

ama to 700, and is the first increase in U.S. military force since the current civil unrest began.

Reagan administration officials, members of Congress, and U.S. newspapers have declared that U.S. military intervention against Panama will be taken, if necessary, to finally “get rid of the system” in Panama.

- Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci on Feb. 27 stated that military action is “in the contingency plans.”

- Vice President George Bush on Feb. 27 stated that the United States will “reserve the right to do whatever is necessary, including military force, to protect America’s sacred interests in that region of the world.”

- On March 6, Bush proposes that the United States kidnap Noriega. “The long arm of U.S. justice” has caught terrorists such as Younis and Hamada, Bush said. “I’m suggesting the system has a way of working to bring people to justice, and I hope it will in this case.” His plan was echoed on March 14 by the *Wall Street Journal*.

- “The United States cannot permit Noriega to remain in power, if it wishes to continue being respected by other Central American nations,” Henry Kissinger has been stating in recent U.S. conferences, Mexico’s *Excelsior* daily reported March 1. “Central American nations respect force. . . . If we overthrow someone in political power, we have obligation to stick to it, and assure that the successor be someone with whom we are in agreement.”

- Democratic Sen. John Kerry (Mass.) 26: “What you have to do is begin to precipitate a larger crisis, frankly. . . . I personally don’t think it will come to a civil war, though it could. . . [Military action] is an option for the U.S.”

- Republican Sen. Alfonse D’Amato (N.Y.) stated on Feb. 26: “We’ve got to put our troops on a full military alert . . . and be prepared to take whatever action necessary. . . . It is not without precedent that the U.S. move, and move strongly, to protect the interests of its citizens. Certainly we did it in Grenada. General Eisenhower—President Eisenhower did it in Lebanon. I think it’s the kind of thing that certainly is a very real option and one that we might have to use.”

- A *Wall Street Journal* editorial March 1 stated, “We do not wish to suggest that the only solution to the General Noreigas of the world is a U.S. military invasion. But we do suggest that when a country such as the U.S. sees its first duty as reassuring the region that its military won’t be used to defend helpless people, the General Noriegas will survive and their number will increase.”

- A *Washington Times* editorial opinion March 10 stated, “With the U.S. once again meddling blatantly in the internal affairs of a Latin American neighbor, it’s time for a closer look at the old shibboleth of non-intervention. . . . Does that give the U.S. the moral right to try to topple him from power? You bet it does.”

Profile: Raymond Barre

The would-be next of France is not his

The first round of presidential elections in France are currently under way, to be followed by a second-round face-off between the two leading candidates in May. Incumbent François Mitterrand and Premier Jacques Chirac are among the candidates. Another leading candidate is a former premier, Raymond Barre. A dossier on Barre has been issued by the European Labor Party, which is well known in the country for having dared to sue a Soviet publication, New Times, in a Paris court for libel. The following article is based on that dossier.

If Raymond Barre were to be elected President of France, it would put an end to France’s leading role in resisting the American Establishment’s sell-out of Europe to the Soviet Empire, and would give the European bureaucracy in Brussels easy control over French national policy. Although his own party, the CDS, is supporting his candidacy, support for him in the Republican Party (both these parties form a “family” known as the UDF), is lukewarm. Endorsements for Barre, including from former President Valéry Giscard d’Estaing, have been made, but with no great enthusiasm.

Raymond Barre can best be described as duplicitous: He plays a double game, using ambiguous language. He prides himself on being “above politics” and “Gaullist.” Yet, he is a leading member of the supranational Trilateral Commission. His is a common face at the ultrasecret Bilderberg group conferences. He is honorary president of the “Davos Seminars” of the European financial elite. And he is a member of the board of the Venetian insurance giant, Assicurazioni Generali.

He paints himself as a “Christian” concerned by “social conditions”; yet he has always favored a ruthless policy of austerity and praised the highly un-Christian looting of the Third World by the International Monetary Fund and related bankers with whom Barre confers “socially” in the organizations listed above. With false innocence, Barre states, “I am in politics by chance, only because I was asked to be.”

President own man

Yet, international policy is the very essence and *raison d'être* of the institutions to which he belongs.

Whenever Barre is confronted with these contradictions, as is inevitable during an election campaign, he flies into a rage and heatedly denies being subject to any outside influences. This reaction, in turn, does not broaden his support in the population or the media. The fact that his fits do not conceal, but rather confirm, is that Raymond Barre is not his own man.

Let's take a closer look at two major aspects of Barre's policy: his outlook on East-West strategic matters, and his economic policy.

The supranational Trilateral Commission

As to the first, East-West matters, Barre's ideas tend to be shaped by the Trilateral Commission, which was founded in 1973 by David Rockefeller with a view, to quote Barre, "to progressively integrate the socialist countries into the international and financial system," in order to "facilitate political dialogue and peaceful cooperation." Then again, in 1985, Mr. Barre stated in *La Suisse*, "The Iron Curtain no longer exists: Eastern Europe is contaminated by the Western life-style, and the deal on American wheat shipments proves that the U. S.S.R. does not want war."

The Trilateral Commission's avowed purpose, of course, is to impose a globalization of the policymaking process, outside and above national governments. Given the severe economic crisis, this is to be accompanied by a weakening of democracy in the West. Already in 1975, the Trilateral report prepared by Samuel Huntington, Brian Crozier, and others, called *The Crisis in Democracy*, stated: "There are limits to democracy. A government lacking authority will not have the means to impose the necessary sacrifices on the population."

The Trilateral Commission, with some 300 members and backed by the 120 biggest multinationals, is described as "a committee of renowned wise men" by Raymond Barre. This

corresponds to the "technocratic" idea of government dear to his heart: The "wise men" impose austerity and brutal population reduction in the Third World, and are accountable to no one.

Barre has never distanced himself from the shocking statements of his fellow Trilateraloids. On the contrary, he "is happy to belong to the commission," which entrusted him in April 1983 to write a report on Trilateral relations—North American, Europe, Japan—for the celebration of its tenth anniversary.

Barre is no pro-Communist, of course, not even pro-Soviet, but in his view, there must be two blocs holding power in the world, and co-managing crisis upon crisis. It is the classical view of the New Yalta faction in Europe, and corresponds to the "balance of power" of the 19th-century's Holy Alliance, which brutally attempted to suppress republicanism. In his book *Réflexions pour demain (Reflections for Tomorrow)*, Barre explains his concept of geopolitics by saying, "Western European countries do not want economic war with the Soviet Union. Without being the slightest bit soft on ideology or a communist regime, they tend to think that socialist countries should be progressively integrated into the international commercial and financial system."

As to current issues, Mr. Barre tries to avoid taking controversial positions openly. However, on the American Strategic Defense Initiative, he found it a "destabilizing factor" for Europe, which is identical to the Kremlin's view. In October 1985, this gained him the nickname of "Moscow's favorite candidate." The Soviet publication *New Times* of January 1985 carried a glowing report on Barre and his eagerness to open up new economic deals with the East bloc. One year later, the same Soviet weekly again carried favorable coverage of Barre, "whose moderation and competence have been understood by a large part of the voters." The article ends with praise for Barre's opposition to the SDI.

It is true that he has consistently opposed the zero option, but then again, so has a faction of the Trilateral Commission, and even Henry Kissinger has expressed reservations on the INF treaty. Interestingly, the Soviet press has carried quite vicious attacks against both Prime Minister Chirac and Defense Minister André Giraud for their stance on disarmament, whereas no criticism for Mr. Barre has been heard.

The Bilderberg Group

A notch above the Trilateral Commission is a secretive group of men whose dream is to have absolute political control over institutions and governments without, however, being up front themselves. They prefer to act in the wings, through "middlemen." Raymond Barre is undoubtedly one of the most eminent such middlemen, given his above-average cultural background and intelligence compared to the run-of-the-mill politician.

A few days before the Williamsburg, Virginia Group of

Seven summit in 1983, Raymond Barre stated: "I don't believe big conferences can supply solutions to the economic problems of our world. . . . They never make firm decisions that have not been drawn up before the meeting." This statement was made at a meeting of the Bilderberg Group, which meets before every important international conference, precisely to determine those policy orientations later adopted by governments. This organization was founded by Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, a confirmed one-worldist and Europeanist, and besides the noble families (Lord Mountbatten, Prince Philip, Axel from Denmark), one finds representatives of political, financial, business, and academic elites. From their discussions and deliberations, not one word is published, nor is the list of participants made known.

Mr. Barre is also honorary president of the Davos Symposium, which is a kind of financial and economic appendix of the Trilateral Commission, albeit with a more European twist. Its leaders have said of it, "Davos is certainly the only complete annual world summit of financial and business circles."

This year for the first time, a representative of the U. S. S. R. was invited to attend and discuss "Europe's common home." The purpose of this forum is not only to make money; it is to raise funds in order to run "special operations" for the benefit of its members. Raymond Barre has nearly unlimited power in this group, which only includes people holding positions of power, with the exception, according to a note handed out last year, of "our president Raymond Barre."

Every bit as important as the above-named organizations is the link of Raymond Barre to the General Association for the Study of the Insurance Economy, or the Association de Genève. Raymond Barre is honorary president of this association, created in 1973, in order "to encourage research and economic analysis in the fields of risk and insurance." In other words, to deliberate on how to maintain the current structures of monetary and banking power, and reduce the "risks" posed, for example, by proposals for a new monetary system or a new world economic order. Needless to say, insurance is absolutely crucial for controlling world finance.

The secretary general of the Association de Genève is one Orio Giarini, a figure who is one of the masterminds of the Club of Rome. It is he who designed the pessimistic malthusian schemas calling for population reduction in the Third World, and for one-world austerity, reminiscent of Barre's own policy when he was in government.

Praise for the IMF and sacrifice

It is not surprising that this man of international banking totalitarianism should also be a fervent supporter of the International Monetary Fund. We could give many examples of this, but the most telling is perhaps a quote from his *Réflexions pour Demain*.

"The international financial crisis linked to the massive indebtedness of developing countries has only been avoided

over the past 18 months thanks to concerted action by the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the central banks, and commercial banks. Debtor countries have courageously implemented adjustment programs recommended by the IMF. . . . But the crisis hitting the world has had beneficial effects in every country. First of all in the industrialized countries who had let themselves get carried away by 20 years of expansion, prosperity, and laxness, and who were faced from one day to the next with problems that could only be solved by accepting sacrifices. . . . In Latin America, in Africa, rigorous discipline has been introduced; their sacrifices in living standards have been great, but the preliminary results are encouraging."

We find here again the exaltation of the "spirit of sacrifice," this perfidious sense of "Christian" solidarity, which so characterized the Vichy regime of Marshal Pétain in France.

Sacrifices are not only for the Third World, however. Mr. Barre has denounced Americans for "living beyond their needs," and recently stated, "The American population may have to sacrifice part of their living standard in order to repay their debts."

Calls of this type are familiar to Frenchmen, who remember the austerity and "rigor" imposed by Raymond Barre from 1976 to 1981 when he was finance minister and then prime minister under the Giscard d'Estaing presidency. This was one of the rare periods in France's history which combined rising unemployment and a rising inflation rate. In 1976, when Barre became prime minister, there were 900,000 unemployed and a 9% inflation rate. Five years later, these figures were 1.5 million unemployed and 13% inflation.

Besides the obvious fact that all of Mr. Barre's connections point to a supranational, one-worldist outlook diametrically opposed to "Gaullism," defense of the absolute sovereignty of nation-states, it should also be noted that Mr. Barre, during General de Gaulle's lifetime, was strongly opposed to Gaullist policy. In 1965, he supported the presidential bid of Christian-Democrat Jean Lecanuet against Charles de Gaulle. Then, in 1966, as a "social technician" after leaving the economics ministry, Raymond Barre was instrumental in defeating one of the centerpieces of de Gaulle's social policy, which would have had workers participate in the benefits of the company employing them.

The unrest caused by the defeat of this plan was in great part responsible for the workers' joining in the student protests of May 1968, which was an elaborate plot for overthrowing de Gaulle. Later on, Barre advised de Gaulle, against the wishes of Michel Debré and Jacques Chirac, to maintain an over-valued franc, which led to further cutbacks in the social programs, and eventually to the referendum which saw de Gaulle driven from power in 1969.

In short, Raymond Barre is an anti-Gaullist tool of the European oligarchy. His election would mean the end of the official resistance in Europe to the "New Yalta" deals being negotiated with Moscow, toward the sell-out of Europe.