

Our Lady said, “Russia will Spread its Errors”:

The European Union: USSR Repackaged

by Michal Semin

More urgent and relevant than ever, are Our Lady of Fatima’s warnings about the spread of the errors of Russia, of Communism, which are also the errors of Masonry — as Pope Leo XIII pointed out, as does John Salza starting on [page 56](#).

To see the big picture of what is really happening in the world today, read Michal Semin’s article together with the articles by John Salza and Father Paul Kramer, which starts on [page 32](#). These articles portray a HORRIFYING FUTURE — which is what Pope Benedict XVI is trying to prepare the Church and the world for.

I was born in 1967 in Prague, that is, during Communism. When I was a teenager I got involved in the underground and the anti-Communist movement. Not being raised a Catholic, I converted when I was 17 years old, due to the example of some of the priests who spent years and years in prison.

Following their example, I attended the underground Masses and catechesis. For that reason I was expelled from university studies and many times interrogated, put into jail, etc. So this is my first life-experience living under Communism, a system that I obviously hate.

Now I live under a new regime that is called “Liberal” or “Secular Liberal” under which I can travel, I can go to conferences on the Fatima message, for example. I can even publish articles about it. But the views that I can publish are getting more and more ostracized. And there are signs that certain areas that we freely debate might become, at least in Europe, soon criminalized.

So twenty years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, the Western world, to which the people behind the Iron Curtain looked with admiration as a model to follow, now resembles more and more the supposedly “outdated”



Michal Semin explaining at *The Fatima Challenge* how the European Union promotes “Russia’s errors” that Our Lady of Fatima warned us about. Our Lady is being silenced, and as a result we all are in grave danger and many people are not even aware of it.

Socialist Utopia.

Although Our Lady in Fatima did not specify the errors of Russia — She didn’t tell us what they specifically are — we can be sure what are the most destructive elements of the Soviet system: secularism, atheism, socialism, artificial internationalism. This is what we usually associate with the Soviet Union. But I can tell you that these features are very much present in the current European Union as well.

European Federal State

You might have heard about Vladimir Bukovsky, a Russian political dissident who spent a total of 12 years in the Soviet prisons, labor camps and enforced treat-

ment psychiatric hospitals that are used by the government as special prisons. In 1967 he was exchanged for a Chilean Communist leader, Luis Corvalán, and since then he lives in Great Britain.

In his famous speech delivered in Brussels in 2006, he stated the following: “In January of 1989, a delegation of the Trilateral Commission came to see Gorbachev. It included former Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone, former French President Valery Giscard d’Estaing, American banker David Rockefeller and former U.S. 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 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 Valéry Giscard d'Estaing served from 2002 to 2003 as the president of the Convention on the Future of Europe. On October 29, 2004, the European heads of State gathered here in Rome. They approved and signed the European Constitution based on a draft strongly influenced by Giscard's work at the convention.

European Constitution Rejected

Although the European Constitution was rejected by *French* voters in May 2005, Giscard continued to

actively lobby for its passage in other European Union States. Speaking at the London School of Economics on February 28, 2006, he said, "The rejection of the Constitutional Treaty by voters in France was a mistake that should be corrected." And it was.

After it was rejected also by the *Dutch* voters in the Netherlands, Mrs. Angela Merkel, the German Chancellor, sent a letter to the Presidents and the Prime Ministers of the EU member States proposing a structural change — a reformulation of the document of the Constitution — so it will *not appear* as a Constitution. This was stated by her in her letter.

The Tricks Used to Get it Accepted

Using different terminology, without changing the legal substance, she had in mind *not* to lay down a specific text that would be clear, like a Constitution. Rather, she proposed just to write down amendments to already existing European Treaties, such as the Maastricht Treaty, Treaty of Rome, Treaty of Amsterdam, of Nice. And this is the treaty that is known to-

day as the Lisbon Treaty that was signed in Lisbon in 2007.

I will read a short quotation from that treaty so you will see what the nations of Europe and what the national parliaments were voting upon. Today if you look on the Internet you will see what they call the *consolidated text*, which is a new text. But when the parliaments were voting on the Lisbon Treaty, they had what they called a *non-consolidated text*, that is, the amendments to the existing treaties.

I have asked many of the Czech Parliamentarians “did you understand what you were voting about in the Parliament”, and some of them frankly said: “Well no, we didn’t. We didn’t even read it because it’s unreadable.” And I’ll show you why.

I apologize especially to our excellent translators because you cannot translate something that doesn’t give any meaning. So just let me read you a short part of a text that has more than 150 pages:

“Article 7 shall be amended as follows:

“1(a) Throughout the Article, the word ‘assent’ shall be replaced by ‘consent’,

the reference to breach ‘of principles mentioned in Article 6(1)’ shall be replaced by a reference to breach ‘of the values referred to in Article 1(a)’, the words ‘of this Treaty’ shall be replaced by ‘of the Treaties’ and the word ‘Commission’ shall be replaced by ‘European Commission’;

“(b) At the end of the first sentence of the first subparagraph of paragraph 1, the words ‘and address appropriate recommendations to that State’ shall be deleted; at the end of the last sentence, the words ‘and, acting in accordance with the same procedure, may call on independent persons to submit within a reasonable time limit a report on the situation in the Member State in question’ shall be replaced by ‘and may address recommendations to it, acting in accordance with the same procedure’.”

Welcome to the Orwellian *newspeak* of the European Union. And this was 150 pages! It’s done this way so that only about three, four, or five occult figures in the highest echelon of the European Union can understand what’s written on the paper.

As we all know this document was not put into referendums, because those pushing for the EU claimed the document was just amending the existing treaties. The only exception was Ireland, because Ireland has a clause in its Constitution that says any transfer of power from the Nation State to a higher authority has to be authorized by a national referendum.

So the Irish had to have the referendum and the result was a resounding “no!” To which the European Commission President José Barroso said: “The treaty is not dead. The treaty is well alive. We will try to find a solution.”

Well, we all know what was the solution. The Irish had to have a second referendum because they gave the wrong answer in the first one. They were bullied into a repetition and they were threatened by various sanctions. The second time, the referendum was accepted.

NOW European National Parliaments Have Given Almost All Authority to EU

The result is that today 80 to 90% of the legislation that is voted upon in the na-

tion state’s parliaments emanates from Brussels in the form of various directives and other pieces of law.

The national parliaments do not usually discuss the legislation because they are expected to approve it. And if it’s not approved, the particular State is brought in front of the Court of Justice to be penalized.

This was the case with the anti-discrimination law approved by the Czech Parliament. The Czech government was defending the law — which presents non-existing “rights” as natural, and potentially criminalizes opposition to, for example, homosexual behavior or other vices — because the Czech Republic would be forced to pay a huge amount of money in fines for not making it part of the Czech legal system.

We have plenty of other cases where the national parliaments just rubber-stamp the EU directives.

European Union is a Sham Democracy

You may remember that some Communist countries called themselves democratic, like the German Democratic Republic or the

People's Republic of Romania or China. And we all know this is a sham; there is nothing democratic, no concern for the people at all in Communist countries. Well, unfortunately, I have to say that the same applies to the European Union.

We only have to look at how the structure functions. Most of the power in the EU is vested in the European Commission that comprises almost 25,000 employees, and these are not accountable to anyone whose power is delegated from national elections. It is the European Commission that is the only EU institution that has the legislative initiative. So usually when we say "Parliament", we associate parliaments with a body that makes law. That is not the case with the European Parliament.

The laws are being written in the European Commission, which is this vast bureaucratic body, then they are approved or voted upon in the Council of Ministers, and only then it goes to the European Parliament for approval.

Here is another similarity between the European Union and the Soviet Union system. In Communist countries *one*

political party *de facto* existed, the Communist Party. There were states where you had more political parties, but all of them had to subscribe to the fundamental tenets of the Marxist regime.

The same is true in the EU Parliament. You can be voted into the European Parliament on an anti-EU platform, like Nigel Farage was. But according to European Parliament procedures, you will not be able to form your party group, you will not receive any financial support, you will not get any staff, you will receive no other support for your activities. And you will have special time restrictions to address the European Parliament.

"A Slow Motion Coup d'état"

Like the USSR, the EU was created with little or no respect for transparent procedures. Much of what has happened within the EU has happened secretly. In their powerful exposé, *The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union*, published in 2003, British journalists Christopher Booker and Dr. Richard North (formerly a researcher inside the EU

bureaucracy) aptly described the EU as “a slow motion coup d’état. The most spectacular coup d’état in history”.

The Belgian Prime Minister Spank, known in Europe as Mr. Socialist, was responsible for convincing his fellow EU founding fathers that the most effective way to disguise their projects’ political purpose was to conceal it behind a pretense that it was concerned only with economic cooperation based on dismantling trade barriers (Common Market, etc.) The Euro-Federalists cloak this destructive revolutionary process under such code words as “integration,” “harmonization” and “convergence”. It was actually a multitude of lies. The EU founders and their successors have been carrying forward nothing less than a brazen scheme of treason dressed up as economic trade policy.

Keeping the Truth Hidden from the Citizens

But the goal was more than that: the creation of a single European State. But those who favored it knew very well that the people of Europe would never accept it. They would never willingly

surrender their freedoms to become just a province in this vast European superstate.

So they conspired to keep the truth from the people. That the Common Market was from the very beginning merely a tool for the future political integration is also obvious from the current euro crisis; that is, when you analyze the crisis of the single European currency.

The Euro Crisis

A real currency reflects economic and political realities but the euro was invented to serve political aspirations. The single currency was an icon of EU inclusion and equality. So a country like Greece, with a profoundly different economic, social and cultural background than, lets say, Germany or Denmark, was treated for political purposes like the most thrifty and hard-working nation on earth, creating artificial imbalances and bubbles that are threatening the very existence of the Euro Zone, or maybe the EU itself.

The European Union has now only two options. (1) Either let the Euro Zone fall apart and return to the concept of a Europe of free na-

tions; or (2) use the crisis for taking even more control over the member states, forming what they call an economic government, a central economic government for European Union countries with the power of setting up the common fiscal policy.

I believe they will take the second option. I just cannot imagine that they will let their dream fall apart.

A New “History”

Another striking similarity between the Soviet Union and European Union is of an ideological nature, and it concerns the concept of nation and people. When Our Lady spoke about the annihilation of nations, we think first and foremost about, and rightly so, of their physical obliteration. But it can also have another secondary meaning. It can mean their artificial neutralization in the melting pot of an ideological project called either the Soviet people or the European people.

In the former Soviet Union the citizens of individual countries were told that they should forget about their former national and ethnic identities. They should, they were told, consider them-

selves members of the Soviet people rather than citizens of Ukraine or Belorussia or Uzbekistan or any other state. And exactly the same is happening in the EU super state.

The European Union is intent on destroying nation states, suppressing national identities and borders, so that we can happily live in an always-progressing supra-national community of EU faithful. Just to give one of the latest examples: Brussels wants the member states to implement a curriculum reform in the schools throughout the European Union regarding the teaching of history.

First they want to have a new subject called “The History of the European Union” that would be taught in all the public schools in all the member states.

Then they also propose a ‘national’ textbook, with individual translations in the various languages of the EU member States, that would present the whole history of Europe from the perspective of the European Union. The European Union is thus presented as the climax of the whole European history. 