Vive La France (if you survive the riots)—death rolls of the socialist paradise which is the EU



Michael Macneil MSc MA

Dec 10

I originally wrote this as a development of a provocative answer in response to the question commented on <u>here</u> which I thought was an excellent answer to a very contemporary question for Europe, **Is the EU the Fourth German Reich?**.

Congratulations on an excellent answer—it gets to the real nitty gritty of the real European project as enunciated by many European leaders after the 2nd world war and explicitly so by the time you get to the Maastricht treaty of 1992 (generally considered as the foundation of the modern EU committed to economic and social integration). Germany by the mid fifties had already started to re-emerge as the natural banker of Europe having rebuilt its economy almost miraculously (VWs, which I love, were already rolling off afresh in 1949 as featured in a National Geographic issue of that era) and whoever has the money, basically, rules. The intellectual inspiration for the modern European project comes more from the French Marxists of the late 1960s that almost managed to execute a revolution in 1969 but it has always been bankrolled by fellowtravelers in Germany. Germany and France have frequently demonstrated their willingness to act unilaterally and in their own interests putting one very large middle finger up to the

"institutions" of the EU when it suited their national interest, e.g. when the UK was humiliated by France and Germany over the "Mad Cow disease" (a mild infection treatable by antibiotics) in the early 2000s and Germany's continued subsidies to its coal industry contrary to EU competition rules. Be of no illusion who is in *really* in charge here—the vision is to build the USSR without the excesses but a socialist paradise nevertheless and the Franco-German axis was intended as the guiding light for the rest of Europe. It is no surprise that modern Russia is happy to build one fat gas pipeline for Germany whilst starving its own rebellious satellites of gas in the depths of winter, particularly those nasty Ukrainians.

Now let me be specific here—even our political parties that call themselves "conservatives" are basically socialist-they accept that it is the state that needs to care for its citizens from the cradle to the grave, the phrase made famous by the British socialists who came to power after the second world war; the difference is just in degree and its self-justifying axiom of righteousness is "social action" (where **what** is right is decided by those who **know** they are right and who then **make sure** we all do what is right)—who in their right mind would want to oppose that? However, as Orwell so perceptively saw in Animal *Farm* the socialist elites promised us everything and did not deliver, they keep giving themselves lots of perks, ignore the people (seen as stupid sheep in need of wise shepherds, i.e. them) and the results are the riots we see in France which may well spill across the channel to the UK if Brexit goes anymore wrong. As a Brit, if our same openly socialist politicians seek to rob our people of their explicit desire to leave the EU (as actually now seems to be the case with the ECJ ruling and our parliament effectively hijacking the Brexit leave process because of our elected representatives refusing to accept the will of their constituents), we might find some of those riots in those cities which overwhelmingly voted to leave (normally associated with the poorer regions of the nation represented by explicit socialists that want to stay in the EU and are now shamelessly ignoring their wishes).



Translated "burn the Elysee" (the presidential palace just up the road). George Orwell could not have written a better story about a socialist paradise gone wrong. France is suffering from a long, slow decay seen particularly in the rural areas where people feel forgotten and ignored by their lying, socialist politicians. But what is happening in France is happening across socialist Europe, the elites have forgotten the people who elected them and what is more, do not think they need to remember them because the institutions of the EU inoculate them from elections in every institution that really matters (the Parliament is a "talking shop", devoid of real power). Some would say it has happened too elsewhere in the West and that is why we have a Trump in the Whitehouse, God bless America.

A glossed over embarrassment of history was that many European leaders actually thought Hitler had the right, revolutionary ideas—it was just the Jewish thing got a bit too out of hand and Hitler misjudged thinking the ruling elite of Europe would fall in with him once they saw the coherence of his plan (a substantial number did rollover without resistance including most of the French). Even as we Brits love to talk about the "miracle of Dunkirk", Hitler was actually acting in self-interest by not obliterating the evacuation after our military humiliation, expecting his fifth column in the UK to assert themselves and he could do with the military hardware—he had strong support within the monarchy (some of them were later exiled), the upper reaches of the landed aristocracy who were beginning to feel uncomfortable with populist demands for access to their vast estates by the country-walking proletariat (before the days of soap operas, the real "opium of the people"), the Lords (our upper chamber of government) and Moseley's Blackshirts who were making their presence felt on the streets of London wanting to build support among the working classes for Hitler. Hitler knew obliterating them would hand a propaganda victory to Churchill, his only real rival as far as the meta-narrative for Europe was concerned and who later became one of the most forceful advocates of a "United States of Europe" which was what Hitler wanted all along, he just wanted to be a bit too much in charge.

Worse still, even as the trains were running into Hotel de Concentration Campe the Allies only bombed the railway lines that were used to export the rubber used for Hitler's war machine and not the lines bringing the Jews + any other deviants (LGBT+) that were not members of the master-race, in. It was not only Hitler that thought getting rid of homosexuals and the Jews and then stealing their money was a good idea (where Switzerland got its post-war fortune from). In fact, judging by the latest <u>vote</u> by the UN to not condemn Hamas for raining hundreds of rockets down in a matter of a couple of days on the Jewish civilians below, there is still substantial support for his final solution — as I believe Nikki Haley put it so well, *"The questions before us is whether the UN thinks terrorism is acceptable if and only if it's directed at Israel."*

(Just imagine what would be the response of the UN if Israel did likewise to Hamas in Gaza, it would add another 500 resolutions to those 500 already passed condemning Israel (all 20700 sq-km of it, cf 1648000000 sq-km for Iran)....who sponsors most of the world's terrorism?//)

Keynes (the great economist) publicly stated the Nazis were right as far as their new economics were concerned (un-backed currency off the gold standard), most major post-war economies dumped the gold-standard (how to spell i-n-f-l-a-t-i-o-n) and followed the Nazi lead in rebuilding their failed economies using monopoly money (as Hitler had done for Germany between the wars) whilst inflating the debt away. Germany and Russia initially started on the same side in the war and only fell out when it became an argument as to who were the real "socialists" and who would rule the new paradise (this is the genesis of that favourite word of the left "fascist"—fascist just meant socialism with brown shirts on rather than red, otherwise it was very much "spot the difference" as far as Stalin's and Hitler's politics and methods were concerned; Mussolini was rather different, he was more the classical Platonic elitist who felt he was born to rule, he had no allegiance to the socialism of Hitler and Stalin, changing sides when it looked like they were going to lose).

Essentially Europe, post-war, adopted Nazi economics in a softened up form and adopted softened up national socialism with the friendly face of the EU and its institutions. In fact, Stalin, Teddy and Churchill ushered in the new world socialist order that has spectacularly failed to deliver through its lying lips. Malcolm Muggeridge, the famous editor and commentator of the then *Manchester Guardian* (later to become the national, now world-famous *Guardian*) during the 1960s and 1970s, in a retrospect at the end of his life when he became a Judas and embraced Christianity, observed something like "we [the Left] during the post-war period all knew what Stalin was doing [killing millions] and we tacitly approved because it was necessary as a cathartic process [to usher in the new socialist world order]".



UK, US and the USSR....spot the difference in worldviews as they carved up the world between them; the sun set soon after on the British Empire upon which it was not supposed to set for a thousand years (rather like the Third Reich) and after the humiliation of going cap in hand to the International Monetary Fund for a bailout (like the banana republics of the world) we joined the EU but the

empires of the latter have endured with a few adjustments. As Rockefeller senior was later to announce 'in terms of straight credit risk, the socialist economies of the world represent less of a risk"; the US was by far the largest grantor of loans to the USSR, even at the height of the Cold War, they made cash from \$ocialism. A Ukrainian work colleague of mine wryly observed at the funeral of George HW that he worked hard to try and keep the USSR together preferring "stability" to the dangers of "freedom"; it seems we can no longer tell that the Marxist forest is made up from our own socialist trees.