

Can the Economic and Financial Core of Europe get out of the Anglosphere's Orbit?

Jacques Huynen

Brussels, Belgium

August 2023

Is there a way for Old Europe – the Six founding countries and those in South and South Eastern Europe they could entice – to get out its vassalage to the Anglosphere?

The last decade for Europe was marked by the following: the US State Department initiated coup against neutrality inclined Ukrainian President Ianoukovytch in 2014; Brexit; Trump's hostile attitude towards the EU; the Russian invasion of Ukraine; the ensuing application of two more Scandinavian countries – Finland and Sweden – to NATO membership; and finally the attack on the Baltic Sea German-Russian pipelines. Over that period, clues and indices accumulated of a concerted attempt at sapping the industrial and financial core of the EU: the Six founders of the EEC and most notably France and Germany – the so called "Old Europe" of Cheney, Rumsfeld, G.W.'Bush, and the Kagan Clan. The neocons had been resenting Old Europe for having seen through the mother of all fake news about Saddam Hussein's WMD, and for not following them in Iraq. That was in 2003. In addition to that, they were wary of seeing the euro becoming a credible challenge to the dollar.

The success of the EU was based on its getting cheap energy from Russia and Central Asia, and from about 2010, on its developing trade with China through the new Silk Road. In order to sap any further progress in the economic and political integration of the continent, they levered the anti-Russian paranoia of the Baltic countries formerly part of the USSR, and the vengefulness of historically hostile Poland. Polish hostility, by the way, is not only directed towards Russia but also towards the "decadent" West, and first of all recently westernized Germany.

I cannot keep from telling an anecdote from the time I was teaching French in Milwaukee in the late eighties. As I was avowing to one of my local American friends that I was going to have dinner across the Milwaukee River in the Polish neighborhood, he asked sarcastically if I needed a visa to go there. The Poles are not an easily forgiving lot. But there is something masochistic in their deeply ingrained resentment. But, strangely enough, it seems that the Poles forgave more easily the UK for the humiliation experienced by their UK resident citizens when, following Brexit, they became the first target of the Brits anti-continental fit, and had to leave the island by the thousands.

The attack on the German-Russian pipelines (Sept. 26, 2022) was secretly plotted by the Biden Administration and involved the three Scandinavian countries of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway with the technical and logistical help

of the US Navy Diving and Salvage Panama Center. The hypothesis according to which some Russian or German agents could be the culprits is not only counter-intuitive, it is squarely ridiculous, and even laughable. Masses of literature have already been published on that issue. The most convincing remains the report by Seymour Hersh, already made famous by his report on the My Lai massacre by US GIs in Vietnam, and the abuses of Iraqi prisoners by US troops in Abu Ghraib, for which he received a Pulitzer Prize. Strangely, almost all mainstream media, even the "liberal" Washington Post and New York Times, remain silent about his report on the attack on the Baltic Sea North Stream pipelines. See:

<https://seymourhersh.substack.com/p/how-america-took-out-the-nord-stream>

That the Russian invasion of Ukraine has been provoked by a long and constant pressure from NATO, dating back to at least 2008¹ is accepted by the largest part public opinion in the Global South- some 7 billion of the Earth human population - and with growing percentage of Europeans and Americans- some 700 million. That strategy of cornering Russia was first articulated in 1997 by Zbigniew Brzezinski, the Polish American former adviser of Jimmy Carter.

Progressive suspension of NATO-Russian official relations up to their final breakup on November 1st, 2021

According to *The Kennedy Beacon* "On 1 April 2014, NATO unanimously decided to suspend all practical co-operation as a response to the Russian annexation of Crimea. In October 2021, following an incident in which NATO expelled eight Russian officials from its Brussels headquarters, Russia suspended its mission to NATO and ordered the closure of the NATO office in Moscow."²

These incidents mark the 2021-2022 run-up to the war. But the deepest roots of the conflict go back much further. Jeffrey Sachs in his May 2023 "The War in Ukraine Was Provoked—and Why That Matters to Achieve Peace"³ and his July 2023 "The Real History of the War in Ukraine: A Chronology of Events and Case for Diplomacy" (*The Kennedy Beacon*, July 17, 2023)⁴ traces these roots back to the 1990s when

"Mid-1992. Bush Administration policymakers reach a secret internal consensus to expand NATO, contrary to commitments recently made to the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation.

July 8, 1997. At the Madrid NATO Summit, Poland, Hungary, and Czech Republic are invited to begin NATO accession talks.

September-October, 1997. In *Foreign Affairs* (Sept/Oct, 1997) former U.S. National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski details the timeline for NATO enlargement, with Ukraine's negotiations provisionally to begin during 2005-2010."

1 See my paper " 'Fuck the EU' ou le complot de l' Anglosphère contre l' Union européenne" on Academia.edu

2 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/NATO%E2%80%93Russia_relations

3 <https://www.jeffsachs.org/newspaper-articles/wgtgma5kj69pbpdjr4wf6aayhrsrm>

4 <https://www.jeffsachs.org/newspaper-articles/history-of-war-in-ukraine>

After 30 years, punctuated by the successive enlargement of NATO to Poland, Hungary, the Baltic States, and openings to Georgia and Ukraine, according to the same source:

“Putin’s draft US-Russia Treaty (December 17, 2021) called for a halt to NATO enlargement. Russia’s leaders put NATO enlargement as the cause of war in Russia’s National Security Council meeting on February 21, 2022. In his address to the nation that day, Putin declared NATO enlargement to be a central reason for the invasion.

Historian Geoffrey Roberts recently wrote: ‘Could war have been prevented by a Russian-Western deal that halted NATO expansion and neutralized Ukraine in return for solid guarantees of Ukrainian independence and sovereignty? Quite possibly.’ In March 2022, Russia and Ukraine reported progress towards a quick negotiated end to the war based on Ukraine’s neutrality. According to Naftali Bennett, former Prime Minister of Israel, who was a mediator, an agreement was close to being reached before the U.S., U.K., and France blocked it.

While the Biden administration declares Russia’s invasion to be unprovoked, Russia pursued diplomatic options in 2021 to avoid war, while Biden rejected diplomacy, insisting that Russia had no say whatsoever on the question of NATO enlargement. And Russia pushed diplomacy in March 2022, while the Biden team again blocked a diplomatic end to the war.⁵”

Over the months that followed the Russian attack on Kiev, Finland and Sweden, until then neutral, applied for NATO membership, joining long-term members Denmark and Norway. That made the whole of Scandinavia and the Baltic Sea region NATO territory.

Norway and Denmark had long been more open to British influence than to any continental influence, except perhaps to that of Lutheran Germany. The history of Denmark and to an extent that of the Netherlands had been linked to that of Britain from the very birth of their respective identities. The Anglo-Saxons came from the Jutland peninsula of Denmark and their migration route to England passed through the northern part of the Netherlands. They were followed by the Norse, equally from Denmark, Sweden and Norway. England all along its history kept close relationship to Denmark. The works of Shakespeare and Downland are witnesses thereof. Denmark joined the EC in 1973 at the same time as the UK and perhaps under the same deep motivations.

Indices of lasting affinities between Scandinavia and the Anglosphere remain up to our day. After Brexit, of all the EU Commissioners, the Dane Vestager was the only one to “regret British humor”. We suppose she did not refer to that of Nigel Farage, or of the British football fans’ ravaging the continent.

From the point of view of the economic and financial core of the EU – so called “Old Europe” – obstacles to the progress of the original federalist European project started with the UK and Denmark joining in 1973. The membership of Sweden in 1995 reinforced the anglophile party in the EC. Finland joined the same year introducing the first country that entertained a modicum of wariness towards Russia. When Poland and the Baltic states joined in 2004, the

5 <https://www.jeffsachs.org/newspaper-articles/wgtgma5kj69pbpdjr4wff6aayhrsxm>

Scandinavian anglophile tropism of Scandinavia combined with the ingrained russophobia of the North East of Europe. They became the main obstacle to pursuing the federalist dream. These two EU sub-regions allied to impede the deepening of any EU federal identity. They did that by repeatedly proposing the new memberships towards the East – among which were those of Turkey, Georgia, and Ukraine. These memberships were not compatible with the federal paradigm and would have been a major stumbling block in that direction.

When joining, the Baltic states and Poland saw the EU as little more than the funding and subsidies providing arm of NATO. Scandinavian countries were mainly interested in the Free Trade Area (FTA) dimension of the EU, easy access to their favorite summer holiday playgrounds, and the possibility of residence in the European South. They were the main cause of Brussels' real estate quadrupling over the last 30 years while having always been the most staunch opponents to sharing of the national debts of EU member countries (mutualization). They are now all entirely devoted to NATO, AUKUS, and QUAD weltaanschauung.

What do we, founders of the EC and the EU have in common with them? Why don't we just deal with the Scandinavians as members of the EEA and EFTA? Then let Poland and the Baltic States deal with NATO and Russia to their best interest.

What follows might probably sound to many ears as political fiction. If so, let it be!

A way out

If France wants to save what is left of the founding fathers of the EC, and the Gaullist vision of a Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, or even further to Vladivostok, Macron or his successor must retake the initiative.

France can do that by designing the main features of a European Federation and convince Germany to embark on such a project.

The founders of the EC began with economy, liberal economy, based on the principle that nations which trade with each other do not wage war on each other. According to Hélène Arhweler, it was Jean Monnet, one of the main founding fathers of the EC, who said "Si c'était à refaire, je commencerais par la culture" (If I had to do it again, I would start with culture). Considering the present context, the heirs of the founding fathers should regret not having begun with security and defense. Is it too late to propose a new version of the CDE project (Communauté Européenne de Défense) rejected by the French in 1954 and invite the willing among European countries to be part of a military alliance distinct from NATO? That military alliance would be the foundation of the Federation.

The Federation would keep the euro as its common currency. There would follow: external borders, fiscal harmonization, debt sharing (mutualisation), promotion of learning continental languages through the immersive approach, and protection of continental cultures against the English language steamroller. It is a cliché, that as we speak, we think, and that language has currently been used by colonial powers to consolidate their sway over the colonized.

Approximately twenty of the EU member countries are neither particularly

anglophile nor NATO-phile. If they were offered nuclear protection by another alliance that they trusted enough, they could be pulled out of NATO's orbit. Most of them have more or less numerically important voting minorities showing at least ambivalent attitudes towards NATO and/or the USA.

Among them are at least 5 of the signatories of the Rome Treaty: Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, perhaps the Netherlands, and possibly the following:

Greece (1981)
 Portugal, Spain (1986)
 Austria (1995)
 Cyprus, Hungary, Malta, Slovakia, Slovenia, The Czech Republic (2004)
 Bulgaria, Romania (2007)
 Croatia (2013)

That is 18 or 19 continental countries. **Of these, 4 are not members** of NATO and do not consider applying: **Austria, Cyprus, Ireland, and Malta**. See:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_Anti-NATO_parties_and_organizations

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Withdrawal_from_NATO

Summary

Belgium: PTB/PVDA: "In 2019 the party scored well in the Belgian federal elections and gained 10 seats. The party did well in Wallonia (13.8% overall there), scoring over 16% in the Liège Province, over 15% in Hainaut Province and also over 12% in Brussels-Capital Region. It achieved at least 22% of the votes in both Charleroi and La Louvière cities. Its strongest showing in Flanders was 12.71% in Antwerp city, while in Wallonia, its strongest showing was in Herstal with 27.55% of the votes. The PTB was also the fourth largest party in the European election the same day in the Francophone areas, winning 14.59% and giving it one seat. ⁶"

In October 2016 the Walloon Parliament derailed the CETA project of a Free trade agreement with Canada, a water-downed version of the TAFTA (Transatlantic Free Trade Area). See:

https://www.lemonde.fr/europe/article/2016/10/20/la-wallonie-maintient-son-opposition-au-traite-commercial-ceta-avec-le-canada_5017686_3214.html

<https://information.tv5monde.com/international/ceta-le-non-de-la-wallonie-est-une-chance-pour-la-democratie-25535>

Bulgaria: Two far-right parties, marginal but growing in 2021-2023 are anti-NATO, making up 13.58 % of the vote; they won 0.04 % at the EU election of 2019. See:

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Revival_\(Bulgarian_political_party\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Revival_(Bulgarian_political_party)))

⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Workers%27_Party_of_Belgium

<https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2023/2/6/why-some-eu-countries-still-harbour-pro-russian-sentiments>

Croatia: the Human Shield Party, refusing to be labeled right or left, calls itself 'humanist'. It got 5.7 % of the vote at the 2019 EU Parliament elections and 2.26 % at the 2020 Croatian legislative elections.

Czech Republic: The Republican Party reached 8.1% in 1996 before falling to 0.03 % in 2010 but picking up to 0.19 % in 2017. They made 0.18 % at the EU Parliament 2019 elections.

France: Of the two main challengers of Emmanuel Macron's party En Marche, which became Renaissance in 2016, Le Pen's RN has indicated their desire to exit at least the integrated command of NATO, and Mélançon's France Insoumise (FI) announced his plan to exit NATO. Together they made up 31.12 % of the vote in 2022, and 29.65 % for the EU elections of 2019.

Macron himself seemed to rejoice in the NATO crisis at the end of Trump's reign when he declared NATO "braindead".

Germany: Die Linke participates in the governments of 4 states: Berlin, Bremen, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern and Thuringia. It got 5.5% of the votes in the 2019 EU elections, went from 9.2 in 2017 to 4.9 % in the 2021 national federal elections. It **condemned both Russia, for the invasion of Ukraine in 2022, and NATO** for its "imperialism", and got 12.20 % in the votes at the Berlin länder election in 2023.

Greece: in 1974, the country withdrew from NATO military command. In 1980 the minister for foreign affairs, Konstantinos Mitsotakis, father of the present president Kyriakos Mitsotakis (ND, conservative), considered completely exiting NATO.

The Communist Party got 5.4 % of the vote in the EU elections of 2019 and 7.7 % in the parliamentary elections of 2023. Antarsya, the leftist parties grouping, got 0.64 (EU) and 0.41 (National)

Italy: With at least six NATO bases in Italy⁷ it would be difficult for the country to claim being anti -NATO, but there are also **6 anti-NATO political parties, of which 2 are leftist**. They got 1.24 % of the vote in the 2022 general elections. But, Italians can be whimsical and paradoxical, that is part of their charm. That is how the present **Prime minister Giorgia Meloni had to accommodate in her coalition Berlusconi and Salvini, notably close to Putin. She also is clearly, like the French and to a point the Germans, not a friend of the cultural influence of the Anglosphere.** Euronews (March 3, 2023) announces that:

"The right-wing party led by Italy's Prime Minister Giorgia Meloni, has pushed forward proposed **new legislation which will punish the use of English and other foreign words in official communications with fines between €5,000 and €100,000...**

Meloni's new proposed legislation takes a strong stance into this debate, pushing for a

⁷ <https://www.napolike.com/where-are-the-bases-born-in-Italy-and-the-nuclear-arsenals>

conservative approach that **intends to virtually ban English words from the public administration, schools and universities**. Under the new law, “any [university] class that isn’t specifically aimed at teaching a foreign language must be in Italian”. Courses in foreign languages will only be justified when targeted to foreign students.⁸”

See also: <https://www.courrierinternational.com/article/decryptage-pourquoi-l-italie-est-si-russophile>

In April 2021, after a **survey by the Pew Research Center, Italy was the second country after Greece with the highest percentage of their population, 36% compared to a European average of 22%, not being wary of Putin and Russia⁹**.

Meloni is also a vocal opponent of France’s African politics, particularly of the monetary aspect of it (the CAF or Central African Francs). **She also seemed not to support a US -French intervention in Niger after the coup against President Bazoum in August 2023.**

Netherlands: only Thierry Baudet, the leader of the far-right party *Forum voor democratie*, admitted privately in 2020 that he wished his country would leave NATO and pivot East.

Portugal: the Left Bloc got 9.8% of the vote in the EU 2019 elections and 4.4 % in the parliamentary elections in 2022. The Communist Party got 6.9 % in 2019 for the EU and 4.3 for Parliament in 2022.

Romania: only the far-right Noua Dreaptă party advocates exiting NATO. It is not allowed to run for Parliament. Walking with an American friend in Liège, Belgium in 2019, to my friend was stating his nationality, a Romanian street vendor, commented “nobody is perfect”.

Slovakia:

<https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2023/2/6/why-some-eu-countries-still-harbour-pro-russian-sentiments>

The Communist Party, has no definite position on NATO membership but is **part of the IMCWP (International Forum of Communist and Workers’ Parties) which denounced at their 2022 meeting in Havana the “strengthening and expansion of NATO”**.

The People’s Party (Kotleba), far-right, is **virulently anti-NATO**, as well as anti-American and anti-EU. It got 12.07 % of the vote in the EU elections in 2019, up from 1.73 in 2014. It got 7.97 % in the national legislative elections of 2020, up from 1.58 in 2012, and down from 8.04 in 2016.

Slovenia: the Slovenian National Party got 4.0% in the EU 2019 elections and

8 <https://www.euronews.com/2023/04/03/ciao-hello-no-italys-right-wing-government-wants-to-ban-english-words-with-100000-fines>

9 In 2023: <https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2023/07/10/overall-opinion-of-russia/>

1.49% in the 2022 national elections. The Left (Levica) got 6.4% in 2019 and 4.46% in 2022.

Spain: Podemos sharing power with the socialist PSOE since 2019, had in 2015 advocated withdrawing from NATO. It got 10.01 % of the vote in the 2019 EU elections and 12.86% at the Cortès elections.

Hungary: besides the **Hungarian Workers' Party**, which got 0.42 % in the EU 2019 elections and 0.16 % in the 2022 legislatures, the **Fidesz**, party of **Viktor Orban**, although not opposing NATO membership and having condemned the Russian invasion of Ukraine, refused to apply the sanctions decided by the "West". Holding power since 1998 with an interregnum from 2002 to 2010, it got 54.1 % of the vote in 2022, up from 49.3% in 2018. At the EU elections of 2019, it got 52.6% of the vote.

Among the candidates to EU membership

Montenegro: joined NATO in 2017 but all the parties that formed the coalition government in 2020 (Democratic People's Party and New Serb Democracy) declared wanting to exit NATO.

Moldova: although a candidate to EU membership, accepted as such by the EU in 2023, the anti-NATO membership **Party of Socialists of the Republic of Moldova (PSRM)** was ousted from the ruling coalition (2019-2021) despite its obtaining 27.17% of the vote.

Serbia: is a candidate to EU membership but all Serbian parties oppose NATO membership.

In such a hypothetical alliance, or federation, under the French Nuclear umbrella

1. The French nuclear force would be put under a joint European Command and would extend its protection to all members of the alliance.
2. All EU countries, as well as the countries accepted as candidates to membership, would be invited, except the countries suspected to have played a role in the blasting of the North Stream pipelines and having manifested a clear pro-NATO tropisme. These are the three Baltic countries, Denmark, Norway, Poland, and Sweden. Countries of the Balkans would also be invited provided their acceptance of the conditions below.
3. Countries applying to membership in the alliance would exit NATO, or cancel their application to NATO membership, under the auspices of the Vienna-based OSCE. NATO and the US, or other NATO member countries, would be compensated for the NATO weapons left on the territory of the alliance. All countries applying to membership would agree to contribute to the maintenance and upgrading of the European nuclear force (ENF) in proportion to their GDP.
4. The countries that are candidate to membership would close all military bases, American, Russian, Chinese or other on their territory.

5. Countries applying to membership would accept the principle of the mutualisation (sharing) of all members' national debts, joining the eurozone, and the initiation of processes toward tax harmonization.

6. The principle of non-interference in internal affairs of nations would be a cornerstone of the Federation's Security, and Foreign relations policy. The plurality of cultures and civilizations, the diverse definitions of democracy and diverse interpretations of Human Rights would be accepted. The plurality of routes to economic development and the right for each nation to choose its own route would be recognized. It would also be their right to open up to foreign investment and influence or to protect themselves, and be helped on the route chosen, without any pressure. The Federation would recognize that the hope for a unified human civilization is a long term prospect that can not be precipitated or forced. On that backdrop the Federation would lift all sanctions illegally imposed on Iran, Russia and China, mainly under pressure of the Anglosphere. Links with the neighboring Russian Federation would be re-instated under the auspices of the OSCE.

7. All political parties of member countries would have to fit in one of the 2 or 3 main groups inherited from the EU Parliament. The representatives of the new pan-European parties would compete in direct universal-suffrage elections. The winner-take-all principle would apply. The regime would be presidential. The Prime Minister would be chosen by the President in the party having won the preceding legislative election.

8. The President of the Federation would be elected every 5 years by direct universal-suffrage elections.

9. In terms of languages and cultures, the Federation could refer to the Indian model. As it is commonly accepted there is one Indian culture and civilization, despite the tens of languages and the hundreds of dialects being spoken on the territory of the Indian Republic. In the same way all member countries of the Federation would accept that there is one European civilization rooted in Middle-Eastern, Greek and Roman cultures.

10. Languages most useful for the development of trade and international relations and integration would be organized in all member countries. Among European languages English – still the *lingua franca* of the world – French, German and Spanish would be given precedence. Chinese and Russian would also be encouraged.

Indeed, French remains important for relations with Africa. German is widely used in Eastern Europe. Spanish would keep up our relations with Latin America. Chinese and Russian would keep the Federation connected with Central Asia and the new Far Eastern economic epicenters. Every European child should speak in addition to his mother tongue at least one foreign language.

10. In the fields of Civil and Family law, based on the principle of subsidiarity and on the legal concept according to which law should follow customs and social evolution of every distinct member country, marriage, abortion, filiation etc. would be left to each member nation's interpretation of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR).

*

In the absence of such an impulse from the French-German “engine”, even if the attrition war in Ukraine found a negotiated conclusion, the economical and political prospect for Western Europe, would be that of becoming a region of the Commonwealth, a vassal of the USA and a long term prisoner of their foreign policy interests, alliances and enmities in the Near East, Central Asia and the Far East. Macron’s “European autonomous strategy” concept would remain in history as the last European pipe dream.

August 23, 2023