

British move ahead with project to balkanize Canada, United States

by Raynald Rouleau

The author is a reporter for the French newspaper Nouvelle Solidarité.

In our issue of April 27, 1990, *EIR* warned that powerful tendencies were working for the balkanization and breakup of Canada over the short to medium term ahead. We pointed out that Quebec separatism was the most likely detonator for a far-reaching process of secession and chaos. That separatism, we said, is fundamentally not a genuine popular movement, as it might have been during the 1960s, in the epoch of President Charles de Gaulle's "*Vive le Québec libre!*" speech; the new Quebec separatism is a purely artificial phenomenon, promoted by London oligarchs, financiers, and their puppets on the ground such as Jacques Parizeau and Lucien Bouchard. The separatist movement has little to do with the reform of Canada, but everything to do with the destabilization of the United States. In this effort, not just the Québécois separatists, but also Anglophone politicians, Native tribes, and indeed all of Canada, are being treated by the British oligarchy as expendable pawns for the purpose of introducing chaos, strife, and the bacillus of separatism and secessionism into the United States. None of this is a spontaneous sociological phenomenon, although much of it was engineered by sociologists. It simply reflects the fact that British Intelligence would be delighted to bring something resembling Bosnia or Chechnya to the longest unguarded border in the world.

Several recent events have taken place to further this scenario, which show a high degree of coordination, at the highest level of British Intelligence. They range from an investigation by the British House of Lords into what rights Quebecers have to their territory, to a media campaign, to hearings in the U.S. Congress on what Washington should do *after* Quebec secession. Let us look at each of these in turn.

The House of Lords and the CFR

First, a "human rights" group of 200 British parliamentarians and members of the House of Lords wants to know: Can Natives separate from Quebec, if Quebec secedes from Canada? The Canadian and the Quebec governments cooperated

with them, until they found out what the Lords were really up to: studying Canadian constitutional issues, which are not supposed to be their business. Canada's High Commissioner to London was quoted in the Montreal paper *Le Devoir* of Sept. 23, complaining that "these are things that have to be taken care of in Canada, by Canadians." In the same article, Glen Calderwood, a secretary to the British group, is quoted saying: "Canada enjoys a great reputation. But when you take into account the increasing ethnic conflict around the world in the past 10-15 years, it seems that if there isn't a way to remedy certain problems existing in Canada, then, it is useless to even have hope about certain countries like ex-Yugoslavia."

Second, *Foreign Affairs*, the flagship publication of the New York Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), the U.S. affiliate of London's Royal Institute of International Affairs, printed an article in its issue of September/October 1996, calling upon the United States to prepare to accept the pieces of the post-Canada breakup. Author Charles Doran¹ emphasizes that the United States cannot do anything about that "social phenomenon," and therefore should only try to make the best out of an uncontrollable situation. The kicker to the article goes like this: "Although it prefers a united Canada, the United States must prepare a plan for affiliation with Canadian fragments, midway between a treaty and statehood."

Doran writes: "Ever-louder rumblings north of the border should not be dismissed as another Canadian non-event. Potentially, they portend much greater consequences for American interests than many nationalist breakups around the world." He continues: "From the perspective of the United States, the right question is: What would follow separation? . . . The U.S. must . . . draw up plans for a form of supranational affiliation with the remnants of Canada. . . . This new form of affiliation should be aimed midway between the fragility of a treaty and the rigidity of statehood. Political affiliation ought to address the basic needs of people."

1. Charles Doran is the head of Canadian Affairs at Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, ACSUS's birth place.

In other words, Doran says that the United States should not try to stop the British from playing with matches in its attic, and that when the fire starts, Uncle Sam should try to extinguish it, with gasoline.

In tune with the CFR, other British propaganda outlets are beating the drums. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) ran a five-part TV documentary called "Which Border? The Americanization of Canada." According to the CBC's special Internet site on the program: "In an era of vanishing borders and globalization, is Canada becoming 'too American' and losing its national identity in the process?" And the Toronto-based magazine *Macleans* on Sept. 2 wrote that Canadians are being too naive about the "imperial American mind and continuing U.S. expansionism."

Congressional hearings

All of these publicity operations were designed to pave the way for hearings in the U.S. Congress on Sept. 25. The hearings were done as a show for the Canadian public, and to scare the members of Congress, to accept the balkanization of Canada as inevitable. Ninety percent of the audience consisted of Canadian press, government staffers, and related law firms and public relations firms—which includes, of course, all the relevant intelligence agency cut-outs.

This was the first time that the U.S. Congress has officially taken up the issue of the impact of the secession of Quebec on the United States. The hearing gave tremendous legitimacy to Quebec's claim for independence, "having finally got the Americans' attention," as one observer put it.

The meeting was chaired by arch-Conservative Revolutionary Dan Burton (R-Ind.). There were five witnesses: Rep. Tom Campbell (R-Calif.), Joe Jockel², Charles Doran, Earl H. Fry, and Christopher Sands³. The hearing was so staged, that the first witness, Representative Campbell, immediately after testifying, replaced Burton as chairman. In fact, Campbell is said to have been the main organizer of the hearing.

The main issue of concern was what happens to the North American Free Trade Agreement, if Quebec separates. Within this, the financial side of the deal was the real issue. All the witnesses agreed that there will likely be another refer-

endum in Quebec, in the next three to four years, and they also all agreed that the Quebec government's belief that an independent Quebec would achieve "automatic entry into NAFTA" was not going to be accepted by the United States. But the real question is, why would anybody with a balanced mind, want to belong to NAFTA anyway?

The second issue was the question of the economy—particularly, the debt. This issue is central to understand how Britain has played on the U.S. money handlers, pushing Washington to prepare contingency plans. Much of Quebec's paper debt is in American hands, with CS First Boston and Merrill Lynch being the most involved. The question of dividing up the city of Montreal was even discussed; although all the witnesses agreed that it would be an ugly process, the "financial hot-money sharks" of the Harry Bloomfield⁴ circle, would love to have part of Montreal become a "free enterprise zone."

Third was the issue of defense and security. Campbell asked: "Canadian troops assist in NATO operations; will Quebec troops as well? . . . In addition, NORAD may be implicated." But that's a completely bogus argument, for there are no NORAD installations of importance in Quebec, and no early warning systems are based in Quebec. Moreover, U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher, on March 28, 1996, signed a renewed and updated version of the NORAD agreement—so up-to-date, in fact, that there are clauses in the new NORAD agreement that take into account Canada's "environmental concerns." Added to that, the United States signed, on Sept. 19, the Arctic Council Agreement, which includes the territory in question (Nunavut). And as for "Quebec troops' non-participation in NATO," the Pentagon is already more than glad, that Quebec doesn't have troops on the U.S. border.

Fourth was the question of the Atlantic Canada/St. Lawrence Seaway. The argument here is that if Quebec separates, the Canadian Maritime provinces are likely to be left hanging, by the rest of Canada. These provinces are among the poorest, and are receiving a lot of "transfer payments" from Ottawa. These subsidies are likely to dry up in the event of Quebec's secession. The Doomsday scenario pushed by Representative Campbell here is: "America may be presented with a new territory along its northeastern border that includes seriously depressed economies and under-funded welfare agencies. . . . Emigration to the U.S. would likely increase. Perhaps of necessity, strategic alliances detrimental to the United States might also seem alluring to Atlantic Canada, in return for foreign aid from countries not necessarily friendly to the

2. Joseph T. Jockel was in 1994 a visiting professor at the Center of Canadian Studies of Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies; a senior associate at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), Americas Program; he created and directed the "Canada Project," 1992-94. He set up the Congressional Study Group on Canada, a CSIS-CFR front, used by Britain Foreign Office to steer Congress on issues pertaining to Canada. During 1992-93, he was a Fulbright Fellow in War Studies at the Royal Military College of Canada. He has been a CFR fellow in the U.S. Department of State's Office of Canadian Affairs. He was a fellow of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, a NATO research fellow, and a senior fellow in the Government of Canada's Canadian Studies Program.

3. Christopher Sands is the current head of the Canada Project at the CSIS in Washington, D.C.

4. Harry J.F. Bloomfield was in the first row at the Congressional hearings. He is the nephew of the late Louis Mortimer Bloomfield, a lawyer for the Montreal-based Bronfman mob interests whom *EIR* has identified as having been implicated in the assassination of John F. Kennedy. Harry Bloomfield is now the handler of an important operative named Guy Bertrand (see *EIR*, Feb. 2, 1996, p. 45).

United States. The status of these provinces might threaten control of the St. Lawrence Seaway." On the other hand, if these provinces were to join with the United States, they would be a financial burden.

The fifth issue involved the possibility of a period of unrest. Earl Fry, a past-president of the Association of Canadian Studies in the United States (ACSUS), asked a series of questions: "Would Ottawa accept a unilateral declaration [of independence] on the part of Quebec, and if not, would it be prepared to send in military forces? Would Quebec be allowed to separate with its current borders intact? Would native groups remain a part of Canada or Quebec? What would happen to the Anglophone communities in Quebec? . . . Would there be widespread civil strife? Unless terms of separation had been worked out prior to the [next] referendum, a highly unlikely possibility, both Canada and Quebec would be moving into uncharted territory. As soon as the [yes] referendum results were known, the Canadian currency would fall precipitously on international markets. If Canadian currency were to fall below its historic low of 69¢ vis-à-vis the U.S. dollar, and the Bank of Canada's reserves were exhausted in a vain effort to slow this devaluation, Washington might be asked to put together a rescue package which could be more expensive than the controversial package rescuing the Mexican peso in early 1995."

The main underlying assumption being pushed here, is that there is nothing that can be done; that an historical-social cycle is now coming to its inevitable end phase.

It's all bunk! Of course the United States could do something! First, it could simply continue to treat Canada as it did during the Cold War. Up until 1989, the different factions forming the U.S. elite were united in the common goal of a strong national defense. They never second-guessed what kind of policy the United States should have toward Canada. They would support any pro-American movement which developed inside Canada (be it among the population or in the government), and would oppose those which were not. Now, the United States should go one step further, and openly or discreetly say, that Washington would be more than glad to help Canada cure itself of its British parasites.

The U.S. Congress must recognize that the world since the end of the Cold War has been dominated by four big powers: the United States, Russia, China, and the British Empire. In this new world, the greatest antagonism is that of the British toward the United States. International terrorism, world finance, and the problems of Canada cannot be understood apart from this continuing hostility of London toward the United States. The stated policy of the Clinton administration concerning the Canadian crisis is in the right direction, as far as it goes: support for the unity and stability of Canada. To this, must be added vigorous countermeasures against the United Kingdom, which is committing an unfriendly act against the United States by deliberately stirring up violence and secessionism on the territory

of its northern neighbor, with the clear intent of spreading it south.

ACSUS: a British intelligence conduit

These issues were certainly not clarified by the deplorably one-sided array of witnesses invited to the hearing by Representative Burton. All the academic experts are members of the Association of Canadian Studies in the United States. Dr. Jockel is its president, while Dr. Doran and Dr. Fry are past presidents; Sands is an ACSUS member who addressed their 1993 annual conference. ACSUS, in turn, is a branch of a larger international organization called the International Council for Canadian Studies. The patron of ICCS is Queen Elizabeth's hand-picked official representative, H.E. the Rt. Hon. Romeo LeBlanc, governor general of Canada and head of the Queen's Privy Council of Canada. Not only is Queen Elizabeth's representative the patron of ICCS, but one of their annual awards is called "The Governor General International Award."

The American intelligence community may think that ACSUS provides a wonderful, cheap listening post into what's going on in Canada; but that's exactly where the U.K.'s Foreign Office has outsmarted them once again.

ACSUS itself appears to have been set up as part of a broader intelligence agency operation, to control what Americans should or should not know about their neighbor to the north. The national security threat to the United States comes from the fact that the majority of the U.S. college and university professors teaching Canadian studies, are part of this network.

In a word, the so-called "American experts" on Canadian affairs have had their "mental map" drawn by a unit of the psychological warfare division of British Intelligence. That is the purpose of the ACSUS network.

ACSUS is funded by the Canadian government, the Business Fund for Canadian Studies in the United States, the International Council for Canadian Studies, and the William H. Donner Foundation. Its corporate sponsors are Alcan, Ford Motor Company, Great Lakes Gas, and Royal Bank of Canada. The William H. Donner Foundation, in early 1992, sent free of charge to all journalists in the United States, a "guide" to the Canadian balkanization operation. It contains a long list of "experts" on Canadian studies, many of them belonging to ACSUS.

In conclusion, Dr. Doran's article in the CFR's magazine argues for a U.S. policy of "supranational affiliation" with the whirling fragments of post-Canada. This supranational monstrosity is Confederate in form, unworkable, and toxic to U.S. sovereignty. One attempt at a Confederacy here was enough. Americans of all party affiliations are sick and tired of supranationalism. It is time for British Intelligence to stop meddling in U.S.-Canadian affairs. Patriotic American experts need to be heard by the U.S. Congress—not Anglophiles.