
Panel 3: Jacques Cheminade

The Enemy of France Is Cartesianism

Jacques Cheminade, president of the Solidarity and Progress party in France, and Presidential candidate in France's 2007 election, addressed the seminar on Dec. 7. The session was chaired by Jonathan Tennenbaum, and included the participation of Helga Zepp-LaRouche. We publish Cheminade's remarks, and a portion of the discussion.



EIRNS/Wolfgang Lillge

Jacques Cheminade

Tennenbaum: I think yesterday, we got a very, very clear sense of what is going on in the United States, and the crucial importance of the future of the world, of the struggle that's going on there, and that Lyndon LaRouche and his collaborators there are carrying on. Also, Helga LaRouche's remarks began to approach the question, particularly from the standpoint of Germany: What do we have to do in Germany? What is the future of Germany? What kind of economy do we have to have? The crucial necessity of overturning the Maastricht agreement, of creating a situation in which Germany, particularly, can play the role that it has to play, in this new world, which we are building on the basis of the transformation of U.S. politics.

Now, this morning we're going to look, with the help of Jacques Cheminade here, very particularly at France, to start off our discussion. And, it's—I think—very unfortunate, when we look at the public discussion in Germany. I think the same thing if you were in France or in other countries, although it's said that with all the means of communication, everybody's well-informed about what's going on. But my sense is that people in Germany, for example, know much less about what is going on in France, today, than they did, for example, 20 years ago, or 30 years ago. Although we're supposedly, in this unified Europe, we're supposedly in this small planet, but in fact, if you would ask somebody in Germany, "Well, what's really happening in France? What are the important issues there?" they would probably not be able to tell you anything. And, likewise, the inverse.

So, we're in what you called in the old times, the *Tal der Ahnungslosen* (Valley of the Clueless).

That just emphasizes the crucial role of LaRouche and his

collaborators in actually putting this world together. And for this reason, particularly because of the great importance of France historically, as Lyn was describing it yesterday, as the main partner of Germany in Europe, but also as a country—and I think Jacques will emphasize this—which has a very much greater potential than has been expressed up to now. And as LaRouche mentioned, we have the story of Mitterrand, we have the British influence, we have a conflict there, which has played a very big role in what has happened in Germany.

So, I want to leave these paradoxes for Jacques Cheminade to solve for us. He is the main collaborator of LaRouche in France, over decades. And he is the person who knows the most, in depth, about that country and where it has to go.

Cheminade: Thank you very much, and good morning to all.

I am going to say certain things about France this morning that do not pertain to France as such, but, as Helga LaRouche did for Germany, pertain to the challenge of present-day history. France is at a crossroads: On the one side you have the neo-conservative sophistry of Interior Minister Nicolas Sarkozy. On the other side, the republican impulse and tradition of our nation, that no political leader represents, except me.

Dominique de Villepin, the Prime Minister, is the official enemy of Sarkozy, in the official cartoon about French politics. But he plays in the same field, and despite his Gaullist proclivities, is impaired by his aristocratic pretenses and his generational Boomerism. (He's a Baby-Boomer, an aristocratic Baby-Boomer.) A key point to understand the French scene, is that both Villepin and Sarkozy are promoted by all the media, as the only alternatives, and that both are noblemen of dubious extraction. Villepin's full name is Galouzeau de Villepin. And Sarkozy's is Sarkozy de Nagy-Bocsa, from an Austro-Hungarian background. Others give certain Balkan names to him, but that's another story.

The Socialist Party is in shambles—even more than usual—devastated by petty quarrels among various heirs of Mitterrand, and maintaining that they are heirs of Mitterrand, proud of their impotence. The Communist Party is like a ghost running after its shadow. And the Christian Democrats, the UDF, are obsessed by positioning themselves on a scene that unfortunately doesn't exist.

In such a situation, we should look first at what Sarkozy does represent. In American terms, the closest person to Sarkozy would be Newt Gingrich, a right-wing Jacobin. He calls for a break, in French history, a re-founding of the state, on the basis of firmness, justice, and decisive action. And he lays a lot on the issue of decisive action. He repeats, again and again, that the French elites are a bunch of cowards, who do not have the courage to diagnose the crisis, and act upon it. "I am the first one to say, and to have said," he stresses, "that the truth has to be put on the table. The French social state is dead, the French integration of immigrants has failed, and I am the only one to propose solutions."



France's neo-con Interior Minister Nicolas Sarkozy. "My deep conviction," said Cheminade, is "that the Sarkozy operation is going to fail. The . . . main reason is that his American-based protectors are on the way out."

These so-called solutions are the policies of the Mont Pelerin Society, and the Pinochet model: the dismantling of the social state, reduction of public expenses in a systematic way, privatization, and integration into globalization—coined under the word of “reforms.” To “integrate oneself into globalization” is called a “reform.” On top of it, like Friedrich August von Hayek, he calls for a strong state, to protect law and order, a strong police force to keep the population in check, and the defense of the republic against the mafias, and the “bearded ones”—the Islamic fundamentalists that he denounces.

When he goes to the United States, Sarkozy goes on a private plane, with a score of bodyguards, and he postures at the American Enterprise Institute—the house of Lynne Cheney and Michael Ledeen—and at the neo-conservative Hudson Institute. And probably, he meets there, the infamous Laurent Murawiec. He declares such things as, “I love American culture! American movies, and American music. And sometimes, I even would say that I feel more at home in the America of George Bush and Dick Cheney, than in my own country, France.” This is a quote. He said that at Columbia University to American students (in a mediocre English, according to the journalists who were there).

Why does such a man represent such a true danger for France and for Europe? He seems so antagonistic to the traditional Gaullist-Socialist mix, that normally, he should not be attractive at all. But he is—because the situation is not a normal one. He’s attractive by default. Sarkozy has understood that, from his opportunistic standpoint, and plays on it. The whole French press, which is at this point more controlled by financial interests than any other in the world, and the French television, keep promoting an image of France as a country in a very deep crisis, because it sticks to the past ideology

of a centralized social state. For example, *l’Expansion*, the publication of the financial conglomerates, depicts France in a state of bankruptcy, where the suburbs burn, the state is over-indebted, the schools have failed, the hospitals have collapsed, and the pensions will never be paid. The only solution to the catastrophe would be . . . the liberal reforms of Sarkozy, and an adaptation of France to the realities of globalization.

And because there is a lot of resistance to this, a strong state and a strong man are needed, to enforce it: Nicolas Sarkozy.

At this point, Sarkozy has taken control of the UMP, the majority party machine, the formerly Gaullist party. And, he has his two hands on the money-bag.

Our Youth Movement, which went to the summer university of the “Young Sarkozistes,” reported the Roman circus atmosphere of the place, with a mixture of a lot of money, a lot of good food and good wine, a lot of entertainment, a private beach, big screens for football games, and an appeal to the values of “labor and social order” (while they were entertaining themselves).

Sarkozy: Little Bonaparte of the Suburbs

Sarkozy, in one word, exploits the consequences of the world that *he* has contributed to destroying as a minister of the preceding right-wing governments, to call for more, and more, of the same. He exploits the disorders of the suburbs, that he himself provoked by police interventions, connections with gangs of drug dealers, and inflammatory declarations on the need to “clean the rugs with *carsher*,” with acid water, to promote law and order. He is helped in that, I must say, by the neo-conservative media networks, notably CNN and Fox News, and also the German and British media, which depicted France as about to be burned down, with the situation as “in Chechnya,” as a CNN correspondent described it. Such wild exaggerations—the situation is already very bad as it is, and France is bankrupt, as any other country in the world—but these exaggerations about the fires, the police, the people—*running*—which concern only 5% of the country, these things only help Sarkozy to appear as a savior, as a superman, the little Bonaparte of the Suburbs: In fact, a fireman and an arsonist, in the same person, an arsonist-fireman.

In one word, the Merkel-Kirchhof operation, having failed as such, thanks to the efforts of the person next to me [Helga Zepp-LaRouche], and to certain reactions of [former German Chancellor] Schröder to the ideas of that person—the Merkel-Kirchhof operation having failed as such, and dissolved itself in the presently stagnant waters of German politics, [Italian Prime Minister] Berlusconi being on the way out, Sarkozy is the trump card of the neo-cons in Europe.

A certain intellectual atmosphere is maintained to promote his ideology, as for example, the recent declarations of the ex-philosopher (I must say) Alain Finkielkraut in *Ha’aretz*, where he [Sarkozy] is depicted as of the school of Le Pen. Alain Finkielkraut, you should understand, was this moderate, humanist thinker, 20 years ago. So now, Alain

Finkelkraut in *Ha'aretz* declares that “the suburbs problem is not a social problem, but the problem of the disruption of the social fabric by ethnic minorities, the blacks and North Africans with a Muslim identity.” Sarkozy supported Finkelkraut for his politically incorrect, and “courageous” declarations, when he was attacked. A whole team of French so-called intellectuals and artists have turned into right-wing reactionaries of the neo-conservative brand, among debates on the benefits of colonization, and doubts cast on the true nature of Resistance to Nazism.

What is emerging is the heirs of the so-called “Vichy Free French” generation, the Vichyites who went with the Resistance only in 1943, or even 1944—like, for example, François Mitterrand. That is to say, in plain words, the financial Synarchists, and their political lackeys. That’s on the scene.

When Cheney Goes, Sarkozy Will Follow

Now: My deep conviction, at this point, is that the Sarkozy operation is going to fail. The first, and main, reason is that his American-based protectors are on the way out. Cheney is on the way out, and his friend Netanyahu is not doing very well, in Israel. They are both very close friends of Sarkozy—you should know that.

Sarkozy plays on the French fears, the French crises, and the weakness of all other French politicians. But he is, nonetheless, a foreign implant in French politics, that can only succeed with foreign protection. In that sense, what Lyndon LaRouche and our Youth Movement are doing in the United States to dump Cheney and the neo-conservatives, is for us, the best weapon to dump Sarkozy in France: And Sarkozy himself knows it. That’s why he looks at us with a certain sense of discomfort.

Inside France, [President] Chirac and Villepin are doing their own job against him, tempted by police-state Venetian methods. Villepin is trying to portray himself as a Gaullist, capable of rallying the right wing and a mainly fatherless left. The last polls, in the case of a Presidential election opposing Sarkozy to Villepin, give 50% of the vote to Villepin, while Sarkozy would defeat any left-wing candidate. Hence the promotion of Villepin.

But the real problem is not, in fact, Sarkozy, as such. Sarkozy is only the disgusting tip of the iceberg. The problem of my country is that it has lost, in the last 35 years, its sense of belonging to universal history. It has lost its taste for the future, that de Gaulle was the last to express. To lose the sense of belonging to universal history, to lose the sense of the future, is already bad for any country. But it is worse for a nation that led the pack in the past—the remote past, but the past.

Caught in the Dangerous ‘Gray Zone’

All politicians other than Sarkozy have no real alternative. They’re all in the gray zone, and that is the real danger: The chaos provoked by that situation.

Villepin has made all of his career in the French diplomacy and bureaucracy. He’s a very competent servant. But he has yet to prove that he’s a real political figure in a stormy world. What he has done until now, aggravates the social and economic situation. For example, he has promoted various forms of “flexible labor,” the famous Danish model, he’s an admirer of the Danish model; [he has] privatized more in six months, than [former Prime Minister Lionel] Jospin in five years (Jospin was second to him); and [he has] promoted a tax reform in favor of the wealthiest, while increasing social contributions against everybody.

Despite various memos that I wrote to various French politicians—right and left, neo-Gaullists and neo-Socialists—none has yet picked up forcefully our New Bretton Woods/Eurasian Land-Bridge proposal. And you have to understand that. There is an incredible pressure on French politicians not to move, coming from the United States and Great Britain. Since the position taken by Chirac and Villepin against the Iraq War, they are looked at by the neo-cons as a potential resistance that they want to crush. And instead of counterpunching, Chirac is faithful to his identity as a political compromiser and bureaucrat.

Nonetheless, two French Deputies have signed Helga Zepp-LaRouche’s call for a New Bretton Woods, and former French Prime Minister Michel Rocard has thrown the New Bretton Woods alternative into the middle of the contributions to the French Socialist Party Congress. The invitation that the Réseau Voltaire made to Helga and myself to speak at the Brussels conference of the Axis for Peace is a proof of courage among some French circles. This is the other tip of the iceberg.

You should also know that there is a big debate going on in France, about the end of financial capitalism, with about a half-dozen books published on the subject, and a very interesting interview given by French top economist and analyst, Patrick Artus, from the Caisse de Dépôts et Consignations, the main public savings and loan association, but at the top of all the others. So, he’s the top French economist and analyst of that. And he gave an interview to the rag *Charlie Hebdo*—it’s very funny to find this very serious interview coming in a rag; this is a typical French method to introduce certain things from the side.

Tennenbaum: By “rag” do you mean something like the *Bildzeitung*?

Cheminade: No, it’s worse than the *Bildzeitung*, much worse! It’s a mixture of atheism, pornography, and simple craziness.

So, in that, all of a sudden, you see appearing the most serious interview of all—typical methods of a Venetian environment.

So, he says three interesting things, very interesting things. First, that there is a consensus among French entrepreneurs, and he mentions [Jean-Louis] Beffa and [Claude] Bébéar, the two top leaders respectively of the neo-Colbertist faction and the financial factions. So, he says there is a consen-



EIRNS

The LaRouche Youth Movement in Paris, lampooning Sarkozy (nicknamed Sharkozy), with his giant budget-cutting scissors, held on a leash by the IMF.

sus among these people that the “stockholders’ value,” 15% to 30% of financial looting per year, that the stockholders’ value is breaking the back of all economies, and has to be stopped. That’s the first thing he says. The second thing he says is that this phase of oligarchical financial capitalism is close to an end, and can not be dealt with with liberal reforms, which is a rejection of a neo-conservative Sarkozy approach. And third, he says that the problem has emerged in this Anglo-Saxon world (a French word to mean “Anglo-American”)—so, the problem has emerged in this Anglo-Saxon world, and can only be solved there.

The problem is that all of these brilliant French analysts are pessimists, and do not expect—or pretend to expect—a solution, from what they echo, the Anglo-Saxon world. The word “LaRouche” is still prohibited to mention, even if it’s no longer cursed as it was in the recent past. It’s not cursed, but it’s not mentioned.

‘But, I Am Very Optimistic’

At this point of what I have to say, some of you may be surprised, but, I am very optimistic. First, because it’s my nature to be so. But mainly, by the change that I see coming from the United States. And don’t think only that you have been lucky to hear what you have heard yesterday, but a tremendous responsibility is on your shoulders, because you heard it, to transmit it.

What Lyndon LaRouche and Jeff Steinberg, in particular, expressed yesterday is not part of American politics, as such. It is a reality alive among us, in Europe, and *for* Europe. It is, as de Gaulle would have said, “our spearhead.” And I can only make a call, to all of you, to utilize such a spearhead much more forcefully, in a mighty way. But, as Helga knows, our American organization and the United States are not going to do the whole work for us. It is for us an impulsion, an

inspiration, but not a life insurance. It is a command to act, here and now.

Hence, my Presidential candidacy in France.

To fight what? Sarkozy? Yes, of course—Sarkozy. But, our enemy is not Sarkozy—it’s what is behind him: sophistry and cultural pessimism. That’s the issue. France is a land of *excellent* analysts, who always tend to forget about the action, coming after their brilliant analyses! Why? Because they are Cartesians. My country is infected by a culture of pessimism, since the wars of religion of the 16th Century, which is a true route, through Louis XIV, Napoleon, and the wars of the 20th Century—world wars, but also the colonial wars of France. And this issue is at stake right now, in the French debate. How to come out, once and for all, of the colonial impulse. What I am fighting for, is to awaken those forces in France, that are now idle and stagnant, what de Gaulle called once, the “Sleeping Princess of the legends” (he had some poetic impulse of his own, at some point). He said, “My task is to awaken the Sleeping Princess of the legends, France.”

Cartesianism is, in brief, existentialist dualism. On the one side, you have the world of human thinking: literature, philosophy, and human sciences, ruled by ideas, or the word called “ideas.” “I think, therefore I am.” And, on the other side, the universe, ruled by logics, syllogisms, induction, and deduction, a mechanistic universe of heavy and exact sciences, what is called in French “*les sciences dures et exactes*”.

This cut between the two, man as a so-called “thinker” on the one side, and the universe as a machine on the other side, promotes a culture of pessimism, because it cuts the capacity for man to intervene in the universe to improve it. The properties of things can be very skillfully analyzed and measured, but there is no way, from such a standpoint, to change the universe. The question of knowledge, therefore, can not—on these grounds—can not be based on truth, and the relation of man to the universe, is necessarily made of sophisms. The truth is no more heard, but the opinions. And the causes are served, but never discovered.

Taking on the Cultural Pessimism

That is the very issue that my campaign is going to take on: Sophism and impotence, as de Gaulle and in a certain way Mendès-France dealt with when they freed France from colonialism, and rebuilt the French economy on the basis of a scientific-industrial driver, that *does* change man.

I’m very optimistic, because, in the last cadre school of the French youth movement, of the LaRouche Youth Movement in France, for the first time—to my best knowledge, probably; it could be a mistake on my part—but to my best knowledge, this issue was dealt with as a group, as a body of people, with gusto. They liked it! They liked to deal with it! They had grown teeth. Developed thinking of the Cartesian brand was mocked, and the creative thinking was expressed,

but not as a lesson imported or “learned” from an outside source, but as a freedom inspired by creative predecessors, welcomed into our minds. I say that, of course, to put pressure on my young friends. But also, because it is the truth. And it is the truth.

So, our campaign in France, both the Presidential and legislative campaign, can therefore, with such an input, if the quality of work is maintained and improved, can reopen the gates of the Sophist jail, and bring back to my country its best history, from Charlemagne to Louis XI, from the Edict of Nantes to the Peace of Westphalia; from Villon to Pasteur, from Rabelais to Lazard Carnot. I am confident: We are going to recover our country, and give back their souls to our people; we are going to give back the souls that were robbed from our people. And they would discover, that something buried quite deep in themselves can re-emerge to the light, and change history.

I’m optimistic, because, as a Leibnizian, I think that we can reopen the eyes of the French mind. And I ask you something here, to all of you: Help me to do so.

Thank you.

Dialogue

Tennenbaum: Thank you very much. Before we go into a discussion where everyone here is most welcome to pose questions and make comments, about what Jacques has said today, I actually have three questions myself.

One of them, is a relatively technical one, but I think is an important one: to hear, Jacques, your sense, looking at it from France, of the fight around the euro, and the question of the euro, which Helga Zepp-LaRouche put on the table very strongly and was discussed a lot yesterday. Because, if there is going to be—if we say, the euro is a failure, the euro doesn’t work, then we’re going to have to move to another sense of a European cooperation in the monetary and European domains.

I noted, also, from some of the reactions of our friends from Asia, that people looking at it from Asia, often were, I think, a bit confused about the relationship between the notion of a “Europe” as an actual leading part of the world, on the one side; and the “euro” on the other side. Because, in the debate on the euro in Germany, for example—There wasn’t much of a debate, actually! There was not a real debate in this country, an open one, about what was the euro? But it was more or less kept out of the debate—But, whatever debate there was, or discussion there was, was dominated by the idea that, “Well, we have to have this Europe, and therefore, we have to have the euro. Europe/euro.” So, if you would oppose the euro, that means that you opposed Europe—which is not true.

In any case, I would like you to talk about this question from France, because I know that that issue is a big issue in France, right now—and Italy, and also other countries.

That was my first point. And I’ll just mention the other two: I would like also, if you could, Jacques, since you’re

moving into a Presidential campaign, maybe to comment a bit on the very high-profile Presidential campaign you carried out in France, and the process that is taking you from that campaign to the one which is before us.

And the last question, which I’d also like Helga Zepp-LaRouche to talk about, is the question of the role of a German-French alliance, relative to where Europe has to go, and where the world has to go in the future.

Cheminade: On the first question: The original vice of Europe, of what is today called “Europe,” is that it has been founded on an explicitly monetarist and liberal basis—from the beginning.

From the beginning, people like Mendès-France in the *la République Moderne*, the modern republic, and de Gaulle, attacked that. And they tried, in their own way—mainly de Gaulle who was in power, Mendès-France was not—de Gaulle tried constantly to make of that Europe something favorable to economic development, and a common area of industrial expansion, from the Atlantic to the Urals. So, when de Gaulle was there—and in a certain sense, there was a prolongation of that under the Giscard d’Estaing-Schmidt axis—there was an attempt to reorient Europe toward this industrial-scientific basis, with an industrial-scientific driver.

The Financial Synarchy’s Euro

It’s an unfortunate and terrible aspect of modern history in Europe, and in France, that it was with a Socialist, with François Mitterrand, that the monetarist conception of Europe re-emerged in a much stronger way. The euro—as it has been very clearly exposed by Christine Bierre, who is in this room, in an article on the beginnings and development of the European Monetary Union—the euro has been a currency created artificially, with a central banking system and union of central banks, composed by civil servants from the treasury, but mainly by former bankers. So, the euro is not a currency of Europe, as a physical identity. The euro is a currency of a synthetic conglomeration of bankers, representing the interests of what has been called during World War I and World War II, the financial Synarchy.

So, you have the currency of the financial Synarchy, which played the role of a debasement of Europe, and in particular of Germany: Why? Because, within Europe, was created an area of free capital flux, free capital exchanges; and the interest-rate weapon, the budget weapon, and the weapon of currency was put in the hands of the European Central Bank, or the Synarchy. What was the only thing left, as certain experts in Germany and France have explained, the only thing left to the states, was wages. So, the money flux, the money capital, would go toward the countries like Spain, Portugal, Ireland, and Greece, and leave Germany and France—mainly Germany, as LaRouche explained yesterday. The other nations thought they were going to live, while sucking the teats of the German economy, and killing, in the process, the German economy—and killing themselves, because there was no more milk.



Charles de Gaulle and Pierre Mendès-France. Cheminade said that his campaign would take on the sophism and impotence of the French ideology, “as de Gaulle and in a certain way Mendès-France dealt with when they freed France from colonialism, and rebuilt the French economy on the basis of a scientific-industrial driver, that does change man.”

So, it happened in that way. What you have now, is that even this money, that went on a very short-term basis toward Spain and Ireland, in particular, now is *leaving* Spain and Ireland, to go to China, India, and the countries with low wages!

So, you have a process of dismantling of Europe, under the euro; a destruction of Europe, under the euro. And people still think that the euro has been a protection against speculation in Europe! Well: What the euro has realized, is a well-ordered, relatively well-ordered, dismantling of the European nations, instead of a disorganized dismantling of the European nations. It has *organized* the dismantlement! That is the role played by the euro.

It is a role in full contradiction of what the real founding fathers of Europe, the de Gaulle of the Europe of the Fatherlands, but even Schuman and Adenauer—Robert Schuman in France, and Adenauer in Germany—had thought that Europe would be.

There is a very interesting point in that, which would explain what has happened. It’s the figure of Jean Monnet. Jean Monnet was a European federalist, associated with various circles of the monetary and financial Europe. But, at the same time, he was committed to economic development, to nuclear energy, and, at the beginning to the development of coal and steel in France and Germany. So, Monnet, who had been a very close advisor to Roosevelt, came back to France and developed the Planning Commission, and the organized development of the French economy, as the Kreditanstalt did in Germany at the same time. So there was a development of France and Germany, which coincided in the Coal and Steel Union, first, and then, what was called the Common Market, of the “six Charlemagne” European nations. So, at that point, you had still, an impulse towards economic development in this group, in association with Russia.

What happened under Mitterrand is, that was broken, and definitely broken in 1989-1990, when the Berlin Wall fell, and when Mitterrand sabotaged Europe and imposed the euro, in association with Margaret Thatcher and George Bush.

Dismantle the European Central Bank!

So, what is the situation now? It’s simple: We have to dismantle the European Central Bank. It has to be killed once and for all. It’s a tick, like those that get on dogs and suck the blood. It’s a tick, getting bigger and bigger. It’s a factor of destruction.

So, we have to impose an association of national banks. And at the same time that Helga [Zepp-LaRouche] made her declaration to return to the German mark, I called for a “franc polytechnique.” Why did I call it a “franc polytechnique”? Because the French currency has been so manipulated in recent history, including the de Gaulle “new franc,” that you need to give it a name to associate it with something that plays into the minds of people: And I called it the *franc polytechnique*, because the *polytechnique* is the institution during the French Revolution associated with the best that was left in the Committee for Education of the French Revolution. So, in that place, outside of the political disaster, certain people met, including the Humboldts—Wilhelm and Alexander—Carnot, Abbé Grégoire, Prieur de la Côte d’Or. Such people like that met, and maintained in certain cultural areas, the idea of *polytechnique*, until Napoleon destroyed it.

So, this *franc polytechnique* would put in the minds of French people, as I said before, the idea that economy should be defined by the physical development of the economy, and the interaction of human minds, to perfect the intervention of human minds to create the conditions for what LaRouche has called, “an increase in the potential relative population-density.” So, this potential relative population-density is what must be back in the French minds, and it’s a very long story in French economics that does exist, and was buried. It’s the attempt of Bodin in the 16th Century, when he said, the only wealth in the economy is man, and the only wealth of man is developing his capacities to increase the production in economy.

Montchrétien, who was another French historian, was connected to the Henry IV policy of development; and the Academy of Sciences of Colbert, which was not a French project, but a European project. And we have to bring back all that in the minds of France, with the last expression of it, that was the École Polytechnique and Arts et Métiers of the end of the 18th Century, associated to the American Revolution.

So, this is what we have to bring back. And this is the type of Europe which will have a *totally* different meaning, with an association of national banks, than the Europe that was made until today, and in particular, since 1980-81. In Germany, it was Ludwig Erhard and Karl Schiller; in France, it has been Mitterrand and that crowd.

So, we have to return to Europe a sense of what it is, and that the only way to go back to the sovereignty of national states is to rebuild it on that basis: Hence, the mark and the franc polytechnique, and the other European currencies. But, it demands an association of this, what Helga [Zepp-LaRouche] said yesterday, in the form of maintaining what Giscard and Schmidt had called the European Currency Union, to balance the trade balances, and, at the same time, to be a currency of reference, but not a currency of physical currency, an accounting currency.

So, we need to base the great projects for Europe, on this association of national banks, which is the only way to do it, to reestablish in the minds of Europeans the sense that Europe is physical development, is the European nations building the future, and not this *thing* in Brussels, which belongs to bureaucrats, associated necessarily with an imperial viewpoint.

LaRouche's Proposal for the European Monetary Fund

Tennenbaum: Just one observation. There's an irony in this, which I think is important to underline: And that is, that Lyndon LaRouche himself can be regarded in many respects as one of the main authors of the idea of the European Monetary Fund. He proposed, at the end of the 1970s—and he and his colleagues made a *major* campaign on this question—that there should be set up in Europe a kind of facility for cooperation between the European nations, as an instrument though, not just for Europe, but particularly for world development, for Europe's role in the transfer of technology to the developing countries. LaRouche was involved in a lot of discussions, at a very high level in Europe, about this idea. And it was also the notion, that a cooperation between the—let us say—converted central banks, central banks converted into national banks, in the European nations, particularly France and Germany and Italy, that a cooperation between them could be a kernel of the kind of reform of the world monetary system, that is required.

And then, when we went with the Productive Triangle program, from 1989 forward, LaRouche wrote a very interesting and very important part of the introduction to our program, in which he emphasized the notion of setting up in Europe, a kind of clearinghouse, of European nations actually going to a national bank system, as opposed to the independent central bank system, in France, in Germany, in the other nations of Europe. And then, these national banks cooperating, and having some kind of joint facility, which would be the basis for financing the Productive Triangle program, very concretely; a vast infrastructure construction program for Europe, and then, in its extension, to Eurasia, to Africa.

And, corresponding to this notion, as opposed to a monetary system which we were discussing—the European Central Bank, the central banks which basically *belong* to the financial community—instead having a credit system for Europe.

And the irony, I think, is, that had Europe gone in the

direction that LaRouche was proposing, and we were working for, Europe, as a factor of a cooperation of nations, actually, would be *vastly* more powerful. I mean—Jacques has said it much more sharply—it would be vastly more powerful than now. Instead, we have a Europe which is collapsing.

So, I think it's very important to emphasize that what Jacques, and LaRouche, and Helga Zepp-LaRouche are proposing, is not a weaker Europe. It's a stronger Europe, but it's a different kind of cooperation.

[To Zepp-LaRouche] Do you want to say something?

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Yes, you asked me this question about the German-French alliance.

I think that everybody immediately can agree that Europe does not function without a German-French alliance. It is the foundation of Europe, and I think it's also very illustrative how this friendship, or this relationship emerged, because, as you know, for many centuries Germany and France actually were arch-enemies, *erbfeindschaft* [ancestral enemies]. And naturally, especially in the 20th Century, the damage which was done in the wars—World War I, four years of meaningless fighting between the Germans and the French—Verdun has become the symbol of meaningless killing back and forth in the trenches, which led to a situation where the young generation who fought in this war, was completely uprooted, which was the seed of the possibility of Nazism in Germany, because of an uprooted generation. The Second World War was not very far behind in terms of horrors for the population.

So, out of this long, long experience of horror, and, even if it went against Napoleon III, Germany was unified in a war against France, which is not the ideal way to start a nation. I don't want to diminish Bismarck's having accomplished German unity, but it was not on the best basis.

So, for Germany and France to overcome that, was *really* big. And it was done by the recognition of de Gaulle and Adenauer, that it had to be done. And it occurred in the Elysé Treaty of 1963. And ever since, it has functioned. And therefore, I think that the German-French relationship, which put aside a century-long arch-enemy relationship, is more significant than just for these two countries: Because if Germany and France could put the past behind, I think it is very much a model for other countries which had similar conflicts and which think that there are long, long historical reasons and no friendship and no trust with the other country.

The Tradition of the Peace of Westphalia

In the German and French case, without the tradition of the Peace of Westphalia, this would not have been possible. The Peace of Westphalia was the recognition by the warring parties that any continuation of the war would leave nobody alive. Because, at the highpoint of the Thirty Years' War, which was just the continuation of a previous religious war, which altogether lasted 150 years, at the high point, there were areas in Bohemia, Saxony, and other places, where 60% of all the population—and the villages, and the property, and everything—was just destroyed. And it dawned on people, if

they would continue this, there would be nobody left to enjoy the victory, if there ever would be one.

So, people then decided on the fantastic principle of the Peace of Westphalia, which was the beginning of modern, international law. It was actually the first time that a treaty arrangement was developed, which later was continued in the United Nations Charter and similar expressions of international law. And the principles of this Peace of Westphalia were exactly that, for the sake of peace, from now on, the interest of the other had to be the basis of the relationship. Second, that in the interest of peace, you have to forgive and forget what one party did to the other, and vice versa.

And then third—this was not in the actual Peace of Westphalia treaty, but it was a principle which was established for the first time, in this explicit form: the idea that the state has to have a function in the reconstruction of the state after the war, which was the beginning of what became cameralism, and the whole idea of Colbertism, and the idea of a state-directed economic program.

So, when the German-French peace actually was made by de Gaulle and Adenauer, actually turned into an alliance for friendship, well, this was also very much based on the idea that you needed national sovereign countries. De Gaulle's trademark was to believe in the absolute sovereignty of France. He drew that conclusion, for example, by leaving NATO, by going into the *force de frappe*, by basically, really representing the national sovereignty of France.

And for Adenauer at the time, it was really a very difficult historical situation, because Germany was still the war-guilty party, it had no international reputation, it was still totally occupied by the occupying powers: For Adenauer to make that step together with de Gaulle, was the first step in the direction of sovereignty for Germany. Which was obviously not fully completed, but it was a first step out of the doctrine of the post-war arrangements.

And I think that model, for example, when two countries like Germany and France could put the past behind: I want to work with Jacques [Cheminade], and let me use this occasion to whole-heartedly support your Presidential campaign. I take pride now to be the first German to do that, and I'm also committed to help you, and help the French organization as much as possible, to accomplish that. Because, I believe that if we do this in the right way, and we can take the tradition of the American Revolution which is now really forcefully re-emerging in the United States, and then we say, "Okay, we go in a similar direction," we will change the character of Europe, we will put the 20th Century behind us; and even the 19th Century was not so great. We make a big parenthesis around the 19th and 20th centuries, and we make a solemn commitment that the 21st Century will become a really beautiful new Renaissance and a new age.

And then, if we prove this German-French collaboration for the good, that we have a joint mission for the development

of the other, not-so-fortunate parts of the world—like Africa—I think it's one of the things where this friendship should not be just for us, but it should have a joint mission. And I think, for me, this is one of the burning causes, to not allow this situation in Africa to continue, because it is not worthy of the dignity of man. And if we do this, I think we can inspire other countries which have similar historical conflicts. You go to Asia, there are many countries which think they have arch-enemies: Japan, China, Korea, the Southeast Asian countries. And, maybe if they look at what the German-French breakthrough meant, it can become an inspiration of approaching these conflicts in a similar way.

There are many other areas in the world—the Middle East is full of them, the Great Lakes region in Africa, the Tutsis and the Hutus. There are many places where people think they can not overcome it. And I just want to have Germany and France work together, so that we become an example of not only putting an ugly past behind us, but also creating something for the future, for others—because I think that that is the step which brings you beyond just looking at your navel, where you count all the many things which went wrong.

But in the moment when you start to be really agapic and say, "Okay, we take a joint mission"—like what Leibniz said: Leibniz had these ideas. He said, "France should develop Africa, Germany should develop the East, Russia, and then build a bridge between Germany and China to develop the region in between." If Leibniz could have these ideas in the 17th and 18th centuries, well, I think we should be at least as modern today.

Cheminade: Yes. I have to say something, which shows that our minds works together. Because, I was thinking, when there has been *no* French-German alliance, as in 1989-90, it is a catastrophe for Europe. Because the fate of Europe has always been associated with what Europe does for the countries of the South, as Helga [Zepp-LaRouche] said.

So, look at what happened then, in 1989-90: First, East Germany was dismantled; the industry of East Germany, the productive forces of East Germany, were dismantled. And these forces could have been the leverage for Third World development. And they were pertinent, they were exactly what was needed, for the heavy-industry development in the South—and it was not done.

And on the French side, the French not only did not improve their policy towards Africa, but the French African policy has become even worse, since the fall of the Berlin Wall. And now, you have all these neo-conservative groups associated with certain so-called evangelicals running around Africa (and also Ibero-America), and taking over governments, like the Ivory Coast government, through the wife of the President Laurant Gbagbo. So, when we are not together, when we are not doing our duty, we create disasters in the world. That's the first thing I wanted to say.

The second, is that maybe the cooperation could turn to

be on the other side, because, before the French Presidential election—I don't know what you think about it—there may be elections in Germany, with the coalition. So, who knows? Maybe we are going to help you, before you help us!

In any case, we are going to help each other, independent of any of these electoral issues.

Cheminade Gets 'the LaRouche Treatment'

Now, the question of the Presidential candidacy, which is my third one. In 1995, when I was a Presidential candidate, we embarked by surprise, as a commando force, on the French political scene—and it was wild. Wild! We got more than 500 signatures of mayors, and I came with signatures to the Constitutional Council, because you need that to be in the Presidential elections. It's a more democratic one: If you get the signatures, you get the money from the state to run, or part of the money, and then you are reimbursed.

So, we went into the Constitutional Council with the signatures, and all the journalists said that what we gave to the Constitutional Council were boxes of newspapers, to pretend that we had the signatures. So, when it came out, that we *had* the signatures, and they had to confirm me as a candidate, immediately all hell broke loose—in one day and a half!

And for *two weeks*, there was a campaign of the same sort—that really freaked out some of the French members, who thought they were somehow in a half-protected island. They were totally shocked to see that was done against LaRouche was exactly done against me: I was—they have not much imagination—I was a “robber of old ladies.” Then, I was associated with an American fascist, an American anti-Semite, a crazy man; I was a crazy megalomaniac myself. I was treated by the journalists in the most incredible way! They put the *worst* picture that they could find of me, and it's really a bad one, as you can imagine! So, everybody was saying, “Arrgghh! What is this guy?!” They were mocking, making cartoons, and the most incredible, dense, thing.

Well, they made a mistake, not in the short term. After the campaign, I must add, the Constitutional Council denied us the money, saying that we had made a mistake in the presentation of the accounts, that were presented by an accountant connected to the Constitutional Council. So, we made a mistake, an unfortunate mistake. So, we were not reimbursed for the money, and I had to pay back everybody who loaned money to me. So, they ruined me. As an individual, I was ruined after that campaign. They took my apartment, and it's a French Venetian operation: they didn't take it physically, but they took it *legally*, which means, at this point, it's a Damocles sword; they can seize the apartment at any moment.

And they attacked something very precious in me: my nose. They sent to a presentation, a first presentation in a school of political science in Grenoble in southern France, they sent a poor guy who punched my nose with a karate move, and destroyed my face. I had a very good doctor, fortunately, afterward, for a few weeks.

So, you had a real freakout in France, about what I could represent on the French political scene. And everything they did at that point, prevented us, and stopped us. And it was a temporary defeat.

But now, what we saw when we introduced a new campaign in 2002, they had a campaign of influence on the mayors, to discredit me, and they managed to make us lose about 100 signatures, and I could not be a candidate; I had only 406, and we should have had 500.

So now, because of the world situation, they are even more concerned by what I'm doing. And they say nothing on the official scene. Under the table, there is a lot of discussion, because we have certain people who tell us.

But, we have an asset: Because, a lot of people remember that in 1995, I had denounced constantly, the “financial cancer.” And that Chirac in Halifax [at the G7 summit] in 1995—he could not say that he denounced the financial cancer, so he said, he denounced the “financial AIDS.” And he said, if nothing is done about it, it will be a disaster for all. He did nothing; nobody did anything, and we have the disaster, now.

So, a certain number of people remember what I said in 1995, many more than I thought. Because, I made all this noise, and this noise is now playing into our hands. Because people remember that, and say, “If the elites are so bad, and that was done to Cheminade, it proves that Cheminade may be good, and we will investigate.”

The LaRouche Youth Movement: A Heavy Weapon

So, it's a very interesting situation, that we have. And this time, we are not acting as a commando in secret, disembarking by surprise on the French scene. This time, it will be fully public, and with the youth movement; and that's the difference: That it's a youth movement. And the youth movement has a certain sense of what it has to fight against, the sophistry and the Cartesian ideology of the country; and it has assimilated the history of our movement in the United States, and in Europe, and in particular, what had happened in France in that period. So, it's a very heavy weapon.

There are no more youth movements in France. Formally—it's not the United States—they have registered youth, in the Socialist Party, in the Communist Party, in the UMP. But with a lot of money, they can only gather a few of them in public meetings—sometimes 1,000, 1,500. But when it comes to daily work, there is nobody.

So, what we have with our youth movement, is in the seeds, a change of the nation. And this is what I am committed to make happen, and what I think all of us are committed—veteran or youth—to make happen. And, in particular, I was very happy, I must repeat it, by the youth cadre school of last week. And those who are here should bring that spirit into our Week of Action, here.

So, it's a very interesting situation. And I think we are worthy of being helped. Thank you.