

Sept. 11 Will Split Trilaterals' Meeting

by Our Special Correspondent

One upcoming event in Washington, D.C. that deserves special attention, is the April 5-8 annual international gathering of the Trilateral Commission. The event, the first Trilateral Commission get-together following Sept. 11, takes on considerable importance now, for reasons that, at first, seem mutually contradictory, but, taken together, are emblematic of the extremely volatile and fluid strategic reality in the world at this critical historical conjuncture.

On the one hand, leading Trilateraloids want to continue the organization's role as an architect of, and catalyst for the kinds of economic, financial, and strategic policies that have been hegemonic in the so-called "advanced sector," since billionaire banker David Rockefeller founded, and bankrolled, the organization in 1973. Some of the very individuals whose policies are the driving force behind the "war of civilizations" coup attempt launched in the United States on Sept. 11, form the hard core of the Trilateral Commission.

On the other hand, the devastating economic and financial crises erupting simultaneously in the three "Trilateral sectors" of North America, Europe, and Japan—crises brought about in large part by following Trilateral Commission demands and prescriptions—have forced to the surface enormous tensions and fissures, among the Trilateral elites themselves.

Goebbels on the Reichstag Fire?

The first Executive Director of the Commission after its founding, President Jimmy Carter's National Security Adviser and "Rasputin," Zbigniew Brzezinski, is a lead protagonist in the murky developments of Sept. 11, as Founding Editor Lyndon LaRouche elaborated in his Jan. 11 *EIR* "declaration of war" on the coup plotters, "Zbigniew Brzezinski and September 11." Although it is not confirmed, whether Zbig will be present at the April 5-8 conference, Trilateral sources stress that the panel on "Islam and Globalization" will discuss some of the policies for which he became notorious, with his late-1970s Islamic "arc of crisis" ravings.

One of Brzezinski's National Security Council subordinates, Harvard's Samuel P. Huntington, popularizer of the perverse "clash of civilizations" doctrine, has been a leading Trilat for almost three decades. It was he who, in 1975, was the coordinator and chief author of the notorious Trilateral "Crisis of Democracy" report, which demanded emergency, police-state forms of rule, under conditions of growing austerity in the "Trilateral sectors" (see Huntington's profile, in the *Feature* in this issue).

Another former U.S. National Security Adviser, Henry Kissinger, is a third Trilat stalwart. It is none other than Kissinger, who has been selected to head a panel on "the events of Sept. 11," during the April conference. This is more or less like asking Nazi Propaganda Minister Josef Goebbels to head a panel on the February 1933 Reichstag Fire.

Relevant to the same point, is that certain individuals whom the Trilateral bureaucracy labels as "former members in public service," are now forwarding the putschists' strategic designs, from within the Bush Administration. Chief among these, is current Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz. But he and other Bush Administration advocates of the "clash of civilization" were set back when the State Dept. recently cut off their prime objective for the next phase of the war against terrorism—a total strike against Iraq. The Department cut off funds for the Iraqi National Congress, which was being touted as the Iraq equivalent of the Afghanistan "national Alliance."

'The Imperial Moment'

All these and other Trilateraloids, especially from the United States, Canada, and Great Britain, are promoters of exploiting the terrorism of Sept. 11, to bring into being what they call an Anglo-American "New Empire," modelled on the Roman Empire. Calls for this began to mount, in London, New York, and Washington, in the days immediately following Sept. 11. In line with this, early in the New Year, the *New York Times* featured a "New Empire" effusion, written by British-born *Washington Post* scribbler Sebastian Mallaby, for the New York Council on Foreign Relations' *Foreign Affairs* magazine. The *Times*, the main mouthpiece of the East Coast liberal establishment, declared that we are now in "the imperial moment."

With this in mind, the formally scheduled "main event" at the April 5-8 gathering in Washington deserves close scrutiny. This will be the presentation of the Trilateral Commission's new report on China, whose main author is Kurt Campbell, a "hardliner" toward China while he was a senior official in the Clinton-era Pentagon. Trilateral sources have affirmed privately, that the presentation of this report could be a catalyst for relaunching the debate over China that was so heated during the second term of President Clinton, and which has somewhat died down, in recent months. One Trilateral insider, echoing the classical British geopolitics that led to the First World War, said that the majority Trilateral view is that "the challenge from China today, is like that of Germany in the last decades of 19th Century." That is precisely the view of Wolfowitz, as enunciated during the latter 1990s, in an article for the neoconservatives' house journal, *The National Interest*.

While all these plans and designs may be afoot, a very sobering reality faces the Trilateral Commission circles. As a result of the rapidly worsening economic and financial crises, simultaneously, in *all* the Trilateral sectors—North America, Europe, and Japan—there are unprecedented tensions and

fissures erupting, among the policy elites. These strains are being made seriously worse, by the Bush Administration's failure to come to grips with the truth of what happened on Sept. 11, and, instead, to pursue military operations in Afghanistan and environs.

By the same token, the push by the Brzezinski-Huntington faction for the "clash of civilizations" policy, is only serving to exacerbate the tensions. Hence, there is no doubt, that preparations for the April gathering in Washington, and the gathering itself, will focus these conflicts. This was confirmed by a senior Trilateral figure in Europe, who is intimately involved in planning for the meeting, during a candid background discussion.

According to this individual, "The tensions that had begun to spring up transatlantically, in the weeks after Sept. 11, have continued. Naively, many of us thought that there was a window of opportunity, after Sept. 11, that the previous 'unipower,' or 'hyperpower' approach of the United States, would change into a more multilateral approach. But this window was quickly shut, with the Afghanistan campaign. And now the tensions continue, and it is very disquieting. There is a political and psychological tension, that should not be happening, among close friends and allies." This is complicated, he indicated, by "the tensions *within* the Bush

Administration, and by the domestic debate in the United States," because of which, Europeans still feel in the dark about what has happened in the United States since Sept. 11.

A large portion of the April 5-8 meetings, both public sessions and private talks, will focus on the U.S. internal situation. Otherwise, "If there is the long, long war that the Americans talk about, the problems will only become more tenacious," the source insisted. "There is all this talk of a 'Phase 2' after Afghanistan, and it is not clear exactly how some people in Washington interpret the 'clash of civilizations.' We in Europe are very worried. . . . At the same time, of course, there is the economic crisis in the Trilateral countries, which takes very frightening dimensions in Japan, but what frightens us even more, is the erosion of the Trilateral concept itself. It is breaking down, and we are all treading very carefully. We are losing the big picture, and the glue that used to hold us together, for example the Soviet Union in the old days, is no longer there. Terror can't be the only glue. Perhaps it should be the economic crisis, but the Trilateral framework in which we used to discuss these problems, along an axis of Washington-Tokyo-Brussels, is just not there."

As astute observers of history know, such feuds within "elites" are markers of truly revolutionary periods.

Russia General Decries Faction's Genocidal Aims

A clear echo of Lyndon LaRouche's characterization of the insane "utopian" military-strategic doctrine promoted by the Huntington-Brzezinski-Wolfowitz faction in the United States—and its connection to the events of Sept. 11—came from a senior Russian military figure on Jan. 11. Col.-Gen. Leonid Ivashov charged in an interview with the semi-official website Strana.ru, that current U.S. military planning reflects a policy to reduce world population and the consumption of resources by developing countries.

Ivashov's statement comes at a moment of increasing alarm in the Russian elites, that the United States may be "betraying" the strategic understanding established between Russia's President Vladimir Putin and U.S. President George W. Bush around Sept. 11. Their fear is that the United States is exploiting Russia's support for the American-led "anti-terrorist operation," in order to build up a permanent military presence in former Soviet republics of Central Asia, and to prepare a dangerous new round of military operations against Iraq or other countries.

General Ivashov, a highly respected military figure who served until Summer 2001 as Chief of the Department for International Military Cooperation in the Russian Defense Ministry, was asked to comment on prominent U.S. press

leaks, that the Pentagon is pushing for a possible resumption of underground nuclear tests.

Ivashov replied: "The Americans are trying to accustom the world to the necessity or possibility of a U.S. battlefield use of nuclear weapons. . . . If we read the documents on U.S. national security strategy for the coming century, we find that the Americans see the exhaustion of natural resources and the rapid growth of world population, as one of the main, priority problems. They project that already by 2015, the world population will increase by 1.1 billion people. And this growth will occur in the East and South, not in the West.

"Therefore, what the United States is doing in various regions of the world, is being done in order to force the nations of those regions into a mode of regressive development.

Ironically, just a day after Ivashov's interview, the *New York Times* de facto confirmed warnings, on the genocidalist aims of the Anglo-American faction represented by Brzezinski. The *Times* reported on a forthcoming article in the Council of Foreign Relations journal *Foreign Affairs*, by British writer Sebastian Mallaby, promoting the idea of a "New Empire."

Mallaby's imperial policy, recommended to the United States and Britain, is focussed very much on *population reduction* in the rest of the world. He is quoted: "A new imperial moment has arrived. . . . The chaos out there in the world is too threatening to ignore, and the existing tools for dealing with the chaos have been tried and found wanting. . . . World population is going from 6 to 8 billion. All that growth is going to happen in poor countries. . . . They threaten our interests."