

## Editorial

### *It's Time for a 'New Deal'*

The news coming out of the Thessaloniki summit of the European Union on June 20, was that the heads of state approved a statement citing the European Commission's intention to launch an initiative to increase European Investment Bank investment in Europe-wide road, rail, and energy projects, plus research and development. The EU summit "invites the Italian presidency to pursue this further," the statement said.

What the European Union Presidents were approving, was the proposal put forward by Italy's Economics and Finance Minister Giulio Tremonti, which goes by the name of a "New Deal" for Europe. Tremonti's plan is an update of the Europeanwide infrastructure program which would build bridges, railroads, and other transport infrastructure, as a means of creating jobs, and improving the productivity of Europe as a whole. Formerly called the Delors Plan, the proposal in fact grew out of Lyndon LaRouche's "Productive Triangle" proposal, which was first put forward during the peaceful European revolution of 1989.

While it can't be expected that Tremonti's "New Deal" will go through without a fight from the monetarists, who have sabotaged it by a denial of credit over the last decade, it is clear that the era of the "New Deal" has arrived, and it is not confined to Europe. All over the world, and even in a tentative form in the United States, the cry for an FDR-style "New Deal" is being heard.

First, let's get straight what this "New Deal" is all about. What is being discussed is state-financed major infrastructure projects, along the lines of what President Franklin Delano Roosevelt put into effect during the 1930s. Those projects, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, and major dams like the Grand Coulee and the Hoover Dam, were models for the world, in their joint functions as job creators, and as extraordinary means for taming nature, for the greater good of society.

Second, it is well-known internationally, that the leading spokesman for an FDR-style New Deal approach, in the United States and throughout the world, is none other than Democrat Lyndon LaRouche. Espe-

cially during the 1990s, but before as well, LaRouche has championed a return to FDR-style programs for the general welfare of the population, particularly through the government sponsorship of necessary infrastructure projects. FDR was also, of course, the author of the Bretton Woods system, which embodied the principles of regulation and promotion of production, which lie at the core of LaRouche's New Bretton Woods proposal. It is also clear that the current neo-conservative and monetarist approach in Washington, is hostile to such FDR-style measures.

Those who have dared to face the severity of the global economic and financial crisis, have been raising the banner of the "New Deal" for a good number of years now. China, for example, cited the New Deal model of state sponsorship of major infrastructure projects when it embarked upon its huge water and transport construction programs in the late 1990s. More recently, the Presidents of Argentina and Brazil have appealed to the FDR "New Deal" tradition, in putting forward their approaches to solving the economic crises in their countries.

Despite the breakdowns of transportation, water, and power infrastructure in the United States—a large percentage of what the country still relies on was built under Roosevelt—the political leadership in the United States, outside of LaRouche, has shunned the FDR model. That fact makes it all the more remarkable that, in recent weeks, a Republican Senator (Jim Talent of Missouri) and a Democratic Senator (Ron Wyden of Oregon) have put forward a \$50 billion program for infrastructure construction, to be funded by Federal government bonds. The *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* did not hesitate to call this a "New Deal" approach.

It has long been the LaRouche movement's belief, that, when the American population began to face the reality of the systemic economic and financial breakdown, it would turn to the model of FDR, as the last President to successfully deal with such a crisis. Today, a turn to that approach necessarily means turning toward LaRouche. All the better, that leading political institutions worldwide are doing the same.