

Oxford University cell promotes treasonous British policy in GOP

by Our Special Correspondent

As it becomes ever more likely that Sen. Bob Dole (Kan.) will become the Republican Party candidate for U.S. President, the British establishment is going to great lengths to control the policy direction of a possible future Republican administration. The British would hardly be averse to having a British-captive Bob Dole replacing President Bill Clinton, whose phasing-out of the U.S.-British "special relationship" has drawn the ire of the British oligarchy. The British would also be concerned to ensure that Dole's patriotic, World War II veteran instincts do not come to the fore. They recall, with horror, how he ruthlessly faced down British government ministers, both directly in London and in meetings on Capitol Hill, over the subject of Bosnia, in 1993-95. They want to make sure that such "mishaps" don't occur again.

One of the more insidious, but little-known channels of direct British influence into senior Republican Party circles, the which requires urgent investigation by patriots in the United States, is an outfit based in Oxford, England, called Republicans Abroad-Oxford University. That may seem an innocent name, suggesting a group of more or less average Americans who happen to live and study in Britain. The reality is quite otherwise. The directors of the group are seasoned, wildly anglophile U.S. State Department professionals; Americans in the intelligence or strategic community who have worked for British intelligence fronts; or, in the case of one Executive Committee member, a British national. Almost all members of the 11-person Executive Committee have operational experience in sensitive conflict zones, such as the Transcaucasus, the Balkans, and the Horn of Africa.

The innocent-sounding name provides a cover for infiltrating British policy into highest-level Republican Party circles. Republicans Abroad-Oxford puts out "Foreign Policy Series" papers. In one such document, in which there is support for strengthening the British-U.S. "special relationship" in opposition to the Germany-oriented direction of President Clinton, there is a call for the United States to increasingly rely on "British imperial experiences" in making policy. Others of the recent papers have included appeals for the United States to adopt a "geopolitical strategy" in the Transcaucasus and Central Asia, based on the early-20th-century ideas of top Empire strategic theoretician Sir Halford Mackinder; and praise for the "realism" of (Sir) Henry Kissinger, as the basis for a GOP foreign policy for the coming years.

Republicans Abroad-Oxford Chairman Jay Jakub is now

a doctoral candidate at St. John's College, Oxford, where he is writing on "intelligence and European security." He was a Foreign Service Officer at the U.S. State Department (1987-94), where he earned four awards for exceptional performance, related to his work on the Gulf war, the Romanian revolution, Central Asia, and the Transcaucasus. He has also had experience in Turkey, Greece, Cyprus, Central Europe, and the Balkans. Jakub was formerly president of the Oxford University Strategic Studies Center, Oxford's oldest international affairs organization.

Another Jakub, Eleni, is a Senior Europe Analyst at the British intelligence-front "Control Risks Group" of London, which is involved in "political and security risk assessment." Formerly, she was also Foreign Service Officer at the U.S. State Department, where she earned awards for exceptional performance for her work on the Horn of Africa, Central Asia, and the Transcaucasus.

The deputy chairman of Republicans Abroad-Oxford is John Hillen. He was appointed Defense Policy Analyst at the Heritage Foundation in Washington, D.C. in October 1995. He is now a doctoral candidate at St. Antony's College, Oxford.

One executive vice-chairman, Laura Le Cornu, a doctoral candidate at Wolfson College, Oxford, is an expert on Azerbaijan, Turkey, and neighboring regions. From 1991 to 1994, she was an accredited correspondent, based in Baku, for, among others, the London *Economist*, the *Financial Times*, and the *Royal United Services Institute Journal*, journal of the British government's official think-tank. Earlier, she was a Reuters and Associated Press correspondent in Turkey.

Geopolitics of the 21st century

One other noteworthy member of the Executive Committee, Dr. Geoffrey Sloan, is not even American, but a British national. He is deputy head of the Strategic Studies and International Affairs Department at Britannia Royal Naval College, in Dartmouth, U.K., where he teaches courses on "geopolitics and intelligence." In 1994-95, he was the British Ministry of Defense Fellow at St. Antony's College, Oxford.

One well-informed maverick British strategist told *EIR*, that the Britannia Royal Naval College is a central place where a new and dangerous geopolitical strategy is being concocted, under the cover of "elite academic studies."

In January 1996, Sloan wrote a paper for Republicans

Abroad-Oxford, entitled "United States Foreign Policy in the 21st Century: A Geopolitical View." In this paper, he complains that "what has been missing from the Clinton administration, has been a geopolitical worldview for the 21st century."

What is his proposed new policy direction? Sloan writes: "The idea of a 'discriminate regionalism' based on the ideas of one of the founding fathers of geopolitical theory, Sir Halford Mackinder, offers a way forward to the future Republican Party." It was Mackinder, Sloan stresses, "who accurately described the constituent elements of politics." He then quotes from two works of Mackinder, *The Physical Basis of Political Geography*, and *Democratic Ideals and Reality*, written in 1890 and 1919, respectively.

This should, now, form the basis for U.S. foreign policy, in his view. After all, "in the past, the United States had, from its inception, policymakers and strategists who had an ability to make a shrewd geopolitical assessment with respect to America's security and the Eurasian balance of power." He praises, in this regard, statements by Thomas Adams in 1799, and the later "geopolitical grand strategy of containment" of the State Department's George Kennan, in the post-World War II period.

As for the future, according to Sloan: "The most important region which will emerge from a geopolitical perspective will be the Central Asian and Transcaucasian republics. . . . Geopolitically, the independence and ethnic composition of these states has made it less likely Russia will ever find it feasible to reestablish its political control, and that various linkages between the region and its southern neighbors will develop, with as yet unforeseen consequences."

The 21st century will have its own "geographical perspective," different from that of this century. "A geopolitical perspective will be the most subtle and erudite way a future Republican administration can meet this challenge."

Sloan has recently written a book entitled *Geopolitics in United States Strategic Policy: 1890-1987*.

Learning from the British Empire

The most shameless statement of the group's devotion to British imperial values, comes in an April-May 1995 paper, by Chairman Jakub, entitled, "The Anglo-American 'Special Relationship' in the post-Cold War World: Much More than Meets the Eye." This is Jakub's synopsis of a conference that took place on April 10-11, 1995, at the Center for Security Studies at Britain's University of Hull, bringing together "seventy-five prominent members of the British and American military, academic, political and government establishments . . . to discuss the state of the Anglo-American 'Special Relationship.' "

The date of this gathering is revealing. Only two weeks earlier, on March 29, the London Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) had organized a major event, entitled "Britain in the World," with the explicit purpose of reviving the British imperial offensive around the world, with

included emphasis on upgrading the British Commonwealth, as the contemporary expression of, or vehicle for, the Empire. The Hull event, and Jakub's comments on it, are perfectly in line with bringing the United States, increasingly, under British imperial sway.

The chief representative from the United States at the Chatham House event was Sir Henry Kissinger. Not surprisingly, a March 1996 "Foreign Policy Series" paper by the Heritage Foundation's John Hillen, entitled "Republican Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War Era: The Art of Discrimination," concludes by praising the "seminal work" of Kissinger, for promoting a notion of "realism" as the basis for policy "in the seemingly unmanageable post-Cold War world."

In his earlier paper, Jakub writes that the conclusions of the Hull event "were somewhat different than might be expected by those who judge British-U.S. ties solely on the media's sensationalist coverage of the various Bill Clinton-John Major public relations fiascos of recent note. Far from being a thing of the past, we found the special relationship to be deeply rooted, generally and genuinely effective, very necessary, and much to our collective relief, likely to continue well into the next century. . . . The special relationship is a series of deep and complex linkages, at many levels of government and, indeed, in the financial, linguistic, and cultural realms of both countries."

Jakub waxes ecstatic, about how the relationship does not



LaRouche
Campaign
Is On the
Internet!

Lyndon LaRouche's Democratic presidential primary campaign has established a World Wide Web site on the Internet. The "home page" brings you recent policy statements by the candidate as well as a brief biographical resumé.

TO REACH the LaRouche page on the Internet:

<http://www.clark.net/larouche/welcome.html>

TO REACH the campaign by electronic mail:

larouche@clark.net

Paid for by Committee to Reverse the Accelerating Global Economic and Strategic Crisis: A LaRouche Exploratory Committee.

only operate at the level of "head of state or government interactions," but on many different levels, including close cooperation between diplomats and the two countries' militaries; "trust in intelligence sharing and codebreaking, particularly in the naval realm"; "sharing of nuclear weapons designs"; and others.

There is something "special" about the "Anglo-U.S. bond" that absolutely cannot be duplicated in the relations of Britain or the United States with other countries. From the British side, Jakub writes sympathetically, it cannot be tolerated that the adjective "special" be used to describe American relations with any other country. While the term "special relationship" is "not in the American political vernacular," it is "critical to Britain's foreign policymaking and British public perceptions about strategic interests. The use of the term 'special' to describe relationships the U.S. maintains with others, distorts our understanding of the peculiarly special Anglo-U.S. bond."

It gets worse. By various "criteria" established at the Hull conference, it is axiomatically inconceivable that the United States could have a "special relationship" other than with Britain! Sneers Jakub: "Try imagining, said one conference participant, American officials candidly and casually sharing nuanced ideas with the French or Germans, such as are routinely encountered in Anglo-American dealings at all levels."

Hull conference participant Jack Crouch, former Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy at the Pentagon, "recalled an instance where a secret British document evaluating a sensitive European issue was introduced into an inter-agency meeting, and it was treated as if it were a U.S. sourced document, by all in the room. This could never happen with a French or German document, Crouch explained to the Hull gathering, as suspicions about the intentions of Bonn or Paris would have fundamentally changed the way the document was utilized and perceived. Many of us nodded our heads, remembering similar experiences during our own government careers. . . . U.S. and U.K. officials—at least in the military/security business—remain much more open and informal with one another than is the case with any other state."

Jakub then gets to the kernel of the matter: "Professor Crouch reminds us, that while the quantity of intelligence flowing from Washington to London is certainly much greater, the reverse flow is generally considered to be of a higher quality by America's policymaking community. Perhaps we are underestimating Britain's ability to act as America's bridge—military, economic, political, and cultural—to Europe and are *underrating the insights the British can still offer from their imperial experiences and Commonwealth ties*" (emphasis added).

Jakub continues: "We also find evidence that the special relationship is still very solid, despite some weakening over time. President Clinton's courting of Germany as a 'special' partner in international affairs has been pointed to by many, as an indication that the Anglo-American relationship is no longer exclusive." But, he says, "the Berlin-Washington relationship" will not "stand up" to reliable "criteria." Indeed, "how likely is it that America will ever trust Berlin with its nuclear, codebreaking, and other military secrets to the same extent that it does with the British? Chancellor Kohl and President Clinton may forge a productive and lasting friendship, but what about these many other levels of cooperation and collaboration which form the foundation of the Anglo-American global partnership?"

Jakub quotes one expert: "In military terms, the special relationship offers more today than it did in the last fifteen years." He goes on: "If multilateralism is the way of the future, with whom else are we to cooperate if not with Britain first? . . . France might be militarily competent, but is wholly unreliable. Germany may fare slightly better on the latter, but is not capable of projecting military force, nor is it willing to do so. And those things which we take for granted regarding the British, such as a common language (for the most part), the shared concept of common law, Britain's immense investment in the United States—ranked first in the world, even above Japan—the corresponding link of the dollar and pound sterling on international exchange markets, and the long, institutionalized nature of ties, must all be considered when judging the whole of the special relationship."

So, You Wish To Learn All About Economics?

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

A text on elementary mathematical economics, by the world's leading economist. Find out why *EIR* was right, when everyone else was wrong.

Order from:

Ben Franklin Booksellers, Inc.
107 South King Street Leesburg, VA 22075

\$10 plus shipping (\$1.50 for first book, \$.50 for each additional book). Bulk rates available. Information on bulk rates and videotape available on request.

