

the interest of the whole world, the trend has to be halted and reversed.

As I speak, one of our neighboring countries [Sierra Leone] in the West African sub-region is burning. This has been a conflict for which Nigeria has made enormous sacrifices. And we are prepared to make more. . . .

Our failure to fully comprehend the fundamental long-term historical causes of conflicts in Africa has prevented us from their mastery. Poverty and conflicts feed on each other while both go hand-in-hand with bad governance, whose hallmarks are the marginalization and social exclusion of the majority of the population, the neglect of the social services and infrastructure, and the failure to maintain law and order. Invariably, the remote as well as immediate causes of conflicts in Africa are real and perceived political, social, and economic injustice and inequality. . . . Mastery of conflict is more than mere cessation of hostilities. We must address their fundamental causes in order to prevent their recurrence.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I began this address by referring to how much our continent and our people have suffered in the hands of non-Africans. It was by no means an attempt to defend Africa against such labels as “The Hopeless Continent,” as proclaimed on the cover of the latest edition of *The Economist*, which I have no doubt many members of this audience would have seen. Needless to say that, for us, Africans living in Africa, development and progress is not an idle debate. For us, it is a matter of life and death! We certainly cannot afford the intellectual luxury of writing off our continent. Nor can we even begin to weigh the possible validity of the rather racist connotation that underdevelopment is innate to the character of Africans and African societies. . . .

*The Economist*, as authoritative as it might be, conspicuously omitted reference to one-quarter of Black Africa, that is to say Nigeria, where we have been devoting all our energy to rebuilding our nation. . . .

Ladies and Gentlemen, Africa’s internal efforts are currently circumscribed by the mostly disadvantageous and inequitable status within the international order. Our situation is like that of a man in a wet pit: He needs a lifeline to make his climbing efforts a success. The history of humankind is replete with such complementarity of efforts. Our vision for this coming century cannot exclude the trend of the world becoming a global village. . . . Let it be a village in which a burst pipe in one compound makes all neighbors sit up with genuine concern and desire to help. It is not — and cannot be — a meaningful village if certain compounds are, for whatever reasons, de-linked, as it is now happening to Africa.

We are struggling and asking for Africa to be re-linked equitably into the international order, politically, economically, socially, and technologically. This demand is predicated on humanity and morality, which are two essential factors that differentiate humans from beasts of the wild. If we can attain this, it will be a quantum leap for humankind in the 21st century.

## A ‘Core’ Europe of, or Against the Europeans?

by Rainer Apel

The miserable performance in recent weeks of the euro, the single European Union (EU) currency that was introduced in January 1999, has done much to decrease popular support for the project of European integration. And it is not the case that the average European buys the established politicians’ stories about the reasons why the euro is hovering around 0.90 against the dollar. The average European may not know much about the details behind this development, but he or she does at least know enough from the leaks by the media, to know that a U.S.-European economic war is raging, and that neither the EU governments nor the European Central Bank are doing much to defend the European economies in this conflict.

Faced with their growing unpopularity, the EU governments had to come up with some device to breathe new life into the European vision, and they seized upon the 50th anniversary celebration of the first genuine design for an integrated Europe, which was presented on May 9, 1950, by French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman (see *EIR*, May 12). Schuman’s initiative provided the platform from which Franco-German cooperation, and with it, the core of what in 1957 became the European Economic Community, could develop.

### Schuman’s Design vs. Monetarism

The irony now is, that the EU politicians of today decided to borrow from Schuman’s reputation, while carefully avoiding any substantial aspects of his economic design — which, because it was oriented toward strong industrial growth and full employment, contributed a lot to the postwar recovery of the economies on the western part of the European continent. The “Europe” which the leading politicians have in mind today, is built on monetarist designs: Its concept and its institutions are an enemy of industrial development. The billions of dollars of bonuses paid by the EU for industrial foreclosures and set-aside programs for the farming sector, are what has transformed the “spirit” of Europe into its “ghost.”

As if that were not enough destruction, the EU politicians added the Treaty of Maastricht (1992), which made budget-balancing the economic doctrine of the 15 member-states of the Union, and they transferred sovereignty on monetary affairs from the nation-states and their national central banks to the newly created European Central Bank. The new clauses went into effect on Jan. 1, 1999, and, because a majority of Europeans remained skeptical of the project, they were told

by the governments that not only would there be more stability against global financial turbulence, but also that the euro would soon be the hardest currency in the world, and would probably even leave the dollar behind. None of that has happened, and the euro, which started out at a rate of 1.18 against the dollar, has lost 25% of its value in its 16 months of existence.

Against this background, French Finance Minister Laurent Fabius announced at EU headquarters in Brussels on May 8, that after taking the semi-annual rotating chairmanship of the EU in July, his government would launch an initiative to boost the euro, and Fabius even hinted at measures against currency speculators.

This sounded rather promising, but the question was posed whether a real change in the Maastricht clauses that worship the free market, deregulation, and privatization as their earthly god, was envisaged by the French government.

Unfortunately, Fabius revealed nothing more in his remarks in Brussels, but he said more than did Germany's Foreign Minister, Joschka Fischer, who gave a long speech in Berlin on May 12, on the "finality of European integration" and institutional reforms, about a "new vanguard" and a "new center of gravity" to be built around Franco-German initiatives. Fischer did not speak on the economic side of European affairs; he only declared that European integration should move ahead on the basis of the Maastricht accords.

### **Cheminade Responds**

Jacques Cheminade, the chairman of the French Solidarity and Progress party and a longtime associate of Lyndon LaRouche, appropriately characterized Fischer's speech, in a May 15 statement. The German politician's proposal for a constitutional federation of nation-states, with a President elected by universal suffrage, a European government, and a bicameral Parliament, he wrote, "is nothing but a utopian scheme built upon institutional quicksand. It sets a target in the remote future, based on a mathematical architecture, instead of responding to the present physical challenge of the collapsing international monetary system. Worse, it keeps intact the disastrous Maastricht Treaty and its financial approach. In a word, one could say that Mr. Fischer acts like a man who wants to reach an ideal of purity, while dragging all the mud with him."

The leading EU politicians do not have the courage to address the real issues, to abolish the Maastricht straitjacket, and replace it with a design like that which LaRouche has proposed, for a New Bretton Woods world financial system, linked to the production-oriented Eurasian Land-Bridge project for infrastructure development and high-technology industry. As LaRouche has emphasized, the formation of a "community of principle" among sovereign nation-states, toward such an objective, would be in the interest of the general welfare of all the world's people. But it requires a decisive break with the current bankrupt system, which is dominated

by the ideology of British neo-liberal free trade, and its latest efflorescence, the "Information Society." So far, the elites of neither the United States nor Europe have shown themselves ready to undertake such a revolutionary transformation—thereby threatening to bring down upon us all the worst financial catastrophe of modern history.

### **British Control Unchallenged**

As for Fischer, he talked of a long-term project of creating a "federation of nation-states," while not touching on the crucial issue of economics. He advertised a political initiative for Europe that would involve France and Germany, but exclude a Britain that prefers to stay outside the European Monetary Union. This has the aura of "Franco-German cooperation" resembling the grand European initiatives of the 1950s, but at the same time (which is what Fischer forgot to mention), British free-trade ideology would maintain conceptual control of EU policies, through the monetarist, free-market, and budget-balancing doctrines of the European Central Bank. And, by some mysterious means, the euro would recover in the near or intermediate future, Fischer's speech implied.

French and, particularly, German media commentators characterized this as "a smart initiative." But, as Cheminade made clear, the lip service paid to the existing EU institutions by Fischer, and those who applauded his Berlin speech, does not threaten the speculators who are keeping the dwindling euro under attack.

And as far as the "vanguard" that Fischer said would form the "new core of Europe," Cheminade said, "A vanguard does not mean a gang of mediocre politicians trying to escape from immediate necessary and fundamental decisions, with futuristic schemes; it means leaders taking the challenge of the history of their nation-states and acting on behalf of future generations, like Robert Schuman did in May 1950, or like [French President] Charles de Gaulle and [German Chancellor] Konrad Adenauer did in 1963."

In January 1963, de Gaulle and Adenauer signed a Franco-German Treaty, which in effect was a declaration of war against the Anglo-centered system of geopolitics and global monetarism. The project was sabotaged from within Germany, mainly, by Adenauer's opponents, who were the forebears of the mediocre minds among German politicians today, like Fischer. The "Europe" that Fischer spoke of, is one that runs against the genuine interests of Europeans. For, what could be the benefit of a "Europe" that maintains political and monetary discipline under a system that is economically doomed?

***To reach us on the Web:***  
**[www.larouchepub.com](http://www.larouchepub.com)**