Instructions for authors, permissions and subscription information:
E-mail: bilgi@uidergisi.com
Web: www.uidergisi.com

The Magic Circle of Madness: How Europe Lost its Soul

Eddie J. Girdner

Professor, Başkent University, Department of Political Science and International Relations

To cite this article: Girdner, Eddie J., "The Magic Circle of Madness: How Europe Lost its Soul", *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, Volume 3, No 12 (Winter 2006-2007), p. 101-126.

The Magic Circle of Madness: How Europe Lost its Soul

(A Book Review Essay of Christopher Booker and Richard North, The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union London, Continuum, 2005)

Eddie J. GIRDNER*

ABSTRACT

The roots of the European Union are to be found in nineteenth century utopian thought rather than in the desire to create peace in Europe after World War II. The recent book by Christopher Booker and Richard North, The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union, argues that the official history of the European Union has neglected this heritage to conceal the fact that the European Union was founded upon these failed utopian ideals embodied in the League of Nations. Moreover, the history of the European Union has been marked by an effort to deceive states and the public as to the supranational thrust toward political integration. While nation-states lost the ability to rule themselves, ironically, the single market has failed in all its essential goals of deregulating the market, rationalizing agricultural production, preserving the ecology, and producing sufficient employment and economic growth. While Booker and North focus upon the United Kingdom, prospective member states should heed the warning of this revisionist history of the European Union. The book is a critically important addition to studies on the history of the European Union.

Keywords: *European Union, Single Market, Jean Monnet, Supranationalism, Political Integration*

Çılgınlığın Sihirli Döngüsü: Avrupa Ruhunu Nasıl Kaybetti

(Christopher Booker ve Richard North, The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union, Londra, Continuum, 2005'e Dair Bir İnceleme Yazısı)

ÖZET

Avrupa Birliği'nin kökenleri, II. Dünya Savaşı'ndan sonra Avrupa'da barış yaratılması isteğinden ziyade 19. yüzyılın ütopyacı düşüncesinde yatmaktadır. Christopher Booker ve Richard North tarafından kaleme alınan The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union başlıklı kitap, Avrupa Birliği'nin Milletler Cemiyeti'nde ifadesini bulan başarısız ütopyacı idealler üzerine kurulduğunu gizlemek için Avrupa Birliği resmi tarihinin bu mirası gözardı ettiğini belirtmektedir. Ayrıca, Avrupa Birliği tarihi, siyasi entegrasyonda ulusüstü etki olduğu kanaatini uyandırabilmek için devletleri ve halkları aldatma çabalarıyla doludur. Ulus-devletler kendilerini yönetme yeteneğini kaybettikleri için, ironik olarak tek piyasa da, kısıtlayıcı şartları kaldırma, tarımsal üretimi rasyonel hale getirme, ekolojiyi koruma ve yeterince istihdam ve ekonomik kalkınma sağlama amaçlarını gerçekleştirememiştir. Booker ve North İngiltere üzerinde yoğunlaşırken, gelecekte üye olması beklenen devletler de Avrupa Birliği'nin bu revizyonist tarihinin uyarısını dikkate almalıdır. Sözkonusu kitap, Avrupa Birliği tarihiyle ilgili çalışmalara çok önemli bir katkı sağlamaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: *Avrupa Birliği, Tek Piyasa, Jean Monnet, Ulusüstücülük, Siyasi Entegrasyon*

---

* Professor, Başkent University, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Bağlıca Kampüsü Ankara

ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLER, Vol. 3, No 12, Winter 2006-2007, p. 101-126

> "It is a revolutionary and almost mystical conception."
>
> Harold Macmillan (1950)
>
> "...[T]he project Monnet had set on its way was a vast, ramshackle, self-deluding monster: partly suffocating in its own bureaucracy; partly a corrupt racket..."
>
> Christopher Booker and Richard North (p. 443)

Every political establishment rests, to a certain extent, upon an ideology designed to carefully conceal its root principles from the people.[1] The neoliberal version of capitalism, practically the universally prevailing ideology today, is no exception. It promises values such as equality, freedom and liberty, clearly illusionary ideals for the majority in large measure, while generally serving the interests of the ruling class. The contradiction between neoliberalism and democracy today has recently been explored by Samir Amin.[2] It would not be incorrect to argue that neoliberalism is infused with a strong utopian bent, which ignores empirical reality, in the same way as neoclassical economics. It is based upon a theory of imaginary economics which could never exist in the real world.[3] Elements are carefully constructed, seemingly grounded in empirical reality, but in fact float upon the myth of the market. A deceptive ideology also underlies the delusions and hallucinations embraced by the contemporary European fantasy known as the European Union. Its roots may be found in the nineteenth century utopian thrust.

After some brief introductory remarks, this essay explores the central ideas in Christopher Booker and Richard North's, *The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union,* London, Continuum, 2005. Today, utopianism in the service of capital has spread its wings. It beckons society to the utopian fantasies of the age: particularly that the glorious future will be born on the wings of the single currency and the "single market." It is a science fiction unfolded, which has firmly excised the working classes and dismissed any pretense that the common people have a legitimate interest in their destiny. The Pilgrim's Progress to that

---

1 On the nature of ideology see Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia,* New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1936. Mannheim notes that "ideological determined conduct" may involve "the incongruence of ... ideas with reality...," may have the "possibility of uncovering the incongruence between its ideas and its conduct, but instead conceals these insights...", or may involve an "ideological mentality based on conscious deception, where ideology is to be interpreted as a purposeful lie." (p. 195) For Manneim, when individuals or social groups try to "realize" their "wish images" through "actual conduct", such as through revolution, then these wish images "take on a revolutionary function" and "will become utopias." (p. 193)

2 Samir Amin, *The Liberal Virus: Permanent War and the Americanization of the World,* New York, Monthly Review Press, 2004. Clearly, neoclassical economic theory is based upon assuming an economic system which exists nowhere in the real world.

3 For an explication of these points, which cannot be explored here, see Amin.

Holy Land of immaculate "European integration" marches onward borne upon the wings of such lofty thoughts.

Nineteenth Century Utopian novels, such as Edward Belamy's *Looking Backward*,[4] envisioned the "future rationalized society." Kerry Walters has argued that this was not a break with capitalist ideology. Rather, these utopian works ultimately served a capitalist agenda.[5] There was a "bourgeois thrust" toward a "technologization and rationalization" of society and in this way individuals were "systematically striped of their very humanity." This utopian vision embodied the view that the "rational few" must rule the "irrational many." Traced to Francis Bacon (1561-1626), the thrust toward a rational society became the ideology of the emerging middle classes and lives on today in positivistic approaches to social agendas.[6] Relying upon propaganda to control the masses, as pioneered in Nazi Germany and twentieth century America, it creates widespread alienation and dehumanization. One could perhaps say it is the hallmark of the modern age, after Walter Lippmann and his associates ushered in the era of the public relations industry in the United States.[7] Social engineering, no fantasy, has been with us for a long time. Indeed, Booker and North show that the roots of European integration, grounded in nineteenth century utopian thought, spring from this agenda. This aspect of European history, however, has been quite carefully concealed by the official Brussels "hagiography." (p. 59)

---

4 Edward Bellamy, *Looking Backward: 2000-1887*, New York, New American Library, 1960.

5 Kerry S. Walters, *The Sane Society Ideal In Modern Utopianism*, Lewiston, N.Y., Edwin Mellon Press, 1989.

6 Ibid. Chapter 5.

7 Walter Lippmann, *The Public Philosophy*, New York, Mentor, 1955. See also Noam Chomsky, *Necessary Illusions: Thought Control in Democratic Societies*, Boston, South End Press, 1989. One of the most influential figures in engineering the control of public opinion in the United States, Lippmann warned of the dangers of democracy. "Mass opinion" was a "dangerous master of decisions when the stakes are life and death." (Lippmann, p. 24) Public opinion was seen to be generally mistaken about events. Moreover, "[t]he voters cannot be relied upon to represent The People." (Lippmann, p. 32) Emphasis in the original. To arrest "the decline of Western society" (p. 136), it was necessary that there be a mechanism for producing the required public opinion from the specialized class. He spoke of a "revolution" in the "practice of democracy," that is, "the manufacture of consent." (Chomsky, p. 16) As can be readily observed, the American political system has been highly successful in this enterprise. This is shown, for example, by the extraordinary beliefs of Americans compared to every other country in the world, but which are politically necessary to the system. A recent example is that the US was the only country in the world where it was believed that there was a link between Saddam Hussein and the 9/11 terrorism in New York, a falsehood intentionally generated by government propaganda. One could equally take other issues, such as attitudes toward the Vietnam War, support for Israel, the Iraq War and so on, where public opinion is shaped by propaganda, sometimes referred to as "White House spin." It works most of the time. It fails when the truth finally seeps into enough of the people's heads, a clear problem for the government. Needless to say, big business readily adopted these successful techniques of public manipulation in the advertising industry to sell their products.

The Great Deception, is written primarily from a conservative British perspective by the leading political analyst Christopher Booker and economist Richard North. The book seeks to dispense with a number of myths that have today become firmly established as truisms. The basic thesis of the authors is that the founders have employed deception from the beginning to further their hidden agenda of a supranational European state beyond the reach of individual national states.

This approach differs sharply from the most widely read recent histories of the European Union in English, for example, recent books by Hugo Young and Roy Denman.[8] These authors do not challenge the standard history of the European Union but Young, a Europhile insider, agrees that politicians in the UK engaged in deception of the people and a "conspiracy of silence" (p. 251) in not telling the whole truth about Britain's entry into the EU. He saw Tony Blair's election as a "revolutionary moment" that would finally resolve Britain's awkward differences with the EU. The sharpest difference with Booker and North, perhaps, is Young's argument that it was Britain's sense of "imperial grandeur" that prevented it from realigning successfully with Europe some four decades earlier. Another book edited by Douglas Brinkley and Clifford Hackett,[9] provides a short history of Jean Monnet's life and work. This book consists of accounts of European reconstruction by Monnet's associates and admirers. It serves as useful background but does not seek to penetrate events critically. Andrew Moravcsik,[10] in his well-known work, argues that economic interdependence has been the fundamental driving force for European integration as states pursued their national economic advantage. This public choice approach sharply contrasts with Booker and North's emphasis upon Monnet's drive for political supranationalism. Another recent history by John Laughland, mistakenly ascribes the origins of the EU to Nazi ideology.[11]

The historical machinations engineered by that gray figure, Jean Monnet, to establish the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) were essentially power grabs, according to Booker and North, resisting any control by member national governments. A large number of examples of Monnet's ruthlessness as a political operator are explored

---

8 Hugo Young, This *Blessed Plot- Britain and Europe, From Churchill to Blair,* London, Routledge, 1998. Roy Denman, *Missed Chances- Britain and Europe in the Twentieth Century,* London, Cassel, 1998.

9 Douglas Brinkley and Clifford Hackett, *Jean Monnet: The Path to European Unity,* New York, St. Martins, 1991.

10 Andrew Moravcsik, *The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power From Messina to Maastricht,* Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press, 1998.

11 John Laughland, *The Tainted Source-The Undemocratic Origins of the European Idea,* London, Warner Books, 1997.

in the book. One example, explained below, is Monnet's "assassination" (p. 89) of the intergovernmental organization, the Organization of European Economic Co-operation (OEEC) (see Chapter 6). The authors argue convincingly that Monnet sought virtually dictatorial powers for his "high authority" in controlling decisions from the top. (pp. 56, 90) He was "...a shrewd, skilled, and ultimately ruthless political operator." (p. 90) The European Union, it would seem, is not just suffering from a "democratic deficit." Democracy has been pretty much absent from the beginning, not as a defect, but precisely because that is the way the organization was designed. As the authors state, "[t]he one thing above all the project could never be, because by definition it had never been intended to be, was in the remotest sense democratic." (p. 443)

Indeed, the European Union has emerged today as a part of the global imperialist system, the triad of global collective rule of the US, Japan and Europe, which continues to control the global wealth and power, inherited from the European colonial conquest of the past.[12] There has never been any official rhetoric against imperialism within the European Union. Member states have often been a part of NATO. The enterprise, rather than promoting democratization, would serve to ensure that there would be no "crises of democracy," that is, no threat of democracy from below for the elites.[13] There would be no threat of socialism, and consequently no threat to the interests of the business and corporate elites. This aspect of the postwar reconstruction of Europe has been explored in Chomsky.[14] But even so, nationalistic

---

12 Samir Amin, "U.S. Imperialism, Europe, and the Middle East", *Monthly Review*, Vol. 56, No 6, November 2004, p. 13-33.

13 A "crisis of democracy" as used in the literature refers to too much democracy, not too little. The system becomes overloaded with demands from below and if not contained could spin out of control and result in a revolution. In this sense, the conservative political science research funded by Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, which produced such concepts, was part of the larger counterinsurgency efforts of the US Government at the time. The danger for Europe had existed immediately after the War, being largely contained by the 1960s.

14 Noam Chomsky, *World Orders Old and New*, New York, Columbia Univ. Press, 1996. Chomsky stresses how the US restored the traditional ruling classes to power, undermining democracy. Indeed, the newly formed US Central Intelligence Agency under President Truman set about this task by rigging election results in Europe. While the US State Department appears to believe that rigging elections around the world is an exercise in "democracy," it is, nonetheless, precisely the opposite: the suppression of democracy. The US has a long and sordid history of involvement in such machinations. Instructive are recent histories of US imperialism and the CIA by William Blum. NATO, served as the military wing of this exercise to restore European capitalism, tightly linked to North American capital. The pretext of the Soviet threat was to be used to get funding from the US Congress and keep American troops stationed in Europe. Clearly, the possibility of the emergence of left-oriented governments in Europe was a threat which the US took considerable precautions against. This required the suppression of democracy. Intervention in the Greek Civil War was but one example. See William Blum, *Rogue State: A Guide to the World's Only Superpower*, 3rd ed., Common Courage Press, 2005 and William Blum, *Killing Hope: U.S. Military and CIA Interventions Since World War II*, Common Courage Press, 2003.

rivalry has continued to exist. The founders have not succeeded in purging Europe of nationalism as they have often claimed. In fact, today there is a surplus of nationalistic and ethnic chauvinism, as seen in the rise of right-wing political parties and considerable hostility toward Turkish membership.[15]

While Booker and North, primarily writing from a conservative perspective, do not compare the European Union with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, this reviewer would argue that the European project aimed at setting up an alternative version of the centralized economy, one under the commissioners (the "high authority"), a new group of Western commissars. It was to be run by the bankers, rather than the Bolsheviks, albeit with similar underlying elitist principles. France, as Booker and North do argue, has been able to exploit the emerging system better than any other country, getting the rest of the member countries to pay dearly to keep its peasants down on the farm and out of the cities. This was meant to serve the interests of political stability in a volatile exploitative system in France. The real agenda, the authors argue, was the setting up of a Federal European "super-state" under the joint hegemony of France and Germany.

Looking at the historical events from a broader perspective than the authors, it seems that while Jean Monnet was setting up his central committee for Western European integration in the late 1940s, events in the East of Europe mirrored the West in significant ways. Indeed, the Soviets were doing their own "European integration" of politics and the economy in Eastern Europe at about the same time under the central guidance of Moscow.[16] Now the central command economy of Brussels has been substituted for that of Moscow and indeed expanded eastward. Centralization, in fact, was the economic and political logic of

---

[15] This is obviously not the only or even major objection to Turkish membership but is merely given as one example among others, such as racism in France against immigrants from North Africa. Polls have shown it to account for around 14 percent of the opposition in early 2005. See Eddie J. Girdner, "A Spectre Haunting Europe: The European constitution, the Budget Crisis, and the Limits of Neoliberal Integration," *Uluslararasi İlişkiler*, Vol. 2, No 7, Fall 2005, p. 69.

[16] David Horowitz argued convincingly that the Soviet consolidation of political control of Eastern Europe in the late 1940s was driven by US foreign policy. As for the Soviet threat, "[a]fter 1955, it became impossible to give sober credence to the existence of any immediate Russian military threat to Western Europe, as the Red Army abandoned its forward position in Austria, and reduced its forces, while at the same time Nato continued its military build-up." (p. 401) The key US policy-maker, George Kennan admitted ten years after the beginning of the Cold War "that military expansion by the Soviet Union was never considered a real prospect by him." (p. 402) This admission is surely sobering, considering that it is in direct contradiction to the established narrative embodied in the bulk of the western literature on the Cold War. See David Horowitz, *From Yalta to Vienna: American Foreign Policy in the Cold War*, Middlesex, England, Penguin Books, 1967, Chapter 6.

both sides in the Cold War. Both were utopian visions, social engineering of sorts. Both grew out of nineteenth century ideas about management of the society by an elite vanguard, the bankers in the West, the Bolsheviks in the East.

Histories are constructed to serve ideologies and nothing could demonstrate this more clearly than the standard historical approaches to the European Union. Once the grand narrative is established, serving the powers that be, it is in bad taste to question the official version. The official party line gets propagated and becomes official wisdom. It is wrapped in its own virtue as a major pillar of the prevailing ideology, underlying the structure of power. Questioning takes on a sacrilegious coloration. Democratic sentiments are often embarrassing to elites and do not mesh with the protocol. History advances forward through the deceit of the people. Nevertheless, the historical myths must be exposed.

And exposed they are in this powerful and meticulously documented book. It is likely that no one who reads this book will ever be able to look in the same way at the European Union again. It is a must read for both Europhiles and EU-critics and applies to every country in the European Union as well as to candidate countries such as Turkey.

Booker and North point out that for the roots of the European Union, we must go back to post-WWI Europe to 1918 and Wilsonianism. The idealism which gave rise to the League of Nations was indeed inspired by utopian ideals, but the vision failed. The Treaty of Versailles in 1919 punished Germany with harsh reparations, partially relieved by the Dawes Plan to reduce German debt. Ideas for Franco-German economic collaboration followed. Utopian ideals were strong in the 1920s, as seen in the rise of the Soviet Union, the architecture of the Swiss architect, Le Corbusier, who would make tower blocks of cement, and the idea of a United States of Europe. In 1922, Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi published *Pan Europa*, an idea that appealed to both businessmen and left-wing intellectuals. He proposed the idea that the German coal and French steel industries should merge. The idea of a European Community also drew on the Zollverein, the German Common Market in the nineteenth century. (Chapter 1)

In the 1920s, such ideas were mostly intergovernmental and widely supported by such figures as French Foreign Minister Aristide Briand, Leon Blum and Winston Churchill. On May 20, 1930, Briand proposed a federal organization to be implemented within the League of Nations, but this did not bear fruit. After Wall Street collapsed at the end of the 1920s and Hitler rose to power, these ideas waned. (p. 12)

That the thrust behind these efforts was rooted in nineteenth century utopian thinkers, such as Pierre Joseph Proudhon and Comte de Saint Simon, is made clear by Booker and North. Proudhon published *The Federal Principle* in 1863, which attacked nationalism as leading to war. St. Simon also proposed a political union of Europe.

Another significant figure was Louis Loucheur who engineered a steel agreement in the 1920s which was the first supranational authority in Europe. He was chief economic advisor to the French Prime Minister Clemenceau at the 1919 Paris Peace Conference. Loucheur thought the way to prevent war was to integrate the industries of France and Germany which were central to waging war. In 1925, Emil Mayrisch, who ran the Luxembourg-based steel company, ARBED, engineered an international steel agreement which included the steel industries of France, Germany, Luxembourg and the Saar. This would be the model for the future Coal and Steel Community after World War II. (pp. 12-13)

The League of Nations, which the US declined to join, was to provide the institutional model for the future European Union. Here, Arthur Salter, a British civil servant, was head of the Reparations Commission and Jean Monnet was League Deputy Secretary General. Monnet had earlier in 1917 tried to set up a supranational organization for shipping but had failed. In the League, he disagreed with the principle of giving every state a veto. He had no use for nationalism. He later was to go to America as a banker and to China in 1932, where he worked to finance railway reconstruction. Salter also had ideas about integration, publishing his work, The *United States of Europe*, in 1931.

Arthur Salter conceived of the United States of Europe as an organization based upon the League of Nations, with a secretariat, a council of ministers, an assembly and a court. The central source of authority would be the secretariat, where a permanent body of civil servants would make decisions. This was necessary as national interests would remain too strong in the council. But all these schemes were to be put on hold as Hitler rose to power in 1933.

This background, reviewed by Booker and North, serves to demolish the myth propagated in the 1990s that the idea of a united states of Europe arose from the Nazis. It drew nothing from the Nazis. In fact the idea was kept alive in the United States and Britain during the war by central figures in the drama. Several European elites were involved. Coudenhove-Kalergi propagated the idea of European Unity in New York. Salter became a professor at Oxford and a friend of John Maynard Keynes, who was involved in a secret committee of economists. Also William Beveridge, a civil servant, and Walter Layton, an economist,

who had been the director of the League's Economic and Financial Section and an editor of the Economist, participated.

In the 1920s, two important think tanks emerged from an Anglo-American society set up by Lionel Curtis, who helped establish the League of Nations. They involved British and American delegates from Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations team. The first was the Royal Institute of International Affairs, or Chatham House, set up in London. The second was the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) set up in Washington.

In 1940, Coudenhove-Kalergi obtained a position at New York University through the CFR, by which he promoted the idea of a European Federation in America. This helped establish the idea of a United States of Europe among elites in America through articles in the *New York Times* and the *New York Herald Tribune*. Salter and Monnet also came together after the outbreak of the War. Monnet was busy arranging contracts for war supplies from America. He was then Chairman of the Franco-British Economic Coordination Committee and the Vice-Chairman was Salter. After the 1940 Blitzkrieg of Hitler, Monnet met de Gaulle and proposed a "Franco-British Union". He then proceeded to America after France fell to Hitler.

In the United States, Monnet was able to significantly influence US policy toward Europe. For Monnet, the solution to the "European Problem" was to prevent states from being "reconstituted" on the basis of national sovereignty. The key industries would be united and larger markets would function as a "single economic unit." Monnet met Dean Acheson and Paul-Henri Spaak in Washington in 1941, key figures in the events after the end of the war.

On the Nazi side, it is true that there was nominal support for a "united Europe," but mostly for propaganda purposes, according to Booker and North. For Hitler, it was an "irrelevance" and for Goebbels it was only for propaganda purposes. A leading Nazi Economist, Werner Daitz, established the Society for European Economic Planning and Macroeconomics, claiming the goal of eliminating notions of national sovereignty and the nation state. Joachim von Ribbentrop, Hitler's Foreign Minister, headed the 'Committee on the Restructuring of Europe," for the setting up of a European confederation. There were also ideas for a "New European Order," including a European economic community, with a single currency, after the War, under German leadership. (p. 24) The Germans claimed to be protecting Europe from the United States, Britain and the USSR.

In the resistance movement during the war, there were genuine supporters of European unity, most notably, Altieri Spinelli, an Italian Communist in the anti-Fascist movement. Imprisoned at Ventotene, he wrote the "Ventotene Manifesto," entitled "Towards a Free and United Europe," which was to become a basic text of the European federalist movement. It was argued that national sovereign states must be abolished and that there must be a socialist revolution for the emancipation of the working class. There would be an all-powerful supranational authority to develop into a united states of Europe. It would have a constitution and its own armed forces. There was a Jacobinist flavor to the document, downplaying liberal democracy. He wrote: "During revolutionary times, when institutions are not simply to be administered but created... democratic procedures fail miserably." The revolution would be a "dictatorship of the revolutionary party." But around this political construction, "new, genuine democracy" would grow. (p. 29) In fact, democracy would be reestablished only when the constitution was in place. Here again, perhaps, is the familiar principle that "democracy" is to function only when it can change nothing fundamental.[17]

The Ventotene Manifesto, smuggled from the small island off Italy, to the mainland from prison in 1941, was to become an important document because it contained many seminal ideas for the European Union. By 1943, the Italian resistance led to a European federalist movement. A major conference was held in Geneva in 1944 involving many nations and proposing that countries must go beyond the absolute sovereignty of the state.

Booker and North spend considerable time in detailing how the official history of the European Union has been constructed based upon

---

[17] Of course democracy in its generic sense can and often does bring radical change. Thus the fear of democracy discussed above. In its doctrinal sense, as is used here, however, "democracy" means a system which preserves the status quo and protects vested interests. This is the way the term is normally used by ruling elites; the European integrationists are no exception. The social, economic and political system is rendered immune from any exercises in "democracy." Many political systems are "rigged" so that a certain result is certain to be obtained. Obviously this is true of elections in Communist countries like China. But also true in the United States where two pro-business, anti-labor parties compete and business corporations contribute to both parties. Truly, there is no winnable alternative. This was true of the Japanese political system over a long period after World War II, where the only party which could win was the Liberal Democratic Party. Under neoliberalism, the trend is to relegate important political questions to the decisions of technocrats. Politics and elections get hollowed out as the decisions have already been made elsewhere. This is what the European Union institutions do and every new treaty advances this process as more decisions are given to the technocrats, as specified in the utopian thinking above. But the process is not complete and so the draft EU Constitution needs to be ratified in order to advance. This will lead to a further democratic deficit as more decisions will be removed further from the people. This is "democratic" only in a Leninist sense. I have argued this further in "A Spectre Haunting Europe."

a misreading of facts and how this history has now become established writ. The most fundamental misconception is that the "intellectual genesis" for the organization emerged after World War II. Booker and North show that, in fact, all the fundamental ideas emerged in the 1920s as a way to prevent another world war, but they in fact, failed to accomplish this. In other words, the European Union was established on hoary failed ideals, rather than new and viable ones.

A second misconception is the confounding of the concepts for European unity with the proposals put forward by Winston Churchill. The major thrust of the ideas about unity, in the 1920s, had been based upon "intergovernmentalism." But Booker and North stress that for Jean Monnet and other founders of the European Union, intergovernmentalism was hated as "their greatest obstacle." (p. 32) Churchill gave speeches referring to a "United States of Europe" a number of times between 1946 and 1949. These speeches, said to be an inspiration for the EU, were, in fact, based upon the idea of an "alliance of sovereign states" coming from the vision embraced in the League of Nations. These were the ideas of Aristide Briand, Gustav Stresemann and Coudenhove- Kalergi. Churchill did not conceive of Britain as being a part of this alliance, speaking of a "temple of world peace," containing four pillars, the USA, the USSR, a United States of Europe and the British Empire. About the only thing that Monnet and Churchill agreed upon was that the British Empire would not be a part of European integration.

After WWII, there was "a renaissance of internationalist idealism." (p. 33) A key figure was Paul-Henri Spaak, the foreign Minister of Belgium who presided over the first UN General Assembly in London in 1946. In Europe the restructuring of economies was on the agenda and both France and Britain nationalized basic industries. In France, Monnet became head of the *Commissariat du Plan,* a four year program for state planning and nationalization under de Gaulle's Provisional French Government.

Washington's primary concern, however, was not French-German rivalry but rather stopping Communism after Churchill's Iron Curtain speech in 1946. It was within this context that big business in the United States latched upon the "economic integration of Europe" and the Marshall Plan. The Council on Foreign Relations was funded by Rockefeller and other big American corporations. Booker and North see the Marshall Plan as an attempt at European integration which failed. It was certainly based upon strong commercial interests and in order to get support from the US Congress for aid it was necessary to raise the "threat of Communism." It was, however, a completely phony pretext,

but something that could be sold in Kansas and other cretin hinterlands of America, and so capable of flying in Washington.

After 1947, the US Central Intelligence Agency began to operate behind the scenes. Josef Retinger and Duncan Sandys, Churchill's son-in-law, went to the US to campaign for European Unity. Two of the key figures in Washington were William J. Donovan, the founder of the CIA in 1947, and Allen Dulles, the head of the CIA under President Dwight Eisenhower. John Foster Dulles, the brother of Allen, was the US Secretary of State. The Dulles brothers had joined with Coudenhove-Kalergi to set up the "Committee for a Free and United Europe." This resulted in a new organization called "The American Committee on United Europe" (ACUE), which was, in fact, a CIA front organization. It served as a conduit for CIA funds through the Ford Foundation and Rockefeller Institute. The US State Department was pushing strongly for a united Europe. In an operation which was to become standard operating procedure, CIA money was funneled to individuals, organizations working for European integration, supportive politicians, Paul-Henri Spaak, supportive trade unions, and British magazines. Among the British publications reportedly receiving CIA money were *The Economist* and *Encounter*. Between 1949 and 1960, some 4 million US dollars of CIA money was provided (1/2 to 2/3 of the total income of the organization). ACUE also involved supplying funds to anti-communist parties, among other organizations. It is well known that one of the first uses of the CIA after it was set up was to rig the Italian elections in 1948 to stop a civil war and prevent the Communists from winning. The CIA spent some $10 million on the successful election-rigging operation, supporting Alcide de Gasperi.[18]

---

[18] Purging Western European politics of communists and social democrats coincided with the purge in the United States of New Dealers in the Government who were holdovers from the Roosevelt and Truman Administrations during the 1950s. Those who had leftist ideas and believed in social welfare were targeted by the McCarthy inquisition launched by Senator Joseph McCarthy and thousands lost their jobs. This was a broadside attack upon democracy and the US social welfare state in the Eisenhower Administration. Jean Monnet had contact with all three major arenas of American power, government officials, military officers, and corporate leaders. By the late 1950s, US corporations and the US military had gained the upper hand over the US political class and their power would grow exponentially over the coming decades as the US consolidated its military economy through the Vietnam War. Taxes would be shifted from social welfare to subsidies to major corporations and the military thereby facilitating capitalist accumulation. The US working class enjoyed relatively good wages throughout the 1960s, despite the triumph of corporate bosses, but was challenged by the neoliberal onslaught as soon as serious competition began with Western Europe and Japan in the late 1960s. By the 1970s, rolling back working class gains became more pronounced and accelerated into the Reagan era of the 1980s and increasingly today. McCarthyism in the United States can be seen as a preemptive strike on democracy, from which the US working class has not yet recovered. Perhaps European integration was similarly a preemptive strike on European democracy and continues today with attempts to establish the draft European

It was the "Prague Coup" in February 1948 which provided the necessary anti-communist pretext which got the Marshall Plan through Congress. The Communists, in the form of the "communist threat," would prove their utility in greasing the wheels of European unity and integration. Washington also promoted integration through the Organization of European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) which was directed by Paul-Henri Spaak. But as an intergovernmental organization, the OEEC was of no use to Monnet. In fact, it was in his sights and he would take care of this problem later.

Another attempt at European integration was the Council of Europe which emerged from a Congress in The Hague chaired by Winston Churchill in May 1948. It would set up a European movement to "break down national sovereignty by concrete practical action in the political and economic spheres." (p. 42) It failed because the British would not go along. Moreover, in the view of Monnet, these efforts were futile in moving toward European integration. It was at this time that he would seize upon the opportunity to set up a genuine supranational authority.

The chance came in the Spring of 1950 over the dispute in the Ruhr involving the coal and steel industry. France sought to control the Ruhr through the 'International Ruhr Authority." The United States had threatened to impose a solution at a foreign minister's meeting in London. Monnet took the opportunity to revive the old idea from the 1920s and set up a supranational authority which would involve several countries. It would be the "first step of a European Federation" but Booker and North argue that the actual supranational purpose was concealed. Monnet did not want to frighten the governments about a loss of sovereignty.

In the event, Monnet succeeded in getting Robert Schuman, the French Foreign Minister, to present the plan to Dean Acheson, the US Secretary of State. In this way Schuman, who did not have a plan, got off the hook and it became known as the Schuman Plan. In May 1950, "Europe Day," Schuman made a radio broadcast announcing the plan. There would be a "common high authority" for the production of steel, but nobody knew what "The Schuman Declaration" was all about, not even Schuman, himself. That is, no one knew except Jean Monnet, who was the actual author of the plan. The British had received only a summary of the plan before the broadcast and opposed the supranational element. German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer accepted the plan as a way to bring some control to Germany.

Constitutional Treaty. In Europe more safeguards were built into the system than in the US, to be sure, but today, neoliberalism is making serious inroads into the erosion of social welfare. C. Wright Mills was perceptive in his analysis of the US "power elite" in the 1950s. C. Wright Mills, *The Power Elite*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1959, Chapter 12.

For Booker and North, these facts puncture the myth about the Schuman plan. It was really Monnet's plan and Monnet was able to keep Britain out of the talks due to their opposition. When the six nations came together, Monnet represented France as Chairman, even though he was not even a member of the French Government. It was Monnet who managed to ensure that the "Authority" remained supreme and that nation-states could not interfere with decisions of the Authority. On April 18, 1951, The Treaty of Paris created the European Coal and Steel Community. It was ratified in December 1951 with Monnet as President in Luxembourg. In the view of Monnet, it was "the first government of Europe."

In the official "hagiography" of the European union, which was to emerge, it was not Jean Monnet, however, but Robert Schuman who would be seen as the "Father of Europe." Arthur Salter's exact institutional model from the League of Nations was to be put into place later in the European Community and the European Union. The mythology, however, portrayed the European Union as having emerged from the years after 1945. It was also claimed that it had put an end to European wars and that it was a "progressive creation of the modern world" rather than a "failed dream of the 1920s." (p. 58) It has also been claimed that Britain could have made the plan more intergovernmental. For Booker and North the "true genesis" was not in the script. It was carried out through the subterfuge of Monnet who achieved success only by "cloaking the project in deceit." (p. 60)

This was a tricky business. It was easy for Monnet to go too far too fast and threaten the whole project, if not careful. Indeed, one could argue that this has been an aspect of the entire process of "integration," even up to and embracing the efforts to railroad the Draft European Constitution in 2005. The EU is again gearing up for a new push with appropriate altered window dressing to sell the Draft Constitution to the public. The effort is not dead; it has simply become more devious.

Early on, Monnet experienced failure with the plan for a European Defense Community (EDC). Rene Pleven, the French Prime Minister, had been Monnet's assistant when he was a merchant banker. The proposal, which predictably became known as the Pleven Plan, became bogged down. France refused to pass the EDC due to the dispute over nuclear policy, leading to the demise of the Antoine Pinay Government.

In a similar manner, Monnet persuaded Paul-Henri Spaak to propose the European Political Community (EPC). It was conceived to be a community based upon supranational authority and promulgated under the unpalatable name: "Draft Treaty Embodying the Statute of

the European Community." It was, in fact, a draft constitution. When efforts toward the EPC died, along with the EDC, "the project went underground." (p. 66) The words "High Authority" and "supranational" vanished and Jean Monnet resigned from the ECSC in 1954. He then turned his attention to the Euratom project, including energy and transport, in an effort to re-launch the "European Idea." Paul-Henri Spaak would be the front man for Monnet but the supranational thrust of the program would now be concealed as economic integration only.

Subsequently, Monnet largely retired into the background to pull strings from the sidelines. In 1955, Spaak and Monnet prepared a "Benelux Memorandum" which involved drafting a treaty for a common market. In Messina, discussions were held, with Monnet out of sight and lurking in the shadows. The French, under high tariffs, wished to bury the proposal. Spaak as Chairman made a deal with Piney, the French Foreign Minister, that a committee would be set up to proceed. In the end, with Monnet orchestrating events from outside, the Messina Communique produced mainly indecipherable double talk.

With this setback, Monnet fell back upon the US, setting up the "Action Committee for the United States of Europe" in late 1955. Funding came from the Ford Foundation and, in the view of Booker and North, probably the American CIA, as noted above. What Monnet desired to do was to eliminate British influence in the direction of inergovernmentalism, which threatened to derail his plans for supranational integration. Britain wished to work under OEEC toward intergovernmental arrangements; Monnet saw no hope in the organization and began to scheme behind the scenes to eliminate it. Britain withdrew its support for the common market. Monnet also refused to budge on keeping Euratom away from intergovernmentalism. He was able to get US President Eisenhower to back supranationalism and release 20 tons of enriched uranium to Euratom in 1956. When the Spaak Committee published a report on Euratom and the Common Market, the word "supranationalism" was left out and "High Authority" was replaced by "Commission."

At this point, the British determined to sabotage the common market project, a strategy which would badly backfire. Britain opted for the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) but the Euratom and Common Market Treaties were established and the Treaty of Rome signed in March 1957 to bring in the Common Market.

When Walter Hallstein became the first President of the European Commission, a staff for the Council of Ministers was created known as The Committee of Permanent Representatives (COREPER). It would prepare the work of the councils. In fact, it often essentially prepared

the decisions as well. Monnet was engaged in working on a monetary union, the purpose of which was political integration rather than economic. He believed that it could accomplish significant political integration in Europe within five years. Monnet also wanted to solve the problem of Britain.

Monnet had already decided that the OEEC, as an intergovernmental threat, must be crushed. While the six Western European countries, France, Italy, Germany and the Benelux countries, had entered the Common Market, EFTA functioned for the outer seven, Great Britain, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Austria, Portugal and Switzerland. He began by having Hallstein draft a paper stating that there would be no association with the Free Trade Association.

Monnet's plan involved a scheme to "reform" the OEEC, which in practice meant neutralizing or abolishing it. He would do this with the help of the Americans. In Washington, he saw Douglas Dillon, who was Under-Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, along with President Eisenhower. In London, he saw John Tuthill, who was US Ambassador to the UK. In order to weaken Britain's influence, he suggested that the United States and Canada should become members of the organization. When the US and Canada agreed to join, Monnet presented Tuthill with a plan to replace the OEEC with the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). This plan succeeded with the help of the Americans, killing the OEEC and marginalizing Britain. Under Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, Britain would have little choice except to move toward joining the European Community.

After reviewing the above history, Booker and North concentrate upon analyzing the relationship between Britain and the European Community and later the European Union. They emphasize the deception within the community itself, as to its underlying aim of supranationalism, and how British leaders and officials came to participate in this deceit in misleading the British people to believe that joining the Community was primarily an economic and trade proposition. According to Booker and North, British officials were aware that they were misleading the people, while, at the same time, they themselves were often unrealistic about the amount of influence Britain could have upon the agendas of other nations in the Community, such as France and Germany.

When President John Kennedy took office in the United States in 1961, there was strong support for British membership in the Community from the United States. George Ball had been chosen as Under Secretary of State, in part, because he favored greater political

integration in Europe. Ball and Monnet were close friends and Monnet could influence Kennedy through Ball. At this point, Monnet favored British membership to help balance the strong nationalism of Charles de Gaulle. For Ball, the Community was more than a technical organization; it should involve political integration. The influence was from Monnet to Ball and Kennedy and then to Macmillan who now made a major push for British membership. The British Cabinet would be given the impression that British membership was inevitable.

The major problem to be confronted from the British perspective was how to present the deal to the British public, that is, how to convince the people that the social adjustments in Britain would not be significant. British officials decided that they must stay "as quiet as possible" (p. 101) about the political objectives. The supranational elements would remain concealed. Membership would be presented as primarily a matter of economics with rich benefits of which Britain could not afford to lose. Stressing increased trade, jobs and greater prosperity was part of the central strategy of deception going back to 1956 when Jean Monnet was forced to go underground in terms of his supranational objectives. Engineering the deal to bring in the British to help curb the intergovernamentalism of de Gaulle was seen as a triumph for Monnet.

Booker and North are at pains to correct the general misperception in most histories of the European Union as to why the French opposed British membership. They argue persuasively that the root reason had to do with the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), and not tense personal relations between British and French leaders. The French needed the revenues from the agricultural program to subsidize French peasants and keep them on the land, but until the details were worked out, British membership would militate against French interests. Therefore, the British had to be kept out of the Community until the CAP was in place. Once this had been accomplished, the situation would be different and the French would then have an interest in bringing the British in to provide a large portion of the huge subsidies needed to keep French peasants out of the cities. This was to be a central plank of French foreign policy, according to Booker and North.

On 26 September 1961, Britain's application for membership was formally accepted. The two French vetoes followed, the first in 1963 and the second in 1967. It was not until 1969 that the French under Georges Pompidou changed and agreed to support British membership. This was said to be due to the friendly personal chemistry between Pompidou and British Prime Minister Edward Heath. According to Booker and North, however, most historians have overlooked the key, the central

underlying reason for the seeming shift in French policy. In fact the personal views of Heath and Pompidou were largely irrelevant. Once the CAP guidelines had been settled, it was in French interest to allow the British into the Community. There was no shift at all in French policy.

Booker and North discuss the conditions for membership as conceived by Monnet, revealing his supranational proclivities. For Monnet, an entering country could never change the rules in negotiations. Countries can give up powers or "competences" to the European Authority, but not the other way around. The "most sacred possession" of the Community is the "acquis communautaire." This is an "inalienable possession" of the Community, and is "non-negotiable." It is the "sum of the accumulated laws and treaties acquired over the years." (p. 103) Entry countries may be given a "temporary derogation" but eventually they must comply with established law.

In terms of British entry, the most fundamental problem was the relationship with the Commonwealth and the EFTA. The "Imperial Preference System" had been in place for some sixty years to regulate British relations with former colonies. Some 43 percent of British exports were to the Commonwealth, only about 17 percent to the Common Market, and 13 percent to EFTA. While EC countries would be able to export freely to Britain, tariffs would have to be raised sharply on goods from the Commonwealth. This presented a hard blow to many countries in the Commonwealth but not many concessions were forthcoming from Brussels. (p. 105)

Nevertheless, Macmillan hoped that Britain could have significant influence in the Community in pushing for greater intergovernmentalism and was encouraged by de Gaulle's concept of "Europe des Etats" which perceived integration along intergovernmental lines. There was a dispute between France and Germany as de Gaulle attempted to weaken the Commission and Germany refused. Nevertheless, the Berlin Wall Crisis in August 1961 brought Germany and France closer and neither country trusted the US over the Berlin Crisis.

In the view of Booker and North, however, the British simply did not understand what was happening and generally ended up with the worst end of the deal. At root, the problem involved the Common Agricultural Policy. As British negotiations proceeded, agriculture made up 25 percent of French employment, while in the UK it was only 4 percent. As noted above, the French were primarily worried about the political impact of a large influx of French peasants into French cities, putting pressure on jobs and housing. The great bulk of French farms were small, inefficient, peasant holdings. At root, the French feared a

radical revolution, with the French peasants losing their conservative orientation and becoming a radical urban element which would destabilize French politics. It was necessary to keep the French peasants on the land. But while politically necessary, the system was not sustainable with 200,000 tons of surplus butter produced, along with vast amounts of wheat, sugar, wine and powdered milk, which was sometimes dumped in third world countries.

In 1962 de Gaulle claimed that "we will have another Algeria on our own soil" if the agricultural problem cannot be solved. The French needed new export markets, but most of all they needed a new source of finance for the peasants. In fact, the CAP favored the French as imports were minimal, unlike in Britain. This meant that most of the funds would come from Britain, if arrangements could be put in place before the British had a chance to protect their interests. Since the decisions on CAP were to be made through Qualified Majority Voting (QMV) the British would have been able to block the proposals and had to be kept out until CAP was in place. Booker and North believe that Macmillan did not understand this and was confused as to why de Gaulle was so opposed to British membership.

The press supported British entry and portrayed those opposed as backward, "a stuffy, tradition bound, class ridden, obsolete Britain, lost in official nostalgia for the empire." (p. 113) Macmillan was portrayed as backward as well, as de Gaulle vetoed British entry on January 14, 1963. French President de Gaulle accused Britain of trying to wreck the Common Market from the inside, particularly on agriculture.

While the European bureaucracy was being put into place, the Berlaymont Building, Europe's own crystal palace, was being prepared for some 180,000 square meters of office space, and 3000 European Community officials by 1967. US President Kennedy had been assassinated in 1963 and the Kennedy Round of trade talks had started.

Booker and North note that European integration proceeded by "the Monnet method" by gradually extending "competences" over more and more areas of economic and social activity. As this creeping centralization proceeded, the member states were losing more and more right to make their own laws. The real purpose behind integration was centralization of political power. Under the Treaty of Rome, there were three types of law: first, "directive" law; second, "regulation" as issued; and third, "decision," directed to a specific situation industry, or country. The court of Justice affirmed that these laws were "supreme." Indeed, one is reminded of the growing power of the Federal Government in the United States in the nineteenth century, as the US Supreme Court upheld more powers of the

central government over the states as time went along. Decision making would be removed further and further from the people.

In a series of famous cases, the European Court ruled that "the member states have limited their sovereign rights" and said that this is "a permanent limitation on their sovereign rights." For Booker and North, it was equivalent to a "coup d'etat." (p. 123)

By 1969, the Common Agricultural Policy had been finalized. It would be funded by import levees from outside the EU and a percentage of the Value Added Tax (VAT).

Booker and North argue that the transition from de Gaulle to Pompidou, with de Gaulle's resignation in 1969, had made no difference. It was simply that for the French, CAP had to come first. British officials would find themselves caught up in the maelstrom as the European dervishes in Brussels whirled ever more wildly into the abyss seeking the nirvana of the single market, greater economic, political "integration" and the European super-state.

In June of 1970, when Edward Heath became the Prime Minister of Britain, only 15 percent of British voters wanted to join the European Union. Nevertheless, the Government was determined to go through with it. Negotiations began and there were some 13,000 pages of *acquis communautaire* with which British law would have to comply. Negotiation is hardly the right word for these proceedings. As noted above, joining states can really change nothing and must eventually accept existing law. Rather it was a process of "swallow it whole, and swallow it now" which British officials came to see was the required "negotiating policy." (p. 134) The term "negotiation," applied to this process, appears to be yet another part of the deceit designed to fool the public into thinking that indeed states have some sovereign voice in the process.

Booker and North reveal how British officials continued to pull the wool over the eyes of the British public about what was really going on in the accession process. At stake, particularly, were the British contribution to the European Union budget, the difficulties due to relations with the Commonwealth, the fisheries policy, and the role of Sterling as a world reserve currency.

On May 20, 1970, the Werner Committee published a report on the single currency. This project, the report made clear, would constitute a huge leap forward in political integration. It had been, in fact, Jean Monnet's purpose in launching the project.[19] The British Foreign Office

[19] The larger role of the bankers and money in general in European integration seems largely unexplored, yet the financial community in the US and Europe stood to gain exponentially and

clearly realized the implications of the Werner Report, namely that economic sovereignty would be lost and that this could not be reversed. The British people, on the other hand, were given to believe that entering the European Union was little more than a trading arrangement. Following in the wake of Werner, the Davignon Report appeared on political unification. It was radically integrationist, proposing a single European foreign policy. The two reports, however, went almost unnoticed in Britain. In fact, Prime Minister Heath had secretly agreed to a common currency, but this was kept secret from the public.

It was obvious to British officials on the inside that the cost to Britain of entry would be extremely high and their worry in July 1971 was how to sell membership to the British public. The answer was that it would be done through massive deceit. The British were promised that they would be better off and that there would be no loss of sovereignty. There was no talk of "supranational" arrangements and the public was led to believe that the British fishing industry could be protected. In fact, the fishing issue became a major scandal, the full extent of which

---

had a natural spokesman in Monnet, himself an investment banker. In general, banks, and the financial community, gain with the control of money. In relation to the expansion for social welfare for the under-classes, their interests lie in policies which impede rapid economic expansion and are consequently anti-democratic. Historic strikes against democracy by the corporate class in America can be seen first in Chief Justice John Marshall's ruling that a chartered corporation possesses "immortality" and "individuality" and is "like one immortal being..." Granting business corporations the rights of individuals under the Bill of Rights and Amendments to the US Constitution would provide great immunity from regulation by the political elite for US banks and other corportions. See Dartmouth College v. Woodward (1819) A second devastating strike against democracy in the US came with the Federal Reserve Act of 1913. With the stroke of a pen, President Woodrow Wilson effectively privatized a key function of the US Government. The Federal Reserve (the central bank of the US) came to be privately owned by the largest banks of Europe and North America with the power to print dollars, including the Rockefellers (Chase Manhattan Bank). It was Senator Nelson Aldrich, maternal grandfather to the Rockefellers who pushed the Act through Congress. This placed in the hands of the bankers vast powers of rule over the US and indeed the world after World War II. Some argue that this law is unconstitutional, since the US Constitution gives Congress the power to coin money. It was a "fine Christmas present" as one US governor put it. Wilson later stated that by signing the bill on Dec. 23, 1913, "I have unwittingly ruined my country." The bankers were given a virtual monopoly on US economic policy and would reap hundreds of billions of dollars of interest from US taxpayers on the national debt. Yet it was done almost secretly during the Christmas recess and not even the President realized the implications. With the post-war Bretton Woods system, this would make the Marshall Plan and European integration inordinately profitable for the banking community on both sides of the Atlantic. Noted above was the close connection between the Council on Foreign Relations, controlled by the Rockefellers, and Jean Monnet. Today, the Euro creates, objectively, a strike against democracy, in that it effectively prevents a rapid democratic expansion of the economy and so represents a triumph for the bankers. European integration, as carried out by Jean Monnet, can be seen as a form of class struggle from above by the bankers against the working class. This contradiction is clearly reflected today in the struggle to establish the Constitutional Treaty seen as furthering the necessary political integration to sustain the viability of the Euro. See Fred L. Block, *The Origins of International Economic Disorder*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1978.

was not to be revealed for 30 years, because it was so embarrassing. Britain, Ireland, Norway, and Denmark, possessed the best conserved fishing waters in Europe, containing 90 percent of Europe's fish. About 80 percent belonged to Britain. European officials were looking for a way for all ten member countries to get access to these waters. When nothing could be found in the treaty allowing this, according to Booker and North, they simply drafted a new regulation to allow equal access to all. This happened on the same day that the four candidates turned in their applications for membership. The argument that Article 38 of the treaty was a legitimate legal basis for the common fisheries policy was simply a "canard." The result was not only economic ruination to the British fishing industry, but resulted in a major ecological disaster. This was a stark example of how British fishermen found themselves stripped of their democratic rights as the Brussels juggernaut rolled on.

But the British Government launched its campaign to sell the EU to the public and Parliament, while the public was essentially being lied to about the fisheries policy. The bill was voted through Parliament even before the members had been given a chance to read the full text. It was a fast-track mechanism, performed through an "enabling act," which simply turned over to the ministers the right to enact law with no parliamentary debate. As noted by Booker and North, the Parliament was about to lose its supremacy. The measure passed 309 to 301. In the words of Tony Benn, "[i]t was a coup d'état by a political class who did not believe in popular sovereignty." (p. 157) The same devious tricks have been seen across the Atlantic, in recent years, in the railroading through of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and subsequent efforts to expand this treaty to other countries. It proved a disaster for labor, as predicted. In fact, the reform of British laws represented a great stripping of democracy from the people. Both business and labor suffered and dozens of examples are cited by Booker and North.

Booker and North see the British as being hoodwinked by the Europeans every step of the way. Things were going against British interests very badly. In addition to the ruination of the British fishing industry, they also lost out on the regional development fund policy which would have helped British industries at the time. In 1973, Jean Monnet announced his plan for a provisional European government, The European Council, with an elected assembly, and summits twice a year. Monnet then retired.

Harold Wilson, returning as Prime Minister for a second time, promised to renegotiate the European Union deal, but the "renegotiations" turned out to be a farce. The British stayed in, but Booker and North argue

that if they had known what they were getting into they would not have voted to stay in the Union.

Booker and North proceed to trace the long struggle of Margaret Thatcher to reduce the disproportionate British monetary contribution to the European Union. The Maastricht Treaty negotiation in 1991 was another struggle in which Booker and North see the British as losing. John Major was in political trouble at home because so many Conservatives in Britain had turned against the EU. At the exact time when the Soviet Union ceased to exist, the "Treaty on European Union" was about to be launched. While Major rejected major planks of the Treaty, such as a common foreign and defense policy, the social chapter, and the single currency, Maastricht was to vastly expand the areas under the control of the Commission. Parliament would have less work to do and the people would have fewer democratic rights with most of their laws made outside the country. Britain too had lost its soul to the crystal cathedral in Brussels.

Establishing the "single market" required issuing 1368 EC directives to harmonize the laws governing economic activity. Hundreds of laws would rain down upon countries, drafted by civil servants and merely nodded through parliaments with no debate. And yet they called this democracy. Ironically, the mass of laws and directives could not achieve their objectives. The single market produced the greatest regulation on trade in history. CAP reform did not reduce production, but rather resulted in ever greater surpluses of food at greater costs. The Common Fisheries Policy, to preserve fish stocks, resulted in an ecological catastrophe. The single market did not produce economic growth as the economy expanded at only 1.67 percent in the first four years of Maastricht. Unemployment stood at 10.9 percent with 20 million jobless, giving Europe the worst record of any developed economy.

Booker and North are unhappy about this from a right-wing perspective, arguing that the British economy would have been doing much better if not hamstrung by the mass of directives flooding down from Brussels. The authors give many cases where absurd directives forced businesses to close because of the inordinate cost of meeting the rules. But it was not just businesses which lost the possibility of controlling their own affairs. Labor was also unhappy and would soon face competition from new member countries from Eastern Europe.

Booker and North claim to have busted the myth of the European Union, namely that it came about as a modern invention to prevent war and usher in a new and democratic era of peace in Europe. They show that what Arthur Salter and Jean Monnet contributed to the organization

was not democracy, but rather a supranational government which would rule, not with the democratic approval of the people, but in spite of them. Monnet's hatred of intergovernmentalism led him to use stealth to set up an essentially supreme organization which would be run by bureaucrats from the top and protect European elites from genuine democracy.

The Monnet method has been described as "engrenage" or "gearing." It extended the underlying agenda of extending supranational power. After each step, it geared up for the next. This gearing goes on today with the attempt to clamp a neoliberal constitution upon the people of Europe, which they have already rejected in significant degree.[20] The gearing and deception continues. Today, the integrationist project has become a neoliberal vanguard party with the determination to lead the European people by the nose and impose upon them whatever capital requires from above. In this, the elites of Europe shamelessly feel no qualms. In their version of "democracy," the people will be told when they have voted right or wrong and when they are out of line. If they make the wrong decision at the polls, as with the draft European constitution, they will be required to do it over again. In fact, they have relegated voting and democracy to just an empty cosmetic exercise. The real decisions will be made by the elites in the interests of neoliberal capital and this will be hailed as a glorious movement forward in the interests of European integration. But still they will not be satisfied. They will gear up for further inroads into the stripping of the nations and peoples of Europe of their democratic heritage and the establishment of uniform cretinism which strips the nations and peoples of Europe of their creative soul. They not only preempt democracy, they prevent it. Europe marches on under its glorious banner of social engineering, part farce, and truly madness.

Booker and North argue that when Europeans began to wake up to reality, they realized it was a Europe that people could not live with. Like the grand schemes of Le Corbusier's tower blocks, Jean Monnet's technocratic bureaucracies had stripped the people of the nation-state, democracy, and the power of states to govern themselves, leaving behind devastation, the "soulless inhumanity of the utopian dream." (p. 454) People missed the old Europe, with its "warmth and vitality" which had been taken away from them.

Conclusion

The European project was a subterfuge, advanced by stealth, in the perpetual deceit manufactured by the elites. It has constituted a continent-wide "manufacture of consent," European-style. The

---

20 Girdner, "A Spectre Haunting Europe", p. 64-85.

architects started with coal and steel and kept chiseling off more and more of the economy and politics to place under central rule over the years. These social engineers have still not satisfied their lust for power behind their democratic pretense. Today many of those steeped in the orthodox history of the European Union are unwilling to consider the possibility that they have been misled and to what extent the emerging super-state in Brussels resembles the other historical example of political centralization in Eastern Europe. The centralization of power in Brussels, Leninist in form, has removed political questions from the public and placed them in the hands of unknown technocrats to decide. Indeed, this is the super-state which alarmed British Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, in her Bruges speech. Today ever more voices are warning that every new "treaty" which further centralizes power is another nail in the coffin of European democracy: more freedom for capital, not for the people. Those who believe otherwise need but read this book which abounds with examples, from the losses of British fishermen, farmers, businessmen and ordinary citizens. The same is true of labor, which Booker and North do not emphasize sufficiently. The people are being ruled more and more by laws made outside their own country. They are losing more and more of their power which has been won over the historical struggle for democracy.

Europe has today lost its soul. The fault does not lie in its utopian heritage. Indeed utopian ideals are crucial for social and human advance. Rather, the humanitarian utopian vision of the nineteenth century was turned inside out and metamorphosed into a monstrous apparatus for fettering toiling humanity to the chains of neoliberal capitalist accumulation on a continent-wide scale. Capital was now the golden calf and the heritage of old Europe was to be sacrificed at the alter of the single market. New nations would be sucked into this menacing vortex to feed the insatiable appetite of the integrationist Leviathan as the malignant dystopia continued to spin its deceptive web.

This revisionist history, written by Booker and North, deserves to be read and taken seriously. Indeed, it serves as a warning to candidate countries and their peoples that they ignore the tragic lesson here at their critical peril. As Booker and North write, "Sooner perhaps rather than later, the fantasy of the great 'European Project' would crumble into reality: destroyed by all those contradictions which in its mad ambition it had failed to foresee and which it could never have hoped to resolve." (p. 454) This book should be read by every policy maker and every student of European affairs in the whole of Europe and prospective membership countries.

Bibliography

Amin, Samir, *The Liberal Virus: Permanent War and the Americanization of the World*, New York, Monthly Review Press, 2004.

Amin, Samir, "U.S. Imperialism, Europe, and the Middle East," Monthly Review, Vol. 56, No 6, November 2004, p. 13-33.

Bellamy, Edward, *Looking Backward: 2000-1887*, New York, New American Library, 1960. (First published in 1888.)

Block, Fred L., *The Origins of International Economic Disorder*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1978.

Blum, William, *Rogue State: A Guide to the World's Only Superpower*, 3rd ed., Common Courage Press, 2005.

Blum, William, *Killing Hope: U.S. Military and CIA Interventions Since World War II*, Common Courage Press, 2003.

Booker, Christopher and Richard North, *The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union*, London, Continuum, 2005.

Brinkley, Douglas and Clifford Hackett, *Jean Monnet: The Path to European Unity*, New York, St. Martins, 1991.

Chomsky, Noam, *Necessary Illusions: Thought Control in Democratic Societies*, Boston, South End Press, 1989.

Chomsky, Noam, *World Orders Old and New*, New York, Columbia Univ. Press, 1996.

Denman, Roy, *Missed Chances- Britain and Europe in the Twentieth Century*, London, Cassel, 1998.

Girdner, Eddie J., "A Spectre Haunting Europe: The European constitution, the Budget Crisis, and the Limits of Neoliberal Integration", *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, Vol. 2, No 7, Fall 2005.

Horowitz, David, *From Yalta to Vienna: American Foreign Policy in the Cold War*, Middlesex, England, Penguin Books, 1967.

Laughland, John, *The Tainted Source-The Undemocratic Origins of the European Idea*, London, Warner Books, 1997.

Lippmann, Walter, *The Public Philosophy*, New York, Mentor, 1955.

Mannheim, Karl. *Ideology and Utopia*, New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1936.

Mills, C. Wright, *The Power Elite*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Moravcsik, Andrew, *The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power From Messina to Maastricht*, Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press, 1998.

Walters, Kerry S., *The Sane Society Ideal In Modern Utopianism*, Lewiston, N.Y., Edwin Mellon Press, 1989.

Young, Hugo, *This Blessed Plot- Britain and Europe, From Churchill to Blair*, London, Routledge, 1998.