

Thatcher endorses de Gaulle against fascist 'Europe 1992'

by Mark Burdman

The supranationalists in Brussels and Strasbourg behind the push for the fascist restructuring of Western Europe under the code-name "Europe 1992," are seething with anger at British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. Their mood is such, that they have made some most unsubtle threats against the prime minister herself.

The extreme reaction came to comments by Mrs. Thatcher during a July 27 interview on British Broadcasting Corporation's Radio-2. She was asked by interviewer Jimmy Young what she thought of European Commission President Jacques Delors' statement earlier in July that Western Europe now required an "embryonic European government" that would make 80% of all important decisions. She replied that this idea was "quite absurd. . . . I think he was wrong. I think he went over the top. I don't think he should have said it." The substance of Delors' proposals she called "airy-fairy," and expressed the hope that Delors' vision of a unified European government would "never come in my lifetime, and, I hope, never at all."

Under the European Commission's "Single Europe 1992" act, all national border restrictions governing the movement of goods and people are to be eliminated, and schemes are afoot to create a European Central Bank to administer the unified economy that results.

But Mrs. Thatcher derided as "very superficial" those who compared this proposed "United States of Europe" with the United States of America, since, in Europe, there are fundamental differences in history, culture, and language. "It is not possible to have a United States of Europe," she said. "What is possible, is for the 12 countries of Europe to work more closely together on things we would do better together, so that we can trade better together."

Mrs. Thatcher then dropped a political bombshell, insist-

ing that her concept of Europe "was really very much with de Gaulle," the late nationalist President of France, "that is, a Europe of separate countries working together." Among supranationalist fanatics in Europe, there are bitter memories of the general's sometimes violent opposition to schemes for destroying the sovereign nation-state, and his insistence on a "Europe of the fatherlands," of sovereign nations cooperating on the basis of a community of recognized principles.

Mrs. Thatcher also stated pointedly, "Europe has only been single under tyranny . . . not under liberty."

Mrs. Thatcher proved that she meant what she said by dismissing Britain's Euro-commissioner, Lord Cockfield, one of the chief authors of the "Europe 1992" scheme, from his post. This was interpreted by friends of Delors on the continent as a "demonstrative sanction" against the pro-1992 faction within Britain itself.

Before she spoke out, a mood of terror and blackmail had been established in Western Europe, as the combination of financiers, corporatist economic planners, and one-world federalists ("globalists") for whom Delors speaks, had been constantly escalating their propaganda on behalf of the "1992" reorganization. Hardly a word of dissent had been heard.

But on Aug. 2, Michel Debré, former French prime minister and Gaullist influential, in an interview with France's *Le Figaro*, expressed his solidarity with Mrs. Thatcher. He warned, "There is a threat of enslavement of France. . . . The projects of the Brussels commission are dangerous, because they advocate supranationality. That's why Mrs. Thatcher has been reacting, and that's why I want to give a warning: The European Commission was not created to destroy the fatherlands, notably the French motherland. . . . There are two possibilities for European community: Europe based on the states, for which I have worked, and the unreal-

istic Europe of supranationality. . . . I believe that under the cover of an economic design, there is a political goal which aims at destroying nation-states. Many of the projects worked out of Brussels are dangerous. . . . There is a danger that French citizens will be enslaved.”

Also on Aug. 2, West German Interior Minister Friedrich Zimmermann stated the fear of many in Europe, that all the talk of a “single European market *without borders*,” would provide fantastic advantages to organized crime. Would “Europe 1992” actually translate into the “Europe of the gangster syndicates?” Zimmermann asked. Noting that there had been increasing “trends toward cross-border operations” in the workings of organized crime, Zimmermann said that, unless accompanied by very strict controls against terrorism, “Europe 1992” would mean “a Europe with far less security for its citizens.”

‘Mrs. Thatcher is not eternal’

The oligarchical interests behind the “Europe 1992” reorganization seem more interested in *deploying* terrorists against their opponents, than controlling terrorists.

Soon after the British prime minister’s BBC-2 interview, the French daily *Le Monde* cautioned supranationalists in Europe not to overreact to Mrs. Thatcher, because that would only play into her hands, as an earlier overreaction had played into the hands of de Gaulle. Said *Le Monde*, “Mrs. Thatcher is not, in spite of everything, eternal.”

Coincidence or not, in the early morning hours of Aug. 1, the Irish Republican Army carried out its first bombing attack inside Greater London in years, hitting the British Army military barracks geographically closest to Mrs. Thatcher’s election district in Finchley, North London. At that moment, Mrs. Thatcher was thousands of miles away, in Australia, but the message was clear. The IRA terrorism escalated throughout the week.

It should be recalled that the great de Gaulle himself was repeatedly the target of assassination attempts. The infrastructure for such attempts was, in part, provided by financier and intelligence-community friends of Jean Monnet, de Gaulle’s bitter opponent and the widely heralded “father of European integration.”

From those in the influential Hamburg financial community who would regard themselves as co-thinkers of the late Monnet, there came some most unpleasant words for Mrs. Thatcher. The week of July 25, *Die Zeit*, weekly of the Hamburg liberals, supranationalists, and Trilateral Commission elite, denounced Mrs. Thatcher as a “dictator,” who “uses her strong institutional position and her considerable personal authority to apply the brakes to all initiatives which lead beyond the ‘Europe of ringing tills’ which she values.”

The real dictators

The irony in *Die Zeit*’s venomous attack is that the inner design of “Europe 1992” is to apply to all of Europe the



Britain’s Margaret Thatcher. She’s down on the “airy-fairy” supranationalists.

policies that Adolf Hitler’s economics minister, Hjalmar Schacht, applied to Germany. The “enforcers” are to be “neo-corporatist” structures, composed of representatives of industry, government, trade unions, and community organizations, who will implement ferocious austerity, under a supranational dictatorship based out of the Brussels headquarters of the European Community bureaucracy, and the Strasbourg headquarters of the Council of Europe.

For the inner planners, “Europe 1992” is a code-word for bringing about a corporatist restructuring *before* the year 1992, under emergency conditions of financial crisis. One close collaborator of the late Monnet said in private discussion that a very large financial crisis is expected to erupt, at the latest, during the early months of the term of the next American President. Under those conditions, he stressed, people would be much more willing than they are now to accept corporatist “planning mechanisms” and emergency austerity measures.

This same individual, a senior figure in the Trilateral Commission, perceives “Europe 1992” as one key prong in a *global* fascist restructuring, overseen by a supranational one-world government, and with the “controlled disintegration” of the world into various regional blocs. For instance, the new U.S.-Canada free trade arrangements would be seen as a “North American” complement to the “Europe 1992” plan. In essence, this is an implementation of the conception of Hitler’s favorite geopolitician, Karl Haushofer, for the creation of what Haushofer called “large-scale economic spaces” in various regions.

To accomplish such transformations, the “Europe 1992”

architects intend to promote cultural ideas radically opposed to the ideas of freedom and republicanism associated with the American Revolution and the German classical period. Ideas of writers like Russia's Fyodor Dostoevsky and Switzerland's Friedrich Nietzsche are more and more being brought onto the center stage.

Mrs. Thatcher may have a more limited understanding of the full implications of "Europe 1992," and her BBC interview is narrower in scope, but she has hit the raw nerve: the question of the sovereign nation-state. By eliminating that, as Delors et al. intend to do, they are eliminating the activity of democratic representative government, the institution that has mediated the values of Western Judeo-Christian civilization for populations over recent centuries.

The Russian question

But Mrs. Thatcher's counterposition of "tyranny" to "liberty" also touched upon another issue: Whether Western Europe will live under Soviet domination.

Italy's *Corriere della Sera* chose the period of mid-July to publish the last political will and testament of dictator Benito Mussolini's foreign minister, Dino Grandi, who stated just before his death earlier this year that he and his circle in the Grand Council of Fascism believed that, for Europe, "the unifying potential is Russian."

Today's most outspoken "Europe 1992" advocates—former Philips company chairman Wisse Dekker, former Montedison head Mario Schimberni, Turin-Venice financier Carlo de Benedetti, West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, former French Foreign Minister Jean François-Poncet—are also the most outspoken advocates of a "Marshall Plan for the East," and of Gorbachov's "common European home."

According to one senior London financial source, the matter of orientation to the East leads to another central question that pits Mrs. Thatcher against the "Europe 1992" crowd: Where will Western Europe obtain its vital raw materials supplies in the future?

Delors, Genscher, et al. are firmly convinced that southern Africa will explode in bloody confrontations during the next years, and that Europe cannot, and should not, rely on this region to supply what it needs in key strategic minerals, this source asserts. They believe that a comprehensive arrangement should be reached with the U.S.S.R., for agreements of stable energy and minerals supplies, in exchange for a large-scale Western European commitment to transfer technology to the Soviets and to develop the U.S.S.R.'s Siberian region.

Mrs. Thatcher is completely opposed to such a deal, and wants, instead, to find ways to stabilize southern Africa, and to maintain traditional European-southern African relations. Complementing this, Britain will tap traditional, mineral-rich Commonwealth sources of supply, such as Australia and Canada.

Burma's turmoil has economic roots

by Sophie Tanapura

On July 25, following five months of rioting and bloodshed, during which more than 200 people were reportedly killed, the Burma Socialist Program Party (BSPP) accepted Gen. Ne Win's resignation as chairman. He had dominated decision-making in the country for 26 years. Burmese President San Yu also resigned. Since then, the BSPP Congress has voted in Brig. Gen. Sein Lwin as party chairman. He has also taken over as President of Burma.

According to informed sources, Gen. Ne Win, 78, was not exactly booted out of his post; rather, he voluntarily moved aside in what is suspected of being an arrangement with his successor. Close bonds between the two date back to the early 1940s when Sein Lwin joined Ne Win's outfit, the Fourth Burma Rifles, as a private. Later on, Sein Lwin served Ne Win as a personal aide and then as commander. In fact, when Ne Win came to power through a military coup in 1962, it was Sein Lwin who commanded the troops that quashed student protests at the time. Although out, it is expected that Ne Win will still continue to play a behind-the-scenes role in Burmese politics as an elder statesman.

That Sein Lwin is a hardliner who will not stop short of brutal measures to suppress unrest should be a surprise to no one. It is generally known that Sein Lwin was widely implicated in the suppression of anti-government riots that took place in March and June of this year, which resulted in the deaths of over 100 persons. Diplomatic sources even quote a figure of more than 200 killed in rioting and clashes with police in cities across the country since March.

Economic roots

The tension building up over time beneath the surface of the Burmese nation has its roots in the worsening of the economic condition of the country since independence. Generally, media news coverage of Burma recalls that the country was once one of the richest nations of Asia. It is true that, while still a British colony, rice production was developed along the fertile banks of the Salween River, making Burma one of the most important rice-exporting countries in the world at one point. However, no one seems interested in