

# Soviets laud 'Europe 1992' fascist plan for Europe

by Mark Burdman

In November of this year, *EIR* released its special report, " 'Europe 1992': Blueprint for Dictatorship," exposing the fascist restructuring plans for Western Europe that underlie the European Community's plans to achieve a "single European market" by 1992-93. In the introduction to that report, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, founder of the Schiller Institute, stated that the "Europe 1992" planners are "engaged in an effort to transform all of Europe into a protectorate for Moscow. . . . Those financial circles promoting European integration do not feel the slightest twinge of an ideological problem in surrendering to Moscow's domination, on condition that they be the satraps in this Russian Empire, who enjoy unrestricted privileges."

As if to confirm Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche's contention, the Soviets have, since Bolshevik Revolution day, Nov. 7, 1988, launched a propaganda offensive praising "Europe 1992."

Most active in the propaganda has been Dr. Vitaly Zhurkin, director of the recently founded Institute of Europe of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and formerly a top assistant to Georgi Arbatov at Moscow's U.S.A.-Canada Institute. In interviews with the *Financial Times* of London Nov. 10 and Spain's *El País* Nov. 14, Zhurkin said that the Soviets looked favorably on "Europe 1992."

Speaking to the *Financial Times*, Zhurkin reported that his Institute had conducted an in-depth study of "Europe 1992," and now believes that it is "practically sure" the internal market reforms will be established by 1992. This, he said, would bring Europe on a path of "Euro-renaissance," countering the "Euro-sclerosis" of the past. Commenting on Zhurkin's statements, the *Financial Times* said, "The European plans for a barrier-free internal market by 1992 have won a startling convert: the Soviet Union."

To *El País*, Zhurkin was even more exuberant. Europe, he said, was a field in which "a great historical experiment is being developed." Noted the Madrid liberal daily, "Zhurkin is more optimistic than many Europeans. He does not hesitate to affirm that 'the unified market will emerge beyond a doubt, even though it might be too soon to talk about a common currency or central bank, but we have looked into this, and it will definitely happen.' "

The unified market, he told *El País*, brings opportunities "not only for economic cooperation in Europe, but on a

global scale. This market will be one of the most important international phenomena."

## A special role for West Germany

In the interviews, he pointed to the creation of the Institute of Europe itself in January 1988, as a clear signal of the Soviets' attitude toward Europe. It was, he told the *Financial Times*, an indication of the "growing role of the European area in Soviet foreign policy. . . . In terms of Soviet participation in the international division of labor, the European dimension is the quickest growing." Prior to January 1988, he claimed, the Soviets had special institutes for every region in the world, except for Europe. That, now, has changed.

Zhurkin told the *Financial Times* that while the Soviets would treat all Western European countries equally from a *political* standpoint, West Germany was the Soviets' obvious chief partner from an *economic* standpoint. That new special role for West Germany, in the context of endorsing the "Europe 1992" plan, was already indicated in the Sept. 30-Oct. 1 weekend announcement by the Soviet government that former Soviet Ambassador to West Germany Valentin Falin would replace former Soviet Ambassador to the United States Anatoly Dobrynin, as the head of the International Department of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party. Falin is widely known as the "Germany man" in the Soviet foreign policy apparatus.

The Soviet intelligence services' intensified destabilization of the Federal Republic, centered around the Jenninger affair, is perfectly consistent with assigning West Germany a "special role," as the Soviets would prefer to have a quivering-run satrap state of West Germany, giving the Soviets everything they want in terms of food supplies, financial credits, etc.

The primary Soviet motivation for favoring "Europe 1992," Zhurkin told the *Financial Times* frankly, was to strengthen Soviet security, under the rubric of the "common European house" proposed by Gorbachov. A stronger European role in the NATO alliance, he mused, would weaken the U.S.'s more "assertive" role.

Earlier, on Nov. 8, the Soviet Communist Party daily *Pravda* not only praised efforts toward creation of a European Currency Unit in the context of steps toward "European in-

tegration,” but blasted British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher for her opposition to a “United States of Europe.” Echoing arguments heretofore associated with the clique around European Community president Jacques Delors in Brussels, commentator Lev Strzhizhovsky criticized Britain for standing in the way of closer monetary unity, on which closer political integration depends.

### **A eulogy to de Gaulle’s enemy**

The timing of the pro-“Europe 1992” propaganda offensive is otherwise interesting. With the United States now in the transition period between administrations, the Soviets are obviously making an overture toward Europe, to increase tendencies toward splitting Europeans away from the United States. Since Nov. 7 is the anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, early November is obviously a time of enormous symbolic significance. But not only on the Russian side. Nov. 9, 1988 happens to be the centenary of the birth of Jean Monnet, the architect of “European integration” conspiracies, and a man bitterly attacked on countless occasions by the late French patriotic leader Charles de Gaulle. Circles associated with Monnet are suspected of involvement in the planning of numerous assassination attempts against de Gaulle.

Mrs. Thatcher has cited de Gaulle as her inspiration for her attacks on what she calls the “airy-fairy” Brussels-Strasbourg plans for creating a new supranational entity to rule Europe.

That there are East-West signals going back and forth is clear from the behavior of French President François Mitterrand. On Nov. 9, Monnet’s ashes were moved to the Pantheon in Paris, a place where many of France’s renowned, mostly those of dubious reputation, are buried. On that occasion, Mitterrand made a speech eulogizing Monnet. Amazingly, Mitterrand never mentioned de Gaulle’s name once, even though Nov. 9 also happens to be the anniversary of the death of de Gaulle.

Mitterrand is arriving in Moscow Nov. 24, and Russo-phile feelings are running high in some leading policy circles in Paris these days.

### **The EC, the Soviets, and Windsor**

The Soviets are meanwhile developing solid relations with the European Community, an entity that Soviet propaganda traditionally would anathematize in the past. Gossip is rife in Brussels, of some kind of super EC-Soviet bilateral deal covering various aspects of mutual relations. The Soviets have also been wooed by leading circles in the European Parliament in Strasbourg, and European Parliament president Lord Henry Plumb has made a pilgrimage to Moscow during the past weeks.

Lord Plumb has also put forward an offer to Queen Elizabeth II to address the European Parliament, to create a British counterpole to Mrs. Thatcher (See *EIR*, Vol. 15, No. 44,

page 41). The Queen’s eldest son, Charles, Prince of Wales and heir to the throne, has been adding in his tuppence. On Nov. 8, while in Paris, Charles announced the creation of a French-British scholarship in memory of Jean Monnet. Then, speaking before the Anglo-French Chamber of Commerce Nov. 10, Charles said, “Certain warnings have been expressed recently about the uniformity which could result from the single European market. I do not think French or English people have very much to fear from that direction. . . . If we want the single market to be effective, there must inevitably be changes, not just on paper but also in behavior.”

“Certain warnings” is an unmistakable criticism of Mrs. Thatcher. That, certainly, is the way it was understood by the Euro-integrationist mafia in Europe. The liberal London *Guardian* Nov. 11 headlined an article about Charles’ speech: “Prince Charles Echoes EEC Attack on Thatcher.”

The Nov. 15 report from London that Gorbachov will meet the Queen at Buckingham Palace Dec. 14, adds a new element of potential anti-Thatcher intrigue to the story.

In any case, who is “echoing” whom along the East-West divide these days is not always clear. Whether Comrade Strzhizhovsky is echoing the Brussels and Strasbourg supranationalists or vice versa, the verbiage against Mrs. Thatcher’s Britain is the same. On Nov. 10, EC President Jacques Delors spoke in Brussels to the Action Committee for Europe, which was honoring the centenary of the birth of its founder, Jean Monnet. Defending the EC’s “social” policies, he warned that “the British should not be allowed to impose their differences . . . on other people.”

On the same day, Lord Cockfield, the European Commissioner responsible for drawing up the Single European Act/“Europe 1992” legislation, accused Mrs. Thatcher of trying to maintain the “law of the jungle,” with her attacks on a potential European “superstate.” Cockfield, who has been retired from his post by Mrs. Thatcher, intoned, “National sovereignty in its original or naked form is the law of the jungle. The gradual limitation of national sovereignty is part of a slow and painful forward march of humanity.”

Cockfield sneered that Mrs. Thatcher and others who endorsed British entry into the Common Market in 1972, should have realized then, that entry into the EC implied a “substantial surrender” of sovereignty. “One wonders, therefore,” he went on, “why they, or at least some of them, have suddenly acquired this passionate attachment to national sovereignty, as though it was now and for the first time under attack from unexpected and unforeseen quarters. It is all very much a mystery. Did they not know? Did they not understand or did they simply fail to read the documents before they signed them?”

Indeed, the fear of Delors, Cockfield, Mitterrand, et al. is that the more patriots in Europe become acquainted with “the fine print” of what “Europe 1992” entails, the more resistance against this plan for corporatism and Russian domination of Europe will grow.