

05.05.2016 -- www.paulcraigroberts.org/2016/05/05/somnolent-europe-russia-and-china-paul-craig-roberts

06.05.2016 -- www.globalresearch.ca/somnolent-europe-russia-and-china-accept-us-hegemony-or-go-to-war/5523732

Somnolent Europe, Russia, and China: Accept US Hegemony or Go to War?

The documents show that the European Union was a creature of the CIA.

By [Dr. Paul Craig Roberts](#)

Can the world wake up?

On September 19, 2000, going on 16 years ago, Ambrose Evans-Pritchard of the London Telegraph reported:

Declassified American government documents show that the US intelligence community ran a campaign in the Fifties and Sixties to build momentum for a united Europe. It funded and directed the European federalist movement.

*The documents confirm suspicions voiced at the time that America was working aggressively behind the scenes to push Britain into a European state. One memorandum, dated July 26, 1950, gives instructions for a campaign to promote a fully fledged European parliament. It is signed by Gen. William J. Donovan, head of the American wartime Office of Strategic Services, precursor of the CIA. **

The documents show that the European Union was a creature of the CIA.

*** Euro-federalists financed by US spy chiefs**, By Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, 19.09.2000 -- <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/1356047/Euro-federalists-financed-by-US-spy-chiefs.html> -- see appendix below

As I have previously written, Washington believes that it is easier to control one government, the EU, than to control many separate European governments. As Washington has a long term investment in orchestrating the European Union, Washington is totally opposed to any country exiting the arrangement. That is why President Obama recently went to London to tell his lapdog, the British Prime Minister, that there could be no British exit.

Like other European nations, the British people were never allowed to vote on whether they were in favor of their country ceasing to exist and them becoming Europeans. British history would become the history of a bygone people like the Romans and Babylonians.

The oppressive nature of unaccountable EU laws and regulations and the EU requirement to accept massive numbers of third world immigrants have created a popular demand for a British vote on whether to remain a sovereign country or to

dissolve and submit to Brussels and its dictatorial edicts. The vote is scheduled for June 23.

Washington's position is that the British people must not be permitted to decide against the EU, because such a decision is not in Washington's interest.

The prime minister's job is to scare the British people with alleged dire consequences of "going it alone." The claim is that "little England" cannot stand alone. The British people are being told that isolation will spell their end, and their country will become a backwater bypassed by progress. Everything great will happen elsewhere, and they will be left out.

If the fear campaign does not succeed and the British vote to exit the EU, the open question is whether Washington will permit the British government to accept the democratic outcome.

Alternatively, the British government will deceive the British people, as it routinely does, and declare that Britain has negotiated concessions from Brussels that dispose of the problems that concern the British people.

Washington's position shows that Washington is a firm believer that only Washington's interests are important. If other peoples wish to retain national sovereignty, they are simply being selfish.

Moreover, they are out of compliance with Washington, which means they can be declared a "threat to American national security." The British people are not to be permitted to make decisions that do not comply with Washington's interest. My prediction is that the British people will either be deceived or overridden.

It is Washington's self-centeredness, the self-absorption, the extraordinary hubris and arrogance, that explains the orchestrated "Russian threat." Russia has not presented herself to the West as a military threat. Yet, [Washington is confronting Russia with a US/NATO naval buildup in the Black Sea a naval, troop and tank buildup in the Baltics and Poland](#), missile bases on Russia's borders, and plans to incorporate the former Russian provinces of Georgia and Ukraine in US defense pacts against Russia.

When Washington, its generals and European vassals declare Russia to be a threat, they mean that Russia has an independent foreign policy and acts in her own interest rather than in Washington's interest. Russia is a threat, because Russia demonstrated the capability of blocking Washington's intended invasion of Syria and bombing of Iran. Russia blunted one purpose of Washington's coup in the Ukraine by peacefully and democratically reuniting with Crimea, the site of Russia's Black Sea naval base and a Russian province for several centuries.

Perhaps you have wondered how it was possible for small countries such as Iraq, Libya, Syria, Yeman, and Venezuela to be threats to the US superpower. On its face Washington's claim is absurd. Do US presidents, Pentagon officials, national security advisors, and chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff really regard countries of so little capability as military threats to the United States and NATO countries?

No, they do not. The countries were declared threats, because they have, or had prior to their destruction, independent foreign and economic policies. Their policy

independence means that they do not or did not accept US hegemony. They were attacked in order to bring them under US hegemony.

In Washington's view, any country with an independent policy is outside Washington's umbrella and, therefore, is a threat.

Venezuela became, in the words of US President Obama, an "unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States," necessitating a "national emergency" to contain the "Venezuelan threat" when the Venezuelan government put the interests of the Venezuelan people above those of American corporations.

Russia became a threat when the Russian government demonstrated the ability to block Washington's intended military attacks on Syria and Iran and when Washington's coup in the Ukraine failed to deliver to Washington the Russian Black Sea naval base.

Clearly Venezuela cannot possibly pose a military threat to the US, so Venezuela cannot possibly pose an "unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security of the US." Venezuela is a "threat" because the Venezuelan government does not comply with Washington's orders.

It is absolutely certain that Russia has made no threats whatsoever against the Baltics, Poland, Romania, Europe, or the United States. It is absolutely certain that Russia has not invaded the Ukraine. How do we know? If Russia had invaded Ukraine, the Ukraine would no longer be there. It would again be a Russian province where until 20 years ago Ukraine resided for centuries, for longer than the US has existed. Indeed, the Ukraine belongs in Russia more than Hawaii and the deracinated southern states belong in the US.

Yet, these fantastic lies from the highest ranks of the US government, from NATO, from Washington's British lackeys, from the bought-and-paid-for Western media, and from the bought-and-paid-for EU are repeated endlessly as if they are God's revealed truth.

Syria still exists because it is under Russian protection. That is the only reason Syria still exists, and it is also another reason that Washington wants Russia out of the way.

Do Russia and China realize their extreme danger? I don't think even Iran realizes its ongoing danger despite its close call.

If Russia and China realize their danger, would the Russian government permit one-fifth of its media to be foreign owned? Does Russia understand that "foreign owned" means CIA owned?

If not, why not? If so, why does the Russian government permit its own destabilization at the hands of Washington's intelligence service?

China is even more careless. [There are 7,000 US-funded NGOs \(non-governmental organizations\) operating in China.](#)

Only last month did the Chinese government finally move, very belatedly, to put

some restrictions on these foreign agents who are working to destabilize China. The members of these treasonous organizations have not been arrested. They have merely been put under police watch, an almost useless restriction as Washington can provide endless money with which to bribe the Chinese police.

Why do Russia and China think that their police are less susceptible to bribes than Mexico's or American police? Despite the multi-decade "war on drugs," the drug flow from Mexico to the US is unimpeded. Indeed, the police forces of both countries have a huge interest in the "war on drugs" as the war brings them riches in the form of bribes. Indeed, as the crucified reporter for the San Jose Mercury newspaper proved many years ago, the CIA itself is in the drug-running business.

In the United States truth-tellers are persecuted and imprisoned, or they are dismissed as "conspiracy theorists," "anti-semites," and "domestic extremists." The entire Western World consists of a dystopia far worse than the one described by George Orwell in his famous book, *1984*.

That Russia and China permit Washington to operate in their media, in their universities, in their financial system, and in "do-good" NGOs that infiltrate every aspect of their societies demonstrates that both governments have no interest in their survival as independent states. They are too scared of being called "authoritarian" by the Western prostitute media to protect their own independence.

My prediction is that Russia and China will soon be confronted with an unwelcome decision: accept American hegemony or go to war.

A P P E N D I X

Euro-federalists financed by US spy chiefs,

By Ambrose Evans-Pritchard,
The Telegraph,
Sep 19, 2000

DECLASSIFIED American government documents show that the US intelligence community ran a campaign in the Fifties and Sixties to build momentum for a united Europe. It funded and directed the European federalist movement.

The documents confirm suspicions voiced at the time that America was working aggressively behind the scenes to push Britain into a European state. One memorandum, dated July 26, 1950, gives instructions for a campaign to promote a fully fledged European parliament. It is signed by Gen William J Donovan, head of the American wartime Office of Strategic Services, precursor of the CIA.

The documents were found by Joshua Paul, a researcher at Georgetown University in Washington. They include files released by the US National Archives.

Washington's main tool for shaping the European agenda was the American Committee for a United Europe, created in 1948. The chairman was Donovan, ostensibly a private lawyer by then.

The **vice-chairman was Allen Dulles, the CIA director in the Fifties.** The board included **Walter Bedell Smith, the CIA's first director,** and a roster of ex-OSS

figures and officials who moved in and out of the CIA. The documents show that **ACUE financed the European Movement**, the most important federalist organisation in the post-war years. In 1958, for example, it provided 53.5 per cent of the movement's funds.

The European Youth Campaign, an arm of the European Movement, was wholly funded and controlled by Washington. The Belgian director, Baron Boel, received monthly payments into a special account. When the head of the European Movement, Polish-born Joseph Retinger, bridled at this degree of American control and tried to raise money in Europe, he was quickly reprimanded.

The leaders of the European Movement - Retinger, the visionary Robert Schuman and the former Belgian prime minister Paul-Henri Spaak - were all treated as hired hands by their American sponsors. The US role was handled as a covert operation. **ACUE's funding came from the Ford and Rockefeller foundations as well as business groups with close ties to the US government.**

The head of the Ford Foundation, ex-OSS officer Paul Hoffman, doubled as head of ACUE in the late Fifties. The State Department also played a role. **A memo from the European section, dated June 11, 1965, advises the vice-president of the European Economic Community, Robert Marjolin, to pursue monetary union by stealth.**

It recommends suppressing debate until the point at which "adoption of such proposals would become virtually inescapable". – *emphasis, Martin Zeis --*