

The historical issues behind the current world crisis

by Criton Zoakos,
Contributing Editor

When the NATO Summit of last Dec. 12 voted up a resolution providing for the introduction of some 600 new theater nuclear weapons, Zbigniew Brzezinski, in a moment of private mirth, hailed that development as "the most important event since the Peace of Westphalia of 1648!" This statement is only accurate if it is viewed against the background of the full extent of the present world crisis and especially against the background of the motivations which drive the powerful behind-the-scenes individuals who have led the world to this crisis with a desperate determination.

To summarize the world crisis as it stands at the moment of writing: Washington, as the place where the instruments of world power are centered, has collapsed, in the sense that the entire array of programs for which the Carter administration had been put in the White House is now lying in ruins.

The China card policy has collapsed as the wily mandarins around Deng Xiaoping took complete control over China's affairs at the last, meticulously prepared Central Committee meeting, where long term policies were put in place, policies which will be pursued on the basis of Peking playing both its "American card" and its "Russian card" for a long time to come.

The "Islamic fundamentalist" policy of the Carter administration has also collapsed formally with the March 10 statement of Ayatollah Khomeini on the matter of the U.S. hostages in Teheran. That maneuver by Khomeini was the product of patient intrigues and deals between the mullahs and the KGB and British intelligence-run networks of the Iranian Communist (Tudeh) Party on the matter of the coming Majlis elections in Iran. To the astonishment of Zbigniew Brzezinski, the most outspoken sponsor of "Islamic fundamentalism," the Soviets have displayed the hitherto unsuspected ability to subvert, turn around and direct religious fundamentalist movements which were originally organized

and deployed as pawns against Soviet policies. With this demonstrated ability of the Soviets to coopt the religious fundamentalist weapon, Washington's entire strategy of the Arc of Crisis is no longer operative.

The "Camp David" strategy of creating a joint Israeli-Egyptian military policing force for the purpose of keeping continental Western Europe out of the Middle East and Africa, has also collapsed as the Israeli government of Menachem Begin appointed to the post of Foreign Minister Mr. Yitzhak Shamir, the outspoken speaker of the Knesset who tirelessly campaigned against Camp David from 1978 onward.

The economic strategy of the controllers of the Carter administration has also collapsed into a nightmare of runaway hyperinflation whose chief characteristic is that every anti-inflationary measure of the government results in yet-higher rates of inflation. The combined Volcker-Carter measures since October 1979 have produced the result, in March 1980, of a situation in which the Central Banks of England and the United States have to choose between bankrupting the U.S. Treasury and bankrupting the British Exchequer. Or between bankrupting those two and the commercial banks of New York and London. Or between these types of bankruptcies and a formal declaration that the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank are defunct.

Consequences of Washington's collapse

Dr. Brzezinski's evocation of the Peace of Westphalia on the occasion of the Dec. 12 NATO resolution was meant to indicate, as he explained, that just as the Peace of Westphalia had relegated the Hapsburg claims of "Holy Roman Empire" to the junkheap of history and had introduced into the arena of history the Richelieu-Mazarin concept of the sovereign nation-state, so also, according to Dr. Brzezinski's reckoning, the NATO

resolution would in turn relegate the notion of the sovereign nation-state to the museum, and replace it with what he affectionately calls the "just and equitable new world order," or "One World government" for the unsophisticated.

At the time, Dr. Brzezinski was not too far fetched—after all, the West European governments, with their decision to have the Pershing II missiles deployed on their soil, had in fact capitulated to a military policy that no sovereign nation-state ever allows itself to entertain: the policy that their national territory can be used for tactical nuclear warfare fought by third powers. In this instance, the NATO resolution was tantamount to West Germany, Italy, Denmark and so forth allowing the United States and the Soviet Union to fight proxy nuclear wars on their national territory. In this sense, the historical principle of the Peace of Westphalia had been violated by the NATO resolution.

What happened between Dec. 12 and now which accounts for the collapse of Washington? The Soviet action in Afghanistan, of course. But its importance is not where most observers ordinarily locate it. The Soviet action in Afghanistan unleashed a process in continental Western Europe which today presents us with a full scale resurgence of European nationalism in the world political struggle. France and the Federal Republic of Germany, acting in coordination, are fast capturing all the political assets of the Middle East until recently held in the hands of London and New York-Washington. West Germany and France, proclaiming that the Washington-London leadership of the alliance is proven bankrupt, are now actively pushing a drive to take over the leadership of the West, based on an entirely different founding principle from the one originally proclaimed in the aftermath of the Second World War. The principle of a "Western order, liberal and universal" is being scrapped.

The case of the London Economist

The underlying historical issues contested during the current world crisis are not ordinarily discussed in public by the principal grand strategists who, behind the scenes, set policies of which the events reported to the public are mere shadows. Brzezinski's reference to the Peace of Westphalia, though precise in terms of the world historical issues involved, is exceptional. Another even more exceptional such public statement is a major essay, published in the current issue of Lord Rothschild's *London Economist*, authored by Mr. Peter Jay, former U.K. Ambassador to Washington, son-in-law of former British Prime Minister Jim Callaghan and a British policy insider known for his spokespersonship of a strategic perspective widely identified with the assassinated Lord Mountbatten, the Queen's cousin. Peter Jay's policy

paper, "Europe's Ostrich and America's Eagle," is an exceptionally candid and exceptionally desperate revelation, an unveiling, of some of the less sordid mental processes now racing inside the heads of those policy makers who have brought the world to its present crisis.

Ambassador Jay's policy essay makes the following principal strategic arguments: **First**, the cohesion of the "West" is in jeopardy as a result of the recent resurgence of European nationalism; **second**, if "continental European nationalism" is not reversed, the "cohesion of the West" will collapse and continental Western Europe will be "free at last" to choose its own way of dealing with the Soviet Union, to be "red or dead"; **third**, if the offensive of "European nationalism" is not reversed, the decade of the 1980s will witness the emergence of a "European Reich," based on the European Monetary System, dominated by economic nationalism, political centralism, military self-assertion, "eroding and in the end destroying the bonds and so the benefits of the west"; **fourth**, if this new "European Reich" emerges out of the EMS, it will cause the reemergence in the United States of nationalist forces (which he calls "the isolationists") for the first time since they lost their battle to "Roosevelt and Churchill in 1941," referring to the Atlantic Charter conference off the coast of Newfoundland.

These eventualities, according to Ambassador Jay, must be prevented if what he calls "the West" is to survive. Americans, especially American conservatives, will be astounded to discover what the gamemasters of London, the very statesmen who drafted the 1941 Atlantic Charter, meant by the term "the West," or, in their favorite phraseology, the "Western order, liberal and universal." To quote Peter Jay:

The shape and cohesion of the west were created in the 1940s out of the lessons of the 1930s, reinforced by the new threat of Soviet power. Among those lessons were:

- That unbridled nationalism is the world's most dangerous force.
- That the world needs a framework of law and institutions ["One World Government"] under which disputes can be conciliated in the full light of world opinion and within which pacific nations can feel secure while belligerent ones will be effectively deterred from seeing to acquire territory by force.
- That, failing conciliation and deterrence under law, collective security is the best defense against any aggressor.
- That economic nationalism—protectionism, autarky, mercantilism—not only damage prosperity, but also reinforce political nationalism and engender friction between nations.

These lessons informed a new international philosophy, based on the principles of the rule of



Former British Ambassador to the U.S., Peter Jay

To quote Peter Jay: "The shape and cohesion of the West were created in the 1940s out of the lessons of the 1930s, reinforced by the new threat of Soviet power. Among those lessons were that unbridled nationalism is the world's most dangerous force."

international law and the sovereignty of the nation state *under it*, of the conciliation of disputes, of collective security, of liberal trade and payments, of cooperative global management of a flexible and stable currency system and of capital aid for post-war reconstruction and for new development.

... These new principles were embodied in the characteristic institutions which defined the post-war political and economic order: the United Nations and its agencies; the World Court; the Bretton Woods twins—the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank; the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; the Marshall Plan and the Organization for European Cooperation and Development; and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

For the first time do we see in a mass circulation publication the formal admission of a former senior British official that all the postwar institutions of "the West" from NATO to the IMF, were designed for the purpose of taming and emasculating the historical institution of the nation-state. This ought to give food for thought to the uninformed American conservative. "The West," under the pretense of defense from the "Soviet menace" has been nothing but a *liberal* organization of affairs, whose principal enemy from the beginning was the destruction of nation-state and nationalism, and this includes NATO, the purported champion of our national freedoms!

Scales ought to start falling from many an eye when we pursue Ambassador Jay's slanderous discourse on specific nationalisms, viz. American nationalism which he slanders as "isolationism" and European nationalism which he slanders by misidentifying it with Schacht, Mussolini and Hitler!

Peter Jay on American nationalism:

The American isolationists were finally defeated in the early 1940s by enlightened East Coast leadership and Japanese folly. They stayed defeated after the war by a combination of Soviet folly and the same internationalist outlook among the prevailing political establishment in Washington. But they were never exterminated; and they can always draw sustenance from economic adversity...etc. In short, America's involvement in Europe, like every other American policy, rests on a balance of political forces within the United States that is neither God-given nor immutable.

Peter Jay on European nationalism:

The whole political history of Europe from the collapse of Christendom to Hitler's war has been an exercise in the most sustained and unbridled nationalism the world has known. Despite the contrary theorizing of every political philosopher from Plato to Plamenatz (excepting only some minor nineteenth-century Germans and, perhaps, Hegel) the nation—its needs, power, glory and wealth—has consistently predominated in political priorities over both the individual and the international community. Nationalism is indeed Europe's characteristic political genius, now alas exported to every corner of the globe...

On the basis of this spurious theorizing, Peter Jay comes to immediate strategic issues at hand, namely the European Monetary System and the EEC under the leadership of France and the Federal Republic of Germany. He falls very little short of calling them Nazi:

...it was only by creating a united Europe, or at

least a superstate in western Europe, that the old nationalist soul could expect to operate in the big new global league. If the ghosts of Frederick the Great, Queen Elizabeth, Napoleon and Hitler in politics, or Colbert, Joe Chamberlain, Schacht and Mussolini in economics were ever to be freed in the world of the late twentieth century, it could only be by forging a state of the size and with the resources of Western Europe as a whole ... the development of a European Monetary System (EMS) with or without aspiration to an eventual EEC currency bloc and even a single currency, undoubtedly owes to the growth of European self-consciousness as such.

What is going on here!!!

Of course the peace of Westphalia

Frederick the Great, Queen Elizabeth, Colbert yes, they can be viewed as spokesmen of Europe's "old nationalist soul." But Hitler? No! Schacht? No! Mussolini? No! In fact there exist to this day official British documents in which the British government, and most emphatically Winston Churchill, publicly proclaim that Hitler and Schacht are Britain's best defense against German nationalism, as that German nationalism was best expressed by Hitler's archenemy General Schleicher; also documents which proclaim Churchill's great satisfaction with Mussolini's success in subordinating Italy's national interests to the global strategies of the British Empire.

So, let us once again clarify the issues of nationalism, the nation state and the bearing it has on the current world crisis.

It is true that Europe's political genius is nationalism. But not in the sense that the freaked-out former British ambassador indicates—not in the sense that European history is mindlessly swept by nationalist passions, but in the sense that Europe, the historical Neoplatonic-humanist faction in European history, invented nationalism *as an instrument to a higher moral purpose*. European history in fact, is the history of an unfinished struggle that has been going on since the assassination of the last Babylonian king, the *Egyptian agent* Nabonidus circa 700 B.C., between two factions, later identified by the eponyms "Platonic" and "Neoplatonic republican" for the humanist faction, and "Aristotelian-oligarchical" for the bestialist faction.

Apostolic and Patristic Christianity emerged as the Neoplatonic political challenge to the oligarchical bestiality of the Roman Empire. Later, the current of Saint Augustine of Hippo within the Christian Church launched a great civilizing drive among the Western and Northern European pagan clans and through the Irish

monk Alcuin launched the great effort of Charlemagne to civilize Europe despite the corrupt Roman oligarchy's grip over Church policy. During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the Neoplatonic humanist forces of Europe were rallied around the great Hohenstaufen emperors and around Roger Bacon's faction within the Church in a life-and-death struggle against the bestialist traditions of the Hildebrand Papacy and its allies the same old Roman oligarchy, the Normans, the Anjou and Plantagenets.

When the humanist forces went down in military defeat, the humanist cause was carried back east, in the desolate ramparts of the Paleologue Dynasty of Byzantine Emperors. For over two centuries, the Paleologues, in their rapidly shrinking domains in Constantinople, Sparta and the environs of ancient Troy, led and cultivated a profound intellectual and philosophical renaissance whose unique fruits were the revival of Plato in practical political affairs carried out by the great Platonist Georgios Gemistos Plethon, the close friend of Cosimo de Medici and teacher of Marsilio Ficino.

It was because of Plethon's and the Paleologues' policy of launching a system of humanist nation-states throughout all of Europe, including Russia, France, England, Germany and Italy, that the Guelph-dominated Papacy conspired with the Turkish Sultan Muhammed II and the pro-Turkish Aristotelian Orthodox Patriarch Gennadios to effect the conquest of Constantinople by Turkish nomad hordes and the destruction of the Paleologue dynasty.

Two of Georgios Plethon's surviving works, *De Rebus Peloponnesiacorum Oratio I and II*, constitute the foundation of all strategies that were later followed by others to establish nation states and national economies. In fact, these two works constitute the political-philosophical foundation of the tradition of national political economy as later developed by Colbert, Richelieu, Alexander Hamilton, Mathew and Henry Carey and Friedrich List.

When the Paleologues went to Byzantium to continue the work of the defeated humanist Hohenstaufen kings, the Papacy installed the evil House of Hapsburg, originally a bunch of minor Swiss nobles, to the throne of the Holy Roman Emperor. With the defeat of the Paleologues, two major events occurred which changed the course of European history: the entire network of Plethon's neoplatonic scholars, statesmen, military officers and clergymen moved from Byzantium to Western Europe, predominantly Italy but also France and there, drawing on the rich soil cultivated by the great Dante Alighieri, helped launch the Italian nation state. At the same time, the Bourbon kings of France, in order to minimize the damage done to civilization by the fall of Constantinople, organized one of the most ambitious rescue operations in history, ordering that every piece of



Zbigniew Brzezinski

According to Dr. Brzezinski's reckoning, the NATO resolution would in turn relegate the notion of the sovereign nation-state to the museums and replace it with what he affectionately calls the "just and equitable new order," or "One World government" for the unsophisticated.

writing, from private correspondence to state documents to literary and scientific works that existed in Paleologue Byzantium to be hunted down, rescued from the Turkish occupiers and shipped and centralized in Paris. As a result, to this very day Paris still is the primary source for anyone who wants to do historical research on Byzantine history.

This way, the French throne inherited the entire legacy of Paleologue statecraft, including the little known and absolutely exceptional documents, the "Legacies" or "Last Wills" of each Paleologue Emperor to his successor, written in Attic Greek metered verse, explaining the application of Platonic statecraft from Plato's *Republic*, the *Statesman* and other dialogues. This Platonic and Neoplatonic legacy formed the core of political weapons that the French throne used in its protracted struggle against the House of Hapsburg and Hapsburg possessions in Spain, the Netherlands and Burgundy. The French kings, despite military inferiority, defeated the Hapsburgs because they systematically employed Plethon's program for organizing nation states, national economies and national cultural efforts. The Peace of Westphalia, of 1648, Dr. Brzezinski's point of reference for the current world crisis, in fact represented the conclusion not merely of the Thirty Years War but the conclusion of a 200-year struggle between the French humanist forces and the bestial Hapsburgs. The Peace of Westphalia, being the first in the history of mankind to recognize in legal form the sovereignty of the nation state, represented, on the matter of principle, a total neoplatonic-humanist victory against the bestial Hapsburgs.

This is how the notion of the nation state was created in human affairs.

The "nationalist genius of Europe" is that that continent was fortunate to be graced by exceptional shep-

herds of men who developed the creative insight that in order to accomplish the great task of bringing morally and culturally backward populations forward into the light of culture and civilization, the mediation of the institution of the nation state is necessary. The nation state was conceived initially and still is today the institution which organized great numbers of people around great moral goals. The nation of the United States, woven out of so many ethnic and previous national strains, is a true nation, in fact a special nation among nations, because of the particular purpose around which the organizers of the nation—Benjamin Franklin's international conspiracy and Washington's, von Steuben's and Lafayette's Society of Cincinnatus—organized the American population. The purpose and therefore the soul of this nation, as spelled out in the Constitution and other founding documents, is to provide a framework of a constitutional republic and a federal government within which the potential of the citizens for creative contributions in the domains of science, technology, industry and the arts can be fostered to the maximum. The larger purpose of the American republic, as founded, was to provide for the establishment of a system of such humanist republics, nation states around the world.

The former British Ambassador goes into a shameless public freak-out for fear that this potential for American nationalism may again be unleashed, and may yet link up with the "nationalist genius" of our European allies, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and the European Monetary System. What would suffer from such a course of events?

Is Peter Jay's concept of "the West" viable?

The liberal, viciously antinationalist post-Atlantic Charter world of the IMF, the World Bank, the United

Nations, NATO, the "bridles" of the nation state will come apart, no doubt, if the half-dormant forces of American nationalism—those forces that Ambassador Jay scornfully slanders as "isolationist"—break through in this election year. And if these forces have the good sense of joining with, and leading "Europe's genius for nationalism," the EMS, nothing will be left standing of this corrupt, sodomic liberal world to which Ambassador Jay is accustomed. But his world will not collapse because of the imminent erupting of the forces of nationalism. On the contrary, these recent stirrings of what Peter Jay calls "nationalism" are only reactions, hasty responses to the fact that his "Western order, liberal and universal" has been coming apart at the seams since at least 1967.

Liberal economic doctrine and its opposition to the Colbertian-Hamiltonian-Listian economic outlook brought about the present world economic crisis. Systematic liberal opposition to science and technology has brought about the threatened collapse of the American economy, following the British collapse. Liberal military and manpower policies have turned NATO into a joke among nations. Liberal educational and juridical practices have brought about the scandalous degeneration among those layers in British and American society which are traditionally expected to think through social problems and provide leadership. So, Peter Jay is complaining that the spirit of "nationalism," in Europe and in the United States, is challenging the leadership of the "Liberal order."

But liberalism proved its bankruptcy long before it was challenged.

The question for the American people, during this election year is, what new international arrangement will replace the bankrupt "liberal order" of the IMF, the World Bank, the United Nations, NATO etc. And of course, there is the great bogeyman of the "Soviet menace."

The Soviet question, which was understood by President Eisenhower more than any other elected official in our postwar history, is best analyzed within the context of the long sweep of European struggles. Official Soviet mythology for the masses notwithstanding, the dominant, though not the only, impulse in Soviet policymaking is not "Marxism-Leninism" nor class struggle, but rather the historical interests of the Russian nation state as augmented into the Soviet nation state. The London *Economist* and the London *Times* among other mouthpieces of the Royal Institute had the good sense to remark, after Christmas of 1979, that, to everyone's surprise, the Soviet leadership is acting more in accordance with classical Russian state policy precepts than according to the "Marxist" profile. The origins of the Russian state go back to Ivan the Third and his wife Zoe Paleologue. Ivan the Terrible, the scourge of the boyar

oligarchs, was a Neoplatonic statesman, a nation builder in the Paleologue tradition. So was Boris Gudonov. Peter the Great was in the Neoplatonic tradition of the Paleologues as augmented by the great Leibniz. Alexander II, who allied with President Lincoln against the Confederacy was in the same tradition. The great Count Witte was also in the Neoplatonic Leibniz tradition. Lenin of the Rapallo Treaty and Stalin who secretly prided himself as a "Leibnizian" were of the same tradition.

Ironically, the present military advantage that the Soviet Union holds over the United States is the result not of any "Marxist-Leninist" principles, but precisely the result of the Leibnizian nation state outlook which is hegemonic in the Soviet military-scientific community as exemplified by their Siberian Academy of Sciences. It is also ironical that Ambassador Jay's concept of the "West," which as a matter of fundamental principle repudiates the policies of economic "nationalism" also holds that eternal hostility with the Soviet Union to be a necessary permanent policy for "the West." The Soviets are attaining military advantage by pursuing "economic nationalist" policies. Mr. Jay's "West," by repudiating such policies on principle is rapidly being condemned to military emasculation.

Great Britain and our own Eastern Establishment are faced with an insoluble paradox: if they are steadfast to their liberal, antinationalist principles, they will not be capable of leading "the West" against the Soviet menace. If they are forced to accept the leadership of "European nationalism" within "the West," they may find that as French and German "nationalism" have ascertained, peaceful coexistence with the Soviet nation state is not, in principle, incompatible with their "nationalist" interest, although, one may allow, tactical turns of each nation's interests may on occasion conflict.

The solution to such a future problem is likely to be, to Mr. Brzezinski's great horror, some 20th century version of the Peace of Westphalia, a concord of sovereign nation states, a world system of humanist republics, commonly pursuing the task of developing the Third World by means of science, technology and industrialization. This is precisely the policy by which France and Germany snatched the entire Arab world from under Brzezinski's nose. This is also the policy that the Soviets applied, in concord with the West Europeans, in India and Pakistan. Increasingly, indications are emerging that the Soviets are about to play their "China card" on the basis of exactly the same policy, i.e. by allowing Peking to play its "Russian card" in terms of pursuing capital equipment and raw materials.

If, in the coming months, the forces in the tradition of Richelieu-Mazarin carry the day, as in 1648, then the Jesuit-trained Brzezinski, like his cherished Hapsburgs, will once again find himself on the losing side.