

**EXCLUSIVE**

# How To Translate Carter's Notre Dame Speech Out Of Trilateralese

Jimmy Carter's May 22 speech on the campus of Notre Dame University has been widely portrayed as a major shift in foreign policy. However, the speech's internal features demonstrate that the presentation was simply a "cut-and-paste" of several Trilateral Commission policy documents, some dating back to 1973.

The one thing actually striking about the Notre Dame speech is that, while Carter is obviously following closely the contours of the earlier Trilateral documents, he is holding back on the specific implementation recommendations included in the earlier pieces. This can probably be chalked up to the increasingly hostile environment — an environment which would give the Trilateral Commission second thoughts about having Carter publicly espouse at this time the vociferously fascist proposals of the Trilateral documents in question.

Rather, the speech represents a fall-back position: probable-author Zbigniew Brzezinski (who, as Director of the Trilateral Commission, edited the Commission's policy statements) rewrote the speech to field only general ideas, so that the specifics could be filled in at a later date if there is no great outcry. This process, in the argot of Brzezinski and the Trilateral Commission, is called "creating a policy consensus."

## *What Carter Said*

The nub of the Carter presentation was the barebones statement that "the Western democracies, the OPEC nations and the developed Communist countries can cooperate through existing international institutions in providing more effective aid (to the developing nations — ed.). This is an excellent alternative to war."

## *What He Meant*

The specifics of this broad statement are not to be found in the Notre Dame speech. But, they are clear from two Trilateral documents — "OPEC, the Trilateral World, and the Developing Countries" (written 1974-75) and "Towards a Renovated World Monetary System" (1973) — and from several proposals emanating from the Brookings Institution, the other major policymaking body of the Rockefeller interests.

The Trilateral documents stress repeatedly that OPEC's oil wealth must be channeled into the International Monetary Fund-World Bank so that those institutions can continue to refinance the developing sector nations which are in danger of default on their dollar-denominated debt. "OPEC, the Trilateral World..." in fact, recommends that the "Trilateral countries could indicate now their sympathetic interest in seeing the OPEC countries' share (in the IMF —ed.) raised to 15-20 percent...assuming, of course, that the OPEC countries are willing to assume increased (financial) responsibilities in the Fund..."

Although the Trilateral Commission has not taken on the question directly, the Brookings Institution (under

the direction of Henry Owen, a Trilateral Commissioner, and C. Fred Bergsten, Carter's Undersecretary of the Treasury, who has authored several Commission studies) has long discussed the possibility of having the Comecon join with OPEC in this bailout of the Rockefeller-dominated Wall Street banks via IMF "aid" to the Third World.

## *What Carter Said*

"We have moved deliberately to reinforce the bonds among our democracies. In recent meetings in London we agreed to widen our economic cooperation, to promote free trade, to strengthen the world's monetary system, to seek ways of avoiding nuclear proliferation; we prepared constructive proposals for the forthcoming meetings on North-South problems of poverty, development and global well-being..."

## *What He Meant*

Notwithstanding Carter's consciously lying representation of what went on at the London summit, the phrase "reinforce the bonds among our democracies" should be translated "How do we keep Japan and the NATO allies from breaking with the U.S., and the dollar monetary system and making their own, independent deals for trade and development with the Comecon and the Third World." This question of "advanced sector solidarity" was the subject of the 1973 Trilateral document "The Crisis of International Cooperation" (also co-authored by Henry Owen). Advanced sector governments "must be held accountable to one another for their actions;" the document states, "at a minimum, they should not be allowed to get away with unilateral or bilateral faits accomplis that are irreversible....the same applies in relations between the advanced countries and the LDCs (Less Developed Countries)."

## *What Carter Said*

In fact, these bonds must enchain the whole world: "our policy must encourage all countries to rise above narrow national interests and work together to solve...formidable global problems..."

## *What He Meant*

The question of "narrow national interest versus global problems" has always been Trilateralese for "limited sovereignty" — the ability of one country to intervene, Entebbe-style, in another. This was outlined most clearly in "Towards a Renovated International System," co-authored by Yale professor Richard Cooper right before he became Carter's Undersecretary of State for International Monetary Affairs in 1977. "A realistic strategy for action must take into account the major obstacles to cooperative management of interdependence. Obstacles of particular importance are

the desire for national autonomy (and) the impact of domestic politics....” Cooper writes.

“The desire for national autonomy and the traditional concept of sovereignty aggravate the tension between national policies and transnational interaction.... In developing countries...the desire for autonomy poses special difficulties...”

The goal of limited sovereignty for the Trilateral Commission and the Rockefeller banks is what some Brookings and Rand Corporation personnel have publicly referred to as “command economies:” fascist regimes capable of enforcing the level of austerity necessary to keep up debt payments. Or, as Cooper in the cited document more daintily puts it: “The fact that politicians must present themselves to the voters every few years has the unfortunate effect of concentrating their attention on issues which secure their re-election and not on the problems of the more distant future...”

#### *What Carter Said*

“We are now free of that inordinate fear of Communism... I believe in détente with the Soviet Union. To me it means progress toward peace. But that progress must be both comprehensive and reciprocal.... We hope to persuade the Soviet Union that one country cannot impose its own social system upon another, either through direct military intervention or through the use of a client state’s military force — as with the Cuban intervention in Angola.

“Cooperation also implies obligation. We hope the Soviet Union will join in playing a larger role in aiding the developing world....”

#### *What He Meant*

Limited sovereignty must be applied to the Warsaw Pact nations, despite the fact that this will cause thermonuclear war. Detente is to be transformed into “reciprocity,” a concept developed by Brzezinski and publicized by him and his colleagues in *Foreign Affairs* magazine, among other places. Reciprocity is the diplomatic analogue of the “limited nuclear war” gameplans worked out by James Schlesinger, Henry Kissinger and others around the Rand Corporation during the 1950s and 1960s: The Soviet Union must be induced to accept “trade-offs”: the USSR is to be induced to stop support for the socialist regime in Angola, for instance, in exchange for some U.S. concessions in, say, the Middle East. According to the Rockefeller-Trilateral planners, this kind of diplomacy will create the environment in which the U.S. can deeply intervene in Warsaw Pact internal relations or launch a “limited” or “theatre” nuclear strike on the Warsaw Pact or its close allies, and the Soviets will accept a trade-off rather than go to full-scale war.

The abysmal failure of Trilateral Commissioner Cyrus Vance in Moscow — where he asked the Soviets to trade off crucial research and development programs in exchange for a new SALT treaty — should be seen as an unequivocal Soviet reaffirmation of their rejection of the premises of reciprocity. Any serious attempt to enforce reciprocity, as that term has been defined by the Carter Administration and the Trilateral Commission, will provoke the Warsaw Pact to begin World War III.

## Ally Denounces 'Risky Righteousness'

London Daily Telegraph, *May 23*, editorial, “*Risky Righteousness*”:

In his speech on foreign policy yesterday ... Mr. Carter enunciated the true faith of the American ‘liberal.’ We must hope that, as with so much that Mr. Carter says, this was largely rhetoric which will have no application to the real, harsh world... In their efforts to preserve themselves from aggression, free societies must very often make common cause with tyrannies with whom they, for a period, share an enemy. Is Mr. Carter arguing that America and Britain should not have made common cause with Stalin against Hitler? Of course not, he would reply. But that is the logic of his argument. Indeed, from his own words yesterday, it was clear that he was not fastidious about *all* tyrannies. He spoke eloquently of the need for closer relations with China. He spoke also of a new foreign policy based on decency and optimism. Decency, yes; but it is difficult to feel optimistic about a world policy based on optimism. The good has in the past often been preserved by those who feared the worst.

• Daily Express, *May 24*:

The United States is peculiarly vulnerable to sudden flushes of compulsive morality, and it elects once in a generation, often on behalf of disparate causes, a politician with an over-developed disposition to public virtue.... Basically Mr. Carter wants his foreign policy no longer to be governed by an ‘inordinate fear of Communism.’ He wants us to treat other forms of non-democratic government which he bundles together unreflectively as ‘totalitarian,’ as being unacceptable. This is as untenable a view in the light of today’s political map as was the unintelligent anti-Communism of Dulles.... When Jimmy Carter first ran for President, the most usual reaction in Europe to the jarring emphasis upon the candidate’s piety and sincerity was a hopeful assumption that neither need be taken too seriously. The terrible truth may have to be faced that Mr. Carter has been entirely honest....

The Times of London, *May 24*:

(Carter’s speech showed) a stirring vision that should raise the drooping spirits of the American people and inspire hope abroad among those who share Mr. Carter’s aspirations. Is it also realistic? Could it even be dangerous? Power politics sometimes demand compromise with moral principles. Military security sometimes demands alliances with governments one does not like. Previous American presidents — notably Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt — have inspired men’s minds while making bad mistakes in foreign policy. If President Carter relies too much on the belief that history automatically rewards the good and the just he will come to grief, and much damage will have been done....