

Dealing With Russia: As in 1907, Wrong Again

by Rachel and Allen Douglas

Five months ago,¹ we told you how the career of Alexander Helphand “Parvus” sheds light on what the neo-con war party, grouped around Vice President Dick Cheney, has really been up to. That is because the hereditary roots of the neo-cons’ current doctrine and practice of permanent warfare and proliferating regime changes trace back to the Anglo-Venetian operative Parvus’s early-20th-Century theory and practice of Permanent War as the pathway to Permanent Revolution. Now the dangerous excitement about a showdown with Iran, on the part of the same war party and the higher-ups providing them guidance—as at British Foreign Minister Jack Straw’s dinner party, reported on p. 36—forces us back to the opening years of the last century once more.

In the United States and Britain alike, certain enthusiasts for an imminent showdown with Iran are eager to get more bang for their buck, taking the opportunity to deal a blow to Russia, as well. They are repeating the duplicitous and deadly approaches used by King Edward VII of Britain and his henchmen in the decade and a half before the outbreak of World War I in 1914, which set in motion all the disasters of the 20th Century.

Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) exhibited the pathology in a pure form during the annual Munich Conference the weekend of Feb. 4-5. He warned Russia and China to cooperate against Iran in the UN Security Council, or else the U.S. would “seek willing partners to impose these sanctions outside the UN framework.” McCain lashed out at Russia, saying that “it is clear that Moscow wishes to be seen as a great power,” but that the only way to achieve that status is to “stand up to Iran’s threats, end the frozen conflicts in Europe’s east, ensure Ukraine becomes an oasis of stability and prosperity instead of a Cold War-style battleground, and help to transform Central Asia.” But rather than doing that, McCain charged, President Putin’s Russia continues “to pursue foreign and domestic policies strongly at odds with our interest and values, . . . seeks to prefer the pursuit of autocracy at home and abroad, to prefer blocking concerted action against rogue states, to weaken [Russia’s] democratic adversaries. . . . Under Mr. Putin, Russia today is neither a democracy nor one of the world’s leading economies, and I seriously question whether the G-8 leaders should attend the St. Petersburg summit.”

1. Jeffrey Steinberg, Allen Douglas, and Rachel Douglas, “Cheney Revives Parvus ‘Permanent War’ Madness,” *EIR*, Sept. 23, 2005.

With Russia chairing the Group of Eight industrialized nations for the first time, the London *Economist* (“he is not the partner the West once hoped for”) and the *Wall Street Journal*, chief mouthpieces of the London and New York financial oligarchy, also piled on demands that Russia be blocked from trying to accomplish anything substantial through the G-8. Putin has declared his G-8 agenda priorities to be global energy security, combating the spread of infectious diseases, and education.

There is some reflection of what is afoot in the fact that Putin has gone out of his way, since the end of January, to stage a running joke at the expense of some British intelligence operatives, caught in a Moscow park with a malfunctioning electronic dead drop concealed in a rock. “Putin knows the British are the problem,” Lyndon LaRouche commented on Feb. 6, “but he has shown no sign of understanding the deeper aspects of the global strategic problem. He thinks he can position himself as an ‘energy tsar,’ to use Russia’s energy resources as a basis for Russia’s role in the world. This is the wrong positive conception of Russia’s potential role. Nonetheless, he has the right analytical sense of the strategic crisis: He knows it’s the Brits.” Many people in the United States haven’t gotten that far.

The Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907

There was also an Iranian—Persian, at that time—angle to the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907. As we reported last week,² elements of today’s escalation of conflicts in Southwest Asia are rooted in the British Foreign Office’s carving up of that region, through the secret Sykes-Picot accord with France in 1916. The Anglo-French definition of spheres of influence in turn incorporated understandings reached a decade earlier between British Foreign Secretary Sir Edward Grey and Russian Foreign Minister Count Alexander P. Izvolsky—both of them operating at the behest of King Edward VII of England—and enshrined in the Anglo-Russian Convention.

Today James Nixey, Russia-Eurasia specialist at Chatham House (the Royal Institute of International Affairs), tells the Bloomberg news agency that Russia is “punching above its weight” in geopolitics, because “the U.S. and EU need it to help persuade the UN Security Council to censure or sanction Iran over its nuclear program.” Nixey’s remark expresses a less visible line of contingency planning than the outright war preparations: namely, to induce Moscow to join the Synarchist financial oligarchy in a smoother termination of Iran’s sovereignty.

The 1907 Convention divided Persia into British and Russian spheres of influence, while maintaining a puppet government in Tehran: “The Governments of Great Britain and Russia having mutually engaged to respect the integrity and

2. Muriel Mirak-Weissbach, “Shades of Sykes-Picot Accord Are Cast Over Southwest Asia,” *EIR*, Feb. 10, 2006.



clipart.com



Library of Congress



King Edward VII of England (right) sowed discord between the great powers led by his nephews, Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany (center, shown with Winston Churchill) and Tsar Nicholas II of Russia (left), leading to World War I. While he courted Nicholas to ally Russia with England, his henchmen plotted the Tsar's overthrow.

independence of Persia, and sincerely desiring the preservation of order throughout that country and its peaceful development, as well as the permanent establishment of equal advantages for trade and industry of all other nations;

“Considering that each of them has, for geographical and economic reasons, a special interest in the maintenance of peace and order in certain provinces of Persia adjoining, or in the neighborhood of, the Russian frontier on the one hand, and the frontiers of Afghanistan and Baluchistan on the other hand, and being desirous of avoiding all cause of conflict between their respective interests in the above-mentioned provinces of Persia;

“Have agreed on the following terms. . . .”

Then followed a list of vital Persian national assets, the control of which was to be divided up between Britain and Russia: “railways, banks, telegraphs, roads, insurance, . . . concessions of political or commercial nature, . . . customs revenues,” and the servicing of “Persian loans.”³

Sir Cecil Spring Rice, British Minister at Tehran, assured the Persian foreign secretary in September 1907, “The object of the two Powers in making this agreement is not in any way to attack, but rather to assure forever, the independence of Persia. Not only do they not wish to have at hand any excuse for intervention, but their object in these friendly negotiations was not to allow one another to intervene on the pretext of

safeguarding their interests. The two Powers hope that in the future Persia will be forever delivered from the fear of foreign intervention, and will thus be perfectly free to manage her own affairs in her own way.” That did not prevent Russian Foreign Minister Sazonov, a few years later, from wiring to London that “The Imperial Government expects that in future its full liberty of action will be recognized in the sphere of influence allotted to it, coupled in particular with the right of preferentially developing in that sphere its financial and economic policies.”⁴

The geopolitical horse trading continued, that is, well into the World War I that the Anglo-Russian alliance had helped to precipitate, and even as Russia itself plunged into the conflagration of that war (9 million Russian dead), the Revolutions of 1917, and its Civil War of 1918-21 (10 million dead).

The Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907 likewise delineated spheres of influence in Afghanistan and Tibet. The three regions had been the front lines of confrontation between the Russian Empire in the heart of Eurasia and the British Empire along the inland fringes of its Asian coastal holdings. Thus the 1907 deal is known as the end point of the Great Game, as Rudyard Kipling dubbed the 19th-Century contest for dominance over the Eurasian continent.

4. F. Seymour Cox, *The Secret Treaties and Understandings; text of the available documents with introductory comments and explanatory notes* (London: 1918).

3. U.K. Parliamentary Papers, 1908.

At the same time, the agreement was the final breakthrough towards formation of the Triple Entente among England, France, and Russia, which Edward VII and his team had sought to forge for over three decades. It was the official reconciliation between Britain and Russia, after the Crimean War of the 1850s, when the British had cut the erstwhile “gendarme of Europe,” Russia, down to size.

In 1908 W.T. Stead, co-founder of Lord Milner’s Round Table group, through which much of Edward VII’s dirty work had been done, published *The M.P. for Russia*, a glowing memoir of his friend, Madame Novikoff (Olga Novikova). She was a Pan-Slav activist, resident in London for many years, who collaborated with Stead and with Lord Gladstone, in particular, to bring Russia into an alliance with Britain by manipulating crises in the Balkans. Stead referred to his coordination with the Pan-Slavs, through Novikova, as an Anglo-Russian Intelligence Department. In the introduction to his book, he crowed that the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907 was the prize for which they had jointly worked since the 1870s, adding that the “Pan-Slavonic faith” of his Russian allies “anticipated in many points the spirit of ideal British Imperialism.”⁵

To Save the Empire

To set the stage on which Edward VII lured his foolish cousin, the Russian Tsar, into the Triple Entente, let us recapitulate the strategic picture in the late 19th and early 20th Centuries, as presented in the above-mentioned article, “Cheney Revives Parvus ‘Permanent War’ Madness”:

“The doctrine of ‘Permanent Revolution/Permanent War,’ widely associated with the Bolshevik revolutionary Leon Trotsky, emerged in a very specific historical context—the late-19th- and early-20th-Century period, in which the ideas of the American System of political economy were gaining wide support among leading governments and political circles throughout Eurasia. This posed an existential threat to the British Monarchy/British East India Company-centered Anglo-Dutch empire, and to the head of that cabal, the ‘Prince of the Isles’ Edward Albert, later Britain’s King Edward VII.

“In the immediate aftermath of the defeat of the British-backed Southern secessionist insurrection known as the American Civil War (1861-65), the United States, despite the British-sponsored assassination of President Abraham Lincoln, emerged as the world’s leading industrial power. What was known as the American System of political economy, associated with U.S. Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton, and such later Hamiltonians as Henry Carey, John Quincy Adams, Henry Clay, E. Peshine Smith, the German Careyite Friedrich List, et al., established a system of protective tariffs, national banking, infrastructure investment, the promotion of science and technology, and other measures. The American System was universally known, at the time, to be the deadly, feared enemy of the British System of free trade, private cen-

tral banking, slave labor, and global cartels.

“It was the industrial might of the Federal states—based on the Hamiltonian American System policy—that provided the margin of victory against the Confederate insurrection. Lincoln was also greatly assisted by the vital international support of his close ally, Russia’s Tsar Alexander II, who deployed the entire Russian Navy to North America to deter Britain and France from entering the war on the side of the Confederacy.

“In a fitting celebration of the American System, a Centennial fair was convened in Philadelphia in 1876, which aimed to spread the American System around the world. In this period, these ideas took root in the new unified German state, under Bismarck, which adopted the ideas of Friedrich List, and which established joint industrial ventures between leading American figures like Thomas Alva Edison and German industrialists Walther Rathenau and Werner von Siemens. In Russia, American and Russian engineers collaborated on the construction of the Trans-Siberian Railroad, which was modelled on the U.S. Transcontinental Railroad project which had helped consolidate a unified continental republic, following the disasters of the Civil War. Under the leadership of Sergei Witte, Russia emerged, at the end of the 19th Century, as the fastest-growing industrial nation in Eurasia. In Japan, under the Meiji Restoration, the American System was adopted, with Carey protégé E. Peshine Smith serving as a leading economic advisor to the Japanese Emperor. Similar American System ideas were adopted in the France of Gabriel Hanotaux, which launched ambitious plans to build railroads across Africa. In China, Sun Yat-sen was trained by American missionaries in the ideas of Hamilton and Carey, and a Chinese republican movement advanced detailed plans for the integration and modernization of China. Other examples of the spread of the American System abounded in South America and as far away as Australia.

“In London, Prince Edward Albert, the son of Queen Victoria, who would later become King Edward VII, viewed this spread of the American System with great alarm. The British response, over the course of the next 40 years, would be to spread perpetual warfare across Eurasia, through an array of manipulations, playing one nationality off against another, assassinating key republican political leaders, fostering the growth of deeply flawed pseudo-political movements and ideologies, conducting each-against-all diplomatic maneuverings, and fomenting ‘regime changes,’ ultimately leading to two successive World Wars. In every instance, British agents, often operating under the cover of official diplomatic postings, forged alliances with the most backward feudalist and fundamentalist factions within the targeted nations—often through Freemasonic lodges and other secret societies, created phony ‘liberation’ movements, and recruited and deployed key agents.

“Thus, instead of a Eurasia united behind American System republican ideas and concrete great development projects, the British manipulated the Franco-Prussian, Balkan,

5. W.T. Stead, *The M.P. for Russia*, Vol. I (New York: G.P. Putnam’s, 1909).

Sino-Japanese, and Russo-Japanese wars. The Balkan Wars of 1912-13 led, lawfully, into World War I. The Young Turk revolution in Turkey, secured for Britain, and an allied France, the breakup of the Ottoman Empire, and its replacement by an Anglo-French series of protectorates throughout the Near East. In the course of these efforts, British Intelligence fostered the Muslim Brotherhood as a permanent insurrectionist force within the entire Islamic world. . . .

“In all of these efforts the British apparatus of Prince Edward Albert modelled their actions on those of the Venetian republic, which had emerged as the center of the new European rentier financial oligarchic power in the wake of the collapse of the Byzantine Empire. As the center of European power shifted from the Mediterranean northward, Venice morphed into the Dutch and later Anglo-Dutch liberal system of global financier dominance, over the course of the 15th-18th Centuries. By the time Prince Edward Albert emerged as the heir to the legacy of Lords Shelburne and Palmerston, London was the global center of what some properly called the Venetian Party.”

The Round Table

Not long after the American Civil War, W.T. Stead wrote that regaining North America for the British Empire was so important an objective as to merit letting the capital of the Empire be in the United States, if that's what it took. Stead worked on that perspective through the single most powerful political bloc in late-19th-Century Britain, the Round Table, which he co-founded with Lord Alfred Milner. Other Round Table luminaries included Lord Esher (otherwise employed by the banker Sir Ernest Cassell, Edward VII's operative who would run the Ottoman National Bank for the Young Turks in 1909) and Albert Grey (Earl Grey, destined to represent the Round Table perspective in Canada and Africa). Grey's cousin Sir Edward Grey, the Foreign Secretary from 1905 to 1916, was also close to Milner and shared the “co-opt America” perspective.

As for Russia, its place in British Imperial strategy was dictated by the divide-and-conquer principle London continued to apply to the Eurasian continent. Russia's adoption of the industrial nation-building policies of Count Witte, launched during the reigns of Tsars Alexander II (r. 1855-81) and Alexander III (r. 1881-94) with guidance from the universal genius Dmitri Mendeleev, made the nation a target for wrecking through war and revolution. In the meantime, Prince Edward's operatives manipulated Russia against the other continental powers.

The task of the Stead-Novikova Anglo-Russian Intelligence Department in the 1870s was to embroil Russia in permanent conflict with Austria and the Ottoman Empire over interests in the Balkans, thus splitting the Dreikaiserbund (Three Emperors' Alliance) of Austria, Prussia, and Russia, while also kindling the fires of religious and territorial disputes which would ultimately detonate World War I. The prime political and military mover of the Balkan Wars cause,

from the Russian side, was Novikova's friend Count N.P. Ignatyev, former Ambassador at Constantinople and future founding chief of the Okhrana security police, which did so much to foment the overthrow of the Romanov Dynasty. Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli exclaimed over the Treaty of San Stefano and its revision in the Treaty of Berlin (1878), ending the 1870s Balkan Wars, “Our great object was to break up and permanently prevent the alliance of the Three Emperors, and I maintain that there never was a great diplomatic result more completely effected.”

Yet matters became more urgent for the British in the 1890s. French Foreign Minister Gabriel Hanotaux was a devotee of nation-building policies and worked for alliances with Germany and with Russia that included financing for Count Witte's industrialization projects.

Witte's Trans-Siberian Railroad would be completed in 1903, giving Russia not only an outlet to the Pacific Ocean, but an axis for industrial development along the whole perimeter of the Great Game battlefield in Eurasia. Witte's concept was to couple a Far East economic perspective with a “continental league” of France, Germany, and Russia. “Once these countries stand together in a firm and steady union,” Witte appealed to Kaiser Wilhelm in 1897, “undoubtedly all the other countries on the continent of Europe will join this central union and thus form a union of the whole continent, which will free Europe from the burden she imposes on herself on account of reciprocal rivalry.”

The Kaiser expressed approval of Witte's design, but follow-through was lacking. Yet in 1902, Germany did secure from the Ottomans a 99-year concession to build and operate a Berlin-to-Baghdad railway, cutting deep into the heart of the British Empire.

The *modus operandi* of Edward and his henchmen was to make deals over colonial territory and prerogatives, while orchestrating regime change against the same people with whom the deals were being made. Thus Hanotaux's France was rocked by the Dreyfus Affair in the mid-1890s, and brought to heel in the colonial realm after the incident at Fashoda in 1898. The Anglo-French Entente Cordiale was made official in April 1904.

King Edward's Diplomacy

Nicholas II came in for the same sort of treatment after 1901, when Edward VII ascended to the British throne upon the death of his mother, Queen Victoria. In the Balkans, British ally Count Giuseppe Volpi of Venice orchestrated the 1903 coup in Serbia, upsetting the Treaty of Berlin balance there. Operations against Russia went into high gear with the mass strikes of 1902-03, in which the Okhrana operative Sergei Zubatov's “police unions” played the central role. The Anglo-Japanese Accord, signed in January 1902, was Japan's launch-pad for war with Russia. It guaranteed Chinese and Korean independence, sending the message that if Russia moved to confront the Japanese in those countries, Russia would have to answer to England as well; the British at the



gazprom.ru

Headquarters of the natural gas giant, Gazprom, in Moscow. Lyndon LaRouche observed that President Putin “thinks he can position himself as an ‘energy tsar,’ to use Russia’s energy resources as a basis for Russia’s role in the world. This is the wrong positive conception of Russia’s potential role.”

time were deeply involved in China’s maritime customs and running the opium trade.

Inside Russia, two figures associated with British ally Count Ignatyev in the Okhrana’s predecessor organization, the Holy Brotherhood, were instrumental in provoking the Russo-Japanese War: Count Illarion I. Vorontsov-Dashkov and Aleksandr M. Bezobrazov. Vorontsov-Dashkov lobbied hard for Bezobrazov’s schemes in the Far East, among which was a lumber concession on the south bank of the Yalu River—and thus in the Japanese sphere of influence under Russo-Japanese agreements made in 1898. In 1901, Bezobrazov formed a company to exploit the Yalu concessions. Its members included Admiral Abaza, the Tsar’s Secretary of State for Far Eastern affairs; Count A.I. Ignatyev, a member of the Imperial Council; and Prince Yusupov, the immensely wealthy father of the future assassin of Rasputin. Bezobrazov boasted that his business model was the British East India Company.

It was Russia’s seizure of Manchuria, together with the Bezobrazov/Vorontsov-Dashkov group’s deals, which obviously cloaked designs for further expansion, that led to the Anglo-Japanese Accord of 1902. Even after the Accord, the Bezobrazov group pushed ahead, pressuring to forestall Russia’s promised evacuation of Manchuria, while the group expanded its commercial operations, which served as cover for the infiltration of tens of thousands of soldiers, disguised as lumberjacks, into the Yalu concession in position to seize Korea. Count Witte, who opposed the Bezobrazov/Vorontsov-Dashkov plans as bound to lead to war, was ousted as Minister of Finance in 1903.

In the absence of a positive Russian response to attempts to restart negotiations, the Japanese made a surprise attack on the Russian fleet off Port Arthur on Feb. 8, 1904. Financing for the Japanese war effort came from London and British-allied banks: a 10-million-pound flotation organized by Jacob Schiff through Kuhn-Loeb of New York and the Hongkong and Shanghai Bank in May 1904, followed by 30 million pounds in July 1904, from M.M. Warburg and Deutsche Bank’s Deutsche Asiatische Bank.

On Jan. 1, 1905, Port Arthur surrendered to the Japanese. On Jan. 9, Okhrana agent Father Georgi Gapon led a group of workers and Okhrana agents to slaughter at the Winter Palace in St. Petersburg. The 1905 Revolution had begun.

Even as the British slammed Russia with war and revolution, King Edward held out the carrot of a strategic alliance between England and Russia. Two members of the Russian diplomatic corps served as agents of the English King to this end. One was Count Alexander K. Benckendorff, the Russian Ambassador in London, whom Witte, according to Kaiser Wilhelm, considered to be nothing but “a chamberlain of Edward VII.” (Maybe it was hereditary, the Count being a great-nephew of the early-19th-Century political police chief Count Alexander Kh. Benckendorff, whose sister, Princess Dorothea Lieven, was a notoriously promiscuous society lady, and spy, in London for many years.) The other was Izvolsky, a career diplomat who suffered from Anglophilia and shared the personality traits that the poet Alexander Pushkin captured so well in an 1824 epigram on his own Foreign Ministry superior, Count Mikhail S. Vorontsov:

Half-Milord, half a merchant,
Half a wise man, half a lout,
Half a scoundrel, but there’s hope,
There will be all [or: enough] of him at last.

Izvolsky had been posted in Copenhagen, original home of the royal Danish sisters who were Edward’s wife (Queen Alexandra of England) and Nicholas’s mother (Princess Dagmar/Empress Maria of Russia). He became Foreign Secretary in 1906.

In 1904, Edward recruited Izvolsky to work for an Anglo-Russian alliance—on the very day the Anglo-French Entente Cordiale came into effect. Sir Bernard Pares, another top British operative in Russia during these years, notes in his *A History of Russia* that Benckendorff had been promoting the

London-Petersburg reconciliation for some time.⁶

Neither Tsar Nicholas nor Kaiser Wilhelm trusted what their Uncle Edward was up to. (The British King was the Kaiser's own uncle, since Wilhelm's mother was Edward's sister, the English Princess Vicky. Edward's wife, Queen Alexandra, was the Tsar's aunt through her sister—the Tsar's Danish mother—while Edward himself was the uncle of the Russian Empress Alexandra, born Alix of Hesse-Darmstadt—daughter of another of his sisters, Princess Alice.)

In July 1905 Tsar and Kaiser met at Wilhelm's initiative, on Nicholas's yacht, at Björkö off the coast of Finland. The Kaiser presented Nicholas with a draft treaty between Germany and Russia, to which France would be invited as well. Preparatory diplomacy with Russia by German Chancellor Bulow—who did not, however, endorse the formal alliance—had progressed far enough that in late 1904 the Round Table figure Lord Esher, “a close friend of the King's, wrote that there was ‘a secret and very intimate understanding’ between Germany and Russia.”⁷ The two monarchs discussed their uncle's “treachery” and “passion for plotting against every power,” and signed the mutual defense document brought by the Kaiser. Wilhelm recorded that he was moved to tears by his interaction with the Tsar, and thought their agreement would be a “turning point in the history of Europe.”

The Kaiser's version of a Russo-German alliance fell flat in both Petersburg and Berlin, as contradicting the two countries' current negotiations with France, in particular. Izvolsky became Russian Foreign Minister in 1906 and moved, with Foreign Secretary Sir Edward Grey, to finalize the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907. The Triple Entente came a crucial step nearer to reality, driving inexorably towards war.

The Revolutionaries

The cast of characters who pressed the Tsar into the alliance with England, also intervened to engineer his overthrow. Already in 1909, on the heels of the Anglo-Russian Convention, Sir Bernard Pares lined up an “unofficial” trip to England for 19 Duma leaders—unofficial, because it was generally understood that much of the Duma (the Parliament, its creation having been conceded by Nicholas during the 1905 crisis) opposed the Tsar, with whom the British had just signed a state-to-state treaty. During this visit, Pares arranged also “unofficial” meetings between Grey and each Duma member, which meetings were discreetly held in side rooms during high-society parties. Pares evaluated the outcome of this trip, during which the Duma representatives also met Winston Churchill and other top British leaders: “I have at other times found that England acted as a kind of uniting influence on Russians. . . . Indeed, I believe that a very important process

was helped forward by this trip to England, and that the English visit had not been without its share in the result when, in 1915, the majority of the Duma, including nearly all the more liberal members, joined together to form the ‘Progressive Bloc.’”⁸

The purpose of the Progressive Bloc, in the minds of most of those who founded it, was to overthrow the Tsar. Pares subsequently said about the trip, “This could not have been done without [Alexander] Guchkov, who actively backed me throughout. . . . From this time on, I remained in close touch with him till the end of his life.” Guchkov was a wealthy merchant, Pan-Slav operative and leader of the Octobrist Party, who was plotting to overthrow the regime.

Besides affording such assistance to the opposition, the British lobbied their candidate to succeed Izvolsky as Russian Foreign Minister in 1910: S.D. Sazonov, who then played a decisive role in bringing Russia into World War I. As Pares's friend Sir Samuel Hoare put it, it was Sazonov—who helped create the Balkan League, which sparked the 1912-13 Balkan Wars—who ultimately “forced” the Tsar to declare war in 1914. A former Ambassador to London, Sazonov was on close terms with Pares, with the latter's friends J.W. Birkbeck and Hoare. A core member of Milner's Round Table and a member of one of the oldest banking families in England, Samuel Hoare was a British Military Intelligence officer, who was soon to represent that agency in Russia during the 1917 Revolutions; later, as British Foreign Secretary in the 1930s, he concluded the Hoare-Laval Pact with the Synarchist French Prime Minister Pierre Laval, ceding most of Ethiopia to Mussolini.

Pares said of Sazonov, “He was a not too usual example of a diplomat who through good and evil report stood always for one central idea. That idea was the creation of friendship between Russia and England. . . .” While Sazonov was Foreign Minister (1910-16), the British Ambassador to St. Petersburg was Sir George Buchanan. “Throughout the critical six years from 1909 to 1915,” wrote Hoare, “Sazonov and Buchanan never ceased to work with each other as closely and unreservedly as if they had been citizens of the same country and members of the same diplomatic corps.”⁹

What they worked for so “closely and unreservedly,” against the wishes of the Tsar and many in the Russian cabinet, was to bring Russia into World War I. Hoare recalled: “There is no more dramatic page in the history of 1914 than that which tells of [Sazonov's] interview, . . . with the Emperor, who was still reluctant to order general mobilization. . . . I myself believe that, if he had not insisted upon general mobilization on July 30th, the Emperor would have continued to hesitate, and Russian mobilization, an undertaking of very formidable difficulty, would never have been possible.”

6. Bernard Pares, *A History of Russia* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953; original edition, 1926).

7. Roderick McLean, *Royalty and Diplomacy in Europe: 1890-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

8. Bernard Pares, *The Fall of the Russian Monarchy* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1939).

9. Samuel Hoare, *The Fourth Seal: The End of a Russian Chapter* (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1930).

In January 1917, on the eve of the February Revolution, Lord Milner himself visited Russia as head of the British Mission to the Inter-Allied Conference. He had private meetings in Moscow with individuals selected by British Intelligence agent Robert Bruce Lockhart, including Prince Georgi Lvov (who, according to Pares, had “a strong spiritual kinship with our statesman, Sir Edward Grey; aristocrat to the core in the best sense of the term, he was also profoundly democratic and even radical in many of his views”) and other members of the Progressive Bloc who would, within weeks, be in the new government. Milner wrote to the Tsar, “In the face of the magnificent work of such new and voluntary organizations as the Zemstvo and Municipalities Unions, it is impossible to doubt the capacity of the Russian people to rise to the increasing danger and improvise new methods to avert it.” By the time Milner delivered this letter, it was an open secret that these organizations were preparing a coup.

Playing by the Rules

What President Putin said about the current “talking rock” British spy scandal, is that he would not advocate expulsion of the diplomats involved. “What can I say?” he remarked at his Jan. 25 press conference in St. Petersburg. “As soon as we send those agents back, others will come. Maybe smarter ones, and then we’ll have to bother about finding them.” In his Jan. 31 annual press briefing, Putin expanded on the friction with London: “We regret that . . . we see our British partners involved in such practices. . . . I am confident that we shall discuss this in private meetings with the Prime Minister.” And he repeated that the diplomats should be left at the embassy, since it is useful to know which staffers work for the intelligence station. Meanwhile, the Russian government took advantage of the espionage case, to crack down on NGOs it said had received funding through those particular diplomats.

In the same three-and-a-half-hour discussion, Putin spoke with vehemence, and this time without jokes, about major destabilizations under way in Eurasia. He lambasted Georgian President Michael Saakashvili for accusing Russia of waging energy war against Georgia. And he replied brusquely to an American reporter who asked about Russian support for last year’s crackdown on an insurgency in eastern Uzbekistan: “We know better than you do what happened in Andijan. And we know who trained the people who ignited the situation in Uzbekistan and in that city in particular, where they were trained, and how many of them were trained. This does not exclude the fact that there are a great many problems in Uzbekistan, but it does exclude the fact that we take an approach in which we could allow ourselves to rock the situation in that country. You probably know what the Fergana Valley is and you know how difficult the situation is there, the population’s situation and their level of economic well-being. We do not need a second Afghanistan in Central Asia, and we shall proceed very carefully.”

The paradox for Putin and Russia, is that it doesn’t work to try to prevail by outplaying others on the geopolitical playing field, if the game is rigged. The Russian President proposes that providing “global energy security” is a mission Russia can take up, during and beyond its G-8 chairmanship. But what is the durability of an apparent strength—the earning power of crude oil and natural gas exports—that in reality is based on the exorbitant world oil price driven by hedge-fund-derivatives speculation? Russia is affronted and wounded by the British and neo-con war games around Iran. Moscow would like to export 40 to 60 nuclear power plants, including new ones to be built in Iran, over the next two decades. Yet, the same Russian leadership stakes its economic strategy for this year on—among other things—securing a new influx of foreign capital from the liberalization of trading in shares of the natural gas monopoly Gazprom (foreign investors may now purchase Gazprom stock on Russian markets), and the upcoming multibillion-dollar IPO of the state-owned Rosneft Oil Company on the London exchange.

Our point is not to compare the sharp-witted veteran intelligence specialist Putin with the floundering Tsar Nicholas II. But the security and growth he ostensibly seeks for Russia can happen only in a world of sovereign nation-states, not under the financiers’ dictatorship known as globalization.

A certain additional insight into the current state of affairs may be had by noting how last week’s *EIR* cover story, “Iran Showdown Is the Fuse for a Global Monetary Bomb,” was received in Russia. Translated into Russian, it was republished by one Ukraine-based website and two in Russia. One of the Russian sites provided an editorial disclaimer, to the effect that our analysis was “rather unusual and smacking somewhat of conspiracy,” although it needed to be considered “due to the urgency of this topic and the totally unpredictable development of events”; this site illustrated our article on the primacy in the Iran crisis of “City of London-centered Synarchists,” with a giant poster of Uncle Sam about to attack Iran. But the other Russian site commented, “You need to know history, in order to realize the significance of what is unfolding before our very eyes and to evaluate how tricky are the Venetian intrigues, orchestrated by the Blair government out of London.” We agree, and think that’s good advice for Americans, too.

Research and writings by Bill Jones, Michael Liebig, and Jeffrey Steinberg were essential to this article. The following past publications in EIR provide more depth on matters touched on here:

- “King Edward VII: Evil Demiurge of the Triple Entente and World War I,” *EIR*, March 24, 1995, from a panel at the February 1995 Schiller Institute conference, including sections on Hanotaux, Witte, and Sir Edward Grey.
- “Triple Entente: The British-led Conspiracy That Sparked World War I,” *EIR*, April 19, 1996.
- “The ‘Land-Bridge’: Henry Carey’s Global Development Program,” *EIR*, May 2, 1997.