

Italy challenges 'new world disorder' in Somalia

by Claudio Celani

On July 12, an obscure United Nations official, Kofi Annan, took the unprecedented step of ordering the government of a NATO country, Italy, to recall the field commander of its military contingent in Somalia, Bruno Loi, because he was guilty of "disobeying U.N. orders." The Italian government, with wounded pride, firmly rejected what Foreign Minister Beniamino Andreatta called a "diktat," thus opening the most serious crisis between Italy and the United States since 1985, the time of the terrorist hijacking of the luxury ship *Achille Lauro*.

The conflict is not only a question of sovereignty between the Italian national government and the U.N. supranational authorities; given that orders in Somalia are formally given by the U.N., but in reality by retired U.S. Navy Adm. Jonathan T. Howe, the policy conflict is between the Italian line of a dialogue with Somali leaders, opposed to a policy of indiscriminate bombing of the civilian population, such as U.S. forces demonstrated on July 12 by killing 78 people in the action supposedly aimed at capturing warlord Mohamed Aided.

The crisis between Italy and the U.N.-U.S. "has enormous ramifications," the *Baltimore Sun* recognized on July 18. At stake, the paper correctly observed, is the "authority—make that sovereignty—[U.N. member states] are willing to relinquish to a U.N. military command that has yet to attain the capability of a quick response." The reality is that there exists a deep contradiction between the U.N. stated goals (in the case of the Restore Hope operation, feeding the Somali population and preventing the total disintegration of the country) and the real U.N. policy, which promotes the disintegration of national structures.

This contradiction exploded when the Italian contingent (the second biggest after the Pakistanis, but much better equipped and more effective) realized that the U.N.-U.S. policy was delivering the situation into the hands of those same warlords whom they ostensibly were fighting.

As Gen. Domenico Corcione, the Italian defense chief of staff, declared on July 16, "A peace mission is turning into a war operation. And we don't like it anymore." "When we arrived there," Corcione explained, "there were 28,000 Americans, and we had food to distribute, potentially a source of strong pressure. There were conditions to impose disarmament. Instead, the task of feeding the population was fulfilled, but disarmament was neglected. Now the machine

is weaker. Therefore, when we were strong we made peace. Now that we are weaker, we make war."

The allegation of having pulled out U.S. forces without finishing the job of disarming rival hands is shared by international commentators, who name this as one of the main reasons for the present escalation of the conflict in Somalia. But the Italians have even more reason to complain about U.N.-U.S. conduct. At the beginning of the Restore Hope operation, the U.N.-U.S. indicated that they preferred General Aided as their interlocutor. Then, without explanation, they dropped him in favor of Ali Mahdi. Suddenly, Aided became "Public Enemy Number One." Despite this about-face, Italian commander Bruno Loi twice offered to capture Aided, since the Italians were able to pinpoint his whereabouts, thanks to their wide intelligence networks. Inexplicably, the U.N. command refused the offer.

Then came the episode which escalated the violence. On June 5, after having rejected the Italian offer to capture Aided, and not even having issued a warrant against him, the U.N. command sent Pakistani troops to search a weapons depot in the headquarters of Aided's radio station. During that search, the U.N. troops reacted to a provocation by opening fire against a group of civilians. It was a massacre, with 23 dead on the side of the U.N. Had the Italian troops not intervened, thanks to their good relations with the local population, losses would have been bigger.

On July 3, a column of 800 Italian paratroopers was ambushed during a similar search operation. Despite the violent fire (Somali fighters used anti-tank weapons), the Italians refused to return fire on women and children who were hugging Kalashnikov machine-guns and throwing hand grenades. As a result, they left three dead and 23 wounded. While the ambush apparently seemed to challenge the Italian strategy of avoiding conflicts by establishing friendly relations with the local population, Italian commanders insisted that it was the result of the escalation provoked by the violent behavior of Pakistani and U.S. troops on June 5. To demonstrate their point, the Italians announced that they would take back the lost checkpoint without firing a shot.

On July 11, they did just that. But only 24 hours later, U.S. forces began bombing a Mogadishu district where leaders of the Aided faction were meeting. As a result of the 17-minute bombardment, 78 died, many of them civilians. This

ignited a popular uprising, in which four western journalists were stoned. That same evening, U.N. vice-director Kofi Annan announced arrogantly that Italian commander Bruno Loi had become *persona non grata*, because he had consistently disobeyed U.N. orders.

Laboratory for the rest of Africa

The enraged U.N.-U.S. reaction can be explained only if one understands that the Italian initiative not only demonstrated that you can achieve results by engaging in dialogue with Somali factions; it also threatened to collapse the entire structure of war economy which the U.N. is supposed to be fighting, but which in reality is a pillar of the U.N.'s world-government project for Africa. In fact, the U.N. is using the Somalian "laboratory" as an experiment for replacing existing nation-states with tribal units, and replacing all economic activity with export of drugs and import of weapons. This scheme already partially works in Somalia, where each warlord has a band working like a company, the "blue-collar" being the guerrilla fighters. Such a societal organization would guarantee that the "world government" (i.e., the U.N.), is not hindered by national interests, while at the same time guaranteeing a constant flow of money, as drug revenues, into the coffers of international banks. Witnesses report having seen U.N. planes loading drugs in Somalia, and point to the fact that each warlord was given initial capital to start his activity. Aided, for example, is rumored to have been financed by the oil company Conoco, while his rival Mahdi is backed by Egyptian financiers, friends of U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali.

The weak flank in such a structure is represented by Somalia's elders—local leaders who still have some authority among the citizenry, although decreasingly so. Therefore, the warlords, in search of legitimacy, have had to come to terms with them. This was the Italians' point of intervention. By contacting every level of Somalian society, the Italians have been able to partially dismantle the war structure. Of course, dialogue is not enough; what is urgently needed is infrastructural investment. But by offering, for example, a small wage for a police job, the Italians have already enrolled youth who otherwise would be toting a gun under a warlord.

As far as the U.N. accusations of insubordination against General Loi, the behavior of the Italian commander was totally correct. Loi accepted orders from the only agency which is supposed to issue them: the Italian government. "By the way," commented military expert Luigi Caligaris, calling the bluff, "don't the Americans in Somalia also take orders from their own government?"

At present, given the Italian government's unyielding support for Loi, the conflict between Italy and the Anglo-Americans has no perspective for a solution. The Italian government is forced to take a nationalist stand under the pressure of public opinion. Surprisingly, a sort of patriotism has surfaced among political forces (less surprising among the people at large, for whom General Loi has become a

national hero), and is motivated by several factors. One of these is the very open criticism against the Anglo-Americans coming from the Catholic Church. On July 4, the Vatican newspaper *Osservatore Romano* accused the United States of "interference" in changing the scope of the U.N. mission from a peaceful one into a war. On July 12, the Pope himself made it known through his spokesman that "if humanitarian interventions are not linked to a moral permanent value, they are no good." The Pope accused Clinton of ordering military operations in Somalia to improve his opinion polls.

'Quelli del Britannia'

The Italian challenge to the Anglo-Americans, however, cannot be understood unless it is seen as the manifestation of a new consciousness which has been developing over the past six months. Italian political leaders have come to understand that Anglo-American power centers are playing a major role in the destabilization of their country. More and more, warnings and analyses to that effect, written by Lyndon LaRouche and his associates and published by *EIR*, have found their way into the media (see box), up to the point that today the "Anglo-American destabilization of Italy" has

All Italy knows who the enemy is

Excerpts of an article appearing in the July 8 magazine L'Italia, entitled "Attack Against Italy—or Rather, Against Europe":

"Italy is victim of a systematic destabilization from forces which are coordinated internationally and internally. The usually less-understood component is the foreign one, represented by a cartel of foreign speculators committed to destroying the country with borrowed money." Is this the thesis of the Great Conspiracy against this poor, battered Italy? It seems so; and this time it was not a more or less official representative of the state who sounded the alarm, but an economic expert, and an American to boot. His name is William Engdahl, and he gave the introductory speech at a meeting recently held [June 28] in Milan and diligently censored by the national press. Yet, the theme of the meeting was an intriguing one: "Is there a plot to destabilize Italy?"

Attracted by the theme proposed by the organizers, the American magazine *Executive Intelligence Review*, businessmen and economic operators, as well as a varied brigade of parliamentarians, participated. . . .

At the center of the analysis by Engdahl and his colleague Claudio Celani, is the attack which they say the

become a fundamental parameter of any serious political analysis made in public.

A document published in January by *EIR*, denouncing a secret meeting which took place last year on board the British royal yacht *Britannia*, has made the plot into almost a household word. "Quelli del Britannia" ("the *Britannia* guys") has become synonymous for the group which is destabilizing Italy. A conference held by *EIR* on June 28 in Milan drew spokesmen from almost all political parties, from left to right, who agreed on the necessity of facing the economic and political destabilization by re-establishing full sovereignty on monetary and financial power. (See "Movement Launched to Save Italy," *EIR*, July 16, 1993.) Such a coalition of forces had never been seen in Italy, except during the time of Enrico Mattei, the founder of Italy's oil giant ENI, who rallied support for his nationalist enterprises among traditionally opposed parties.

Even Freemasonry seems to be split along a nationalist line, a phenomenon which brought the British Mother Lodge to "suspend relations" with the Italian Grand Orient last month. An unnamed high official of the Grand Orient was quoted in the weekly magazine *Il Sabato* on July 3, substan-

tially supporting *EIR*'s allegations of a "British freemasonic plot" against Italy. A representative of the "excommunicated" Grand Orient, former Grand Master Armando Corona, told this news service on July 7, "It is beyond doubt that the British—and the Americans—launched economic warfare against Europe." The other worrying aspect, Corona said, referring to the activities of financier George Soros pointed to by *EIR*, is the prevention of autonomous monetary and financial life of European nations, through speculation against currencies. Corona said his friends in the Italian government (not including Prime Minister Ciampi, who is close to "quelli del Britannia"), will launch a fight to prevent "wild privatizations," i.e., the sellout of state companies to international financial circles.

Will American leaders prove themselves more stupid than Italian freemasons? Not if they act like Sen. Robert Byrd, who strongly attacked U.S. behavior in Somalia, requesting a congressional debate. The next step is to launch a large-scale reconstruction program like the one which Lyndon LaRouche indicated at the beginning of Operation Restore Hope, when everyone had good reason to believe that George Bush could not have suddenly turned into a pacifist.

Anglo-political-financial world has unleashed against Europe and against Italy in particular, which is considered to be a weak link in the European front. "An economically stable Italy," Engdahl observed, "connected to a continental Europe strengthening itself around a reunified and prosperous Germany, was no longer useful to a global Atlanticist hegemony—rather, it represented a threat." The American expert clearly refers to the Anglo-American establishment, accused of pursuing the "globalization of the markets," that is, the realization of a single world economic system without any control over the circulation and creation of capital. . . .

The remedies? Given the economic approach of the meeting, the *EIR* experts insisted on the necessity of containing the "derivative" phenomenon, maybe with an ad hoc tax. The spreading of this financial malpractice has transformed the world stock exchange system into an "immense gambling house, now almost totally disconnected from the real economy. Derivative transactions amount daily to almost a thousand billion dollars, enough to defeat any central bank." . . .

The most interesting aspect of the meeting was maybe the emergence, among the leftist representatives, of an unsuspected receptivity for a national policy that defends the economy and Italian independence. Ugo Gaudenzi, a Social Democrat, went so far as to wish an alliance among all national political forces to defeat the Anglo-American strategy of hegemony in Europe. If the Milan meeting has a followup in the Parliament and among political forces,

we will really see some fun.

Extracts of an article appearing in the Italian Catholic weekly Il Sabato on July 5:

. . . [According to Senator Carmine Mancuso of the La Rete party,] "In the banking world everybody knows that nobody is admitted in the high financial circles in New York or London, if he is not a member of a masonic lodge. . . . Powerful Anglo-Saxon masonic circles control a fundamental aspect of the international narcotics traffic, a business that some international police authority estimate in 600 billions a year." . . .

But when did it start, this thick air of suspicions between Italians and British that even overthrew links between brothers? There is a date: On June 2, 1992. . . . On that day, the yacht *Britannia*, owned by the British Crown, lands on the Italian shores. On board, the magnates of the City's financial and banking world. Under the auspices of Queen Elizabeth herself, they meet the leaders of the Italian financial elite, of ENI, AGIP, Credipol, COMIT, Generali, Società Autostrade. The sophisticated meeting remains secret, until last Jan. 14, when *Executive Intelligence Review* in Wiesbaden makes the scoop. . . .

Fantasies, or reality? Difficult to say. On March 3, Treasury Director General Mario Draghi, in a parliamentary hearing, admits to having been on the *Britannia*, but of having read his speech without participating on the cruise that followed, different from *some who today have ministerial responsibility and who then stayed on board.* . . .