

The Fraud of the ‘Simplified European Treaty’: No to British Supremacy!

by Jacques Cheminade

Editor’s note: *The simplified European Reform Treaty, agreed upon by European Union heads of state at the Lisbon summit Oct. 18-19 is essentially a remake of the European Constitutional Treaty, which was soundly rejected in referendums by 55% of the French population in May 2005, and 61.5% of the Dutch population a couple of weeks later. This new treaty would outlaw any Franklin Roosevelt-style approach to the onrushing financial collapse and depression. Since it bans Hamiltonian generation of productive state credit, building the Eurasian Land-Bridge would be impossible. At least 50 new powers (involving energy, justice, police, immigration, asylum, foreign policy) are taken out of the hands of nation-states and transferred to the EU.*

The posts of High Representative and European Commissioner for External Relations are to be merged into a High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and a single European diplomatic service will be created, bypassing member-states. The highly unpopular provision on free and fair competition was carefully avoided in the main body of the treaty, by the trick of creating a “competition protocol” that includes the exact same highly disputed formulation contained in the previous European Constitution Treaty.

Europe’s leaders hope to ram the treaty through, without national debate, after they sign it on Dec. 13.

The following statement was issued on Oct. 29 by Jacques Cheminade, who is the president of the Solidarity and Progress party in France.

The simplified European Treaty, negotiated in Lisbon, Portugal on Oct. 18 and 19, is a political fraud, aimed at forcing the French people to submit, by parliamentary ratification, to a treaty, which they had previously rejected by referendum on May 29, 2005. As such, it is not only an instrument to block any other policy—that of a Europe of the Fatherlands,* and the projects that we uphold—but it confirms and extends the paralysis of national sovereignty instituted by the European Union’s Maastricht Treaty and the ensuing Stability Pact. Adopting this treaty means making nearly

* Gen. Charles de Gaulle’s term for a Europe of sovereign nation-states, unified by common interests.

impossible a great Eurasian policy such as that of our Eurasian Land-Bridge—since its adoption would outlaw any form of public productive credit generation, beyond taxes and debt, necessary for a policy of great infrastructure development. The policy [for infrastructure development] advocated by Jacques Delors [in 1993-94] failed due to lack of financing; the choice made today is to continue to favor monetarism, short-term financial profit, and the social austerity of the European Central Bank, at the expense of real capital investment in infrastructure and industrial production. Therefore, we say “no” to this treaty, and we will campaign against it, not only for what it institutes, but especially for what it prohibits.

The ‘No’ Vote of 2005 Disregarded

Most European experts, such as Daniel Gros and Stefano Micossi of the Brussels-based think tank Centre for European Policy Studies, which cannot be suspected of anti-Europeanism, assert that “most of the innovation of the 2005 European Constitutional Treaty (ECT) has been safeguarded.” Former French President Valéry Giscard d’Estaing himself estimates that the text agreed on in Lisbon contains 95% of what was in the ECT, of which he was the author. The provisions of 2005 have been reintroduced, article by article, at the initiative of German Chancellor Angela Merkel, with the support of current French President Nicolas Sarkozy, into the current treaty of the European Union and the Treaty of Rome, re-baptized “Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.” Hence, the 256 pages of the “simplified” treaty are a deadly xerox copy of university law departments.

The word “constitution” and its symbols, the mention of a European flag, the hymn, and the euro are thrown out the window, to make people believe that France has aborted the constitutional project, but the content of 2005 has been kept, with its most shocking provisions!

1. The main innovation is the naming of a president for a 30-month term, elected with a qualified majority by the heads of state. That president will have at his disposal the power to give impetus to new policies or to block them. It is revealing that the preferred candidate to occupy that position is former British Prime Minister Tony Blair.

2. The number of domains for which unanimity is no

longer mandatory or which are explicitly transferred (over 50 in total) increases (energy, justice, police, immigration, asylum, foreign policy). A systematic transfer of sovereignty, without any serious debate on the objectives of the European Union, has to be observed. A supplementary, but revealing element of the British supremacy, is the fact that the Charter of Fundamental Rights will not have to be binding upon London, and Great Britain will be able to refuse to associate with judiciary and law enforcement cooperation, i.e., maintaining its own system of judicial penalties.

3. The creation of a post of High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, designated by a qualified majority, and the creation of a diplomatic service totally opposed to the sovereignty and independence of the member-states. We're not talking here about coordination, but guardianship. To do what? To impose the policies of monetarism and fiscal austerity promoted by the European Central Bank (ECB).

4. The reduction in the number of European Commission members to two-thirds of the number of member-states, beginning in 2014 (18 members of the Commission for 27 member-states) suppresses the connection between a member-state and the Commission member, strengthening the supranational character of the Commission. It will seek a "European general interest," which is undefined, under ECB orders, markedly different from those of member-states.

5. The Court of Luxembourg will become a constitutional super-court, a "supreme court" capable of controlling the actions and decisions of the European Council, becoming formally an "institution of the Union," or, in other words, a supranational judiciary in service of monetarism, by intention or default.

6. The mention of "free and undistorted competition" was not taken up again, thanks to the intervention of Sarkozy. However, this is once again a cosmetic measure. Added to the treaty, a "competition protocol" was created that includes the words from Article 3(1)(g) of the ETC in favor of "a system ensuring that competition in the internal market is not distorted."

7. Concerning the environment, the "fight against climate change" becomes a new competence of the EU, taken out of the hands of member-states. This comes down to creating a lever to block growth, especially since the relations between [European Commission President José Manuel] Barroso and Mr. [Al] Gore have become closer and closer.

An Unacceptable Method

The method used to push through this fraud is as unacceptable as its content. The text has been cooked up by experts, far from any serious debate on its objectives among citizens, with the explicit marching orders to avoid referenda and to push it through at great speed. This way of proceeding reveals the treaty's very nature: It is a weapon

against the people and the fatherlands. "The problem, in this matter, is that avoiding referenda is part of the process aimed at cheating the citizen," wrote the Portuguese daily *Público*.

Sarkozy tries to make us believe that he has brushed aside the dangers and offered some answers to the worries of those who voted "no" in 2005. But as we have seen, free and undistorted competition comes back through the chimney after having been thrown out of the window, and the ECB retains all its powers to harm.

In respect to the ECB, as soon as [former Socialist Party candidate for President] Ségolène Royal protested against its policy, François Hollande and the "elephants" of the Socialist Party started blowing their trumpets. The Socialist Party is divided and incapable of putting together a coherent opposition....

The rest of the Socialists think that it is urgent to wait. They think that after the municipal elections, Sarkozy will launch his great austerity program, just before France takes over the Presidency of the EU on July 1. For them, that will be the time to start mobilizing ... when it will be too late. In the meantime, they call for abstention, except for Jean-Luc Melançon, who doesn't like our Solidarité et Progrès party, for reasons of his class consciousness, but who, on this subject, has more courage than his comrades. Henry Weber, the very mundane and Fabiusian European deputy who perfectly incarnates the mindset of this amputated left, screams, "Let's be Mitterrandian!" meaning: Let's abstain, like [former President François] Mitterrand had called people to do in the 1972 referendum on the entry of the U.K. into the European Economic Community. That is revealing, since it was by this Mitterrandian reservation, supporting the Pompidolian opportunism of the day, that Great Britain got the power to deconstruct Europe by orienting it toward self-destructive financial priorities, while keeping for itself the right to escape that which others inflicted upon themselves. Britain has always kept the pound sterling, without adopting the euro or the ECB.

It is clear that we have to say "no" to this tomfoolery, a tomfoolery far worse today than that of 1972, because we are plunged into a decisive crisis for humanity. Hence our party presents the alternative—because without it, opposition would lack meaning—a Europe of the Fatherlands and of the projects, against the powers of financial blackmail of financial fascism, a Europe that is building itself not by money but by great projects, by "reinforced cooperation" among member-states and by great cultural ambition. It has a Eurasian dimension, reaching from the Atlantic Ocean to the China Sea, without which the "European space" is insufficient. To achieve this, we have to unbolt the lock of Maastricht, and not reinforce it. We say so, we repeat it, and we will show what policy should be applied capable to overcome the financial crash. Without that policy, all the rest, including the simplified European Treaty, is meaningless.