Report from Bonn by Rainer Apel

Rise of Gore is viewed with alarm

While official Bonn hails the U.S. bombing of Iraq, more sober analysts are distressed at the shift in U.S. policy.

It was already in early August, six weeks before Social Democrat Gerhard Schröder was elected Chancellor, that he assured American leaders in Washington, D.C. of his full support in a new conflict with Iraq. That conflict broke out in December, and Schröder kept his promise, being one of the first international leaders to back the Anglo-American air raids on Iraq. Schröder's Foreign Minister, Joschka Fischer, did the same.

This statement of "loyalty" to a dramatic shift of U.S. foreign policy for the worse, has startled many in Germany, particularly because, unlike the leaders of Britain or France, the German Chancellor had not even been informed by the Americans, before the air strikes were launched. The fact that this German government is unprincipled, that it came to power by opportunism and had no program, has been illustrated in a shocking way by its conduct on the Iraq issue.

Many Germans recall, however, that the Greens, the party of Foreign Minister Fischer, abstained from protesting the Gulf War of George Bush and Margaret Thatcher, eight years ago.

The sell-out of principles has a longer history, therefore, and it is very interesting to note that the rise of Fischer to become Foreign Minister, as the first Green party politician ever to hold such a post, received much applause by American think-tankers in the political orbit of U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and Vice President Al Gore. The cordial reception, particularly by Albright, which Fischer received during his first offi-

cial visit to the United States in early November, was revealing: It tells that the move of the German Greens into the government occurred in the context of the rise of Gore, and that it was orchestrated by the same networks.

Some German think-tankers were quite shocked at the bombing of Iraq in December, because it signalled a very profound shift in U.S. strategic thinking. (As *EIR* documented last week, the bombing was orchestrated by the Gore crowd, while President Clinton was out of the country. See Michele Steinberg, "Iraq Crisis Placed Gore Center-stage," and Joseph Brewda, "How Britain and Israel Set Up the Iraq Trap.")

In a discussion with this author, a senior analyst at the Frankfurt-based Hesse Foundation of Peace and Conflict Research (HSFK) described the American action as in flagrant disregard of international law, and guided by the belief that power, raw power, determines "legality."

It is neither the resistance of the Russians to this "new world order," nor the opposition of China, the new rising power in Asia, that can be held responsible for this American policy shift, the analyst said. The real catalyst is the arrogant notion that the Anglo-American alliance is uncontested as the sole world power. A Western brand of fundamentalism, which treats everybody who does not go along with it as an enemy, is emerging in London and Washington, the analyst said.

The rise of Gore fits in this constellation, the source added. Gore has always cultivated close ties to both the military-industrial complex of the United States, and to Wall Street. In that, Gore is slightly less "conservative" than, for example, Jesse Helms, but he stands for the same basic policy outlook.

Similar assessments were given also by other senior analysts. U.S. policy may get drawn into protracted conflicts in the Persian Gulf, and in Central Asia, analysts here fear, and what some fear most, is that there is no constructive design at all behind this policy shift. The HSFK source pointed at the outright disasters that U.S. policies have created in Central Africa, with the support for Laurent Kabila in the Congo, and with the support for the Taliban extremists in Afghanistan. With every new move and military intervention into conflicts, this kind of policy creates new and bigger conflicts, at the end of which process would be a "new world disorder," the analyst said. Such a future for the world would be almost as threatening as a world war, he said.

The core of the problem, namely, the fact that monetarist elites are desperately trying to save their global system from outright collapse, has been addressed by numerous German banking experts whom this author has talked to. They have noted that over the last 12-15 months, hysteria has more and more dominated official U.S. government responses to "reformist" proposals, like the Japanese or Malaysian ones for an Asian Monetary Fund or a new Bretton Woods conference. The arrogant conduct of Gore at the mid-November Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation conference in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia was "equivalent to a declaration of economic warfare," as one of the experts put it.

The present German government being exposed as a junior partner of Gore's ambitions, means that it is certain to run into deep trouble, on the financial front and in foreign relations.

50 International EIR January 15, 1999