

British Imperial Strategists Push EU To Confront Russia

by Rachel Douglas

One week after the European Union summit of October 18-19, 2007, approved the draft Lisbon Treaty that would erase the sovereignty of its member-nations, the EU leadership proceeded to its semi-annual meeting with the President of Russia. In preparation for Vladimir Putin's arrival in Lisbon, the *Financial Times* reported Oct. 25, European Commission chairman José Manuel Barroso ordered up a series of confidential discussion papers, which gave away the other strategic thrust of the Lisbon Treaty's consolidation of supranational control, besides bankers' dictatorship over the EU members themselves: to challenge, confront, and block the comeback of Russia.

The Barroso position papers said that the EU should adopt a more aggressive policy towards Russia, which one draft characterized as "a strategic partner in many areas of common interest, notably in economic fields, but in others—such as involvement in the post-Soviet space—a competitor or even an opponent." Warning of "the dark side of growing nationalism" in Russia, it said that the Presidential election of March 2008 would result in "an assertive foreign policy, tougher domestic policies, and loud rhetoric."

Thus, rising acrimony in British-Russian bilateral relations, throughout 2007, has been carried over into relations between the EU and Russia. And no wonder, since those British politicians and strategists most committed to cementing the Lisbon Treaty regime are simultaneously leading a drive to put Russia in its place—never again to be a great power, nor even to recover from the radical free-market assault that Russia suffered in the 1990s.

The London *Economist*, flagship of the City of London financial center, and propaganda voice for a restored British Empire with the EU as its satrapy (see, for example, "Britannia Redux," *The Economist*, Feb. 1, 2007), clearly enunciates the strategy of forcing Russia to back down. In its version of

things, the EU is an instrument to achieve such a humiliation of Eurasia's keystone nation. The *Economist* of March 17, 2007 included in its EU 50th anniversary package, a piece of futurology titled, "The European Union at 100," which depicted the EU vanquishing both the United States and Russia, after a U.S. financial collapse and an EU-instigated Russian-American nuclear showdown over Ukraine.

From the projected vantage point of 2057, the *Economist* wrote: "The EU is celebrating its 100th birthday with quiet satisfaction. Predictions when it turned 50 that it was doomed to irrelevance in a world dominated by America, China and India proved wide of the mark. A turning-point was the bursting of America's housing bubble and the collapse of the dollar early in the presidency of Barack Obama in 2010.... The other cause for quiet satisfaction has been the EU's foreign policy. In the dangerous second decade of the century, when Vladimir Putin returned for a third term as Russian president and stood poised to invade Ukraine, it was the EU that pushed the Obama administration to threaten massive nuclear retaliation. The Ukraine crisis became a triumph for the EU, ... promoting the decision to go for a further big round of enlargement. It was ironic that, less than a decade later, Russia itself lodged its first formal application for membership."

The Defense of Sovereignty

In the British House of Lords debate on the Lisbon Treaty, held in November 2007, between the time of the draft Treaty's approval at Lisbon and its signing on Dec. 13, some of the ardent supporters of the scheme emphasized the strategic dimension of confronting Russia. Most vocal on behalf of the Treaty were:

Lord John Kerr of Kinlochard, the former British diplomatic service head and current Royal Dutch Shell board member. As chief of the Secretariat of the European Conven-

tion, chaired by former French President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing and Italian Interior Minister Giuliano Amato, Kerr had been lead hands-on author of the Treaty's previous version, the European Constitution that French and Dutch voters rejected in 2005;

Baroness Elizabeth Symons of Vernham Dean, the intimate of Mr. and Mrs. Dick Cheney and of British neo-imperialist writer Robert Cooper (see *EIR*, Feb. 29, 2008); and campaigner against Lyndon LaRouche;

Geoffrey Howe, former Chancellor of the Exchequer and then, Foreign Minister in Margaret Thatcher's cabinet, now Lord Howe of Aberavon.

Howe, motivating the need for the Lisbon Treaty to help Britain address "a much wider multilateral agenda" in its foreign policy, identified as a major challenge "the re-emergence of Russia, which, having lost an empire, is still looking for a role, under determined leadership, even if that is rather uncomfortable for the rest of us."

The *Economist's* lead writer on Russia, Edward Lucas, a person of language less diplomatic than Howe's, chose the eve of the March 2 Russian Presidential election to make a book tour of the United States, touting his just-released book, *The New Cold War: The Future of Russia and the Threat to the West*. Confronted by LaRouche Youth Movement activists in Washington, D.C., and again in Providence, R.I., Lucas gave a circus geek-act kind of demonstration of how the drives for a single Europe, and against Russia, go hand in hand (see box). Lucas's tirade against sovereignty is typical of a whole layer of British strategists, who are crucial to the attack on national sovereignty through the Lisbon Treaty. His book is part of their push.

The same anti-sovereignty and anti-Russian outlook was put forward in an article titled "Russia vs. Europe: the sovereignty wars," published Sept. 5, 2007 by Ivan Krastev on the OpenDemocracy website. Krastev, chairman of the Centre for Liberal Strategies in Sofia, Bulgaria, has written books on "anti-Americanism" worldwide. He was executive director of the International Commission on the Balkans, chaired by Giuliano Amato, and he has operated out of St. Anthony's College, Oxford, a British Intelligence center that is home base to numerous Central European promoters of the British imperial EU model, such as *Europe as Empire* author Jan Zielonka.

According to Krastev, the "sovereign democracy" principle put forward by Putin and his associates is a problem because it clashes with the "post-modern European order" without nation-states. This clash, according to the British-sponsored Bulgarian, is the cause of "growing tensions in EU-Russia relations." Russia "embodies the nostalgia both for the old-European nation-state, and for a European order organized around the balance of power and non-interference in the domestic affairs of other states," wrote Krastev, while the key elements of post-modern Europe—and this he explained by quoting Cooper's *The Post-Modern State*—are

"a developed system of mutual interference in each other's affairs."

Under Putin, charged Krastev, Russia has rejected these notions. Krastev denounced Moscow for breaking with the "intrusive inspections" of the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty (CFE) and the "active monitoring" of elections by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). "The rhetoric of EU-Russia cooperation and partnership," he wrote, "cannot mask the fact that the regime of sovereign democracy is absolutely incompatible with the post-modern hegemony. Russia's comeback has taken the form of an open challenge to the European order."

Among other complaints, Krastev worried aloud that Russia's "stress on bilateral relations with big European member-states, and its growing reluctance to deal with the EU," will feed a "re-nationalization" of foreign policy on the part of key EU member countries like Germany and Poland.

Krastev is an overt crisis-monger, writing in a series of articles since 2004 that a full-scale crisis over Kosovo's declaration of independence from Serbia—a guarantee, among other things, of increased tension with Serbia's historical ally, Russia—is "the crisis that the European Union badly needs at the moment." Managing to integrate the chaotic Balkans into the EU, claimed Krastev, will prove the EU's historical viability. Harkening back to those Cold War era founders of the future EU who in the early 1950s had pushed hard, together with Britain's Lord Plowden and American Anglophiles Dean Acheson and John Foster Dulles, for a European Defense Community as stepping-stone to a single European government, Krastev pumps the EU as a military-strategic formation. He wrote in 2005, "Europe needs leaders who remember that at its foundation the primary purpose of the European Union was to provide not jobs, but peace and security."

Energy Warfare

Russia's assertion, under Putin, of a more sovereign economic policy especially rankles. "The Kremlin thinks not in terms of citizens' rights, but in terms of the population's needs," objected Krastev, about a nation that is struggling not to plunge into demographic oblivion after losing 500,000 to a million people per year since the 1990s crisis. He also urged that Russia-EU relations not be reduced to the issue of "energy dependency" alone. Yet, the imposition of harsh conditions on Russia as an energy exporter to Europe is unquestionably high on the British and EU strategic agenda.

Even as individual EU members, including new ones in Eastern Europe, like Hungary, eagerly contract bilateral natural gas supply deals with Russia's Gazprom, the EU discussion papers target Russia's energy export operations on several fronts. One continuing demand is for Russia to allow foreign acquisition and construction of oil and gas pipelines from Russian fields, which Moscow rates as a national security matter. At the same time, EU regulators seek to keep Rus-

sian firms from gaining controlling stakes in energy-delivery and other companies in Europe.

Jean-Claude Juncker, the Luxembourg prime minister and finance minister who is a leading candidate for the single-Europe presidency under the Lisbon Treaty, called Feb. 7 for measures to block Russian acquisitions in Europe. Speaking in Japan before the G-7 finance ministers' meeting, which he attended as chairman of the Eurogroup of finance ministers, Juncker demanded roadblocks to the investment of Russia's sovereign wealth funds—accumulated from taxation of oil and gas exports—in Europe, saying, “It is unacceptable that while Russia's government-affiliated fund is sweeping into Europe, European companies are in a situation where they are unable to do similar activities in Russia.”

Another British plan to curb Russia's energy clout, this time by exploiting weaknesses in its gas sector, appeared in January from the Defence Academy of the U.K. In *The Shrivenham Papers #6*, titled “Russia & the West: A Reassessment,” James Sherr raised an alarm, writing: “A powerful Russia is once again a fact of life.... They have recovered pride in their own traditions and are determined to advance their own interests.... The post-Cold War partnership, founded at a time of Russian disorientation and weakness, is over.... Although Russia is not a global threat, it seeks to be both enabler and spoiler.” Sherr berated Western leaders for having “underestimated” the Russian leadership's assumption that it should have “equal say” with other nations, concerning security issues in Europe.

The British analyst proceeded to catalogue weaknesses of the current Russian system, which could contribute to cutting Russia down to size. In the economic field, Sherr pointed to vulnerabilities in the energy sector, the chief one of which, he proposed, is Gazprom's failure to develop new gas fields. The Russian gas monopoly depends on purchasing gas from Central Asia, in order to meet domestic demand and also export. For Sherr, the most promising developments in the energy field are revitalized EU efforts to force Russia to change Gazprom's distribution practices.

The EU and NATO

While negotiating hard for its interests as an energy exporter, Russia is highly sensitive to the EU's military-strategic expansion eastward. On Feb. 18, dozens of Russian media carried an RIA Novosti dispatch on the reported intention of French President Nicolas Sarkozy to push, “after the Lisbon Treaty goes into effect,” for the creation of elite EU military forces. Left-wing and patriotic press ran sensational headlines like “Sarkozy Prepares To Fight Russia.” The Novosti article itself, while lower-key, interviewed an expert from the Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), who reflected the close Russian attention to potential military projects that may be launched under the EU.

In the as yet unannounced Sarkozy plan, wrote Novosti,

the EU elite force would comprise 10,000 men from each of six EU countries: France, the U.K., Germany, Italy, Spain, and Poland. Dr. Vladimir Yevseyev, the IMEMO analyst, said it remained unclear whom the EU expects to be fighting, but he indicated that IMEMO and others are carefully studying how such a joint EU force would work.

In a Feb. 20 speech at the Hudson Institute, U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs Kurt Volcker brought the energy and military themes together, saying that NATO would be the institution to “protect” European customers from any cut-off threatened by Russia. “The EU ought to impose restrictions on the bundling of energy companies and energy supply so that it breaks up monopolistic tendencies in the marketplace,” Volcker said, taking aim at Gazprom. “There are also things that can be done within NATO. The things that NATO is good at are the operational things,

‘Economist’ Editor Slams Westphalia; Lauds Lisbon

Edward Lucas, editor for Russian and Eastern European affairs for the Economist magazine, the official publication of the British Empire, has written a book, The New Cold War: Putin's Russia and the Threat to the West (Hampshire, England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008). During a book signing, prior to a lecture he was to deliver at the Watson Institute at Brown University in Providence, R.I., two LaRouche PAC (LPAC) organizers, Alexandra Peribikovsky and Matthew Ogden, drew him into a pointed dialogue, during which he exposed his lust for the Lisbon Treaty process, which aims to eliminate the sovereignty of nation-states, and bring to an end the era of Westphalia.

A paraphrase of the exchange follows, with direct quotations indicated:

LPAC: What do you think of the Kennebunkport process, launched at the meeting of Putin with Bush?

Lucas: Bush said he looked into Putin's eyes and saw his soul; I would have seen the letters KGB.

LPAC: Many people have compared Putin's Kennebunkport proposal to Reagan's SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative].

Lucas: I think the concept of strategic defense is highly overrated.

LPAC: While Putin was involved in the meetings

the concrete things, where there is a security element that NATO can tackle. . . . The day-to-day things that happen in the energy field are not going to be done through NATO. But the consequence is that if you nonetheless have a catastrophic interruption of energy supplies to a NATO member, then that is a security issue. That is a strategic issue that NATO needs to think about.”

This posture would not be presented as “anti-Russian,” Volcker hastened to add, but rather as “pro-free market.”

The shift of London and the EU, during 2007, towards increased confrontation with Russia makes sense of the contrast between Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov’s formulation of the place of Russia and Europe in the world, which he put forward at the beginning of last year, and President Putin’s stark warnings, made at the close of the Russia-EU summit in Lisbon, Oct. 26, 2007. Speaking to *Izvestia* in January 2007, Lavrov

named a “Russia-USA-EU triangle” as one important constellation of nations, which he defined not in any narrow, “Atlantic” way, but on a Eurasian scale, saying, “For us, it is of fundamental importance to establish practical cooperation in the area from Vancouver [eastward] to Vladivostok. . . . Such cooperation would also provide a material guarantee for those who fear Russia may want to ‘drive a wedge’ into relations between the USA and Western Europe.”

In October, however, Putin compared the ongoing showdown over the Bush-Cheney Administration’s desired installation of missile defense systems in EU-NATO members Poland and the Czech Republic, to the Cold War brinksmanship of the 1960s. “Analogous actions by the Soviet Union provoked the Cuban missiles crisis,” Putin said. “For us, technologically, the situation is very similar. On our borders, such threats to our country are being created.”

at Kennebunkport, many leading people in Moscow were repeatedly discussing the legacy of Franklin Roosevelt.

Lucas: Well! I think Putin has his own reasons for bringing up FDR!

LPAC: Both the Kennebunkport proposal and the SDI are reminiscent of Roosevelt’s war-time Russian-American alliance. In fact, the Russian-American partnership goes all the way back to the Civil War and even the American Revolution. And, ironically, America was always allied with the Russians, against the British!

Lucas: World politics were different back then.

LPAC: In the context of the crash of the entire world financial system, what do you think about the United States entering into an alliance with Russia and China, to stabilize the dollar, as Roosevelt did with the Bretton Woods conference?

Lucas: Why should Russia be party to that sort of conference? Economically, Russia is now a third-rate power. They have no economic power. They’re at the level of a Holland, or a Belgium. Why should the Dutch or the Belgians have a seat at the table discussing a new world system?

LPAC: Brussels wants to dictate the new world system, actually! The Lisbon Treaty would give the president of a United Europe a seat in Belgium.

Lucas: [direct quote] “I am a strong advocate of the Lisbon Treaty. I support it 100%! We should end all of this discussion and debate about an EU Constitution, and just do it! Just make it happen!”

LPAC: So you advocate the elimination of sovereignty for the nations of Europe?

Lucas: “The nations of Europe don’t need sovereignty! They no longer need to be separate states; Europe needs to create its own internal market.”. . .

LPAC: What you’re advocating would mean the end of the Westphalian System.

Lucas: “I HATE THE WESTPHALIAN SYSTEM! The world needs to move beyond the age of Westphalia!”

LPAC: You don’t believe that government should exist to promote the general welfare of its people?

Lucas: “I believe in international security organizations, like NATO . . . international governing institutions.”

LPAC: You know, here in the United States of America, we Americans value highly the idea of national sovereignty.

Lucas: I don’t know much about the American system of politics, but I don’t believe in sovereignty. By the way, are you two part of some specific political party or group? I am beginning to notice a certain consistency in your questions. . . .

LPAC: Let us ask you one last question. Would you support the construction of a tunnel across the Bering Strait, to connect Russia and the United States, as proposed by Lyndon LaRouche?

Lucas: LaRouche! I wouldn’t support anything that that crackpot LaRouche proposed!

LPAC: He was the intellectual author of the SDI, you know. . . .

Lucas: Members of your group intervened in an event that I held in Washington recently! You practically destroyed my event!