

monetarist policies and to the cause of the so-called stability pact—which is nothing but chains preventing the prisoners from leaving their jail cells while the prison is burning. The euro, the common currency of 11 of our states, is going to be imposed on Jan. 1, 2002, against the sovereign national power of each nation to print its own currency.

The debate is not based on reality, but on formal combinations hiding the absolute impotence of all to address the real problem. As in a Rabelaisian story, each of the participants grabs a tail which leads to no real body. Some call for a federalist utopia, with no defined purpose—a hara-kiri of their very self to do so. It is said that while the American government is conducting a war without knowing its aim, the European governments are searching for unity without knowing why. Others respond to such a flight forward with a flight backward, and mistake national sovereignty for chauvinism, retreating into a foxhole. The more sophisticated fools call for a “federation of nation-states,” a sort of animal with two tails but, still, no body.

We cannot tolerate that any longer. In the real world of today, in the present tragedy, the nations of continental Europe are only going to survive as nations if they break with the present financial and monetary system, throw away the rotten pedestal and drop the tails. It can only be done, at this point, by joining the New Bretton Woods and Eurasian Land-Bridge perspective, as a common cause of Europe. It requires political boldness in action more than in words, and no institutional martingales of any sort. It is the only option to reshape the world economic order according to the best that our common political culture has been able to bring forth.

How To Make The Impossible, Possible

Europe can only be built by daring to accomplish great projects together, not by compromises around diplomatic tables or following the advice of so-called experts. Under the dictates of Maastricht, Amsterdam, and Nice, it is impossible. At the same time, the process of the enforcement of the euro is taking place. The question, therefore, is how to make the impossible, possible. In other words, how to introduce, under the aegis of Europe, a new hypothesis, solving the paradox that we are confronting, and succeed in doing so. After all, is it not the solution of paradoxes that defines European culture, and not vain deductions or synthesis?

Let’s then see what true European culture and the laboratory of European history tell us.

First, that none of our European continental nations is able today—as opposed to Russia, the United States, or the British monarchy—to conceive of itself as providing leadership to the world, for the best or for the worst. Why? Because we have been, over recent decades, occupied countries, both by foreign armies and by the Anglo-American counterculture and financial power. France, except for some years under de Gaulle and a few months under Mendes-France, has never recovered from Napoleon, the Holy Alliance, World Wars I

and II, and the scars of colonialism. Germany was, after France, the target of the British monarchy, and it never recovered, as a world-leading nation, from World War I, Nazism, World War II, and the post-war occupation. Other continental countries are in no better shape, or, worse, with the exception of those Italian politicians inspired by the principles of Pope John Paul II. The situation, in official terms, is therefore practically hopeless.

But, reality is never restricted to official terms. Out of the best of our nations—which all have been part, at different moments, of the great European Renaissances—it is possible for a group of people to emerge of the type that Jean Monnet used to call “inspirers.” This is again a paradox: As the tragic present moment of history scares our leaders and political careerists of all sorts, it, on the contrary, gives rise to the best impulses in people who identify with those past moments of the Renaissance. These are generally, as Lyndon LaRouche often repeats, individuals born before 1945, old enough to have escaped from the short-termism of post-war counterculture.

Thus we have, in each of our countries, a potential “assembly of good minds” that can provide inspiration and leadership. It is our task to find them, give them hope, and mobilize them as a body. Those, by historical impulse, will tend to understand the present importance to link up Russia, China, India, and continental Europe in a “common cause,” in a community of principle around an economic development program—the Eurasian Land-Bridge. At the same time, they would identify the crucial issue as the direction taken by the American Presidency, because their experience covers the impact of the policies adopted by Franklin Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, and Martin Luther King. Therefore, LaRouche and the New Bretton Woods would appear for them, beyond the present limitations of their nations, as the key factor not only for the world, but also for the recovery of those very nations. Moreover, and much more important, they would identify the issue of “culture” conveyed by this approach, as opposed to the disastrous effects of the nihilism of the last 40 years.

To gather these men and women as a body of ambassadors of continental Europe, to outflank the impotence of our present politicians, and represent the cause and contribution of Europe in the debates on the New Bretton Woods, is therefore our first task. Here, today, is a step to broaden our outreach.

Getting Europe In Shape

Our second task is to establish the minimal conditions of principle required to make Europe fit for its participation in the New Bretton Woods impulse. It does not mean that the changes are going to take place by naming them, but they are well-needed points of reference for a political fight.

First condition: Europe should not continue to be built around a monetarist order, but should accomplish great infra-

structure projects, with the physical leverage of science drivers. A few years ago, European Commission President Jacques Delors tried to stress this point, but with two main flaws. He simply outlined the projects, as an excellent technocrat, but without attacking the international financial system that prevents their realization. And he did not extend the projects toward Asia and Africa, failing to give the necessary world dimension to Europe. Today, after Chinese President Jiang Zemin's call on May 24 for a "New Silk Road" between Asia and Europe, at the third foreign ministers meeting of the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM), in Beijing, the opportunity cannot be clearer.

End The Maastricht Conditionalities

Second, the paralyzing conditionalities of Maastricht and of the European Stability Pact have to be dropped. The law of physical economy has to replace the logic of impotence: because, according to the present regulations, no European state has the right to issue long-term, low-interest credit in favor of great projects—which will be reimbursed by the payback generated throughout the economy by the realization of those projects. This is labelled "inflationary," while to the contrary, the banks can issue credit with a multiplier effect to invest in the financial markets! This scandal is generally little known, except by some "experts" managing the rules of the game. Of course, on top of that system, is the European Central Bank, a bankers' and Treasury officers' bank, with no control by elected officials or political institutions.

What an hypocrisy! There is, in such a system, enough money to save the financial bubble, until the crash is detonated, while there is no credit to generate a physical development policy to the benefit of peoples and their nations. It is self-destructive and absurd. We have to reestablish instead a national banking system in each of the European states, and an association of national banks at a European level, issuing credits for great projects on the basis of their reimbursement by the earnings generated by the project itself ("deferred payments," as it was called in the terminology of the Marshall Plan). This means to shift from a short-term, fraudulent financial leverage, like in the present European system, toward a virtuous long- and medium-term physical leverage.

Third, "advanced forms of cooperation" among European states should be organized around, and for, those great projects. Such "advanced forms of cooperation" should not pertain to the domain of "the experts," but be discussed in a dialogue between the states and the citizens. As needed for the accomplishment of the corresponding physical projects, the delegation of sovereignty could be conceded on a case-by-case basis. It should never be in the abstract, in a dogmatic way, but always on a physical basis. In the latter case, it contributes to enhance the concept of national sovereignty in a higher order of common labor; in the former, it destroys the very idea of national sovereignty and republican democracy.

Fourth, behind those projects, there should be an in-depth examination of the foundations of European culture, which is the only way to assert and maintain political will. Today, there is nothing of that sort, and it could not be, because the political economy enforced in Europe goes directly against the very basis of our historical European values!

Fifth, to those who think that our arguments are good, but that one cannot go "against the winds of history," we answer that many times in the past, and quite recently, the word "Europe" has been associated with evil things, bad for other nations, and bad for Europe itself. Fortunately, Europe was able to start again, following an opposite and better track. Indeed, Europe is not a thing in itself, it depends on the intention behind those who fight for it. So, it is because we are faithful to the Europe of the Renaissances—those of Charlemagne, of Italy, of the German Classics, of Henry VII of England, and of Louis XI of France, and of the economic policies associated with them—that we absolutely reject the Europe of Maastricht, Amsterdam, and Nice, which is incompatible with a New Bretton Woods system and the resources needed for the Eurasian Land-Bridge.

A Golden Euro

So these are our principles, defining our political horizon. Nonetheless, it is already Nov. 5, and the euro, symbol of all the wrongdoings that I have just mentioned, is going to be enforced on Jan. 1 of next year. My hope would be that an unexpected and major event, such as the financial "big one," would prevent that from happening, and force through a change, in the direction that I defined. Nonetheless, one cannot bet on mere facts, and when an unpleasant trend develops, the solution is to judo or outflank it.

I propose, therefore, that the nations of continental Europe, as a national emergency measure under the present circumstances, study the feasibility and then immediately issue a golden euro. Not as a standard, a gold standard, but as a transitional instrument of common reference, calling the game of those who would prolong the evil survival of the financial bubble. The initiatives taken in Russia and Malaysia going in the same direction, with, for example, the issuance of the Russian golden chernovets, create the conditions for a first step toward the Eurasian Land-Bridge and the New Bretton Woods. In other words, the idea with this initiative is to put the hot iron where it burns, creating the conditions for an accelerated fall of the present international and monetary system, and therefore an opportunity for a change for the better.

The golden euro, so conceived, is a bridge toward the New Bretton Woods. I expect that the nations of continental Europe would dare to say what they have to say on this point, rejecting forever the delusion that we are suffering from a mere bump, while we are plunged neither into a recession nor, to be precise, into a depression, but into the final phase of the systemic world monetary and financial crisis.