



The
**Red
Cell**

The Wider Perspective

Dr Lee Rotherham
October 2018

www.theredcell.co.uk

The Wider Perspective

This is the accompanying paper to a previous collection of pan-European essays published by *The Red Cell*.

In *The Big Picture*, we explored something of the ambitions accompanying Brexit that now arise across the continent.¹ We heard from Denmark of aspirations for that country to leave the EU too. From Estonia, we heard the argument that the foundations of the EU are not dissimilar to those of the USSR – as this view was from a former member of the Supreme Soviet, and not from the UK's Foreign Secretary as enounced at the Conservative party conference, such observations proved less controversial than they subsequently became.

From Ireland, we heard the suggestion that the future for the Republic lay with its own departure. From Iceland, we learned that Brexit opened up opportunities for it to step away from the flawed EEA. From Norway we were prompted to consider the bilateral wins that a clean Brexit break would generate. Meanwhile from Slovenia, a campaigner grounded the reader on the wider and enduring democratic problems that remain.

These papers collectively demonstrated that Brexit wins are not confined to just the UK, but also that Brexit itself carries an invigorating force that has the power to reshape the EU 27.

We turn now to other European countries, ranging from France to Greece, and Switzerland to the Czech Republic and Poland, that is to say embracing not just the opportunities for EU states but also those beyond.

Of course these are personal views and each author is responsible only for their own perspective. A key thread that emerges is that of the *broken consensus*; and the need to be able to make reasoned democratic decisions after honest democratic debate.

The danger has ever been one of the false and forced agreement reached while wider discussion is taboo. When the consensus is merely that of the ungrounded establishment and ignores the honest concerns of the public, then the foundations of the democratic order truly are at risk.

¹ http://www.theredcell.co.uk/uploads/9/6/4/0/96409902/the_big_picture.pdf



Brexit: a fantastic hope for France

Dimitri de Vismes, delegate for the French UPR party in the UK

In France, opinions regarding the EU can be divided into two:

- The Pro-EU position, which can either be: the EU functions fairly well and should be further developed, or the EU principles are good but some aspects should be changed. This latest position is called euro-critical or euro-reformist.
- The position that rejects the principle of belonging to the EU and wants the country to leave it.

The Pro-EU position is largely spread in the French mainstream media – overall owned by a dozen of private interests or individuals – while the latter is barely exposed and its supporters have very little opportunities to debate with the Pro-EU people. Most often, when such opportunity arises, this position is minimised or not considered seriously.

By voting in favour of Brexit on 23rd June 2016, the people of the UK gave a new hope to all the French who reject the principles of the EU and more generally those who voted “No” to the European Constitution with a large majority of 54.7% in 2005. By deciding to leave the EU through a referendum, the people of the UK have perpetuated their long tradition of respect for people’s freedom, democracy and sovereignty. Fully in line with the spirit of the highly innovative *Magna Carta* 800 years ago establishing limitations of the government’s powers by law and setting up the basics for individual liberties, the UK is once again leading the way in Europe by democratically choosing to leave a technocratic institution that disregards the interests and opinions of the People it administers – namely the EU.

In France, one political party follows this situation with the greatest interest. Founded on 25th March 2007 – the 50th Anniversary of the signature of the Treaty of Rome – by a French politician, François Asselineau (former candidate for the French Presidential election in 2017), the UPR (Union Populaire Républicaine; *Popular Republican Union*) has steadily developed and became one of the biggest French political parties in 2018. This party aims at withdrawing France from the EU (Frexit), from the Eurozone (abandoning the Euro currency) and from NATO. For the past 10 years, the UPR has held hundreds of conferences on EU topics – generally very detailed – across the country, trying to educate people on the true nature of the EU and why it urges so much to leave this supra-national structure. With nearly 32,000 members (as of the beginning of September 2018), the UPR is almost absent from the French media coverage despite having the most attractive political website of France (according to *Alexa Ranking* for Internet traffic).

After more than 60 years of existence, the EU has clearly demonstrated the lack of democracy of its institutions.

The Treaty of Lisbon – which was initially rejected (through referendums in 2005) by the French and the Dutch voters in its original shape, the “European Constitution” – entered into force in 2009, setting the EU *full competency* (full power) in a number of strategic domains such as competition rules or customs union. It also gives to the EU a *shared competency* (large power) in other key domains such as environment, energy or research. In addition to the laws (regulations and directives) directly applicable for all member States, bespoke orientations - set in yearly reports named *Council Recommendations* - are directed to each member state. In the early 2000’s the German advisor Klaus Regling has been a key decider for the policies to the French government.

Despite being not elected by the so-called “European People”, the twenty-eight European Commissioners hold both legislative and executive powers, unlike the fundamental principle of the “Separation of Powers System” recommended by Montesquieu during the 18th century, and which is applied in a number of European countries where the government stands for the executive power and the parliament for the legislative one.

Between 1995 and 2007 the EU went from twelve to twenty-seven member states, thus becoming a huge bureaucratic machine with more than twenty official languages. Most of the states who recently joined the EU were from Eastern Europe, where the economic conditions were obviously lower than in several western states. However, the People from the original member States were never given a choice over this enlargement.

Besides the power confiscation by a non-elected oligarchy, the European Union leans on various European treaties, which cannot benefit all member states. The main reason for this is that the twenty-eight member states have not the same interests in the EU. They also have different historical – and sometimes, contradictory – ties with third countries (non-EU countries), making EU diplomacy inefficient. Whereas some countries would like to escape from the Russian sphere of influence (Eastern European countries for the most part), some others would certainly benefit from closer co-operation with Russia. France is one of them.

Chained into a complex network of divergent interests, the member states of the European Union must accept the rules of a game for which no one can win. By prohibiting any restriction on the movement of capital, Article 63 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU) puts all the EU workers and fiscal systems in competition with one another *and* with third countries. As companies can transfer their funds without any control from the state, they build factories in countries with the least costs and regulatory constraints, heavily contributing to unemployment and de-industrialisation. In France about one factory shuts down every day because of the direct effects of Article 63. As a result, the unemployment rate is extremely high: close to 10% of the active population in the beginning of 2018.

The cost of the EU for states that are net contributors to the EU budget – UK and France are net contributors – is also very important. For France it is deemed around 23 billion Euros per year. The direct cost for the UK would be of a similar order. This money is a direct expenditure from the state and can only be partially recovered through various funds or programs decided by the EU: France recovers about 14 billion Euros per year. In any case, the member state does not have the final

decision on how and where to spend the money. The rest of the state's contribution - about 9 billion Euros per year for France - is being re distributed amongst the net beneficiary member states of the EU (i.e. poorer States) and other countries not members of the EU such as Turkey and Ukraine.

As regularly illustrated by the increasing abstention rate at each new European Parliament election, the people of Europe do not believe in the EU anymore. In parallel, both Brexit and the recent rise of "populist" movements are a sign of a general discontent with the policies applied in EU states.

The Brexit referendum is a fantastic hope for the all the people of Europe who fight to restore their lost democracy and sovereignty. It also proves that getting out of the EU is not an extremist idea - as opposed to what is very often stated in the French media – but more importantly, this is a real option through the activation of Article 50 of the Maastricht Treaty. Brexit is also a great demonstration that people's voices shall always prevail over any other form of illegitimate authority. By getting rid of the EU confinement, the member states will decide their future again and will start forging new international bonds for the greater benefit of the world. It will also promote the plurality and the diversity of opinions and bring more peaceful and fairer relationships between countries.

Not only will Brexit benefit the United Kingdom, but it will also show to the other states that a better life is possible outside of the EU. This idea already started to emerge in France, where for the first time we can hear some debates about the EU belonging.

Long live the British People, and long live Brexit!



Brexit from the Czech point of view

Jiří Payne, MEP, former chairman of the Czech Parliament Foreign Affairs Committee, former Deputy Foreign Minister, and an adviser to President Klaus

Britain is leaving the EU and representatives from continental Europe do not control their emotions. They get carried away by grievance ("the Brits spoil it for us"), temptation of revenge ("we will make them pay for this") and need of exemplary punishment ("the EU is perfect") in order to prevent the exit of other EU members.

All of these feelings are quite well known to us from the times of the division of the Czechoslovak federation. We remember how important it was to not succumb to such emotions, because of our goal to have good relations with Slovakia twenty years later. We had to be broadminded and pragmatic to reach our goal.

The European Commission started negotiations and it is apparent that it fails to control the above mentioned emotions. The temptation of revenge wins over composure. The position of EU citizens within the UK is the first point of negotiations. The EU Commission chose for the beginning the most

complex issue and it set a negative mood right from the beginning of negotiations. Theresa May has not promised an easy agreement as she rightly assessed the negative mood of European politicians. It would be irresponsible of her to promise an easy way out. The only outcome in this case would be deep disappointment

EU clearly wants to punish the United Kingdom. The right to terminate EU membership is part of the Lisbon Treaty. No one should be punished for using his legal right. It has been part of European moral and traditional legal system. This example shows how distant is the EU from traditional European values and it also shows incapability to act responsibly and within democratic principles.

Negotiations are more and more similar to the ones that took place in Yugoslavia. Slovenia was meant to be punished for its decision to leave the Yugoslavian federation via military force and other obstructions in 1990. The same scenario was repeated later in Croatia. The temptation of revenge outbalanced other reasonable solutions during the disintegration of Yugoslavia - causing harm to the other country even for the price of apparent self-harm. Up to now are relations among post Yugoslav countries complicated.

The Czechoslovakian scenario was focused on reduction of loss and damage. Federal cooperation was transformed to a set of bilateral agreements within a couple of months. We started with simple problems and proceeded gradually to more complex ones. As the number of agreements was rising the atmosphere became more positive and feelings of insecurity diminished.

Why has the EU been proceeding in the opposite direction? It is because it favours its propagandistic goals over pragmatic political solutions. The above mentioned proves how deep the European Union's deficit of democracy is. It is certain that free market is the absolute minimum that needs to be agreed on. If the free market issue was solved as one of the first problems, both sides would be more open to negotiate other questions. Why does the European Union postpone negotiations on trade relations to the end? Thousands of EU citizens work in companies that export to the UK, there is more people who are considerably affected within EU than in the UK itself. The jobs of these people are put in question by the European Commission. Instead of strengthening trust and stability, the European Commission creates doubts and uncertainty by postponing this issue to the end. The Union takes these people as hostages. There might be more unemployed citizens on the European side of the channel than on the British one.



Why Brexit?

Daniel Pawłowicz, former Polish MP 2005-2007 (League of Polish Families) and former vice-chair of Office of the Committee for European Integration

From the perspective of the states that are still in the EU, Brexit is a highly significant lesson that the Brussels elites give to free nations of Europe. It is a very valuable lesson of "how it really is", contrary to the propagandist "what it is said to be." First of all, in the light of Brexit and the negotiation complications experienced by the UK, it is clear that the European Union is like a political swamp that slowly and imperceptibly draws into its depths, but prevents withdrawal for anyone. In this sense, the European Union is a trap and the UK is rightly and rationally trying to get out of this situation.

Secondly, an attempt to humiliate Great Britain in the negotiation process is an obvious warning to other countries that would like to follow the UK route. In this regard, the EU is like a prison in which every attempt to escape is punished by public whipping. And it is the UK that is publicly whipped for trying to leave the EU. There is no space in the EU's response for respect for the British people, respect for democratic procedures and respect for state sovereignty, only pure and naked lust for power.

There is no doubt that UK's exit from the EU is in the interest of Europe. I emphasize "Europe", not the "European Union". In the interest of the future of our continent there needs to be an incredibly profound reform of the European Union, so deep that this reform can be easily called "dismantling". The European Union, as an institution and legal norms, has wrapped the whole of Europe in the net of its regulations, bureaucracy, way of thinking and acting. It sips the best juices from Europe, dedicating them to its own survival. In this sense, the EU is an anti-European force, because it weakens Europe's potential, which will flourish and flourish only in the natural environment of Europe - which means free, cooperating with each other nations. Of course, Brexit has caused a crisis in the European Union, but Europe needs a crisis in the European Union, because without this crisis change will never happen.

The European Union has made too many mistakes. Douglas Murray in his book "The Strange Death of Europe" even puts forward a thesis that it is a collective suicide. We are dealing with a demographic catastrophe, which leads in a straight line to the cultural and economic crisis; we face an immigration disaster that already results in a cultural and security crisis; we are dealing with an innovative catastrophe that makes the modern world simply flows away from us, as the motorboat flows from steamer. We are finally dealing with the catastrophe of democracy, which manifests itself in the fact that national sovereignty is called dictatorship, freedom of speech - intolerance and democratic procedures - violations of European law. This is due to the fact that at some point Europeans ceased to reign over the EU, that this creation began to live its own life and in its activity is guided only by what Robert Michels called "Iron law of oligarchy."

Meanwhile, we Poles joined in our referendum a different Union and we wanted a different Union. Poland wants to follow the words of Saint John Paul II, who in 1997 said that, "Europe will not be

unity until it is a 'community of spirit'. This deepest foundation of unity brought Europe and for centuries strengthened Christianity with its Gospel, with its understanding of man and contribution to the development of the history of peoples and nations". We also want to be faithful to the warning that the Pope gave us in 1993; "Entering Europe cannot be done at the expense of giving up the rights of a healthy conscience in the name of misunderstood tolerance and pluralism. It would mean voluntarily surrendering to a new form of totalitarian enslavement - the more dangerous that it was accepted in a private way. "

Will Britain, through its exit from the EU, achieve more than just its own political and economic sovereignty? In my opinion - yes. Brexit, of course, was not the first Eurosceptic event in Europe, but it gave the British a fast-sprouting palm in the new pan-European movement of the rebirth of our continent. Eurosceptic movements are growing in strength in virtually every European country, and in a several years these political movements will govern European countries. At this point, Britain will be an attractive and trustworthy partner for these governments. Maybe now for the UK Brexit means "blood, toil, tears and sweat," but in the end, "Let that be realized; no survival for the British Empire, no surviving for the urge and impulse of the ages, that mankind will move forward towards its goal."

Poland, learn from Brexit has that an effective Polesxit should be carried out together with Czechexit, Lithuexit and Hungaroexit. We cannot make mistakes as with our accession process before 2004, when all Central European states separately negotiated accession to the EU. Now we have to negotiate together.

When one asks what this new European community should be, created on the ruins of the EU, the answer is very simple. It must be a Christian-based community, according to what St John Paul II said prophetically in 1997;

"Today, they still stand in front of those responsible for massive politics works. Strengthening democratic institutions, economic development, international cooperation - all these activities will achieve their true purpose only if they provide a standard of living that would allow a person to develop all dimensions of his personality. The sublimity of the mission of people directing politics lies in the fact that they are to act in such a way that the dignity of every human being is always respected; create favourable conditions for the awakening of selfless solidarity, which leaves no fellow citizen in the margins of life; allow everyone access to cultural goods; to recognize and implement the highest humanistic and spiritual values; give expression to your religious beliefs and show their value to others. Following this path, the European continent will strengthen its unity, maintain its fidelity to those who laid the foundations for its culture and fulfil its worldly calling in the world."



Why don't the Swiss people want to join the EU?

Dr. Alexandra Nogawa, member of the Swiss People's Party, former member of the Basel Canton Parliament

The people of a nation share a common history, common customs and common traditions but do not have necessarily a common language, as the example of Switzerland and other countries show. However, for centuries the Swiss have shared the same political traditions. To destroy the knowledge of the history and traditions of a nation has always been a means to conquer it.

A more recent strategic instrument is described in the book of Prof. Kelly M. Greenfield, *The Weapons of Mass Migration*.² This instrument is now applied by the Soros Foundation and a member of it is Gerald Knaus, an adviser of Angela Merkel. For deeper context, some reports claim the German Chancellor herself was a communist in GDR days. George Soros, famous in Britain because he betted against the Bank of England, is a founder of the Open Society. In terms of its practical effects, it might be said that the goal of this foundation is to destroy tradition and history (e.g. by mass migration), health (legalizing drugs) and influencing politics (Hilary Clinton, Angela Merkel). The refugees under the smoke screen of philanthropy meanwhile are a very good business for some. They pay a lot for forged passports to be put in cheap boats, but which leak in the open sea and the taxpayer has to pay for their rescue. Now media reports suggest that the Italian authorities are being pressed to investigate Soros-supporting charities, as their tactics actively encourage the migrant traffickers - some of whom have been identified as having links to Islamic terrorism, and even use this taxi service to enter Europe themselves.³ This is the current political situation and is responsible for the strengthening of right wing parties in the EU, in turn then called Nazis by mainstream newspapers.

Of course, although Switzerland is not a member of the EU, the inhabitants know very well what is going on in Europe. They also have refugees who come from the neighbouring countries, which they try to "integrate" with not much success. The problem is mainly those refugees who are not willing to work and are criminals. Switzerland has no money to pay a decent social support rate to old people but apparently enough to spend 2 billion CHF for refugees.

If Switzerland would join the EU an even bigger mass migration would be the "present" of the EU for our joining, not only by people from the Near East and Africa but also from European countries, due to a big gap in the salaries in the different countries. Switzerland accepted an agreement with the EU. This was a mistake. Everybody who had the slightest idea of the salaries in Europe would not have agreed to such a proposition. But as it seems now to be the practice of the government to cheat and in this case, pretend that only a few Europeans will look for employment in Switzerland. Actually it was ten times more than they pretended. Every year the number of inhabitants is increasing rapidly. The Swiss have generally nothing against foreigners if they work and behave well.

² Cornell Studies in Security Affairs.

³ "'Undesirable NGOs' Fund ISIS-linked Refugee Boats to EU", F. William Engdahl, 5 April 2017.

They do not agree with companies which dismiss middle aged persons and replace them by cheaper young foreigners, so that the Swiss remain without work. The Trade Unions and the Socialists have nothing against this practice, because they receive new socialist members who will vote for them, when they become Swiss.

To understand the political situation and the key for the rejection of the EU in Switzerland we must take a glimpse at history and the modern political situation. Switzerland was founded in 1291 by three neighbouring Cantons in the alpine region in the centre of Europe. This region was inhabited by peasants, who had always been independent and wanted to remain so. Therefore, when Leopold von Habsburg attacked them, they manned their defences and vanquished him and his army. This was a total surprise, as nobody had ever thought that a group of peasants could vanquish such a well-trained army of knights in armour. The Swiss became famous soldiers and served in many of the armies of Europe.

Slowly, Switzerland became bigger and bigger. Rich cities, which were at that time independent and governed by manufacturers and merchants and their corporations, joined the Swiss confederation. As the cities were independent and not aristocratic, Switzerland remained independent. The only exception was Napoleon. He conquered Switzerland, as many Swiss citizens sympathized with the ideology of the French Revolution. These sympathizers were mainly in the French and in the North West region and the big cities of Switzerland, approximately the same regions which are today socialist and those regions have also a tendency of being EU-friendly. The First and the Second World War were survived through independence. But in Europe a big power was slowly rising, the EEA (European Economic Area). Of course the government of Switzerland wanted also to join it, against any tradition. According to the law, the government submitted the result of its negotiations to a popular vote. The people voted No to the great surprise of the government and the self-appointed elite which did not any more understand the world and Switzerland. Our Chief Negotiator for the EEA-agreement, Franz Blankart, predicated furiously: in 5 years the Swiss people will beg the EEA on their knees for Switzerland to become a member at any price.⁴ But this prediction proved to be wrong. Swiss citizens understood very well that the question was not to accept an economic agreement, but to join a future Empire in which they would lose all their civil rights.

I deliberately do not write: "Why Switzerland does not want to join the EU", because we have here in Switzerland the rare case that a government does not represent the people, at least over this question. The constitution of 1848 (revised in 1999) stipulates that the People is the supreme sovereign and its decisions must be followed by the government. The government is elected by the members of the Parliament; the left wing was always willing to join the EU. For some time the Government has been no longer willing to act according the popular vote, if the decisions do not conform with its opinion it just ignores them, which is a deliberate infringement of the constitution. To participate in the government affairs, the Swiss have, however, the possibility to collect in a given time 100,000 signatures to ask for an Initiative and a new law and 50,000 if they want to reject a bill which was carried by the Parliament. In the last years the Initiatives have multiplied to force the Government to act as the constitution stipulates. The Government wants therefore to increase the number of signatures, but failed so far. On the other hand the Government knows very well, that a

⁴ Interview, 21 November, 2006.

popular vote to join the European Union does not have any chance of approval. Therefore they try to trick the Swiss people.

They asked for an expert view from a Swiss professor (Daniel Thürer) who is teaching in Germany. This report leaked out and many members of the Parliament were furious. The intention was clear: to force the Swiss through court decisions into the EU. In this connection the EU and the Swiss Government are engaged in negotiations. The Government is negotiating on a skeleton agreement with the EU, not a single Member of the Swiss Parliament has seen it and it proves itself more and more to be a skeleton in the cupboard of the Swiss Government. The most important points leaked out were: a Court should be created to settle disagreements which might arise between the EU and Switzerland, but this Court will be dominated by the EU and therefore a subordination of Switzerland is clear. As international agreements are not subject to a popular vote, the Swiss Government will try to subordinate Switzerland to the EU. The Swiss will lose all their political rights and have to accept the laws of the EU.

Nobody knows the reason why the members of the government of an independent state choose to become the slaves of another state. The Swiss suspect that some members of the Government were promised well paid positions in the EU, if they would join. For the EU, Switzerland is a rich prey as the EU needs money. On the other side, the EU is near a financial and political collapse. More and more, nobody reasonable wants to join a collapsing system, though the so called elite (government, medias, think tanks, finance and industry) already wished to join the EEA and now the EU. After the negative vote on the EEA they had forecast a total financial collapse of Switzerland. Nothing of all that had happened - on the contrary, Switzerland flourished and prospered. Courage was rewarded. On the other hand the EU has indeed declined. Woolly ideas are not enough for a reasonable policy. Therefore every country should find its own way and I think that Brexit is a reasonable alternative in the long history of the UK. It will give the UK back its independence and preserve it from being engulfed in the abyss of a collapsing system.



Some history is unfashionable.

*Dr George Sidirountios, founder of new think tank the **International Centre for Cultural and Geopolitical Cooperation***

Without understanding who has created the EU and why, and who exactly is running it, it is not possible to make the right decision either to remain or leave.

The *Pan-Europa* movement was initiated in 1922 by Count Aoyama Eijiro Richard Nikolaus Coudenhove Kalergis⁵ (1894-1972), a descendant of the Imperial Nikephoros Phocas II family and of Charlemagne. The European Union Kalergis wanted to create was modelled on the Confederation of the Swiss Cantons, as planned by Count Ioannis Kapodistrias (1776-1831) when he was a Russian

⁵ Kalergi in singular genitive.

diplomat. Kalergis' designs fitted the Globalisation plans first made in the UK by Lionel Curtis (1872-1955), when the UK was the world's leading power. Curtis had advocated a political and financial union of the entire world, starting first with a federation among the English speaking countries which would gradually absorb other non-English speaking federations.

The German establishment were making their own, separate plans for global expansion. Rather than political these were economic. As early as 1904 Bayer, the company which dwarfed and recently bought the greatest US chemical giant Monsanto, was calling for the formation of a German Cartel that would dominate the international markets.

By 1923 Kalergis had received significant support from German capitalists and their bankers to maintain offices in most European capitals. In the same year German capitalists were advised by German security services to embrace Hitler.⁶ Both Kalergis and Hitler were talking about a new Europe which needed to be born, each from a different perspective. Ten years later Kalergis was told in a meeting with his German supporters in Berlin to step aside and make space for Hitler. Kalergis disagreed with the rise of the Nazis. His friend and supporter, the Austrian prime minister Engelbert Dollfuss was murdered by Nazis in 1934 and Kalergis later fled to the U.S. where he continued his own designs for another type of united Europe. After Hitler failed to make Europe as the German capitalists wanted it, they again called Kalergis to co-operate with them. In the meantime, Kalergis had also made his own allies in the US.

During the years Kalergis had been sidelined, the headquarters of the world's richest company, IG Farben, provided logistic, organisational and managerial support to the Nazi party. As Taylor/Niedzwiecki/Rath/Kowalczyk point out, corporate interests underwrote Germany in both world wars.⁷

The term *European Economic Community* itself was coined⁸ inside IG Farben during the Nazi period, when the IG Farben directors worked in parallel to Walter Hallstein (1901-1982), a professor of law, who was preparing the legal blueprint of the EEC.

Hallstein became the first president of the EEC Commission in 1958, and almost everything he had published between 1933 and 1945 simply disappeared. '*After 1945, the Cartel invested hundreds of billions of dollars with one goal only: to rewrite history and cover its criminal past.*'⁹ This could provide part of the explanation as to why most of us know little or nothing that the same German capitalists who had employed Hitler not only brought the Nazis into power but also planned WWII and had designed EEC. This backstory is the EEC's unhappy Original Sin.

⁶ General Erich Ludendorff had asked the first German tycoon, Fritz Thyssen, to sponsor the Nazi party.

⁷ Paul Anthony Taylor, Aleksandra Niedzwiecki, Mattias Rath and August Kowalczyk, *The Nazi roots of the 'Brussels EU'* (Berlin, 2010), p. 11.

⁸ By Werner Daitz (1884-1945). One more mastermind behind a European economy controlled by Germany was Arno Sölter (1911-1978) who also worked at IG Farben.

⁹ Ibid, p. 12. The world's largest publisher which bought companies like Random House and Penguin as it happened was Bertelsmann, the main company which circulated Nazi propaganda during WWII .

Then, new forms of self-interest emerged. On 12 March 1947 President Harry Truman had urged the Western Europeans to unite if they did not wish to end up like Greece, where in a civil war the Communists were advancing and annihilating the establishment. Greece was ruined, but the goal was achieved: many Western European politicians had started flocking together out of fear. By 4 July 1947 Kalergis gathered a good number of them in the first European Parliamentary Union.

In the 1950s IG Farben was divided into other companies and many of their shares were given to American and British bankers. By that time the Americans were persuaded by German strategists that they would get the best grip on Europe not simply by following Kalergis' idealism, but by continuing the IG Farben plans.

A number of former IG Farben directors were sentenced by the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal in 1948 for genocide, slavery, plunder and other crimes against humanity. Among their numerous crimes they had built the largest industrial complex in the world in Auschwitz, where vast numbers of Jews and other slave populations worked and were exterminated. However, none of the IG Farben directors stayed in prison for long.

One American who was employed by the US military as a translator and mediator between US services and the notorious Nazis was the young Henry Kissinger. His very close personal relation with important Germans brought the US and Germany so close together that many in the US administration became ecstatic that the Germans were the best allies America could find in the world.¹⁰ As a result of the excellent relationship with the US, Germany was given special permission and assistance to grow its economy over a number of decades, while the economies of many other countries were systematically pushed down so that they would remain weak and easier to control. Today, in the 21st century, many even in the US understand that Germany was helped to grow too much, and that the German administration increasingly treats their partners in Europe as subordinates and the US as an unfriendly competitor.

Five signals given by the German establishment are listed here, which make it clear that they are overjoyed with power and they no longer conceal that they are continuators of earlier extremist imperialist plans.

A. In October-November 2014, long before the Brexit campaign began, Angela Merkel had told the UK to either keep accepting the millions of European emigrants who want to enter UK, or else leave the EU.¹¹ In other words, as the German capitalists loot many Eastern European regions and leave them severely depopulated, Merkel demands from the UK to absorb the evicted populations.

B. In 2015 Greece had secured a vital loan from China. Yannis Varoufakis revealed that Berlin made a direct phone-call to the Chinese Prime Minister and forbade him to give the loan.¹² In May 2018, the German ambassador to Greece reported that whoever thought there

¹⁰ Z. Brzezinski, *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and its Geostrategic Imperatives* (NY, 1997), pp. 61, 80.

¹¹ 'Germany would accept UK exit from EU to protect migration rules,' BBC News, 3 Nov. 2014

¹² January 2016, interview to Alexis Papahelas

would be any loan coming from China or anywhere else, simply had illusions.¹³ Berlin has arranged that Greece should not get help from anywhere in the world, unless approved by Berlin. A number of experts do know that the loan deals Greece has been forced to accept are against International Law,¹⁴ but Greece can do nothing because nobody dares to take Berlin and its accomplices to the courts.

C. When in 2001 the victims of Distomo, a village massacred by the SS, including 53 infants and children and 117 women, continued their legal case¹⁵ against Germany for compensation, Berlin called the Greek prime minister directly to influence the verdict of the Greek courts in its favour. The German Embassy in Athens also intervened by sending a German diplomat to warn a Greek judge¹⁶ that if Greece would not halt this case, Greece would not have Germany's support if any troubles begin with Turkey.¹⁷

D. Himmler's daughter who died this year was employed by the German security services well after WWII ended, and supported the *HIAG* and *Stille Hilfe* post-war SS organisations. During the same period Himmler's daughter was active and the *HIAG* and *Stille Hilfe* were distributing millions to support former SS personnel, Simon Weisenthal (1908-2005) was left with minimal support and very limited funds to persecute a very small number of war criminals. Despite the SS being declared a criminal organisation by the International Military Tribunal in 1946, thanks to *HIAG* and *Stille Hilfe*, Germany has continued paying official state pensions to all former SS servicemen since 1961. Many calls to all German administrations to stop the pensions have been ignored, and they continue paying them.¹⁸

E. An entire network of anthropologists who worked in Germany up to fourteen years ago, were permitted to produce and circulate fake science, supportive of German racial superiority theories. Notwithstanding any warnings, the work of the fraudsters, of whom Reiner Protsch was the most prolific, was repeatedly published by the most reputable international science journals. On the basis of fabricated scientific data which passed as valid, Protsch's circle ruined the scientific work of a number of other professors, such as Dr Aris Poulianos, whose discoveries are of tremendous importance for our understanding of human evolution. The University of Frankfurt eventually fired Protsch and closed his entire institute in 2005, but was forbidden by other German authorities to give a planned press conference and inform the public.

Anyone who is staying inside a European Union which is guided by this type of totalitarian German administration, is increasingly losing their dignity and jeopardising their future.

¹³ 25 May 2018, to G. Sahinis, Crete TV.

¹⁴ Search, for example, the work of Professor Georgios Kasimatis, honorary president of the *International Association of Constitutional Law*.

¹⁵ Organised by lawyer Giannis Stamoulis.

¹⁶ Panagiotis Dimopoulos.

¹⁷ Testified by Professor Costas Beis; interview to journalist Costas Vaksevanis, 'Δίστομο-Χάγη,' Το Κουτί της Πανδώρας.

¹⁸ Ben Knight, 'Nazi criminals still receiving war victim pensions,' DW, 6 December 2016

