

# B'nai B'rith gives the international marching orders at Washington meet

by Scott Thompson and Ana M. Phau

Approximately 50 international leaders of the freemasonic organization B'nai B'rith assembled May 17-19 in Washington, D.C., to hear reports from area specialists and receive marching orders for their current activities. Gathered by the International Council of B'nai B'rith (ICBB), one of two foreign policy arms of B'nai B'rith International, which purports to represent Jewish interests, the sessions in fact promoted the same Anglo-American policy agenda that has created global economic collapse and placed the world on a rapid course toward generalized war. ICBB members argued for the continued application of the International Monetary Fund's (IMF) "shock therapy"; for the destruction of national sovereignty, in the name of defending "democracy" and "human rights"; and for genocide in the Balkans in the name of the Vance-Owen "peace plan."

Those who oppose such policies, the gathering was instructed, should be smeared as "anti-Semitic." As ICBB International President Kent E. Schiner put it in his introductory remarks:

"When the Berlin Wall collapsed, followed by the collapse of the Soviet empire, many of us were whirled into a world beset with euphoria; we believed we were entering an era of peace and serenity. . . . How wrong we were. The new united Germany sporadically erupts into spasms of xenophobia, violence, tinged with more than a little anti-Semitism. . . . And we have heard over the last two days of the anti-Semitism that is on the increase in Latin America. . . . That being the case, the worldwide ICBB network becomes increasingly significant. . . . In this regard I remind you of the role played by our staff and volunteers here in Washington, because we have access to the administration of the U.S. government as well as the embassies of all nations."

## Toeing the British line on Bosnia

The ICBB panel titled "How Does Europe Appear through the Clinton Administration Eyes?" which was chaired by Alan Cohen, European co-chairman of the ICBB, focused almost entirely on the British Foreign Office's view of Bosnia. It seems that Cohen had managed to arrange for the appearance at the panel of Ralph Richardson, the Head

of Chancery at the British Embassy in Washington. The respondent speaker was Alan Elsner of the British news service Reuters. During and after the panel, Elsner kept describing Americans—with an eye to the Clinton administration—as being "simplistic" and "stupid."

When asked why Europe would not back President Clinton's plan to use air power against Serbian military installations in Bosnia, while lifting the arms embargo on the Bosnian Muslims and Croats, Elsner responded with arguments paralleling those of British agent-of-influence Henry Kissinger:

"There is only a moral argument for military involvement, but there is no real strategic interest. The only strategic interest is the fear that it might become a wider war, perhaps involving Hungary, Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, and Turkey. But why get involved before the war becomes wider? You should just lay down markers, saying it can go no further."

When one of the more intrepid ICBB members ventured to state that military force *was* necessary, because Serbia had invaded Bosnia and Serbs were committing genocide, the British Embassy official intervened:

"The British government does not rejoice in acrimonious debates across the Atlantic over Yugoslavia. My government is doing everything possible to maintain the special relationship and to calm things down. Lady Thatcher's call for massive military intervention is sublime and courageous, but it is not popular in England. . . . Prime Minister John Major sees Bosnia as representing treachery, intrigue, a vortex, a mess, and how easy it would be to sink in there. . . . There are just not enough troops, and there is no way to exit them."

After the panel, Richardson told *EIR* that what he meant by "doing everything possible to maintain the special relationship" referred to a visit by British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd to meet with Secretary of State Warren Christopher on May 21. Richardson said that despite press statements that the Bosnian Serbs had rejected Vance-Owen in the recent referendum, the only real disagreement was on the redrawing of the map of the area: The Bosnian Serbs wanted a bigger chunk of Bosnia. Hurd would try to convince Christopher that Vance-Owen must still be taken as the basis of allied policy and be given a chance.

## Taking aim at Ibero-America

The opening panel of the plenary, “The Latin American Political Scene: A Dialogue with Experts,” hammered at two central policy points:

First, that the economic austerity policies imposed on Ibero-America over the last decade by the IMF and the international financial community were necessary and desirable, but that they had created a social crisis of unthinkable proportions which had to be dealt with. There have been deindustrialization, cutbacks in services, and the virtual “disappearance of parts of Latin America,” the Peruvian Daniel Schydrowsky accurately explained. If this crisis is not addressed, he warned, people will want to jettison free-market liberalism and return to a dirigistic economic approach. That means looking to authoritarian leaders, which in turn will lead to an increase of anti-Semitism, he argued incoherently.

The second policy theme was that the promotion of “democracy” and “human rights” had to be used to contain the influence of the Ibero-American armed forces, Catholic Church, trade unions, and other “corporatist” institutions. Joseph Tulchin, the head of the Latin American program at the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington, D.C., proposed that an “International Code of Good Behavior” be established, and that nations that didn’t live up to it would be subject to international intervention—Iraq-style.

These two policy points are identical to the agenda for Ibero-America established by the Inter-American Dialogue, an influential Washington think-tank, which is a kind of Trilateral Commission for Ibero-America. In fact, the current head of the Dialogue, Peter Hakim, was the moderator of the ICBB panel. Former Dialogue president Richard Feinberg heads the Latin American division of President Clinton’s National Security Council, from which post he exerts powerful influence over administration policy, as can be seen in the current “human rights” crusade against Peru by the State Department, private organizations such as Americas Watch and Amnesty International, and others.

## Dismantling nationalist institutions

Mark Falcoff, of the American Enterprise Institute, argued that the United States’ pluralist model had to replace what he mischaracterized as “corporatism” in Ibero-America. The problem, he explained, is that these countries are organized in a corporatist way, around institutions like the Catholic Church, the armed forces, the labor movements, and so forth. He added candidly: “It seems to me that in a number of countries now, the Jewish communities are being accepted as one of the groups that has a place at the table within this corporatist definition of citizenship.”

But such admitted indications of religious tolerance are not at all what interests the B’nai B’rith, whose real concern is only to assure the implementation of the policies of their British freemasonic masters. Speaking about President Car-

los Menem of Argentina, whose government has been most amenable to B’nai B’rith influence, Falcoff said sarcastically: “Well, President Menem believes in the international Zionist conspiracy, and he wants it on his side. It’s not terrific, but it works.”

Many of the speakers expressed concern over the instability of the current pro-IMF governments of Ibero-America. Schydrowsky, for example, said that he would not bet that there would not be a military coup in Argentina in the coming years. Various speakers noted that there had been three coup attempts against President Carlos Andrés Pérez of Venezuela. And Schydrowsky added that the only two countries that could survive the neo-liberal free-market economic policies without being overthrown are Chile and Colombia, since the latter’s politicians have mastered the art of compromise.

Chilean lawyer Claudio Grossman, currently at the American University Law Center, focused on the important role that members of B’nai B’rith could play in implementing free trade and pluralistic democracy in the Americas. But he complained that the U.S. State Department should be called the Fire Fighters Department, since it always intervenes in other countries only to “stop fires”—that is, popular military and civilian revolts against the very economic policies which he and B’nai B’rith promote. What is needed, Grossman proposed, is a strong, independent judiciary that can keep the Ibero-American military under civilian control. Grossman is currently a candidate to become a new member of the Inter-American Human Rights Commission of the Organization of American States (OAS)—a candidacy which all of the B’nai B’rith leaders present were urged to support.

Joseph Tulchin of the Woodrow Wilson Center picked up the same theme, with his proposal for an “International Code of Good Behavior,” an idea that he said has surfaced already in discussions at the Group of Seven nations, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the OAS, the United Nations, the World Bank, and others. Such a code of behavior would be binding on all nations, and would provide the cover for U.S. or multilateral intervention against offending countries. In Tulchin’s scheme, the code would pose such questions as: “Is the country redeemable? Does it have good citizens? Can the corrupt act with impunity or is there accountability?”

Cynthia Arnson of Americas Watch liked the idea. In her view, what will determine whether a country is behaving or not is its attitude on human rights. “Only where human rights are respected, can democracy emerge,” Arnson insisted—without explaining how organizations like hers are using the banner of “human rights” to back narco-terrorist insurgencies like Peru’s Shining Path. She praised the fact that the State Department’s U.S. Agency for International Development, which funded a book-length study on how to destroy the Ibero-American military, entitled *The Military and Democracy*, has now become involved in creating an “independent judiciary” by training Ibero-American judges and lawyers.