
Book Reviews

Advocating genocide and enjoying every minute of it

by Mark Burdman

The Real World Order: Zones of Peace, Zones of Turmoil

by Max Singer and Aaron Wildavsky
Chatham House Publishers, Chatham, N.J., 1993
212 pages, paperbound, \$16.95

Do you want to feel good about the perspective that nearly 90% of the world's population, outside of the United States and Europe, will find itself in chaos, with untold millions dying from famines, epidemics, and wars over the next decades? Does the prospect of large-scale genocide make you happy? Then *The Real World Order: Zones of Peace, Zones of Turmoil*, by Max Singer and Aaron Wildavsky, is just the book for you.

The Real World Order is the most blatant expression of a strategy that might best be called "geopolitical triage," in which the perspective of writing off large numbers of non-white peoples of the world is welcomed as the basis for the geopolitics of the West. Certainly, in the past decades, an attitude favoring the triage of Third World nations has predominated in such institutions as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and in malthusian-ecologist groups such as the Club of Rome and World Wildlife Fund (World Wide Fund for Nature), but triage was not so openly and triumphantly proclaimed as the basis for global strategy. Now that the accumulated effects of malthusian policies have driven large parts of the world into collapse, types like Singer, a co-founder of the Hudson Institute, and Wildavsky, a well-connected strategist who taught at the University of California at Berkeley until his recent death, step forward to celebrate the consequences. *The Real World Order* brings together crude American pragmatism, a utopian "democracy and free markets" triumphalism, and a social Darwinist survival-of-the-fittest ideology, all into one morally insane package.

As repulsive as the world view of Singer and Wildavsky may be, the book is required reading to understand a growing trend among "new world order" ideologues. The book re-

ceived significant publicity in the English-language press in Europe during September-October, with commentators portraying it as either a harbinger of emerging American policy or an expression of what Washington's policy has already become. Certain knowledgeable Europeans fret that policies favoring the elimination of large parts of the non-white world will gain ground quickly in the United States, under conditions of growing economic and social crisis.

Millions will die unnecessarily

The "key to understanding" the world, according to Singer and Wildavsky, is to separate it into "two parts" that are strictly divisible, one from the other. The first are the "zones of peace, wealth, and democracy," comprised of North America, western Europe, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and maybe a few smaller countries around the world. In these "zones," which represent less than 15% of the world's population, are concentrated the vast majority of its power and wealth.

Contrasted to these, are the zones of "turmoil, war and development," with the emphasis on "turmoil and war" for at least the next one or two centuries. They write: "There is distressing disorder in the six-sevenths of the world that is not yet wealthy and democratic. Neither we nor anyone else is going to make that part of the world stable or peaceful in the next few decades. Millions of people will die unnecessarily in the next century—from starvation and disease, from war, and from government murder—and we cannot stop these horrors from happening. . . . The fundamental conditions that now exist in the zones of turmoil, as well as the lessons of history, make it clear that these zones will be the scenes of wars and revolutions, and of mass murders, famines, and epidemics caused by governments or by wars. Stability would be an impossibility. The modern media will give us a front-row seat at one scene after another of devastation and death."

We need not fret over this, they advise, since, after one or two centuries, these "adolescent" regions will grow up, and experience "development" like the lucky 13% has done. But the more fundamental "strategic" point in all this, is that "nothing that happens in the zones of turmoil will threaten

the existence of vital interests of the countries of the zones of peace." In other words, what happens in such giants as China, India, South Africa, Russia, etc. is essentially irrelevant to the peace and well-being of the 13% or so that have "made it"!

U.S.-based writer Richard Reeves captured this mood in his review in the Sept. 24 *International Herald Tribune*. Reeves praised the authors' "optimistic" differentiation between the "zones of peace" and the "zones of turmoil," the latter described as "everyplace else, the 85% of world population living in Sarajevo, Mogadishu, and other miserable places," which will undergo "decades of slaughter and famine."

By normal standards, such a vision of the world would horrify anybody with even a shred of Judeo-Christian morality, or would provoke speculation that its authors had been released from an insane asylum that was cutting its budget. To any halfway-sane person, the perspective that as we approach the year 2000 the vast majority of the world is going to hell, would signify the absolute failure of the "global system." But this is not what Singer and Wildavsky think. For them, such a situation is "profound good news" (their words), a cause for exultation. We live in a "historically unprecedented situation"; the only problem is a subjective one, that Americans don't really know how wonderful things are, and are susceptible to being led around by disciples of gloom and advocates of radical change. They write: "We have been given a Cadillac and are drowning in moans about the fullness of the ashtray and the need to buy gas."

As indicated by this last sentence, the authors' arguments are advanced with the worst kind of venality. The "democratic world," they write, "has most of the money," in a world in which "most politics follows the money." They betray an absolute ignorance of the laws of economics, in explaining why "peace in the zones of democracy is compatible with war in the zones of turmoil": "Modern economics has reduced the economic importance to the great democracies of the outcome of conflicts in the zones of turmoil. Our prosperity depends on our productivity, not on what happens in the zones of turmoil. So much of the world's money is in the zones of peace that it is not worth fighting over what is in the zones of turmoil."

This mood extends to their view of Russia. They disagree with those whom they call "traditional internationalists," such as former National Security Agency head Gen. William Odom and foreign policy influential Eugene Rostow, who fear the grave potential threat to the West represented by a resurgent Russian Empire. According to Singer and Wildavsky, Russia is nothing to worry about. It will become "weak and unimportant," as it descends into internal disorder and collapse. "We do not have to be afraid of Russia. . . . Nor need we treat Russia as a great power." In fact, they advise holding Russia responsible for the crimes of the Bolsheviks, denying Russia and other former Soviet republics the right to possess nuclear weapons by subjecting them to the "Iraq treatment," and, even possibly having the United States oc-

cupy Russia to "impose democracy" on it, as in postwar Germany and Japan: the kind of utopianism that is the perfect way to drive the world toward a new general war!

The same cretinism extends, at least implicitly, to the war in former Yugoslavia. Chew over this morsel: "The World War I model—of small disputes outside the main arena leading to big wars between the central powers—is unlikely to apply in the future. Conflict between England and Germany in their former colonial areas will not lead England and Germany to go to war, any more than bitter conflict between their soccer teams will."

In reality, there are not "zones of turmoil" because of the "lessons of history," but because of a conscious policy by British-centered geopoliticians, working through such organizations as the Club of Rome, IMF, and the World Wildlife Fund, to destroy the social and economic fabric of whole nations. The apparent relative success of the United States and other countries is, in significant part, due to the successful looting of the Third World over the past two decades. In many cases, this process of deconstruction has been aided by destabilizations carried out by the Anglo-American intelligence services. The case of the Iran-Iraq War, when every major western power poured weapons into the mutual slaughter of hundreds of thousands of people, is exemplary. Following that 10-year conflagration, the new world order crowd exploited the circumstances of the Persian Gulf war to drive a once prosperous Iraqi nation toward Stone Age-level conditions, through U.N. sanctions.

Singer and Wildavsky, of course, are not just covering up for these facts. They are the lying propaganda whores for such institutions as the IMF. They glibly write, at one point, that a primary argument for imposing "democracy" on countries is to create a legal system that "makes the collection of debts possible."

Continuous war and unrest

In the United States, their book fits into the most radical wing of the "Project Democracy" spectrum. The authors heap praise on the National Endowment for Democracy, Freedom House, the late Friedrich von Hayek, and Michael Novak, who attempts to unite savage liberal economics with Catholic theology, and they agree with the utopian thesis that we have reached the "end of history now that liberal democracy has triumphed" of former State Department official Francis Fukuyama. They propose the reform of the United Nations, to have it be controlled by a "U.N. Democratic Caucus," that would, via a weighted voting system, be run primarily by the United States. Their work is complementary to that of Harvard University's Samuel Huntington, chief propagandist for the Trilateral Commission and New York Council on Foreign Relations. In the Summer 1993 issue of the CFR's *Foreign Affairs*, Huntington put forward the thesis that the United States should mobilize for a "war of civilizations" during the coming years, in which "the West" will be pitted against "the rest."

The danger posed by the combination of Singer, Wildavsky, and Huntington is that, under conditions of foreign policy chaos of the Clinton administration, such lunatic ideas could step into the void and define the policy of Washington. Both the German *Welt am Sonntag* on Nov. 28, and U.S. commentator William Pfaff, in the Nov. 4 *International Herald Tribune*, have written that Huntington might emerge as the “Mr. X” of the 1990s, a reference to the late-1940s pseudonym used by George Kennan in elaborating his strategy of “containment” of the Soviet Union, which became the basis for American global strategy at that time. Pfaff warned that Huntington’s strategy could lead to “something like racial war” of a Hitlerian type. (Underscoring the bizarre state of mind of strategists today, Pfaff had earlier, on Oct. 9, welcomed the Singer-Wildavsky book as a “realistic” alternative to the “desiccated Wilsonian . . . idealistic and sentimental view of history” of the Clinton administration, adding that “what happens in China, Iran, or South Africa is marginal to what happens in North America, western Europe and Japan.”)

Senior London *Guardian* commentator Martin Woollacott wrote Sept. 29 that Singer-Wildavsky exemplify a “new mood,” which was somehow the real inner message of President Bill Clinton’s U.N. General Assembly speech, with his theme of pulling the United States back from a wider role in U.N. “peacekeeping” actions. Woollacott wrote that the Singer-Wildavsky thesis “has obviously struck a chord in America. The notion is simply that the rich world will carry on as a comparatively pleasant place to live, free of major violence, while the other 60 or 70% of the globe will—is already—descending into a brutish state of continuous war and unrest.” The attitude should be to “do nothing” about these “zones of turmoil.”

In Europe, the book should be compared and contrasted with the book of Jean-Christophe Rufin, *L’Empire et les Nouveaux Barbares: Rupture Nord-Sud*, (see *EIR*, Nov. 26). Rufin describes how, in the “post-Cold War” period, there is a tendency toward reviving the Roman imperial idea of the “Limes,” the defense walls which separated the “empire” from the “barbarians.” Now, in the 1990s, that conception is being re-created, to separate the North from the South, large parts of which are written off, where chaos reigns. However, Rufin, former director of the Doctors without Borders, does display a certain kind of conscience and regret about what he is describing, even if he stoically and cynically portrays such a world system as inevitable and irreversible.

A warning from Edgar Allan Poe

In the real world, nothing like what Singer and Wildavsky describe will ever come to pass. While the descent of large parts of the world into hell is likely under current policy, there is no way that North America and western Europe will emerge unscathed from the devastating consequences of this. Edgar Allan Poe’s “Masque of the Red Death” would be a useful way to understand this. What could be more absurd

than to believe that epidemics will take their toll in defined “zones of turmoil,” and stop at the geographical points defined by Singer and Wildavsky? Have they signed a contract with the AIDS virus to this effect?

There is also the impossibility that the moral decay caused by sitting in one’s “front-row seat” and watching genocide will not corrode and destroy the “spectator” as well. Ancient Rome, where spectators cheered as Christians were eaten by lions, was morally destroyed from the inside. In the United States, violence is *already* endemic in many places, where yuppie strategists like Singer and Wildavsky would never dare to tread. Indeed, responsible observers, such as the liberal Arthur Schlesinger who would ordinarily disagree with Lyndon LaRouche on most points, have echoed LaRouche’s warning that the nation is on a course toward disintegration.

Singer and Wildavsky represent that faction of the U.S. policy establishment which hopes to channel the moral rotteness of significant segments of the American population into an overt fascism, with the idea that eliminating large numbers of people were to seem enjoyable. That probably explains, at least in part, why they exclude discussion of the reality of violence and unrest within the United States. Undoubtedly, they and their co-thinkers hope to turn this fascistic attitude against the “zones of turmoil” within the United States and to have the unruly ghettos “dealt with,” so that the peace of the graveyard can reign supreme. That kind of game is very dangerous, and will, sooner or later, become a “Harlow’s monkey,” destroying its architects.

The authors ultimately resort to threats against the bearers of bad news: The main problem, they say, is Americans “choosing to ignore the good news.” And then follows the threat: “Feelings of American guilt and failure, perceptions of crisis and impending disaster, are such misunderstandings of the world that they *stand in the way* of effective programs to make the world better. Since there is good reason to believe that current trends will bring wealth, peace and democracy within a century or two, there is a lot to lose. We need to understand the process now working, to make sure that we do not make radical changes that interrupt it. . . . Those who seek radical change insist that things are getting worse and deny that there will be any progress at all unless their radical remedies are used. . . . It is prudent to *beware of those* who deny the virtues and prospects of the system that have brought wealth, democracy and peace to our one-seventh of the world and that seem likely to bring those blessings to much more of the world in the next century.”

In these contorted words, one hears the voice of that Anglo-American new world order faction which has demanded the incarceration of Lyndon LaRouche, who has committed what Singer and Wildavsky would undoubtedly perceive as the greatest “crime”—which might interfere with their plans—questioning the axioms of the “new world order,” or, in other words, telling the truth.