

President George Bush's supremacy in the conflict not only won the unanimous support of the permanent members of the Security Council, but also succeeded in consecrating an internal U.S. doctrine which unilaterally legitimizes the use of force, burying the principle of proportionality, while at the same time making possible the application of the concept of "limited sovereignty" to the countries of the Third World. I refer to the so-called Thornburgh Doctrine, which justified the invasion of Panama in December 1989. The actions sanctioned by the U.N. Security Council in the Persian Gulf were nothing less than the application of this doctrine on a global scale, the granting of extraordinary powers to decide the fate of a single nation of the South.

Such powers can be used again, in the best colonial style, and that prospect is foreseeable in at least two circumstances.

First, in any action that legitimizes the principle of "limiting national sovereignties," as was made clear in the deliberations that followed the cease-fire in the Gulf regarding the Kurdish problem. The Anglo-French proposal of creating a "Kurdish enclave" in northern Iraq, was also backed by former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, who publicly stated that the idea of national sovereignty, as understood in the 19th century, was now obsolete. The authors of the enclave proposal did not have merely the "solution" to a local problem in mind. According to the *Financial Times* of April 10, Soviet delegate Yuli Voronstov asked if something similar might be created in other regions, for example, "in the Brazilian Amazon."

Second, the superpowers on the Security Council have already suggested the need to extend that body's powers to such issues as the environment. This is the proposal of Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland, author of the report *Our Common Future*, which will orient deliberations at the Eco-92 ecology conference, to be held in Brazil next year.

The war against Iraq had no military sense. What occurred was a cruel experiment in de-industrialization and in depopulation. . . . Using unprecedented military force, the coalition headed by the Anglo-American axis placed Iraq—previously a promising Third World nation which was making an effort to achieve sovereign control over advanced technology—alongside the nations of Africa and other Third World nations which require humanitarian aid for their immediate survival. . . .

There are further ethical aspects of the conflict which merit analysis. One of these was the censorship imposed by the coalition leadership, with the complicity of the major news media worldwide. While a nation and its people were cruelly bombarded, the news services took on the role of psychological warfare technicians, repeatedly transmitting the idea that the attacks were "surgical." As part of this technique, one of the few scenes shown of the "real" effects of the war were two birds coated with oil, a presage of what could become an "environmental catastrophe." What an ab-

erration, defending animal life over human life!

As is now known, the indiscriminate bombardments intentionally destroyed all of Iraq's infrastructure, obeying a purpose that can only be described as genocidal. The exact number of civilian and military deaths is still unknown: 300,000 is the estimate. And the sanctions continue. . . . "Bombs today, death tomorrow," was the rule applied to Iraq, where the malthusian consequences of the destruction of infrastructure are all too evident: hunger, epidemics of cholera and typhoid, etc. Unless the sanctions are lifted, 170,000 children under five years of age will die in the coming weeks. Medical facilities which before the war met the needs of 90% of the population were destroyed. Before the war, Iraq's electrical generating capacity was 9,000 megawatts. Today, it is at 20% of that level.

One may well ask why there are no reactions by the international community? . . . As was stated here on Tuesday [June 24], there was an immense psychological warfare campaign, in which the "war was waged in the minds of the population, which was victim of a massive bombardment so that it would accept the war." The U.S. population has lost its ability to make moral distinctions. . . .

Bush new order means war against South

Following are excerpts of the speech presented by Lorenzo Carrasco on June 28, 1991.

To situate the topic we're discussing tonight, let me begin by mentioning a conversation I had with a Bolivian military friend at the beginning of the Gulf war. He recalled that wars are the midwives of human history, and asked what this conflict might engender. But, since this wasn't a war but rather the Mother of all massacres, what was born was an aberration. So, since 1982, as a result of Anglo-American machinations, we've been watching a different order emerge in this hemisphere. With the Malvinas War, we saw the launching of NATO's "out of area" deployments, which, since the Gulf war, have been called "extra-jurisdictional deployments." At the same time, we witnessed the demise of the hemispheric security system, the Inter-American Reciprocal Assistance Treaty (TIAR), as a result of U.S. collaboration with Britain.

Now, let's jump to Dec. 2-3, 1989, to the Malta summit between George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachov, at which they formally proclaimed the "end of the Cold War" which gave rise to a period of "hot wars" of the North against the South. That was inaugurated only two weeks later, on Dec. 20, with

the blood of at least 4,000 defenseless civilians during the U.S. invasion of Panama. . . .

Among other things, what the Anglo-Americans sought with their “splendid little war” against Iraq was the consolidation of NATO’s “extra-jurisdictional” deployments as their primary instrument of military power for the purpose of emphasizing to the nations of the South the futility of attempting any resistance to the implementation of a “100-year new world order” heralded by President Bush.

From July 7, 1990, two months prior to Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait, at the meeting of NATO members’ foreign ministers, until the very last meeting, we witnessed the statutory implementation of the concept of that agency’s “out of area deployments.” This is the primary military instrument of the new world order.

The new order’s basic concept is the worldwide imposition of limited sovereignty, which allows for foreign domination of broad regions of the planet—especially those rich in natural resources, particularly energy and mineral resources. The most diverse pretexts are used—the alleged threat of population growth, drug trafficking, destruction of the environment—in order to justify “preserving” vast regions of the planet, such as the Amazon, as the “patrimony of mankind”. . . .

In 1975, after the first artificially created oil crisis, former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger proposed global control of raw materials when he recommended the creation of an International Resources Bank, as a solution to the Third World’s financing problems. It was during that same period, 1974-75, that Kissinger formulated plans for control of Saudi Arabia’s oil fields, which, according to then-U.S. ambassador in that country, James Akins, are the same ones currently being implemented.

Another crucial aspect of the new order is population control, an issue of great interest to Kissinger. In 1974, under his direction, the National Security Council issued a secret document—NSSM-200—adopted some months later as official policy, which established that the population growth of 13 developing nations, among them Brazil, constituted a national security threat to the United States, alleging that eventually, these nations would interrupt the flow of raw materials and energy abroad. . . .

At the beginning of the 1980s, the idea that NATO would carry out out of area deployments was incorporated into U.S. military planning, as a result of the Carter administration’s *Global 2000* program which planned a drastic reduction of the world’s population. In 1980, this malthusian policy was actively promoted by Gen. Maxwell Taylor, a member of the influential Draper Fund, to which George Bush is intimately linked.

NATO’s new jurisdiction

Finally, on Nov. 29, 1990, at a meeting of the North Atlantic Assembly, NATO Secretary General Manfred

Woerner defended the new definition of NATO’s jurisdiction, explaining that “tensions are being exacerbated not only due to the ambitions of dictators like Saddam Hussein, but also because of population growth, conflict over resources, migrations and underdevelopment. . . .”

First, in analyzing the technological implications of the Gulf war, it’s clear that the great powers intend to impose on the developing sector what has already been baptized as “technological apartheid,” allegedly to prevent the dissemination of technologies which have possible military uses, and thus preventing the nations of the South any possibility of independent scientific and technological development. . . .

Second, the great powers intend not only to dismantle military industries—or in the “softer” version, to convert them into *maquiladoras* for the large international companies—but also the armed forces, alleging that with the presumed end of the Cold War and East-West conflict, there is no reason for sophisticated Third World armed forces to exist. . . .

In the case of Ibero-America, the hypocrisy is even greater, because it presupposes that Desert Storm proved the futility of any country of the region seeking independent technological development. What’s left as a corollary is the idea that the United States will have exclusive responsibility for hemispheric security—which they themselves destroyed during the Malvinas War.

Dignity of life is under attack

Lastly, the most insidious aspect of the “new world order” is located in the area of culture. In this regard, the “new order” attacks the fundamental idea of the sanctity and dignity of human life. That is why the Anglo-American offensive in the Western Hemisphere includes a vigorous assault against the predominantly Catholic roots of Ibero-America. This attack is centered around the reaffirmation of the “Weberian” approach to economics—which is premised on the supposed superiority of the so-called “Protestant ethic,” which is promoted in order to justify usury as everyday economic practice—and an insidious attack on the planned celebrations of the 500th anniversary of the arrival of Christopher Columbus to American shores, and of the beginning of the process of evangelization.

In closing, I cannot fail to mention the fact that the emergence of this “new world order” was foreseen back in the early 1970s, independently by two prominent figures of the international political scene: the American Lyndon H. LaRouche, and Brazilian Ambassador Araujo Castro, both of whom denounced the efforts of “Kissingerian” diplomacy to freeze the unjust world *status quo*, on behalf of the Anglo-American oligarchy. For LaRouche, the price of this position has been a 15-year jail term; for Araujo Castro, his teachings seem to have been largely forgotten. But in the ideas of both, the patriots of this subcontinent can surely find valuable inspiration.