

4-1-1991

Decoding Europe's Geopolitics An Afrocentric View

Linus A. Hoskins

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dh.howard.edu/newdirections>

Recommended Citation

Hoskins, Linus A. (1991) "Decoding Europe's Geopolitics An Afrocentric View," *New Directions*: Vol. 18: Iss. 2, Article 6.

Available at: <https://dh.howard.edu/newdirections/vol18/iss2/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Howard @ Howard University. It has been accepted for inclusion in New Directions by an authorized editor of Digital Howard @ Howard University. For more information, please contact digitalservices@howard.edu.

Decoding Europe's Geopolitics

An Afrocentric View

18

By Linus A. Hoskins



Two questions immediately come to the fore in this analysis: Why are the Europeans feverishly and assiduously consolidating their ranks into "Europe 1992"/"Fortress Europe 1992"? Why is the United States, the leader and most powerful of the European powers, engaging in geopolitical actions in order to protect, maintain, and defend the multifaceted interests of European Nationalism as we approach the 21st century? At first blush, the answer lies in mere global survival because the Europeans are and will be the global minority in the 21st century. In other words, psychologically Europeans are scared *vis-à-vis* their numerical position in the world. Hence their paranoid *raison d'être* for erecting "Fortress Europe 1992" as a geopolitical shield and engaging in overt and covert actions to safeguard their existence.

The U.N. Population Division has estimated that by the year 2000 Europeans (the industrial nations) will comprise *only* 20 percent of the world's population, with 80 percent residing in the so-called developing, non-European world, and by the year 2025 Europeans will account for *only* 16 percent of the world's population, with non-Europeans accounting for a whopping 84 percent. It is this progressively dwindling global numerical value/power that has propelled Europeans to engage in their mad rush to consolidate/close their ranks, circle the wagons, into "Fortress Europe 1992" and to speed up the process of East-West German unification. They have calculated that time is running out and if they do not unite as a global fortress *now*, then they will not be able to cross the time-line into the 21st century as a putatively secured, powerful, united but global minority people.

In the 1970s, former President Richard Nixon called communist China the "great

red plague" and the "scourge of the earth"; in the 1980s, former President Ronald Reagan labeled the communist Soviet Union as the "evil empire." However, ironically, Eurocentric geopolitical reality finally set in, and in a stroll through Moscow's Red Square in 1988, accompanied by President Mikhail Gorbachev, during their fourth summit, President Ronald Reagan confessed to the world that the Soviet Union was no longer the evil empire destined for the ash heap of history. Indeed, Reagan's confession should alert all African people to the fact that the Eastern European superpower (the Soviet Union) and the Western European superpower (the United States) are two sides of the same European imperialist coin. This confession is only part of the European-American global collusive survival strategy to the extent that Soviet President Gorbachev's "perestroika" economic program no longer regards Western European capitalism as "the evil machinery of exploitation."

This so-called "new-era" in East-West European relations is camouflaged under the guise of the policies of "glasnost" or openness and "perestroika" or restructuring of the economy. These policies are not new because the Soviet Union represents state capitalism and not classical communism.¹ Mikhail Gorbachev's putative economic liberalization program is nothing but a smoke-screen for the institutionalization of Euro-American Western capitalism, cultural values and *modus vivendi*, i.e., the perpetuation of Euro-Western democratic principles. What has happened in actuality is that former President Reagan bailed out a fellow European imperialist state by skillfully utilizing a private sector version of the Marshall Plan (i.e., international Reaganomics). What this scheme has resulted in is the truism that about 20 U.S. democratic capitalist corporations signed joint-venture agreements with the com-

munist Soviet government as an integral part of the "perestroika" program "to underwrite/overhaul the stagnant Soviet economy by introducing modern technology and Western ways of doing business,"² i.e., maximizing profits. In addition, a group of seven companies, the American Trade Consortium, was formed to cement this "new thinking" on economic/financial relations.

According to James H. Giffen, president of the Consortium, "this is not aid, this is trade. What we're after is [only] profit."³

Other components of this international Reaganomics/Marshall Plan bailout of the state capitalist Soviet Union include the following:

□ A Western group composed mainly of American banks led by First National Bank of Chicago⁴ loaned \$400 million to the Soviet Union in November 1987 "at low interest rates to buy U.S. and Canadian agricultural products."⁵

□ A group of West German banks in May 1988 granted the Soviet Union a \$2.1 billion private commercial transaction line of credit "to help Mikhail Gorbachev modernize his economy"⁶; in October 1988, West German executives signed more than 30 commercial agreements worth \$1.5 billion with the Soviet Union; and in November 1988, the State Department confirmed that commercial banks from West Germany, France, Britain, Italy and Japan signaled their intention to provide the Soviet Union with separate lines of credit totaling about \$9 billion.

□ The Western European Community (EC) the Eastern European Economic Organization (Comecon)" in June 1988 ended 31 years of hostility by signing a declaration of mutual recognition that smooths the path for new East-West trade agreements in Europe.⁷

□ The president of the World Bank, Barber B. Conable, an American, indicated in October 1986 that the Bank "would be

happy to explore" a membership bid from the Soviet Union, and in April 1988 the International Monetary Fund (IMF), whose Managing Director is a European, decided to aid debt-burdened countries in Eastern Europe and assist in the Soviet bloc's most important economic reform programs.

□ Soviet leader Gorbachev in June 1988 did the ultimate at the Communist Party Conference by putting forth his plan for "a fundamentally new state" that calls for "the creation of a presidential system of government"⁸ à la Euro-American political system. By this pronouncement, Gorbachev finally completed the East-West Eurocentric geopolitical collusive cycle.

□ Gorbachev in April 1989 signed a treaty with Margaret Thatcher of Britain that protects Western-European foreign investment in the Soviet Union against expropriation, etc.

The bailout assistance the American and Western financial community has provided the European communist Soviet Union is radically different from the assistance (or non-assistance) it provided to "socialist" Grenada under Maurice Bishop 1979-83; the "Cuban surrogate" government of the Democratic Socialist Michael Manley of Jamaica 1972-80; "communist" Cuba under Fidel Castro; and the "Cuban-Soviet-backed communist" government of Nicaragua under the Sandinistas.

European Nationalism

In terms of Afrocentric geopolitical linkage analysis, one must realize that although Euro-American scholars/experts have concluded that the European communist system is moribund, this does not mean that European Nationalism is moribund. On the contrary, what this simply means is that only a component of European Nationalism, *viz.*, the Eastern European communist system is moribund. The poignant fact that African people must keep in mind is that the

European System still works. The micro Eastern European communist system may be a failure but the macro European international system/European Nationalism is *not* a "grand failure." The permanent built-in mechanisms are operative in that we find that the Western European capitalist industrial democracies are bailing out /assisting their fellow Eastern European communist nations financially, economically, and nutritionally.

In addition to the Reagan-Marshall Plan, the Bush administration requested the Euro-American-controlled-International Monetary Fund (IMF) to grant loans to Eastern European communist nations on "kinder and gentler" terms, compared to the severe, draconian conditionality measures that are *always* imposed on non-European/Pan-African World nations.

In May 1989, the administration sold 1.5 million tons of wheat to the Soviet Union at a subsidized rate, allowed the Soviet Union to buy an additional 450,000 metric tons of corn under a long-term supply agreement, and was weighing a request by the Soviet Union to buy up to 500,000 tons of soybean oil at subsidized prices. During the December 2-3 1989 Malta summit with Soviet President Gorbachev, President Bush promised completion of a trade agreement that would grant most-favored-nation status to the Soviet Union, thereby making the communist Soviet Union equal to other democratic trading partners and the recipients of observer status at the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade (GATT) negotiations.

In January 1990, (i) the Bush administration sold an additional 497,750 metric tons of U.S. wheat to the Soviet Union at subsidized prices for delivery in February 1990 under a long-term grain supply agreement. Nine private U.S. companies shared in the sale; (ii) President Bush was planning to lift restrictions that would exempt Czechoslovakia from a 1974 amendment to U.S. trade laws, thereby granting Czechoslovakia the most-favored-nation status necessary for its exports to enter the United States at low tariff rates; (iii) the Bush administration decided to support increased sales/exports of advanced computers, telecommunications equipment/systems and machine tools to Eastern European nations that have overthrown their Communist governments and have begun to liberalize their economies à la capitalist America; (iv) the United States and other major European industrial democracies created a \$1 billion fund to

assist Poland in its transition to a free-market economy and to stabilize its currency. The United States provided a \$20 million grant, Britain provided \$100 million, West Germany \$250 million, Japan \$150 million and France and Italy each provided \$100 million in loans; (v) a committee of creditor governments, including the United States, known as the "Paris Club" permitted Poland temporarily to suspend interest payments on its \$39 billion foreign debt; and (vi) 34 nations from East and West, in-

...No high ranking administration official was sent to the Pan-African World in order to reinforce America's commitment to their interests....

cluding the United States, laid foundations for the creation of a "new international bank to help finance the economic transformation of Eastern Europe." This regional institution, known as the European Reconstruction and Development Bank for Eastern Europe, "is to be capitalized at \$12 billion and start its first loan operations with 30 percent of that amount in 1991." The objective of the Bank consists "primarily of reviving the private sector, but without excluding the public sector, particularly concerning infrastructures." The project called for a number of countries to provide 8.5 percent of the initial \$12 billion capital. These countries included France, Britain, West Germany, Italy, the United States, Japan and the Soviet Union.

On July 12, 1989, President George Bush in a televised speech at Karl Marx University of Economic Sciences, offered the Eastern European communist country of Hungary an economic package that included the following:

To build a new U.S. culture center in downtown Budapest.
 To ask Congress for \$5 million to establish a regional environmental center in Budapest.

To send about 50 to 60 Peace Corps volunteers to Hungary to teach English.

To establish a \$25 million private enterprise fund and to ask the Senate to authorize the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) to issue American private investments in Hungary.

To remove trade barriers and give Hungary long-term most-favored-nation access to U.S. markets for its products without the need for annual presidential waivers and to give Hungary access to selective tariff relief under the Generalized System of Preferences.

To establish a series of U.S.-Hungarian exchange programs to include labor leaders, legislators, professors, students and legal experts;

To ask other fellow Western European industrial democracies to support economic and technical assistance for Poland and Hungary.

And in a televised address to the Polish Parliament on July 10, 1989, Bush promised Poland that he would:

Seek \$100 million⁹ from Congress to establish the "Polish-American Enterprise Fund." This special fund would grant hard currency loans or venture capital grants for private enterprise projects such as starting up businesses, taking over state-run firms, training and technical programs, export projects or U.S.-Polish private joint ventures. The OPIC in the Commerce Department would coordinate this Fund;

Seek another \$15 million for the environmental cleanup of Krakow,

Seek "concerted action" from other fellow Western European industrial democracies to aid Poland.

Push the Euro-American-controlled World Bank to loan \$325 million for Polish agriculture and industry.

Seek "an early and generous" rescheduling of Poland's \$39 billion foreign debt.

Grant Poland a five-year grace period on \$1 billion owed to two U.S. agencies; and

Sign an agreement to provide for the opening of cultural centers in Poland and America.

It is important to note that President Bush has lauded the communist Polish government for its "Roundtable Agreement" with Solidarity and for the political reforms in Poland that would allow the Eastern European communist leader of the Solidarity trade union Lech Walesa, to run for president of Poland. Ironically, President Bush has *not* demanded a similar "Roundtable Agreement" between the

South African government, "a natural ally of the United States," and the African National Congress (ANC) so that such political reforms would one day allow the non-European leader of the ANC, Nelson Mandela, to run for president of South Africa. The fact is that the Eastern European communist-bloc member Poland, under the presidency of fellow European Walesa, is *not* a challenge/threat to the multifaceted interests of European Nationalism, but a democratically-elected government in South Africa, under the presidency of non-European/Pan-African Nationalist Mandela, is a perceived challenge/threat to the multifaceted interests of European Nationalism.

It is also vital for African people to note that *no* high-ranking administration official was sent to the Pan-African/non-European World (Latin America, Asia, the Caribbean and Africa) in order to reinforce America's commitment to their interests, nor were they offered any economic packages.) The IMF was asked to grant them "kinder and gentler" conditionality measures for loans. Within the context of 21st century European-American geopolitical survival strategy (European Nationalism), their interests are a *non sequitur*. African people must, therefore, conclude that since the Eastern European communist Soviet Union is no longer the "Evil Empire," then this collusive/divide and conquer geopolitical strategy of the Bush administration not only indicates that the European-American partitioning of the world has already set the parameters of the real global struggle in motion but also supports the central argument, that the global struggle is between the Eastern European communists, plus the Western European democratic-capitalists, plus their auxiliary cohorts, the Japanese, versus the Pan-African/non-European World (the global majority).

With the context of this European-American-trilateral global collusion, it need occasion no great surprise that (i) in early November 1989, 12 Pacific Rim nations, including the United States, opened talks in Australia aimed at "taking tentative steps toward launching the Asia-Pacific region's first official economic and trade organization" as the complementary countervailing side of the same European Nationalist coin, the other side being "Fortress Europe 1992." This new international trade organization called APEC, Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation, is designed "to improve trade relations among the capitalist

economies around the Pacific Rim," "to give them extra clout on international economic issues," and to preserve the European-dominated international liberal trading system. The countries who attended this meeting were the United States, Australia, Japan, South Korea, New Zealand, Canada, and the six members of the Association of South East Asian nations (ASEAN): Thailand, the Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia and Brunei; (ii) in mid-November 1989, President Bush

... Soviet communist expansion/global domination is no longer the fear, threat, or enemy that is descending over the European Continent.

signed a military spending bill that, *inter alia*, guaranteed \$500 million in reparations to Japanese-Americans interned in U.S. camps during World War II. This financial payment was called an "entitlement" to be paid in 1991. In the meantime, Congress authorized \$20,000 for each of the estimated 60,000 survivors for a grand total of \$1.2 billion; (iii) in May 1989, President Bush paid glowing tribute to nearly four million Americans of Asian and Pacific ancestry, proclaiming May 8-15 1989 "Asian-Pacific-American Week." President Bush stated quite unequivocally that Asian-Pacific-Americans earned recognition "through excellence," upholding such values as "discipline, self-sacrifice, humility, compassion, an abiding belief in work [and] a soaring love of freedom" ¹⁰; (iv) on May 12, 1989, in a commencement speech at Texas A&M University, President Bush came full circle and completed the European-American-trilateral geopolitical collusive cycle by insisting that because of the new, warm, non-iron-curtain-clad relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, "now is the time to move beyond containment" and to "seek the integration of the Soviet Union into the com-

munity of nations" and to help them share the rewards of international cooperation" ¹¹; and (v) in February 1990, President Bush and his economic advisors called for new policies to increase the number of skilled immigrants from Eastern European communist countries as one way to deal with an impending labor shortage in the United States.

These new policies, by design, however, bear *no* relation to the stark reality that Black unemployment has been twice that of white unemployment for decades. In his annual Economic Report to Congress, President Bush stated that major changes in the makeup of the U.S. work force will "shift attention away from worries about the supply of jobs that have haunted us since the 1930s, and toward new concerns about the supply of workers and skills."

Although President Bush pledged in his acceptance speech at the Republican National Convention in 1988 to create 30 million jobs over the next eight years, Michael Boskin, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, who compiled the report, has re-affirmed that the demographic trend (translated to mean the rumblings in communist Eastern Europe) marks a "sea change in American labor markets" and that over the next 20 years, "the challenge will no longer be to create jobs, but to assure that there is an adequate supply of workers [from fellow Eastern European communist countries] with appropriate skills to fill the jobs that are available." In his report, Mr. Boskin suggests that "with projections of a rising demand for skilled workers in coming years, the nation can achieve even greater benefits from immigration...with policies designed to increase the number of skilled immigrants" ¹² from communist Eastern Europe.

What this scenario portends is that the Euro-American administration is sending the clear signal to the non-European/Pan-African World as to exactly what their geopolitical reality is. African people must realize that Soviet communist expansion/global domination is no longer the fear, threat, or enemy that is descending over the European Continent. Indeed, it is no mere coincidence then that during the first seven months of the Bush administration, Secretary of State James Baker went to Europe to assure European allies that the alliance is still united and potent; Vice President Dan Quayle was sent to Latin America to wield the Euro-American big-stick and

to remind the non-Europeans not to forget their strict adherence to the principles of Western democracy and to register the Bush administration's strong opposition to the slightest notion of their forming a debtors' cartel à la Eastern European communist Poland. And in his first trip overseas, President Bush went to Asia to assure the chosen few Asian/Pacific and Chinese so-called Newly Industrializing Countries (NICs), (the pro-Western, "honorary whites"), that they are still a vital link in the Euro-trilateral united front.

22

After the Western European NATO summit in May 1989, President Bush strongly urged his fellow Europeans that the "time is right" for the European nations of the East and West to reconcile, to unite, "to be whole and free." President Bush insists that there is a radical shift away from East-West military confrontation to a global emphasis on shared economic relationships among European nations. In the President's own words: "Our doctrine need no longer be containing a military aggressive Soviet Union. It means a united Europe. It means a Europe without as many artificial boundaries."¹³ And, the "iron lady" Margaret Thatcher of Britain, in a speech in Aspen, Colorado, in August 1990, said: "We don't see this new Soviet Union as an enemy, but as a country groping its way towards freedom. We no longer have to view the world through the prism of East-West relations. The Cold War is over."¹⁴ In Mrs. Thatcher's geopolitical Eurocentrism, "Europeans must take care of Europeans."¹⁵

To forge President Bush's concept of a united, stable, free and whole Europe, on June 6, 1989, the Eastern European communist superpower, the Soviet Union, and the Western European capitalist superpower, the United States, signed an accord called "The Prevention of Dangerous Military Activities," and pledged that neither country will use force against the other in responding to any accidental military contact or incident and would also prevent accidental military confrontation growing into wider conflict, perhaps even nuclear war. The accord specifies that "the parties shall take measures to ensure expeditious termination and resolution, by peaceful means without resort to the threat or use of force, of any incident which may arise as a result of dangerous military activities."¹⁶

Other major Western European industrial democracies have also provided finan-

cial/economic assistance to the Eastern European communist Soviet Union and its surrogates. For example, in October 1988, Switzerland registered Eurasco Zurich AG, the Soviet Union's entry into Western-style high finance as a "bank-like finance company" to manage bond issues and arrange syndicated loans for the Soviet Union. The Eastern European communist Soviet Union already has banks in Western European democratic/capitalist countries such as England, France, and Austria.

The United States ranks fourth . . . in terms of the Western European countries that have concluded joint-ventures with the Soviet Union.

During September-October 1989, the Western governments of the European Community provided \$960 million to the two Eastern European communist countries of Poland and Hungary "as part of a Western effort to support the political and economic reforms" underway in those countries; the West German government announced a major credit package to the tune of \$1 billion that would guarantee bank loans to help Poland finance specific foreign exchange earning projects; and the Canadian government proposed a \$36 million package of food and economic development aid to Poland and Hungary. Canada also promised to reschedule Poland's \$2.2 billion foreign debt. In mid-October 1989, 140 U.S. companies took part in a Moscow trade exhibition, held under the auspices of the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Trade and Economic Council, with the result that in the first few months of 1990, this American Trade Consortium hoped to ship \$500 million worth of consumer goods, financed by bank loans, to the Soviet Union.

The United States ranks fourth behind West Germany, Finland, and Italy in terms of the Western European countries that have concluded joint-ventures with the Soviet Union. At the end of June 1989, there

were about 25 joint-venture agreements signed between U.S. corporations and the Soviet Union.

On November 24, 1989, the Japanese government approved a \$150 million low-interest loan to Poland "to help its transition to democracy and a market economy," and in January 1990, Japan agreed to provide Poland and Hungary with emergency food aid and technical assistance in the fields of management and environment, authorized its Export-Import Bank to lend \$500 million each to Poland and Hungary during the next three years to help finance their economic reconstruction, and also formulated plans to encourage trade with these two Eastern European communist countries by insuring Japanese companies for up to \$750 million in deferred-payment exports. And on November 27, 1989, the European Community signed a draft trade and economic cooperation accord with the Soviet Union, making it the fourth accord between the European Community and an Eastern European communist country since 1988.¹⁷

Common Interests

Indeed, acknowledging the failure/collapse of the communist system, per se, President Gorbachev has concluded that the destiny of the Soviet Union and its Republics is inextricably and irretrievably tied to the destiny of the United States, Western Europe and its allies. Ergo, the Soviet Union, as a *quid pro quo*, has provided its fellow Western European capitalists with foreign investment opportunities, including no customs duties on imports or exports, joint ventures, and a 100 percent plant ownership.

As its *quid pro quo*, Hungary's foreign investment law allows foreign plant ownership to go as high as 100 percent; foreign investors get a five-year tax holiday concession and the right to convert local profits to foreign [hard currencies] for repatriation. As of January 1990, there were about 700 joint venture agreements signed between Hungary and Western European investors, and these foreign investors were given "broad freedoms to establish wage scales without negotiating with [local] labor unions."

In terms of Afrocentric geopolitical linkage analysis, it is instructive to observe the alacrity with which the United States and the other major European industrial democracies have responded in providing multifaceted assistance to the Eastern

European communist countries of Poland and Hungary. (For example, compared to the billions of dollars that these two communist countries have received, the United States allocates *only* about \$565 million annually to more than 40 countries in sub-Saharan Africa.) Nevertheless, this multifaceted assistance not only brings to the fore the endemic cultural/ethnic/nationalist allegiance within the bodypolitic of European Nationalism but more importantly, it also represents a natural, subconscious reflex action on the part of Europeans and quasi-Europeans ("honorary whites"), outside the Eastern European communist bloc, to help their kith and kin. On the other hand, the racial tone of this assistance must also not be overlooked. Indeed, the Rev. Allan Boesak of the United Democratic Front (UDF) in South Africa hits the nail directly on the head when he suggests that:

... there has been great joy and exaltation and enthusiasm for what is happening in Eastern Europe and rightly so. We in South Africa ask only a few questions when we see this: How can nations gathered in this [U.N.] Assembly rejoice in the crumbling of the Berlin Wall while their economic and political support continue to provide the bricks and the mortar upholding the Walls of Apartheid? How can they applaud the arrival of a new order in Eastern Europe while they still shore-up an old and discredited and dying order in South Africa? It seems to me and you must not blame South African people for thinking this; it seems to me that if the major [European] nations of the West were only half as enthusiastic about political change in South Africa as they are in Eastern Europe, we would not today have still been talking about this problem [of Apartheid] in the Special Session of the United Nations. There is, we detect, a major problem with many of these major Western [European] nations because in South Africa, power will be changing from white hands to black hands whereas in Eastern Europe, at least, the color of the hands remains the same. This underlying and unacknowledged racism that still informs foreign policy in so many [European] countries needs to be unmasked for what it is. You must not blame us if we keep on asking: if the situation were the other way around and little white children

were dying on the streets today, whether the reaction of these [European] nations would still have been so deliberately slow and so infuriatingly little in terms of what is demanded of our times and situation? The joy over Eastern Europe would remain empty and hypocritical as long as the claim of South Africa's people is not seen over Apartheid [and that Apartheid] would no longer be allowed to survive. . . .¹⁸
And as Robert S. Browne, staff director

Eurocentric miseducation has . . . imbued/moulded African Americans with the same subconscious mind-set/attitude/world-view that Europeans have toward Africa and its peoples.

of the House Subcommittee on International Finance, concurs:

... [European-] Americans are so happy that all of this is happening in Eastern Europe that they are willing to pay any price for the victory of capitalism over communism. . . . But there is also a racial component to all this. For every one of those countries in Eastern Europe, there are thousands and thousands of ethnic Americans who trace their heritage back there and are willing to support the people with money and votes. It's not the same with Africa. People just don't get keyed up about Africa. . . .¹⁹

Malcolm X (El-Hajj Malik el-Shabazz) was *perfectly* correct when he concluded that the problem of Africans in America is that "we left our minds in Africa." Indeed, the German immigrants *did not* and *were not* forced or threatened or brutalized to leave their minds in Germany; the French *were not* forced to leave their minds in France; the British immigrants *were not* brutalized to leave their minds in Britain; the Italians *were not* dehumanized to leave their minds in Italy; the Greeks, Polish, Belgian and Canadian immigrants *were not* threatened

to leave their minds in Greece, Poland, Belgium or Canada. Hence, the historical Eurocentric reason why it is exceedingly subconsciously easy for the Europeans to create their "Europe 1992" as a powerful united homeland fortress with such speed. European immigrants in the United States have *never* been misdirected or dislocated. They were and are always allowed to hold on to, to be proud of, and to protect and defend their original ancestral homeland and reference locus.

Eurocentric Miseducation

On the other hand, the sole reason why people in general, and African Americans in particular, "don't get keyed up about Africa" is directly correlated with the deleterious psychological/sub-conscious impact of 371 years of Eurocentric miseducation. Eurocentric miseducation has succeeded in tearing African Americans away from any endemic cultural/ethnic/nationalist allegiance with their ancestral homeland, Africa. It has succeeded in cutting the umbilical cord that once tied Mother Africa to her children/descendants. It has also succeeded in poisoning the seeds of any Diasporan African extended family relationships. Ergo, the interests of the African Continent and the plight of its people are a *non sequitur* to the majority of African Americans. Africans brought to the United States have *never* been allowed and will *never* be allowed to hold on to, to be proud of, and to protect and defend interests of their ancestral homeland and reference locus. We have been misdirected and dislocated. More specifically, by design, Eurocentric miseducation has purposefully and deliberately imbued/moulded African Americans with the same subconscious mind-set/attitude/worldview that Europeans have toward Africa and its peoples.

The nub of the issue is that Europeans may argue among each other and even scare each other over East-West short-range nuclear missiles, Star Wars (SDI) and who can kill the other hundred times over, but the bottom line is that they are *not* going to kill each other again as they did during the last two World Wars. There might have been a Cold War between them, they might have come very close to the brink of a nuclear war, but as they approach the 21st century, they know that their survival depends on forging a new era of warm relations between themselves. They have realized that since the "Iron Curtain" is no longer descending across the European

Continent, they must do business together to create a "Common European Home."

In order to build this "Common European Home," on June 13, 1989, the Eastern European communist Soviet Union and the Western European capitalist/democratic West Germany pledged in a unique East-West Document to strive for disarmament, intensify their bilateral cooperation, and respect peoples' rights of self-determination with the overall aim of "overcoming the division of Europe." The primary objective of the accord is to seek "a peaceful European order or a Common European Home." The accord also expands guarantees to West German transnational corporations that invest in the Soviet Union. These guarantees include free repatriation of profits to West German corporations from their Soviet Union ventures, compensation in case of expropriation, and international arbitration of disputes with their Soviet partners. The two governments not only proclaimed that their "stable and lasting" cooperation can be a "catalyst for new relations between the East and West" but also indicated their determination to work to end the East-West confrontation that has dominated the continent's political life since the end of World War II. West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl firmly believes that, coming on the heels of the June 6, 1989 signing of the "Prevention of Dangerous Military Activities" Accord between the United States and the Soviet Union, West German-Soviet relations "are of central importance for the future of Europe," and further, that "it is in the West's interest to contribute actively to Gorbachev's success."²⁰

The European geopolitical survival cycle was finally completed in August 1989 when Pope John Paul II called for the creation of a "common united European Christian Home," and again and again urged his fellow Europeans to "be of one heart and one mind" à la Euro-American President Bush's geopolitical survival game-plan/strategy. In an attempt to consummate this creation, we find that on December 1, 1989, the leader of the Soviet Union, Gorbachev, held "a historic meeting" at the Vatican in

Rome with the leader of the Catholic Church, the Pope. This was "the first encounter between a Kremlin leader and the head of Roman Catholicism."

Global Struggle

In terms of Afrocentric geopolitical linkage analysis, it need occasion no great surprise that the Pope has joined the European global collusive survival strategy. Let us recall that on January 8, 1455, another European, Pope Nicholas V, through his Bull, *Romanus Pontifex*, authorized the Portuguese "to subject to servitude all infidel peoples"; and in a subsequent companion Bull, *Inter Caetera*, on March 13, 1456, Pope Nicholas V granted to Prince Henry, "as Grand Master of the Order of Christ in Portugal, all lands discovered or conquered from Cape Bojador in Africa to and including the Indies." Of course, "infidel peoples" referred then and now to all non-European (African) peoples. Once again, almost 535 years later, a European Pope is repeating history by authorizing Europeans, this time, the Eastern European communists and Western European democratic-capitalists, to create a global collusive united European nationalist front in order to reduce to exploitation, dependency, powerlessness, and domination (scientific, modern-day slavery) all "underdeveloped," "developing" non-European peoples, i.e., peoples of African descent.

Indeed, there are moments in history when traumatic permutations suddenly occur and the real impact of Eurocentric global miseducation is of such magnitude that we do not realize it even after we have been hit. We are now in the midst of one of those moments, which dictates that African people must re-evaluate their status in the European-dominated international system, similar to the time when we were forced to come to grips with the stark realities of multifaceted European colonialism at the Fifth Pan-African Congress in Manchester, England, in 1945.

For the past 500 years, the European curtain has been descending across the Pan-African World and the geostrategic policy of imperialist domination and expansionism has characterized relations between the two camps. For while American administrations have pursued either "globalist" or "regionalist" policies toward the Pan-African World, respectively, the

bottom line is that the primary aim of U.S. policy was and still is not only to achieve its "milieu goals"²¹ but also to maintain, defend and protect European-American financial/ economic/national security interests (European Nationalism); its secondary goal was and still is to stymie and, in some cases, annihilate the interests of the Pan-African World and its people so as to posit the Pan-African World in a permanent state of dependent-underdevelopment and powerlessness within the global system.

Indeed, unfolding national and international events over the past eight years have contributed in no small measure, more than any other events since 1945, to alert African people to the nature of the real global struggle. African people must realize that when it comes to European geostrategic survival/security that ideology/democracy takes a back seat. Such a time is now.

As we approach the 21st century, "democracy must think, not only strategically for the purpose of defense, but also geopolitically for the purpose of offense."²² Hence we have the *raison d'être* of the Europeans who are merging the military forces of the current members of the NATO and Warsaw Pacts as a new "security framework" into a Pan-European Army or a Pan-European Military Alliance which would protect and defend the multifaceted economic, geopolitical and geostrategic-security interest of this "new pan-European structure" ("Fortress Europe 1992"/"Europe 1992")²³

African people must awake and face these stark realities. Otherwise, we are going to cross the time-line into the 21st century as a global majority, but powerless, disunited, self-defeated, invisible, dependent and expendable people. For "if the strong [Europeans] can recognize that unity is strength, it is time the small and weak [Africans] realize that they must unite or perish." African people must go through the process/program of Afrocentric global re-education as a necessary condition so that we will be fully equipped with that particular Afrocentric geopolitical sub-conscious mind-set so that we can challenge European Nationalism in the 21st century. □

Linus A. Hoskins, Ph.D., a former member of the faculty at Howard University, is now an associate professor in the Department of Pan-African Studies, and director of the Institute for African American Affairs, at Kent State University. The above was excerpted from a recent monograph he authored, DECODING EUROPEAN GEOPOLITICS: AFROCENTRIC PERSPECTIVES.

NOTES

¹Yuri Afanasyev, one of the Soviet Union's leading progressive historians supports this contention by stating that the Soviet Union is not a socialist society "not even a deformed" socialist society. He asserts further that "the counter-revolutionary road that was taken by Joseph Stalin and his enormous apparatus was not historically necessary or justifiable." Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has even assailed the collectivized system of agriculture for turning millions of Soviet farmers into nothing more than "day laborers" who were losing all interest in the land. Gorbachev has also called for an increased emphasis on family farms and a cutback on collective and state farms. He has defied the traditional communist fear of the "foreign exploiter" by permitting Western capitalist firms to own majority interests in joint ventures in the Soviet Union. His finance minister, Boris Gostev, has even floated the idea of creating a Soviet version of the New York stock market. See David Remnick, "Pravda Readers Told U.S.S.R. Not Socialist," *The Washington Post* (July 27, 1988); Michael Dobbs, "Gorbachev Assails Collective Farms as Resounding Failure," *The Washington Post* (October 14, 1988) and David Remnick, "Resistance to Perestroika Seen Gaining," *The Washington Post* (November 6, 1988).

²Elizabeth Tucker and Stuart Auerbach, "U.S. Businesses, Soviets Increasing Joint Ventures" *The Washington Post* (November 22, 1987), p. K7.

³Gary Lee, "Gorbachev Prods and Dines American Business Leaders," *The Washington Post* (April 14, 1988), p. A25.

⁴Pepsi Cola International, the First National Bank of Chicago, Ford Motor Co., Dresser Industries, Johnson and Johnson, Honeywell, Nabisco, and Midland Bank have had very close financial ties with the apartheid government of South Africa.

⁵Groups of Western Banks to Lend Soviets \$400 million," *The Washington Post* (November 24, 1987).

⁶Robert J. McCartney, "Soviets Get W. German Credit Line," *The Washington Post* (May 10, 1988).

⁷Robert J. McCartney, "Comecon, EC End Hostilities," *The Washington Post* (June 25, 1988), p. A 22.

⁸David Remnick, "Gorbachev Proposes Presidential System" *The Washington Post* (June 29, 1988).

⁹On November 17, 1989, the Senate and House voted to approve a bipartisan bill that provided \$857 million to Poland and \$81 million to Hungary. The bill provided \$125 million in emergency food, including corn, pork bellies, sorghum, feed grain, and butter to ease food shortages in Poland; \$200 million for currency stabilization; \$260 million for an enterprise funding distributing loans to spur private business; \$25 million for a modern telephone and communications system to encourage commerce; and authorized the U.S. Import-Export Bank to insure up to \$200 million worth of commercial bank loans to U.S. businesses for trade with Poland. For Hungary, \$65 million for private enterprise business loans over three years. The bill also authorized a variety of smaller aid programs for both Poland and Hungary, including \$12 million for democratic institutions, \$20 million for environmental work, and \$14 million for cultural and scientific exchanges. In addition, during a week-long visit to the United States in 1989, "the father of Solidarity," Lech Walesa, who was here solely in his capacity as a union leader and not as an official of the Polish government, not only had separate dinners with AFL-CIO Presi-

dent Lane Kirkland, President George Bush, House and Senate Democratic leaders and a Senate luncheon but also was awarded the Presidential "Medal of Freedom," the nation's highest civilian award, at the White House. And on November 15, 1989, Walesa, publicly recognized as the "architect of the first non-Communist-dominated government in Eastern Europe" and "the spiritual godfather of a new generation of democracy," addressed a Joint Session of Congress; this was the first time since 1824 that a private citizen addressed Congress.

¹⁰President Honors Americans of Asian and Pacific Ancestry," *The Washington Post* (May 9, 1989).

¹¹David Hoffman, "Bush Urges Soviets to Broaden Reforms," *The Washington Post* (May 28, 1989).

¹²Alan Murray, "Bush Sees Labor Shortage, Looks Abroad," *The Wall Street Journal* (February 7, 1990).

¹³Ann Devroy and Don Oberdorfer, "Bush Sees Historic Shift to East-West Integration," *The Washington Post* (June 2, 1989).

¹⁴Don Oberdorfer, "Thatcher Says Cold War Has Come to an End," *The Washington Post* (November 18, 1988) and "Thatcher Asks Rights for all Europeans," *The Plain Dealer* (Cleveland, Ohio, August 6, 1990).

¹⁵Gene H. Hogberg, "Winds of Change: As Superpowers Recede," *The Plain Truth* (January 1990), p.5.

¹⁶Bob Woodward and R. Jeffrey Smith, "U.S.-Soviet Pact to Curb Incidents," *The Washington Post* (June 7, 1989).

¹⁷The Euro-American controlled World Bank has also stepped in to help Eastern European communist Poland. In January 1990, the bank announced a five-year \$2.5 billion "bundle of loans for Poland" aimed at increasing Poland's exports, improving telecommunications and transportation, financing the unemployment insurance that Poland is establishing for hundreds of thousands of workers, and assisting various businesses/companies involved in forest products, electricity and industrial chemicals. The bank also strongly urged that Poland's \$39 billion foreign debt owed to Western European industrial democracies and commercial banks be forgiven. The World Bank, however, is not strongly urging and has never strongly urged that the \$3 trillion foreign debt that non-European governments of the Pan-African World owed to the Western European industrial democracies and commercial banks be forgiven. In addition, in February

1990, the IMF approved a 13-month \$723 million loan to Poland in order "to undergird the Polish government's recovery program by helping to bring down inflation and accelerate a shift to a market-guided economy," and in that same month, the IMF also granted a one-year \$213 million loan to Hungary.

¹⁸Remarks made before a Special Session of the U.N. on Apartheid on December 13, 1989 and aired during "South Africa Now" over WHMM TV-Channel 32 on January 13, 1990.

¹⁹Neil Henry, "Africa Analysts Worry that Eastern Europe Will Siphon Away Western Aid," *The Washington Post* (January 3, 1990).

²⁰Robert J. McCartney, "Gorbachev, Kohl Pledge Peace Effort," *The Washington Post* (June 14, 1989)

²¹Stanley Hoffman in his article "What Should We Do in the World" (*The Atlantic Monthly*, October 1989) suggests that "milieu goals" refer to "promoting [Euro-American] values abroad or at least preserving chances for the flowering of those values and shaping international agreements and institutions [IMF and World Bank] in such a way that the nation's fundamental objectives and values are served" (p.85).

²²Quoted in Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Game Plan: A Geostategic Framework for the Conduct of the U.S.-Soviet Contest* (New York: The Atlantic Monthly Press, 1986), p. 194.

²³Al Kamen, "Havel Asks U.S. to Aid Soviet Democratization," *The Washington Post* (February 22, 1990), p. A28, and Jim Hershberg, "A Pan-European Military?" *The Washington Post* (June 7, 1990).