June 7—The Russian and Belarusian military speakers at the May 23 Third Moscow Conference on International Security, spelled out in increasing detail how what they called “color revolutions,” foreign-controlled attempts to overthrow governments under the initial cover of democracy promotion, are actually nothing but a new form of aggressive war. This yearly conference has been a venue for significant Russian policy statements, such as in 2012, when Chief of the General Staff Valery Gerasimov made a detailed analysis of how NATO’s BMD plans threaten to strip Russia of its defenses.

Russian Defense Minister Sergei Shoigu opened this year’s conference by reading a message from President Vladimir Putin, who was unable to be present, in which he explicitly attacked the “color revolutions.” “It’s time to stop playing geopolitical games,” read the headline of the Voice of Russia report on the message. They then report the following remarks from the Russian President:

“The process of development of a new polycentric system of international relations is proceeding with difficulty and is accompanied by an increase in global instability. We have not been able to make considerable headway in the formation of a union space of peace, security and stability in Europe and the Atlantic.”

“The situation in the Middle East and Northern Africa remains tense, and serious risks are associated with the situation in Afghanistan,” the President said. “Obviously, modern challenges and threats make it necessary to stop the archaic logic of geopolitical games with a zero sum game, the attempts to force your own methods and values on other peoples, including by color revolutions.”

Indeed, according to the reports available in the West, the major theme of the conference centered on the threat which so-called “color revolutions,” like those that occurred in the Philippines, Georgia, Ukraine, and the like, represent to a stable international order, based on national sovereignties. Thanks to the Obama Administration-instigated boycott of Russia, there were few Americans attending the event, but two who did, have posted extensive notes, along with the PowerPoint slides shown. This report on the conference is based on these notes.

A View That Should Not Be Ignored

Anthony Cordesman of the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) was so struck by the laser-like focus of the Russian and Belarusian military speakers at the conference that he posted 52 pages of his raw notes, with PowerPoints, to the CSIS site under the title, “Russia and the Color Revolution: A Russian Military View of a World Destabilized by the U.S. and the West (Key Briefs).”

He wrote, “Key Russian officers and officials presented a view of the U.S. and the West as deliberately destabilizing nations in North Africa, the Middle East, and the rest of the world for their own ends. They describe such actions as having failed, and been a key source of terrorism. Cordesman indicated that they see the West as rejecting partnership with the Russia and as threatening Russia along all of its borders with Europe.

“Senior Russian officials are also using the term ‘Color Revolution’ in ways that are far more critical than in the past. For example, the Russian Foreign Minister, Sergei Lavrov, has accused the United States and the European Union of an attempt to stage yet another color revolution in Ukraine, and said during the Conference that, ‘Attempts to impose homemade recipes for internal changes on other nations, without taking into account their own traditions and national characteristics, to engage in the export of democracy, have a destructive impact on international relations and result in an increase of the number of hot spots on the world map.’

“What is critical is that the U.S. and Europe listen to what Russian military leaders and strategists are saying.”
saying. These are not Russian views the U.S. and Europe can afford to ignore” (emphasis in original).

Defense Minister Shoigu

In his keynote address, Defense Minister Shoigu addressed the negative impact of color revolutions on international stability. The following summary was provided by Dmitry Gorenburg, a Russian military analyst at the CNA Corporation, a non-profit research organization that runs the Center for Naval Analyses and the Institute for Public Research.

Shoigu said that color revolutions were a new form of warfare invented by Western governments seeking to remove national governments in favor of ones that are controlled by the West, in order to force foreign values on a range of nations. He made the argument that the same scheme has been used in a wide range of cases, with the initial goal of changing the government through supposedly popular protests, shifting into efforts at destabilizing and fomenting internal conflict if the protesters are not successful. This scheme was used in Serbia, Libya, and Syria—all cases where political interference by the West transitioned into military action. Now the same scheme is being followed in Ukraine, where the situation in recent weeks has become a virtual civil war, and in Venezuela, where the so-called democratic opposition is actually organized by the United States.

Shoigu pointed out that the consequences of color revolutions are very different from the protest organizations’ initial stated goals. The main result has been instability. The Arab Spring, for example, has destabilized the Middle East and North Africa. Now, a whole range of African states are near collapse because of the effects of events in Libya. Afghanistan is increasingly unstable, which has forced Russia to increase its military presence in Central Asia in order to contain threats coming from the south.

Others addressing this theme in detail included General Gerasimov, Belarusian Defense Minister Yuri Zhadobin, Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO) Secretary General Nikolai Bordyuzha, and Gen. Vladimir Zarudnitsky, head of the Main Operational Directorate of the Russian General Staff, who
spoke on a panel on the Mideast and North Africa.

**Chief of Staff Gerasimov**

Gerasimov reiterated the idea that the United States has developed a new method of warfare, beginning with using non-military tactics to change opposing governments through color revolutions that utilize the protest potential of the population to engineer peaceful regime-change. The two graphics from his presentation that we reproduce here (Figures 1 and 2), give a good idea of his strategic argument about what the Western policy has done.

Gerasimov emphasized that military force is concealed behind the color revolutions. If the protest potential turns out to be insufficient, military force is then used openly to ensure regime change. Libya was cited as a textbook example. In Syria, the West is using mercenaries and military assistance in an effort to overthrow the government. What began as a purely internal conflict has turned into a battle between religious radicals and the government.

The following raw notes from Cordesman detail the flow of Gerasimov’s argument.

- The breakup of the former Soviet Union has led the U.S. to act as if it were the only superpower, and for its own ends using a mix of force and sanctions using its NATO allies.
- The U.S. military interventions in Iraq in 1991, in Yugoslavia in 1999, in Afghanistan, and then again in Iraq in 2003 used pretexts to allow aggression that violated international norms and law.
- Color revolutions have led to civil wars and threats to civilian populations that only make things worse, and leave major parts of the state under militant control, which become training areas for terrorists.
- Afghanistan has seen more than 10 years of war, and a 30-fold increase in drug production. There has been no concern for the civilian population; drones have killed some 2,500 in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Yemen. Create revolutions so as to be able to use military forces.
- Crises in Libya, Egypt, Sudan, Somalia, Yemen, Georgia, Ukraine. Tensions in many other areas like Algeria and Mauritania.

- Use transfers of arms, SOF (special operations forces), mercenaries, and foreign fighters.
- Claim to protect civilians and deal with WMD, but use to change regimes and force support of the U.S. and NATO.
- Syria sees influx of foreign troops, U.S. double standards. Use of SOF and weapons supplies, threat of military operations like cruise missiles, and constant use of information warfare.
- The adaptive approach to Color Revolutions allows the U.S. and Europe to fight low cost wars at the expense of local populations.
- Libya is a warning of the costs: terrorism, migration, fragmentation, suffering, spread of MANPADs to Mali, Tunisia, etc. Then [they] left Libyans to themselves without assuming any responsibility for order.
- Russia favors collective action to bring stability and unity.
- Ukraine is another case in point:
  - Pressed to change the regime;
  - Overturned the legitimate power;
  - Suppressed protests;
  - Operations by private military groups;
Military Threat Integral to Color Revolutions

According to Cordesman’s notes, Belarusian Defense Minister Zhadobin “mentioned Gene Sharp as the originator of the strategy used in these revolutions,” thus bringing in the British hand behind the policy, as EIR has documented (see article by Rachel Douglas in this section). Zhadobin also noted that color revolutions are always set up from outside. In the three PowerPoint slides (Figures 3, 4, and 5) we re-publish from his address, his central point is clear.

But the speaker who delved into the most detail on the color revolution strategy appears to have been General Zarudnitsky, head of the Main Operational Directorate of the Russian General Staff. This is Gorenburg’s summary of Zarudnitsky’s talk:

“Like the plenary speakers, Zarudnitsky focused on the military aspects of colored revolutions. He argued that while the West considers colored revolutions to be a peaceful way of overthrowing undemocratic regimes, events in
the Middle East and North Africa have shown that military force is an integral part of all aspects of colored revolutions. This includes external pressure on the regime in question to prevent the use of force to restore order, the provision of military and economic assistance to rebel forces, and if these measures are not sufficient, the conduct of a military operation to defeat government forces and allow the rebels to take power. Colored revolutions are thus a new technique of aggression pioneered by the United States and geared toward destroying a state from within by dividing its population. The advantage of this technique is that it requires a relatively low expenditure of resources to achieve its goals.

“Zarudnitsky argues that since this type of warfare is based on the network principle, it has no front line. It is used primarily in urban areas, frequently using civilians as shields. Commonly accepted rules of warfare are ignored, since official state-run armed forces are not used. Instead, criminal and terrorist forces and private military companies are allowed to act with impunity. Counter-guerrilla warfare tactics are required to defeat this type of warfare.

“The key question for military planners is which state will be targeted next. Weak states with poor economies are generally the most vulnerable to these tactics, but the main factor in determining targets is the geopolitical interest of the provoking state. For this reason, such revolutions are organized primarily in countries with significant natural resources or ones that have an important strategic position and conduct an independent foreign policy. The destabilization of such countries allows for a major shift in the balance of power in a particular region (in the case of the Arab Spring—the Middle East and North Africa).”

Cordesman’s more inclusive account adds the following points from Zarudnitsky:

The Color Revolution is:
• Delegitimizing war
• Urban areas are targets
• Use of human shields
• Goes beyond boundaries of humanitarian behavior and international law
• Criminalizing war
• Seizes and uses religious values as weapons
• Use private military units, SOF disguised as rebels: forces like Blackwater
• The most disgusting medieval methods of violence.

Coming to a Head

The Russian leadership’s understanding that the irregular warfare, or color revolutions, being instigated in the nations around it, are an undeclared war against it, has been evident at least as far back as 2011, when, in the aftermath of the Libyan war, the subversive apparatus of several hundred NGOs in Russia, championed by U.S. Ambassador Michael McFaul, moved, after the Dec. 4, 2011 parliamentary election, to try to prevent Prime Minister Putin from being elected President in May 2012.

On Dec. 8, 2011, Putin spoke to his National People’s Front, declaring that the U.S.A. had invested “hundreds of millions of dollars” to shape the Russian electoral process. “We must develop forms of protecting our sovereignty, protecting ourselves from outside interference,” he said. Subsequently, Russia passed laws requiring rigorous registration of NGOs operating in Russia as agents of the foreign organizations supporting them. The U.S. has had exactly the same law since 1938, according to Putin.
The British Empire Created the ‘Color Revolutions’ as Acts of War

The following two articles provide the essential documentation on the British Empire’s spawning of the “Color Revolution” strategy, which has been implemented by “democracy” thinktanks and other irregular warfare operatives throughout the world. They have been slightly abridged, and footnotes removed.

Note that the major players in the direct anti-Russia operations described here have also been in the center of the Ukraine operation—notably, British moneybags George Soros, and British-trained National Endowment for Democracy head Nadia Diuk.

Empire Pushes To Overthrow Putin

This article, by Rachel Douglas, appeared in the Jan. 20, 2012 EIR, under the headline “Bankrupt British Empire Keeps Pushing To Overthrow Putin.”

Jan. 9 [2012]—Organizers of the December 2011 “anti-vote-fraud” demonstrations in Moscow have announced Feb. 4 as the date of their next street action, planned as a march around the city’s Garden Ring Road on the 22nd anniversary of a mass demonstration which paved the way to the end of the Soviet Union. While there is a fluid situation within both the Russian extraparliamentary opposition layers, and the ruling circles and other Duma parties, including a process of “dialogue” between them, in which ex-Finance Minister Alexei Kudrin is playing a role, it is clear that British imperial interests are intent on—if not actually destroying Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s bid for re-election as Russia’s President in the March 4 elections—casting Russia into ongoing, destructive political turmoil.

Lyndon LaRouche has observed that anybody acting according to this British agenda with the intention of coming out on top is a fool, since the British financial-political empire is bankrupt and its entire system is coming down.

Review of the events leading up to the Dec. 4, 2011 Duma elections, which the street demonstrators demanded be cancelled for fraud, shows that not only agent-of-British-influence Mikhail Gorbachov, the ex-Soviet President, but also the vast Project Democracy apparatus inside the United States, exposed by EIR in the 1980s as part of an unconstitutional “secret government,” have been on full mobilization to block the current Russian leadership from continuing in power.

Project Democracy

Typical is the testimony of Nadia Diuk, vice president of the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), before the Subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia of the U.S. House Committee on Foreign Affairs last July 26. The NED is the umbrella of Project Democracy; it functions, inclusively, through the International Republican Institute (IRI, linked with the Republican Party) and the National Democratic Institute (NDI, linked with the Democratic Party, and currently headed by Madeleine Albright).

Diuk was educated at the U.K.’s University of Sussex Russian studies program, and then taught at Oxford University, before coming to the U.S.A. to head up the NED’s programs in Eastern Europe and Russia beginning 1990. She is married to her frequent co-author, Adrian Karatnycky of the Atlantic Institute, who headed up the private intelligence outfit Freedom House for 12 years. Her role is typical of British outsourcing of key strategic operations to U.S. institutions.

In her testimony, Diuk came off like a reincarnation of a 1950s Cold Warrior, raving against the Russian government as “authoritarian,” “dictators,” and so forth. She said, “The trend lines for freedom and democracy in Russia have been unremittingly negative since Vladimir Putin took power and set about the sys-
tematic construction of a representation of their interests within the state.” She announced at that point that the elections would be illegitimate: “[T]he current regime will likely use the upcoming parliamentary elections in December 2011 and presidential election in March 2012 with the inevitable falsifications and manipulations, to claim the continued legitimacy of its rule.”

Diuk expressed renewed hope that the disastrous 2004 Orange Revolution experiment in Ukraine could be replicated in Russia, claiming that “when the protests against authoritarian rule during Ukraine’s Orange Revolution brought down the government in 2004, Russian citizens saw a vision across the border of an alternative future for themselves as a Slavic nation.” She then detailed what she claimed were the Kremlin’s reactions to the events in Ukraine, charging that “the leaders in the Kremlin—always the most creative innovators in the club of authoritarians—have also taken active measures to promote support of the government and undermine the democratic opposition….”

While lauding “the democratic breakthroughs in the Middle East” in 2011, Diuk called on the Congress to “look to [Eastern Europe] as the source of a great wealth of experience on how the enemies of freedom are ever on the alert to assert their dominance, but also how the forces for freedom and democracy will always find a way to push back in a struggle that demands our support.”

In September, Diuk chaired an NED event featuring a representative of the NED-funded Levada Center Russian polling organization, who gave an overview of the then-upcoming December 4 Duma election. Also speaking there was Russian liberal politician Vladimir Kara-Murza, who predicted in the nastiest tones that Putin will suffer the fate of President Hosni Mubarak in Egypt. In this same September period, Mikhail Gorbachov, too, was already forecasting voting irregularities and a challenge to Putin’s dominance.

The NED, which has an annual budget of $100 million, sponsors dozens of “civil society” groups in Russia. Golos, the supposedly independent vote-monitoring group that declared there would be vote fraud even before the elections took place, has received NED money through the NDI since 2000. Golos had a piece-work program, paying its observers a set amount of money for each reported voting irregularity. NED grant money has gone to Alexei Navalny—the online anti-corruption activist and cult figure of the December demonstrations—since 2006, when he and Maria Gaidar (daughter of the late London-trained shock therapy Prime Minister Yegor Gaidar) launched a youth debating project called “DA!” (meaning “Yes!” or standing for “Democratic Alternative”). Gorbachov’s close ally Vladimir Ryzhkov, currently negotiating with Kudrin on terms of a “dialogue between the authorities and the opposition,” also received NED grants to his World Movement for Democracy.

Besides George Soros’s Open Society Foundations (formerly, Open Society Institute, OSI), the biggest source of funds for this meddling, including funding which was channeled through the NDI and the IRI, is the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). Officially, USAID has spent $2.6 billion on
programs in Russia since 1992. The current acknowledged level is around $70 million annually, of which nearly half is for “Governing Justly & Democraticly” programs, another 30% for “Information” programs, and only a small fraction for things like combating HIV and TB. On Dec. 15, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs Philip Gordon announced that the Obama Administration would seek Congressional approval to step up this funding, with “an initiative to create a new fund to support Russian non-governmental organizations that are committed to a more pluralistic and open society.”

Awaiting McFaul

People from various parts of the political spectrum in Russia see the impending arrival of Michael McFaul as U.S. Ambassador to Russia as an escalation in Project Democracy efforts to destabilize Russia. McFaul, who has been Barack Obama’s National Security Council official for Russia, has been working this beat since the early 1990s, when he represented the NDI in Russia at the end of the Soviet period, and headed its office there.

As a Russia specialist at Stanford’s Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies and Hoover Institution, as well as the Carnegie Endowment, and an array of other Russian studies think tanks, McFaul has stuck closely to the Project Democracy agenda. Financing for his research has come from the NED, the OSI, and the Smith-Richardson Foundation (another notorious agency of financier interests within the U.S. establishment). He was an editor of the 2006 book Revolution in Orange: The Origins of Ukraine’s Democratic Breakthrough, containing chapters by Diuk and Karatnycky.

In his own contribution to a 2010 book titled After Putin’s Russia, McFaul hailed the 2004 Orange Revolution in Ukraine—which was notoriously funded and manipulated from abroad—as a triumph of “people’s political power from below to resist and eventually overturn a fraudulent election.”

Before coming to the NSC, one of McFaul’s many positions at Stanford was co-director of the Iran Democracy Project. He has also been active in such projects as the British Henry Jackson Society which is active in the drive to overthrow the government of Syria.

The Internet Dimension

The December 2011 street demonstrations in Moscow were organized largely online. Participation rose from a few hundred on Dec. 5, the day after the election, to an estimated 20,000 people on Bolotnaya Square Dec. 10, and somewhere in the wide range of 30,000 to 120,000 on Academician Sakharov Prospect Dec. 24.

Headlong expansion of Internet access and online social networking over the past three to five years has opened up a new dimension of political-cultural warfare in Russia. An EIR investigation finds that British intelligence agencies involved in the current attempts to destabilize Russia and, in their maximum version, overthrow Putin, have been working intensively to profile online activity in Russia and find ways to expand and exploit it. Some of these projects are outsourced to think tanks in the U.S.A. and Canada, but their center is Cambridge University in the U.K.—the heart of the British Empire, home of Bertrand Russell’s systems analysis and related ventures of the Cambridge Apostles.

The scope of the projects goes beyond profiling, as can be seen in the Cambridge-centered network’s interaction with Russian anti-corruption crusader Alexei Navalny, a central figure in the December protest rallies.

While George Soros and his OSI prioritized building Internet access in the former Soviet Union starting two decades ago, as recently as in 2008 British cyberspace specialists were complaining that the Internet was not yet efficient for political purposes in Russia. Oxford University’s Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism produced a Soros-funded report in 2008, titled “The Web that Failed: How opposition politics and independent initiatives are failing on the Internet in Russia.”
The Cambridge Security Programme

Two top profilers of the Runet are Ronald Deibert and Rafal Rohozinski, who assessed its status in their essay “Control and Subversion in Russian Cyber-space.” At the University of Toronto, Deibert is a colleague of Barry Wellman, co-founder of the International Network of Social Network Analysis (INSNA). Rohozinski is a cyber-warfare specialist who ran the Advanced Network Research Group of the Cambridge Security Programme (CSP) at Cambridge University in 2002-07. Nominally ending its work, the CSP handed off its projects to an array of organizations in the Open-Net Initiative (ONI), including Rohozinski’s SecDev Group consulting firm, which issues the Information Warfare Monitor.

The ONI, formally dedicated to mapping and circumventing Internet surveillance and filtering by governments, is a joint project of Cambridge (Rohozinski), the Oxford Internet Institute, the Berkman Center for Internet and Society at Harvard Law School, and the University of Toronto.

Deibert and Rohozinski noted that the Runet grew five times faster than the next fastest growing Internet region, the Middle East, in 2000-08. They cited official estimates that 38 million Russians were going online as of 2010, of whom 60 had broadband access from home; the forecast number of Russia-based Runet users by 2012 was 80 million, out of a population of 140 million. Qualitatively, the ONI authors welcomed what they called “the rise of the Internet to the center of Russian culture and politics.” On the political side, they asserted that “the Internet has eclipsed all the mass media in terms of its reach, readership, and especially in the degree of free speech and opportunity to mobilize that it provides.”

This notion of an Internet-savvy core of the population becoming the focal point of Russian society is now being hyped by those who want to push the December demonstrations into a full-scale political crisis. Such writers call this segment of the population “the creative class,” or “the active creative minority,” which can override an inert majority of the population. The Dec. 30 issue of Vedomosti, a financial daily co-owned by the Financial Times of London, featured an article by sociologist Natalya Zubarevich, which was then publicized in “Window on Eurasia” by Paul Goble, a State Department veteran who has concentrated for decades on the potential for Russia to split along ethnic or other lines.

Zubarevich proposed that the 31% of the Russian population living in the 14 largest cities, of which 9 have undergone “post-industrial transformation,” constitute a special, influential class, as against the inhabitants of rural areas (38%) and mid-sized industrial cities with an uncertain future (25%). Goble defined the big-city population as a target: “It is in this Russia that the 35 million domestic users of the Internet and those who want a more open society are concentrated.” . . .

[The article concludes with an extensive profile of Alexei Navalny, one of the leading NED operatives at the time. Footnotes are available in the version on www.larouchepub.com.]
Destabilizing Russia: Michael McFaul

The following article, by Rachel Douglas, run in the Feb. 3, 2012 EIR, under the headline “Destabilizing Russia: The ‘Democracy’ Agenda of McFaul & His Oxford Masters.”

Jan. 22 [2012]—Two centuries ago, Russia and the young United States entered the dread year of 1812, each in peril of annihilation. We Americans were about to be assaulted along our East Coast by the British, who would seize and burn Washington, D.C., while the Anglo-Venetian creature Napoleon marched on Moscow. At that time, our ambassador at St. Petersburg was a universal thinker, an astronomer, a rhetorician, one of our outstanding statesmen and future greatest Presidents, John Quincy Adams. In Count Nikolai Rumyantsev, the commerce minister, foreign minister, and chancellor to His Imperial Majesty Alexander I of Russia, Adams, during his 1809-14 posting, found an interlocutor of likewise broad interests, and a crucial shared one: awareness of the British Empire as the common enemy of the United States and Russia.

Today we are all the more in need of such a high quality of diplomatic representation, as the financial powers and geostrategists of the collapsing Trans-Atlantic system, descended from that same British Empire of 200 years ago, threaten to plunge the world into a dark age of depopulation and war—a thermonuclear war that would wipe out civilization.

Instead, Barack Obama this month sent to Moscow as the new U.S. ambassador, one Michael McFaul, who has pursued a narrow ideological agenda throughout his career. It is not an American agenda, but a British one: the cynical cultivation of “democratic” movements for geopolitical purposes, all the way up to and including the overthrow of governments deemed uncooperative with recent decades’ globalization agenda. That has been the design of Project Democracy from its outset in the 1970s-1980s. The Oxford background of leading figures like McFaul and National Endowment for Democracy (NED) vice president Nadia Diuk dramatizes the British connection, while they themselves openly state what it is they are up to.

McFaul told Slon.ru in a June 2011 interview: “Most Russia-watchers are diplomats, or specialists on security and arms control. Or Russian culture. I am neither. I can’t recite Pushkin by heart. I am a specialist in democracy, anti-dictatorial movements, and revolutions” (emphasis added).

It is truly difficult to study Russian without learning by memory at least something from Alexander Pushkin, Russia’s national poet, and only somebody obsessed with a higher priority would make such an omission and then brag about it. McFaul indeed had adopted a higher priority than mastering Russian culture and politics, or Soviet history. He spelled it out in a December 2004 op-ed in the Washington Post. “Did Americans meddle in the internal affairs of Ukraine?” asked McFaul, talking about the events of that month, when street demonstrations in Kiev forced the rerun of a Presidential election, resulting in a different outcome—the so-called Orange Revolution. “Yes,” he answered to his own question. “The American agents of influence would prefer different language to describe their activities—democratic assistance, democracy promotion, civil society support, etc.—but their work, however labeled, seeks to influence political change in Ukraine.”

McFaul enumerated the funding for the Orange Revolution from U.S. government sources, government-funded NGOs, and George Soros’s Open Society Institute (OSI), an account he later expanded in more detail in the 2006 book, Revolution in Orange: The Origins of Ukraine’s Democratic Breakthrough. But he also demurred: “Did American money bring about the Orange Revolution? Absolutely not.” According to McFaul, the cumulative billions of dollars spent on “democracy promotion” merely assists a process which is moving ahead of its own accord: “The combination of a weak, divided and corrupt ancien regime and a united, mobilized and highly motivated opposition produced Ukraine’s democratic breakthrough. . . . Democracy promotion groups do not have a recipe for revolution. If the domestic conditions aren’t ripe, there will be no democratic breakthrough, no matter how crafted the technical assistance or how strategically invested the small grants.”

Any review of the NED or U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) grant lists for Russia, for example, will reveal how very strategically crafted the funding is.

McFaul wrote, “Does this kind of intervention violate international norms? Not anymore. There was a time when championing state sovereignty was a progressive idea, since the advance of statehood helped destroy empires. But today those who revere the sover-
eignty of the state above all else often do so to preserve autocracy, while those who champion the sovereignty of the people are the new progressives” (emphasis added).

It’s hard to say whether that formulation of the British doctrine of liberal imperialism contains more sophistry, or hypocrisy. Nation-states are to be smashed in the name of “the people,” while the same people, as well as their nations as a whole, are brought under the tyranny of the still-existing, albeit bankrupt, British Empire: the empire of globalized finance, and the “empire of the mind”—the rock-drug-sex-digital counter-culture. The Empire which campaigns for reducing Earth’s population from 7 billion to no more than 1 billion humans.

A veteran Russian human rights activist highlighted McFaul’s hypocrisy, in a question during Lyndon LaRouche’s Jan. 18 State of the Union webcast (EIR, Jan. 27, 2012, p. 20). “I know people who were told by McFaul personally,” he reported, “that when he came to the Soviet Union in the late 1980s and early 1990s on various ‘democratization’ projects, he was never interested in achieving ‘democracy’ as such, but rather in collapsing the Soviet Union. On Monday [Jan. 16], McFaul presented his credentials. On Tuesday, he met with representatives of the liberal opposition to the Kremlin. . . . Has Michael McFaul been sent here with the same intention of breaking up Russia, as he had toward the Soviet Union over 20 years ago?”

After McFaul’s hosting of some of the December 2011 street protest leaders at the U.S. Embassy, Russian state-owned TV commentators sharply criticized his behavior openly asking if the new ambassador had come with a mission to “dismantle the existing regime” in Russia. In a Jan. 20 interview with the government daily Rossiyskaya Gazeta, former Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov joined these commentators in chastising McFaul for violations of diplomatic custom and protocol.

In this installment of our dossier on the current British-driven campaign against Russia, and Prime Minister Vladimir Putin in particular, we shall look at the British roots of McFaul’s agenda, particularly of Project Democracy’s so-called color revolutions, and discover that these allegedly non-violent projects are a form of irregular warfare.

**Democracy Promotion**

From the time of the ruination of Greece in the Peloponnesian War of the 5th Century B.C., democratic parties again and again have served as tools of imperial factions. The manipulation of a popular movement, whose members fail to grasp who is using them, and to what ends, is an ancient skill, honed by every empire since Babylon.

Regarding contemporary “democracy promotion,” it is essential to keep in mind that all the institutions of Project Democracy, since the establishment of the NED in 1983, belong to the post-Aug. 15, 1971 world (though their roots reach farther back). The floating-exchange-rate system, installed then by President Richard Nixon at the behest of his Director of the Office of Management and Budget George Shultz, opened the gates to
globalization: a world in which financial activity, decoupled from the real economy, but demanding to be serviced by it, would balloon to unprecedented dimensions before collapsing.

Under globalization, the populations of most countries figure as pools of cheap labor, at best; at worst, they are part of what Prince Philip and lower-level ideologues consider to be the 6 billion excess people on the planet. National leaders who stand in the way of the imperial agenda, or who are powerful enough to threaten to do so, are subject to attack. Through Project Democracy, “anti-dictatorial movements” have been cultivated and used as weapons for this purpose.

No wonder the same George Shultz is credited by McFaul with pioneering the approach that he, McFaul, takes today: “American diplomats must practice dual track diplomacy of the sort practiced by Shultz in dealing with the Soviet Union: engaging autocratic leaders in charge of the state and democratic leaders in society in parallel and at the same time.”

And no wonder the biggest private financier of democracy promotion is the London-Wall Street financial kingpin George Soros. By the late 1990s, Soros’s OSI was pumping $400 million annually into “civil society” programs in East-Central Europe. In the very same period, wagers by hedge-fund operator Soros against national currencies in Asia were notorious as a trigger of the 1997-98 phase of the global financial crisis, culminating in Russia’s being forced into default in August 1998. The close ties of Soros with the London Rothschild banking interests date from their sponsorship of his career in post-war Britain, while the Rothschilds and their Inter-Alpha Group—the largest financial combine in the world—have never abandoned the intention of gaining control over Russia’s vast assets. In the current generation, Nat Rothschild has made no secret of his drive to build a presence in Russia, both through his JNR Ltd. investment company and Russia-oriented raw materials ventures like Vallar Plc., and by cultivating post-Soviet “oligarchs” like Oleg Deripaska.

Cambridge and Oxford: Brain Trust for the Empire

For sheer quantity of patronage, you can’t beat Soros, the NED, and USAID. For the guiding principles of “democracy promotion,” however, you have to go to Oxford.

Leading acolytes of Project Democracy did so, literally. McFaul was a Rhodes scholar at Oxford. U.S. Permanent Representative at the United Nations Susan Rice was a Rhodes scholar at Oxford. Nadia Diuk, the NED vice president who talks about Russia’s current leaders strictly as “authoritarians” to be ousted, taught at Oxford before assuming her duties in the U.S.A.

Two Oxford professors, Sir Adam Roberts and Timothy Garton Ash, have conducted a project called Civil Resistance and Power Politics since 2006. Its goals, as related to regime change in the world today, are better understood by first knowing about the centuries-long role of the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford as two wings of a brain trust, managing the British Empire.

British redcoats and gunboats were the overt instruments of imperial rule in the 18th and 19th centuries, but the Cambridge and Oxford dons were always developing its stratagems. These universities served as the monasteries of an imperial priesthood; well into the second half of the 19th Century, the “dons” even had to be members of clerical orders who had taken vows of celibacy. Today, when the British Empire operates through control over international finance and through cultural warfare, or the “empire of the mind,” the role of Cambridge and Oxford is as important as ever.

Over the centuries, a rough division of labor has functioned between the two universities: Cambridge, as the center of the British cult of mathematics, has run the deeper intellectual schemes, such as James Clerk Max-
well’s subversion of the physical science breakthroughs of Gauss, Riemann, and Ampère in the mid-19th Century. During the past 60 years, Cambridge has sat at the center of the creation of computers, the cult of cybernetics and systems analysis, postwar “mathematical economics,” and an array of information-age brainwashing typified by Facebook, Twitter, and the Internet in general. Oxford has been more of the hands-on colonial administrator, especially through persons awarded Oxford degrees in Politics, Philosophy, and Economics (PPE). During the 20th Century, the Cambridge-based Lord Bertrand Russell, identified by LaRouche as the most evil man of his age, was a pivotal figure in both types of project.

Oxford became a staging ground for the far-flung imperial plans of Cecil Rhodes (1853-1902), including the Round Table organization whose creation he inspired. Formally headed by Lord Alfred Milner (1854-1925), the Round Table was a British Crown project to carry the Empire’s worldwide lines of influence well into the 20th century, until after World War I.

Alongside Milner, the active leaders of the Round Table club included royal family intimate Lord Esher (Reginald Balliol Brett, 1852-1930), who was the Constable and Governor of Windsor Castle and strategic advisor to Queen Victoria, King Edward VII, and King George V; and William T. Stead, the journalist and intelligence operative who wrote that it was so important to recapture control over Britain’s former North American colonies, after Abraham Lincoln’s victory over the British-backed Confederacy in the Civil War, that it would be worth it to allow the seat of British power to reside—at least in part—in the U.S.A. The point was to cultivate subtle forms of indirect rule, a tradition continued in Oxford’s promotion of “democratic” and “people power” revolutions today.

Stead and Lord Nathan “Natty” Rothschild were Rhodes’ designated heirs in the Round Table. In 1902, Rhodes had established the Rhodes scholarships at Oxford, to educate an elite of scholars and statesmen from the colonies (later the Commonwealth) and, especially, the United States. Lord Rothschild looked after the financial side of the Rhodes scholarships. Not every Rhodes scholar becomes an agent of British influence, as the experience of Bill Clinton demonstrates. But most of those working in PPE fields swallow British foreign policy methods hook, line, and sinker. The outstanding example in our day is now-UN Ambassador Susan Rice, whose 1990 Oxford doctoral dissertation lauding the British Commonwealth Initia-

tive in Zimbabwe received the Chatham House (Royal Institute of International Affairs, RIIA)-British International Studies Association prize as the best international relations thesis written in the U.K. that year.

The Oxford ‘Civil Resistance’ Project

A mentor of Rice at Oxford was Sir Adam Roberts (b. 1940), co-chairman of the Oxford project on Civil Resistance and Power Politics (CR & PP). Famous as a proponent of liberal internationalism, Roberts is bringing out a book titled Liberal International Order in the Spring of 2012. Advocates of liberal internationalism, also called liberal interventionism, or liberal imperialism, trace the doctrine to the continental operations of Lord Palmerston in the 19th Century, as exemplifying interventions by self-identified “liberal” states in the affairs of others on behalf of liberal values.

Roberts’ crony Timothy Garton Ash, in a 2008 commentary denouncing Russia for its clash with Georgia after the latter’s attack on Russian peacekeepers in South Ossetia, dubbed himself and co-thinkers “FLIO,” for “friends of liberal international order.” In a 2007 column in The Guardian, Garton Ash reported on his interview with outgoing British Prime Minister Tony Blair: “Sitting in the Downing Street garden, I ask him what is the essence of Blairism in foreign policy. ‘Liberal interventionism.’”

Roberts’ other major ongoing project is the Oxford University Programme on the Changing Character of War. As we shall see, the leading Oxford specialists in democracy promotion, non-violent action, and civil society view their efforts in military-strategic terms—lawfully enough, for a top British policy-shaper like Roberts. After retiring from teaching at Oxford, where he had been at the Centre for International Studies in the Department of Politics and International Relations, Roberts, in 2009, became President of the British Academy, the government-funded U.K. National Academy for the Humanities and Social Sciences. This top establishment body, which today has 900 active fellows, received its Royal Charter in 1902 for the promotion of British intellectual influence worldwide. Roberts is also a member of the U.K. Defence Academy Advisory Board and the national Council for Science and Technology, and has been appointed Knight Commander of the Order of St. Michael and St. George by the Queen, for “services to the study and practice of international relations.”

His younger colleague Garton Ash, as one of Britain’s most prolific writers on contemporary European
Among the Oxonians groomed as agents of British influence in the U.S.A. is UN Ambassador Susan Rice (Rhodes scholar). Sir Adam Roberts (right) was her mentor at Oxford; Timothy Garton Ash (below) is Roberts’ crony at Oxford.

history, has been named to “most influential intellectuals” lists by *Time* magazine and the British journals *Prospect* and *Foreign Policy*. Most of what he churns out is related to East-Central Europe and Germany. At the height of the British elites’ “Fourth Reich” campaign against German reunification in the Summer of 1990, just months after the genuine, peaceful revolution that had brought down the Berlin Wall, Garton Ash was one of a handful of academic consultants who met with Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher at her Chequers residence to share their “reservations concerning Germany, [which] had not only to do with the Hitler era, but referred to the period before, the whole era after Bismarck.”

In 2006, Roberts and Garton Ash announced themselves as the “principal investigators” for the already mentioned Oxford “interdisciplinary research project on Civil Resistance and Power Politics: Domestic and International Dimensions.” They held the project’s major international conference at St. Antony’s College, Oxford, in March 2007. Its proceedings were published in 2009 as a book titled *Civil Resistance and Power Politics: The Experience of Non-violent Action from Gandhi to the Present*. The paperback edition came out in 2011 from Oxford University Press, “with a new foreword on the Arab Spring.”

In October 2011, according to a promotional release from the Oxford Centre for International Studies, meetings were held at Oxford, the British Academy, the Columbia University Law School, and the Carr Center at Harvard University, “all with a focus on the Arab Spring.” Two years earlier, the U.S. venues for the hardcover book launch also included Stanford University.

The Oxford CR & PP organizers declared that they had evaluated “the nature and significance of civil (i.e., non-violent) resistance, especially, though not exclusively, in the period from the 1960s up to the Arab Spring from December 2010 onwards.” At the time of the 2007 conference, flushed with excitement about the Orange Revolution in Ukraine two years earlier, they had presented case studies including the overthrow of President Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines in 1986, and the sequence of regime changes in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, from Serbia in 2000, through Georgia’s Rose Revolution of 2003, and then Ukraine.

A review of the resulting book, published in the *RIIA’s International Affairs* magazine in 2010, described Roberts’s attitude toward the movements he studies as “sympathetic through critical.” “The book rejects the often repeated charge of western orchestration,” the review noted, “[h]owever, the protesters received substantial funding and technical advice from abroad—for example, on how to use the media and how to organize effective peaceful demonstrations.” In reality, the project’s recommended questions for the case studies reveal an effort to fine-tune the techniques of outside intervention:

3. Has civil resistance demonstrated a particular value as one instrument (alongside other instruments such as external election monitors) for challenging fraudulent election processes and ensuring a free and fair outcome?

4. Can an international legal/normative regime provide a favorable background for civil resistance?

5. To what extent did the non-violent movement succeed in undermining, or threatening to undermine, the adversary’s sources of power and legitimacy (military, economic, psychological, organizational)?

7. What has been the role of external actors of all
kinds (government, quasi-non-governmental organizations, NGOs, diasporas) in assisting or attempting to assist or influence civil resistance? Have international economic sanctions and/or external military interventions proved useful to civil resistance movements?

“9. How has the development of technologies, especially information technology (e.g., email, internet, social media), affected the capacities of civil resistance?

“10. Was there any implicit or explicit threat of a future use of force or violence to carry forward the non-violent movement’s cause if the movement did not achieve a degree of success, or if extreme repression was used against it?

“12. In cases where outside governments or organizations supported the movement, did they understand and respect the reasons for avoiding the use of force or violence? Should rules (possibly in the form of a draft code of conduct) be established regarding the character and extent of such support?

“13. Was civil resistance in one country instigated or assisted by another state as a mere instrument for pursuing its own ends or embarrassing an adversary? If accusations of this kind were made, did they have any credibility?”

At the 2007 conference, Roberts chaired a session on “Civil Resistance and the Roles of External Actors.” One of his panelists was Michael McFaul, who had done Africa studies at Oxford as a Rhodes scholar, but by this time, was a senior fellow at Stanford’s Hoover Institution of War, Revolution and Peace, specializing on Russia.

The Gene Sharp Playbook

The Oxford CR & PP project’s website recommends just a handful of “selected websites on civil resistance,” including the British openDemocracy.net and the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict (ICNC) of Washington, D.C. At the top of this short list is the Albert Einstein Institution (AEI), located in East Boston, Mass. Its founder and senior scholar, Gene Sharp, gave the main paper on yet another panel chaired by Roberts at the 2007 Oxford CR & PP conference: “The Politics of Nonviolent Action and the Spread of Ideas about Civil Resistance.” Sharp (b. 1928) is a product of the same Oxford establishment as McFaul, but a generation earlier.

In the wake of the Ukrainian events of 2004-05, exposes published by EIR and others made Gene Sharp a household word in Russia as the author of the “color revolutions.” Longtime Kremlin deputy chief of staff Vladislav Surkov, just before stepping aside from that post in December 2011, named Sharp in an Izvestia interview about the Moscow demonstrations: “There is absolutely no doubt that some people want to convert the protest into a color revolution,” Surkov wrote. “They are acting literally according to Sharp’s books and the latest revolutionary method guides. So literally, that it’s even tedious.” During a recent raucous debate on the Russian state TV program “The Historical Process,” over whether the Moscow street actions would lead to something like the February 1917 Russian Revolution (the overthrow of Tsar Nicholas II), co-host Sergei Kurginyan displayed huge visual images of Sharp hunched over a desk in his basement home office, and of McFaul.

The playbooks in question are Sharp’s three-volume The Politics of Nonviolent Action (1973), based on his 1968 Oxford doctoral dissertation, and From Dictatorship to Democracy: A Conceptual Framework for Liberation (1993). His writings, especially the latter, have been translated into over 40 languages. Sharp boiled down the techniques of what he calls “PD” (for “political defiance”) to a list 198 tactics, ranging from boycotts to symbolism using “Display of Symbolic Colors,” “Protest disrobings,” “Symbolic lights,” “Paint as protest,” “Rude gestures,” and so forth. His recommendations also include sophisticated political targetting, as a Tahrir Square activist said last year in Egypt: “One of the main points which we used was Sharp’s idea of identifying a regime’s pillars of support. If we could build a relationship with the army, Mubarak’s biggest pillar of support, to get them on our side, then we knew he would quickly be finished.”

Like his friends at Oxford, Sharp employs the nasty sleight-of-hand of lumping together truly heroic struggles, like those of Mahatma Gandhi against British rule in India, or Martin Luther King in the U.S. civil rights movement, with the synthetic movements targetted against specific leaders by the modern-day British Empire, employing Sharp’s formulas, plus backing from Soros and/or the NED. Sharp doesn’t distinguish: In his writings, they are all movements against “various dictatorships.” Instead of powerful metaphors like Gandhi’s homespun garments and spinning wheel (denoting real economic independence of the British, as well as simplicity in daily life), there are arbitrary colors chosen according to advertising criteria, as in “viral marketing.”
Sharp’s AEI, though he protests that it is a modest, two-person operation run out of his basement, received crucial funding, according to its own statements, from the NED, the NED-subsidiary International Republican Institute (IRI), and the Ford Foundation. Soros’s OSI earmarked grants for the translation of Sharp’s manual into various languages. The IRI funded an AEI training session held in Hungary in early 2000 for activists of the Serbian Otpor! (Resistance!) organization, which was to lead the overthrow of President Slobodan Milosevic later that year. NED officials acknowledged massive funding of Otpor!, whose activists later dispersed and took part in spreading Sharp’s methods to activists in Georgia, Ukraine, and elsewhere.

An array of color revolutions used his techniques. Sharp himself, in a 2006 interview with The Progressive, boasted that he was in Tiananmen Square in 1989, meeting with democracy activists “three or four days before the crackdown,” and that he wrote From Dictatorship to Democracy at the request of Burmese exiles after a trip to Myanmar (Burma) in 1992, when he entered the country illegally.

The cookie-cutter color revolution formula of recent years is now being applied to the Russian situation, though it is clearly not the only attack against Putin that British interests have up their sleeve. As the RIIA reviewer of the CR & PP book noted about Georgia and Ukraine, “in both cases the catalyst was the detection of election fraud—with the help of western monitors.”

In Russia the Golos (“Vote” or “Voice”) organization, a self-described “independent election monitor,” a longtime recipient of NED and USAID funding, prepared for many months to step to the fore in charging vote fraud in the Dec. 4, 2011 Russian State Duma elections. Its activists now have their eye on the next Russian election, the Presidential vote on March 4, 2012.

The supposedly “neutral” Golos website has featured writings by people like St. Petersburg Prof. Grigori Golosov of the Helix Center for Democracy and Human Rights, who exults that the role of “social networks in spreading discontent and organizing the demonstrations in Russian cities is a crucial development,” but insists that “any scenario allowing for Putin to remain in power is a pessimistic one…. An optimistic scenario is one in which Putin goes; there is no other way.”

A color has been chosen for the would-be new Russian revolution: Moscow’s mostly well-to-do street demonstrators wore white ribbons.

The War-Mongering Peacenik, Bertrand Russell

When Sharp left his native Ohio for Britain in the 1950s, he didn’t go straight to Oxford. Beginning in 1955, he worked for the British pacifist publication Peace News, which had been notorious in the 1930s, when it was founded, for advocating peace with Nazi Germany at any cost. In the late 1950s, Peace News supported Bertrand Russell’s Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND), and it was under CND auspices that Sharp made the acquaintance of Adam Roberts, a CND activist who would become a Peace News writer in the 1960s, moving on to his high posts at Oxford and the British Academy. Roberts even credits Sharp with
introducing him to the topic of “non-violent action under totalitarian regimes.”

Historians of the work of Sharp and his fellow Oxonians trace their civil-resistance studies to Bertrand Russell’s article “War and Non-Resistance,” published in *The Atlantic Monthly* in April 1915, during World War I. There, Russell painted a fantastical picture of how England could confront an imagined German invasion through “passive resistance”: “Whatever edicts they might issue would be quietly ignored by the population…. If they ordered that English young men should undergo military service, the young men would simply refuse; after shooting a few, the Germans would have to give up the attempt in despair. If they tried to raise revenue by customs duties at the ports, they would have to have German customs officers; this would lead to a strike of all the dock laborers, so that that way of raising revenue would become impossible. If they tried to take over the railways, there would be a strike of the railway servants. Whatever they touched would instantly become paralyzed…."

(The article is also noteworthy for Russell’s take on the turn-of-the-century mass strikes in Russia, which were largely police-agent projects, culminating in the January 1905 Bloody Sunday massacre of protesting workers led by secret police agent Fr. Georgi Gapon in St. Petersburg. Russell wrote approvingly, “Even in Russia, it was the general strike which secured the Constitution of 1905.”)

The same Bertrand Russell is infamous for his 1946 article in *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, advocating that the Soviet Union be forced to accept a one-world government with supranational control of nuclear weapons, under threat of defeat in a war the West would launch before the U.S.S.R. itself could develop nuclear weapons: a nuclear first strike against Russia. It was only after the Soviet nuclear (1949) and thermonuclear (1953) bomb tests that Russell went full-steam onto the “peace” track of his world government campaign, inviting Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchov’s representatives to his World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government conference in 1955.

For many years Gene Sharp’s “civilian nonviolent resistance” advisors were couched in Cold War military terms, supposing conditions in which Soviet forces would have overrun Europe. An attendee at one of his lectures in 1984, when Sharp was working with the Harvard Center for International Affairs (CIA), described the scenario Sharp presented for a quarter of a century in the future: “The year is 2010. Russian tanks swarm into a small country in Western Europe, spearheading an invasion by Warsaw Pact troops. But this invasion is unusual because no shots are fired. Instead, the Communist soldiers are greeted by shuttered windows and deserted streets. The nation being overrun phased out its military years ago and now relies on a carefully planned program of civilian nonviolent resistance to deter its enemies.”

Sharp was not a Rhodes scholar, but he worked at Oxford University off and on for nearly ten years, in 1968 completing the thesis that became *The Politics of Non-violent Action*. In its preface, Sharp thanked Sir Isaiah Berlin, the British liberal philosopher and intelligence figure whose closest associates were leading lights of Russell’s logical positivist school, like A.J. Ayer and Ludwig Wittgenstein. Berlin is today idolized by Timothy Garton Ash, among others. Sharp’s immediate academic advisor was the Montenegro-born John Plamenatz, with whom his “supervised study … emphasized theories and philosophies of the nature of political power, authority and obedience; dictatorial systems; resistance and revolutionary movements” (Sharp’s account). Plamenatz was a fellow of All Souls College, historically the most important of the Oxford colleges for the Round Table.

**Dr. Strangelove**

BBC journalist Ruaridh Arrow last year made a laudatory documentary titled “Gene Sharp: How To Start a Revolution.” In a BBC interview about the project, Arrow characterized Sharp’s 198 measures as follows: “Designed to be the direct equivalent of military weap-
ons, they are techniques collated from a forensic study of defiance to tyranny throughout history.”

The military provenance of Sharp’s *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* is unmistakeable, leaving no doubt that it is an irregular warfare manual. On whose behalf: the brave resistance fighters seeking personal freedom and betterment for their nations; or Bertrand Russell’s crazy followers who gave us the nuclear brinksmanship of the mutually assured destruction doctrine for the past 60 years?

Sharp, in the Preface, cites the financing of his work while he was at the Harvard CIA, between Oxford stints in the 1960s, by “funds from grants for projects of Professor Thomas C. Schelling made to Harvard University from the Ford Foundation and from the Advanced Research Projects Agency [ARPA] of the U.S. Department of Defense, Contract No. F44620-67-C-0011.” This was the same Thomas Schelling who, in 2005, would receive the Nobel Prize in Economics, with Robert Aumann, “for having enhanced our understanding of conflict and cooperation through game-theory analysis.” The Nobel committee outdid itself, hailing Schelling’s “vision of game theory as a unifying framework for the social sciences.”

The vision was set forth in Schelling’s 1958 book *The Strategy of Conflict*, in which he developed the notion of “rational irrationality.” He applied this game theory to scenarios for nuclear war. This was in the period when Russellite “peaceniks” in the Anglo-American strategy establishment were holding events like the 1958 second Pugwash conference, where Leo Szilard delivered his infamous speech, “How To Live with the Bomb and Survive”; Szilard proposed that terms of a limited nuclear exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union, possibly triggered by a conflict in the Middle East, should be negotiated beforehand. Nuclear war games were played at the RAND Corporation, where Schelling worked, and other hotbeds of Cambridge-originated mathematical modelling, such as MIT and Stanford. Schelling provided consultations to film director Stanley Kubrick for the famous nuclear Armegeddon film of this time, “Dr. Strangelove.”

Schelling also served as an idea man for Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara in the Vietnam War. “What is little-known in general,” wrote one critic of Schelling’s Nobel prize, “is the crucial role he played in formulating the strategies of ‘controlled escalation’ and ‘punitive bombing’ that plunged our country into the war in Vietnam.”

Far from being merely a channel of money to Sharp, Schelling wrote the introduction to *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*, speaking of the project less as Sharp’s own personal investigation, than as a joint commitment with Schelling and others: “The original idea was to subject the entire theory of nonviolent political action, together with a full history of its practice in all parts of the world since the time of Christ, to the same cool, detailed scrutiny that military strategy and tactics are supposed to invite. Now that we have Gene Sharp’s book, what we lack is an equally comprehensive, carefully study of the politics of violent action…. It is too bad that we haven’t that other book, the one on violent action. It would be good to compare the two in detail.”

From 1983 to 1989, Sharp was director of the Program on Nonviolent Sanctions of the Harvard CIA. He launched his Albert Einstein Institution in 1983, the same year as the founding of the NED.

**Dumping Bad Axioms**

So, Dr. Strangelove’s grandchild is sitting in the U.S. Embassy in Moscow? It’s something like that, since Bertrand Russell begat both the game-theorizing nuclear brinksmen and the civil-resistance irregular warriors, and they all came together in the Oxford programs from which Gene Sharp and Michael McFaul emerged.

McFaul’s thinking, as revealed in his tedious political-science prose (the writing of a person who avoided memorizing Pushkin), is so horribly compartmentalized that he no doubt would refuse to put the picture together that way. His *Advancing Democracy Abroad* book portrays democracy promotion as a budgetary and policy line-item, competing with economic or strategic relations. McFaul churns out books on his chosen topic at an alarming rate, many of them commissioned through a pipeline of research grants from historically British-oriented operational intelligence fronts like Freedom House, the Smith-Richardson Foundation, the NED, Soros’s OSI, et al., and some evidently being published without even a spellcheck, never mind copy-editing (“expatriate” spelled as “ex-patriot” is an eloquent example).

McFaul has shown an amazing capacity to screen out what doesn’t fit his “democratization” construct. In September-October 1993, some of the people he had earlier cultivated as exemplary democratizers were in the resistance against President Boris Yeltsin’s abolition of the Constitution and the elected Parliament, a
maneuver Yeltsin made in order to override parliamentary opposition to the looting of the country, packaged as economic reform. Some of McFaul’s former contacts were arrested and imprisoned, as events moved toward the artillery shelling of the defiant Parliament on Yeltsin’s orders (hundreds, possibly thousands died). He offered them no help.

McFaul’s behavior during nearly three decades of interaction with Russia brings us back to EIR’s 1999 article about his Oxford classmate Susan Rice: “[T]he question Americans must ask is: When will we finally rid the foreign policy establishment in Washington of this British contamination, and reestablish sovereignty in the tradition of the American Republic?”

Prime Minister Putin, in a heated session with his National People’s Front on Dec. 8, noted that the U.S.A. has invested “hundreds of millions of dollars” to shape the Russian electoral process. “We must develop forms of protecting our sovereignty, protecting ourselves from outside interference,” he said.

Some Russian patriots, who are not happy with their government’s current economic policies of joining the World Trade Organization and playing by the rules of the bankrupt world financial system, but are even less pleased with outside interference in Russia’s affairs, have expressed hope that the current political tension may prompt Putin to make a profound shift: not only to rid his administration of a few individuals who are particularly close to international financial interests, but to jettison the whole set of British monetarist axioms, foisted upon Russia after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Putin’s recent call for a “new industrialization,” as well as his attacks on the prevailing practice of protecting income streams through offshore holding companies, point in that direction.

If Russia and the U.S.A. dump every policy axiom of the bankrupt British monetarist system, then the way will open up to a quality of statecraft that would please John Quincy Adams and Count Rumyantsev, to an economic boom based on the nation-building principles of Hamilton and Russia’s 19th-Century industrializer Count Witte, and to vindication of the words of Marshal Zhukov to General Eisenhower at the close of World War II: “If the United States and Russia will only stand together through thick and thin, success is certain for the United Nations. If we are partners, there are no other countries in the world that would dare to go to war when we forbade it.”