

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-



Sir Oswald Mosley, the founder and leader of the British Union of Fascists, was jailed during much of World War II for his pro-Nazi activities. The ideas behind his post-war scheme for a single European oligarchical state, are embedded in the current Treaty of Lisbon.

ference, and he wrote it, defining his full program of Europe a Nation, that he had advocated since 1948. After a long discussion at the conference, the draft proposal was adopted with only a few amendments. There was no chairman at the conference, and discussion was held in the fashion of an Arthurian round table, only without King Arthur.

The following is the European Declaration agreed and signed at the Venice conference on March 1, 1962:

We being Europeans conscious of the tradition which derives from classic Greece and Rome, and of a civilization which during three thousand years has given ample thought, beauty, science and leadership to mankind; and feeling for each other the close relationship of a great family, whose quarrels in the past have proved the heroism of our people but whose division in the future would threaten the life of our continent with the same destruction which extinguished the genius of Hellas and led to the triumph of alien values, now declare with pride our European communion of blood and spirit in the following urgent and practical proposals of our new generation which challenge present policies of division, delay and subservience to the destructive materialism of external powers before which the splendour of our history, the power of our economy, the nobility of our traditions and the inspiration of our ideals must never be surrendered:

1. That Europe a Nation shall forthwith be made a fact. This means that Europe shall have a common

government for purposes of foreign policy, defense, economic policy, finance and scientific development. It does not mean Americanisation by a complete mixture of European peoples, which is neither desirable or possible.

2. That European government shall be elected by a free vote of the whole people of Europe every four years at elections which all parties may enter. This vote shall be expressed in the election of a parliament which will have the power to elect a government and at any time to dismiss it by vote of censure carried by two-thirds majority. Subject to the power of dismissal, government shall have full authority to act during its period of office in order to meet the fast-moving events of the new age of science and to carry out the will of the people as expressed by their majority vote.

3. That national parliaments in each member country of Europe a Nation shall have full power over all social and cultural problems, subject only to the overriding power of European Government in finance and its other defined spheres, in particular the duty of economic leadership.

4. That economic leadership of government shall be exercised by means of a wage-price mechanism, first to secure similar conditions of competition in similar industries by payment of the same wages, salaries, pensions and fair profits as science increases the means of production for an assured market, thus securing continual equilibrium between production and consumption, eliminating slump and unemployment, and progressively raising the standard of life. Capital and credit shall be made available to the underdeveloped regions of Europe from the surplus at present expatriated from our continent.

5. That intervention by government at the three key points of wages, prices, where monopoly conditions prevail, and the long-term purchase of agricultural and other primary products alone is necessary to create the third system of a producers' state in conditions of a free society which will be superior both to rule by finance under American capitalism and to rule by bureaucracy under communist tyranny...."

No One Here But Us Fascisti

No list of the groups present at the Venice conference exists in the public record, and the claim that only a minority of the participants were fascist or national socialist is moot. Mosley's post-war efforts took him on the familiar neo-fascist trail to Franco's Spain and Verwoerd's South

Africa, as well as to Italy where a neo-fascist movement was established soon after the war. He met with Serrano Súñer, Franco's brother-in-law and former foreign minister; Filippo Anfuso, Mussolini's last ambassador to Berlin; and he got to know Italian MSI leaders like Giorgio Almirante and Alvisio Loredan. He came in contact with Hitler's favorite killer, the son-in-law of Hjalmar Schacht, Otto "Scarface" Skorzeny, the German air ace Ulrich Rudel (whose memoirs, with an introduction by Douglas Bader, were published by Mosley's publishing house), the Italian Prince Junio Valerio Borghese, and the Wehrmacht's *Panzerkrieg* (tank warfare) expert Arthur Ehrhardt, later publisher of *Nation Europa*. He met SS survivors who were "passion-

ately European and entirely supported my advanced European ideas."

As for the success of the conference, Mosley says the prospect was wide open for a National Party to which men of all opinions could adhere, provided they were agreed on the one decisive point of making Europe a Nation, but finance was lacking. Writes Mosley: "Hopes of an early making of Europe receded for several reasons. The British Government not only missed every opportunity to take the initiative in Europe after the war, but still maintained an attitude which impeded any early hope of effective union. All existing European governments were certainly opposed to any union so complete as we advocated. Meantime, German hopes in par-

Churchill Boosted Oligarchical 'Pan-Europe'

Even before Sir Oswald Mosley, leader of the British Union of Fascists, put forth his scheme for a single European oligarchical state, his protector and friend, Winston Churchill, was promoting the same idea. Just six months after his Fulton, Mo. "Iron Curtain" speech, Sir Winston delivered an address in Zurich, Switzerland, on Sept. 19, 1946, promoting a single European state to curb the "Teutonic" menace and battle communism.

Churchill lied about Britain's pivotal role in launching two world wars on the European continent, instead asserting, "We all know that the two world wars through which we have passed arose out of the vain passion of a newly united Germany to play the dominating part in the world. In this last struggle crimes and massacres have been committed for which there is no parallel since the invasion of the Mongols in the 14th Century and no equal at any time in human history."

Churchill's solution? "We must build a kind of United States of Europe." Invoking a leading European Synarchist, Churchill continued, "Much work, Ladies and Gentlemen, has been done upon this task by the exertions of the Pan-European Union which owes so much to Count Coudenhove-Kalergi and which commanded the services of the famous French patriot and statesman Aristede Briand. . . . If Europe is to be saved from infinite misery, and indeed from final doom, there must be this act of faith in the European Family and this act of oblivion against all the crimes and follies of the past."

Churchill concluded, in summary: "Under and within



Library of Congress

Prime Minister Winston Churchill at the Potsdam Conference, July 17, 1945.

that world concept we must re-create the European Family in a regional structure called, it may be, the United States of Europe. And the first practical step would be to form a Council of Europe. If at first all the States of Europe are not willing or able to join the Union, we must nevertheless proceed to assemble and combine those who will and those who can."

ticular of their grievances through the union of Europe became more and more bitterly frustrated.” As Mosley points out: “At an earlier stage young Germans fresh from the army, and particularly from SS regiments, were passionately European. . . . I had heard from many of them long before I was free to travel, and had an insight into what they were thinking which is perhaps unique.” But, with the collapse of the Venice conference, “the failure of this European policy reduced to the vanishing point all hope of a natural and pacific reunion of Germany within Europe,” and the former SS officers returned to nationalism.

Mosley had no adherence to the British Commonwealth, and in the atomic age, viewed European participation in most of the world an endless trail of trouble. The sole exception for Europe a Nation was Africa. Until Europe a Nation gained parity of strength with America, there could be no independence for any of Europe’s colonies. As Mosley wrote about “spheres of influence,” “I have long suggested a division of the world into three main spheres of influence to replace the make-believe of a world force in the present United Nations, which by reason of its inherent divisions can never function. . . . The realities in terms of action are the great powers, and it is humbug to pretend anything else; the facts survive either illusion or deceit. Two powers exist in the world, America and Russia, and this result of the last war will prevail until the emergence of a third power in united Europe and possibly of a fourth in China. The danger of a new war will also continue until the strength as well as the wisdom of Europe can hold the balance of the world. That is why, since the war, as before it, I have stood for the strong armament of Britain and as soon as possible of a United Europe . . . because in an armed world European strength is the only alternative to servitude under America or death under communism.”

Mosley opposed the 1956 invasion of Suez: “I contended that in modern terms support for the French position in Algeria was far more important than pursuit of our own past through the irrelevance of Suez. A reasonable settlement backed by the strength of united Europe in northern Africa could have secured us a safe bridgehead to Africa, where lay enormous possibilities for the whole European future.”

For Africa, Mosley advocated the Mosley-Pirow proposals, that were jointly named after the former South African Minister of Defense Oswald Pirow. As Mosley writes about it:

These proposals in broad principle divided the whole of Africa in white and black governments. . . . Black government in this policy received roughly two-thirds of Africa, south of the Sahara, and the rest was to be held clearly and firmly by white governments where substantial and deeply rooted European populations existed. Rhodesia was naturally included in the definition of territory under white government,

and the danger of a clash with British people would have been eliminated by a comprehensive plan which gave a fair deal to all. The basis of this policy was that Africa is an empty continent with a population of twenty to the square mile as compared with two hundred in Europe—and we should therefore legislate for the future rather than the *status quo* which could not endure.

If the claim of Europeans to any part of Africa be disputed, we should inform those whose passions blind them to history, that Europeans arrived in Southern Africa three centuries ago in 1652, long before the present black tribes drove down from the north to encounter the whites six hundred miles north of Cape Town at the decisive battle of the Great Fish River in 1770. . . . Separate development or apartheid on a big scale could then have been secured by a decisive initiative from Britain, and would have averted many past tragedies and many present difficulties. . . . I have stood throughout for a ‘genuine apartheid,’ a real separation of the two peoples into two nations which enjoy equal opportunity and status: not the bogus apartheid seeking to keep the Negro within white territory but segregated into black ghettos, which are reserves of sweated labour living in wretched conditions.

On the question of a single currency, Mosley writes:

The entry of Britain into the Common Market will not solve our balance of payments problem, and the same problem in other countries will not be solved until Europe is a community as the component countries are today. It will not then be a question of Britain having an adverse balance of payments and France and Germany having a surplus, or vice versa, but only a question of whether a firm in Manchester can or cannot compete successfully with a similar firm in Lyons or Hamburg. We shall no more have balance of payments problems within Europe than we have balance of payments problems between Yorkshire and Lancashire today. A common currency will follow naturally from any such arrangement. Until Europe is integrated it will be found that these problems are insoluble and will cause increasing friction until we end in a major crisis.

Sir Oswald Mosley’s fascist vision of Europe a Nation, was to unfold over a period of decades, to the point that all of the essential features of his post-war scheme are now embedded in the Treaty of Lisbon, presently being shoved down the throats of European parliaments, and behind the backs of the European population who have already, once rejected this horror.