

Former Soviet Dissident Warns For EU Dictatorship



(copied from <http://www.brusselsjournal.com/node/865>)

Former Soviet Dissident Warns For EU Dictatorship.

From the desk of Paul Belien on Mon, 2006-02-27 21:13

Vladimir Bukovksy, the 63-year old former Soviet dissident, fears that the European Union is on its way to becoming another Soviet Union. In a speech he delivered in Brussels last week Mr Bukovsky called the EU a "monster" that must be destroyed, the sooner the better, before it develops into a fullfledged totalitarian state.

Mr Bukovsky paid a visit to the European Parliament on Thursday at the invitation of Fidesz, the Hungarian Civic Forum. Fidesz, a member of the European Christian Democrat group, had invited the former Soviet dissident over from England, where he lives, on the occasion of this year's 50th anniversary of the 1956 Hungarian Uprising. After his morning meeting with the Hungarians, Mr Bukovsky gave an afternoon speech in a Polish restaurant in the Trier straat, opposite the European Parliament, where he spoke at the invitation of the United Kingdom Independence Party, of which he is a patron.



Bukovsky and Belien

An interview with Vladimir Bukovsky about the impending EUSSR

In his speech Mr Bukovsky referred to confidential documents from secret Soviet files which he was allowed to read in 1992. These documents confirm the existence of a "conspiracy" to turn the European Union into a socialist organization. I attended the meeting and taped the speech. A transcript, as well as the audio fragment (approx. 15 minutes) can be found below. I also had a brief interview with Mr Bukovsky (4 minutes), a transcript and audio fragment of which can also be found below. The interview about the European Union had to be cut short because Mr Bukovsky had other engagements, but it brought back some memories to me, as I had interviewed Vladimir Bukovsky twenty years ago, in 1986, when the Soviet Union, the first monster that he so valiantly fought, was still alive and thriving.

Mr Bukovsky was one of the heroes of the 20th century. As a young man he exposed the use of psychiatric imprisonment against political prisoners in the former USSR (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 1917-1991) and spent a total of twelve years (1964-1976), from his 22nd to his 34th year, in Soviet jails, labour camps and psychiatric institutions. In 1976 the Soviets expelled him to the West. In 1992 he was invited by the Russian government to serve as an expert testifying at the trial conducted to determine whether the Soviet Communist Party had been a criminal institution. To prepare for his testimony Mr Bukovsky was granted access to a large number of documents from Soviet secret archives. He is one of the few people ever to have seen these documents because they are still classified. Using a small handheld scanner and a laptop computer, however, he managed to copy many documents (some with high security clearance), including KGB reports to the Soviet government.

Former Soviet Dissident Warns For EU Dictatorship

An interview with Vladimir Bukovsky

Listen to it here :

(<http://www.brusselsjournal.com/system/files?file=bukovsky-interview.mp3>)

Paul Belien: You were a very famous Soviet dissident and now you are drawing a parallel between the European Union and the Soviet Union. Can you explain this?

Vladimir Bukovsky: I am referring to structures, to certain ideologies being instilled, to the plans, the direction, the inevitable expansion, the obliteration of nations, which was the purpose of the Soviet Union. Most people do not understand this. They do not know it, but we do because we were raised in the Soviet Union where we had to study the Soviet ideology in school and at university. The ultimate purpose of the Soviet Union was to create a new historic entity, the Soviet people, all around the globe. The same is true in the EU today. They are trying to create a new people. They call this people "Europeans", whatever that means.

According to Communist doctrine as well as to many forms of Socialist thinking, the state, the national state, is supposed to wither away. In Russia, however, the opposite happened. Instead of withering away the Soviet state became a very powerful state, but the nationalities were obliterated. But when the time of the Soviet collapse came these suppressed feelings of national identity came bouncing back and they nearly destroyed the country. It was so frightening.

PB: Do you think the same thing can happen when the European Union collapses?

VB: Absolutely, you can press a spring only that much, and the human psyche is very resilient you know. You can press it, you can press it, but don't forget it is still accumulating a power to rebound. It is like a spring and it always goes to overshoot.

PB: But all these countries that joined the European Union did so voluntarily.

VB: No, they did not. Look at Denmark which voted against the Maastricht treaty twice. Look at Ireland [which voted against the Nice treaty]. Look at many other countries, they are under enormous pressure. It is almost blackmail. Switzerland was forced to vote five times in a referendum. All five times they have rejected it, but who knows what will happen the sixth time, the seventh time. It is always the same thing. It is a trick for idiots. The people have to vote in referendums until the people vote the way that is wanted. Then they have to stop voting. Why stop? Let us continue voting. The European Union is what Americans would call a shotgun marriage.

PB: What do you think young people should do about the European Union? What should they insist on, to democratize the institution or just abolish it?

VB: I think that the European Union, like the Soviet Union, cannot be democratized. Gorbachev tried to democratize it and it blew up. This kind of structures cannot be democratized.

PB: But we have a European Parliament which is chosen by the people.

VB: The European Parliament is elected on the basis of proportional representation, which is not true representation. And what does it vote on? The percentage of fat in yoghurt, that kind of thing. It is ridiculous. It is given the task of the Supreme Soviet. The average MP can speak for six minutes per year in the Chamber. That is not a real parliament.

Former Soviet Dissident Warns For EU Dictatorship

Transcript of Mr Bukovsky's Brussels speech

Listen to it here :

(<http://www.brusselsjournal.com/system/files?file=bukovsky-speech.mp3>)

In 1992 I had unprecedented access to Politburo and Central Committee secret documents which have been classified, and still are even now, for 30 years. These documents show very clearly that the whole idea of turning the European common market into a federal state was agreed between the left-wing parties of Europe and Moscow as a joint project which [Soviet leader Mikhail] Gorbachev in 1988-89 called our "common European home."

The idea was very simple. It first came up in 1985-86, when the Italian Communists visited Gorbachev, followed by the German Social-Democrats. They all complained that the changes in the world, particularly after [British Prime Minister Margaret] Thatcher introduced privatisation and economic liberalisation, were threatening to wipe out the achievement (as they called it) of generations of Socialists and Social-Democrats – threatening to reverse it completely. Therefore the only way to withstand this onslaught of wild capitalism (as they called it) was to try to introduce the same socialist goals in all countries at once. Prior to that, the left-wing parties and the Soviet Union had opposed European integration very much because they perceived it as a means to block their socialist goals. From 1985 onwards they completely changed their view. The Soviets came to a conclusion and to an agreement with the left-wing parties that if they worked together they could hijack the whole European project and turn it upside down. Instead of an open market they would turn it into a federal state.



According to the [secret Soviet] documents, 1985-86 is the turning point. I have published most of these documents. You might even find them on the internet. But the conversations they had are really eye opening. For the first time you understand that there is a conspiracy – quite understandable for them, as they were trying to save their political hides. In the East the Soviets needed a change of relations with Europe because they were entering a protracted and very deep structural crisis; in the West the left-wing parties were afraid of being wiped out and losing their influence and prestige. So it was a conspiracy, quite openly made by them, agreed upon, and worked out.

In January of 1989, for example, a delegation of the Trilateral Commission came to see Gorbachev. It included [former Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro] Nakasone, [former French President Valéry] Giscard d'Estaing, [American banker David] Rockefeller and [former US Secretary of State Henry] Kissinger. They had a very nice conversation where they tried to explain to Gorbachev that Soviet Russia had to integrate into the financial institutions of the world, such as Gatt, the IMF and the World Bank.

In the middle of it Giscard d'Estaing suddenly takes the floor and says: "Mr President, I cannot tell you exactly when it will happen – probably within 15 years – but Europe is going to be a federal state and you have to prepare yourself for that. You have to work out with us, and the European leaders, how you would react to that, how would you allow the other East European countries to interact with it or how to become a part of it, you have to be prepared."

This was January 1989, at a time when the [1992] Maastricht treaty had not even

Former Soviet Dissident Warns For EU Dictatorship

been drafted. How the hell did Giscard d'Estaing know what was going to happen in 15 years time? And surprise, surprise, how did he become the author of the European constitution [in 2002-03]? A very good question. It does smell of conspiracy, doesn't it?

Luckily for us the Soviet part of this conspiracy collapsed earlier and it did not reach the point where Moscow could influence the course of events. But the original idea was to have what they called a convergency, whereby the Soviet Union would mellow somewhat and become more social-democratic, while Western Europe would become social-democratic and socialist. Then there will be convergency. The structures have to fit each other. This is why the structures of the European Union were initially built with the purpose of fitting into the Soviet structure. This is why they are so similar in functioning and in structure.

It is no accident that the European Parliament, for example, reminds me of the Supreme Soviet. It looks like the Supreme Soviet because it was designed like it. Similarly, when you look at the European Commission it looks like the Politburo. I mean it does so exactly, except for the fact that the Commission now has 25 members and the Politburo usually had 13 or 15 members. Apart from that they are exactly the same, unaccountable to anyone, not directly elected by anyone at all. When you look into all this bizarre activity of the European Union with its 80,000 pages of regulations it looks like Gosplan. We used to have an organisation which was planning everything in the economy, to the last nut and bolt, five years in advance. Exactly the same thing is happening in the EU. When you look at the type of EU corruption, it is exactly the Soviet type of corruption, going from top to bottom rather than going from bottom to top.

If you go through all the structures and features of this emerging European monster you will notice that it more and more resembles the Soviet Union. Of course, it is a milder version of the Soviet Union. Please, do not misunderstand me. I am not saying that it has a Gulag. It has no KGB – not yet – but I am very carefully watching such structures as Europol for example. That really worries me a lot because this organisation will probably have powers bigger than those of the KGB. They will have diplomatic immunity. Can you imagine a KGB with diplomatic immunity? They will have to police us on 32 kinds of crimes – two of which are particularly worrying, one is called racism, another is called xenophobia. No criminal court on earth defines anything like this as a crime [this is not entirely true, as Belgium already does so – pb]. So it is a new crime, and we have already been warned. Someone from the British government told us that those who object to uncontrolled immigration from the Third World will be regarded as racist and those who oppose further European integration will be regarded as xenophobes. I think Patricia Hewitt said this publicly.

Hence, we have now been warned. Meanwhile they are introducing more and more ideology. The Soviet Union used to be a state run by ideology. Today's ideology of the European Union is social-democratic, statist, and a big part of it is also political correctness. I watch very carefully how political correctness spreads and becomes an oppressive ideology, not to mention the fact that they forbid smoking almost everywhere now. Look at this persecution of people like the Swedish pastor who was persecuted for several months because he said that the Bible does not approve homosexuality. France passed the same law of hate speech concerning gays. Britain is passing hate speech laws concerning race relations and now religious speech, and so on and so forth. What you observe, taken into perspective, is a systematic introduction of ideology which could later be enforced with oppressive measures. Apparently that is the whole purpose of Europol. Otherwise why do we need it? To me Europol looks very suspicious. I watch very carefully who is persecuted for what and what is happening, because that is one field in which I am an expert. I know how Gulags spring up.

It looks like we are living in a period of rapid, systematic and very consistent

Former Soviet Dissident Warns For EU Dictatorship

dismantlement of democracy. Look at this Legislative and Regulatory Reform Bill. It makes ministers into legislators who can introduce new laws without bothering to tell Parliament or anyone. My immediate reaction is why do we need it? Britain survived two world wars, the war with Napoleon, the Spanish Armada, not to mention the Cold War, when we were told at any moment we might have a nuclear world war, without any need for introducing this kind legislation, without the need for suspending our civil liberties and introducing emergency powers. Why do we need it right now? This can make a dictatorship out of your country in no time.

Today's situation is really grim. Major political parties have been completely taken in by the new EU project. None of them really opposes it. They have become very corrupt. Who is going to defend our freedoms? It looks like we are heading towards some kind of collapse, some kind of crisis. The most likely outcome is that there will be an economic collapse in Europe, which in due time is bound to happen with this growth of expenses and taxes. The inability to create a competitive environment, the overregulation of the economy, the bureaucratisation, it is going to lead to economic collapse. Particularly the introduction of the euro was a crazy idea. Currency is not supposed to be political.

I have no doubt about it. There will be a collapse of the European Union pretty much like the Soviet Union collapsed. But do not forget that when these things collapse they leave such devastation that it takes a generation to recover. Just think what will happen if it comes to an economic crisis. The recrimination between nations will be huge. It might come to blows. Look to the huge number of immigrants from Third World countries now living in Europe. This was promoted by the European Union. What will happen with them if there is an economic collapse? We will probably have, like in the Soviet Union at the end, so much ethnic strife that the mind boggles. In no other country were there such ethnic tensions as in the Soviet Union, except probably in Yugoslavia. So that is exactly what will happen here, too. We have to be prepared for that. This huge edifice of bureaucracy is going to collapse on our heads.

This is why, and I am very frank about it, the sooner we finish with the EU the better. The sooner it collapses the less damage it will have done to us and to other countries. But we have to be quick because the Eurocrats are moving very fast. It will be difficult to defeat them. Today it is still simple. If one million people march on Brussels today these guys will run away to the Bahamas. If tomorrow half of the British population refuses to pay its taxes, nothing will happen and no-one will go to jail. Today you can still do that. But I do not know what the situation will be tomorrow with a fully fledged Europol staffed by former Stasi or Securitate officers. Anything may happen.

We are losing time. We have to defeat them. We have to sit and think, work out a strategy in the shortest possible way to achieve maximum effect. Otherwise it will be too late. So what should I say? My conclusion is not optimistic. So far, despite the fact that we do have some anti-EU forces in almost every country, it is not enough. We are losing and we are wasting time.

More on this topic, see:

Czech President Warns Against Europeanism, 27 August 2005
<http://www.brusselsjournal.com/node/206>

Former Soviet Dissident Warns For EU Dictatorship

Germany is the Head of the Monster

Submitted by David Ben-Ariel on Fri, 2006-06-09 23:10.

"In a speech he delivered in Brussels, Belgium, Mr Bukovsky called the EU a "monster" that must be destroyed, the sooner the better, before it develops into a fully-fledged totalitarian state."

Germany is the Head of the Monster.

Germany Behind the Mask: Monster or Marshmallow?
<http://ezinearticles.com/?id=138202>

"So long as we wear the mask, we remain hidden and continue to conceal the situation from ourselves."

Justice for Yitzhak Rabin
<http://yitzhakrabin.blogspot.com>

» [login or register to post comments](#) | [email this page](#)

I'd like to think that there

Submitted by Spogbolt on Thu, 2006-03-02 23:20.

I'd like to think that there is such a thing as a European (or European-American) people or identity. As individuals, at least, we seem different enough to be interesting to one another but not so much as to be incapable of living together quite closely. But this doesn't mean that this "people" requires a federal political union.

Also, I have the impression that the EU oligarchy is trying ultimately to create not a "European people" but something on a larger scale, starting with the North Africans?

» [login or register to post comments](#) | [email this page](#)

I'm afraid mr. Bukovsky is

Submitted by McMad on Wed, 2006-03-01 17:24.

I'm afraid mr. Bukovsky is right. I am a former soviet citizen myself and i too recognize many similarities between EU and USSR, even in their propaganda. It does not matter how different nations are forced to live under one rule, whether that rule is brought by strenght of arms or whether the different rulers decide upon it by so called peaceful means. We should learn from history, by their 'un-national' nature, huge centralist "empires" are unnatural and oppressive. And they ALL will disintegrate one day, simply because they are held together by unnatural bonds. When that happens it always brings with itself a lot of misery and violent clashes. Lets not let the balkanisation of Europe become a reality.

» [login or register to post comments](#) | [email this page](#)

EU Propaganda

Submitted by Nicolas Raemdonck on Tue, 2006-02-28 23:50.

Europe creates a new religion. For the USSR it was communism, for Europe is europeanism, like Klaus said. ALL other believes are not accepted.

» [login or register to post comments](#) | [email this page](#)

Former Soviet Dissident Warns For EU Dictatorship

[The history is different, but parallels can be drawn...](#)

Submitted by Flemish American on Tue, 2006-02-28 23:37.

Granted, the history of the European Union and the lack of a totalitarian dictator such as a Stalin or Lenin would point to a different path. However, these are not the only measuring blocks of a society and many other aspects of the E.U. could be compared to the former- (or even present) U.S.S.R., especially from an economic standpoint.

Although it should seem that we are all enlightened and that such things are no longer possible in the Western world, I think this is just naïve of us.

One need look no further than Belerus where they are M-TV enough to win Eurovision for kids, but where totalitarian government and ideals are alive and well. Look at Serbia & Montenegro where war criminals guilty of genocide are protected at a governmental level. We don't have to go to China or North Korea to see these ideals put into practice. We just need to take a walk around the corner.

Nonetheless, I don't believe it will ever be the same. The Soviets would never have tolerated the kinds of things Europe seems more than willing to accept. Besides the moral issues, violent crime was almost non-existent (except when performed by the government) and the only religious groups that openly defied them were living somewhere else.

No, the E.U.'s lack of backbone definitely puts them in another category.

Lord, grant me the strength to change the things I can; the serenity to deal with the things I cannot change; and the wisdom to know the difference.

» [login or register to post comments](#) | [email this page](#)

[The EP is the most dangerous](#)

Submitted by Nicolas Raemdonck on Tue, 2006-02-28 22:47.

The EP is the most dangerous institution of the EU. It changes economic liberal measures from the commission in to terrible socialist measures, like Bolkestein directive. Or it makes socialist propositions of the commission even worsen, like REACH. The problem with the EP is that anti-european union parties have no interest in it and socialist have a lot of interest in it. I do not know if David Cameron could change this.

EDIT: I see that I posted this two times. This is an error.

» [login or register to post comments](#) | [email this page](#)

[You asked if Bukovsky](#)

Submitted by Nicolas Raemdonck on Tue, 2006-02-28 22:43.

You asked if Bukovsky believed that the Parliament was a democratic instrument. Bukovsky rejected that statement by saying that they decided about futile things. Well, I don't agree. Of all the European institutions the EP is the most dangerous. Why? The Eurosceptics do not send their best people or don't have a interest in doing something in Europe or in a eurocentrist party like EPP. The socialists at the contrary amuse themselves in the EP. They can socialize and harmonise so much as they want. And they have power. For some competence the EP has the right to co-decide with the council about a proposition of the commission. Well, this right was created in the 80th's and in Maastricht, Nice and the Constitution enlarge this right. The Constitution makes it even the normal decision method. But what is the problem. Before the power of the EP rose, you

[Former Soviet Dissident Warns For EU Dictatorship](#)

still had some intelligent economic liberal politicians who voted in the council for a liberalisation of the markets in Europe, for example freedom of trade for goods. The EP had in those days nothing to do with it. But what do we see now: EP rejects economic liberal reforms (like Bolkestein) and changes them in socialist rules like REACH and other. Many economic liberal propositions of the commission are changed into socialist rule by a socialist parliament.

» [login or register to post comments](#) | [email this page](#)

[Comment to the article](#)

Submitted by Poul Nielsen on Tue, 2006-02-28 18:21.

I was planning to write some more earlier - today, but when the "delete proces was started here" and a lot of Muslim article was placed here - well why write something - when somebody will make everything to a issue about religons.

From a Russian angle - Mr Bukovsky's statement's are very logic and wrong.

But if we look at how Europe is developing now, where the Eastern block don't excist -democracy is spreading. Former Eastbloc countries like Polan, Hungary, the Baltic's etc. have chosen to be member of the EU.

The welth in the former eastern europe is growing, because of the EU. Since The European Parliament don't have any absolute power in Europe, but must co-excist with national parliaments, it must adjust to that.

Mr Bukovsky's want to regard the Eurpean Union as a state. The EU is not a Union as the USSR.

It's union of independent states, who have chosen to be member of the EU. Not states who are forced to be a member of the EU.

The purpose with EU - was to remove the "economical factor", wich was the reason for the wars in Europe (ww1&2).

With that in mind - it only natural, it takes some time to devellop EU, since it's growing by size.

» [login or register to post comments](#) | [email this page](#)

[EU Dictatorship ..No our modern history is different from USSR](#)

Submitted by Poul Nielsen on Tue, 2006-02-28 13:01.

EU Dictatorship ..No our modern history is different from USSR

EU has it's foundation in a union of "Independent countries". Every law in EU must be implementet by the national goverments in the EU.

The former nation "USSR", was based on a communist revolution against the Zar. The result was - a regime based on Terror.

Here in Europe - the foundation of EU is democracy.

» [login or register to post comments](#) | [email this page](#)

[Comments deleted](#)

Submitted by Paul Belien on Tue, 2006-02-28 12:04.

I have deleted all comments that were posted here so far. This article is about the EU. Please post comments about Islam elsewhere.

» [login or register to post comments](#) | [email this page](#)