

Jacques Cheminade Presents His 'Gaullist' Policy for Europe-China Cooperation

In the Discussion Session of the October 21, 2020 Schiller Institute and Cátedra China Conference, "China and the West Face to Face: Rivalry or Cooperation," Jacques Cheminade answered a question on the proper basis for Europe-China cooperation, posed to him by Spain's three-time Ambassador to China, Eugenio Bergolat, who is also a leading member of Cátedra China.

Moderator: This is a question addressed to Jacques Cheminade by three-time former Ambassador of Spain to China, Eugenio Bergolat:

Last year, at the Menéndez Pelayo International

University in Santander, Enrico Letta, the former Prime Minister of Italy, said that if the European countries didn't achieve or move towards unity, within 10-15 years they wouldn't be able to do anything other than to decide if they wanted to be subjects of the United States or of China. So, the question is, what do you think about this statement, first? And second, do you believe that the European Union will be able in 10-15 years, to move towards political union?

Jacques Cheminade: I am, in foreign policy, a Gaullist, and as Charles de Gaulle did, I care a lot

about Europe, the true Europe. I don't think much of the European Union as an institution, nor about the euro. The euro has not been an independent currency, it is not based on a real sovereignty of the people—there is none. The euro has been put forward before the necessary economic projects to create a unity of Europe.

So, at this point, even Jacques Delors, who was probably the most pro-Europe person in France, says “I don't understand what my euro has become.” It's true. Now, there is a pure monetarist policy from the European Central Bank, which is now a powerful institution in Europe, and it exists in the framework of the control of nation states by central banks worldwide. In that sense, we must get rid of the grip of the central banks over the economies. These central banks are in the tradition of the City of London and Wall Street.

The big challenge is not an agreement between European countries as they now are, but rather one based on what European countries should understand as a true *raison d'être*, as a true policy for today's world. In that sense, I think an opportunity was missed in Europe when there was a Fouchet Plan in 1962, where he proposed a Europe around physical projects. With these physical projects, whether certain people agreed or not—this was called a reinforced cooperation—we would have created a business of real economic and physical development for Europe.

Instead, we put money first, and this money has been the servant of—let's say the word, we should not mince words—of the international banking oligarchy with the central banks. This has been, in Europe, the big mistake. This has to be solved. A single country cannot do it. It can be solved with the physical economic projects that would bring countries together in a common purpose, doing things among themselves—participation in the Silk Road, and the development of Africa—which would create projects having positive development content.

The Baggage of Bureaucracy vs. A Community of Projects

Europe is now the combination of the bureaucracy of Brussels and the European Central Bank (which is a

monetarist institution). Christine Lagarde and Mario Draghi are the same in that sense, as was Jean-Claude Trichet before. And NATO? NATO is *de facto* part of the European Union, because all countries that participate in NATO—this is one of the elements in the European Union—should be recognized as being part of NATO; some others may be outside, but the majority are in NATO.

So it's a system of the Brussels bureaucracy, the euro, and NATO, which combined makes it absolutely impossible for the European Union to agree on a level of national sovereignty. We should try to agree on projects based on national sovereignty. The Memorandum of Understanding negotiated between Mr. Geraci [of Italy] and China was a key moment in that approach. It proves that something different from the general mainstream in European policies, since I would say 1986 and the *Acte Unique Européen* [Single European Act of 1986] is possible. Europe at that point, back in 1986, miscarried. There is today a tendency in today's Europe to commit *hara-kiri*, suicide, because Europe is not based on a community of projects.

So, let's see what comes with a community of projects. I am not a formalist; I am not involved in the straight legal organization. With the European Union as it now functions, with the euro and with the NATO part in Europe—at the point where NATO has completely betrayed the agreements made by the European countries and the United States with Russia, and has brought nuclear arms and troops beyond the borders of the unified Germany—at this point it cannot work in this way. It should work in other ways; it is the issue of sovereignty in all aspects.

At this point, we can't talk about the sovereignty of France. All the data from the Defense Ministry is given to Microsoft; all the embassies are controlled by Palantir, which is known as a CIA firm, even in the United States; and there is control even in education, where part of the education system was negotiated with Microsoft's assistance. So, at this point, things should be organized in a way that the governments decide to not submit all the time, but create something in which the Chinese Belt and Road would help to get out of the dilemma.