

Is Europe the Continent of Poets, Thinkers, and Inventors, or on the Sidelines of Strategic Developments? An Optimistic Vision for the Future of Europe

JACQUES CHEMINADE: PANEL III KEYNOTE

What Europe Should Contribute To the New World Paradigm

Jacques Chminade is a former French presidential candidate. This is an edited transcript of his presentation to the Nov. 25-26 Schiller Institute Conference, "Fulfilling the Dreams of Mankind."

Qui sommes-nous? Europe and the nations of Europe, who are we? Who are we? Europe. "Of course one can jump up and down on one's chair like a kid goat, bleating 'Europe, Europe, Europe,' but it leads nowhere and signifies nothing." These were the provocative words of General de Gaulle, in an interview given on December 14, 1965. Even today, some still maintain that in reacting in that way, de Gaulle was only concerned with France's own political Grand Design and its prestige, while



Jacques Cheminade

others claim that he was mainly inspired by commercial and economic, especially agricultural motivations, in a conception of protectionist national interests raised against all other nations. Both are wrong.

It is now key for European nations to ask themselves why it is wrong—because that raises the question of what a nation-state and what a world region like Western Europe really are. This is the first question to raise in order to muster a sense of a mission, to realize what we could and should contribute to the new world paradigm, to our World Land-Bridge. Identifying

the source is indeed key to understanding what could and should spring from it. All the more so, as it was the same de Gaulle, who after recognizing the People's Re-

public of China in January 1964, declared quite prophetically what nobody else was then able to foresee: “It cannot be excluded that China will once again become what it was for centuries, the greatest power in the universe.”

What de Gaulle rejected was a supranational institution and a pseudo-federal model of integration launched against the very principle of nation-states. He understood that solidarity, as opposed to what is happening in the current European Union, means having a common mission, not to undermine national sovereignties, but to base solidarity on a mutual understanding. He told his press secretary, Alain Peyrefitte, the following: “What the Anglo-Saxons want is a Europe without shores, a Europe that would no longer have the ambition to be itself. A Europe without borders. *Europe à l’anglaise* [English style]. . . . A Europe in which every European country, beginning with ours, would lose its soul.”

The key word here is “soul.” Because if Europe can contribute today to the New Silk Road and the World Land-Bridge, it is with the soul of each and all of its nations, the soul of its major composers, poets, philosophers and statesmen, with their science, their art and their technologies, and not with the sterile product of an artificial entity ruled by a monetarist bureaucracy. De Gaulle, in that sense, was definitely and absolutely pro-European. In the same interview about the “kid goats,” so often misquoted, he said:

“As long as I am French, I am a European. Given the fact that we are here in Europe—and I would have to say that France has always been an essential if not a capital part of Europe—therefore I am of course European. . . . Our countries have their history, their language, their way of life, and they are French, German, Italian, British, Dutch, Belgian, Spanish, or Luxemburgers. These are the countries that we have, to progressively become accustomed to live together and act together. In that sense, I am the first one to recognize and think that our Common Market is essential, because if we manage to



Deutsche Bundesarchiv

Charles de Gaulle

organize it, and consequently to establish a real economic solidarity among these European nations, we will have done a lot for the fundamental coming together of the people and for our common life.”

And he added, in a speech given in Bonn on June 11-12, 1965:

“We Europeans are builders of cathedrals. It took us a long time. We have made many efforts. But we have succeeded. . . . In any case, there is a foundation—it is the reconciliation of France and Germany. The pillars are our six members of the European Economic Community. There is going to be a top, made of the arches and the roof, and it is going to be our political cooperation. The pillars are built after the foundation is laid. The top is

going to be settled when the pillars will have been properly built. . . . When our cathedral has been built, it is going to be opened to others. Who knows if, with them, when we will have acquired a taste for building, we are not going to build an even greater and more beautiful cathedral, the union of the whole of Europe?”

De Gaulle, in the middle of World War II, on November 11, 1942, had already invited “Europeans to join together in a practical and lasting fashion.”

It is key to understand this concept. Of course, things have changed a lot since the 1940s and 1960s of the last century, but the challenge remains the same and is even clearer. There are two traps. The first is to think that there is way out that leads to the past as such, as a withdrawal of a nation into itself, a fixed model. The second is to subjugate our nations to a European Union which has become a tool of a one-world monetarism, ruled by money fakers such as Mario Draghi, through the euro and the financial institutions of the fake Europe and NATO. Both mean submitting to the ruling financial oligarchy, the ideology and financial power of the British Empire with its somehow Anglo-American new skin, which is the very reason why de Gaulle vetoed British admission to the European Union.

It is very important for our American and Chinese



American artist John Trumbull

The signing of the Declaration of Independence.

friends to understand this point: It means that Europe must break away from geopolitical rule to be truly itself, and European nation-states must work together for common projects, and therefore not give in to that geopolitical rule, one-by-one or together. It should be clear that the present-day European Union is based on a betrayal of the best historical and cultural sources of Europe—and I mean sources, not roots clinging to the ground. But it should also be clear that the European nations and their leaders, and their so-called populist opponents as well, have also given away their souls. Therefore, where is hope? What could our European contribution be? It obviously lies in the sense of an understanding of what a nation-state is, something which is latent, even if concealed, in the hearts of all true Europeans. Our task is to inspire an awakening from the sleep of reason.

A nation-state is much more than a territory or a given state of the population, or even a religion or a tradition. It is the dynamics of an idea evolving and increasing in power and scope over the course of history. Friedrich Schiller, Heinrich Heine, François Rabelais, Miguel Cervantes, Dante Alighieri, Alexander Pushkin, Percy B. Shelley or, at their best, Adam Mickiewicz and Victor Hugo brought forth this “idea” in their writings, as many poets did in their own ways. This idea is dynamic, as all ideas are, and its political embodiment, I am convinced, is the best contribution that we can make to the new world paradigm.

If you are inspired by this idea, you begin to understand the Confucian tradition of China, and you won’t

fall into the traps of geopolitics or monetarism. Great minds always tend to coincide over the main issues. In the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648, we have the conception of the “advantage of the other,” and in the American Declaration of Independence, we find the “pursuit of happiness,” which is the same conception of happiness developed by President Xi Jinping—a happiness that it is only possible to reach for oneself if you make it possible for others.

To have something to contribute, demands that we Europeans all engage in a profound heart-searching, since the path to reason is opened by the heart. Such an effort by us, un-

derstood by the Chinese, would be the best way to respond to the challenge of the Belt and Road Initiative. To build, out of the present European Union, the euro, and NATO, a true Europe of the nation-states, as de Gaulle said, “from the Atlantic to the Urals.” And this time building well beyond the Urals, to connect the Atlantic with the China Sea on the one side, and to a renaissance America on the other, should and would be an education for the world, and the basis for the great World Land-Bridge. Such an effort would take us out of the ideology that says that success can only be achieved at the expense of the other, with the expectation that the winner takes all. And the Chinese would appreciate that. It would also get us out of the foolish idea that the New Silk Road is good because it is a tool against the United States. And the Chinese could appreciate that.

Europe’s Proper Role

President Trump’s visit to China proved that the Chinese authorities are committed to a community of development among all nations, because they understand that their interest coincides with the interests of all of them. Here in Europe, we should work to surpass the cultural pessimism of geopolitics and financial greed, and revive those moments, such as in our great Renaissance, when we attempted to contribute to creating a Republic by reaching out to the shores of America, to free ourselves from the grip of the European oligarchy. In that sense, we can contribute by reappropriating our own history and rediscovering how we brought about our revolutions in science and art.

It also demands shedding a self-destructive euro-centrism, to bring to the world the gift of a true internationalism, freed from both narcissistic nationalism, and from the cosmopolitanism of financial slave-herders. Then, we can understand and joyfully share with others the fact that Europe was only able to exist because, between the fall of the Roman Empire (despite the reign of Charlemagne), and our great Renaissance, remarkable achievements took place in other parts of the world. Mainly in China, but also in India, Cambodia and parts of Africa. In that sense, to make our contribution fruitful, we must understand that our civilization has sources other than the Greek and Judeo-Christian. This does not mean underrating those fundamental, great Judeo-Christian contributions, but, on the contrary, realizing that they are not only key for the world of the future, but also substantial for us now.

Europe has not only been made from within European territory. For example, if it were not for the visitors from China who came to meet Paolo dal Pozzo Toscanelli at the time of the 15th-century Council of Florence, America would probably not have been “discovered” by us Europeans until much, much later—and the cause of freedom against the oligarchy would have been, at least temporarily, lost.

Today, the Belt and Road Initiative, together with the existence of the BRICS, is not only a network of infrastructure projects, economic institutions and high-speed trains, but a change of paradigm which is not only Chinese—although inspired by China—but universal, as the Chinese understand much better than we do. It is a potential leap from a geopolitical and financial order based on the possession of goods and territory, to an economic order of exchanges and mutual development, based on connections and permanent innovations, and not on annexations and possessions. To understand this, we should contribute and share with the Chinese the approach of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz on this point.

Starting from the principle of the universality of reason, Leibniz, at the end of the 17th century, notably in his *Novissima Sinica*, not only concludes that Christian



Schiller Institute

Helga Zepp-LaRouche (lower right) and other participants on May 14, 2017, at the opening session of the Belt and Road Forum for International Cooperation.

revelation theology and the Chinese natural theology of Confucianism are compatible, but that it is necessary to launch economic, scientific and cultural cooperation between the two “more developed extremes of Eurasia,” Western Europe and China. He writes:

“A specific arrangement of Providence, according to my opinion, has ordained that the highest culture and ornament of the human race, are today somehow concentrated at the two extremities of our continent, Europe and China; the latter as the Europe of the Orient embellishes the opposed side of the Earth.”

Leibniz considers the Europeans more advanced in the science of non-physical things and in metaphysical speculations, and in geometry, considered from the standpoint of philosophy, while the Chinese have a better management of practical philosophy and the rules of life. Hence the Belgian Jesuit Ferdinand Verbiest taught the “European sciences,” trigonometry and astronomical mathematics, to the Kangxi Emperor, so much so that the Emperor became a highly learned man, looking at geometry from the standpoint of philosophy and not mere artisanry, and composed a book to promote the principles of such a beautiful science to children.

The Jesuit priests sent to China by the French monarch were organized by Leibniz to share this knowledge more generally with a Chinese literate elite, with the communication of ideas accompanied by the exchange

of goods. But for Leibniz this was not a one-way relation. He points out, both seriously and ironically, that “The state of affairs among us seems to me such, through the overflow of corruption, that it would seem almost necessary that the Chinese should send us missionaries to teach us the use and practice of natural theology, as we send them some to teach them the revealed theology.”

Europe should contribute to deepen the knowledge, on both sides, of this first draft of a global Silk Road, as a web of both physical and mental exchanges. A good lesson for us all is to understand how this mission was historically killed. First, by the ultramontanists of Rome, who refused to admit that the *ren* and the *li*, the idea of a sovereign universal good, could be compatible with the spirit of Christianity—and second by the brutal assault of the British Empire, supported, as Victor Hugo denounced this, by the French, notably through the Opium Wars and murderous “gunboat diplomacy” and plunder.

This shared historical knowledge should contribute to avoid repeating the mistakes of the past; to then, always, consider our relations with the eyes of the future.

There are of course many areas of cooperation now, but in a far too limited way. On the history of sciences, looking to the input we Europeans can have, there is the common study of the works of Vernadsky, the German and Russian schools of cosmic and astronomic sciences, the Italian school of hydrodynamics, and the French developments in laser fusion.

Concretely, there is a lot to share, provided there is a political will and not ideological mistrust. I have been told so many times, that if scientists organize their own channels of communication, they work very happily together because science does not belong to one single country, but to all of us, to build a better world. But the problem in all ventures is the lack of collaboration from the European administrations, which, too often, think in terms of the Chinese situation of five to ten years ago, without taking into account the enormous progress accomplished in China in the most recent years. The French seem to be even more bureaucratically paralyzed than the Germans: There are presently about 5,000 Chinese doctoral students in Germany, but only 500 in France. The last Franco-Chinese science com-



CNES

Artist's rendition of the deployed CFOSAT spacecraft in orbit.

mission took place six years ago, and there have been fewer than five visits by heads of scientific agencies from either side in the last ten years! The worst is the censorship of many initiatives by the security and defense services on our side, and the lack of a long-term strategy of cooperation.

France does have, for example, two aerospace projects with China: CFOSAT, a satellite to be launched in 2018 for the observation of the oceans; and SVOM, set for 2020, for the observation of gamma-ray pulses. The French project Cardiospace has been embedded in the Tiangong 2 Chinese space mission.

But all of this is far, far away from what we could and should contribute. I am fighting for the launching of areas of common and far-reaching cooperation, on the Franco-Chinese and European-Chinese levels—for a truly ambitious space policy, the blossoming of an oceanic “blue” economy, and the development of Africa.

None of that can be decided or arranged, at a French or European level, from the bottom up. A strategy from the top down, vertically promoted within an *Auftrag-staktik* approach, is needed to contribute in a crossroads-type of exchange of ideas, research, innovations and goods, which has to be reached to establish a community of development and world peace. For us, as Europeans, the emergence of China presents the opportunity to open our eyes, look at ourselves, and lift our heads—instead of walking on them. It will make us happier, like all those Chinese children driven by joyful curiosity, and all those we have seen from the Yemeni youth cabinet.

The challenge for us adults is to care for them, being rationally and wholeheartedly proud of our nations once again, proud to work together for a future based on a community of principles, solidarity and peace.

Let us stop crawling egotistically from the past—and we do crawl egotistically from the past in Europe—

and leap ahead toward the future to rediscover and recover our souls, the souls of Europe and of our nations. It is for us, true Europeans and true patriots, to make our mandatory contribution, inspired by our past history of world citizens. It is time now to be human, fully human, as patriots and world citizens.