

The Multiple Personalities of Italy's Premier Giuliano Amato

by Claudio Celani

The current phase of European politics, characterized by the French initiative for "strengthened cooperation," has unleashed in Rome the perennial debate, on whether Italy should support a continental policy based on the German-French axis, or whether the interests of the country are not better served by pursuing a "balance of power" strategy, which means, in this case, allying with Great Britain to prevent a Franco-German bloc from being cemented. The fact that the real aim of the French initiative (to regain some national sovereignty) is not openly and clearly stated, and is disguised under the usual formulas of European integration, does not make it easier for Italians to make a choice in a dilemma which, in its modern version, is at least as old as the Italian nation itself.

One definite problem in Italian politics is the "exclusion syndrome," a corruption of the national character constantly fed by the mass media for manipulative purposes. Instead of conceiving of themselves as a nation which has all the means necessary to pursue its mission to develop the world, and need ask no one for an invitation, Italians tend to fall prey to discomfort each time somebody threatens to leave Italy out of the "Club," be it the G-7, the UN Security Council, or the Euroclub. Playing on such a beggar's mentality, British geopolitics has regularly portrayed the Franco-German axis as a potential exclusion threat.

Thus, it was more than a positive surprise when Foreign Minister Lamberto Dini, shortly after French President Jacques Chirac had announced a policy shift, enthusiastically endorsed the renewed Franco-German axis. Chirac indicated that members of the euro currency bloc control European Monetary System policy, over and above non-EMS members of the European Union, meaning especially Britain. Speaking at the Hanover Expo on July 1, Dini explained that Italy is "on the same wave length with France and Germany," and therefore the three countries are "in favor of a strengthened cooperation." In a clear reference to Britain, Dini said that "the founding members of the European Union cannot be blocked by those who do not want to, or cannot keep pace." Such a prompt reaction meant only one thing: The Italians had been previously informed of, or had even taken an active part in, the plot to kick Great Britain out of continental European affairs.

It was to be expected, however, that London would mobilize all its assets to get Italy to switch sides. Great Britain had already demonstrated that it has the Spanish government in its pocket; if they succeeded in pulling Italy onto their side, the British would have worked continental Europe on its flanks, as usual. The frontal attack would then follow.

Thus, the British operation was started by deploying all of its Italian assets, starting with European Union (EU) Commissioner Mario Monti, followed by EU Chairman Romano Prodi, who both called on the Italian government to oppose the French-German alignment.

The last to enter the field was Italian Prime Minister Giuliano Amato, the man whom the London *Financial Times* described as "the most anglophile Italian politician." When Amato explained his views on the matter, it was clear that he and Dini were on opposite tacks. From that moment, the role of Italy in the current "battle for Europe" has become a question mark, depending on which policy will prevail, Dini's (the national elites) or Amato's (the international oligarchy).

Giuliano the Anarchist

Worse than the '68 generation, is the generation of the '68 teachers. Such is Giuliano Amato, one of the many technocrats who have recently become prime minister without being beholden to a constituency. Amato was chosen as an "anti-parties" prime minister in 1992, when he made sure that the attack against the Italian currency, the lira, planned on board the British royal yacht *Britannia* and eventually unleashed by the British-directed global speculator George Soros, would meet no serious reactions (on those events, there is still an investigation in Naples, opened after a legal brief submitted by the LaRouche movement). After the lira crisis of the summer of 1992, Amato implemented the largest austerity package ever seen in Rome since the times of Diocletian.

In April 2000, Amato was again appointed prime minister by President Carlo Azeglio Ciampi (who, in the summer of 1992, was Amato's pal at the Central Bank), as a result of a palace coup against Massimo D'Alema. It was clear that, with Amato, the international oligarchy again had their man in the driver's seat.

Amato revealed his intentions in an astonishingly candid interview given to the daily *La Stampa* on July 12. He con-



must act ‘as if,’ in Europe, . . . as if states remained sovereign, to convince them to no longer be sovereign. The Brussels [European Union] Commission, for instance, must act as if it were a technical body, in order to operate like a government. And so on, dissimulating and leaving things unsaid. Amato . . . let it be understood that this is a tactic the better to enter through the [narrow door]. The narrow door is the December conference in Nice. . . . Until that day, one must act ‘as if.’ . . . Amato, in reality, envisages an evolving world, abstracted from the balance of power still prevailing in the West: He envisages a world he calls post-Hobbesian, post-sovereign, without hierarchies. He seemed enthralled by this mental speculation, so much so that he became a prisoner of it. Hence, his criticism of the Federalists, who still believe that the United States of Europe will be born of a transfer from the old sovereignties to a superior, supranational sovereignty. According to Amato . . . the sovereignty lost on a national level does not go to any new subject. It is given to faceless entities: NATO, the UN, at last the [European] Union. The Union is in the vanguard in the evolving world: It points to a future of princes without sovereignty. In this sense, it supersedes the United States itself, which is bound to the old idea of the prince. . . . The new one is headless, and the driver is neither catchable, nor electable.”

“The truth is,” Amato says, “that sovereign power, by changing, evaporates. Powers are moved to higher levels, without these lev-

els taking on sovereignty, and therefore I speak about changing functions and not powers.”

In reality, sovereignty, like power, does not disappear. What Amato does not say is that power will be “privatized” in the hands of the oligarchy, which will pull the strings of the “higher levels.” In this picture, citizens’ rights will be also privatized.

Amato goes on: “What is taking shape, and the European Union prefigures that perfectly, is a new post-Hobbesian, post-state order. . . . Today, nobody is sovereign any longer . . . [as in] the classic state expressed by princes with exclusive powers. Such powers today become dispersed, without, however, giving life to a new sovereign figure, as the Federalists thought.”

Being a radical positivist, Amato believes, or speaks “as if” he believed, that the modern nation-state was born with Hobbes. What he means really, is a “post-Leibniz” world. He also lies when, later on, he adds, “This is how Europe was built.” In reality, the original European Common Market was

fessed that he wants to sabotage anything opposed to what he believes to be the inevitable transfer of power away from the sovereign nation-state—not in favor of a supranational European institution, but in favor of a state of anarchy! He called it a “post-Hobbesian world,” or better, a “medieval” world.

Anybody who thinks that Lyndon LaRouche exaggerates, when he accuses the international oligarchy of planning to go back to the Middle Ages, where 90% of the human population is thrown back into the condition of animals, should carefully read what the current Prime Minister of Italy, a former head of the Aspen Institute, says.

It may be to the credit of the interviewer, Barbara Spinelli, that Amato’s thoughts came out of the closet. Spinelli believes in the utopia of a supranational European government, and is provoked when Amato bluntly replies that this will never come into being. “The Italian Premier,” she writes, “indicates that projects can be ambitious, but in order to overcome the political obstacles, one must hide, dissimulate them. You

built as a community of nations, and only afterwards, was the European idea subverted by a supranational conspiracy. The method of the conspiracy, however, is accurately described by Amato: "By creating community bodies, such that these bodies, where they overlapped with states, gave the impression that they were imposed a higher power. The Court of Justice as a supranational body was born in this way." In the same way, Amato suggests that the European Commission must act "as if" it were a technical body, but should enforce policy. By saying this, Amato reveals that he is in reality against the French proposals *in toto*.

Mother England

"Frankly, I do not want a continental Europe only, without the immense patrimony of England, and of the Scandinavians linked to England. Nor would I like to lose Spain, which is skeptical of the vanguard. . . . To have England among us would not be bad: In many ways, London is already where we would like to be. It would not be bad if England [which is not part of the euro bloc], with its experience of economic reforms, were present in the Council of States belonging to the euro. . . . Therefore I prefer to go slowly, to crumble little by little pieces of sovereignty, avoiding sudden shifts from national to federal powers. . . . I do not believe in a federal sovereign, because our globalized universe is post-Hobbesian."

Amato's profession of anarchy is evidently too much for the interviewer, who challenges him: "The world you describe seems to be pre-Hobbesian. It seems to precede the nation-state."

"And why not going back the period before Hobbes?" replies Amato. "The Middle Ages had a much richer humanity, and a diversity of identity which today can be a model. The Middle Ages is beautiful: It can have its policymaking centers, without relying entirely on anyone. It is beyond the bounds of the nation-state. Today, as then, nomads are reappearing in our societies. Today, also, we have powers without territories. . . . Without sovereignties, we will not have totalitarianism. Democracy does not need a sovereign."

Amato is campaigning for a return to feudalism, which is the true word for his system. In his clinical insanity, he calls "beautiful" a system which was characterized by the enslavement of most of the population, by the absence of individual rights and a system of justice, and by short life expectancies. But, he is accurate when he says that we are in a transition to that system. The Black Death is again there, already threatening to eliminate one-third of the African population as a sacrifice to keep the international financial system alive. Maybe Amato thinks that by reducing world population, there will be more wealth for the oligarchy, their money managers, and for himself. That is what he calls a "richer humanity."

In Memoriam

Brazil's Barbosa Lima Sobrinho, a Bridge to the American System

by Silvia Palacios

By the grace of God, the famous and beloved Brazilian patriot Alexandre José Barbosa Lima Sobrinho lived for 103 years. Although he died before his final dream could be realized—the return of the Companhia Vale do Rio Doce mining conglomerate to state control—his legacy, properly appreciated, guarantees not only that Vale do Rio Doce's privatization, but also that the entire process of globalization which has kept the productive capabilities of this wounded South American giant in agony, will be annulled, and that Brazil will fulfill its mission as an industrial power.

Barbosa Lima passed away on July 16. He will be remembered not only as a patriot and defender of Brazil's sovereignty and development, but also as Brazil's 20th-century

representative of the intellectual tradition of the American System of Political Economy, whose valid principles produced the industrial might of the United States, France, Japan, and Germany, as well as the best moments of progress of several Third World nations, Brazil among them.

Fifteen years ago, my husband, Lorenzo Carrasco, and I met for the first time with Barbosa Lima at the offices of the Brazilian Press Association in Rio de Janeiro. At that time, he remarked to us, emphatically, that, unfortunately, in Brazil there was widespread knowledge of the British System of Adam Smith, but that, with only rare exceptions, was there an awareness of the richness of the anti-colonial school of national economy represented by Alexander Hamilton and