one of deception, intolerance, and power grabbing covered up by a marketing patina of caring and sharing. Nationalistic and anti-centrist forces have prevailed at times, but in the spirit of Monnet who understood that a long-term, incremental approach was required, the European Union has gradually become more and more centralized, with the ultimate goal becoming a one-world government.

The EU and the New World Order

CFR-inspired political forces in the US have attempted to take similar actions in America. The NAFTA agreement was signed with Canada and Mexico in an attempt to create a North American “free-trade” zone that was meant to emulate the European Common Market. Constant efforts by Democrats are being made to break down US sovereignty and legalize immigrants; to eliminate all barriers to immigration so that America can be flooded with Hispanics who will then vote for Democrat politicians and break down traditional American power centers.

However, CFR and internationalist initiatives apply to both sides of the US political aisle. President Bush and CFR-inspired Republicans, supported by American oil firms, have

prosecuted the war in Iraq, which has required billions to be spent on the military and has created huge US budget deficits and corresponding reductions in the value of the dollar. In turn, it has also provided the Democrats with a huge stick to beat the Republicans, and to argue for more international control, creating a win-win for internationalist forces controlling both political parties.

Thus the world has been coalescing into large political entities of varying power and influence, in three tiers: Europe and America in the first tier; Russia, China, Japan, the Muslim world of the Middle East and Africa, and the Commonwealth nations (Canada, Australia and New Zealand) in the second tier; and Central and South America, India, and Southeast Asia in the third. The groups that hold the levers of power in these countries and regions are the “ten-horned beast” of the new world order. Among these ten, seven are by far the most powerful and influential: Europe, America, Russia, China, the Muslim world, Japan, and Canada. They are the “seven heads” of the order, with Europe being the head whose power had been diminished and “slain,” only to rise again to worldwide prominence in the figure of the European Union.