

Mitterrand defines a grand design

The acting President of the European Community calls for aid for freedom in Eastern Europe, development in the Third World. By Christine Schier.

French President François Mitterrand broke with the supranational plans for a Single Europe 1992 during his speech to the European Parliament on Oct. 25. For the first time, Mitterrand defined Europe's role as a pole of development for the rest of the world, bypassing the sterile internal discussions on what institutions and agencies the 12 countries should set up and when. At a time that Eastern Europe's hopes center on Western values, and the Third World looks toward Europe for a solution, the European Community (EC) must find the means to respond to these expectations, Mitterrand insisted, often with verve.

Internally, Europe's main objective is to accelerate economic and monetary union. Abroad, he insisted on the urgency of solving the debt crisis in the Third World and granting new credits for development, citing two main areas of grave concern: the fight against drugs and stopping AIDS. He announced two concrete initiatives, a summit between Ibero-Latin American countries and the EC, and another between Arab countries and the EC before the end of 1989. As for Eastern Europe, "What élan! What hope!" We are "witnessing the undoing of the order of Yalta."

"As during the great moments of 1789, it is the people who raise their outcry. It is the determination of a people taking control of events which forces walls and borders to collapse. The people themselves are now defining the path upon which our century will draw to a close and future times will embark. This, in itself, is great news. Once again, the people are on the move, and when they move, they decide. For the sake of what? For freedom, very simply."

The challenge for Western Europe is to help those countries out of their crisis. "Why not create a bank for Europe which, like the European Investment Bank, would finance great projects, including on its Board the 12 Europeans [EC member nations] and others, Poland, Hungary . . . why not the Soviet Union?" There are echoes here of proposals made over the past years by Lyndon LaRouche: to set up new institutions to finance specific development projects at preferential conditions and penalize purely speculative uses of money.

Mitterrand limited himself to one concrete case during his speech: Poland. "I suggest a Euro-Polish solidarity loan, a kind of emergency plan for each country, for each city, which could take responsibility for a region or city of Poland and supervise the delivery and distribution of aid. . . . This

should be a coordinated mission of the 12 member countries." The French government had announced that morning a program of emergency aid worth \$630 million for three years. Mitterrand proposed to the EC "some coherent great projects, as priorities: agriculture, transportation, telephone. How to finance them? I thought for my country of a Franco-Polish center for promoting investments, with an initial endowment of 300 million francs per year." Together, Europe could do much more.

To those who predict that the collapse of Eastern Europe will bring a dislocation of Western Europe, Mitterrand replies: "Shouldn't this destruction of structures in the East produce the contrary effect in the West? Strengthening and accelerating the political construction of Europe is the only answer to the political problem." As for German reunification, a legitimate wish of the German people, French policy is to firmly anchor Franco-German cooperation and pull the East toward it.

Now, as *EIR* has often pointed out, the "Europe 1992" proposed until recently would only lead to a loss of national sovereignty. However, the premises of those plans have been changed, on the one hand by the events in the East bloc and, on the other hand, by the complete lack of confidence in the Bush administration. European leaders have no illusions that the U.S. government will be able to avoid a financial crash or solve the monetary chaos. A Soviet-U.S. condominium is not to the liking of the Europeans—especially not the French government.

So the challenge is to give political content to the new European institutions. This poses basic problems, including to what extent national independence should be subordinated to interests of the European Community. President Mitterrand made clear to the European Parliament in Strasbourg that the Single Europe Act of 1992 must not be based on financial deregulation, nor on "survival of the fittest" in the monetary jungle.

He scored attempts to "create, under the pretext of deregulation or liberalization, unfair competition and new barriers. This remark pertains especially to the liberalization of capital flows and the concentration of companies. . . . I draw your attention to the danger of a competitive lowering of taxes on savings. I am sorry to say that the policy of withholding taxes proposed by the [European] Commission, is not unanimously

approved." In France, those taxes are used to finance infrastructure and public investments in schools, hospitals, research, etc., and France is opposed to lowering them. "The absence of harmonization contradicts in any case the spirit of the Community. But we must avoid emphasizing differences, or accepting, for example, that banking secrecy cover up fraudulent operations, or, worse still, dirty-money laundering." This clarification is of the utmost importance, since the free flow of capital and of goods could also lead to free flow of drugs and drug money.

A true economic and monetary union should lead to "a common monetary policy, a common currency, and a central bank," he said. "This union will be a decisive step toward the objective of a political union of the Community." Mitterrand insisted then on the importance of a social policy for Europe and protection for workers. "Building Europe without the help of the workers would be building it against their interests. This hypothesis is all the more absurd since social policy is . . . indispensable for economic progress."

The French President's view of Europe goes against that of British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and the Anglo-American financial interests, and opposition from that quarter will be enormous. Although Mitterrand's attacks remained oblique, they have certainly been clearly understood.

The developing sector

Relations between developing countries and the EC was another major aspect of Mitterrand's considerations. "I find it intolerable that Europe, our Europe, is not always as active, as alert, as prompt as some other powerful forces in the world. . . . We have our say, but generally in an isolated fashion. . . . This is where the political absence of Europe is sorely felt." On the international debt crisis, "the case-by-case approach, in favor today"—especially in Anglo-American circles—"is not enough, since it exposes developing countries to economic and strategic pressure. . . . We need a global approach. . . . We need to create a multilateral fund with new money."

He also appealed to all European countries to intervene much more fervently on behalf of Lebanon, a nation fighting for its very survival.

"Europe of the Economic Community is not a fortress. She has no drawbridge. She has no weapons in the nooks, nor thick walls of protection. She rather wants to tear down walls." François Mitterrand has outlined a political project for Europe, one which fosters a Grand Design for the East, economic growth for the South, and a pole of development hostile to speculation in the West. This perspective, adopted by a head of state, is promising. Now translating words into actions must begin. The political battle to bring such a Europe into being will be tough—very tough—and a firm, principled alliance among France, Germany, Italy, and Spain is a precondition for victory.

Australian patriot is frameup target

by Allen Douglas

Readers of *EIR* may remember the humorous but devastating exposé of the "greenhouse effect" and "ozone hole" frauds in our Oct. 27 issue, by Australian publisher Peter Sawyer. The exposé, one of the most effective on the subject produced anywhere, was particularly useful coming from "down under," since the Fabian Socialist governments of Australia and New Zealand have been leading the charge in international forums for supranational police-state measures to be enacted to "save the environment."

In his *Inside News* newspaper, over the past couple of years, Sawyer has produced several similar exposés which have rocked Australia and have forced themselves onto the floor of the Federal Parliament. Most pointed have been his revelations on Soviet penetration of Australian politics, and on the buildup of police-state measures in the country.

For instance, Sawyer first blew the whistle on the true role of the Deakin Center in the nation's capital of Canberra. The Deakin Center was alleged by the government to be a telephone exchange, but it turned out to be a massive computer center with centralized data on all Australian citizens and satellite links to the U.S. National Security Agency. In another article, *Inside News* exposed the now-defunct National Safety Council as a CIA-funded private political police force. The NSC's exotic range of weaponry, as well as facts which came out in March 1989—when NSC head John Friedrichs disappeared, leaving a \$35 million-plus hole in the NSC's accounts—confirmed Sawyer's charges.

Inside News has caused a great deal of grief to Australia's establishment, and to its Fabian foot-soldiers in government. Now, according to reports reaching *EIR* from several sources, that establishment has decided to get rid of Sawyer, with help, in particular, from the CIA and from British MI-5 and MI-6, agencies which have always been extremely active in Australia.

The plot is fairly simple.

Several months ago, these sources report, bank accounts were opened up in the names of Sawyer and nine others loosely associated with him in what Australians refer to as the "Freedom Movement," a loose-knit grouping of individuals and organizations bitterly opposed to the economic and political destruction being wreaked on the country by its