

Britain's Chatham House pursues 'condominium' delusion with Soviets

by Mark Burdman

During a speech before the United Nations Organization on June 7, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze called for the creation of a U.N. naval force and for the expansion of U.N. peacekeeping forces for intervention into crisis spots around the world. This proposal was the latest in a flurry of Soviet proposals over the past year, for strengthening the U.N.O.

These statements have been made in public diplomatic formats; through private diplomatic communications; and in overtures made to or through such East-West organizations as former West German chancellor Helmut Schmidt's Inter-Action Council, the World Federation of United Nations Associations, the Institute for East-West Security Studies, the Pugwash Conference, and various environmentalist neo-malthusian organizations, like the Club of Rome. These are the think tanks and clubs of the East-West condominium known unofficially as the "Trust."

In one notable case, Yuri Ponomarev, member of the Board of the State Bank of the U.S.S.R., told a group of bankers in Vienna in May of this year, that the Soviets supported "the convocation within the U.N.O. framework of an international monetary conference," and were seeking closer relations between the socialist countries and the International Monetary Fund.

The Soviets have upgraded their involvement in U.N.O. activities in many domains, including in UNESCO, the Brundtland Commission, and others. (See "Mayor Zaragoza caper at UNESCO tickles the Soviets . . . pink," *EIR*, Nov. 13, 1987.) They have also created several globalist organizations during the past months, such as an International Fund for the Survival and Development of Humanity, on whose founding board is top Soviet intelligence asset Armand Hammer.

As is customary on such occasions, Shevardnadze's June 7 statement was met with glee among Western "Trust" circles, even though it was little more than an expansion on an earlier Soviet proposal for the creation of a U.N. naval force for the Persian Gulf, and even though it is purely self-serving for the Russians. After the *USS Vincennes* shot down an

Iranian civilian airliner in the Gulf on July 3, a new wave of enthusiasm was expressed for Soviet U.N.O. proposals, typified by an interview conducted by the *New York Times'* Flora Lewis with Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Petrovsky, which appeared in the *International Herald Tribune* on July 7. Petrovsky emphasized that such incidents could only be countered effectively by a strengthened U.N.O. system.

In practice, the replacement by a U.N.O. force of the U.S. naval task force would mean the unilateral removal of Western naval forces in geographical areas where the Soviets could more easily deploy their own naval forces in the event of future crises, while the United States and its allies would find themselves excluded by U.N.O. arrangements.

Both Shevardnadze and those in the West who welcomed him, aim to strengthen trends toward bipolar "global power-sharing arrangements" and a bipolar "global empire," which have come increasingly to the fore in the wake of the Reagan-Gorbachov summit in May-June. In both East and West, there are those who long for the recreation of the kinds of international oligarchical arrangements that came into being during the 1815 Congress of Vienna, which were themselves echoes of ancient arrangements between competing and co-operating imperial centers.

Today, the Western players of this bipolar game usually choose to ignore some basic facts, the first and foremost of which is that the Soviet Russian military, church, and intelligence services have no intention of foregoing their own ambitions to rule the next world empire, which they imagine to be Moscow as the "third and final Rome." The "globalist" proposals, seen through Soviet eyes, are efforts to undermine the West's will to assert its own values, and to create the administrative infrastructure for a future Soviet empire.

The Western players have also been caught off guard by the intensity and ferocity of the internal factional warfare inside the Soviet Union, which may lead at any point to the dumping of what Gorbachov's opponents deride as the "cosmopolitan" strategy of the U.S.S.R.—as well as to the dumping of Gorbachov himself. Neat bipolar arrangements could be torn apart by what one senior British expert on

Soviet affairs, in a discussion with *EIR*, called "a fight so brutal and savage inside the U.S.S.R. that it defies the Western imagination."

The Anglo-Soviet Round Table

Highly informed Britons report that one of the more important players of the game on the Western side is the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA) in London, also known as Chatham House. In cooperation with the Soviets' Institute for World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), Chatham House has, for much of the past two decades, been sponsoring an Anglo-Soviet Round Table, which has proven to be a key back-channel, for policy planning outside the framework of governments. As one senior British expert told *EIR* in June, "Chatham House has been completely *hoaxed* by the Russians, and that admiral who runs the place [RIIA director Sir James Eberle] has been taken for a fool."

The Anglo-Soviet Round Table really began to take shape in the mid-1970s, and many of its British partners were key individuals in the development of the Trilateral Commission of David Rockefeller et al. The Round Table met April 11-13 at Chatham House. A high-powered Soviet delegation was led by Yevgeni Primakov, a senior Soviet policy influential and intelligence operative, who now heads IMEMO and who was formerly chief of the Moscow Oriental Institute. On the British side, participants included RIIA Council head Christopher Tugendhat; RIIA director Eberle; RIIA deputy director William Wallace; former British Minister of Trade and Industry Leon Brittan; St. Antony's College, Oxford Soviet specialist Archie Brown; and others.

The meeting coincided with the release and circulation of a new report, jointly authored by IMEMO and RIIA, entitled, "International Economic Security: Soviet and British Approaches," which has become one of the conceptual frameworks for the proposed globalist-U.N.O. arrangements. According to one British participant, Primakov's main concern was to discuss ways to "strengthen international security through the U.N."

The Anglo-Soviet Round Table discussions provide some of the backdrop to the silly talk in some British circles linked to Whitehall, about some kind of "Anglo-Soviet condominium," or about a new role for Britain in "mediating" between the superpowers. The Chatham House perspective is not unrelated to Margaret Thatcher's odd enthusiasm for Gorbachov during the past months, and has something to do with the rumors in London that Queen Elizabeth II, or a lower-level but high-ranking member of the Royal Family, will make an unprecedented visit to the U.S.S.R. during 1989.

Historically, the roots of the Chatham House-IMEMO cooperation go deeper. The Royal Institute is one of the most important hubs of policymaking of the Western branch of the Trust during the 20th century. It was created in 1919, by the circles of the secretive British "Round Tables," in collaboration with an organization of liberal British and American

oligarchs called "The Pilgrims." High-level circles of the Fabian Society, the Socialist International, and the Cambridge Apostles were also involved in its creation.

The RIIA became the mother for a number of institutes around the world, the most notable being the New York Council on Foreign Relations. It was patronized by the Royal Family, and received funding from many leading multinational concerns, including banks involved in financing of the international drug trade. The core of the Round Table conception derived from the ideas of Cecil Rhodes and the Rhodes Trust: to see the British Empire as the seed-crystal of a *world government*, ruled by the Anglo-Saxon race, and with the "former colony," the U.S.A., fully partners in this imperial world-federalist system. These same circles helped the Bolsheviks into power, hoping to create a new form of society in Russia that could join with the Anglo-Saxons in a de facto international "Caucasian race" alliance.

The worldview of the Rhodes Round Tables group was very much that of the 1815 Congress of Vienna, which had sought to utilize Russian messianism as a means of destroying republican culture in the West. In the 20th century, the 1815 concept was mixed together with an Anglo-Saxon racialist desire to see the reduction of the nonwhite peoples of the world.

The most useful point of departure for understanding the development of the RIIA worldview is the writings of historian Arnold Toynbee, who served as RIIA director of research from the mid-1920s to the mid-1950s. During this period, Toynbee was also responsible for helping establish such gnostic world-federalist organizations as the World Council of Churches in Geneva.

Toynbee veered between desiring a single, one-world empire, based in one capital, and a multipolar world empire, with several centers. He was usually more comfortable with the first, and was wont to make the point that the population of the United States and the West would ultimately prefer a "Leninist one-world dictatorship" based in Moscow to a world war: the "better red than dead" thesis brought to its starkest conclusion. But in a series of lectures in the 1950s, Toynbee eulogized the second century A.D.'s multipolar "Roman-Parthian-Kushan peace" between three imperial centers, which brought peace "from the Ganges to the Tyne," as a positive alternative to the "nightmare" of the previous century's "revolutions, wars and rumors of war . . . tumult and violence."

This tripolar "peace," in Toynbee's view, brought "constructive statesmanship" and a "tolerable" world settlement, based on "the benevolent action of efficient authoritarian governments." The only problem with this wondrous world order, in Toynbee's view, was that it created a "spiritual vacuum" which had to be resolved by a "religious counter-offensive," a "new religious movement" led by "preachers of strange religions." He eulogized the cult gods Isis and Mithra, together with Christ, as the divinities of the "new

society, in which there shall be neither Scythian nor Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female. . . . Mithras will lead us as our captain. Isis will nurse us as our mother.”

Toynbee was portraying the second century A.D., as a model for the second half of the 20th century and the early parts of the next century. Keep such concepts in mind, when reading the more staid language of the “International Economic Security” report as we outline it.

‘Beyond the sovereign nation-state’

The guidelines for the “International Economic Security: Soviet and British Approaches” report were first enunciated at the 1986 Anglo-Soviet Round Table meeting, and completed in 1987. The “IES” report’s introduction begins with a direct attack on the nation-state, and a pitch for the strengthening of “international organizations”:

“In the last decade of the 20th century the option of economic security provided entirely by national action is no longer available. National policies pursued regardless of the international economic situation can be unsound or even dangerous. . . . Rapid economic and technological change has compromised the autonomy of nation-states, transformed the international economy, and posed new problems for the management of relations between the two blocs, NATO/OECD and Warsaw Pact/CMEA. . . .

“Interdependence brings enormous benefits, but forces painful adjustments in national policies. Sovereignty is compromised, and states are faced with hard choices in balancing national autonomy with international interdependence. . . . But the international economy is not self-stabilizing, and there is therefore a growing need for the development of existing means of international regulation as well as for the creation of some new mechanisms.

“Those who play a major part in international economic relations have therefore to share in its management. . . . Economic reforms in the Soviet Union will lead to its more active involvement in global economic relations and make its internal economic system and foreign trade regime more compatible with the rules of membership in the above organizations. Nevertheless, questions for the West of how to accommodate the largest socialist economy within the established organization structure persist.”

The body of the report is divided into two sections, a Soviet contribution and a British contribution. The Soviet section, authored by Igor Artemiev and others, is essentially the Gorbachovian “new thinking” line, but also containing strong evidence of the intense policy battle within the U.S.S.R. For example, part of the report is clearly a polemic against the anti-Gorbachov opposition. Artemiev et al. write: “The character of the dialectics of internationalization is such that on the one hand, it is incompatible with autarchy, because the country which dooms itself to that will inevitably ‘drag behind’ in scientific and technological progress; and at the

same time, to the extent of the involvement of that national economy in the world reproductive process, its liability to the influence of external factors is intensified. . . . The economic isolation path is almost universally recognized as untenable, *although autarchical ideas appear here and there as a reaction to external threats springing up every now and then.*” (Emphasis added.)

The Soviet authors then proceed toward “globalist” proposals, the core of which involves the strengthening of the U.N.O. world-federalist system: “In international economic organizations, work directed towards affirming principles and standards in world economic relations, which could become the elements of a future IES system, is already under way,” they write, and enumerate the contributions of the different U.N.O. bureaucracies. “In conditions when the systems of economic security of two socio-political systems function largely autonomously, while the process of their rapprochement and interpenetration has only just begun and is developing very unevenly, United Nations economic agencies possessing true universality acquire special significance. . . .”

‘One world is what we have’

The British contribution basically echoes the Soviet one. Near the beginning, a quote from British Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe that “one world is what we have for good or ill,” sets the tone. It acknowledges that the “globalist” trend in Soviet thinking, “lays special emphasis on International Economic Security.”

Then: “There are many in the U.S.S.R. and the West, who are skeptical about such an approach, but those stressing the common character of many global problems have been increasingly heard in recent years.”

Here, too, we see the nervousness about the “opponents of globalism,” this time from the Western side. In this context, it is worth recalling a recent event, that sheds light on the bitterness of the fight in the West over such questions. This involves the case of David Watt, former researcher director of the RIIA.

In the first days of 1987, British Prime Minister Thatcher was planning her trip to Moscow, to meet with Gorbachov. In the pages of the London *Times*, Watt shocked readers with a commentary, reminding Mrs. Thatcher that what rules in Soviet Russia today, and what will rule in that country for decades to come, is the aggressive, anti-Western matrix of *Russian* culture. Soon thereafter, Watt, in his early 40s, was found dead, supposedly in a freak accident when he electrocuted himself during a storm. Some Britons have never been satisfied with the explanation of Watt’s death, and wonder whether it reflected a war inside British policymaking circles on the Russian question.

In any case, the ghost of David Watt may hover over the proceedings and deliberations of the Anglo-Soviet Round Table for some time to come.