

EIR Feature

For a Europe of the free fatherlands

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

EIR's bureau in Wiesbaden, West Germany, has released an explosive new Special Report on the oligarchical plan for restructuring Europe, titled "Europe 1992: Blueprint for Dictatorship." What follows is the introduction to the report.

What is the hidden reality behind the debate on the "European Domestic Market 1992" or even the "United States of Europe"? This report provides the answer to that question. Behind the plans for European integration, there lies a monstrous attempt to impose fascist dictatorship upon the entirety of Europe, East as well as West, with Moscow in the dominant role. The proponents of "Europe 1992" assume that the biggest financial crash in the history of the markets is imminent, and they are determined to emerge from this collapse as the victors.

In this vision of "Europe 1992," all forms of political power would end up in the hands of some five large banks, five cartels, and five reinsurance companies, which are supposed to swallow the still relatively independent forces of today. These leading financial circles are counting on the short memory of the population, since what they are trying to sell as a new vision for Europe, is nothing but a warmed-over version of the same discussion that went on in the 1940s and 1950s. It was French President Charles de Gaulle, of course, who frustrated the realization of these plans, because he was not for a moment willing to sacrifice the national sovereignty of France, and thus individual freedom, or to surrender decisions affecting the fate of his people to a supranational dictatorship.

In summer 1988, the Italian daily *Avvenire* described the true background to the creation of a European domestic market, together with the efforts of super-financiers like Carlo De Benedetti, who are currently buying up immense capital resources in many countries. In reality, they are engaged in an effort to transform all of Europe into a protectorate for Moscow. For, who but Moscow would ultimately benefit from such a "liberalized" Western European economy: a Europe in which national governments and elected parliaments no longer defend the interests of nations, but, instead, a small caste of supranational bureaucrats and a handful of financial magnates would be allowed to satisfy their greed for profit, unchecked?



Dean Andromidas

Helga Zepp-LaRouche and Lyndon H. LaRouche visit the Charlottenburg Palace in Berlin, Oct. 11, 1988. During their stay in the historic capital of Germany, Mr. LaRouche issued a proposal for the reunification of Germany, in the context of a Europe "from the Atlantic to the Urals"—not the other way around, as the Russians would have it.

The butter, financed with billions of tax monies, that the European Community bureaucracy sold to the Soviet Union at 11 pfennigs per pound, ought to serve as a stern warning in this regard, along with the tons of highly subsidized beef. The hungry populations of the East bloc have never received this butter—instead, Western taxpayers, without knowing it and without being asked, financed the consumption needs of the Soviet *nomenklatura* class, which shops in stores that are off-limits to the normal population.

The "European Domestic Market 1992" would mean nothing but extending to Western Europe the conditions under which the satellite states of Eastern Europe are forced to live. It may be difficult for the normal, thinking citizen to imagine, but this is the reality: Those financial circles propagating European integration do not feel the slightest twinge of an ideological problem in surrendering to Moscow's domination, on condition that they be the satraps in this Russian Empire, who enjoy unrestricted privileges.

Russia, the policeman of Europe

In an interview published by *Corriere della Sera* in July 1988, which caused considerable uproar, the infamous fascist and former collaborator of Benito Mussolini, Dino Gran-

di, admitted to certain historical truths which official accounts usually ignore. Mussolini, Dino Grandi explained, was only a figurehead for the masses. It was Grandi himself and Count Volpi di Misurata who had played far more important roles. Grandi specified that he owed thanks to the Venetian Contarini family, who made it possible for him to emerge from obscurity to a position of enormous power. Today, Grandi went on unabashedly, the point in history had been reached where a unification of Europe by Russia would be both possible and desirable. Charles V, Louis XIV, the German Kaiser Wilhelm, and Adolf Hitler had attempted to fulfill this task in vain, but Russia today was the first to have the geographical prerequisites and the political power to carry out such a unification.

The fascist Dino Grandi wants Russia to dominate all of Europe? If one considers the parallels between German fascist Friedrich Nietzsche and Russian fascist Fyodor Dostoevsky, and the common historical roots of bolshevism and fascism, this is certainly not surprising. What is more surprising is the arrogance with which a representative of this Venetian tradition speaks out, precisely at a point in time when international financial circles are committed to managing the world economic and financial crisis with the same

methods as in the 1930s—corporatism and fascism.

That a unified Europe would by no means be made up of a neutral Western Europe and a separate, peaceful East bloc, was grasped by no one better than it was by de Gaulle. In his famous press conference on May 15, 1962, he put a stop to the Europe policy-debate of the time, and launched in its place the design for a Europe of nations, which became known as the "Fouchet Plan." In his press conference, de Gaulle pointed out the practical impossibility for supranational institutions to be able to function, for these institutions would inevitably run counter to the interests of nation-states, unless these institutions were based upon a power outside themselves. "Perhaps there would then be a federator, but not one who would be European. And then it would not be an integrated Europe, but something quite different, much larger, and more encompassing, and—I repeat—with a federator. Perhaps it is this, which sometimes inspires certain speeches of this or that proponent of European integration. If that is so, it would be better to say so openly."

The danger de Gaulle warned of has not receded; it has grown greater. European integration today would indeed only be possible under a federator, and this federator would be no other power than Moscow. Dino Grandi's interview deserves to be mentioned because, in contrast to all the other proponents of an integrated Europe, he openly identifies Russia's role; it is in fact better to state openly what the reality is, rather than fall into the trap of those proponents of "European 1992" who are indeed inspired by the same idea of Moscow's dominion, but are less honest when challenged to admit it.

Whether or not Chancellor Helmut Kohl is really fully aware of what he is propagating when, approaching the end of his half-year chairmanship of the European Council, he suddenly sees himself as the father of the "United States of Europe," he has obviously been successfully convinced that, by playing the role of the visionary of an integrated Europe, he can take all the burdensome problems in his coalition government and within his own party and sweep them under the rug. Kohl seems quite happy, undoubtedly, at having been able to pull such a good idea out of his hat just before going on vacation at the Wolfgangsee.

The danger of Western decoupling

It is not utterly incomprehensible that the European idea should be receiving such an impulse, since, following the summits between President Ronald Reagan and Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachov in Washington and Moscow, and following the signing of the INF treaty, Western Europe suddenly found itself in a political vacuum. Both superpowers had decided to divide the world up in a new Yalta agreement, and then to govern the world as a condominium. In the course of this condominium government, Western Europe is to fall within Moscow's sphere of influence. It is, therefore, a question of Europe's survival, of

preserving its independence and freedom. The solution, however, lies in the exact opposite of what the proponents of an integrated Europe are trying to carry out; it lies in an entente of sovereign national republics. The "United States of Europe," on the contrary, would mean the complete destruction of national sovereignty and the establishment of a supranational dictatorship, which no electorate could hold accountable, and no voters could influence.

All leading financial circles and politicians know that "Black Monday," Oct. 19, 1987, was only a mild foretaste of what is about to happen: the biggest financial crash in market history. If efforts to support the dollar through the period of the American presidential elections in November do ultimately prove successful—and the U.S. administration is currently applying immense pressure in this regard, particularly upon Japan—then a collapse of the international financial markets in the period immediately after the elections should be expected, a collapse in which approximately \$20 trillion in paper values will be wiped out.

Regardless of whether the next American President is called Bush or Dukakis, the decoupling of the United States from Western Europe and the withdrawal of the first American troops is high on the agenda in either case. The only difference is the greater speed at which Dukakis would drive the decoupling process ahead. It is in this expected chaos that the proponents of the European Domestic Market intend to emerge as the big winners—some five large banks, five food cartels, and five reinsurance companies plan to survive, having gobbled up all small and medium-sized businesses and industries.

In other words, the plans being circulated now as propaganda for "Europe 1992" are not slated for implementation only in 1992; rather, they are the emergency program of the oligarchical Yalta forces for the imminent collapse. The intent is to subjugate Western Europe beneath brutal austerity and partition it into a few rich regions and many poor ones. The richer regions, where the beneficiaries of this plan intend to proliferate, include Baden-Württemberg and Bavaria, Switzerland, the region around Lyons, northern Italy, Barcelona, and the City of London. Practically all the rest of Western Europe, including such regions as the Mezzogiorno and northern Germany, or entire nations such as Denmark, are to be written off, and collapse to the economic level of a Third World country.

The White Paper of the European Community on "Completing the Internal Market" blatantly says that, of course, within this intended desired constellation, investments in "profitable regions" might make sense. And Lothar Späth [prime minister of the German state of Baden-Württemberg], who hopes to be one of those to swim to the very top in an integrated Europe, has already launched the appeal that the economically stronger regions of southern Germany, northern Italy and southern and eastern France should cooperate

more intensively.

Who will pay for all of this? Now, in the "Europe 1992" of the banks and cartels, there is no room at all for any independent economic forces. The family farm, medium-sized businesses, and even craftsmen are each and all supposed to be swallowed up.

Farmers, at best, could become employees in agro-industrial complexes, and work farms which they had previously owned, for low wages. Other vocational groups would become dependent employees within the framework of the neo-corporatist management of business, a small power elite of politicians, management, and trade-union bosses. In the end result, conditions would be approximately what they are in the state-monopoly businesses of the East bloc. There, the party bosses are the privileged managers, whereas here, it would be the neo-corporatist financial elite, but, for the population, the loss of freedom would be no different. "Change through growing closer," is what Egon Bahr [the Social Democratic architect of West Germany's *Ostpolitik*] talked about 20 years ago; but a Europe integrated in that way means nothing other than that East bloc conditions take hold throughout Europe.

The 'Ideas of 1789'

The Europe on which this unification is supposed to be modeled is the Europe of 1815, when the reactionaries of the Holy Alliance destroyed all the republican achievements and assigned Russia the role of policeman in Europe. Today Henry Kissinger represents this political current, treading on the heels of his idols, Austria's Count Metternich and British Foreign Secretary Castlereagh. What is to be set up today in an altered, but essentially identical form, is the feudal corporatist state of the Karlsbad Decrees of 1819: All the achievements of the American Revolution, the idea of 1789, of the Prussian reformers and the Liberation Wars of 1813, are to be destroyed once and for all.

In our superficial age, oriented to material values, it has been nearly forgotten, but, for the history of humanity, the era between 1776 and 1813 produced the most decisive steps in political progress down to this day. With the American Declaration of Independence of 1776, the inalienable rights of all people and their republican equality before the law, founded in natural law, were guaranteed for the first time in constitutional form. The nobility, and with it the division of society into people of different value, enjoying different privileges, was abolished constitutionally for the first time, and individual freedom secured in the best possible way through the republican right to vote. This principle of representative, republican government found expression, among other ways, in the possibility that any citizen might attain to the highest office of the President.

The beginning of the French Revolution, or what we are accustomed to refer to as the "Ideas of 1789," promised the

hope that in Europe, too, it would be possible to achieve the freedom of the individual and his equality before law through a republican revolution. The Prussian reformers were inspired by the same ideas, and the liberation of the peasants by Baron vom Stein was one of the most important steps toward a modern constitutional state.

The Liberation Wars of 1813 were by no means directed only against Napoleon's imperialist repression; rather, the majority of the population were enthusiastic participants in a conscious constitutional movement, and the boldest minds forged plans for how the state should be shaped following victory. The Liberation Wars in Germany may indeed be considered as a successful republican revolution. It was solely due to the precarious geographical position of Germany, that the intrigues of the reactionary oligarchs of Europe cheated Germany out of the fruits of its victory and the opportunity to create a sovereign nation-state.

That the creation of a German nation-state would be the result of the Congress of Vienna, was a conviction shared by both Wilhelm von Humboldt and Baron vom Stein, who participated as representatives of Germany. Even though the establishment of a German nation-state was frustrated by the scheming of Metternich, Castlereagh, Talleyrand, and Capodistria, the Liberation Wars still represent probably the most glorious period of German history. At no other point in time was the humanist ideal of mankind embodied in the German classics more widely spread in the population than in these years.

The idea that every person, regardless of birth, is endowed by the divine order of creation with inviolable human rights, and that every person who develops all the potentials with which he is endowed can become a beautiful soul: It was this conception of man which the oligarchical elite saw as the

To find out more

The full *EIR* Special Report, " 'Europe 1992': Blueprint for Dictatorship," is available for 400 DM from Executive Intelligence Review Nachrichtenagentur GmbH; Dotzheimer Str. 166; D-6200 Wiesbaden, Federal Republic of Germany. Telephone (06121) 884-0.

The report, which is in English, is 261 pages, with charts of the Europe 1992 oligarchical control structure, and an index. Chapter headings are: 1) Europe in a Trilateral World, 2) Cultural Parameters for a Europe of the Regions, 3) The Social-Economic Policy of the Cartels, and 4) Know Your Enemy: Who's Who in "Europe 1992."

The corporatist plan for Europe's labor force

The bureaucrats who drafted the plans for an integrated European 1992 Domestic Market claim that their program will create some 2-5 million new jobs within five years. This was the boast of Paolo Cecchini, in a European Commission report issued in June of this year.

But there's a catch: The Cecchini report concedes that the "first phase" of the European integration process "may" witness the drastic reduction of employment in such sectors of the economy as: agriculture and food-processing, transportation, pharmaceuticals, telecommunications, auto, and public services. That is not to mention steel, which has already been massacred by the EC's "rationalization."

The idea, as the map on the cover of this magazine shows, is that most of Europe's industrial centers will be turned into "rust belts," leaving a few pockets of manufacturing, supplied by a cheap and mobile labor force, traveling about the continent in search of a livelihood.

Naturally, this means destroying what little remains of the power of the labor unions to defend the living standards of their workers. Already, employers' associations are putting out the line that strike laws and other labor and social regulations will have to be scrapped, and that workers will have to be prepared for "rough times."

The integration schemes of Europe's financial cartels were mapped out at a meeting in Stuttgart, West Germany on Feb. 5, 1988, organized by Deutsche Bank and Baden-Württemberg Prime Minister Lothar Späth, the leading spokesman for corporatism inside the German Christian Democratic Union party. Among the firms represented at the meeting were Daimler-Benz, IRI, British Steel, Total, Nestlé, Bosch, and Crédit Suisse.

The meeting developed a catalogue of sweeping de-

mands: "Administrative impediments" costing the European economy about DM 40 billion a year have to be removed; there must be more deregulation, more privatization of industry, and fewer subsidies for "old" industries. Deutsche Bank's Alfred Herrhausen insisted that the cartels need absolute freedom in their decisions, including "a regionalization of wage levels." In other words, industry will invest in your area—just make sure the wages are low enough!

Not long after the Stuttgart conference, the president of the Federal Association of German Industry (BDI), Tyll Necker, made this austerity policy even more explicit: "In the future, labor law and social law, laws governing labor-management relations and co-participation, job protection, work time, and unemployment compensation, will become factors of competition. This has not been recognized adequately in the Federal Republic."

The model for the proposed restructuring of the European labor force is "the Swedish way," itself nothing but a modernized version of Mussolini's corporatism. In August of this year, a delegation of the West German Social Democratic Party traveled to Sweden for a first-hand look at the economy which has a remarkably low 1.3% official jobless rate. The German Socialists attributed this to the unusual degree of cooperation among the Social Democratic government, large industry, and labor. They praised the fact that Sweden has eliminated subsidies to "old industries" (meaning the world's most modern shipbuilding and steel industries).

What they failed to point out is how Sweden's corporatism has allowed savage reductions in wages and living standards—all "democratically" imposed. Low unemployment has been achieved by creating a monstrous state bureaucracy and the world's highest per capita taxation level. "Early retirement" programs take people off the employment rolls often by age 55, and sometimes even at age 20! Even more devastating, is the fact that a recent study comparing European wage levels found that after-tax wages in Sweden were the *third lowest* in Europe, after Portugal and Greece.

greatest threat to its power. Free and proud citizens in a feudal state? Impossible.

The un-Holy Alliance

The so-called Holy Alliance hastened to reintroduce the feudal corporatist state, and in so doing, was most un-holy, in that it proceeded to deny the majority of the population the exercise of its God-given human rights. In this battle of Holy Alliance forces lies the beginning of universal fascism, which

proliferated at that time throughout Europe, as well as in North America, as a countermovement to the ideal of a free citizenry. It was from this current of thought that Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, and Dostoevsky were later to emerge. From Nietzsche's *Herrenmenschen* to the master-race and *Untermenschen* of the Nazis, was but a small step. The Pan-Europe ideas of Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi and his eugenics movement represent another element in the continuity of this fascist conception of man and state.

In the 1940s and 1950s, there were essentially four men who launched and shaped the discussion of a federalist European state: Jean Monnet, Denis de Rougemont, Paul-Henri Spaak, and Coudenhove-Kalergi himself. All the current ideas for establishing a supranational European government, for example, by elevating the status of the EC Commission, had already been fully developed in the 1940s and 1950s.

The first document after World War II in which these plans were laid out was the "Hertensteiner Program" passed on Sept. 21, 1946, which proposed a world union governed by the United Nations. There it says, in part:

1) A European Community established on a federative basis is a necessary and essential constituent part of any real world union. . . .

3) The European Union will be integrated in the organization of the United Nations and forms a regional organization in the sense of Article 52 of the Charter.

4) The members of the European Union will transfer a part of their economic, political, and military sovereign rights to the federation they have formed.

A federated Europe would have been only a sub-region of a United Nations world government, governed by such supranational institutions as the IMF, the World Bank, GATT, and the like. It was self-evident to the planners of this world government, that the commissars would be nominated in principle by private financial interests and deployed into the various branches of government. That would render the function of national governments and elected parliaments irrelevant.

Charles de Gaulle defeated these plans for Europe, because he was a passionate patriot who correctly saw in national sovereignty the sole guarantee for individual freedom. Only when representatives elected by the people represent the interests of the people to government, and, in turn, defend and represent the interests of the state to the electorate; only when, in this reciprocal relationship under law, the representatives are accountable to the people, only then is there a protective wall erected against the despotism of individuals or private groups who assert themselves in a Darwinian, law of the jungle, manner.

In a federated Europe, this check of a republican democracy would drop away. Super-financiers like De Benedetti, the late Jean-Baptiste Doumeng of France, or Alfred Herrhausen, who control many thousands of enterprises, would be unbridled in their greed for profit and power. If they fulfilled their tasks as Russian satraps according to plan, they would have no need to fear the Red Army; rather, they would count on it to maintain law and order, just as the governments of the satellite states in the East bloc do today.

In addition to the leading financial circles, and in part overlapping them, it is primarily the majority of the Eu-

ropean nobility which is fueling the drive to decouple from America and turn to the East. These are the forces which lurk behind the one-worldist institutions, like the Trilateral Commission, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, the Inter-Action Council, and the plethora of regional, separatist groups which are plotting "Europe 1992." Not only do these aristocratic circles hope to occupy leading positions, segregated from the "masses," in a United States of Europe based on the 1815 feudal model; but also they have no problems with the idea of the "Common House of Europe," for they understand "house" to refer to the castles in the East, whose high nobility have been their blood relations for many centuries in any case.

If one imagines a Europe in which the feudal upper class governs, then the idea of a "Common European House" causes no problems. But there certainly is a problem if one has a clear idea of the values of Western, Christian humanist culture. From this standpoint, the idea of a "Common European House" is absurd. Western Europe and some Eastern European nations, such as Poland, belong to European culture, by virtue of their common basis in the principles of Christianity, the Italian Golden Renaissance, and the German classics. Russia, on the other hand, along with certain other Eastern peoples, was dominated for generations by the murderous Tatars, and have never brought forth a Renaissance with its humanist conception of man. How can one live in a house when part of the tenants have not even progressed into our age, but instead still live in the Middle Ages?

The true European culture

But what could a positive conception of Europe look like, in respect to the real situation of the world today? First of all, a Europe which could replace a union of sovereign nation states does not exist. Europe in this sense is the same "fantasy" that de Gaulle said it was, when he stated, "It is a fantasy to believe one might create something more effective and "recommend it to the people, which would be outside of, or above, the state" (Sept. 5, 1960).

The relationship of the individual person to humanity as a species is not mediated by broad cultural areas, such as Europe, or Southeast Asia, but by nations. It is the shared sense of history, and especially the common language of a people, which allows the sense of nation to emerge, and, more than anything else, it is the highest forms of poetical expression which determine the most direct access to the identity of a person.

In this sense, there is in fact a European culture, determined by the values of Christianity and humanism over the last 2,500 years, and we certainly look upon Dante Alighieri, Goya, Shakespeare, Rabelais, Verdi, Beethoven, and Schiller as representatives of European culture. But it is also incontestable that, although the greatest of universal geniuses be-

longs to anyone who makes his work their own, a patriotically minded Italian nevertheless feels a certain pride in knowing that the great prince of poets, Dante, was an Italian, just as a German will feel an especially tender love for the poet of freedom, Schiller. And that is good, because it is precisely this multiplicity in unity which constitutes the special wealth of human society.

A further element which brings cohesion to European culture is the special importance attributed to the role of the individual. There is no other culture or civilization in the world in which the inviolable rights of human dignity occupy the central role, which the development of Christianity, the breakthrough of humanism on the part of Cardinal Nicolaus of Cusa, and the Italian Golden Renaissance have assigned them in European culture. In this beautiful human ideal, in which the individual is free under natural law, and called upon to develop all the creative potential with which he is endowed, there lies perhaps the most important contribution of European culture to human history.

But since precisely this freedom of the individual can be defended only by a republican, representative system, Europe can only be defined as an entente of sovereign nation-states. Europe can only be a Europe of the Fatherlands.

For that reason, the 1979 decision for direct election of deputies to the European Parliament should be reversed. At best, such a parliament by direct election is an irrelevant debating club—as it largely has been up to now—or, at worst, this institution has powers for which it has no legitimate mandate, since its members, who make supranational decisions, are not responsible to the nations concerned.

It would be far more meaningful instead to assign normally elected deputies of national parliaments to cooperate at the European level on certain topics. In that way, those parliamentarians who work in the special committees of their national parliaments, and whose policy can be examined and judged by their own electorate, can meet at regular intervals to discuss and elaborate a common orientation. Political agreement will never be found at the level of the lowest common denominator in any case, as the entire history of the United Nations or the European Common Market proves, but will be achieved only on a programmatic basis which defines a higher level for all concerned.

In principle there are two possibilities: Either Europe becomes another of the regions of the world whose role is restricted to being bled dry by social Darwinist and neo-malthusian financial cartels, in approximately the same way as this is happening today with the so-called Third World. Then is our freedom lost, and probably irreparable damage also done to human civilization. Or, the citizens of the different nations mobilize in time to defend their national sovereignty and their right to pursue their activities as independent economic producers, whether as a medium-sized businessman, farmer, retail salesman, or craftsman.

Europe is culturally one of the richest continents on this Earth. There is no arrogance in saying so; on the contrary, out of this wealth derives an immense responsibility to find solutions to the problems of this world. Who would not be overwhelmed by the incredible cultural wealth offered in so many diverse forms in the various countries, in all the cathedrals, sculptures, paintings, buildings, beautiful cities and villages, and in the manifold works of the many great scientists, composers, city-builders, poets, and philosophers?

If one reflects on how many individual creative efforts, how much work through the course of many generations, and what personal sacrifices, often of one's own life, were necessary to create this cultural wealth of the last 2,500 years, as Schiller said in his essay on "Universal History," who will not feel the ardent desire to take up this great honor in himself, and to multiply it through his own contribution, passing it on to future generations? If one gazes on the manifold beauty of Europe, one can not accept the perspective that Europe, once again in this century, and this time perhaps forever, may be subjected to the yoke of dictatorship.

The Europe of the Fatherlands has a clearly defined historical mission. Counterposing his own positive concept for a strong Europe in the "Fouchet Plan," to that of the European federalists, de Gaulle saw the mission of Europe as being nothing less than contributing to "the development of other peoples" and "the emergence of a better world."

There are two historic tasks which we must fulfill before the turn of the century if we want to overcome the current, apocalyptic crisis and take steps along the path leading to the age of Reason. The first is the long overdue development of the Southern Hemisphere. It would be our own declaration of moral bankruptcy if we were to stand by and look on, as entire continents in the developing sector die, when it would be so easy for Europe to help alleviate the need there, building up infrastructure, agriculture, and industry. What is necessary is not the ridiculous destruction of agricultural and industrial capacities by the Brussels EC bureaucracy, but rather the further expansion of these capacities for an unprecedented export offensive into the developing countries.

Western Europe must immediately realize a Marshall Plan for Africa, Asia, and Latin America, and not the "Marshall Plan for the East" shamelessly put forward by Carlo De Benedetti. If Western Europe takes the initiative to realize a new, just world economic order, we will not only be creating expanding markets for our export-dependent economies for the future, but we will also be reacting to the moral imperative in the only human way possible, that we cannot tolerate seeing the greater part of humanity in such an impoverished and undignified condition.

If we so use the human and industrial resources of European nations, to make our contribution to the grander plan of developing a better world, then that establishes the level of Reason uniquely capable of bringing about agreement among

Europe 1992: No farmers, no food

In the many official reports and studies about the integrated domestic market of "Europe 1992," the word "agriculture" appears rarely. Probably the bureaucrats deem it wiser not to say too much about the condition of European agriculture, which has already been largely destroyed, as a pilot project for what the European Commission has in mind for other economic sectors.

But the "restructuring" of Europe's agriculture has only just begun. The ultimate goal is that at least 85% of the farms in the European Community will have been forced into bankruptcy or otherwise shut down. Out of today's 750,000 farmers in West Germany, at most only 80,000 are to continue to farm. Instead, large landowners will again emerge, employing tenant farmers and low-paid farm hands, a situation leading directly to a new feudalism.

Part of the plan of the Brussels bureaucrats is to raise taxes across the board. Every farmer and producer will be so burdened with regulations, that he will be drowned under the paperwork alone.

Take the situation for grain production. The heads of state decided at their last European summit to limit the grain harvest of the European Community to 160 million tons. If this amount is exceeded, then the EC will collect a producer tax of 3%—above the 3% which is already collected. But both taxes are due *in advance*. Only if it turns out that the grain yield remains below the upper limit, can the already-taxed farmers apply for a refund on

the taxes they have already paid.

One study commissioned by the EC, "Goal 1992," levels harsh criticism at the current decision-making process, which is deemed too democratic. National agricultural secretaries are accused of introducing too many national viewpoints and interests, all of which, according to the Brussels technocrats, should be eliminated within an integrated domestic market. The study proposes mechanisms for agriculture that would adjust producer prices to "current budget conditions." Then, it specifies, "New decisions by the agriculture secretaries council for implementing this policy will no longer be necessary."

Soviet looting of Europe

With food shortages looming in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, the European Community is paying tribute to the East already. This is expected to increase dramatically under the rubric of Europe 1992, as Europe is unified "from the Urals to the Atlantic." Now, as always, the Soviets get what they want from the EC, for token prices: butter for DM 1.80/kg—one-sixth the price that the West German consumer pays; beef for DM 1.50/kg—one-fifteenth of what it costs inside the Community. According to a report in the German newspaper *Bildzeitung*, in 1987, the EC paid DM 6.6 billion in tribute to the East, in the form of subsidized food. And Moscow wants more.

Already, the Bavarian Farmers Association has signed a cooperation treaty with the State Committee for the Agro-Industrial Complex of the Russian Soviet Republic, involving export of new plant varieties, planning and expansion of warehouses and agro-technology centers, and the export of meat and dairy products. West German Agriculture Minister Ignaz Kiechle is seeking similar agreements on the federal level.

the diverse sovereign states.

The second grand goal, toward which we must at least make immense progress even in this century, is the industrialization of space. If we seriously set about work on completing a colony on Mars in approximately the year 2020 as a first step, in the course of this project, we will have solved all the scientific and technological problems necessary for survival on Earth, such as the exploitation of nuclear fusion or biophysics.

No less important is the moral impulse of such a vision directed into the future, and toward overcoming existing limits. Only when people cease to war among themselves on Earth over petty things, and bring their own activity into accord with the lawfulness of the universe in a more fundamental way, will we come closer to that which is human in

us. The great German rocket builder and space scientist, Krafft Ehrlicke, was right when he saw in the "extraterrestrial imperative" the way for humanity to reach the Age of Reason. In today's world, it is of paramount importance for West Germany, Italy, and France together to draw on their great traditions in space science, and define the industrialization of space as one of the goals for peace in Europe.

The answer to the plans for an integrated Europe can only lie in making the role of a Europe of sovereign nations in the world conscious to all people. The great humanist Renaissance of the fifteenth century, which liberated Europe from the Dark Ages of the fourteenth century, and shaped European culture for 500 years, is the proof that even most severe crises can be overcome. Such a humanist and cultural Renaissance is necessary and possible today.