

Reagan-Bush administration. It includes Iran-Contra protagonists Elliott Abrams, Stephen Bryen, Fred Iklé, Jeane Kirkpatrick, Richard Perle, former deputy CIA head Howard Teicher, and former Swiss ambassador and Oliver North intimate Faith Whittlesey. The deputy director, Sven Kraemer, is the son of Fritz Kraemer, the man who boasted of having "created" Henry Kissinger in the late 1940s.

On Sept. 5, the center issued a press release provocatively entitled, "The true German export control policy: profiteering at the expense of Western security," which accuses the Kohl government in Bonn of "chronic, if not wanton, disregard of elementary technology security." It demands that President Bush "impose import sanctions against German companies judged to have violated regulations controlling exports."

Shackley's CIA hit team

Another CIA "old hand" from the Iran-Contra days who is active in the new economic espionage mission against Europe and Japanese industrial groups is former CIA Deputy Director for Operations Theodore Shackley. Shackley, whose career goes back to the Bay of Pigs in the early 1960s and to the CIA's alleged involvement in drug running with Meo tribesmen in Laos, warned the annual convention of the Association of Former Intelligence Officers on Sept. 29 in Washington, that "Germany cannot be allowed to dominate Central Europe." He declared that the U.S. intelligence services should use Eastern Europe as a "window" to conduct economic espionage against Western Europe. Indeed, talks between the CIA and ex-East German communist trade official Alexander Schalck-Golodkowski suggest this may be the model Shackley and associates have in mind.

German chemical industry is at the top of the economic warfare target list of Washington as well. Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.) has introduced a new bill, S. 2152, the International Chemical Controls Act. Using the pretext that European, especially German, chemical firms are enabling the South American cocaine mafia to process cocaine that is sold to U.S. youth, the Kerry bill, if passed, would open the floodgates to possible legal attacks on rival German chemical and high-tech firms.

The campaign is apparently being coordinated with long-standing Anglo-American interests inside Germany, especially those located in Hamburg. According to reports from former Reagan administration senior officials, Washington is planning to launch a major German internal foreign policy debate soon following the Dec. 2 elections, using recent *Der Spiegel* revelations of German firms' supplying certain technology to Iraq via Daimler-Benz's Messerschmitt-Bölkow-Blöhm subsidiary. "It is no secret that neither *Der Spiegel* nor the Hamburg-based interests that it reflects, are happy about the manner in which German unification was carried out. The weekly is a staunch opponent of any independent German foreign policy thrusts," say these Washington insiders, according to reliable reports.

Ban on whaling hides trade-war aims

by Ettore Tovo

The nearly 20-year campaign conducted by the United States to impose a total ban on whaling, under the pretext of environmental protection, is particularly odious to the Japanese. Whale meat is a traditional dish in Japanese cuisine, mentioned even in the oldest collection of poems of Japan, *Manyōshū*, from the eighth century A. D. In the early postwar years it became Japan's major protein source, as its consumption spread to the majority of families during times of food scarcity.

That is why the Japanese have such high regard for whalers, contrary to the West, where, but for sporadic exceptions, interest in the products of whaling, destined exclusively for industrial uses, began to wane midway through the last century, when the first petroleum deposits were found in the United States, and petroleum products replaced those of the whaling industry. The major U.S. whaling company, part of the Del Monte Fishing group, went out of business in 1971. Previously, the United States, Norway, Iceland, and Great Britain had practiced unlimited whaling in all seas, and Melville made *Moby Dick, the White Whale* into an epic.

It is worth taking a closer look at the events that led the International Whaling Convention to impose a global moratorium on whaling in 1982. The IWC is the international association of nations that hunt whales. According to its statutes, it was founded after the war with the task of stabilizing "a system of international rules for whaling, so as to assure an appropriate and effective conservation of whale stocks." Instead, it has been used by the U.S. government to impose a total blockade on such activities.

The demand for a moratorium on all whaling, first raised by the United States in 1972, appeared to have no scientific basis to the IWC's members. Not all whale species risked extinction; logically, quotas should have been set for non-endangered species. Faced with resistance, the U.S. representatives resorted to a ruse. During the annual IWC meeting in 1975, they asked to allow non-whaling nations to join. So, a certain number of states joined the IWC, such as Monaco, Antigua and Barbuda, Santa Lucia, and Senegal. In many cases the seats of these nations at the IWC turned out afterward to be occupied by ecologists of *different* nationalities!

In 1982, thanks to this artificial "majority," the IWC

approved the moratorium resolution, and the United States threatened trade reprisals against non-complying nations. Japanese spokesmen commented: "It seems that the United States assumed the role of 'policeman' of the international community regarding the problem of defense of the whales, even though no one conferred that authority on them."

The U.S. Congress, especially in the 1969 Endangered Species Conservation Act, as well as the Pell Amendment of 1971 and the Packwood-Magnuson Amendment of 1979, has passed fishing legislation that is in open contrast to international trade laws. The Packwood-Magnuson Amendment introduced the automatic reduction of the fish import quotas from nations that did not accept the IWC's (U.S.-manipulated) rules. Such reprisals would not only hit Japan, but also Norway, Iceland, and other whaling nations which are major fish exporters.

The current General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) accords ban trade reprisals on products different from those involved in a given controversy. Article 20 of GATT states unequivocally, "Reprisals to be applied against nations who do not respect international accords in defined fields cannot be used as pretexts to impose arbitrary limits to trade in other fields." Thus, if the presumed violations regard whaling, the Americans could, under GATT, retaliate against imports into the United States of whales and whaling derivatives, but not against fish, auto, or other imports. But the Americans are missing no chance to use any available excuse to limit imports from Europe and Japan. In the case of the anti-whaling diatribe, the United States was sitting pretty to enact trade reprisals in the name of "environmental protection."

A shady alliance

The plot thickens when we look at the connivance between U.S. institutions and the so-called environmental movements. From the outset, these movements have carried out flanking actions, "sensitizing" world public opinion in a distorted manner. Since the clash between the United States and whaling nations arose, the United States has named to represent it at the IWC individuals of the stamp of a Russell E. Train (1972). Train is a big wheel in the world ecologist movement: cofounder in 1961, and president in 1978, of the rich and mighty World Wildlife Fund (WWF), the main mouthpiece for the interests of the Anglo-Saxon oligarchy. The choice of such a spokesman reveals that the U.S. government is itching for a clash, rather than to rationally face the problem of the appropriate management of available resources.

This also explains why the delegations of nations invited to join the IWC by the Americans, in order to have a majority in favor of their fatuous demands, were led by such notorious environmentalists as Dr. Roger Payne, a WWF researcher and collaborator who in 1984 represented Antigua and Barbuda at the annual IWC meeting! The U.S. government and

the ecologists moved in lockstep to impose the whaling moratorium—a collusion that passed unscathed through Democratic and Republican administrations from 1972 to the present. WWF and Greenpeace are the organizations that most stand out in this "flanking operation" of the U.S. government.

The whaling moratorium has also caused permanent damage to the delicate balances of the marine ecosystem. As occurred before in the "save the seals" campaign, this ban has caused an uncontrolled increase in the whale population. Since seals, dolphins, and whales are predatory species which compete with man's fishing activities, nations like Iceland and Norway whose economy is based mainly on fishing have been forced to reduce their fishing quotas, suffering incalculable economic losses. Even Mrs. Gro Harlem Brundtland, the former prime minister of Norway and founder of the Brundtland Commission to safeguard the environment, recently told a BBC interviewer: "The number of whales and seals must be reduced, because they are devouring too much fish."

The ferocious campaigns against fishing around the world, under the pretext of environmental protection, are taking on the character of aggressive trade and strategic operations. They caused a greater dependency by many nations on the few companies that control world trade in food products, i.e., the food multinationals, mostly controlled by Northern European and U.S. interests. In a world more and more afflicted by food scarcity, these companies will have great strategic weight, especially vis-à-vis nations like Japan which is so vulnerable because it depends greatly on food supplies from abroad.

Prof. Kazuo Sumi, who teaches international law at the University of Yokohama in Japan, in his paper "The Whaling War Between Japan and the United States: Problems and Perspectives," describes the situation: "It seems that the widespread opinion against whaling is based mainly on emotion rather than on science and on logic. It is silly to attempt to impose one's own values on others by force. The food resources of each nation are based on dietary traditions and customs which have ripened over long historical periods. If India's inhabitants were to protest against Americans' habit of eating beef, how might the Americans respond? It is not a final and acceptable solution to the problem, for the Japanese to turn to meat imports from the United States. By itself the fact that McDonalds is in Japan does not indicate Americans' food preferences have affirmed themselves in Japan. . . ."

"The unification of food resources can contribute not only to the loss of the diversification of food cultures, but can become dangerous to the environment. A good example of this is the destruction of tropical forests in South America, due to the growing consumption of meat for fast food in the United States. The U.S. hamburger industry depends on supplies of low-cost meat from those nations."