

NEW EUROPEAN



**Biannual Green News
of International Affairs
Summer 2011**

NEW EUROPEAN

Biennial Green News of International Affairs

Summer 2011 • Vol. 20 • No 1

Contents

Editorial, *page 1*

Divide and Rule in Palestine, *David Cronin, page 2*

The EU and Israel: The Union's double standard,
Morten Harper, page 5

Sustainable agriculture and the European Union:
are they compatible?, *Sir Julian Rose, page 7*

The European Union: a project without a people,
Luise Hemmer Pihl, page 12

The dictatorship of the Bankers,
Alessio Christianini interviews Ida Magli, page 16

What makes a nation? *Robert Henderson, page 21*

The lesson from Fukushima, *Peter David Pedersen, page 28*

European Union versus Local Community,
John Papworth, page 31

Finland needs an Independence Party, *Antti Pesonen, page 33*

The NEW EUROPEAN, *page 35*

Contributors to this issue, *page 36*

NEW EUROPEAN

Editor: Luise Hemmer Pihl

Published by the Knud P. Pedersen Centre for European Studies

©: Knud P. Pedersen Centre for European Studies,

skrodhoj@gmail.com

Editorial

The European Union must put an injustice right

The European Union gradually gathers to itself the trappings of a superstate. It has now a President to speak on the world stage for 500 million people: and a Foreign Minister as overlord of all the embassies of all the member states. A foreign policy is thus emerging.

Will this foreign policy be independent or tied to the coat-tails of Uncle Sam? Events in the Middle East throughout the last twelve years show the European Union to be subservient to the United States. Of the many lobbies in Washington, none is more effective than the Zionists'. They have persuaded the State Department to make the protection of Israel its primary objective. Hence the flow of millions of dollars to support an Israeli economy that was otherwise fragile. Hence also the supply of arms and equipment and the provision of nuclear weapons. The Zionists have now persuaded the United States to protect Israel still further by creating unrest and even civil warfare in neighbouring Arab states. The strategy could have far reaching consequences and even embroil two member states of the E.U., Greece and Cyprus.

The Arab nations will never forget the plight of the two million Palestinians who have been forced from what was their homeland for thirty centuries. The New European is unreservedly on the side of those Palestinians whose lives have been blighted. The Arab nations, as well as many Moslems elsewhere, believe that until they are given justice, peace will not be secure in the Middle East. The policy-makers in the European Union should realise this. They should also understand that until this injustice is put right Islamic extremists believe they have a pretext for a dastardly form of warfare, notably as we have seen in New York and London.

Divide and Rule in Palestine

DAVID CRONIN

Brussels is a city of whispers. More accurately, those who work in its European quarter love to gossip about people regarded as important within their cosy bubble.

Catherine Ashton has been singled out for a relentless whispering campaign ever since she took up her post as EU foreign policy chief. For the first time, a Belgian government minister recently said publicly what many other diplomatic and political figures have been saying about Ashton behind her back: that she is forever spouting platitudes.

Ashton's response to the "reconciliation" between the rival Palestinian parties Fatah and Hamas appeared platitudinous but was actually something more sinister. She claimed that the "EU has consistently called for peace and reconciliation, under the authority of President [Mahmoud] Abbas leading to an end to the division between the West Bank and Gaza and in support of greater security and stability across the region."

There are two problems with this statement. First, it is misleading. Far from urging unity, the EU has connived in Israel's "divide and rule" strategy against the Palestinians.

Alastair Crooke, who advised Javier Solana (Ashton's predecessor as foreign policy chief), has exposed how Britain orchestrated a dangerous shift in the EU stance on the Middle East when Tony Blair was Prime Minister. In an article published by the London Review of Books in March, Crooke recalls the glee of Jack Straw, then the UK's foreign secretary, when he convinced Germany that Hamas should be placed on the Union's list of terrorist groups in 2003. This led to a situation when the EU was showing preference for one Palestinian party (Fatah) over another (Hamas). The argument about Hamas being "terrorists" was bogus; Fatah, too, accepts the principle that Palestinians have the right to resist their occupation, including by arms.

The Palestine Papers, those internal documents made public by Al Jazeera earlier this year, show that Blair contemplated exporting

some of the most pernicious aspects of Britain's own imperial legacy to the occupied territories. In 2003, Britain and the US agreed on a secret "counter-insurgency" operation that would target members of Hamas and Islamic Jihad. Internment without trial of Hamas members was even considered, despite how Britain's use of that policy in the North of Ireland during the 1970s exacerbated the conflict there.

Many aspects of the "counter-insurgency" strategy were taken on board by the European Union collectively. In 2006, the EU launched an initiative called COPPS (Coordinating Office for Palestinian Police Support). Two of the police officers who have headed this initiative, Colin Smith and Paul Kernaghan, had formerly served with the Royal Ulster Constabulary, a force that was synonymous with harassment of the Catholic community in the North of Ireland. For most of its history, COPPS has mentored police loyal to Fatah in the West Bank and has declined to deal with Hamas representatives in Gaza. How does that advance the quest for "peace and reconciliation", trumpeted by Ashton?

The second problem with Ashton's aforementioned statement is her demand that "reconciliation" must be led by Mahmoud Abbas of Fatah. Contrary to what she implies, Abbas no longer has a democratic mandate. His term as elected president of the Palestinian Authority expired in January 2009. The legality of his term's extension is questionable, to say the least.

More broadly, there is something condescending – racist, even – about how Israel and the West vets who should be the Palestinians' political representatives. After Hamas won a parliamentary election in 2006, the EU – under pressure from the US – froze its aid to the Palestinian Authority and helped trigger the collapse of the resulting coalition between Fatah and Hamas. That was despite how the Union's own supervisors of that poll, led by British MEP Edward McMillan Scott, confirmed that it was conducted in a free and fair manner.

Although Ashton's statement did not refer to Salam Fayyad, the Palestinian "prime minister", the West has also been eager to shore up his position. Fayyad was appointed premier by Abbas in 2007, without the decision being approved by the Palestinian Legislative Council (the closest thing that the Palestinians have to a parliament). The legitimacy of his appointment is, therefore, dubious.

Fayyad has made quite a few enemies among his fellow Palestinians, yet Western "experts" have ran a public relations campaign on his behalf. In his capacity as an international envoy for the Middle East, Blair regularly extols Fayyad's virtues. Robert Danin, head of Blair's Jerusalem office from 2008 to 2010, has gone further by portraying Fayyad as an intellectual trailblazer. Writing in the January-February

issue of the journal *Foreign Affairs*, Danin told Fayyad's critics that they should "stop resenting his successes".

What are these successes? Near the top of Danin's list was that Fayyad had kept public spending within his targets. This is in keeping with the neo-liberal doctrines inculcated in Fayyad when he previously worked for the World Bank and IMF.

Never mind how setting up a viable Palestinian state has become virtually impossible now that Israel has built a massive annexation wall in West Bank. Never mind how malnutrition among young Palestinians has reached "crisis point", according to Save the Children. Never mind how Israel controls most of the water resources in the occupied territories. Never mind how elementary principles of democracy have been traduced. Of far greater importance to the EU's representatives is that they can deal with Palestinian "leaders" cut from the same ideological cloth as themselves .

The EU and Israel: The Union's double standards

MORTEN HARPER

In Norway's debate on the European Economic Area it is generally asserted that if we want to trade with the European Union, there is no realistic alternative to full membership.

The Irish journalist David Cronin's book about the relationship between Israel and the European Union, *Europe's alliance with Israel*, shows that such assertions are not accurate. The EU has extensive agreements on trade and cooperation with Israel without the full panoply of rules included in Norway's EEA agreement.

This is a useful lesson from *Europe's alliance with Israel*, even if the book really deals with another theme. The EU has developed strong political and economic ties to Israel, which is among other things a full member of the EU's scientific research programmes. In his introduction Cronin attacks the EU's double standards: "Whereas the EU representatives often talk about the Union being anchored in fundamental values such as human rights and democracy the alliance with Israel is practically devoid of ethical integrity."

One of the instances that Cronin describes is the Israeli attack on Gaza during the winter of 2008-2009 when 1,400 people were killed. On that occasion, the EU's ambassador in Tel Aviv declared that it was not a suitable moment for extending the scope of cooperation with Israel. This created the impression that at the EU was digging its heels in. During the Summer of 2008 the EU and Israel had agreed on a declaration that the cooperation should be upgraded. The ambassador appeared to have been speaking on his own behalf. The EU did not formally decide to freeze the negotiations on improving its ties with Israel. In actual fact, relations remained strong as if nothing had happened.

Cronin is very critical of Israel's occupation and behaviour against the Palestinian people. His style is concerned and sarcastic. He makes use of much of his own experience and of anonymous sources but the

text is generally well supplied with source references.

The book shows that the EU's Israel policy is not different from that of the USA. The EU's ties to Israel are explained by a feeling of guilt after WW2 and the notion that Israel represents Western values, as well as calculated economic interests. Cooperation on scientific research is particularly central. Cronin reveals that part of this research is related to military use. Furthermore, money has been given to researchers based in occupied territory, including the Golan Heights. The EU also gives aid to the Palestinian territories, but one half of this money vanishes into the Israeli economy.

Europe's Alliance with Israel is a well-written and easy-to-read book. I would like to have seen the inclusion of a short summary of the agreements between the EU and Israel. But this book gives the reader an up-to-date introduction to a subject on which too little is written.

Europe's Alliance with Israel – Aiding the Occupation,
by David Cronin, 2010, 208pp, Pluto Press

Sustainable agriculture and the European Union: Are they compatible?

SIR JULIAN ROSE

If the agricultural policy of the European Union ever had any positive attributes – and this is questionable – they have long since been subsumed in a sea of bureaucracy. Worse than this, however, are the decisions emanating from the European Commission which this bureaucracy is supposed to enforce.

Let us remind ourselves that the European Commission is run by unelected technocrats, who have, over the years, granted themselves very substantial powers. Powers that carry with them the right to accept or reject vital policy decisions that affect us all every day of our lives. In the meantime, the European Parliament, which is an elected body, is largely consigned to the sidelines, failing (more often than not) to imprint its conclusions on the statutory agenda overseen by the Commission.

So it is within this disturbingly autocratic context that we struggle to make an impression in our attempts to reform the Common Agricultural Policy and get taxpayers' money diverted to support those arenas that really need and merit it: the health and diversity of the food we eat, the countryside we love and those caring farmers who are the ultimate trustees of the land and all it produces. Make no mistake, at present your and my money is supporting a regime wholly antithetical to this wish list. With 80 per cent of CAP funds going to just 20 per cent of farms, something looks decidedly wrong. But when one becomes aware that the 20 per cent of farms getting the cream are mostly large-scale, monocultural factory-farming units and agro-industrial commodity dealers, it becomes abundantly clear that the CAP is little more than an institutionalised banking arm of the corporate agribusiness cartel. A cartel that fields hundreds of 'lobbyists' to infiltrate the Brussels networks and ensure that EU Commissioners are wined, dined and made thoroughly replete with all the necessary propaganda to convince them of the merits of Big Pharma and its GMO and seed industry cousins.

Now, anyone with a sense of fairness and justice will immediately recognise that this is a grossly biased way of doing business. What small or even medium-sized business enterprise can afford to pay dozens of lobbyists to promote their cause? The 20 per cent of our money being made available to the millions of smaller farms that struggle to make a living does not begin to address their needs if they are to survive and thrive in the cut throat market places of today's world.

Amongst such farms are virtually all the ecologically-managed concerns, barring the few 'landed' large scale units, and the vast plethora of mixed traditional farming practices whose environmentally friendly methods have been passed down from generation to generation over centuries. These are the farms with whom the majority of the discerning public have the most sympathy – and for good reason. They produce the only food fit to eat in Europe today.

It is corporate agribusiness, which has made its money turning pristine meadows into monocultural deserts that gets the lion's share of government and EU support. This leads to our hard-won taxpayer contributions being used to trash the food chain and ensure that nitrate-soaked, sterile soils remain the foundation of the modern food chain. It also ensures the survival of the "efficiency and progress" dogma so beloved of politicians, academics and rapacious corporations. Such enterprises, after all, produce just about enough taxable revenue to convince bureaucrats that they are worth subsidising; whereas the majority of humane small and medium sized family farms are operating at close to the poverty line, thereby failing to enrich government coffers. Their owners do at least retain their independence, preferring the time-honoured farming 'way of life' to becoming slaves to global agribusiness.

EU subsidies are paid to farmers on a per hectare basis, so as long as this lasts, the largest farms will always get the greatest financial reward. And so long as decision-makers are locked into mainstream economic dictats that cannot see beyond the 'growth economy' – regardless of the fact that it destroys virtually all it touches - we will be hard pressed to save our planet from certain sickness and ultimate sterility.

Over the past three to four decades Europe has experienced a rapid decline in agricultural land and number of small farms. Between 1960 and 2008, the EU lost 18 per cent of its agricultural land and the same period has seen an intensification of agricultural practices concentrating on a smaller and smaller number of ever bigger farms. At the same time prices and rents have risen, severely restricting

the opportunities for new applicants to enter the profession. While those farmers who have been able to maintain their enterprises are financially squeezed by the relentless speculative fluctuations of the market and rising farm costs that rarely match incoming revenue.

Additionally, all across Europe thousands of small community-scale processing plants and abattoirs have been driven out of business by having totally unrealistic and unaffordable EU 'sanitary and hygiene' regulations imposed upon them. This has caused the fragmentation and destruction of the entire infrastructure upon which quality food processors and farmers rely.

Could this mark the nadir of the CAP and the turning point for a radically reformed EU?

Clearly only a major shift in thinking can bring about the deep-rooted reforms that are needed to dig European agriculture out the ever deeper hole it finds itself pushed into.

The EU should start afresh by taking as its main point of emphasis '**Food Security and Food Sovereignty**'. Each member state should be encouraged to draw up and implement plans to ensure that as many of its citizens as possible have direct access to adequate amounts of good quality, home-grown, pesticide- and GMO-free foods. As oil prices continue to climb and targets to prevent further fossil fuel emissions are tightened and enshrined in legal acts, the mass transportation of foods across the world is clearly becoming a no-go area. Aside from wars, transportation has been identified as contributing the highest levels of CO₂ emissions in our society and considerable environmental degradation.

EU policy-makers should now be aware that rural economies do not thrive on the World Trade Organisation's global import/export model. Under the WTO regime money is sucked out of local communities and lands up in the ever-swelling pockets of vast supermarket chains that profit from a purchasing policy which coerces farmers into supplying mass-produced commodities at knock-down prices. The upshot of this is a catalogue of farm bankruptcies, degraded environments, increasingly sterile de-vitaminised foods and a major public health crisis.

The EU has to part company with the WTO's Codex Alimentarius if it is to effect a realisable Food Security programme in Europe.

Under current WTO rulings, the pressures to mass-produce tailor-made "cheap food" for a global marketplace are so great that farmers will extract the last ounce of fertility from the soil in an effort to fulfil their contractual obligations to the super and hypermarket chains that epitomise globalised food retailing. Agrichemical inputs, antibiotics, growth promoters, hydroponics, irradiation and even

nanotechnology are now being turned to as ways of maintaining the mass production of foods to fulfil the market's rapacious demands. Thus once prolific rotational, bio-diverse farming practices carried out by generations of families who cared for the land, their farm animals and crops, are replaced by factory farming units that tick none of the boxes increasingly recognised as constituting good practice and 'sustainable' agriculture.

Under a regime redirected towards food security, the emphasis is not on import/export markets of mass-produced commodities, but on stimulating self-sustaining local and regional supply and demand chains and the least environmentally destructive practices; food 'quality' replacing food 'quantity' as the key focus, with new links forged between consumers and producers which greatly shorten the supply chain. This has the benefit of ensuring fresh food is eaten in its optimum condition and as close as possible to its area of production – following a formula which I have called "The Proximity Principle".

The EU should redirect its policies towards enabling and encouraging farmers and local authorities to establish strong circular regional food production and processing enterprises that catalyse the rural economies of the regions and lead to an abundance of distinctive, ecologically raised foods that can be purchased directly off the farm, in local market places and in small to medium sized retail outlets that offer 'local foods for local people'.

Food Security is also dependent upon high quality, vigorous seeds being widely available to farmers and growers. Therefore local 'living seed banks' should be strongly encouraged in order to fulfil this need. Non-hybrid, traditional, un-engineered seeds have been shown to have greater vigour and more natural resilience than their finely-tuned laboratory bred counterparts, when confronted by climactic fluctuations and airborne disease. The denaturing, patenting and corporate monopoly of seeds via genetic engineering have no place in any serious plan to address and stimulate national and regional food security. GM cross contamination of neighbouring crops via wind blown pollen, bees, insects, birds and people makes it impossible to establish an ecologically stable food chain. What is needed is the local and interregional biological integrity which gives citizens the confidence to purchase foods raised on land free from the toxic residues and the novel genotypes that form the basis of genetic engineering techniques.

It has been repeatedly shown that some 65 per cent of Europeans don't want GM food products on their plates or in their fields. Such resistance has been vindicated by recent independent laboratory research studies carried out in four different European countries

which have conclusively shown that rodents fed on a diluted GM feed diet suffered severe lesions of the liver as well as malfunctioning of the kidneys within one year. After two years the rodents became infertile and died. As this provides an indication of what might happen to humans, it is only criminal negligence that has prevented GM crops being banned already.

The CAP exists because we pay for it. Almost no reasonably discerning citizen today actually wants his or her health to be compromised by the way in which our food is grown. We also don't want our countryside to be dominated by vast expanses of chemically forced crops whose nutritional quality is as poor as the sterile soils from which they come. Neither do we want animal concentration camps where thousands of chickens and pigs spend their suffocatingly short lives confined to airless, neon lit sheds and a diet of antibiotic laced GM soya and maize whose residues have been shown to contaminate our food supply.

An ever growing number of people in the EU member countries want real food from real farms and they want assurances that the methods used on these farms will not compromise their health or the health of the land the produce comes from. EU agricultural commissioner Dracian Ciolo is increasingly reflecting these concerns in his pronouncements on CAP reform. He is doing so at the behest of a coordinated citizens action movement which is pressing for a fundamental rethink of EU agricultural policies, bringing them in line with recommendations made by the 400 specialists and scientists who made up the IAASTD report of 2006. Namely: that traditional mixed family farms and biological farming methods are best able to ensure national food security, and that genetically modified foods will not be effective in ensuring an end to global hunger.

Consensus on this message is essential if European food and farming is to survive and thrive in the twenty-first century.

The European Union: A project without a people

LUISE HEMMER PIHL

*Who controls the past controls the future.
Who controls the present controls the past.
George Orwell in *Nineteen Eighty-Four**

The liberty of the market is the prison of humanity. This thought struck Ida Magli, Italian professor of anthropology, when she first read the Maastricht Treaty of 1992.

What also struck her was the provisions on the convergence criteria, which the member countries of the European monetary union would have to follow. They are: low inflation rates, sustainable public finances, limits to public debt, participation in the ERM and low, fixed rates of interest.

These criteria, which are, as they are part of a text between states, meant to be everlasting. And that is sinister, writes Ida Magli: that provisions like these, all about money and all for the sake of the market, should be seen as everlasting and indispensable.

Ida Magli has written two books on the European issue, *Contro l'Europa* (*Against Europe*) in 1997, and now, in 2011 her second, *La dittatura europea* (*The European Dictatorship*). The latter is the subject of this review

This idea of something final and perfect originates with the German philosopher Immanuel Kant, who wrote *"Zum ewigen Frieden"* (*Perpetual Peace*), a treatise which can be seen as the first step in the process of European and Global unity.

According to Kant, a single institution is necessary in order to create everlasting peace among the nations: the democratic republic, writes Ida Magli. And this is, according to her, a serious breach of the rules of the scientific method. She says:

"The idea that it will not be possible – as time passes, when we look back and consider history and the experience of history which are the only true sources of learning for human beings – to invent a different system of government which would be better than that of

the republic, is one of the major faults of the Kantian project. But, more than this particular flaw, what frightens in Kant's work is the renouncing – by one of the greatest philosophers of the Western world, by the the philosopher of the Illumination par excellence – of the scientific principle of "doubt", which is the prerequisite of any form of knowledge: to have forgotten that a "hypothesis" is per definition always susceptible to a different and and possibly substantially different approximation to the truth."

Kant's treatise has been a point of reference for the Paneuropean movement, and, according to Ida Magli, his reputation has served as a kind of warrant for the legitimacy of all the efforts that have been made during the twentieth century to move towards a unified world.

And what is wrong with European or Global unification?

The absence of the peoples, answers Ida Magli. The Maastricht Treaty is so devoid of anything human that hardly anyone in Italy has read it. It does not take into account the histories of the peoples, their cultures, their identities and their ways of life – but only of the free movement of money and labour.

The apparently "democratic" processes by which the European Union has come about, are not in the least democratic. If the peoples had had the faintest notions of the costs of European unification in terms of loss of identity, history, culture and political autonomy are going to be they would have rebelled.

In her capacity of anthropologist, Ida Magli insists that you cannot change the identity of a people, e.g. transform an Italian into an European or a citizen of the world. Europe is a fiction, and there is no European people. The peoples of Europe each have a history and a language which have shaped their respective identities.

In Italy there has never been a debate on the unification of Europe. In all the political parties there has been a tacit understanding that it was just the most natural thing in the world, and that consequently you need not talk about it at all.

No one in Italy ever debated the loss of the lira and the implicit loss of democratic power over the nation's finances – just as no one had debated the loss of democratic power over the country's foreign policy made through the Constitution's art. 11. (See note on p. 20.) It all happened by signing papers at desks.

But why is that so? Ida Magli continued to ask herself that question, and she sat down to find the answer. Why have kings and queens signed treaties that must necessarily reduce their own power and importance? Why has the Catholic Church accepted a process that will necessarily reduce its influence by amalgamating Catholic countries like Italy with a majority of Protestant countries as well as by paving

the road for mass immigration of Muslims? And why would national politicians thus reduce their own influence and power by handing it over to the Union?

How has it come so far that the European arrest warrant has been allowed to take away the protection of a citizen's nation and hand him over to the jurisdiction of another country, although what he has done is fully lawful in his own country?¹

Magli's answer, the result of extensive research by a competent scientist, is that none of these people, kings, queens, popes, cardinals, prime ministers, senators, are what they seem. They are all puppets, but puppets who are being rewarded with pomp and money for enacting a play in front of their deluded peoples.

And where do these rewards come from? From the bankers, says Ida Magli. The bankers who are playing fast and loose with nations and human beings in order to secure an ever-increasing power. And the Bankers are doing that through three international institutions to which only the very rich and very important people have access, the Trilateral Commission, The Bilderberg Conference and the Aspen Institute, all of them closely connected to the Masonic movement according to Magli.

On the last page of her book Magli writes that she has been tracing what is going on as in a detective story:

"The Whodunnit remains, however, a whonunnit, a mystery. I do not believe that there are people, even those extremely powerful and extremely rich like the greatest bankers in the world, who would really think that they could govern billions of people in such a singleminded manner and without aiming at a goal. As we have seen during the journey of research which we have made, the main fault of the hypothesis, all the way back to Kant, is the consequent immobility of history, the absence of a "becoming"; which absence means, in human terms: Death. I confess: In spite of everything, I know that even today I do not know what the truth is."

The reader is likely to be sceptical too. But the central message is, for those who accept her analysis of the powers between the plight of the nations as for those who are more sceptical: take back everything that makes life worth living before it is too late.

Magli is eloquent in her despair and anger. Why, oh why do we

1. The instance given in the book is that of David Irving whose crime was that he had denied Holocaust. He is a British citizen but was handed over to Austria where Holocaust denial is against the law, and sentenced to three years in jail – for an act which was not a crime in his home country where he had published his books. (A clever choice, as public opinion tends to find his assertions both repellent and erroneous. It looks like thin end of the wedge being driven into the right of citizens to be protected by the laws of their own nation. LHP)

allow such forces to destroy the human race in all its rich variety, acquired through millennia?

Her approach appears to me to be a very happy synthesis of the Marxist criticism of capitalism and the green-conservative concern with the loss of vital and fundamental values. She succeeds in establishing an indissoluble connection between the loss of the nations' history and the loss of political power.

The book is written throughout in the first person and in the beautiful language of someone who is deeply familiar with her country's rich heritage in art and literature. But is it also the work of a serious scientist who carefully sets down source references to all the apparently monstrous discoveries that her quest for the truth and for a key to freedom have led her to.

May this one-woman army succeed in waking up the Italian people before it is too late.

LA DITTATURA EUROPEA, by *Ida Magli*.

208pp. BUR Rizzoli 2010. ISBN 978-88-17-04542-1

€ 7.63 from www.lbs.it . Also available as an e-book at € 8,99 .

Ida Magli's first EU-critical book, **CONTRO L'EUROPA** (1997 and 2000) is available in Swedish from italibro@libero.it.

The dictatorship of the Bankers

ALESSIO CHRISTIANINI INTERVIEWS IDA MAGLI

You have always been strongly opposed to the project of European Union. And you have just published a new book with a very direct and explicit title: “*La Dittatura Europea*” (The European Dictatorship). Why did you choose this moment in history to publish this new book?

• My first book on Europe, published in 1997 by Rizzoli, also had a very explicit title: “*Contro l’Europa*” (Against Europe): it explained the reasons why the project of the European unification was wrong and was doomed to fail. Since I am a professor and a scientist – not a fortune-teller – I should rejoice, because the analysis and the predictions that I made at that time were correct. On the contrary, I am full of anger and grief because of the arrogance of those who are in power: they wanted at all costs to build an empire for themselves, thereby ruining their subjects. I wrote this second book because I hope that we are still in time to warn the Italians – and all the other peoples of Europe – that they must rescue themselves before the earthquake comes. And I also wanted to leave to the historians of tomorrow the documents with the names of those who are responsible for this catastrophe.

In your opinion, which are the scopes and the undeclared goals of the European Union?

• The goal that they already reached is the transfer of the governing power from the politicians to the bankers. Nobody talks about the bankers, but democracy has been cancelled since they were not elected by the people. The second goal that they about to reach is the destruction of the nation as a political, financial and cultural entity. The most important negative consequences are: migratory invasion, loss of our national coinage due to the introduction of the Euro, standardization of the products on the market, cancellation of the European civilization plus the importation of the worst American habits: political correctness and absence of form. These were not

the collateral damages of the unification process, these were the final goals which were deliberately pursued. Once the European civilization will be eliminated and the bankers' government will be extended to the greater part of the planet under Anglo-American rule (do not forget that the Commonwealth is included) in the near future the undeclared goal would emerge as a New World Order. This would mean one language, one currency, one religion, one single culture. But I believe that globalization would delete all creative capabilities from the human mind, and consequently this cannot be the final goal of intelligent people such as the banker freemasons who are holding the world's destiny in their hands. I think that this is just the instrument for achieving some project, but I do not know what it is.

How important is the European Parliament, whose members are 'directly elected by the citizens', as we can read in the official page of the European Parliament website?

- **The European Parliament is of no importance whatsoever. Its function is simply to enact the fiction of the existence of a European State, just to deceive people. And, of course, it served to multiply very rich job positions for the leaders of the national parties, so that these parties were able to place their men in those posts of command and to siphon an enormous amount of public money (the European Union is financed with a part of the V.A.T. of all member States together with all income from import customs). They can spend this money as they like. This is the reason why there are so many oddities in the European regulations: these were simple men who are losing their head because they live in a world that has no language (27 different languages simply mean that they cannot communicate); they have an immense wealth and power, but do not know how to use it.**

Who is in command in the European Union? Who makes the decisions that so dramatically affect us?

- **The manipulators of Finance and the bankers. About twenty people in all. And we must take into account that they all belong to the freemasonry, or to other very powerful clubs such as the Bilderberg, the Trilateral Commission and the Aspen Institute. These Clubs are supporting the careers of the few politicians that are in charge of averting public attention from the bankers, or to exchange posts with them (such as Mr Ciampi, former governor of the Bank of Italy, who became President of the Italian republic). All the fuss that politicians are making around the weirdest things**

only serves to draw away the attention of public opinion from the real problems, and to convince the people that if they do not obey the bankers they will drown. This is the main reason why the Left is silent: it is impossible to pretend that they are standing alongside with the workers, while in fact they are supporting the interest of the bankers.

The Lisbon Treaty. Can you explain briefly which is the final objective of this controversial and in a way mysterious treaty? What is it going to change? And why it was so important to ratify it? Is it really useful for the functioning of the enlarged European Union? Is it true that the treaty is reintroducing the death penalty within the European union?

- **The final goal was partly missed because they wanted to 'constitutionalize' the treaties that had been signed before, in order to make them sacred and untouchable. But popular referenda rejected the Constitution, and this confirmed that the European unification was realized against the will of the peoples. The sense of 'mystery' that surrounds it is due to the ethic and spiritual implications that were hidden behind a cryptic language which ordinary people cannot understand; but the 'priests' who are involved can interpret it at will. Let me just give one example, a matter so important that it should be discussed loudly everywhere: The Charter of Human Rights is included in the Lisbon Treaty as an instrument of power, so that by starting from the so-called "right to life" to such a degree that in the end it led to the prospect of introducing the death penalty "for acts committed during wartime or in imminent danger of war". Originally this phrase belonged to the Council of Europe and not to the European Union, but then it was introduced surreptitiously into the Lisbon Treaty. The articles were intertwined one with the other in such a way that I cannot say with certainty if really the Lisbon Treaty is reintroducing the death penalty: probably it is, or it would be better to say that they want to have it without declaring openly that it is so. It depends on how the jurists will want to apply this rule. It is obviously a joke to say that the Treaty will assure the good functioning of so many nations and peoples together. Today the situation is such that even Germany is tempted to say "every man for himself!"**

While all this is happening, the media are silent. Why?

- **This is the most difficult problem to solve, even if it is the main cause of the situation of impotency in which we are living. This is what is most scary. Cowardliness, ignorance, bribery, stupidity: all these elements are involved. But it seems impossible to me**

that no journalist, no opinion leader would remain immune, notwithstanding the various ways of communicating that exist today. Unfortunately the fact that the printed press is silent makes the voices on the web weaker, even if they are extremely active. I can quote as an example the fact that everybody knows me at the *Corriere della Sera*: my book is published by the same editor, and in a chapter I mention that the flag of the European Union is placed next to the heading of the newspaper itself. Nevertheless, nobody in the *Corriere* has mentioned my book or reviewed it, not even to criticize or repudiate what I wrote.

How do you live and work since you decided to assume such a strong public position against a project that involves interest and power that are extremely powerful?

• I live and work as I always did. Yes, I made a great effort in writing this book in the first person, something I never did before; I was supported by the trust of Ottavio di Brizzi to whom goes the merit of this publication. Through my own passion I wanted to make the Italians understand and feel how urgent and dramatic the present situation is. I do hope that someone will join me, breaking the silence and disseminating my thoughts in the widest possible way among those who have the possibility and the duty to do it. If there were just 10 or 20 people like me, screaming out loudly how things really are, the famous “strong powers” would become much weaker. Their strength comes from the fact that everybody, especially journalists, are helping them to keep secret even the most basic data. One example can be enough: how many Italians do really know that the “Banca d’Italia” is not the Bank “of” Italy, as it belongs to extremely rich private individuals, including Mr Draghi (current Governor of the Bank) and not to the Italian State? And that the same goes for the European Central Bank that is governing our lives right now?

Are we in a cul-de-sac or are we still in time to escape? What do you think that will happen?

• Yes, I believe that we can escape. We must go back immediately to our monetary sovereignty by leaving the Euro, as it was proposed by the former minister and economist Paolo Savona. If we do not want to quit the European Union, we must at least suspend the Schengen Treaty, restore the national borders and the control of people and goods. The problem is that in Italy no politician ever expressed a negative opinion against the European Union; and the will of the people concerning this matter was never taken into account.

Finally, now that the Euro is on the verge of collapse everybody understood what Lucio Caracciolo meant when he wrote “Europe is a bluff”. Maybe some Italian Party could start doing something. If we started to talk about this openly, and they understood that they would have a great consensus of opinion, this would help them come out. Yes, there would be some costs, but it is nothing compared to the noose that is choking us, and to the crack that is surely awaiting us tomorrow. This crack will surely come, because the European Union was created on purpose in order to destroy Europe. I do not know how this will end, because we are governed by people who deceived and betrayed us – bankers and politicians together – from the very beginning of the Italian Republic when they wrote article n. 11¹ of the Constitution in order to take away from us our Independence. It was a banker, Luigi Einaudi (the Governor of the Bank of Italy at that time) who dictated it. This stands for all and until now I never heard a politician proposing to abolish article n. 11.¹

Translation: *Marina Mascetti*

1. Art. 11, la Repubblica italiana ripudia la guerra come strumento di offesa e come mezzo di risoluzione delle controversie internazionali (ovvero consente l'uso di forze militari per la difesa del territorio in caso di attacco militare da parte di altri paesi, ma non con intenti espansionisti) e accetta una limitazione alla propria sovranità (ad esempio accetta di ospitare sul proprio territorio forze armate straniere) nell'intento di promuovere gli organismi internazionali per assicurare il mantenimento della pace e della giustizia fra le Nazioni.

Translation: The Italian Republic repudiates war as an instrument of aggression and as a means of solving international controversies (or consents to the use of military force to defend the territory in case of a military attack on the part of other countries, but not with expansionist intentions) and accepts a limitation to its sovereignty (for instance it accepts to house foreign armed forces on its territory) with the intention of furthering international organisations' securing the upholding of peace and justice among the nations

What makes a nation?

ROBERT HENDERSON

Rome as an empire lasted six hundred years at best; the Jews, a people long without a land and scattered to the four winds, are unobliterated after two millennia of persecution. Moral: Empires fall, but nations survive – perhaps the single most important lesson of history.

Nations survive defeat, enslavement and centuries of oppressions. Empires may mutate as the Russian did from Tsarist to Soviet, but they cannot withstand successful conquest. Then they always die and stay dead.

Why are nations so stubbornly durable in contrast with empires? The answer is simple: an empire is a political construct, but a nation is an expression of Man's nature. Where empires are held together by force or conscious self-interest, nations just exist, organic constructs which evolve out of Man's innate tendency to associate in discrete, clearly bounded groups.

But although nations are inherently natural in the sense that they evolve organically and survive through their own qualities, they are relative newcomers on the human scene, with a history of a few thousand years as compared with the 100,000 or so years of modern Man's existence. So how did such structures evolve? How did Man move from small groups to the massive collectives we see today?

Man in the "wild"

Man is designed by Nature to live in small groups (even today most of the world's population live in small settlements despite at least forty centuries of extensive urban settlement). Archaeological evidence for large human settlements is not found beyond, at best, 10,000 years ago (the earliest levels of Jericho, one of the very earliest, are dated between 7000 and 8000 BC). The remains of large human settlements dated before 4000 BC are very rare.

Why did Man not develop larger associations for so long? There is a straightforward practical reason. Human beings are very large animals

(in the top five per cent of mammals by size). That alone makes them relatively scarce where the only food resources they have are those to be gained by hunting and gathering. This would be a problem if men existed purely on a vegetable diet, but it is exacerbated by the fact that men naturally seek a diet containing a good proportion of meat (living as a vegetarian on wild plants would be impossible in much of the world including Britain). Large mammals which rely on a substantial intake of meat are near the top of the food chain. They are necessarily few in number because the food they require is scarce. Hence, really large agglomerations of humans are impossible without the greatly enhanced supplies of food produced by farming.

The enlargement of human groups

Increased resources through the development of agriculture and husbandry explain the how of the growth of human population; it does not explain the why. There are two likely reasons for the expansion, one general to all organisms and the other specific to Man as a social animal.

Taking the evidence of history as a whole, it is reasonable to conclude that there is an inherent tendency within human society to attempt to create ever larger units of political authority. It is probably no more than the general tendency of organisms to maximise their position in Nature by colonising as much territory as possible and then sustaining the maximum population the territory will bear. (However, like all behavioural traits in the natural world, it is no more than a tendency and there is an opposed tendency for large groupings to disintegrate if sufficient homogeneity and institutional development in the group does not exist.)

The fact that Man is a social animal with a high degree of self-awareness and intelligence makes human beings unique as an organism. This allows Man to extend the group in ways which no other social animal can because the self-awareness and intelligence permits a psychological enlargement as well as a material one. Nonetheless the process of group expansion is complex and fraught.

Because living in large groups is not natural to Man in the sense that his evolutionary history did not include such behaviour and because the complexity of life is greatly enhanced in large communities, large groups have to develop new strategies to cohere.

In a tribe of 500 it is easy to see how a sense of belonging and identity exists, because everyone will have a personal relationship of some sort with everyone else. In a group of 10,000 that is not possible in any meaningful sense. Nonetheless, in a group of 10,000 the individual can still be practically aware of the group, for example

through public meetings. With a group of a million the relationship between the group members becomes intellectual rather than personal or practical. Man can create such an intellectual sense of belonging because he is self-conscious.

To create very large agglomerations of people who see themselves as part of a whole requires a core of values which are accepted by generality of the population. These values may be religious, as in the case of the mediaeval church or Islam. Then the sense of belonging is supranational, indeed supracultural. But such feelings have always bowed before the demands of family, tribe, feudal lordship and nation. Hence the failure of the mediaeval church's claim to supremacy; hence the mutual antipathy of many Muslim peoples throughout history. National identity does not consist of clone-like similitude, but it does require a sense of belonging, an instinctive recognition of those included within the parameters of a national group.

The components of national identity

National identity is most commonly presented in terms of such banalities as "national dress" (often a mark of past servitude), food and crafts or in the more demanding but still narrow world of High Art. Both are inadequate explanations because they touch only a small portion of human existence. To find the answer to a people's national identity one must look to their general culture which includes at its most sophisticated; science, technology, politics, education, sport, history, morals, humour, language.

From the general culture comes what might be called the secondary human personality, which is developed by and is continually developing the components of culture. By secondary personality I mean a nurtured overlay on the innate personality. The range of basic human traits – aggressiveness, placidity, timidity, extroversion and so forth – are universal. But those qualities are the mere skeletons of minds. Above them stand the modifications of experience. From experience develops the secondary personality. The social context of that experience and the reflection of that experience through the secondary personality creates culture, is culture.

All of this is not to say that the material and mundane accoutrements of a man's life are completely unimportant to the foundation of national identity. There are certain things which are such a part of the warp and weft of life over a long period that they acquire true symbolic value. For example, the wilful destruction in England of their historic measures and money which arose naturally from man's everyday needs, and a coinage more than a thousand years old, has helped undermine the self confidence of a people who retained such

things not out of backwardness, but from a sense of national worth and importance.

The importance of the destruction of national symbols and habits cannot be overestimated as a destroyer of national cohesion, for they rob the nation of their cultural mooring-posts and reduce the individual's sense of difference as a people.

The importance of territory

The United Kingdom (UK) is a state really without parallel in the world. Until devolution in 1998 which resulted in the creation of assemblies in Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales, it was a unitary state with a central government which took all the important decisions for the entire country.

The UK has worked in Scotland, Wales and England for one simple reason: each people had a territory which they dominated. Scotland might be subject to an English-dominated Parliament but a Scot could still live in a land where all about him were his fellow countrymen and women and the administration of the practical government which he encountered was in the hands of Scots.

The one place where the UK did not work and does not work is Ireland, the one part of the UK where there is a division between the native population and the product of large-scale settlement from the British mainland.

There is a lesson from the UK experience. Territory is what people care about. The great tragedy of the Jews is that they lost a homeland for nineteen centuries.

The advantages of homogeneity

To live in a homogenous society is a luxury for it removes the great cause of human friction, the clash of cultures.

A homogenous society implies other things. It means by definition that the people of the society live in a territory which they have secured, at least for the time, for themselves.

Perhaps most importantly, it allows a people to enjoy their own culture both by having ready access to it and by being allowed to celebrate it.

The creation of the nation state

The movement from a kingdom ruled as a personal fief by a monarch to the nation state is a remarkably rare phenomenon. All countries belonging to the UN claim to be nation states, but the reality is that precious few even begin to meet the description. Rather, they are empires of competing peoples.

England probably became the prototype of the nation state because it was homogenous. Whatever criterion is used for homogeneity, England is out in front. In the seventh century the English were identified by Bede as a people. Even then they occupied most of the territory which is modern England. The country has not been subject to a serious invasion let alone conquest since 1066. Until 1945, immigration into England from outside the British Isles had been remarkably small for the better part of a thousand years.

It is noticeable that even with England's example very few countries have been able to create anything approaching a true nation state. Those that have come close, such as the French or the Germans, have all shared a high degree of homogeneity.

The multicultural society

A multicultural society is by definition not a nation but an empire.

To live in a multicultural society is to be constantly assailed by considerations which simply do not arise in the homogenous society, such as naturally segregated areas and their accompanying tensions. Elites of course use the opportunity to act in an authoritarian manner but they also act from practical need. Simply to maintain order, laws and their application must be more restrictive of personal liberty. That is particularly so in the case of free expression.

Before the post-1945 immigration, Britain did not have any restrictions on free speech beyond those of libel, slander, obscenity and blasphemy (which was very rarely invoked). Now we have a raft of legislation which makes it an offence to incite racial discord, the interpretation of this being ever more narrowly interpreted.

In addition, to the restrictions on free speech, the most vital engine of democracy, the British are now bound by laws and practices which make it a criminal offence or civil wrong to do anything which may be interpreted as having a racial motive. Thus the whole of our lives are tarnished with new restrictions and fears and all because of the immigration into Britain of those who cannot or will not assimilate.

The easy destruction of social norms

Social norms exist because people overwhelmingly observe them. Indeed, it takes very few people to destroy a social norm. To take an example. If black boys are treated with kid gloves by teachers because of political correctness, boys from other racial groups will attempt to behave in the same way as the black boys in the expectation that the same leniency will be extended to them. The consequence is that behaviour generally worsens.

Citizens but not part of the nation

Despite the most strenuous propaganda efforts by liberals, everyone knows in their heart-of-hearts that having the legal right to carry a passport and reside in a country does not make a person part of a nation.

Adult immigrants are plainly not part of the receiving nation because they lack the cultural imprinting which being brought up in a country gives, but neither can those born and raised in a society be realistically seen to be part of the nation in the emotional sense.

The difference between legal nationality and belonging to a nation can be seen in the difference between England and Britain.

Britain is a blend of legal entity, geographical proximity, historical interaction and a degree of fellow-feeling deriving from (by now) shared values and experiences. But it is a second order focus of loyalty, more legal construct than emotional reality.

The essentially legal nature of Britishness was shown rapidly after the votes on devolution occurred. Not only did the Scots and Welsh become much less likely to refer to themselves as British; the English, who had long used British as a synonym for English, soon began to refer to themselves as English rather than British. Claiming to be British suddenly seemed anachronistic. Ironically, and pathetically, the only parts of the population who continue to commonly describe themselves as British are the Northern Irish Protestants and the various ethnic minorities.

The fact that the ethnic minorities in Britain almost invariably describe themselves as something other than English, Scots, Welsh or Irish is very telling. Although they use British frequently it is rarely un-hyphenated. Rather we find black-British, Asian-British or more specific constructions such as Chinese-British. Alternatively, they may use a description such as British Muslim. The native peoples of Britain have never hyphenated their Britishness.

But many of the ethnic minorities in Britain are even more removed from the native population than that. They commonly describe themselves as black, Asian, Indian, Bangladeshi, Jamaican, Afro-Caribbean, Nigerian, Muslim, Hindu and Sikh or any other racial, national or cultural distinction you care to name.

Nor are these terms confined to common usage. The 2001 census form offered choices such as Black British, while groups supposedly representing this or that ethnic group commonly describe themselves as "black", "Asian", "Bangladeshi" and so on, for example the Association of Black Police Officers. These groups are recognised by the government and not infrequently funded by them. The principle of multiculturalism has become institutionalised in Britain.

The future

A true nation is a precious thing as a cultural artefact. A nation which forms itself into a true state is doubly blessed because it is the most effective means of allowing men to live in security with a minimum of strife. Only a fool would throw away such a luxury.

Much as liberal internationalists would like to imagine that nationality can be put on and taken off as easily as an overcoat; rather, it is an adamant part of being human for it is the tribe writ very large.

Men need have a sense of belonging. Remove their opportunity to feel part of a "tribe" and they will be disorientated. Of course, those at the top of the social pile may be able to form their own quasi-tribe of privileged internationalists and pretend to themselves that nation states are anachronistic and that multicultural societies are a positive good and the wave of the future. The vast majority of any society do not have such an opportunity to delude themselves for they have to live with the direct consequences of mass migration. In fact, the internationalists are living a lie even by their own lights, because they ensure their own privilege by organising their lives to live in a very homogenous élite society which is overwhelmingly white, university-educated and wealthy.

But the internationalists are also profoundly mistaken in imagining that the mixed societies which they are creating are necessarily controllable in the long run. The history of states with racial and cultural mixes is that sooner or later the tensions become too large to contain and they fall apart.

With ever-increasing frequency, individuals are granted legal status as a citizen or national of a country without being part of the nation. But the process is not even. Countries of the Third World have little immigration – and indeed generally discourage it – while the West is besieged with incomers both illegal and legal.

The more racial and cultural difference in a state the more it resembles an empire. The more it resembles an empire the greater the risk of civil war and dissolution of the nation state. That is what we in Britain and the rest of the developed world ultimately face, the dissolution of our states and the loss of control of our homelands.

The lesson from Fukushima

PETER DAVID PEDERSEN

I am writing this from a hotel along the shore of Biwa-ko, Japan's largest lake some 528 kilometres west (and slightly south) of the Fukushima nuclear power station. Fresh snow is covering the landscape in what would, normally, be a very idyllic setting.

Right now, it feels absolutely surreal, as if all the earthquake destruction in Eastern Japan combined with the man-made spectre of nuclear destruction were scenes out a Hollywood movie entitled "Twin Disasters." But this is no movie, and whether there will be any form of "happy" ending to the nuclear malaise remains entirely unpredictable.

The Japanese government "cannot" talk openly and honestly to the Japanese public about the potential dangers in a worst-case scenario at Fukushima, primarily because of fears of panic in the 30 million population in the world's largest metropolitan area, Tokyo + Yokohama.

Personally, I have over the last ten years or so repeatedly experienced the attempts of TEPCO (Tokyo Electric Power Co.) to control information on nuclear power in this country. For eighteen months, from 2000-2001, I anchored the main news program at MX TV, Tokyo's local TV station, and was told by the producer that "since TEPCO is a sponsor of our program, I would prefer if you do not openly criticize nuclear power."

On another occasion, I was writing a piece for a well-known publication for 5-6th grade schoolchildren on the environment, this time being told by the chief editor that, "TEPCO is one of the sponsors of our magazine. While I would like you to write on the environment, please don't be critical of nuclear power."

On a third occasion, not directly related to TEPCO, I was interviewed by the Yomiuri Newspaper, one of Japan's top two newspapers in terms of circulation, about the 1978 demonstrations throughout Denmark, in which I participated as a child, against the possible introduction of nuclear power. When the interview appeared

in the newspaper, my phrase “demonstrations against nuclear power” had been altered to “demonstrations for renewable energy.” This was not what I had said, and when I called the journalist in charge, he sheepishly apologized, saying that “I did not dare to write anything negative about nuclear power lest I should invite the wrath of my editor (boss).”

I feel so very sorry for the people who are, right now, sacrificing their future health, and some of them their immediate lives, working to stop the disaster at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station. They may be described as “heroes” – and surely their efforts as such are heroic – but in a wider perspective they are victims of an industry in which the brainwashing of contractors and workers to believe that what they work with is safe has been pervasive.

In its entirety, the present situation in Eastern Japan and the Tokyo Metropolitan area has revealed the amazing fragility of modern civilization. All lifelines – water, transport, electricity, food supplies – have been severed or disrupted in Eastern Japan, and one of the world’s largest cities, Tokyo, was yesterday afternoon (March 17th), in danger of a large scale, sudden blackout as a cold spell of weather drove up electricity consumption close to the limit of maximum supply. A good friend of mine, working at Tohoku University not far from the epicentre of the earthquake, called to tell how he finally, after six days, managed to leave Sendai (a city of more than a million on Japan’s (Honshu’s) east coast), driving to Tokyo in a sixteen-hour ordeal. No gasoline being available anywhere on the route, he barely managed to reach Tokyo, his gas tank drying up. More frightening than the drive, though, was how food and water were virtually impossible to obtain in the city centre of Sendai. “Emergency supplies have been distributed to the schools where tens of thousands of people take refuge, but nothing seemed to reach the city of Sendai and shelves in supermarkets were almost completely empty. For the first time, I had the feeling of a threat to my life because of an inability to buy food,” he told me.

My friend made it, but older and weaker people are dying - or will die as the crucial lifelines of a hypermodern society have been devastated.

The question, obviously, is what we can learn, not only in Japan, but in modern society as a whole, from this experience. It remains to be seen whether we will, truly, learn anything at all. To me, there seem to be at least three major lessons. The first is the question of how or if lifestyles and values will change. The thing that the Japanese have been praised for throughout the first week of this terrible disaster, has not been “technology” or “financial strength”; it has been the strong

spirit, the patience, the human qualities of the people here that has touched many around the world. Money and shiny goods in temples of consumption have carried absolutely no value for the people here in the last week. Is there a chance that we may, now, see and act on the emptiness of useless consumerism? A chance there must be, I hope, although I do at the same time fear that once things settle down, Japan and the world will go on as if nothing had happened.

The second lesson is the danger of concentration of population into huge metropolises. Although the epicentre of the M9.0 earthquake was hundreds of kilometres northeast of Tokyo, the city was paralyzed, streets clogged, subways inoperational, phone lines dead. The staff at my office could not get home or get in touch with their family. What if – and this could happen any day – the earthquake had hit Tokyo straight on? I have not the courage to think of the scale of disaster or the number of human lives that would have been lost. As urbanization continues at great speed in the world's population centres, the utter fragility of the twenty-first century megacity poses serious questions. Is there a way to answer this question in a more humane and sustainable manner than we are experiencing today? There must be.

The third lesson is the folly of making ourselves dependent on energy production from large-scale and extremely dangerous power stations, where no workable plans exist to control worst-case scenarios. Huge costs will be incurred in Japan over the next several decades to clean up Fukushima. Huge costs were incurred to build the plant in the first place. Surely, this money could have been used more wisely. Hopefully, the lesson taken from Fukushima will, finally, make the idea of non-violent, non-toxic, decentralized energy sources the mainstream policy and business choice around the world.

If we can learn the lessons, there is hope for the future.

Ogoto-onsen, near Kyoto, March 18th, 2011

European Union versus Local Community

JOHN PAPWORTH

The most significant political development of the modern era is one scarcely noticed by most professional commentators; it is the upsurge of concern and awareness of the importance of the local community.

History has long been dominated by the struggles of rival groups of tribes or communities, battling under the banners of great leaders for national supremacy. These rivalries have gestated not just wars, but world wars; they have produced not just economic crisis, but global economic crisis; and today, increasingly they are creating ecological, environmental and social dangers which are demonstrating that power is out of control and that centralised modern nation states are unworkable.

They are demonstrating that if we want peace, freedom, economic stability, and social equilibrium there must be a new disposition of the decision-making powers that govern societies, one that makes them less top-heavy, less prone to excess, less wasteful and less ungovernable: one that ensures local communities have proper control of their local affairs, and through such control of local affairs and resources are able to exercise a significant influence on the conduct of national questions and national government.

At present it is the other way round; instead of local communities controlling the national forms of power it is the centralised national forms which have reduced local powers to a virtual nullity. There has been no serious debate on this development; instead the illusion has been cherished that democracy is assured so long as the ballot box is in place, regardless of the extent to which it enables central government powers to exercise blanket control of local matters.

But a major change is clearly under way in every continent across the world. There is a profound change of consciousness emerging, one which sees that if we are to be free nationally we must first be free locally; in matters of health, schooling, trade, banking and planning for example, we must have government from the base up, not from the

top down, and if there are questions, such as teacher training colleges for example, beyond the capacity of a single local community, the local community must be able to elect their own representatives to special area boards for such purposes, leaving the national government free to focus its energies on national and international matters.

Everywhere these considerations are emerging as people grasp that if we want to exercise full democratic control of national forms of power we must limit them to essential matters of national concern whilst developing our local powers, whether in village, parish or community, to their fullest extent.

It is in this light that the folly of the EUropean exercise can be more fully appreciated. There has been no popular movement to unite Europe from any part of the continent, it has never been anything but an imposition; arrogant, contemptuous, dishonest, insincere, malevolent, blind and inspired by greed. Its financial arrangements carry but one persistent label; they are out of control. They are being operated on a scale far too large to enable any sort of control to be exercised and floods of money will continue to pour down the drain of bankers' pockets until the entire system implodes in a welter of futile rescue operations and pointless cross-purposes.

Meanwhile the sense of community goes from strength to strength; in Britain, despite its partial commitment to the Brussels masquerade, the government has established a special department for Communities and Local Government having its own member of the Cabinet.

In this the government is responding to genuine public opinion even if to date there has been little shift of decision-making power from Whitehall to the localities. It may only be a start but it *is* a start and one which has its own significance for future developments. Not least in light of the rapidly increasing financial problems which have central government very much in their grip.

Events themselves are showing that government has lost control of its own spending propensities. Far from liquidating its debts they are showing signs of increasing as we are sucked increasingly into the maelstrom of the Euro meltdown stemming from the monetary shipwreck of the Greek, Irish, Icelandic, Portuguese and Spanish economies.

It can only be a matter of time before it dawns on political perceptions that one answer to the problems of government spending lies in abolishing some spheres of government. The savings to be made, for example, by abolishing the Ministry of Education and transferring its powers to local communities, where the principle of voluntary service is still strong, must be colossal.

How long, oh Lord, how long?

Finland needs an Independence Party

ANTTI PESONEN

All politicians would say that they support democracy and are ready to defend it. But they have different opinions of what democracy means.

Democracy should mean that big issues in the society are decided as the majority of the citizens want them to be decided. In the European Union it is more and more clear that the top politicians do not take account of the opinions of the citizens at all. The best example of this is that top politicians do not want to give voters the possibility to decide the future of the EU constitution in a referendum, even if at the beginning of the EU constitution it is written that it gives expression to the will of the citizens.

The leaders of Finland will not give the citizens the possibility to decide over the future of the EU constitution. Instead, they will accept it to be above the Finnish laws. According to a recent public opinion poll only about seventeen per cent of the Finns support this kind of decision.

Representative democracy means, according to the Constitution of Finland, that voters elect decision-makers to represent them for the periods of time in between elections. But representative democracy does not give these temporary representatives the right to dispose of, or steal, the highest power, which belongs to the citizens, or to give it away from the country.

The political system does not stand very long in a situation wherein important social concepts, like independence, democracy, well-being, or not belonging to a military alliance or cooperation, are explained to mean whatever each particular speaker in different times wants them to mean.

The present degeneration of democratic concepts will have more and more serious consequences. We should remember that the dictatorships of the twentieth century had partly their foundation in the misinterpretation of these important concepts.

Democracy in the European Union is not possible. One reason for

this is that big companies have a strong influence on the EU. And their interests are often different from those of the majority of the people. That is why there is no real democracy in the EU, the parliament of which is not a real parliament, and their unelected Commission, formed of civil servants surrounded by companies' lobbyists, has the sole right to initiate bills. And democracy is not any more possible in the member states, because they no longer have any independent power in issues belonging to the EU.

Democracy is possible only in independent nation states. Independence, democracy and a just welfare society belong together. It is possible to achieve all of them, if only citizens get their voices heard.

Now it is time to increase cooperation between those movements who are working for real democracy and independent nation states.

We have to tell the citizens that there are better and sustainable alternatives to the EU State.

The recent parliamentary election in Finland saw "The True Finns", a party that says that it is critical to the EU and the Euro, but also very anti-immigration, and which lacks the will to respect that Finland has two official languages, Finnish and Swedish, go from from 5 to 39 seats. This party is not, however, the party that Antti Pesonen refers to. So Finland still needs an Independence Party in its parliament. Ed.

The NEW EUROPEAN

"So, let us solve the one insoluble problem of our time, the high altitude disease of excessive size and uncontrollable proportions, by going back to the alternative to both right and left of a small-scale social environment with all its potential for global pluralist co-operative and largely unaffiliated self-sufficiency by extending not centralized control but the decontrolling locally centred and nourished communities, each built around a nuclear institution with a limited but strong and independent gravitational field of its own as it existed in the form of medieval monasteries."

Leopold Kohr in his Right Livelihood Award Acceptance Speech on December 9th, 1983, three weeks before Ninety Eighty-Four.

The NEW EUROPEAN has existed since 1988 when it was founded by Sir Richard Body and the late John Coleman. It is now being carried on by the Knud P. Pedersen Centre for European Studies, but the focus will be the same: How can we find a way out of the deadlock of our present situation with war, environmental degradation, increasing inequality and an ever-increasing democratic deficit?

There is no easy answer.

But the New European was and is convinced that one important key is the issue of size. "Beyond a given critical size, we simply cease to be masters of our fate," says Kohr in his 1983 speech and continues to quote the sixteenth-century physician Theophrastus Paracelsus: "Everything is poison: it all depends on the quantity." Or, as another wise person said: "Power is like muck, it should be spread very evenly".

From this point of view it becomes vital to ask ourselves: where is Europe going? When we say "Europe", we refer to the entire continent with its 48 nations, not to the European Union which is aspiring to take over the name of the continent.

Europe as characterized first and foremost by the variety of languages, peoples and cultures of these 48 countries. But we

cannot help experiencing a chill around the heart watching this variety is being threatened by the zeal shown by the European Union to "harmonize" almost every aspect of human existence in order to pave the way for the free passage of capital and labour.

The European Union has as its motto "United in diversity" – at the time of writing this we see the people of Greece being press-ganged into gratefully and humbly accepting loans from the European Union. These loans are financed by taxpayers in the other member countries at extortionate interest rates. The burden of paying back these loans will keep the people of Greece humble and miserable for a generation, and the money will have to be paid back, not to the taxpayers but to the banks. And the peoples of the other countries will live in fear of suffering the same fate and accept a centralized economic government.

If Greece had not joined the Eurozone and abolished the drachma it would still have had its problems with a rampant corruption and an endemic tax-dodging. But the country would sooner or later have been forced to find its own way out of the morass.

We do not, however, believe that the nation state is the solution to everything. Many issues should be settled in small units such as families or villages, while others may require global solutions. And every level in between will have its use. But we insist on a true "subsidiarity principle", according to which a task is only transferred from the smallest possible unit to the larger one if very strong arguments speak in favour of such a transfer and after a proper decision procedure has been carried through.

This issue of the *New European* deals with a variety of issues: the Middle East and the European Union, the social and ecological consequences of the growth economy, the role of the nation state and that of the local community. No reader will agree with each and every word – but then he or she was never meant to do so.

Contributors to this issue

DAVID CRONIN

is an Irish journalist based in Brussels

MORTEN HARPER

is a Norwegian bachelor of law and free-lance journalist

SIR JULIAN ROSE

is a British leading exponent of organic farming

LUISE HEMMER PIHL

is a Danish journalist, translator and publisher

ALESSIO CHRISTIANINI

is an Italian journalist

IDA MAGLI

is an anthropologist and writer and professor emerita at the Università di Roma

ROBERT HENDERSON

is a british free-lance writer and former civil servant

PETER DAVID PEDERSEN

is the chief executive of E-Square-Inc, Tokyo

JOHN PAPWORTH

is a priest of the Anglican Church and an economist

ANTTI PESONEN

is Chairman of the Independence Party in Finland

You are welcome to order free PDF copies of the **NEW EUROPEAN**
from skrodhoj@gmail.com

NEW EUROPEAN



ISSN 0953-1432