

# State of Union Speech Arouses Unusual Opposition in Europe

by Mark Burdman

The flight-forward of American international policy since President George W. Bush's Jan. 29 State of the Union "axis of evil" outburst, and as evidenced by the bulk of the U.S. delegation at the Feb. 1-3 Wehrkunde meeting in Munich, has caused a singular development within the oligarchical establishment. Certain highly-placed individuals who have long associated themselves with the most miserable policies, and strong factions in Great Britain or with very close British connections, have gone into opposition to a policy that they perceive as a catastrophe.

In Europe, including in the United Kingdom, senior policy circles have been quick to observe—and to agree with Lyndon LaRouche—that the Enron scandal is one significant factor in the recent derangement from Washington, featuring and the use of this scandal by forces typified by U.S. Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), to force or blackmail Bush into the new flight forward. Others see the latest from the administration as an ill-conceived attempt, to reverse the economic collapse through vastly increased military spending.

But at the same time, many informed observers, even those usually strongly opposed to LaRouche, share his concern, as he recently expressed it in his "Brzezinski and September 11th" feature (*EIR*, Jan. 11), that the events of Sept. 11, have propelled to prominence those U.S. "utopians" personified by Zbigniew Brzezinski, Samuel Huntington, and Paul Wolfowitz, who have unleashed a neo-imperial frenzy.

## 'On a Very Dangerous Course'

On Feb. 5, *EIR* spoke to a continental European source, who has been a mover-and-shaker in such oligarchical institutions as the Club of Rome, the Bilderberg Society, and the Trilateral Commission, and who has decades-long links to higher echelons in the British monarchy. Insisting that he would speak strictly on background, he launched into an impassioned attack on the "axis of evil" thrust.

He warned: "I think the American government is on a very dangerous course. What this administration is saying, is making it a danger to world peace. What it is doing, will only increase terrorism, not diminish it. For this American government, everything has been reduced to *power*. This takes us back to the balance of power way of thinking, and we should have learned, from history, that the balance of

power always breaks down. This is all, purely, the thinking of Thomas Hobbes."

And further, "It undermines the rule of law, if you say that international law must confirm to the interests of America. This means there *is* no law any more, and it makes the advocate of such an idea, an outlaw. Can you imagine a German getting up now, and saying something like this, especially as we regrettably *heard* such language from Germany, at a very unfortunate time?"

"It is amazing," he said, "for the United States to say that other countries cannot build weapons of mass destruction. I am certainly not in favor of biological-warfare weapons, but it is rather strange, for the United States to say other countries cannot develop what the United States is developing. This is the worst kind of unilateralism. With this kind of attitude, there is no international law, and frankly, the country insisting on this, becomes, itself, a terrorist state. I fear, that the United States is becoming the most dangerous terrorist state, and its attitude is 100% wrong."

This Trilateral figure insisted that only a policy of "reducing the gap between rich and poor, and development," can stop terrorism.

## 'Britain Is Joining Europe'

On Feb. 6, a second continental European strategist, also caught up in oligarchical policy institutions, stated that what is striking and singular, in the current reaction to the "axis of evil" offensive, is that the United States' "special relationship" partner, Great Britain, has joined the opposition.

"Everybody and anybody outside the United States finds this policy outrageous, but what is of extreme importance, is that this includes the British," he said. "The British are publicly supporting the Europeans' policy on the Middle East, as stated at the recent European Foreign Ministers meeting in Luxembourg, which is exactly contrary to the policy we heard in the State of the Union speech.

"Absolutely for the first time, Britain is joining Europe, in relation to recent developments in the United States. On both sides in the House of Commons, you hear voices that say the direction of American policy is unacceptable. This is making life very difficult for [British Prime Minister] Tony Blair, because he went so far in backing the United States, and has to figure out what to do. It has become more and more

apparent to everybody, including in the United Kingdom, that nobody in his right mind, could support military action against Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. If they had stuck to Iraq, they would have been at the dividing line between opposition and support, but to add these other two, has outraged everybody, including the British.”

Because of the “extent of resistance in Europe,” a military attack by the United States, of the sort being mooted, “is logistically not possible,” the source said, “because the United States is indeed a superpower like nobody else, but it can’t carry out such vital operations all by itself, if it doesn’t have the sympathy, or blessing of its allies.”

As for Iraq, he added that an attack is not in the offing, despite all the rhetoric, because “at least in Afghanistan, the ground fighting was done by the Northern Alliance, but in Iraq, the Iraqi National Congress is a joke, just theater, with no capability to do anything at all, no matter what Wolfowitz may say.”

The European strategist emphasized that aside from imperial delusions and the Enron matter, what is driving the war rhetoric in the United States more than anything else, is “the collapse of the economy, and the belief that a massive defense buildup would turn this around.”

### **‘The Arrogance of Power’**

A notable confirmation of this point, was a commentary in the Feb. 7 London *Times*, by Anatole Kaletsky, whose usual views favor the most extreme and brutal “free-market” nostrums. Having spent the past days in the United States, including at the World Economic Forum in New York (see article in *Economics*), he warned of the extreme danger posed by a growing mood of “war fever” and “irrational hysteria” in Bush Administration circles. He said that the American policy elites, predominantly, are suffering from a “collective nervous breakdown,” and “manic-depressive paranoia.”

Kaletsky concluded with a curious—for him—echo of the late U.S. Sen. William Fulbright (see *Investigation* in this issue), when he warned that “the arrogance of power” in Washington now represents a great threat. Kaletsky stated that the irony of the situation, is that the “war fever” in the United States is now so extreme, that this will trigger an increasingly negative reaction around the world, and bring about a defeat for those insisting on the extension of American power.

Consistent with this, a British influential, who is a leading “NATO lobby” figure, a member of the Trilateral Commission, and a strong supporter of the “war on terrorism,” had stated, a day earlier, that he was “very worried, that tremendous damage could be done to the Atlantic Alliance, if this ‘axis of evil’ policy is really to be implemented, rather than just spoken about.”

“I think the international situation is becoming pretty raw,” he said. “Our Foreign Office insists, as our Foreign Secretary [Jack Straw] stated in Washington last week, that all this ‘axis of evil’ talk is just American domestic politics,

driven by factors like the Enron scandal, and that we shouldn’t take it seriously, as a guide to future action. However, the same Foreign Office is telling me to expect rough times in the United States, when I go there later this month, because of my particular view.”

Asked what he meant, he replied: “I think it is a mistake, to lump together all these countries, under one slogan; it only makes the situation more complicated. I also think it a big mistake, to use the war against terrorism, to reverse what was not achieved in the last Gulf War. This is very dangerous indeed. But my main worry, is the tremendous damage that could be done to the entire Atlantic Alliance. I am very uneasy, because we made all this effort, to articulate Article 5 of NATO, after Sept. 11. I really fear this was a mistake, because this is the most sacred bit of NATO. It’s been invoked, yet, in practical terms, it means nothing, as we are now seeing.” (Article 5 specifies that if one NATO member is attacked, the other members will provide assistance, including, if necessary, taking military action.)

The source further stated: “I fear that all the gains we have made in Afghanistan, could now give way to a political disaster. An attack on Iraq would break up the coalition, and turn the Middle East into turmoil. It would unleash Israel completely. And aren’t these people in Washington reflecting on the very heavy price we would pay, for what would happen in Egypt and Jordan?”

Lastly, he said that many policy elites in Britain are alarmed, that the United States is not putting more pressure on Prime Minister Ariel Sharon in Israel. “Too many people in Washington are obsessed with reversing everything Bill Clinton did, and I find this very distressing, for the Middle East situation.”

### **‘Dumber Than Dumb’**

Such sentiments are spilling over into certain interesting U.S. circles. For example, one attendee at the Wehrkunde gathering was Brent Scowcroft, former National Security Adviser, former head of Kissinger Associates, and now the head of the President’s Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB). He stated, in a briefing while returning to the United States from Germany; “The Americans and the Europeans are still drifting apart, and that partly affects the course of the war on terrorism.” On the “axis of evil” line, he said: “I really don’t know what it was designed to do,” and he warned that the next part of the war would be an *intelligence war*, in which Europe must play a central part.

On Feb. 2, Belgian Count Arnaud de Borchgrave, known usually for nasty diatribes as an editor of the Reverend Moon-owned *Washington Times*, ridiculed the “axis of evil” polemic. He stated that to call North Korea evil, “can only jeopardize South Korea’s diplomatic efforts;” and that were the United States to attack Iraq, it would be alone, and without basing rights for the 100,000 troops that would be required for such a campaign. “The dual evil status conferred on [Iraq and Iran] is dumber than dumb,” de Borchgrave concluded.