

Setback for the Trilateral Commission's 1986 agenda?

by Mark Burdman

David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission is beginning the New Year of 1986 on a strange and discordant note. According to Commission members who have made certain information available to *EIR*, the next planned Trilateral international summit, to be held in Madrid, Spain, has been postponed for 10 weeks, on request from the Spanish government, from its originally scheduled date of March 1-3, to the middle of May.

A confidential Trilateral Commission memorandum, produced on the basis of discussions held during the Commission's Oct. 25-27 European Region conference in Paris, claims that a postponement had become necessary because "recent press articles have started to link our presence with the referendum on NATO" planned for Spain in spring 1986. The same memorandum cited intensive discussions between the Trilateralists in Europe and in Washington, over whether or not, under conditions of such political pressure, the meeting should be shifted to another locale. No, a shift should not be made, the consensus emerged, because to change the location would undermine the Commission's efforts toward "the unification of Europe," now that Spain has become a member of the European Economic Community.

What is really going on behind this curious drama?

It would be preposterous to look for some "spontaneous" anti-Trilateral eruption in Spain. As we show in an accompanying article, real political and financial power in Spain, on the visible level, is held by precisely those influentials in the media, in the banks, in the political parties, and among the cultural elites, who are also members of the Trilateral Commission. Furthermore, the "unification of Europe" theme is the pet project of a cluster of old Hapsburg Empire and

similar imperialists, or "synarchists," inside Spain and out, who would not postpone their plans out of fear of negative reaction in the tightly controlled Spanish situation itself.

The whole story is not yet out, but this much can be said: The only systematic campaign against the Trilateral Commission inside Spain, as opposed to isolated grumblings from this or that quarter, has come through the wide circulation there of material published by this journal, including a Special Report on the Trilateral Commission written by *EIR* founder and contributing editor Lyndon LaRouche. In Europe more broadly, throughout 1985, *EIR*'s material has catalyzed, or intersected, an anti-Trilateral mood among political elites, producing, especially in France, an unprecedented density of articles against the Commission.

Evidently, the "LaRouche Factor," is among the considerations that has entered into Trilateral Commission planning for 1986.

The Trilateral action program

Another remarkable event concerning the Trilateral Commission during 1985, was that the Soviet leadership, through the foreign ministry publication *International Affairs*, for the first time warmly recognized the Commission as its favored Western interlocutor, on matters pertaining to strategic policy. In its summer, 1985 edition, *International Affairs* hailed the Trilaterals' opposition to President Reagan on the question of the Strategic Defense Initiative.

The Trilateral Commission "program for action" for 1986, as that program has been made available to *EIR*, indicates that the Commission is working hard to demonstrate that it merits Soviet praise.

Five identifiable policy thrusts have been given priority by David Rockefeller, et al., for this year:

Slashing U.S. defense spending: According to the December 1985 French magazine *Spectacles du Monde*, reporting on the meeting of the Trilateral's European Region, "the priority objective decided on by the meeting in Paris, in October, was to put pressure on American official circles, so that they would become aware of the 'dramatic' character of the budget deficit maintained by the United States. And that they would act on Congress, to slow down the rise of military credits demanded by President Reagan." French sources have also reported that Trilateral European Region President Georges Berthoin has expended considerable energy, during the last quarter of 1985, in pressuring high-level officials in the Reagan administration and in the Congress, to cut defense spending.

A confidential Trilateral Commission document reports that West German Trilateralist Otto Wolff von Amerongen, the head of the German Industry and Trade Association (DIHT), has been circulating a proposal for a special Trilateral task-force that would present its preliminary findings in Madrid, on "the financing of defense." For years a member of the International Advisory Board of David Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank, von Amerongen is described in the cited *Spectacles du Monde* exposé as "scion of a family of industrialists specialized in commerce with the East since 1918."

To the same effect, it is noteworthy that one of the featured speakers, as of this writing, at the mid-May Madrid meeting, will be former U.S. Office of Management and the Budget chief David Stockman, a former student radical, who persistently fought against necessary U.S. defense spending during his tenure as OMB head.

Whether or not Trilateral input was determining, the Gramm-Rudman budget bill in the Congress should be regarded as a New Year's present to the Soviets' most-praised Western interlocutors.

Undermining the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative Program: At a meeting in Munich, West Germany, during the second week of December, Commission executive member Horst Ehmke, a leader of the West German Social Democratic Party with links by marriage to the East bloc intelligence services, praised the Gramm-Rudman bill. In Ehmke's view, Gramm-Rudman would ensure, minimally, a 40% cut in the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative.

His cohort von Amerongen had made the same link between "budget" and "SDI," during an early-December meeting in Bonn of European political and financial leaders, sponsored by his DIHT. Commenting on discussions in various European capitals on whether or not to participate in the U.S. SDI, von Amerongen warned that participation should be contingent on whether the SDI were proven to be "cost-effective," or not.

To this day, the Commission abides by the advice of Trilateral ideologue Henry Kissinger, that the SDI should be

"whittled away" through congressional budget cuts and through transforming the SDI into a limited "point defense" system. In the latter days of 1985, the most active front in this fight in Europe was in West Germany, because of the desire of the Trilateralists, and the Soviets, to prevent West German participation in the SDI, since this would catalyze European-U.S. SDI cooperation on a broader scale.

Ehmke and von Amerongen are two of the three West German influentials who most often flaunt their Commission membership. The third individual is former Christian Democratic Union parliamentarian Karl-Heinz Narjes, today the Commissioner for Science and Technology at the headquarters of the European Community in Brussels. Narjes is a member of the "Genscherite" faction of the CDU, allied to arch-appeaser West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

On Dec. 18, West German newspapers revealed that Narjes had written a special memorandum to the ministers of research and technology in all European capitals, recommending that they *not* participate in the SDI, so that there would not be a "brain drain" from Europe to the United States. On that date, Narjes' chief of staff, Heinrich von Moltke, went to Bonn to give a confidential interministerial briefing to government officials.

On the next day, the "Genscherites" had scored a significant tactical victory, with the West German government decision to "negotiate with" the United States over SDI—rather than to agree to participate in the program. From Bonn, Trilateral-linked American ambassador Richard Burt lied that the United States did not give a priority to a "formal agreement" between the United States and the Federal Republic over SDI. According to reliable American sources, Burt, during his late-1970s position as a *New York Times* "special correspondent," was the favored journalist and "leaker" for Trilateral ideologue Zbigniew Brzezinski, during Brzezinski's tenure as Jimmy Carter's National Security Adviser. To this day, Burt is extremely close to leading Trilateral Commission circles.

Throughout 1986, the East-West offensive against the SDI, spearheaded on the Western side by the Trilateral Commission, can be expected to escalate. One particular focus, about which *EIR* will be presenting further documentation in coming weeks, will be the Commission's project to define the "post-Reagan era" in the United States, and on making sure that the next U.S. administration will water down the SDI into a "bargaining chip" with the U.S.S.R., and/or a "limited point-defense system." Either of these conceptions, means, in fact, making the SDI itself meaningless.

Heating up the southern Africa crisis: According to *Spectacles du Monde*, Trilateral European Region President Georges Berthoin made a special trip to the United States, in November 1985, to promote a priority Trilateral Commission objective, "to obtain from the U.S. Congress that it would put itself in opposition to the maintenance of diplomatic relations with the 'racist regime' in power in South Africa."

According to a confidential Trilateral Commission document, parts of whose contents were made known to *EIR*, the end-of-October meeting in Paris featured an exchange among European members, on the subject of making southern Africa into a priority issue at the 1986 Madrid meeting.

Speaking in the name of the British Trilateral members, Lord Shackleton of Rio Tinto Zinc strongly urged that a Commission group be formed on "Southern Africa and Antarctica," in the context of renewed international interest in the "Law of the Sea" accords. A modified proposal was raised by Sr. Gianni Agnelli of Italy and Herr Ehmke of West Germany, for the task force to be concerned with "South Africa and the front-line states," while cautioning that this subject could be of potential embarrassment to the Japanese members of the Trilateral Commission, because of the "sensitive racial issues" involved.

It was resolved, that the most likely option would be to have some kind of panel on this issue, but that no speaker

The Trilateral Commission's "program for action" for 1986, as confidential elements of that program have been made available to EIR, indicates that the Commission is working hard to demonstrate that it merits the praise accorded it by the journal of the Soviet foreign ministry.

from any involved southern African country be invited to speak. A "British or Portuguese" representative should address this issue, the Trilateralists recommended.

Strengthening the role of the IMF and other supernational financial institutions: One of the Madrid panels is slated to be a focus on the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) talks, in the context of efforts to counter "protectionism" around the world. Efforts are underway to have GATT head Arthur Dunkel as a speaker in Madrid.

At the Paris meeting, according to the cited confidential Trilateral document, Georges Berthoin called for the Trilaterals to deal with not only the economic, but also the "cultural" effects of "protectionism."

This point is most interesting. For the Trilaterals, as for other world-federalist institutions such as the New York Council on Foreign Relations, "protectionism" actually means "mercantilism," or the "sovereign nation state." As was openly stated in the *1980s Project* of the New York CFR, which formed the basis of policy for the Carter administration and which is still the basis of policy for the U.S. State Department

and many other agencies of the Reagan administration, "mercantilism," or "protectionism," of the sort that Alexander Hamilton devised for the American Republic in the 18th century, is the fundamental enemy to be fought, and smashed.

The GATT talks, the vehicle by which policies of "free trade," "privatization," and other euphemisms for drug-trafficking and destruction of national economies is being carried out, have become one of the key flanks of the Commission for the coming year. This will create conditions of destabilization in the developing sector, from which only the Soviets will benefit.

Consolidating a "New Yalta" political deal with Moscow: The centerpiece of the arrangement to bring the "Eurasian landmass" into Moscow's political sphere of influence, is a deal over the "German question," that would be in the Soviets' interest. Through 1986, the Trilateral Commission will be committed to helping bring a coalition to power in the Federal Republic in 1987, that would, in one likely version, consist of Genscher's Free Democratic Party, the SPD, and perhaps the Greens, and that would ease Germany out of NATO. Behind closed doors, officials at Trilateral Commission offices in both Paris and Washington, are wont to boast about the marvelous relations, developed through the years, between the Trilateralists and the SPD of Ehmke, Willy Brandt, Egon Bahr, et al.

One reporting panel in Madrid will be that on "East-West Relations," featuring Kissinger protégé William Hyland, currently director of studies at the New York CFR and former staffer at the U.S. National Security Council, and Karl Kaiser, head of the West German branch of the CFR (the Gesellschaft für Auswärtiges Politik), now resident at Harvard University.

At the same time, British Trilateralist John Roper, former parliamentarian and member of the British Social Democratic Party, is coordinating a set of task forces on "The German Question," on behalf of the Royal Institute of International Affairs of London. One closed-door meeting on the subject will be held at the RIIA during two days in late January. A second, and broader, meeting will be held at the RIIA during the first three days of May, soon before the Trilateral Commission meeting in Madrid.

An RIIA associate of Roper's, in a private discussion, outlined the prevailing strategic thinking in the London-Trilateral circles, for the coming months. "It is our view that a cutback in the American troop presence in Europe has been effectively inevitable, for some time, although the budget-cutting pressure in the Congress, as with this Gramm-Rudman legislation, will only hasten things, presenting severe handicaps for the U.S. defense program." He affirmed, "The situation in the Central Front in Europe is more stable than most people imagine, in this nuclear age, so there is not a military problem in the U.S. cutting back, but only a problem of political management. It's a matter of political will, and if the intent and will to make a deal with the Soviets is there, a deal could be struck."