

# **The Common Market and the Communist Challenge**

WOULD BRITAIN'S ENTRY INTO THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC  
COMMUNITY HELP TO DEFEAT COMMUNISM?

Paper given by Eric D. Butler at the 1962 Australian League of  
Rights Annual Seminar.

## **The Common Market and the Communist Challenge**

As one of the main arguments advanced for the proposal that Britain should sign the Treaty of Rome and join the European Economic Community, is that this policy would help strengthen what is claimed to be an anti-Communist barrier in Western Europe, it is essential to examine this argument in some detail. Most of those advancing this argument obviously know little about the true nature of Communism, even less about Communist strategy and tactics, and apparently nothing about the type of structure being erected along the lines laid down by the Treaty of Rome.

Communism is an international conspiracy against the traditional concepts of society, and it cuts across geographical and other divisions. It penetrates deeply into the heart of all non-Communist communities, particularly the communities of Western Europe. Will this penetration in Western Europe be eradicated by the policies underlying the creation of the European Economic Community? In order to answer this question, it is necessary to stress the point that the progressive development of the European Economic Community must result in the establishment of a super-bureaucracy. Already this bureaucracy is being created as the non-elected nine members of the European Economic Commission exercise their vast powers.

The real power of the European Economic Community rests with the Commission. Under the infamous article 189 of the Treaty of Rome, this Commission exercises its powers through directives and regulations. The article states: "Regulations shall have a general application. They shall be binding, in every respect and directly applicable in each Member State".

Government by regulations issued by an all-powerful bureaucracy means the end of genuine representative Government. Acceptance of the Treaty of Rome by the British Government means the gradual abolition of self-government from Westminster. The startling truth is not only that a British Government is attempting to start to bring to an end parliamentary self-government as understood in British countries, but that so many people refuse to face the truth even when supporters of the Common Market frankly admit what is involved. They are like the old lady who upon seeing the giraffe for the first time, looked up at its long neck and firmly said, "I don't believe it".

### **THE DESTRUCTION OF SELF-GOVERNMENT**

Lord Gladwyn, chairman of the British Common Market Campaign, has said with commendable frankness: "Quite simply, if we accept the Treaty of Rome, we shall gradually surrender the right to make economic decisions decisively affecting our economy ... Membership of the Common Market would mean that in ten years' time or so we might well be a member of a confederation in which major economic and social decisions affecting our lives would be taken elsewhere than at Westminster."

In his book *The Common Market*, Stuart de la Mahotiere, the French authority on the subject, writes:

"It will certainly be a novelty in English law that regulations issued by foreign institutions such as the Commission and the Council shall automatically have force of law in England (Article 189) and that sanctions such as fines, imposed by these institutions (Article 192) on British citizens or bodies possessing legal personality, for violations of these regulations shall be enforceable in British courts whereas an appeal against such sanctions lies not with the latter but with the Court of Justice of the Community."

After examining the loss of sovereignty which the British Government must suffer if Britain joins the European Community, Mahotiere concludes that:

"This erosion of the useful functions of Parliament will soon leave M.P.'s with little else to do but to keep an eye on the purely domestic aspects of government and watch over the day-to-day interests of their constituents . . ."

As Mahotiere believes that Britain must join the European Economic Community, and as his book is warmly recommended by leading Common Marketeer Lord Gladwyn, his conclusions concerning the end of the British Parliamentary system and the British system of law must be accepted as a realistic reflection of the far-reaching implications of acceptance of the Rome Treaty.

The destruction of British sovereignty and British institutions, and the break-up of the British Commonwealth following such destruction, would be no contribution to the defeat of International Communism, but would be the very opposite. The break-up of the British Commonwealth has long been one of the major objectives of the promoters and controllers of International Communism.

## **AN ALL-POWERFUL SUPER-BUREAUCRACY**

Faced with the facts concerning the type of super-bureaucratic structure proposed by the Rome Treaty, many wishful thinkers take refuge by saying that if Britain joins the Economic Community, she will be able to lead it from within. Also, that the structure can be altered. But the Rome Treaty provides no evidence to support those who will not face realities. Article 157 is quite explicit that the Economic Commission shall take notice of no one in using its vast powers. The following is from clause 2 of article 157:

"The members of the Commission shall act independently in the performance of their duties, in the general interest of the Community. In the performance of their duties, they shall neither seek nor take instruction from any Government or other body . . . Each Member State undertakes to respect this principle and not to seek to influence the members of the Commission in the performance of their duties."

If it is claimed that member States of the Economic Community will exercise some democratic control through the Parliamentary Assembly which is to serve not only the European Economic Community, but also the Euratom Community and the Iron and Coal Community, it is essential to point out that the European parliament has no power whatever to legislate on anything. The only power given to this travesty of Parliament is in article 144 of the Treaty, which reads:

"If a vote of censure on the activities of the Commission is tabled in the Assembly, no vote shall be taken thereon until not less than three days after it was tabled, and this vote shall be by open ballot.

"If the vote of censure is carried by a two thirds majority of the votes cast and representing a majority of the members of the Assembly, the members of the Commission shall collectively resign their office."

Article 143 states that "The Assembly shall discuss in open the annual general report submitted to it by the Commission."

The main business of the so-called Parliament is, therefore, merely to meet once every twelve months to hear a report from the super-bureaucrats running the Economic Commission. And its only means of disciplining a Commission is to sack it—providing a two-thirds majority of those who vote are agreed. However, even this unlikely action would have no real impact on the Commission or its powers. In order to exercise their powers, the present nine members of the Economic Commission have already built up a staff of approximately 2,000. As the European Economic Community develops in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty, so must there be an inevitable progressive expansion in the bureaucracy.

## **BUREAUCRACY AND COMMUNISM**

Bitter experience has demonstrated that just as dogs are one of the natural habitats for fleas, so are bureaucracies a powerful attraction for the Communists, where their secret members can exert tremendous influence. When Roosevelt started to establish his New Deal programme early in the thirties, Communists quickly gravitated into the expanding bureaucracy necessary to run the New Deal. As we know today, much to our sorrow, by the time the decisive events of 1938 and 1939 were being shaped, secret Communists in key positions surrounding Roosevelt were able to play a decisive role concerning those events. During and immediately after the war, these same secret Communists, men like Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White, were responsible for the tremendous expansion of International Communism. As the former top Communist agent, Whittaker Chambers, points out in his great classic, *Witness*, no more than a handful of secret Communists, whose names were, and still are, generally unknown, played a decisive role in changing the course of history in favour of International Communism.

So far from hampering the International Communist conspiracy, a monolithic structure in Western Europe, fostering the very concentration of economic power which Communist teaching declares leads towards the Communist State, and run by a super-

bureaucracy, must be regarded with pleasant anticipation by Communist strategists. We should therefore note with interest the recent report from Moscow, transmitted by British United Press, which states that at a Conference of Communist economists from 23 countries, those from Common Market countries had agreed that their national Communist Parties should try to gain a hand in the directing bodies of the Market. These economists also agreed that it was desirable that Britain should join the European Economic Community.

## **COMMUNIST DIALECTICS**

Those who know little or nothing of Communist dialectics will naturally reply to what has been said by asking "But has not Mr. Khrushchev denounced the Common Market? Are not Communists everywhere strongly opposed to Britain's proposed entry?" All Communist statements, particularly from Communist leaders, must be considered against the background of basic Communist belief and teaching. Stalin certainly attacked Hitler bitterly in public, but this did not prevent him from directing the German Communists to help Hitler to come to power because Stalin correctly assessed Hitler and the National Socialists as the most likely to further Communist strategy of revolution through another major war. Students of International Communism were not surprised, therefore, when Stalin gave Hitler the green light in 1939 with his non-aggression pact. It is certainly true that the present Indonesian Army leaders are anti-Communists. But the Communists are quite happy to provide them with modern Soviet military equipment and to allow them to carry the ball for them *at present* on the West New Guinea issue. Communists continually look beyond the immediate tactics of today to the strategical objectives of tomorrow.

If Communists were judged only by their statements, it would be logical to assume that they are bitter opponents of monopoly, and that they would support all policies designed to decentralise economic power, to enable genuine competitive enterprise amongst smaller and medium-sized organisations to flourish. But the Communists verbal denunciation of monopoly is merely part of their tactics. Their verbal attacks are designed to enable them to reach and to influence the victims of monopoly. So far from being opposed to the development of monopoly, Communist teaching lays it down very clearly that this development is both inevitable and desirable, in that it leads towards the creation of the Communist society. European Socialists generally, have been much more infected with Marxism than British Socialists. It is significant that European Socialists like Spaak of Belgium are enthusiastic supporters of the European Economic Community.

## **A MAJOR FALLACY**

The erection of the monolithic structure proposed for the whole of Western Europe must inevitably intensify the drive towards economic centralism, and the progressive elimination of the smaller primary producer and business man. Even should this programme provide temporarily a higher material standard of living,

this will not in any way challenge Communist strategy. One of the most dangerous fallacies widely publicised today is that the Communist challenge can be eliminated merely by providing people with sufficient to eat and to wear. It is right and proper that no individual should suffer physical poverty, quite apart from the question of Communism. Every Christian must support right policies primarily because they are right, not for other reasons.

Communist leadership from the time of Karl Marx, a product of a solid middle-class family and financed by his wealthy friend Engels, down to men like Mao-tse-tung in China today, has been generally drawn from families who have materially been reasonably well-to-do. The overwhelming majority have been influenced towards Communism during their University days. Sweden has the highest material standard of living in Western Europe today, and yet the Swedish people freely elect to the Swedish Parliament more Communists per head of the total population than does any other country in Europe. It is true that people suffering material poverty can be used by Communists, but the abolition of material poverty of itself does not prevent people from becoming dedicated Communists. **The basic Communist issue concerns the nature and the purpose of man.** The Communist challenge is not going to be defeated by creating a monolithic Western Europe in which the individual possesses no genuine freedom and lacks any real moral purpose in life. There is a grave danger today of many opponents of Communism becoming infected with the very disease they think they are fighting.

## **BRITISH STABILITY**

When Karl Marx observed that the English would never make their own revolution, and that foreigners would have to make it for them, he made a most important observation concerning the nature, not only of the English people, but of the British social structure and of British institutions. The comparative stability of the social structure in all British countries has been the result of institutions which enable the individual to achieve economic and other reforms through peaceful, constitutional means. And the system of law has protected the rights of the individual. Violent revolution is alien to British countries. If the Communist challenge is to be met successfully, it is essential for one nation to provide a lead by demonstrating that a genuinely free society, reflecting Christian values, can be created. Although they have departed in many ways from those principles upon which their past successes and greatness have been erected, the nations of the British Crown Commonwealth, Britain, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, still possess within themselves the ability and the means to lead the world to salvation.

But what if Britain, the senior member and fountainhead of the British Commonwealth, joins the European Economic Community, surrenders herself to the alien philosophy underlying the Rome Treaty? This must have a shattering effect upon the true unity of the British Crown Commonwealth, a unity based upon diversity, and throw those people in other Commonwealth countries who see their only hope for the future in continued association" with the British Commonwealth, into a spiritual wilderness. Many of the nations

struggling towards stability and economic progress could be propelled rapidly towards the Communist bloc. If it is argued that the weakening of the unity of the British Commonwealth would be more than compensated for by the "unity" of a European Economic Community containing Britain, it is necessary to point out that the so-called unity of Western Europe is rather synthetic.

## **"UNITY" IN EUROPE**

Britain's nearest neighbour in the European Economic Community, and one of the three major members of the Community, France, is a virtual dictatorship run by General De Gaulle. The throwing of plastic bombs has become a rather prevalent sport. With the passing of De Gaulle, France could be plunged into a violent national upheaval. A powerful Communist Party plans and awaits an opportunity for massive action. Italy has a Communist Party of five million supporters strongly represented in the Italian Parliament. It is significant that most of the Communist strength in Italy comes from the highly industrialised and relatively more prosperous North.

Britain has far less Communists relatively than most of the present members of the Common Market. How then can it be logically suggested that she is going to help strengthen the West against Communism by joining with countries which have powerful Communist Parties, and which do not possess the same tradition of Parliamentary democracy as that of the British? Britain can only make her own distinctive contribution to the saving of Western Civilization by remaining true' to her own traditions and to the association of nations which share these traditions with her. Britain has exercised her greatest influence in Europe by keeping out of it. British entry would mean that Britain would be more directly exposed to the revolutionary movements which have convulsed all the three major European nations within living memory.

## **COMMUNISTS NOT REALLY CAMPAIGNING AGAINST BRITISH ENTRY**

When the Communists decide to really oppose a major policy, such as Britain's proposed entry into the European Common Market, their tactics are well known. French and Italian Communists have been comparatively quiet on the issue. There have been no revolutionary demonstrations. Even Mr. Khrushchev has not made any threats against the Austrians for wishing to become associated with the Common Market. Communist campaigning in British countries has carefully confined itself to warning what would happen to Britain and British countries if Britain joined the Common Market, but there is no full-blooded campaigning designed to keep Britain out. There have been no protest marches, no petitions, while the pink clergy have been silent. No thundering of opposition from the pulpits and elsewhere.

The Communists clearly see in Britain's proposed entry into the Common Market a golden opportunity to advance their own programme. And that

programme has been outlined in all Communist literature on the Communist Market. The programme is more trade with Communist China and other Communist countries. This is the solution offered to Australians, New Zealanders and Canadians concerned about where they are going to send their surplus agricultural production. The Communists regard trade as a major weapon. If Australia, as the result of losing markets in Britain, is forced to send more agricultural production to Communist China, so will she increase the danger of Communist pressure to change Australian policies such as recognition of Communist China and the seating of the Communist leaders in the "United" Nations Organisation.

## **AMERICAN PRESSURE**

The more Britain's proposed entry into the Common Market is examined, the more obvious it becomes that this policy, so far from helping to defeat International Communism, would in fact assist the strategy of the Communists. This conclusion does not mean that it is suggested that the Treaty of Rome was written in the Kremlin or by its agents. But just as the Communists have successfully exploited the policies of economic centralism, and the results of those policies, so do they seek to exploit the policy of monopoly being imposed upon Western Europe today. The fact that this policy has the strong backing of the American policy makers does not make it any more acceptable to its victims. Quite apart from the fact that the forces of subversion which used Roosevelt are obviously still operating in the U.S.A., as witnessed by the incredible rise to power in Cuba of Castro with the powerful support of the American State Department and papers like the influential *New York Times*, it is unfortunately true that many Americans have been so successfully brainwashed with revolutionary propoganda that they see nothing wrong about trying to destroy the "wicked" British Commonwealth, and permit their representatives to vote with the Communists in the "United" Nations against the Portuguese and other "Imperialists". It is interesting that the most outstanding anti-Communists in the U.S.A., those who have a positive and constructive philosophy, do not see American pressure on Britain to join the Common Market as a contribution towards defeating International Communism. They agree substantially with the central theme of this address.

## **MORE THAN MILITARY DEFENCE REQUIRED**

Military defence of the West is, of course, essential. And Britain can make her contribution without joining the European Economic Community. The genius of the British people in the field of the industrial arts still continues to shine brightly in a world clouded with loud propoganda claims from others. But those who are obsessed only with the military defence of the West, completely overlook the fact that it is not part of Communist strategy in the cold war to expose Russian soldiers to the influences of Western Europe *until Europe has lost the will to survive*. The finest military weapons in the world are not sufficient if they are in the hands of people who have been cut from their past and their traditions, who are economic

and spiritual proletariats increasingly urged to regard the purpose of life primarily as a contest in economics. Such people, and the philosophy of the Common Market seeks to create the economic man, must inevitably become attracted to the ideological dynamic of the Communist world and prefer under pressure to be Red rather than Dead.

If the West is to survive and to win the struggle for the world, it must regain its own soul. And just as the individual can make no contribution towards the salvation of his nation until he has saved himself, so no nation can make a contribution towards saving other nations until it has saved itself. The great Pitt urged the British to save themselves by their own exertions and the rest of the world by their example. The whole British world should use Pitt's words as their motto for today. For Britain to join the European Economic Community would -be to cut herself off from a thousand years of history and achievement. It would be a spiritual death. The British world can play a decisive role in the struggle for the world by remaining true to its own soul.

The technological leadership of the British people, applied, to the proper use of the vast and practically unlimited natural resources of the British Commonwealth, and the preservation and extension of British institutions, provide the necessary basic elements for demonstrating a dynamic which would soon generate a new spirit right throughout the world. A new cohesion could be brought into the British Commonwealth by the creation of the necessary instruments. But in the last analysis everything depends upon will and faith. The Common Market issue confronts the peoples of the whole British Commonwealth with the greatest challenge in their long history. By successfully facing and meeting that challenge they could lead Western Civilization into a new and more glorious age. If they fail to face the challenge, they will be making one more retreat in the face of the forces of materialism.

## **THE RED PATTERN OF WORLD CONQUEST** By Eric D. Butler

Every reader should obtain at least one copy of this incredible story of the expansion of International Communism from 1903, when Lenin formed his first Bolshevik Party, until the present time, when the Communist offensive is in sight of its ultimate object of World Domination.

Heavily documented, this booklet has been widely acclaimed as the best of its type yet produced in the English-speaking world. A special Canadian edition has been published.

The following are some of the matters dealt with:

- How the Communists Worked to Produce the Second World War.
- The decisive role of the Roosevelt Government, heavily infiltrated with Communist agents, in helping to start the war in Europe.
- Pearl Harbour was planned in Washington! The booklet should be read if only to study how Roosevelt's advisers, some secret Communists, deliberately provoked Japan to strike in order to bring America into the war.
- How Stalin dominated the war-time conferences with the aid of Roosevelt's advisers.
- The United Nations as a Communist instrument. The real significance of the retreat of the Europeans in Africa.