

Britain deploys the NGOs to dismantle the nation-state

by Joseph Brewda

The following is excerpted from EIR's upcoming special report on the United Nations.

According to the British establishment's long-term plans, the era of the nation-state will begin to come to an end during the 1990s. In its place, Britain intends to establish a new imperial order, in part run through such supranational institutions as the United Nations. While eliminating the nation-state has been British policy since the American Revolution, the particular plan now being implemented dates back to the years following World War II. This is the plan behind many diverse British strategic operations since that time; for example, the Serbian genocidal war on Croatia and Bosnia, the enforced starvation of Somalia, and the economic conditionalities policies of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which are killing off Ibero-America and Africa, and increasingly devastating eastern Europe.

A major purpose of these operations is to create a series of profound psychological and political shocks which foster what the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, British intelligence's psychological warfare department, terms a "paradigm shift." A paradigm shift occurs when a target population's earlier concept of its identity and the world is abruptly shifted into a planned, differing one. The 1990s, according to the plan, will see the triumph of the imperial paradigm, superseding the old nation-state paradigm.

Here, we bring to the reader's attention some of the Tavistock Institute's thinking on the role of the U.N. non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in effecting this change. We focus on a 1989 conference on this plan, referencing relevant Tavistock writings going back to the 1960s, where the plan, and some of the theories behind the plan, were outlined. To do so requires using some of these operatives' peculiar and often intentionally vague jargon. This has the advantage, however, of making the reader familiar with the typical manner in which such operatives present their thinking, and thereby better equipped to identify such operatives.

Creating the globalist ideology

On Nov. 13-19, 1989, the Program for Social Innovations in Global Management (SIGMA) at Case Western Reserve in Cleveland, Ohio, began a series of conferences on the use of NGOs to end the era of the nation-state. The

decade of the 1990s was identified as the period when this era would begin to end. The theory presented at the conference had been developed by Tavistock, and many of its speakers were among its long-time operatives. The conference drew psychiatrists, sociologists, and political activists from 44 countries.

Conference coordinators Drs. David L. Cooperrider and William Pasmore introduced a series of articles on the conference to *Human Relations* readers by reporting that the powers of the nation-state had to be drastically curbed, if the world were to solve a series of global challenges identified by the United Nations and other organizations.

These alleged challenges, they said, include unbridled population growth, depletion of natural resources, global warming, tropical deforestation, loss of species diversity, chronic hunger and malnutrition, injustice and violation of human rights, increases in terrorism and communal violence, and the ever-present potential for nuclear holocaust.

Referencing the then-recent collapse of the Berlin Wall and transformation of eastern Europe, the authors reported that the world was facing the threat, but also the opportunity, of being at a point of "encounter" between the limitations of mankind's past and the potentialities of mankind's future.

To overcome these alleged limitations, they said, requires the widespread growth of "global consciousness." This they define as the task of the social sciences. SIGMA, they reported, with the aid of the United Nations University, the International Social Science Council, and the International Federation of Institutes of Advanced Study, has concluded that the NGOs are best suited to foster this growth.

There exist thousands of transnational organizations which have emerged since World War II, they note, which are capable of meeting this "global challenge." These NGOs "represent a unique social invention of the post-modern, post-industrial, information-rich and service-focused, globally linked world system." The authors caution against idealizing the NGOs, but add that although the idea of such an organization is only a century old, it is "one of the most striking phenomena of the twentieth century." They report that there are now over 20,000 transnational non-governmental organizations listed in various U.N. or associated compilations.

What is essential about these organizations is that they cut across national boundaries, since they exist as entities

beyond the nation-state.

The NGOs' operations, they gloat, in their peculiar jargon, have led to the "current transnationalization of world affairs whereby the international relations of the nation-state system have been superseded or supplemented by non-territorial relations among private individuals, groups, and organizations, and the emergence of new forms of organization and management that illuminate the pathways by which peoples of the world may enlarge their spheres of cooperation in the service of sustainable global well-being."

The 1990s as an 'Axial age'

Elise Boulding, Dartmouth professor and a long-time activist with U.N. organizations, informed the conference that the 1990s would be a period of the greatest social transformation since the thirteenth century. The NGOs will steer this radical transformation, she said. The wife of prominent Club of Rome economist Kenneth Boulding and a popularizer of Tavistock conceptions, Boulding identified the current period as an "Axial age."

Axial ages, Boulding reports, are periods when peoples, ideas, and cultural traditions from widely different regions come together in a "great flowering of human creativity." The great task of the 1990s, made possible by the coming Axial age, is to foster "transnationalism," which is the awareness that human identities must cross national borders, and "current state-centered nationalisms" be rejected.

Boulding posits the first Axial age as having occurred around 12,000 B.C., when man made the transition from the putative hunting and gathering existence to settled agriculture. The first documented Axial age was the formation of central empires in Africa, the Mediterranean, Egypt, and Sumer, about 3,000 B.C. She describes the period of 500 B.C. to 500 A.D. as the next Axial age, when small bands of Zoroastrian, Buddhist, Jainist, and later Christian and Muslim holy men carried the message that there was a cosmic order of which the earth was a mirror. Unfortunately, she says, their "networking" had few concrete referents.

The next Axial age was in the 1200s, when "the great nomadic empires of Genghis Khan and Kubla Khan were reorganizing the social face of Asia," and learning was advancing in Europe.

Alas, she says—ignoring the Italian Renaissance—Europe then turned its back on the process begun in the 1200s. How? Through its policy of Christian evangelization, especially linked to exploration. "These explorations followed a pattern of domination and exploitation that violated an important principle of axialism—symmetric interaction." As a result, she says, "Europe, for all its expansion of frontiers, had been slow to move toward radically new domains of the future."

Fortunately, she says, new forms of universalism developed in England. Boulding points to the "promising" role played by Quakers, the Brethren, Mennonite, and other

"peace churches," who began building international networks based on world brotherhood, made possible by the fact that the earlier Axial age had eradicated the "existing institutional church-state complex." Later, in 1780, the English Enlightenment philosopher Jeremy Bentham coined the word "international" to apply to the law of nations, wherein, she says, one finds the origin of the concept of "world citizen." This concept developed further with the first World's Fair in London in 1851, followed by Paris (1855, 1867, and 1900), and Chicago in 1893.

This "flowering" led to the rise of the "international civil society" as contrasted to the "international society." It also led to the formation of the first non-governmental organization. Beginning with 200 NGOs at the turn of the century, there were 18,000 by 1980. "Future oriented, their members highly mobile and highly interactive, NGOs fulfill the triad of conditions for contributing to an Axial age," Boulding exults. A new Axial age, she proclaims, one last experienced during the days of Genghis Khan, will characterize the 1990s, but this time the NGOs will be the instrument of change leading to a global civilization.

The first global civilization

Howard Perlmutter, a professor of "Social Architecture" at the Wharton School and the de facto head of the Tavistock Institute in the United States, reported on how this global civilization could be built. Perlmutter is a protégé of the now retired Eric Trist, a long-time leading official of Tavistock, who later emigrated to the U.S. to hold the post at the Wharton School now held by Perlmutter.

Perlmutter reports that "the central thesis of our recent work has been that we are seeing a paradigm shift in the social architecture of societal institutions around the world . . . which have as both a cause and consequence the building of the planet's first global civilization." Perlmutter had previously studied this phenomenon as far back as the 1950s, when he was advising multinational corporations on how to expand throughout the world. More recently, he led a Tavistock team that studied the mechanisms through which Europe and the U.S. could block advanced western technology from spreading uncontrollably to the Third World.

Perlmutter cautions that the notion of a global civilization based on an ethnocentric universalism, as advocated by British intelligence official and historian Arnold Toynbee, where one group such as Europe seeks to become hegemonic, has become discredited. Hence, control must only be exerted covertly, he indicates. An early British imperialist notion relating to this concept was "indirect rule," the method by which, for example, Britain ruled India using Maharaja frontmen.

Consequently, by the first global civilization, Perlmutter claims to mean a new "world order with shared values, processes, and structures, whereby nations and cultures become more open to influence by each other." In this civilization,

which entails a new paradigm, there is also a recognition of the identities and diversities of peoples. Peoples of different ideologies and values both cooperate and compete, but no ideology prevails over all the others, he states.

The main characteristic of this period, Perlmutter reports, is that there will be a paradigm shift from what Trist and he have termed the Industrial Model (Paradigm I), to the Symbiotic and Societal Model (Paradigm S), via the De-Industrial Model (Paradigm D). That is, the disintegration of Paradigm I under the attack of social forces defined by

Britain offers mankind the choice of either Euro-American-imposed IMF genocide or mass-death through spreading xenophobic wars. Moreover, by orchestrating conflict between the advanced and former colonial sector, Britain intends to create a new global system eradicating what is positive about both.

Paradigm D will eventually lead to a new integration, Paradigm S. Paradigm S is the paradigm of the new world order. Paradigm D is the paradigm of the NGOs.

The Industrial Model, Paradigm I, has, as its main characteristics, the following defined values: efficiency rather than people, short-term profits without concern for consequences; secondary concern with the environment; competition rather than cooperation; and ethnocentrism.

Paradigm I is based on a set of underlying values, a logic, in which dominance and dependency are a central preoccupation in societal and intersocietal relations.

The De-Industrialization Model, Paradigm D, has the following characteristic values: greening, feminism, "small is beautiful," intuitive thinking, concern with species extinction, and doubt over the sustainability of industrialization.

Paradigm D is characterized by the idea of limits. A society based on such an underlying logic would be a world become an "archipelago of largely self-contained relatively small communities," at least in intent.

One version of Paradigm D is arcadian. Another version is spiritual. Mao Zedong and the nineteenth-century Russian anarchist Nikolai Bakunin are typical leaders of arcadian movements; Mahatma Gandhi is a typical leader of the spiritual movement, according to Perlmutter. These are the two main versions of the paradigms defining the NGOs currently, Perlmutter reports, but adds that under conditions of econom-

ic breakdown, new variants of both will emerge.

The Symbiotic and Societal Model, Paradigm S, seeks to balance the values of the two previous, clashing paradigms. There is concern for results but also consequences, a global but also a local orientation to problems, concern for both people and efficiency, the use of technology but a concern for the environment, the balancing of autonomy and independence.

Hence, the hoped-for Paradigm S will triumphantly emerge.

Perlmutter claims that neither Paradigm I nor Paradigm D can be a viable basis for a global civilization, since the continuation of the first may lead to human extinction, while the second might lead to a utopian retreat from the real world.

Here are some contrasting characteristic values of the three paradigms.

I. Western science, technology as source of knowledge;

D. Eastern truths as enduring and source of perennial wisdom;

S. Global complementarities of knowledge, wisdom, spiritual insights along with differences;

I. Western medicine;

D. Eastern medicine, e.g. herbal remedies;

S. Different scientific approaches produce breakthroughs.

Here it is apparent that this manipulated conflict of "I" and "D" is simply an imperial effort to block what is positive in the West from radiating into the former colonial sector. There is another series of sets of contrasting values, where the purpose of the manipulated conflict is quite different. For example:

I. Western style of capitalism as a model, with shock therapy advocated;

D. Rejection of pure capitalism; importance of agriculture makes industrialism less relevant for high debt countries;

S. Elements of free market accepted widely with wide variety of safety net ideas.

Here the intent is to force the Third World to accept modified forms of colonial rule, made palpable through a process of conflict and compromise. The process is analogous to the process by which a trade union leader's will is broken by brutal negotiations, and he feels lucky to find an apparently slightly better alternative to the worst proposal of the employer. In the above case, the alternatives all ultimately destroy the nation.

Perlmutter forecasts the following scenario:

European and American efforts to impose "homogenized westernization," the universalization of Paradigm I, lead to such developments as video-rock in Nepal and the imposition of shock therapy on eastern Europe. This, in turn, provokes counter-reactions from peoples resistant to such developments. These counter-reactions, however, are characterized by a "xenophobic reaction to increasing interdependence in all the areas," somewhat masked by an affirmation of histori-

cal legacies and cultural identities. This counter-reaction then becomes the source of reviving old ethnic and religious rivalries, which, Perlmutter gloats, are now becoming deadly hostilities.

The universalization of such a counter-reaction would constitute the victory of Paradigm D. So, one is left with the choice of western-imposed shock therapy and trash-culture, or mass-death through the rise of irrational social movements.

Eventually, the universalization of Paradigm D could lead to the fragmentation of humankind. As an example of this, Perlmutter projects a "nuclear confrontation between western countries and fundamentalist Islam in the twenty-first century." The British effort to create such a confrontation is now evident. Perlmutter warns that this fragmentation could also lead to many peoples being held hostage to psychopathic or messianic leaders who are determined to convert the rest of humankind.

The alternative to this scenario is the hegemony of Paradigm S, he claims, since the first two paradigms cannot be universalized without dire results.

In other words, Britain offers mankind the choice of either Euro-American-imposed IMF genocide or mass-death through spreading xenophobic wars. Moreover, by orchestrating conflict between the advanced and former colonial sector, Britain intends to create a new global system eradicating what is positive about both. This is the task of social science in the present period. . . .

Shifting the world into Paradigm S, from its present Paradigm I, has several requirements, Perlmutter reports. One is building internationally committed networks of international and locally committed organizations, that is, the NGOs. Another is creating global events. What are these global events? Perlmutter compares them with terrifying initiation rituals of primitive societies. He approvingly quotes the British historian (and *Praxis* board member) E. P. Thompson:

"And so the transition from civilization to planetization, from a materialistic industrial society based on production and consumption to a contemplative culture based upon consciousness and ecological symbiosis, is an initiation experience for the human race. The demons we see outside us in the forms of nuclear war, famine, and ecological catastrophes are the terrifying images that accompany the shift from one level of reality to another. Because of the limitations of our egos we cannot realize that we are all part of one single planetary life unless we discover to our horror that we are now threatened by one single planetary death." . . .

The NGO role in the turbulent environment

Writing in 1986, Perlmutter and Trist confirm [Tavistock theorist Fred] Emery's assessment that during the last 20 years "a deep change has been taking place in the world environment." "The salience of the disturbed-reactive environment," which they say characterized the period from the

immediate postwar years through the 1960s, has been "giving way to the salience of the turbulent environment."

This transformation of the environment means that the "institutional forms and modes of adaptation" that came into existence in relation to an earlier environment, have become dysfunctional. "Response capabilities that can absorb and eventually reduce turbulence will develop only if humankind succeeds in building a set of major social institutions based on premises, values and beliefs radically different from those that underpin our present institutions." The authors report that "to raise institution building to a new level of consciousness is a primary task of the present era," which they define as "social architecture."

In respect to the paradigm shift under way, they note that until recently the notion that there were no limits to growth was hegemonic, an essential underlying belief of Paradigm I. Such developments as the 1973 oil shock, however, began to expose the "falsity" of that belief, and thus undermine the paradigm.

They note that the alternative of industrialism envisioned by Paradigm D thinkers, the philosophy of the NGO, is characterized by the notion of limit. Consequently, Paradigm D thinkers seek to transform "nation-states" into "an archipelago of small communities." "The superpowers and former 'great powers' would dissolve into regional groupings with distinct linguistic and cultural identities," according to the objectives of organizations which hold such views. Moreover, "complex technology would be avoided" as "inherently elitist."

The authors strongly emphasize that Paradigm D thinking cannot ultimately replace Paradigm I thinking, since some of its values are undesirable and others unfeasible.

They further report that social science must intervene: "The degree of suffering that will occur if one waits for the collapse of [Paradigm] I to begin before attempting proactive social architectural intervention by all relevant means and through all access routes is too great to be acceptable."

Thus Tavistock poses Paradigm S thinking as the only acceptable alternative to the discredited Paradigm I thinking, while avoiding the impractical, or not yet obtainable, society envisioned by utopian NGOs proposing Paradigm D.

Through the intervention of social science, Paradigm S, which provides a soft alternative to Paradigm D, is made acceptable. An example of this alternative:

"In addition to blind unregulated growth [I] or no growth [D], there is the policy of selective regulated growth [S], which can harmonize the need for growth with the requirements of the environment.

"Nation-states would remain, but their sovereignty would be limited. Some powers would be transferred to larger, others to smaller, units."

The acceptance of such a "compromise" by nations faced with, on the one hand, the IMF and new world order, and on the other hand rampaging NGOs and spreading wars, constitutes the victory of British intelligence's "social architecture."