

ony? In India, in any case, leading circles have understood that the campaign is intended not only to destroy China's image, and advance separatism, but also to destroy India's relationship with China.

In Russia, it is very well understood what lies behind NATO expansion, and what is aimed at with the absorption of Georgia and Ukraine into NATO: namely, to further the policy of encirclement against Russia, and, with it, to create an unacceptable security situation. At least on this point, Berlin has resisted the pressure of the empire faction. Russia has made it clear, with the expulsion of 150 members of the BP oil company due to alleged visa problems—in reality, there is suspicion of espionage—that it understands the intention. There have appeared in Russia a whole array of highly instructive articles, which document, primarily, the attempted manipulation of the U.S.-Russian relationship by the British Empire over the last 250 years.

Nuclear Power Alliances—Without Germany!

All these strategic maneuvers naturally also concern raw materials and energy. Just as the United States is seeking to get control over the Indian nuclear energy program through the proposed U.S.-Indian nuclear treaty, which has been fully rejected by India's Parliament and scientists, so Great Britain wants to extend control, through its special relationship with France at the just-concluded summit, over nuclear energy worldwide. Industry Minister John Hutton explained that Great Britain would take the lead in the development of nuclear energy globally, which, however, is running into resistance in France, which does not want to lose its own technological advantage. Meanwhile, Russia and Japan have decided to establish a civilian nuclear energy alliance between Atomenergoprom and Toshiba, which would make them leaders on the world market, and has delivered a well-deserved shock to the new Entente Formidable.

And Germany? Germany, in this respect, in spite of all its service to the empire, is totally isolated on the question of nuclear energy, and has just given up the Transrapid maglev project for Munich. Eight billion euros of tax money alone was spent for bad debts at Deutsche Industriebank (IKB), but Eu3 billion for a maglev project that could mean abundant benefits for the whole world—this could not be spent!

We find ourselves not only in the worst crisis since 1945, or 1931, as it now is almost commonplace to say. If we continue on this course, then an asymmetrical global war threatens to emerge out of the systemic crisis, a war by which the British Empire would draw the United States, with its special relationship, as well as a militarized EU, into further wars against Eurasia. Such a third world war would throw mankind into a Dark Age.

The only alternative to that is the emergency conference proposed by Lyndon LaRouche, for a New Bretton Woods System and the construction of the Eurasian Land-Bridge, as the seed crystal for reconstruction of the world economy.

NATO Summit Agenda: Drumbeat for Empire

by Karel Vereycken

In the lead-up to the April 2-4 NATO summit in Bucharest, Romania, an array of proposals have been floated for “urgent reforms” of the Atlantic Alliance, which is presented as being on the verge of collapse and bankruptcy.

In reality, under conditions of the current rapid disintegration of the international financial and monetary system, the London-centered international financial cartels are pushing “NATO reform” as an instrument to consolidate a British Liberal imperialist dictatorship over both the United States and Europe.

The former secretary general of NATO, Javier Solana, currently in charge of the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP), together with his close associate Robert Cooper, in charge of the EU's directorate E (economic and military affairs), are at the heart of this drive, and serve as the explicit reference for most geostrategic “thinkers” arguing for these reforms.

Cooper, the “foreign policy guru” of former British Prime Minister Tony Blair, is not a thinker, but an ideologue. He took most of his ideas from Giuliano Amato, his fellow visitor to the Woodstock, U.K. headquarters of the Trans-Atlantic establishment policy center, the Ditchley Foundation. Amato had previously outlined such a design for empire in great detail in 1995.¹ Amato, not surprisingly, is one of the authors of the Lisbon Treaty, which precisely outlaws any resistance to the Liberal imperial financial fascism the British desperately need today.

From Failed States to Rogue States

After the Club of Rome's neo-Malthusian IMF policies transformed many of the developing countries into corruption-ridden concentration camps, Cooper “observed” that they had become “failed states,” and began pleading for the return of some sort of “soft” empire, combining military interventions and humanitarian aid as a means to “rescue large numbers of endangered populations.”

In Cooper's cynical worldview, the world is divided into three kinds of nations:

- The “pre-modern” states, some kind of jungle zone (e.g., Somalia, Afghanistan).
- The “modern nation-state,” crafted at the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, which he lies was based on mere “*raison d'état*”

1. Robert Cooper, “The New Liberal Imperialism,” *The Observer*, April 7, 2002, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2002/apr/07/1>.



U.S. Army/SSG Marcus J. Quarterman

Coalition military forces in Afghanistan, 2007. London-centered imperialists are pushing NATO “reforms” that would make troops available as marcher-lords all over the world—far outside NATO’s treaty-defined area of responsibility, which is the North Atlantic.

(reason of state) and the use of “pure force” (Hobbes), creating rivalries leading to war.

- The “post-modern,” or “post-Hobbesian” state, which allegedly creates permanent peace through permanent negotiation, transparency, compromise, and “mutual interference.”

For Cooper, of course, most large nations, such as Russia, China, India, the United States, or France, still fall into this awful category of states of the “Westphalian order,” while his European Union is the most perfect model of “a post-Hobbesian” form of society and the essence of a “liberal cooperative empire” based on the voluntary abandonment by both individuals and states of their sovereignty, not to be transferred to some kind of superstate, but to “faceless entities” such as the EU and NATO (as Amato has said). Cooper liberally adds that “such an institution must be as dedicated to liberty and democracy as its constituent parts. Like Rome, this commonwealth would provide its citizens with some of its laws, some coins, and the occasional road.”²

If the 1995 Balkan War “to stop genocide” offered the initial opportunity for pleading for more integration of the EU and NATO operations, commonly deployed increasingly with private military (i.e., mercenary) corporations, it is an understatement to say that 9/11 came as a benediction for Cooper’s imperial plan, since both pre-modern “failed states” (Afghanistan), and even “modern” states (Iraq), appeared as “rogue

states,” committing genocide against minorities, harboring international terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, and organized crime, and responsible for, or incapable of, controlling “global threats” that even may include “climate change.”

It is also remarkable that the day after 9/11, Sept. 12, 2001, was the very date on which, for the first time in its history, NATO’s solidarity clause (Article 5 of the NATO charter) was invoked by a then-Dick Cheney advisor, Victoria Nuland, currently the U.S. ambassador to NATO, to demand that NATO members join the Alliance’s out-of-area war deployments. It failed then, but it might soon go through. (Articles 5 and 6 of the charter also specify that the area it governs is limited to “Europe or North America.”)

Once one penetrates Cooper’s coded language, one can “read” the British aims behind current “debates,” in which any event, be it Kosovo’s independence, Russian oil, or Tibet, the drumbeats for empire can be heard. It is in this context, that the proposed merger of NATO and the EU, can be seen as a key element of this “permanent putsch.” It is clearly the message of the March 2008 discussion paper of the Brussels-based Security and Defense Agenda (SDA)³, called “Revisiting NATO-ESDP Relations.”

The British Trap of the EU-NATO Merger

One of the contributions to this document, bluntly titled, “A Checklist for Enhanced EU-NATO Cooperation,” is writ-

2. Giuliano Amato, “Inter-Governmental Co-Operation and Integration in the European Union,” Ditchley Foundation Annual Lecture XXXII, July 1995, <http://www.ditchley.co.uk/page/319/lecture-xxxii.htm>.

3. Mark Leonard, “The Project for a New European Century,” *The Globalist*, <http://www.theglobalist.com/dbweb/storyid.aspx?storyid=4464>.

ten by Daniel Korski, a senior policy fellow of the George Soros-financed European Council on Foreign Relations (ECRF), directed by Tony Blair's other "European Century" wonderboy Mark Leonard, who trumpets Cooper's lunacies as a triumphant prophecy, convinced that the "Eurosphere" will soon dominate the planet, "Not because the EU will run the world, but because the European way of doing things will become the world's" (i.e., the British empire's).⁴

Complaining about the lack of sufficient funding for military-humanitarian interventions, Korski says both the EU and NATO have great problems "exerting influence in strategically important regions, such as Central Asia where the Sino-Russian Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) is becoming a bigger player."

NATO and the EU "are struggling with the twin challenges of integrating civilian and military assets on the one hand, and integrating NATO and EU assets in post-conflict operations on the other. They are sometimes, but not always the same issue."

So far, these kinds of operations have been unsuccessful, says Korski, but "NATO's 60th anniversary in 2009 will be an opportunity to revitalize Europe's premier security organization, and following this year's U.S. presidential election, rebuild a consensus on Euro-Atlantic security, including an agreement on the role for the EU. This year is a good time for both organizations to begin preparing for 2009 by addressing some key problems. EU leaders' agreement on the Lisbon Treaty means they can now move away from intra-institutional arrangements and focus on Europe's role in the world."

How To Defeat French Resistance?

France's reintegration into NATO's command structures is seen by Korski as key: "Responsibility for gently moving both processes to a mutually reinforcing conclusion will rest in large part with France," and French President Nicolas "Sarkozy will need to resolve the 'French paradox'—opposing efforts to integrate civilian and military components inside NATO but, in parallel, obstructing cooperation between NATO and the EU."

Says Korski: "The signs so far are good, but the Elysée Palace [the French Presidency] will need to spell out in greater detail what Sarkozy meant when he said the price for NATO membership was respect for ESDP, and he in turn will need to stamp his views on the recalcitrant diplomats in the Quai d'Orsay [foreign ministry], for whom opposing NATO and championing ESDP has been a long-standing article of faith."

For Korski, the EU and NATO must concentrate on Kosovo

and Afghanistan. Then, "As overlapping organizations, the EU and NATO need to find practical ways to cooperate better, especially when dealing with fragile and failing states. Talk of a 'reverse Berlin-plus,'⁵ which would allow NATO access to EU civilian assets—much like the original arrangement allows the EU to use NATO's capabilities—is moot as NATO does not have the headquarters apparatus, staff, or concepts for managing the range of civilian assets. Two areas for collaboration should be pursued. The U.S. together with European governments should establish a joint NATO-EU Center for Security and Justice Sector Reform to house their respective capabilities in this field. They should also set up a NATO-EU School for Conflict, Post-Conflict and Stabilization to provide training for both civil servants and private sector consultants. This could improve inter-operability in doctrine and training, and create the basis for joined-up exercises. The EU and NATO should both develop their respective 'strategic concepts,' taking care to avoid duplication and developing better ways to collaborate. For NATO, such a concept must address the gap in the allies' perceptions of what the North Atlantic alliance is for, and what Article 5, in which its members pledge to defend one another, actually means in this 'age of terror.'"

Unfortunately, and while most French professional military commanders warn that Afghanistan is an unmanageable *merdier* (shithole), Sarkozy, falling in the British trap, is expected to announce in Bucharest, a reinforcement of the French deployment to Afghanistan, in an effort he considers vital for France to be promoted into the higher echelons of NATO-EU empire.

Cooper's British empire propaganda is reproduced in Republican Presidential candidate John McCain's raving article in the March 19 *Le Monde*, calling for a "new global pact" between the EU and NATO to face the current "global threats." EU and NATO members "must have the capacity and the will to defend freedom and economic prosperity" and spend what is necessary "to deploy in the entire world, from the Balkans to Afghanistan, from Chad to Eastern Timor."

"We salute the eminent role that Europe plays to make the world a safer and better place to live in. We are waiting impatiently the full and entire reintegration of France into NATO. And we support the EU's efforts to construct an efficient European security and defense policy. A strong Europe, a strong NATO and a real strategic partnership among them [EU and NATO] are in our interest."

The time is ripe to tell our leaders, on both sides of the Atlantic, to stop babbling like poor zombies, lost, but mentally managed by that essence of fascism which is British geopolitics.

4. Both the current NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer and EU High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) Javier Solana are directors of SDA, while Cooper sits on the advisory board; Solana is also a member of the Spanish chapter of the Club of Rome. (http://www.securitydefenceagenda.org/Portals/7/Reports/2007/SDA_NATO_ESDP_relations_DiscussionPaper2008.pdf)

5. In 1994, the "Berlin-plus" agreement permitted the EU (Solana, Cooper, and company) to have access to the logistical and planning means of NATO, including its intelligence capabilities. Today, NATO demands a "reverse Berlin-plus" so that NATO can get access to the EU's capabilities.