GlobalResearch
Center for Research on Globalization

G7, the Summit of Western Hypocrisy

By Thierry Meyssan
Global Research, May 31, 2016
Voltaire 30 May 2016

Theme: Global Economy, Militarization and WMD, US NATO War Agenda

The G7 meetings, which were originally little more than simple informal conversations between the Western leaders, flirted for a while with the idea of becoming a world governement before falling back to organising a sort of public relations training course. The Ise-Shima summit reviewed the world's main problems, and defined, for each of them, the elements of language which should be employed.

e G7 has just met at Ise-Shima (Japan). But although we had been swamped with information about the preceding summits, this one was hardly mentioned by the international Press. The fact is that the objective of this meeting is profoundly different.

In the context of the first oil crisis of 1974, five Ministers of Finance (Western Germany, France, Japan, the United Kingdom, USA) met without an agenda in the library of the White House, simply to exchange their points of view. This was the «Library Group».

On this model, the only two survivors of this group, Valery Giscard d'Estaing, who had become the President of the French Republic, and Helmut Schmidt, who had become the Chancellor of Western Germany, took the initiative of inviting the heads of State and government of the same countries, plus Italy, for the following year (1976), to Rambouillet castle, in order to exchange their points of view on the major subjects of the moment. At that time, international summits were rare and extremely formal. The G6 differentiated itself by its lack of protocol, its simple, relaxed and friendly nature, the atmosphere of a private club. The discussions were in English – directly, without translators. The meeting was announced at the last moment. There was no agenda, and no journalists were present.

The first G5 meeting in Rambouillet, France (1975).

In 1977, the Prime Minister of Canada was invited (G7), and as from 1978, the President of the European Commission. In 1994, the Russian President was also invited, and was officially integrated in 1997 (G8). The Western powers were convinced that after the collapse of the USSR, Russia was about to join with them to create a unipolar world which they would dominate together. This was the era of the creation of an international ruling party whose ambition was boundless. It imagined that it could do away with international law and substitute itself for the UN Security Council, in order to govern the world without control.

In 2000, the G8 supported the proposition by Paul Wolfowitz and the World Bank to cancel the debt of the poorest nations. There was however one small condition – these countries would have to completely liberalise their economy, leaving them open for unrestricted pillage by the multinationals. Of the 62 countries concerned, only 9 accepted this fools' bargain. The G8's stand on this issue raised a universal wave of anti-globalisation. During the following summit in Naples (2001), repression of the demonstrations caused one death. It was decided that as from now, these summits would be held outside of major cities, under military and police protection. Anything could therefore be plotted out of the view of the public.

But in 2013, things took a turn for the worse – Vladimir Putin was back in the Kremlin, and the Western powers had just relaunched the war against Syria, despite the engagements negotiated by Kofi Annan and confirmed by the Geneva Communiqué. The summit at Lough Erne became a confrontation, 1 against 7. It should have been dealing with the struggle against tax havens, but the discussion was monopolised by the Western reversal against Syria. The following year (2014), after the coup d'état in Kiev, the division of Ukraine, and the adhesion of Crimea to the Russian Federation, Germany noted that trust between the participants had been destroyed, and that the meeting could not be held in its usual form. In panic, the Western powers decided to cancel their participation in the Sotchi summit, and met, without Russia, at The Hague (Holland). The G8, minus 1, became once again the G7.

42 years ago, the summit was concluded by a short declaration indicating the economic subjects which had been discussed, and stressed the cohesion of the Western block. Quickly, these Press releases were lengthened in order to reassure international investors that no important decisions were being taken within the confines of this secret meeting. As from the invitation of Russia, and the mass arrival of journalists, a political declaration was added, aimed at demonstrating that the world was united around Washington. Then came the publication of long dissertations on the state of the world and the holy desire of the powerful to improve it. But never, absolutely never, was any decision taken by the G8. At the very best, announcements were made and quickly forgotten (the eradication of world hunger, for example) or questions about the promulgation of Charters which would quickly be violated (concerning open sources, for example).

As from 2001, the G8, which presents itself as a world government parallel to the United Nations, has in fact become a meeting of consultation without risk. In this photograph, which was banned from publication in a number of countries, we see President Dmitri Medvedev drunk at the 21011 summit.© Voltaire Network

What has become of the G7 ?

Of the 9 official members of the G7, 2 have a double voice – the United States can count on the President of the European Commission, the Luxemburger Jean-Claude Juncker, who was obliged to resign from his functions as Prime Minister after it was revealed that he belonged to the Gladio network (NATO secret services). As for Germany, it counts on the President of the European Council, the Pole Donald Tusk, whose family has been linked to the Merkel family since the beginning of the Cold War.

From now on, the G7 is no more than a simple formatting class, where the United States and Germany indicate the language fomulae that their vassals are required to adopt. Thousands of journalists are present at this high mass. In the end, the Ise-Shima summit published a long economico-political declaration and six appended documents which reflect the language of the US elites. Everything is perfect, at least in appearence, because upon careful study – as we are about to see – the truth is revealed to be scandalous.

In the introduction to their declaration, the members of the G7 stress their common values, the four main subjects being:

Liberty
Democracy
the rule of Law
respect for Human Rights.

Next, they affirm their capacity to guarantee:

Peace
Security
and the Prosperity of the world.

Finally, they reveal their priority:

> Global Economic Growth.

Even a small child can understand without difficulty that these «adults», by affirming that their priority is global economic growth, care little for the ideals and the objectives they display.

The 9 members of the G7.

The final declaration of the G7

I will limit myself here to the study of the passages in the declaration relative to international politics as seen by these 9 people, who intend to become the most powerful people in the world [1]. It is a catalogue of the 18 most prevalent Western lies today. It provides the occasion for a review of the main subjects of conflict.

The «war against terrorism and violent extremism» [2].

It is now unfortunately a commonly-held belief in international summits that terrorism, according to their declaration, is the fruit of violent extremism. It is nothing more than the maturation of certain personal psychological problems in non-resolved political contexts. Terrorism is therefore not a military strategy, no state organises it, and it is financed exclusively by private gifts and various forms of trafficking. Such is the theory defended since December 2015 by UN General Secretary Ban Ki-moon, who came to join the G7 to give the impression of world consensus [3] : the only enemy is «radicalisation». A formula which enables those who organise terrorism to fight any form of opposition on the pretext of fighting terrorism.

As we have been developing in our columns since 2001, at least 8 of the 9 members of the G7 are directly implicated in support for Al-Qaïda and Daesh in Iraq, Syria and Libya. Only Justin Trudeau's Canada seems to have ceased participating in this secret war.

«Migration and the refugee crisis» (and not «the refugee and migrant crisis»).

We should note the semantic distinction between the flow of migrations and the refugee

crisis. Migrants choose to move elsewhere. They are considered as a tide, not as people. On the contrary, refugees are forced to move, and have the right to international protection.

However, in reality there are very few real refugees. The great majority of Syrians who have fled their country refused to defend it against the jihadists because they were convinced that the Republic was going to be overthrown by NATO. Others fled the combats hoping to come back after the victory of the jihadists and the construction of a true Islamic state. But international Law does not apply the status of refugees to insurgents who refuse to bear arms to defend their country when it is attacked from abroad, nor to those who hope for a victory for which they will not fight.

There is no doubt that the phenomenon of the flight of Syrians was encouraged by the states who were attacking them, who thereby hoped to win by emptying the country of its inhabitants. All members of the G7 participated in this plan.

Syria

Le G7 categorically condemns the violations of the cessation of hostilites by the «Syrian régime». Fair enough, but it says not a word about the violations committed by the armed groups beforehand, nor – and this is what matters – about the violations that it first committed itself. I am speaking, for example, about the delivery of 2,000 tonnes of arms and munitions by the US Departement of Defense, attested to by *Jane's* magazine – arms and munitions of which at least half were handed on to Al-Qaïda and Daesh, whom the G7 clamied to be fighting a few lines earlier [4].

The G7 also condemns «the régime» (a pejorative expression used to decribe a member-state of the United Nations Organisation, and aimed at pointing out that the goal of G7's war is «régime change» on the grounds that the «régime» had blocked the access to international humanitarian aid. However, the cases quoted by the UN reveal a non-respect by the UN itself of the dates and routes previously agreed upon with the Syrian government. Apart from the fact that the G7 does not condemn the armed groups for having blocked the access to several locations, it announced that it will use the excuse of what it abusively attributes to the «régime» to authorise the World Food Programme to parachute aid into jihadist-controlled zones. Since the WFP does not have the means to carry out this sort of mission, it will sub-contract the job to the US Air Force, which not only parachutes food and medical supplies, but also weapons and ammunition. This type of operation has only the appearance of being humanitarian, since the food and medical supplies parachuted into the jihadist-controlled zones will immediately be confiscated by the armed groups, who will sell them at exorbitant prices to the populations under their control, or even export them to Turkey, as we have seen recently.

Finally, the the G7 evokes the question of chemical weapons, without poining the finger at anyone in particular – a sign that it can always use this accusation against any party at any time, including the armed groups and Turkey. It is a means of potential blackmail against the unpredictable Erdoğan government.

Iraq

The G7 supports «the unity, the sovereignty and the territorial integrity» of the nation. It congratulates the Iraqi government for its struggle against Daesh, and announces that it will help Baghdad to come to the aid of the populations in the liberated zones. However, since it

has not also congratulated the «Syrian régime» for its victories against Daesh, we may conclude – contrary to the Resolutions of the UN Security Council – that its main objective is not the war against terrorism.

The members of the G7 announce that they are currently spending more than 3.6 billion dollars to help the Iraqi authorities, including the Kurds. But by stating this, they contradict what they stated a few lines earlier – indeed, they pretend to support the unity of the country, but deliver arms directly to a province which they encourage to no longer obey central power.

Iran

The G7 unhesitatingly congratulates itself for the 5+1 agreement concluded a year ago with Iran. This accord called for the lifting of US, European and international sanctions, which should have allowed Iran to gain access to the 150 billion dollars blocked all over the world. However, although certain small countries have indeed unblocked the funds which they had been obliged to freeze – Switzerland, for example, liberated 12 million dollars – Iran has still not seen a single centime of the money still blocked in the United States or the European Union. Worse, although Washington officially pretended to unblock 450 million dollars, they were immediately impounded by an «independent» US judge as compensation for the victims of the 11th September attacks, for which the United States have never once accused Iran over the last 15 years. The stand by the 9 members of the G7 comes in response to the complaint registered by Iran with the Security Council with the support of the Non-Aligned Movement [5].

The G7 continues by condemning Iranian research on missiles, which contravenes Resolution 2231. However, this Resolution has nothing to do with the missile question. During the Security Council debate, Ambassador Samatha Power pointed out that Iran was not only obliged to conform to the Resolution, but also to apply other international rules concerning ballistic missiles [6]. The United States know that they can not link the question of ballistic missiles and the question of nuclear energy, and in fact, since the 5+1 agreement, have registered no complaints against Iran.

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

The G7 condemns nuclear research by what it calls «North Korea», suggesting by this title that the United States are still at war with it since 1950. Consequently they can base themselves on several Resolutions by the Security Council. But in the absence of a peace treaty, and considering the pressure brought to bear over the last 10 years on Iran, which had no military nuclear programme, it is understandable that Pyongyang has not conformed.

«Ukraine/Russia»

The G7 reaffirms the obligation to respect «the sovereignty, the territorial integrity and the independence» of Ukraine. Then it condemns the illegal annexation of Crimea by Russia. This is one more example of Western hypocrisy. It was the members of the G7 who organised the coup d'etat in Kiev, which violated the sovereignty and the independence of Ukraine. The citizens who refused the putsch first of all attempted to enter into resistance. They quickly understood that the population was divided geographically between pro-Atlantists and pro-Russians. The pro-Russians – Crimea, Donbass and Louhansk – proclaimed

their independence, but only Crimea reacted quickly enough to request its incorporation into the Federation of Russia.

We note one phrase criticising the corruption of the Ukrainian government – a sign that the members of the G7 are already embarrassed by their new ally.

Libya

The G7 gives its support to the government presided by Fayez al-Sarraj – the only authority recognised today by the UNO – in order to pacify the country, to enable the exploitation of the oil resrves and the fight against Daesh.

Since the country no longer has a legitimate leader, it has divided into tribal factions. The al-Sarraj government was constituted by the UNO during the Skhirat Accords (April 2015). But it has never been invested by the Chamber of Representatives which was created by NATO after the murder of Mouamar el-Kadhafi. As a result, it is no more legitimate than the others, even though it is more obedient. In any case, the members of the G7 announce that they support the lifting of the embargo on weapons for the al-Sarraj government, which should enable it either to massacre its rivals or relaunch the civil war.

Afghanistan

The members of the G7 support any «peace process animated by the Afghans», which is truly alarming, 15 years after the Anglo-US invasion and the Bonn agreemeents imposed by the winners. They applaud the participation of Afghanistan in the NATO summit, next July in Warsaw, which says a lot about this peace process «animated by the Afghans» and about the G7's intention to continue the military encirclement of Russia.

«The peace process in the Near East»

The G7 admits by this formula that the Israelo-Palestinian conflict is in fact an Israelo-Arab conflict. Given the poor state of relations with the present Israeli Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, the G7 supports the French initiative for an international conference – without the Israelis or the Palestinians – the only way, according to them, to move ahead with the «two-state solution».

Yemen

Advancing with precaution, the G7 affirms that peace in Yemen must be sought through a political transition. An indirect formulation to signify that it supports the transitional President, Abd Rabbo Mansour Hadi, who was ejected by popular opinion, and is maintained entirely by Saudi Arabi and Israël.

Africa

While the G7 treated the preceding states in detail, it did not bother to bring the same attention to bear on Burkina Faso, Burundi, Mali, Nigeria, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Somalia and Southern Sudan, as well as a few other states, not even mentioned, of the Chad Basin, Sahel and the Horn of Africa. They are all tossed off in a single paragraph which lists a quantity of problems and invites them to reinforce their inter-governmental organisations in order to resolve them. The Pentagon has still not swallowed the fact that AfriCom was not afforded a warm welcome by Africans when

it was created.

This paragraph was drawn up in the presence of the President of Chad, Idriss Deby, who had been invited on the fringes of the summit. The sacrosanct US rule according to which no head of state should seek more than two consecutive mandates does not apply in this country. Mr. Deby, who has been in power for an uninterrupted period of more than 25 years, is accused of numerous crimes in his own country and in Darfur, but is the best ally for a military deployment on the African continent.

Venezuela

The G7 calls for both a dialogue between the government and the citizens, and between the government and the parliament. This formula cleverly suggests that the government is an authoritarian régime, contested by both the population and the political parties.

In reality, since Washington failed to organise the riots (the «Guarimba») in 2014 [7], to manage a coup d'etat in February 2015 [8], and decreed that Venezuela was a «threat to its national security» [9], it then fabricated a dossier accusing one of the main Bolivian leaders, Diosdado Cabello, of being a drug trafficker [10]. Despite President Obama's courtesy when he met with his Venezuelan opposite number, he renewed his decree in 2016. On the 25 February, SouthCom and the US Special Forces drew up a plan for the destabilisation of the country, which was unfortunately leaked [11]. Its objective, in the years to come, is to provoke chaos, as was done in the Levant.

Maritime Security

The G7, which presents itself as a guarantor of maritme security, despite the fact that its members organised the pirates from the Horn of Africa in 2009-10 [12], criticises the claims by Beijing in the China Sea by basing its arguments on maritime law, which is absolutely not the problem.

Beijing's claims are historically legitimate, and had never bothered anyone until the oil fields were discovered. The Spratley and Paracel islands were considered to be Chinese until the 18th century. But since they were mostly uninhabited, the Emperor never sent a representative. The islands were abandoned during the colonisation of China in the 19th century. Consequently they may be claimed by either Taipei or Beijing, depending on the interpretation of the word «decolonisation». And of course, the old colonial powers do not read the events in the same way as the Chinese people, who kicked them out of their country.

Non-proliferation and disarmement

We expect the G7 to be favourable to nuclear non-proliferation and disarmement, since its discourse is always peaceful, although its practice is imperialist.

Western hypocrisy is incarnated here by Barack Obama, who received the Nobel Peace Prize for having announced his desire to see an end to nuclear weapons, but who, once in power, on the contrary modernised and extended the US nuclear arsenal. Just after the summit, he went to Hiroshima, where he gave a speech. Of course, he did not apologise – he is not responsible for the actions of his predecessor – but he did not answer the question of the legitimacy of atomic bombing, which leaves no doubt as to what he really thinks.

The G7 pretends not to know that last year, a certain family managed to procure the atomic bomb, and has already used at least two tactical bombs in Yemen [13]. Yet this is a tangible danger, far more serious than that represented by the North Korean tests. Besides, the fact that the Saud family acquired this technology as a private customer, and not in the name of their state, Saudi Arabia, opens another breach in the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Reform of the United Nations and peace operations

Appropriately, the G7 is favourable to an evolution of the United Nations Organisation. It takes the opportunity to reaffirm its support for the summit on Peace Operations which was presided at the UN by President Obama.

The problem is that the very principle of operations for the maintenance of peace is contrary to the UN Charter. During its creation, the founders had planned for observation missions to verify the application of the peace agreements. These were only useful – and indeeed, possible – in the case of agreement between the belligerents. On the contrary, today, the Security Council imposes its solution on the parties involved, in other words, it takes one side or the other, and deploys an armed Force to force respect for its decision. This is simply colonial practice disguised as international law.

Human Rights

This short paragraph perfectly illustrates my point – who is against Human Rights ? No-one. However, the text presents the respect for these Rights as a «partneship between states and civil societies». By saying so, it is re-adopting the British definition of Rights, and Emmanuel Kant's definition of civil societies.

According to the G7, Human Rights are a protection for individuals faced with reasons of state. Everyone should be able to take legal action against the abuse by which they suffer. The «civil society», in other words, the political actors – in earlier times, the commoners – who did not participate in the life of political parties, should therefore be able to represent citizens against the state. This gibberish is the negation of the French, Russian, Cuban and Iranian Revolutions, for which the first Human Right is to question the legitimacy of Power, not to prtotect oneself from it. By doing so, the G7 affirms that the new international ruling class does not intend to allow itself to be overthrown.

Nuclear Security

The G7 distinguishes here between technical safety and the political security of the installations. It calls on the shareholders of the multinational companies concerned to respect the International Convention which governs their activity. And it applauds the summit organised by the White House on the prevention of the theft of nuclear weapons by terrorist groups.

By distinguishing between the question of atomic weapons possibly held by terrorist groups and the question of non-proliferation, the G7 clearly demonstrates that it is making no serious effort to acheive either of these goals. Non-proliferation is simply the refusal by the nuclear powers to allow non-nuclear powers to enter their club. The White House summit was a pretext for the Pentagon to «help» every state, and thus better control them.

The future of the G7

The history of the G7 reflects the evolution of international relations. During the Cold War, it was a club for state leaders and the heads of goverment who met discretely in order to learn how to work together. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, it was transformed into a summit for the great and powerful who intended to rule apart from the United Nations. Paradoxically, its current collapse is not due to a political cause, the Russian revolt, but a sociological distinction – the Russian leaders are of the same calibre as those who were once in power in the West, they have nothing to do with the new ruling class which meets in Davos.

Thierry Meyssan

Translation
Pete Kimberley

Notes:

[1] "G7 Ise-Shima Leaders' Declaration", *Voltaire Network*, May 26th, 2016.[2] "G7 Action Plan on Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism", *Voltaire Network*, May 27th, 2016.

[3] « Plan d'action pour la prévention de l'extrémisme violent », par Ban Ki Moon, *Réseau Voltaire*, 24 décembre 2015.

[4] « Les États-Unis violent le cessez-le-feu en Syrie et arment Al-Qaïda », *Réseau Voltaire*, 25 avril 2016. « Qui arme les jihadistes durant le cessez-le-feu ? », par Thierry Meyssan, *Télévision nationale syrienne , Réseau Voltaire*, 30 avril 2016.

[5] "Complaint from Iran to the Security Council", *Voltaire Network*, May 6th, 2016.

[6] "Resolution 2231 and debates (Iranian nuclear)", *Voltaire Network*, July 20th, 2015.

[7] "US against Venezuela: Cold War Goes Hot", by Nil Nikandrov,*Strategic Culture Foundation* (Russia) , *Voltaire Network*, March 8th, 2014. « Las "guarimbas" de Venezuela : derecha embozada », por Martín Esparza Flores, *Contralínea* (México), *Red Voltaire* , 28 de abril de 2014.

[8] "Obama failed his coup in Venezuela", by Thierry Meyssan, Translation Roger Lagassé, *Voltaire Network*, February 24th, 2015.

[9] "Executive Order – Blocking Property and Suspending Entry of Certain Persons Contributing to the Situation in Venezuela", by Barack Obama, *Voltaire Network*, 9 March 2015.

[10] "Washington is picking out of air a dossier against Caracas", Translation Anoosha Boralessa, *Voltaire Network*, 21 May 2015.

[11] «Operación Venezuela Freedom-2», *Red Voltaire* , 22 de mayo de 2016.

[12] « Pirates, corsaires et flibustiers du XXIe siècle », par Thierry Meyssan, *Odnako* (Russie) , *Réseau Voltaire*, 25 juin 2010.

[13] "Nuclear Red Alert", by Manlio Dinucci, Translation Roger Lagassé, *Il Manifesto* (Italy) , *Voltaire*

Network, 28 February 2016. «L'Arabie saoudite a la bombe atomique », par Giulietto Chiesa, Traduction IlFattoQuotidiano.fr, *Réseau Voltaire*, 1er mars 2016. "The nuclear Near East!", by Thierry Meyssan, Translation Pete Kimberley, *Voltaire Network*, March 7yth, 2016.

The original source of this article is Voltaire
Copyright © Thierry Meyssan, Voltaire, 2016

Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: Thierry Meyssan

About the author:

Intellectuel français, président-fondateur du Réseau Voltaire et de la conférence Axis for Peace. Dernier ouvrage en français : L'Effroyable imposture : Tome 2, Manipulations et désinformations (éd. JP Bertand, 2007).

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca