
Conference Report

Washington demands that allies back new 'global European order'

by Yves Messer

On June 19-20, an international colloquium was held by the Council of Europe in Strasbourg, France, on the theme, "1992: Europe and North America: The Dialogue of the New Solidarities." Behind this fancy title, the purpose of the meeting was to integrate Europe into the "new world order" of George Bush and Henry Kissinger, to help create what U.S. Secretary of State James Baker III has dubbed a "global European order."

One high-level Strasbourg source, not involved in this event, told *EIR* that "for two years now, the relations between the U.S. and Europe have become increasingly cool, especially insofar as the attitude of the U.S. Congress is concerned. The Americans seem obsessed by organizing Europe around the American political will."

The U.S. delegation to the Strasbourg event included several senators and congressmen, the directors for European Affairs (David Gompert) and European Political Affairs (Dr. Robert L. Hutchings) of the National Security Council; various ambassadors who had come out of the Kissinger years at the U.S. State Department; and former CIA deputy director and ambassador to Germany Vernon Walters. The preparations for the U.S. side of the event were orchestrated in significant part by U.S. Information Agency deputy director Walter Raymond, Jr., a "former" senior CIA official, who is one of the architects of the "Project Democracy" program, and who was one of the chief controllers of Lt. Col. Oliver North, in the Iran-Contra affair. (See *EIR*, June 12, "Project Democracy Dirty Tricksters Establish a New Beachhead in Europe.")

The conditionalities of the 'new order'

As seen from the standpoint of certain Europeans who believe they are being pragmatically clever, the Strasbourg conference was part of an effort to impose on the United States a series of *faits accomplis*, so as to prove that there exists a "European pillar" of the Atlantic Alliance, constituted by the European Community (EC), the Council of Europe, the European Parliament, and the military arm of all of them, the Western European Union (WEU). This institutional complex, so the thinking goes, is different from the Anglo-American-dominated Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and NATO, the latter two of

which tend to submit the European continent to a secondary role in world politics. Such Europeans tend to believe, wrongly, that they can now "impose" such a reality, because American economic power has been substantially weakened relative to Europe.

To better understand these various geopolitical machinations, we need first to recall that German reunification provoked a violent reaction from the Anglo-Americans, fearful of losing their world hegemony. One has to go back to the July 5-6, 1990 NATO summit in London, after which the "Declaration of London" called upon the members of the Anglo-American-dominated CSCE to create a newer parliamentary assembly, baptized the "Assembly of Europe," as well as a Center for the Prevention of Conflicts. The proposed Assembly of Europe would be a transatlantic body in which American and Canadian parliamentarians would participate, rather than a strictly European institution.

Such efforts, in the words of James Baker, would help "set up a global European order"—one that would be integrated into the Anglo-American "new world order."

This same NATO meeting called for increased attention to "out-of-area" deployments, particularly into the Middle East. How prescient! Four weeks later, Iraq invaded Kuwait, which was encouraged to a significant extent by the U.S. State Department. The Anglo-American push for a "new world order" was—and still is—aimed at preventing the emergence of any economically and politically solid Eurasian bloc, and instead sparking a North-South conflict based on the notion of securing the flow of raw materials like oil, grain, cacao, coffee, and metals. In the malthusian view of London and Washington, this means a neo-colonialist policy that puts a priority on what they consider as the primary factor of destabilization: population growth.

Continental Europe, in the Anglo-American view, must be subordinated to this geopolitical-malthusian strategy. The Council of Europe is an object of special attention from U.S. officials, as a weak flank within the European institutional framework. Secretary General Catherine Lalumière is a French Socialist, who, accompanied by her right-hand-man Francis Rosenstiel (who claims to be a friend of Kissinger), met with Kissinger earlier this year, at the Davos, Switzer-

land World Economic Forum, and then met with George Bush and Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger, the former president of Kissinger Associates, in Washington in February.

At the June 19-20 meeting in Strasbourg, certain conditions were enunciated, under which the United States would agree to join the European institutions, and “permit” the council to become a future Assembly of Europe. These conditions popped up during the various speeches and discussions, in the following arrogant ultimatums:

1) Europe must accept the fact that NATO is going to reduce its stationed troops, and will therefore not intervene in the crisis in former Yugoslavia, a crisis that is not considered as threatening U.S. strategic interests. European forces like the WEU must consequently be ready to move into the vacuum there—but strictly under NATO (i. e., Anglo-American) leadership.

2) With reference to the “success” of “Operation Desert Storm” against Iraq, Europe should learn the lessons of what is known as “public diplomacy” by the Project Democracy crowd: the propagandistic use of *lies* in order to fulfill strategic goals.

3) Europe must understand that NATO is far less important than successfully concluding the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Europe must submit to the “free market,” and open its trade barriers to U.S. exports. Less politely put, trade war is to become the dominant feature of transatlantic relations.

4) The United States will not accept any interference into its judicial system. This is a response to the appeals by the council’s Human Rights Court and the European Parliament to put an end to the death penalty worldwide.

The new NATO and the methods of Goebbels

The first ultimatum came from Robert Hunter, a member of the colloquium’s preparatory committee. Hunter is the vice president and Regional Programs Director of European Studies at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Washington. A well-known figure in the U.S. establishment, he was a National Security Council official, responsible for the Middle East during the Carter administration, before joining Henry Kissinger’s apparatus in the shaping of the Project Democracy policy that led the Reagan administration into the Iran-Contra fiasco.

Hunter stated arrogantly: “The U.S. wants to, and will, be involved in European defense. . . . But we have to say to Europe: ‘You don’t need 100,000 American troops, so don’t ask for what you don’t need! The U.S. will be engaged as much as it was during the Cold War, but first, we have to solve our domestic problems, in order to face our world responsibilities.’ ” On the crisis in former Yugoslavia, he made the cynical pronouncement: “We don’t have interests there . . . or rather only a moral interest, and nobody dies for reasons of moral commitment. What’s needed here is leadership.”

So, how to achieve this goal? By lying! Said Hunter: “When you think about it, if the American people had been told a few months beforehand that we were going to invade Kuwait and Iraq, they wouldn’t have accepted it. There would have been a revolt. So one had to see how to present things. First we said it was ‘to spread the American way of life.’ That didn’t work. So we said it was for ‘jobs,’ and that didn’t work either. Finally, we hit upon ‘Saddam Hussein is Hitler,’ and that worked! Now with the Serbs, with diplomacy and promises of much money, we could have gotten them to understand that they could have the border changes they wanted, without the trouble of taking to arms, and then we could have turned around on them, to say it wasn’t true.”

Similar views about the future of transatlantic defense were put forward by Gregory F. Treverton, a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, who circulated in Strasbourg his just-published CFR “New Europe” study; Ambassador James Dobbins, a Kissinger protégé who is U.S. representative to the European Community in Brussels; and Ambassador Avis Bohlen, senior political counselor at the U.S. embassy in Paris.

According to a senior European Community official who attended the colloquium, Dobbins was much more conciliatory in private discussions with the Europeans, an attitude which this individual interpreted as indicating that the Americans are aware that their economic power, and hence their powers of blackmail, are not what they used to be. Whether this interpretation is valid or not, it certainly seems that a combination of sticks and carrots was brought to Strasbourg from across the Atlantic.

Submit to GATT and ‘free market’

The next ultimatum came from Kim R. Holmes, vice president and director of foreign policy and defense studies at the Heritage Foundation in Washington. “With the collapse of the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union,” he said, “this [U.S.-European] partnership will change. . . . No longer will the free part of Europe be so dependent on the United States, no longer will America wield such influence in Europe. . . . In fact, the most important question facing U.S.-European relations today, is the extent to which Europe’s industrial and trade policies are protectionist. If Europe becomes more protectionist, the U.S. will develop free trade relations with Asia, Latin America, and other regions of the world, downgrading U.S.-European economic relations in the process.”

Holmes then summarized what American interests are in Europe today: “1) to prevent the domination of Europe by a hostile power or bloc of powers that could turn the vast resources of the continent against the U.S. The first interest in the balance of power can be ensured, so long as the U.S. remains involved in NATO . . . ; 2) open markets and free trade; 3) the spread of western-style democratic and free market institutions into eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. . . . [In order to] combat protectionism . . . the U.S.

should continue to use GATT as the main forum for liberalizing global trade, targeting EC agricultural subsidies and trade restrictions on farm commodities . . . and ultimately, negotiate an American-EC Free Trade Agreement.”

Robert Hunter had made a similar point: “In fact, economic policy is the most important thing today. The success of the GATT round is more important than the next NATO meeting.”

On this very crucial front, Europe has already made significant concessions to the suicidal GATT “free trade” agenda, especially in the vital area of agriculture.

‘Limits to democracy’

U.S. Ambassador Richard Schifter, formerly the U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights, set down the conditions for the United States to become a member of the council—or rather, for the council to become a new “Assembly of Europe,” including the United States and Canada. He insisted on “reformed structures”: “Collaboration among the executive agencies must be pursued, but . . . you have to change your statutes. Amendments should be submitted, in order that your membership be extended to the CSCE process”—in other words, that the council be integrated into the Anglo-American-dominated CSCE.

Schifter went on to point out that “the major obstacle for the U.S. to find some form of future integration into the Council of Europe work, is the fact that all national courts of justice in Europe were subordinated to the Council of Europe European Court of Human Rights. This requirement of subordination,” he warned, “would obviously be totally unacceptable for the U.S. judicial system. Maybe the Council of Europe could think of waiving this requirement, given the 200 years of American constitutional history.”

Such words should have a curious effect on Europeans who have become uneasy about violations of human rights in the United States, typified by the barbaric use of the death penalty, the legal targeting of political opposition leaders like Lyndon LaRouche, and the “Thornburgh Doctrine” upholding kidnappings by U.S. officials in foreign lands, even when such actions violate existing bilateral extradition treaties. Indeed, only days before Schifter spoke, Europe was rocked by news of the June 15 Supreme Court decision ratifying this practice.

Schifter’s intervention provoked a weird discussion, started off by France’s Simone Veil, former president of the European Parliament and former minister in the French government. She fired off a series of questions: “Are there other values than democracy? In order to defend democracy, are the democrats permitted to not be democratic any more?”

This questioning of “democratic principles” was continued by Oxford University/New York University Law School professor Ronald Dworkin: “Are there limits to democracy? Must democracy become non-democratic to protect itself? Should Europe be based on a community of principles rather than on an economic community?”

A strange twist for a colloquium that was supposed to “defend democracy” throughout the world.

Of malthusians and Trojan Horses

Continental Europe’s “inoculation” against the Project Democracy offensive can only be seriously weakened, if influential Europeans endorse the axiomatic premises that underlie Anglo-American geopolitical thinking. A most unfortunate example of this was on display in the person of Prof. Michael Stürmer, director of the Ebenhausen Scientific and Political Foundation, an influential think tank which is financed by the German Foreign Ministry. Stürmer is one of Chancellor Helmut Kohl’s policy advisers.

In Strasbourg, he gave an overview of the world situation, which veered off into extreme malthusian irrationalism. Stated Stürmer: “Weimar Germany is like a picnic compared to the situation of the ex-Soviet countries. Yugoslavia is more than a regional war. . . . Four principal sources of instability can be identified:

“1) The crumbling of the Soviet Union: Western Europe may be faced with ecological problems of a new magnitude, such as the breakdown of heavy industries, or the burning-out of nuclear reactors. . . . In the long run, however, Russia will re-emerge as a world power. . . . Russia is bound to play a decisive role, at the turn of the century becoming possibly the most dynamic country of Europe;

“2) The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction;

“3) The Islamic ‘Arc of Crisis’;

“4) The most threatening long-term configuration, however, could come from the combined effect of unchecked population growth in the poorest parts of the world, especially South Asia and Africa south of the Sahara: migration of people, ecological breakdowns, scarcity of resources, water disputes, conflicts over the right to pollute the environment or over unsafe industrial installations. At present, the cause seems to be unchecked population growth, at a rate of 100 million growth per annum. . . . This means long-term destabilization in large parts of what used to be the Third World, with violent and incalculable spillover effects into the OECD zone and further loss of control in the former Soviet Union. Our imagination will not suffice to describe the scenarios in detail. . . . Waves of desperate boat people would try to reach Europe’s wealthy shores. This is the bigger bomb than any other bomb invented yet. . . . But any kind of military ‘Maginot Line’ could only be a last resort.

“To sum up,” Stürmer concluded, “the present new world order may soon turn into a new world disorder.”

The continental European vulnerability is, as usual, being manipulated by the British. Former British Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe quipped during the colloquium’s opening speech: “Why is my country chosen for the opening speech? Maybe because it represents the half part of the Anglo-Saxon Trojan Horses, according to [Charles] de Gaulle’s expression.”