

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

Alexandru Amititeloaie*

Abstract

European integration, begun more than 60 years ago, has always faced, with each legal measure adopted in this respect, the resistance of the European peoples that have always been afraid to lose their sovereignty. Camouflaged in an attractive packaging for Europeans, political integration has constantly continued its course, since what has been done so far in the economic sphere, accepted by peoples out of reasons that keep to prosperity and progress, could not have been possible without the transfer of political decisions from a national to a community level. In other words, this means giving up on national sovereignty in favor of some superstatal authorities; however, Europeans have never been told this directly.

Now, when the process is quite advanced and one may notice that in certain national affairs the internal authorities, democratically chosen by the citizens, no longer have the power to make a decision, the issue of sovereignty is thus more often brought into public attention, the reactions against being more and more radical. Political leaders tackle differently the issue of sovereignty, and subsequently states regard this issue as being more or less important, comparing it to other issues considered now more urgent, such as for instance the crisis and its effects.

The latest treaty for the establishment of the European Financial Stability Facility, by its content, unfortunately too little known and analyzed in the public sphere, represents perhaps the most important step towards the almost definitive abandonment of national sovereignty. The British Foreign Secretary, William Hague, declared right after the Summit of the European Council on 9th December 2011: "There are countries willing to give away their national sovereignty and the control over national budgets, so as to make the Eurozone more functional". Romania is obviously part of these countries, if we take into consideration the attitude of submission that our leaders adopt towards the power organisms of the European Union.

But giving up on its national sovereignty, Romania seems to be receiving nothing in exchange and this makes us wonder on the commitments of our leaders, more exactly in favor of whom and on what grounds are these commitments exerted. One should also emphasize the fact that the process of Romania's integration in the European Union was done without consulting the people. Taking into

* Alexandru Amititeloaie, Ph.D., is Reader at „George Bacovia” University of Bacău, Romania; contact: amititeloaie@yahoo.com

consideration the fact that the integration implies, as one may notice, the abandonment of national sovereignty, we should ask ourselves the question whether those who decided the European integration had a clear mandate from the rightful owner of sovereignty, i.e. the Romanian people, as is stipulated in the Romanian Constitution, article 2, paragraph (1).

Keywords: European Union, sovereignty, federation, European Commission

I. The United States of Europe – a camouflaged federation?

Officially we know that the roots of the actual European construction are chronologically placed in the period following the Second World War. The disastrous effects of the conflagration had created an extremely favorable climate to implement some older projects of European management. Therefore, when a new political geography of Europe was suggested as a solution to prevent future conflicts, the entire population of the old continent agreed, strongly supporting the political acts initiated for this purpose. .

But the idea of a United Europe is much older and, as it is very well known, all historical attempts to achieve this failed, being actually rejected by the European public opinion. However the project was never abandoned. In the 20s top theoreticians started supporting more adamantly the idea of unity and cooperation among European countries. Two of these, Jean Monnet², who would become the father of Europe, and Arthur Salter did not limit themselves to a union based mainly on cooperation, but went further supporting the idea of a „supranational government” that would rule „The United States of Europe”. In several essays Arthur Salter supported the idea of the total subordination of European states towards a sole political, economic and military authority, national Parliaments and Governments becoming thus mere local administration institutions³.

The European political climate following the First World War was not favorable for the implementation of such a project. National states had been barely founded and therefore any idea of „European unity” generated fears regarding the risk of losing their recently gained integrity, independence and freedom.

When however in 1940 the danger for France to be occupied by Germany was imminent, the initiators of the project had a first attempt to start its implementation. A French – British union was proposed but not as an inter-state collaboration, but actually as a newly created state that would have a sole government, army, citizenship and currency. Except for the joint currency, the

² Jean Omer Marie Gabriel Monnet (born on 9th November 1888 – dead on 16th March 1979) is regarded as the architect of European Union. As a businessman he became known during the First World War, while catering the Allied Forces. He is thus rewarded with the position of UN Deputy Secretary General. During the Second World War he met Charles de Gaulle, Winston Churchill, Franklin Delano Roosevelt as well as other political personalities, who he influenced in their project of European unity

³ Christopher Booker, Richard North, The Great Deception – A Secret History of the European Union, <http://www.free-europe.org/blog/english.php>, <http://eureferendum.blogspot.com/2006/05/europe-day.html> .

project was accepted by the British, but rejected by the French, who feared they would thus become a British dominion.

After the Second World War the situation was much more favorable not only because of the European general state of mind, traumatized by the consequences of the war and concerned with finding solutions to avoid such tragedies, but also because this project was now supported by the most important political figures of the time, such as Charles de Gaulle and Winston Churchill, whose image and credibility had consolidated during the war and who thus enjoyed a huge political capital. Since the French – British union had failed, a second alternative was chosen, i.e. a partnership between France and Germany, supported by Winston Churchill ever since September 1946, when at the University from Zürich he had used the term “United States of Europe”. On 9th May 1950 a first plan was effectively launched and accepted by the two countries; according to this plan, the production of coal and steel of the two countries would be controlled by a supernational High Authority. With Italy, The Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg joining, the European Community of Coal and Steel was formed in 1952. This was a matter of tactics inspired by the Prime Minister of Belgium at that time, Paul-Henri Spaak. He considered that given the historical context the idea of a political union could not be suggested at the beginning. Therefore, the solution was to disguise the political purpose under the mask of economic cooperation. This is how in 1957 the Rome Treaty, setting the base for the European Economic Community, was signed.

Another important collaborator of Jean Monnet was Altiero Spinesi, an Italian communist, who was rather anonymous until today⁴, though he strongly supported the idea of „The Single European Act”, a pact that was the basis of the harmonization of the legal systems of Member States and then the Maastricht Treaty, which marked another stage in the evolution of the process of European integration.

Even though the focus has always been placed on economic integration, the political decision-making process was also gradually transferred towards the European administrative institutions. The project „Jean Monnet” is considered to have been in fact „a slow-motion coup d’état”. In this entire process European nations have only been represented, but not consulted, even if based on their sovereignty right they should have given up on their sovereignty by transparent and free consent.

It is difficult to say now what the initiators and all the other persons, who during this period of more than 60 years in one way or another brought their contribution to this vast project, actually intended. Did they perhaps believe that 500 million inhabitants, of different nationalities, speaking different languages, coming from completely different historical and cultural traditions and last but not

⁴ On 26th February 2002, at Brussels the works of the Convention for the drafting of the Constitution of United Europe began. As a sign of gratitude towards Altiero Spinesi, considered to be the first who ever suggested the idea of a Constitution of the United States of Europe and an activist of political integration, the Convention gave his name to an important administrative building.

least living in countries that differed greatly in their levels of civilization and economic development, could indeed have a unique government? Moreover, how could such a government remain democratic?

Without suspecting the fact that the initiators of this project had any bad intentions whatsoever and without throwing any doubt on the fact that these initiators of the project had nothing else in view but the welfare of all Europeans, one should still notice and emphasize the fact that the stages and political actions adopted so far have not involved the European nations, i.e. the large masses of citizens, as well. Their participation was somehow avoided, kept at a distance from the entire process of political integration, disguised as it has been shown here in the form of economic cooperation.

Before 1990 the population in the West was not effectively involved in the political process. A series of factors contributed to the increase in their standard of living and civilization and thus the people did not show much interest in public affairs, which were handled exclusively by political leaders, who also as a result of prosperity and welfare had the trust of the people. From this point of view the “Iron Curtain” played a certain role in its turn. Under its pressure, Western politicians felt obliged to do everything to avoid disappointing the large masses of citizens, who under strong ideological influences could have produced social turmoil. However, this factor disappeared once the dictatorial regimes from Central and East European countries collapsed. Moreover, these countries were also attracted in the process of European integration, which led to the appearance of new problems on the agenda of the European project. Under these circumstances, with the disappearance of the balance of forces existent before 1990, the European administration suddenly felt more relaxed and therefore less fearful of the consequences of its political actions. Subtly there appeared in the structure of this administration a certain select category, with the intention of being considered “elite”, which has managed so far to monopolize to a great extent the European decision-making process, thus constantly increasing its authority, strongly promoting the democratic values and interests of the peoples of the Old Continent, without however stating to serve and defend them. This “elite” has indeed acquired too much power and since power can be stopped only by power, we the Europeans, regardless of nationality, should stop being indifferent towards whatever happens in Brussels.

II. National sovereignty – the price of European integration

The European Union is an atypical international organization with strong super-statal traits and clear federalist tendencies⁵. As it has already been shown above, the European Union has had so far a process of integration of Member States but the people of these states were not aware of the fact that along the integration they would eventually lose their sovereignty. Unlike cooperation, integration implies a fusion of political, administrative and legal systems of Member States, and the creation of similar institutions with competence over the entire European space. In other words it is a transfer of sovereign power towards a super-statal

⁵ Dumitru Mazilu, *Uniunea Europeană și alte puteri ale lumii*, in the journal *Lumea*, issue 12/2008, p. 62

authority. This process, though begun more than 60 years ago, has so far never generated so many radical reactions like today. Not even the debates on the issue of sovereignty have been so popular to the public, as is the case now when under the pressure of the crisis the authority leaders of the European Union make arbitrary decisions, with no democratic legitimacy, against the official position of some Member States and – which is less known – against the interests of the European states.

National or state sovereignty is the emblem of the independent state. Based on this sovereignty the leading institution of the state is an inner authority, without any external traits whatsoever. The sovereignty also allows the state to become subject of international law, i.e. to participate in relations to other states and international organizations. So, to sum up, the sovereignty expresses exclusive power, internally and independence in international policy.

But sovereignty is regarded by each nation from rather personal perspectives. In the case of nations that were ruled for longer or shorter periods of time by other nations, gaining their freedom at the expense of great sacrifices, becoming then independent states, sovereignty is a supreme value and does not refer only to legal or political matters. For these nations the concept of sovereignty is far more complex, encompassing cultural, religious, spiritual values that define every nation in part. When talking about sovereignty, especially in the case of these nations, one cannot ignore their turbulent history or the sacrifices made by generations of predecessors for this purpose. For all these nations sovereignty is thus a sacred value and should not be tackled superficially, especially by those persons, who for a short period of time have certain leading positions in these nations. They are not the holders of the right of sovereignty, so as to allow negotiations and concessions on it. This fact should be emphasized especially in case of Romania, since sovereignty is for the Romanian nation the quintessence of its turbulent history and no matter how complicated the current situation is, no one should negotiate solutions based on sovereignty. The other nations of Europe that are in a similar situation with ours, strongly stick to their sovereignty. Some of these nations however have leaders who do not deny this supreme value and who actually fight for it.

Being such an important value for each nation in part, sovereignty turns out to be a serious obstacle for the vast European and globalist projects.

The end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century marked a genuine offensive of the globalization process that was unequivocally supported by leaders of great powers, who thus obtained important benefits from the consolidation of the economic world system. According to one of the most famous analysts of international complex processes, the ones gaining the most from global economy, which they actually dominate, are the Americans, which is why the globalization bears the label “made in USA”⁶. From the ample multilateral diplomatic debates especially within specialized institutions of the World Trade Organization, it results that the main role within this process is played by the

⁶ Francis Fukuyama, *Construcția statelor. Ordinea mondială în secolul XXI*, Editura ANTET XX PRESS, 2004, p. 114.

transnational forces⁷. They are considered to be the main actors of the erosion of national states that reduce sovereignty to an outdated concept, an obstacle that should be removed at any cost, so as to allow „the global progress of humanity”⁸.

Taking into consideration the latest European integration process one may notice that globalization affects Europe, as well, especially if one considers the fact that transnational institutions, as well as their base instruments, i.e. the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, are to be found in Europe. At the December 2011 summit of the European Council from Brussels one tried to take the most important step in giving up the sovereignty, following the Rome and Maastricht Treaties. It is the Treaty of establishing the so-called European Stability Mechanism. By means of the 1957 Rome Treaty one gave up on tariff policy, thus creating the unique market. This was followed by the disappearance of national currencies, considered national symbols just like flags, and also of monetary policies that used to set the types of interest and exchange rates. Now one tries to oblige states to give up entirely on their budgetary policies, i.e. „the political soul of the national state”⁹.

According to the project treaty, the European Stability Mechanism (ESM) was to be invested with super-statal powers which would allow for the immediate and clear execution of its provisions. With full exercise capacity ESM would become a European legal entity. The ownership, its funds and assets would have full immunity towards any form of jurisdiction. Therefore, they could never become the object of any search warrant, requisition, seizure, expropriation, distraint etc. According to the Treaty the leading institution would be a Council of Governors, the members of this council benefitting from immunity in what regards official documents and their personal actions.

For starters the social capital should have been € 700 billion, as a result of the contributions of Member States, which would have been bound irrevocably and unconditionally to pay at request within 7 days any capital request whatsoever. The sum could have been modified at any time by the Council of Governors. We believe that only these provisions of the pact are enough to make us become aware of the absolute power of this institution, with no democratic legitimacy whatsoever. The decisions of the European Council around this pact generated in the capitals of most Member States serious political debates precisely around the great issue „hidden” behind the economic and financial crisis: sovereignty. Great Britain and Hungary decided not to take part in this agreement, whereas the Czech Republic and Sweden wanted to consult their parliaments.

⁷ Georg Henrik von Wright, *The crisis of social science and the withering away of the nation state*, Associations I, 1997, p. 49, apud Dumitru Mazilu, *Există un drept la violarea suveranității naționale?* in the journal *Lumea* issue 10/2011, p. 100.

⁸ *Ibidem*.

⁹ Sandy Orășanu, *Adio dulce suveranitate*, in the journal *Lumea*, issue 1/2012, p. 63.

On 2nd March 2012¹⁰ the leaders of the EU Member States, among which Romania, as well, reunited within the spring European Council, signed at Brussels the Treaty regarding the stability, the coordination and governance within the Monetary and Economic Union. The Czech Republic and Great Britain kept their positions and did not join the treaty¹¹. This treaty is to be ratified according to the procedures from each Member State, which are, as it has been shown, parliamentary.

The issue of sovereignty has recently become the most important topic in the European project. Even though the process begun a couple of years ago, still it seems that now under the pressure of the crisis, the European „elite” insists on an almost complete integration and the nations begin to feel afraid of losing their sovereignty. However, national leaders are usually part of this „elite” and thus try to impose the decisions from Brussels to the states they represent. There are nonetheless voices that not only oppose, of course with the risk of sanctions applied to their states, but also try to draw the attention upon the danger of Europeans losing their sovereignty.

Great Britain has always had a reserved position. Their Sterling Pound is a much more important symbol than any other national currency of Member States. The imperial greatness and the national pride are unsurpassable obstacles and British leaders do not dare thus to endanger in any way their national sovereignty. Talking about the states that had joined the intergovernmental treaty, the Foreign Affairs Minister William Hague declared that „there are countries willing to give up on their national sovereignty and control over their national budgets in order to make the Eurozone more functional”, but Great Britain „does not wish to give up on national powers, we do not wish to give up on our national sovereignty”¹².

If Great Britain can afford such attitudes without major risks, countries like The Czech Republic and Hungary, which by their leaders also oppose to this treaty, are exposed to drastic measures from the illegitimate power from Brussels. The President of Czech Republic, Vaclav Klaus declared that if the government from Prague decided to join the fiscal pact, he would refuse to adopt the law, since this law would mean „a drastic reduction of national sovereignty”¹³. Even the manner in which the Greek crisis was handled is a serious warning that this transfer of sovereignty is not for the benefit of Europeans. The governor of the Central Bank from Prague declared that „Greece was given money only to give the Greek rich enough time to transfer their money in other countries.”¹⁴ We tend to believe that

¹⁰ Why did the President of Romania write next to his signature of this treaty the date 02.02.2012, as everyone saw? Was this a mistake, a joke, as he suggested, or is there a deeper meaning to all this?

¹¹ <http://www.cotidianul.ro/un-nou-tratat-pentru-tarile-ue-174713/>

¹² http://www.realitatea.net/izolarea-britanica-nu-dorim-sa-ne-cedam-suveranitateanationala_893948.html#ixzz1qIwmyMd1

¹³ <http://www.cotidianul.ro/suveranitatea-nationala-in-pericol-presedintele-cehiei-nu-va-promulga-pactul-fiscal-al-ue-169514/>

¹⁴ Ibidem.

this specialist in Finances knows what he says and does it with great courage and honesty.

Another opponent of the fiscal pact and generally of the political integration is the Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban. After the European Council summit from 2nd March 2012 at Brussels he declared: „We want Hungary to revolve around its own axis, therefore we will protect our Constitution, which is the key to a safe future. An independent national bank is the one that protects national economy from foreign interests. They know, just as well as we do, that obviously “one does not leave the storeroom key to one’s neighbors”¹⁵. Furthermore, he warns us that „if we do not act on time, the entire Europe could become a colony of a modern financial system.”¹⁶Such an attitude cannot be ignored by Brussels. Knowing the state of mind of the Europeans, the power center from Brussels realized the danger of such reactions. From the declarations of the European Commissioner for Justice, Fundamental Rights and Citizenship, Viviane Reding, Hungary is currently under a careful supervision. „We are watching closely all these manifestations”¹⁷, she declared.

Everything going on nowadays and the international public opinion pay attention to the major risks – planned a long time ago – humanity is being exposed to. The indifference towards the signals of the mass media at that time could be one of the major causes of the fact that the process has so far easily imposed, thus creating the impression of transparency and of the lack of any risk whatsoever. The declarations of the ones initiating and implementing this process of globalization are enlightening.

For example, Zbigniew Brzezinski, founder of the Trilateral Commission and former counselor of the US President, declared that regionalization was the way to „the gradual convergence of East and West towards a unique World Government. National sovereignty is no longer a viable concept.” If we consider how much emphasis is being placed in our case on the issue of regionalization, we may strongly believe, without the fear of making a mistake, that the Romanian government is keen on achieving this project and follows thoroughly the instructions of certain structures that are still mysterious to many people. One may easily notice that regionalization is the way towards the disappearance of national states and Brzezinski inferred this pretty well 15 years ago¹⁸.

Against the possibility of a world government, another partisan of this project saw the existence of two strong forces, namely religion and patriotism. Therefore, these two should be removed, since according to this opinion, humanity

¹⁵ Istvan Deak, *Comisia Europeană amenință Ungaria cu o măsură „ECHIVALENTĂ CU O BOMBĂ ATOMICĂ”*. Premierul ungar refuză să-și transforme țara într-o „colonie financiară”, article published in „Jurnalul național” on 26th March 2012.

¹⁶ *Ibidem.*

¹⁷ Mihaela Gheorghiu, *Criza europeană, datoriile suverane și moneda euro*, in the journal *Lumea*, issue 12/2011, pp. 49-53

¹⁸ Dan Zamfirescu, *Ce se ascunde în spatele crizei planetare*, in the journal *Lumea*, issue 12/2011, p. 48

could thus evolve towards „a scientific society”, which can be stable only under the rule of a world government.

David Rockefeller declared not long ago: „We are in a process of global transformation. We only need a major crisis and all nations will accept the New World Order”. George Soros also warned us in 1995 that „a period of great disorder in the world” would come, the ultimate solution being a new world order. In 2009, pleased with the success of his actions and of the financial elite, he is part of, Soros declared that „the current crisis is the climax of my lifetime work ... I am experiencing an excellent crisis”¹⁹.

III. The Romanian people did not ratify the treaty of Romania joining the European Union

After more than five years since Romania joined the EU, I believe it is only natural to wonder whether this position of EU Member State really means a chance of progress and development, as well as a better life for Romanian citizens. The general state of the country is severely altered and even the hopes of Romanians that they would once enjoy life according to their work, have shattered. Nothing of what once was considered the wealth of the country belongs to us anymore. Other people exploit this wealth and do it actually so naturally, as if it had always been theirs, as if they had an ancestral right over this wealth. Gradually even the land begins to be taken over by them and so we begin feeling more estranged in Romania than in any other country in the world. Some of us however take „advantage” of their right to migrate and of the „chance” to sell themselves in a humiliating way to foreigners. The prostitution networks, the organs banks, the fatiguing and degrading agricultural or household labors, all these are „great achievements” from Romanian citizens, as a direct result of Romania joining the „select” European family. Maybe Romanian citizens should have wondered a longer time ago whether the decisions of their leaders regarding joining the EU were in their interest, as well. Even if it may seem somehow late, certain things should still be clarified. First and foremost, one should emphasize the fact that Romania joined the European Union without the consent of Romanians and avoiding their consultation was deliberate.

As one knows, the Pre-Joining Treaty was signed in 1995, when a series of measures to be implemented so as to reach the European standards was set. We did not fulfill of course all conditions so as to take the risk of joining a market with extremely tough rules. First we had to become compatible with these values and that is why we were asked to implement reforms under highly strict and exigent supervision of European authorities. So, in 1995 Romania did not meet the conditions to join the European Union. But after 12 years of „reforms” did Romania manage to reach the European standards, so as to be fully accepted in this „select” family? What did actually happen in this period? Romania continued the self-destructive process begun in 1990. The deeper the economic, social, cultural, spiritual degradation, the greater the alteration of education, health, defense, public

¹⁹ Mihai Constantinescu, Ioan Muraru, Antonie Iorgovan, *Revizuirea Constituției României, Explicații și comentarii*, Editura Rosetti, Bucharest, 2003, pp. 131-132.

order, justice, administration; as the wealth of the country was given away almost for free, the country reports showed progresses.

When the economy of the country was still functional, when the state still had the capacity to support the health and education systems, when the administration and justice were not as vitiated as today, the European authorities considered we were not ready to face Community exigencies, but needed a time to prepare. All governments did everything to please European commissioners, each in turn taking pride in the joining process. What exactly did this pride mean? Destroying or selling away inland production facilities, facilitating the access of foreign products on the Romanian market to the detriment of local products, free access of foreign companies to national resources, reformation of education and health systems, so as to weaken the vitality of the Romanian people etc. When all these conditions were met, Europe considered we had reached the joining standards, thus being accepted in the „select” European family.

This was the great diversion of the joining process, in other words the great lie. Romanians however saw the huge gap between the promising and visibly deceiving political speech, on the one hand, and the concrete actions taken to transform the country into a colony, on the other hand. They could not have been so naive as to believe that the demolition of economic factories, the country's deprivation of its wealth, the highly aggressive attempts to ruin cultural and spiritual values could actually represent the desired reform and could really have benefic results for them. The joining „activists” noticed quite well that the state of mind of the population was not at all favorable to the idea of Romania joining the EU, precisely because of the fact that the country was falling apart. Therefore, organizing a referendum would have been pretty risky.

That is why in 2003, when the Constitution was changed, a new chapter was introduced under the name: Euro – Atlantic Integration. According to article 148, paragraph (1) of this chapter, „Romania can join the constituent treaties of European Union, so as to transfer some attributions to community institutions and to exert the competencies mentioned in these treaties, together with the other Member States, this joining process being done by means of a law adopted in the joint session of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate, with a majority of two thirds of the number of deputies and senators.” Therefore, one was not to use the referendum, as it had happened in the other states, including at the 2004 EU enlargement, the greatest in the history of the Union, when 10 countries joined the EU. Why did the Romanian Constitution establish that joining would be made by means of law and not referendum, as it had happened in the other countries? Did Romanian governors receive an order to give up on the referendum or, seeing the state of mind of the population, did they themselves wish to avoid a failure, a negative vote of the referendum meaning in fact a negative vote given to the power? These are questions that cannot be left without an answer, taking into consideration the fact that day by day we find out more and more inside details of the European integration. Romania has the most to lose from this process and this fact cannot be overlooked.

So, by means of a law adopted by the Parliament, certain attributions are transferred to community institutions. Not any attributions, but those belonging to national sovereignty. However, according to article 2, paragraph (1) from the same

Constitution „national sovereignty belongs to the Romanian people, exerting it by its representative institutions, elected by free, periodic and fair vote, as well as by referendum”. Nowhere in this article is it written that sovereignty attributions may be exerted by other authorities than those elected, which do not have the right to transfer such attributions to other institutions. They are given these attributions only to exert and not to transfer to other institutions. Therefore, the provisions of article 148, paragraph (1) are contradictory to those of article 2, paragraph (1).

In what regards this situation, we find the explanations and comments of prestige „constitutionalists” ridiculous²⁰. First, they regard Romania’s joining the EU as a highly important act, comparable to the great events from the modern period of our state, considering furthermore that in this way our country joins again the family of European democratic states, being thus a climax of „the social, economic and political processes started by the Romanian Revolution”²¹. Hence, according to these commentators, the changes in Romania in the last period are nothing else but democratic transformations and progress. These persons either have no sense of reality, or in their opinions, progress means the opulence, in which the devourers of this country, including the earnest activists of this imperial-type Europeanism, live.

Secondly, even though the text of the Constitution states pretty clearly that EU joining is done for „the transfer of certain attributions to community institutions”, the above mentioned commentators say that this „does not affect the sovereignty of the country, but quite on the contrary, guarantees its achievement on a superior, European level, to the benefit of all and each, in part”. Such a statement reminds us of another epoch, which according to the same commentators was ended by the Romanian Revolution, this moment marking the beginning of social, economic and political processes that would have brought us closer to „the family of European democracies”. I would like to mention here once again that sovereignty means exclusiveness of power inside and independence outside. But, as long as the decisions regarding the governing of the country are made by an outer authority, since the elected institutions of the country have become mere performers, could we still say that sovereignty is not affected? Maybe when this comment was made, the loss of sovereignty of EU countries was not so advanced, but the so-called „reforms” implemented for the EU joining showed not only to specialists, but also to common people that one day Romania would cease to exist as a national state. This moment is closer and closer, unless something happens in Europe to stop this project.

Precisely since it is such an important political act, according to the same commentators, the joining treaty has to be adopted in the joint session of the two Chambers with a majority of two thirds. Not by referendum that would give the people the possibility to express their opinion regarding the sovereignty of their country. And this comment shows us clearly that the referendum was avoided

²⁰ *Ibidem.*

²¹ Viorel Patrichi, *Cinci ani de UE – Între pragmatism și dezamăgire*, in the journal *Lumea*, issue 3(228)/2012, pp. 72-74.

intentionally, as the risk for the people to reject the joining treaty was pretty obvious.

If, as already shown before, other European leaders stick to the sovereignty of their states, Romania does not have such rulers. Instead of previously consulting the people regarding the position that should be adopted towards the decisions of European institutions, these Romanian leaders discretionarily take commitments that emphasize the enslavement of the country and of future generations, as well. One may notice the fact that referendums are organized only as a result of presidential whims but not when there are issues of interest that need the opinion of the people.

The President of Romania recently declared: „The only solution for EU to be a leader of global policies is a profound integration. The adequate solution is the creation of the United States of Europe. Sooner or later we will have to place together the sovereignty, so as to create a sovereign European Union, capable of competing against great global actors.”²² This idea is not supported by a singular voice, but quite on the contrary, it is a subsequent voice, receiving orders from someone else, expressing interests of someone else and not of our country. Last year, the German Minister of Labor, Ursula von der Leyen, declared that this crisis in the Eurozone may be overcome only by the creation of the United States of Europe: „My objective is to create the United States of Europe, after the model of other federal states, such as Switzerland, Germany or USA”. One may easily notice that as Romania has less and less inhabitants, other countries from the elite nucleus of European Union, especially Germany, prosper even during the crisis.

So, for us the solution would be „to place together the sovereignty”. What could possibly result if we place together the sovereignty of Romania, as well as of other countries in a similar situation, with the sovereignty of Germany? Would that result in a stronger sovereignty at the level of European Union, a sovereignty for the benefit of all nations or would that result in a Europe desired by Hitler, and since his project failed, with a sacrifice of more than 50 million people, a new experiment is now attempted? What Germany has in view obviously poses interest to us and precisely since we know the history of Germany, we should pay more attention. However, first and foremost, we should wonder how and why the President of Romania became such an earnest activist of integration, as Germany wants, and especially who mandates him to dispose of the sovereignty of the country according to his will.

Conclusions

Utopian plans regarding the future of mankind have been made before and every time they failed, having however dramatic consequences for humans. As in the case of other fatal experiences, these plans are the direct consequence of the fact that certain fellow creatures have gained and gathered too much wealth and power, a process which strangely goes hand in hand with the indifference of masses, even though the warnings are more and more incisive and contended. This is why the nations of the Old Continent, still considering the tragedies from their history,

²² <http://karadeniz-press.ro/kara/germania-forteaza-formarea-statelor-unite-ale-europei/>

should no longer be tempted by the perspective of a Europe „to the benefit of all and each, in part”. Something like is a utopia and I do not think it is worth sacrificing the national sovereignty. Sovereignty is the utmost value of a nation, the greatest expression of its freedom. It is not given as a gift, but is the result of great sacrifices that every nation had to make so as to gain independence.

REFERENCES

- Booker, Christopher Richard North, *The Great Deception – A Secret History of the European Union*, <http://www.free-europe.org/blog/english.php>.
- Orășanu, Sandy, *Adio dulce suveranitate*, Lumea, issue 1/2012.
- Constantinescu, Mihai, Ioan Muraru, Antonie Iorgovan, *Revizuirea Constituției României, Explicații și comentarii*, Editura Rosetti, Bucharest, 2003.
- Fukuyama, Francis, *Construcția statelor. Ordinea mondială în secolul XXI*, Editura ANTET XX, 2004.
- Gheorghiu, Mihaela, *Criza europeană, datoriile suverane și moneda euro*, Lumea, 12/2011.
- Mazilu, Dumitru, *Uniunea Europeană și alte puteri ale lumii*, Lumea, 12/2008.
- Mazilu, Dumitru, *Există un drept la violarea suveranității naționale?*, Lumea, 10/2011.
- Patrichi, Viorel, *Cinci ani de UE – Între pragmatism și dezamăgire*, Lumea, 3(228)/2012.
- Zamfirescu, Dan, *Ce se ascunde în spatele crizei planetare*, Lumea, 12/2011.