

## Europe takes steps toward joining the Survivors' Club

by Jonathan Tennenbaum

Over the first two weeks in November, French and other European leaders have made a series of extraordinary statements on the world strategic and economic situation, reflecting a growing perception among certain institutional circles in Europe, that an utter catastrophe is in the making, unless currently prevailing policy "axioms" are radically changed. While offering no coherent answer to the crisis, these voices do reflect a significant reaction of institutional forces in continental Europe to what is seen as a growing threat to their very national survival, coming from the sorts of policies identified with Britain's Blair government, and the likes of the deplorable Madeleine "Mad Meddling" Albright in the United States.

That threat features, on the one side, the rapidly deteriorating situation in Russia and the danger of a new East-West strategic confrontation spinning out of control; and on the other side, the escalating process of political and economic destruction of the institutions themselves, which is an intended feature of the British-sponsored "globalization" and related policies which have produced the largest speculative bubble in human history.

Not accidentally, this European concern has also expressed itself in a growing number of endorsements of the U.S. Presidential candidacy of Lyndon LaRouche, including by senior diplomats and former high officials (see *EIR*, Oct. 29, pp. 33, 42; Nov. 5, pp. 34-40; Nov. 12, p. 70; this issue, p. 59). Notable also, is the growing density of signs of a shift in continental Europe toward the conception of the "Survivors' Club," as set forth by LaRouche himself—the idea that a group of nations, including China, India, and other developing nations, as well as industrial nations, should join together to build an alternative to the ongoing collapse

of the global financial system, focussing on large-scale infrastructure development and related "dirigistic" currency, credit, and trade policies, oriented toward expanding real physical production.

### Strong words from France

The sharpest of the public utterances so far, are contained in speeches delivered by French President Jacques Chirac and Foreign Minister Hubert Védrine, at the 20th anniversary celebrations of the French Institute for International Relations (IFRI) on Nov. 3 and 4.

Going beyond merely deploring what in Europe are now frequently characterized as "dangerous and irresponsible" trends in U.S. foreign policy vis-à-vis Russia and China in particular, French Foreign Minister Védrine "broke the rules," by pointing his finger explicitly at U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright's mentor Zbigniew Brzezinski, Henry Kissinger, and Samuel Huntington as the immediate *source* of doctrines which are leading the world toward a threatened new strategic confrontation. At the same time, Védrine attacked several other "sacred cows" which until recently have customarily received at least lip-service in gatherings of the so-called "international community": "market economy," "liberal reform," "deregulation," "human rights," "democracy," "new interventionism," "prohibition of dual-use technologies," and so on. These, not accidentally, are the slogans most strongly identified with Britain's Blair government and its sympathizers in the United States.

"What are the lessons of the last eight years?" asked Védrine in his Nov. 3 speech. "I never believed that we had reached the 'end of history,' even in the sense of Francis Fukuyama, . . . because I do not automatically identify 'mar-



*French President Jacques Chirac with President Clinton at the White House in 1996. Today, Chirac urged Europe, and the United States, to develop relations with “the principal actors in the multipolar world: Russia . . . China, Japan, and India, but also other countries”—the crucial nations if President Clinton is to convene a New Bretton Woods conference to reorganize the global financial system.*

ket economy’ with ‘democracy,’ and both with ‘the end of conflicts,’ ” he said.

As to the role of the United States, he said: “I think that the word superpower do not suffice. . . . I use the term hyperpower, which the U.S. media do not like. . . . Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, or Samuel Huntington might have occasion to ask themselves, about the best way to keep American leadership, and to avoid reactions against an overbearing hegemony.”

On relations between the West and the rest of the world, “which means, first of all, Russia, and China, but also other countries,” Védrine criticized the view of those who think of the West as the victor over the former Soviet Union, as comparable to the victory over fascism in World War II. This view, Védrine said, is “linear vision.” He assaulted the ideology of economic “shock therapy”: “We do not know any magic formulas that could transform China, in an instant, into a great democracy, or suddenly transform the ruins of the Soviet Union, into a prosperous economy. . . . We must think

in terms of an historical process, involving step-by-step progress and consolidation.” He rejected the myth that “the prescription for ultra-liberal deregulation had been appropriate to the situation in Russia in 1992, a Russia which was in worse shape than Western Europe after the war.” On the contrary, the success of Europe’s postwar reconstruction was due to “decades of planning, regulation, and centralized decision-making.”

### **Wrong economic, strategic policies**

Certain people “see a clash of civilizations,” Védrine said, “but that is not my opinion.” Instead, he put the blame for East-West and North-South tensions on wrong economic and strategic policies. For example, the West (led by British Prime Minister Tony Blair et al.) has gone beyond Chapter 7 of the UN Charter, claiming the “right of intervention,” even “going against the Security Council if necessary, and relativizing . . . the sovereignty of states. The West demands instantaneous democracy and opening of markets,” whereas the countries of the South say, they also need development. “The West denies to others, the right to have the types of weapons, which it itself has . . . denying access to dual-use technology.” The nations of the South respond, that they also have a right to security, and that “the West has no right to invoke its security, in order to stop the development of the South.”

Védrine concluded that “we can accept neither a unipolar world, nor a culturally uniform world, nor the unilateralism of the only hyper-power.” We accord a leading role to the United States, because of its “creative vitality,” but unilateralism is opposed to a “multi-lateralism, which would respect all the members of the international community.” The European Union should be one of the poles of this world, “the poles should cooperate with, and not confront each other, and that includes not only Euro-American relations, but also the challenge of relations with Russia, China, Japan, and India. . . . The Security Council should not be deprived of its central role. . . . In pursuing universal values, we should use less arrogance and more dialogue, . . . less liberal dogmatism, and more attention to economic development.”

The thrust of Védrine’s comments was echoed by President Chirac on Nov. 4, with some interesting, additional points of emphasis. No doubt reflecting the high-level French-Chinese discussions which occurred in and around Chinese President Jiang Zemin’s recent, highly prominent visit to France, and which (among other things), included strong joint opposition to the U.S. anti-missile defense plans, Chirac pointedly criticized the Republican-dominated U.S. Congress which has “too often succumbed to the temptations of unilateralism and isolationism. And because of this, there are already the beginnings of what could become a new bipolar tension between Washington and Beijing.”

“We will not escape from this grave risk, without creating a balanced dialogue,” Chirac said. The European Union

should develop its relations with “the principal actors in the multipolar world: Russia—without which there will not be peace and security on our continent—China, Japan, and India, but also other countries.” Chirac said, “I hope that the United States will again assume all its responsibilities on the international scene as soon as possible, but the world is fragile. It does not wait. If it does not progress, it regresses. Let us remember the lessons of history.”

### **Back to sane economics**

The economic component of the same institutional tendency reflected in the Védrine-Chirac statements, was expressed, in part, in a speech by French Prime Minister Lionel Jospin, at the Nov. 8 Socialist International conference in Paris. Not accidentally, that speech contained a frontal attack against Blair’s “Third Way,” calling instead, for a return to the successful, “dirigistic” economic policies of the postwar reconstruction period.

Jospin emphasized that, thanks to those dirigistic policies, “economic growth and full employment were the rule during several decades. The control of capitalism made it possible for a model of economic performance and social progress to emerge. During the 30 years following 1945, this model led to growth, accumulation, and employment rates unprecedented in our history, and not only in the developed countries.”

Jospin continued, “We must reflect on the reasons that have led us to allow the return of periods of stagnation and massive unemployment. . . . The great crisis of the 1930s—and we must not forget its lessons—plunged the world economy into a long and deep depression. Tens of millions of human beings were brutally flung into dire poverty. It was overcome, thanks to deliberate political action, and the role played by the state.”

From this standpoint, Jospin polemicized against the “free-market” dogmas which have led to stagnation and mass unemployment in Europe: “The market is an instrument, an efficient and precious one. But it is only an instrument. It needs to be regulated. It must remain at the service of society. In itself, the market creates neither meaning, nor direction, nor project. It is the society of citizens which, through discussion and political action, establishes itself and chooses its values and its course. We reject the ‘marketization’ of societies. Health is not merchandise. The works of the mind are not merchandise. . . . For three successive decades, after the Second World War, full employment was the norm in European societies. It must become so again. And so it can, if we so desire.”

### **Not just France**

The institutional “survival” reaction, manifested by the French statements, is occurring also in Germany—albeit in a less open form than in France, and centered much more in German industry, which makes up the core of Europe’s re-

maining economic capacity. Notable is the visit of German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder with a high-level industrial delegation to Beijing (see article this issue, in *Economics*), in the context of which, Schröder went out of his way to blast the use of so-called “human rights” issues as a pretext for sabotaging development of economic and political relations with China. Breaking with his model, Tony Blair, on this point, was no act of personal integrity by Schröder himself; he was obviously operating under heavy pressure from German industrial interests, who see in expanded high-technology exports to China, India, and other developing nations the only visible way out of an otherwise hopeless situation for what remains of Germany’s in-depth industrial capacities. The agreements for cooperation on application of Germany’s revolutionary magnetic levitation train, the Transrapid, in China, are typical of this “survival” reaction among institutionalized forces in Germany.

### **Albright must be dumped!**

In their striving for some “way out” of the strategic and economic crisis, sane forces in Europe are conscious of the fact that there is hardly any chance of survival, without a *fundamental shift* in policy in the United States. This realization is reflected on the one hand, by increasing interest in the “LaRouche option,” and on the other hand, by a growing chorus of voices calling for Albright to be dumped, as a first step toward cleaning out the most dangerous British-linked influences on the U.S. government.

In a Nov. 3 discussion with *EIR*, Rome’s Lucio Carracciolo, editor of the Italian geopolitical magazine *Limes*, affirmed that “Madeleine Albright is a disaster in every sense. Her name may be Albright, but she is not bright. She has some psychological problems. . . . She hates the Russians, and wants to bring Russia back to the Middle Ages. . . . It is not in the American interest that Russia go back to the Middle Ages.” He said that Albright is one of those who believe that “NATO should be a global policeman for Anglo-American interests.” He thought it a good idea, that Albright be removed.

On Nov. 2, a European influential linked to traditional social democratic circles, exclaimed that “history will judge Albright very severely.” U.S. foreign policy, he warned, is in “total disorientation,” and “if President Clinton wants his last year in office to be in better shape, he should think fast and quickly about finding another Secretary of State.”

Survival is also an issue among the more sane circles in England itself. On Nov. 4, a well-connected strategist from Britain commented: “Madeleine Albright should absolutely be dumped. . . . She’s intemperate, and dashes around interfering in everything. She’s an absolute disaster from beginning to end, made even worse by being the carrier of the policies of Brzezinski.” He added wryly, “If she is dumped, can she take [British Foreign Secretary] Robin Cook with her?”