

Britain's Cooper Promotes Imperial EU

by Mark Burdman

This article is reprinted from EIR, July 2, 2004.

One of the mortal threats facing the continent of Europe, is the fact that the leading British propagandist for “liberal imperialism,” Robert Cooper, now occupies a strategically crucial position in the European Union structure. Since May 2002, Cooper, one of Britain’s most senior diplomats, has been director-general of External and Politico-Military Affairs for the Council of the European Union (EU), and is a chief advisor to EU foreign policy spokesman Javier Solana.

Cooper’s assumption of this post is key to the British move to steer continental European policies in an imperial direction. It also indicates the powerful influence on the continent, of synarchist syndicates, supranational financial interests, operating through former Nazi SS officer Dutch Prince Bernhard’s Bilderberg Group and related entities, equally committed to imperial policies.

Cooper has been hyperactive on the European scene, featured at conferences at Britain’s exclusive Wilton Park center, at the Aspen Institute-Berlin headed by leading American neoconservative propagandist Jeffrey Gedmin, and elsewhere.

Cooper’s writings expose him as a bestialist promoter of the ideas of 17th-Century British philosopher Thomas Hobbes. He is opposed to the core humanist ideas of European civilization, as developed for the modern era in the 15th-Century Golden Renaissance. His ideas for the EU ensure the collapse of areas inside the EU structure, as well as in the areas contiguous to the EU, to the status of “failed states”—i.e., into the general chaos against which Cooper supposedly polemicizes. This paves the way for fascism in Europe.

Similarly, on the global scale, with his division of the world into “zones of order” and “zones of chaos,” he sets the stage for a generalized descent into a new dark age.

Cooper generates strong negative reactions from saner elements in Britain and continental Europe. A leading foreign policy expert in Britain, opposed to the Blair entourage, denounced Cooper as a “fool and idiot,” and insisted that “his ideas for a new imperialism must be resisted at all costs. His division into chaos and disorder is simply a new way of ex-

pressing Rudyard Kipling’s attack on ‘lesser breeds,’ in a new way.” A usually mild-mannered Rome political strategist described Cooper as “completely crazy.”

Imperialism, the IMF, and Globalization

The May 2002 date of Cooper’s assuming the EU position is notable, as a few months before, in October 2001, in the immediate aftermath of 9/11, he had catalyzed an intense discussion in Britain and elsewhere about moving toward a “new imperialism.” The catalyst was his article, in the October 2001 edition of the trend-setting British Establishment monthly *Prospect*, entitled “The Next Empire,” in which Cooper wrote that “all the conditions seem to be there for a new imperialism.” As *EIR* featured at the time, this article provoked numerous articles in British publications, jumping on the “new imperialism” bandwagon (*EIR*, Nov. 9, 2001).

Precisely at the moment Cooper was thus being propelled into the limelight, he was seconded, on Oct. 22, 2001, from the post of Prime Minister Tony Blair’s special foreign policy advisor to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, to be Britain’s special envoy to Afghanistan and neighboring regions of Eurasia. In his Cabinet Office position, working out of the public view, he had been an inspiration for Blair’s notorious Spring 1999 “liberal imperialist” speech in Chicago, delivered in the time frame of the Kosovo War, where Blair espoused a new era of global interventionism, supposedly on “humanitarian” grounds.

According to several British sources, Cooper has developed close relations to Baroness Liz Symons—the Foreign Office, Fabian Society-linked British figure at the center of dirty tricks activity against Lyndon LaRouche internationally (see “The Bizarre Case of Baroness Symons,” *EIR*, June 25, 2004). One senior British source, a staunch Atlanticist, asserted that Symons and Cooper “work together as a team; they are both intimates of Tony Blair.” A second British insider said that “they are in regular touch with each other, and, from my understanding, meet regularly. They are both central figures in the ‘Blair project.’”

In his *Prospect* article, Cooper enumerated the various empires that have existed since ancient times, and wrote that “all of this suggests that the history of the world is the history of empire. . . . Compared with empire, the nation-state is a new concept; the small state began to emerge with the Renaissance, and the nation became a major political factor only in the 19th century. . . . The non-existence of empire . . . is historically without precedent. The question is whether this can last. There are both theoretical and practical reasons for thinking that it won’t. . . .”

He went on to cite three phenomena that were emblematic of the current trend toward the “new imperialism”: the International Monetary Fund (IMF), globalization, and the European Union. He lauded IMF “interference in domestic af-

fairs,” as similar to Anglo-French colonial control of Egyptian finances in the 1870s. The IMF-focussed system, he wrote, would be the core of what he called “the imperialism of globalization.”

Of course, by so writing, he avoided the obvious point, that IMF austerity/“conditionality” policies foster the descent of states into chaos and barbarism, as can most graphically be seen, now, in the case of Argentina.

He concluded by recommending that the EU evolve into a new “cooperative empire” that would be “like Rome.”

‘Imperial Expansion’

Soon thereafter, Cooper was given scope to realize his recommendation, when he assumed his EU posting. In his 2003 book, *The Breaking of Nations: Order and Chaos in the 21st Century* (New York: Atlantic Monthly Press), he wrote: “The most far-reaching form of imperial expansion is that of the European Union. . . . The post-modern European answer to threats is to extend the system of co-operative empire ever wider.”

By “post-modern,” Cooper means two things. One, on the economic-cultural side, a “post-modern state” is characterized by, in his words, “the post-industrial service economy” and “consumerism.” In the real world, outside the fantasies nurtured by Cooper, states ruled by such values are economically and culturally unsustainable, and must devolve into chaos, under conditions of a generalized economic and financial crisis, of the type that is now unfolding. Expanding such a system “ever wider” is a key-and-code expression for looting outlying regions, as sources of raw materials and cheap labor. It is no wonder that the Russian leadership is viewing the process of EU expansion with horror.

The Schachtian-fascistic content of what he is espousing, is contained in the following astonishing assertion: “It is striking that monetary integration [in the EU] has been achieved precisely by removing monetary policy from the hands of politicians and handing it over to the technocrats.” This gets to the core of Lyndon LaRouche’s warnings about the danger of the “independent central banking system” in Europe, whereby sovereign governments completely lose control over the issuance of money and credit, and the general direction of financial and economic policy. This makes it impossible for governments to respond to economic crises, by mobilizing nations behind anti-Depression policies, along the lines of what President Franklin D. Roosevelt launched for the United States, in the 1930s. Indeed, what Cooper is espousing, has been codified in western, and more recently, central Europe, with the Maastricht and “Stability Pact” agreements of the early- to mid-1990s.

‘The Laws of the Jungle’

By “post-modern,” Cooper also means “post-nation-state,” or “post-Westphalian,” a reference to the great 1648

Treaty of Westphalia that brought a close to Europe’s Thirty Years War and longer-standing religious wars. To this end, he makes the ludicrous claim that the Treaty of Westphalia brought about the “balance of power” in Europe, which itself was the cause of post-1648 wars in Europe, since the balance of power “is a system where wars are waiting to happen.” He perpetuates the mythology, that it is the existence of sovereign nation-states that is the driving force for wars. In reality, the “balance of power” has been a constant *British imperial* policy, to keep the European continent disunited, and in a constant state of conflict.

Cooper sees the balance of power operating in Asia, in the relations between India and China, and foresees future conflicts resulting from this. At one point, he puts forward the idea that the EU should emerge as a balance to the United States and China. The biggest danger posed by Cooper, is his axiomatic claim that the world today is divided into “zones of order” and “zones of chaos,” the latter encompassing “failed states” like Liberia, Somalia, Afghanistan, and so on. At one point, referring favorably to Harvard’s Prof. Samuel P. Huntington, author of *Clash of Civilizations*, he wrote that the world is divided into “Them and Us.”

Cooper wrote: “When dealing with old-fashioned kinds of state outside the postmodern limits [!], Europeans need to revert to the rougher methods of an earlier era—force, preemptive attack, deception, whatever is necessary for those who still live in the nineteenth-century world of every state for itself. In the jungle, one must use the laws of the jungle. . . . It was not the well-organized Persian Empire that brought about the fall of Rome, but the barbarians.”

He continued: “The difficulty, however, is in knowing what form intervention should take: the most logical way to deal with chaos is by colonization. If the nation-state has failed, why not go back to an older form—empire?” I.e., “post-modern” equals “imperial.”

One vehicle for this imperial policy (as in his *Prospect* article) is the IMF-World Bank system, the “programmes of assistance” which he calls “a limited form of voluntary empire,” similar to what was done in 1875, during the Egyptian financial crisis, when the British-French oversight over Egypt’s finances resulted in the Egyptian government’s overthrow, “as sometimes happens with IMF programmes too”; 31,000 British troops were sent in, “to restore order and good government.” Today, the IMF would “renegotiate.”

Preventive War and British Geopolitics

It is not surprising, in this context, that Cooper fully backs the Iraq War, using sophisticated-Cheneyesque argumentation, to claim that Iraq represented a threat in potentially having nuclear weapons, with the only “proof” presented, being that Gulf War I—more than a decade earlier, and before Iraq underwent crippling sanctions and close

international monitoring of its policies and economy—revealed that Iraq had detailed programs and plans for weapons of mass destruction. Nothing is more important, according to Cooper, than preventing the emergence of new nuclear weapons powers, and preventing terrorists from getting WMD. Hence, he gives full backing to “the doctrine of preventative action in the U.S. National Security Strategy,” the main theme of which is “enduring strategic superiority.” He wrote: “In practice, this is not so different from the longstanding British doctrine that no single power should be allowed to dominate the continent of Europe. . . .”

The time since Cooper wrote his book has shown something that was predictable when his *The Breaking of Nations* went to print in 2003: Iraq has plummeted into chaos, in a process that threatens to drown all of Southwest Asia and contiguous areas. Happily, the core Bush Administration group, centered around Vice President Cheney, that planned this war, is now in deep political trouble in the United States. May a similar fate await Robert Cooper!

Beyond this, Cooper counts on a dumbed-down American population to approve of such a British-authored direction of American foreign policy. “For Americans history is pure bunk,” he writes, and proceeds to simply ignore the entire matter of the American Revolution, and the historical tensions between the American System and the British Empire. But with the growing impact of the LaRouche political movement in the United States and internationally, we are seeing what might be called “history’s revenge,” a reawakening of the great ideas of 1776, typified by the Declaration of Independence from the British Empire.

Hobbesian Wars

Cooper sees, today, the seed-crystal of conflict coming from the continued existence of nation-states, the potential “success” of which could upset the global “balance.” China and India are reviewed in this context. He raises the possibility that both of these states could collapse into “pre-modern” states of unrest and chaos. But the highest potential for conflict comes from “failed states” in Africa, such as Sierra Leone, Rwanda, and Congo. He wrote that “pre-modern states are usually the scene of a series of conflicts—initially civil wars, later the wars of all against all (as Hobbes so aptly named them)—for the control of resources.” What a travesty! In fact, as *EIR* has documented, these conflicts in Africa are initiated and orchestrated by powerful British, American, and Israeli interests, primarily centered in Anglo-American supranational mining conglomerates.

Once again, this proves that it is imperialism which creates and foments wars, and that it is the final defeat of Hobbesian-imperial policies of the type espoused by Cooper that, alone, can bring peace to our troubled world.

Sir Oswald Mosley

The Fascist Roots of The Lisbon Treaty

by Scott Thompson

The idea of a unified European dictatorial state, which is embedded in the current Treaty of Lisbon, was, from the outset, a fascist idea, launched in the hours immediately following the defeat of Hitler and the Nazis. One of the first and most vocal champions of a united European single oligarchical state was the British Fascist, Sir Oswald Mosley. Mosley was the founder and leader of the British Union of Fascists, and was jailed during much of World War II for his pro-Nazi activities. In 1944, Mosley and his wife were released from prison and placed under house arrest until the end of the war, through the intervention of their good friend Winston Churchill, then the Prime Minister of Britain.

On Feb. 8, 1948, a collection of 51 organizations, many of them the remnants of Mosley’s British Union of Fascists, convened a conference to launch the Union Movement, to promote a single European state, to, among other things, better fight communism, and challenge the United States as the leader of the post-war world.

Mosley spoke of the Union Movement, otherwise known as Europe a Nation, which he would head for the next 14 years, in his autobiography, *My Life*: “As soon as I was free to speak after the war, I returned to the theme of the union of Europe and linked it with the startling development of science during the war, which reinforced my longstanding belief that it should be the main preoccupation of statesmanship. . . . It is in the interest of America to have a partner rather than a pensioner. It is in the interest of the world for a power to arise, which can render hopeless the Russian design for the subjection of Europe to communism.” In his original scheme, Mosley called for the creation of a single European currency, to free Europe from dollar “domination.”

Two events decisive for Europe a Nation were the publication in 1947 of *The Alternative*, which was Mosley’s own dialectic of 3,000 years of Greco-Roman thought, and his declaration of being in favor of the same in a 1948 speech in East London. Between 1953 and 1959, he published *The European*, and his second wife, Diana, was the editor.

In March 1962, Mosley succeeded in calling a conference in Venice after winning agreement among various European parties, and he claims only a “small minority. . . had previously been fascists or national socialists.” Mosley had been asked to write a draft program to be circulated in advance of the con-