

Euro-Trilateral Center Stage Grabbed by Perle

by Mark Burdman

The European branch of the Trilateral Commission held its annual meeting in Prague, the capital of the Czech Republic, over the Oct. 18-20 weekend; it was the first time the Commission had ever gathered in that city. The Trilateral Commission, founded in the early 1970s, originally bankrolled by David Rockefeller and dominated by the nefarious policies of Zbigniew Brzezinski and Henry Kissinger, has been one of the most influential global institutions of oligarchical policy for almost 30 years. Therefore, its deliberations deserve attention.

The Prague meeting was dominated by an unusual participant, in Trilateral Commission terms: self-professed “Prince of Darkness” Richard Perle, head of the Defense Policy Board, an advisory group to U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, which is notorious for promoting the worst of American imperial-utopian strategies. Perle has recently joined the Trilateral Commission.

Perle has spent most of the two years since the 2000 election of George W. Bush stating that the Bush Administration doesn’t care at all, what doubts its traditional European allies may have about its provocative policies, especially about the planned war with Iraq. His most recent outburst was his Oct. 2 interview with the German economic-business daily *Handelsblatt*, when he was asked his opinion about the opposition to the Iraq war by German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder, who had just been re-elected. Replied Perle, imperiously, “It were best he resign.”

‘Some Water in the Wine’

Hence, one must take with substantial grains of salt, Perle’s claim to the Prague meeting—as a leading Euro-Trilateral figure reported to this publication—that he is a committed “multilateralist,” and far from the worst of what he called the “unilateralist fundamentalists” in Washington. Sometimes, tactically, as Biblical scholars are aware, the Prince of Darkness obfuscates his stratagems.

The featured event at the Euro-Trilateral gathering was a debate, on the subject of U.S.-European relations, between Perle and Chris Patten, the European Union’s External Affairs Commissioner. Patten, hardly ignorant of imperial strategies since he served as Britain’s last colonial Governor of Hong Kong, has, over the past months, been a harsh critic of the crude, unilateralist “Pax Americana” policies of many leading

figures in the Bush Administration.

According to a Euro-Trilateral member who was in Prague, Perle delivered a very blunt message, although with certain rhetorical qualifications. Said this individual: “We received confirmation from Richard Perle, that the Bush Administration will move into Iraq, although the Administration is now accepting certain different avenues than earlier, toward reaching that goal.”

EIR’s source had played a leading coordinating role in the April 6-8, 2002 annual meeting of the Trilateral Commission, in Washington. On that occasion, he now recalled, attendees had heard speeches, from Rumsfeld, Vice President Dick Cheney, and Secretary of State Colin Powell—all of whom, although with different forms of expression, had told their European and Asian audience, “We are going into Iraq, whether you like it or not.” *EIR* had noted months before the meeting, the tensions that were threatening Rockefeller’s global think-tank (see *EIR*, Jan. 25, “Sept. 11 Will Split Trilaterals”).

Now, the U.S. Utopians’ message has been somewhat modified. Perle affirmed, that he would personally accept certain “multilateral” initiatives on the Iraq question, but with a strict time limit. As *EIR*’s source put it: “The Americans have had some water put in their wine. Since the President’s speech on Sept. 12 at the UN, they have had to go through the UN system, which involves some complications, but the substance is not changed. The strategic decision has been made, it is only the tactics that have changed. Perle confirmed to us in Prague: ‘We will go in, we will accept certain regulations and rules, but we will not wait too long.’ ”

French ‘Between Two Chairs’

With this in mind, this individual, himself French, gave his interpretation of the French obstruction of the war-mongering American-British resolution at the United Nations Security Council, as follows: “The French will win, on insisting on a second resolution, before any force is used. But the reality will be, from all I understand, that the first resolution will be so strenuous, that the Iraqis won’t be able to respect it. It’s possible to formulate a demand, in such a way, that the party it is intended for, won’t be able to comply. The French would have won, in their immediate aim, but they will be there with the Americans, when force is used.

“The French are in a singular and difficult position. They are between two chairs. They want a more independent Europe, but not as far as the Germans want to take it. And they don’t want to be absent from what happens in Iraq, and from what happens in the post-intervention period. They want to be at the UN Security Council table for the Iraqi intervention, not against the United States, but with it.”

This view of French intentions is at odds with the simple fact that a new Iraq war is monumentally unpopular in France, including with leading individuals in the French political class, across the spectrum.