G. Galice¹ TOWARDS A LARGE FREE CONTINENTAL EUROPE

On America's side, Europe must always keep its eyes open and provide no pretext for retaliation. America is growing every day. It will become a colossal power, and a time must come when, placed in easier communication with Europe by the means of new discoveries, it will wish to have its say in our affairs and to put its hand in them. Political prudence, therefore, imposes on the governments of the old continent the duty of taking scrupulous care that no pretext should arise for such an intervention. The day America sets foot in Europe, peace and security will be banished for a long time.²

Ch. Talleyrand

My view is that of a critical Western European peace researcher, more precisely a Swiss peace researcher who is a French citizen. I negotiate with my four qualities.

The peace researcher (1) postulates the absolute, legal, and moral primacy of negotiation over the use of force. The critical thinker (2) strives to go beyond appearances, to look for the background of any foreground, which is complicated in international politics, where cultural, national prejudices abound. Switzerland (3) was a good observation post thanks to its neutrality. Unfortunately, its leaders suddenly abandoned the elementary appearances of neutrality to join the American warmongering positions adopted by the "vassals" (the term comes from Zbigniew Brzezinski) of the European Union. The French citizen (4) observe the choices of his ruling leaders and opinion makers in the country and abroad.

On this four-pillar basis, I would like to exchange information, opinions, concerns, and some hopes with you. I advocate a friendly continental independent Europe associated with Russia.

A Chain of Events Leading to War

As is well known, the breach in the Berlin Wall on November 9th, 1989, was the entry into the 21st century. The implosion of the USSR and the dislocation of the European communist bloc, ending the Cold War, opened a path to peace. Unfortunately, Western hawks or owls³ preferred supremacy to balance and peace. The subtitle of Brzezinski's book "The Grand Chessboard" dealing with Eurasia is blindingly clear: "American Primacy and its Geostrate-

gic Imperatives".4 The roadmap was followed to the letter. The EU and NATO have jointly expanded eastwards. When the crisis in Ukraine became severe in 2014, Brzezinski⁵ changed his mind, he considered then that Ukraine joining NATO was a bad idea. Before that, the war against Iraq 1991, against the FRY 1999 (after sabotage of the Rambouillet negotiations⁶, Kissinger considered the conditions imposed to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia as a provocation⁷, the first NATO war), the same year as the first NATO extension, the joint declaration on UN/NATO secretariat cooperation 23 September 2008⁸, the war to Libya 2011 turning from a R2P (responsibility to protect, Russia and China did not veto, for the last time) into a regime change with assassination of several leaders, including Ghaddafi, and about 30 thousand killed, were the main steps toward a harsh confrontation. President Putin reacted in words at the Munich Security Conference 2007, by action in Syria 2014.

On December 15th, 2021, the Russian authorities made a last diplomatic attempt towards the USA and NATO when they met the US-ambassador.⁹ Some western experienced observers consider it was a US-error not to have started negotiations, among them the German Klaus von Dohnanyi who served in the ministry of economy as state secretary, and later as Federal Minister of Education and Science.¹⁰

¹ President of the Geneva International Peace Research Institute (GIPRI). Author of a number of academic publications, including books "Peoples – Nations: Essay on the National Environment of the Peoples of Europe", "Reflections on the Republic, War, and Peace in Jean-Jacques Rousseau Footsteps" (co-authored), etc.; articles "Berlin – Geneva", "Our Barbarian Times", "Has the Idea of 'National Interests' Become Outdated in the Environment of the New World Order?", etc.

² "Du côté de l'Amérique, l'Europe doit toujours avoir les yeux ouverts et ne fournir aucun prétexte de représailles. L'Amérique s'accrôît chaque jour. Elle deviendra un pouvoir colossal et un moment doit arriver où, placée visà-vis de l'Europe en communication plus facile par les moyens de découvertes nouvelles, elle désirera dire son mot dans nos affaires et y mettre la main. La prudence politique impose donc aux gouvernements de l'ancien continent le soin de veiller scrupuleusement à ce qu'aucun prétexte ne s'offre pour une telle intervention. Le jour où l'Amérique posera son pied en Europe, la paix et la sécurité en seront bannies pour longtemps" (See: *Talleyrand Ch.* Mémoires, lettres inédites et papiers secrets. P. : Albert Savine, 1891).

³ Benjamin Barber poses the difference between subtle owls and brutal hawks, both raptors. Bush was typically hawk, Obama rather owl.

⁴ My essay on Brzezinski and Kissinger. URL: https://www.herodote.net/ Ombres_et_lumieres_sur_deux_penseurs_et_strateges-synthese-3178-216. php (accessed: 12.04.2023).

⁵ Zbigniew Brzezinski died in 2017.

⁶ See: Interim Agreement for Peace on Self-government in Kosovo. URL: https://www.monde-diplomatique.fr/IMG/pdf/rambouillet-kosovo-1999.pdf (accessed: 12.04.2023).

⁷ "The Rambouillet text, which called on Serbia to admit NATO troops throughout Yugoslavia, was a provocation, an excuse to start bombing. Rambouillet is not a document that an angelic Serb could have accepted. It was a terrible diplomatic document that should never have been presented in that form" (The Daily Telegraph, 28 June 1999. The historian Christopher Clark supports this view, asserting that the terms of the 1914 Austro-Hungarian ultimatum to Serbia appear lenient compared to the NATO demands).

⁸ See: Joint Declaration on UN/NATO Secretariat Cooperation. URL: https:// www.ipinst.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/pdfs_un_nato_jointdeclaration_lisbon2010.pdf (accessed: 12.04.2023).

⁹ See: Press release on Russian draft documents on legal security guarantees from the United States and NATO. URL: https://www.mid.ru/ru/foreign_ policy/news/1790809/ ; Agreement on measures to ensure the security of The Russian Federation and member States of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. URL: https://mid.ru/ru/foreign_policy/rso/nato/1790803/ ; Treaty between The United States of America and the Russian Federation on security guarantees. URL: https://mid.ru/ru/foreign_policy/rso/ nato/1790818/ (accessed: 12.04.2023).

¹⁰ See: Klaus von Dohnanyi über Putin und Biden. URL: https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=1667510723591043 (accessed: 12.04.2023).

A Confused and Torn Europe with Brainwashed Citizens Turned into Pavlov's Dogs

The demolition of the Berlin Wall also meant a leadership change in Europe. By the weight of its population, the strength of its economy, its central place with privileged relations to *Mitteleuropa*, Germany became the major power, instead of France. The USA therefore played the German card rather than the British one, much to the disappointment of Mrs. Thatcher.¹ While the Warsaw Pact was dismantled on July 1st, 1991, the new European Union mentioned the NATO within the Maastricht Treaty 1992, without considering the consequences, just to please the US conductor. Only a minority of European citizens realised that this project was not European but Euro-American. Even the peaceful Czechoslovakia was dismantled, the Czech Republic as the former Kingdom of Bohemia.

Soon in 1991 a first break occurred when the French president Mitterrand failed to launch in Prague a European Confederation near to Russia.² The unconditional allies of the USA suggested to include the USA, Canada and even Japan. The Atlantic Europe won a first round against the continental Europe.

A second rupture appeared in 2003 with the second Gulf War, between the France-Germany-Russia axis resisting American leadership on the one hand and the 'New Europe' (Donald Rumsfeld) shaped by the Eastern European states nurtured by old conflicts with Russia on the other. It is worth noting that the 2003 Azores summit, which paved the way for the war with Bush, Blair, Barroso, and Aznar, was hosted by Portuguese Prime Minister Manuel Barroso, who was to become President of the European Commission, against the French and German candidate, Guy Verhofstadt. As the best advocate of the US cause, the UK opposed Verhofstadt, France and Germany resigned themselves and Barroso promoted the Euro-American vision for ten years long before he joined Goldman Sachs bank. Apparently, the new West European elites ignore the past, the interest of their people, the fundamental principles of international law and global challenges. President Sarkozy acted as a frankly pro-American activist when he led France's reintegration into NATO: "France also knows who its allies and friends are: our friends and allies are first of all the Western family3. The conditions for independence are first to know where one's family is."4 At the time, François Hollande, leader of the opposition, gave a Gaullist speech in the National Assembly criticising NATO membership. After his election, President Hollande endorsed and even reinforced with tax breaks Sarkozy's decision. Serious leaders like Churchill and de Gaulle know that "We have no lasting friends, no lasting enemies, only lasting interests," they would never have confused their allies and family.

As a matter of fact, the war in Ukraine is a test field for the western new concepts "war amongst the people"5, "political warfare"6 (hunting Russian artists or athletes, banning holders of bank accounts bearing a Russian consonant surname) and "cognitive warfare"7. The Chinese strategists Qiao Liang and Wang Xiangsui called this "Unrestricted Warfare"8. In doing so, the European Union and its member States flout the "values" they proclaim loud and clear, first and foremost the freedom of expression. The ban on Russian media violates Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers." In addition to that, the western media select the NATO oriented opinions of analysts, as many of us experience constantly who are no longer invited in the radio or TV shows. The social medias are also censored.

Necessity of Shared Laws, Rules, and Principles

Most of the no longer well-educated, misinformed west-European citizens do not know and do not care. Due to the "Cognitive Warfare" they never heard from Brzezinski before and still do not know anything about George Friedman, who clearly explains the main strategic purpose of the USA for centuries, which is to avoid any emerging competitor in Europe and thereby any alliance between Germany and Russia.⁹ *Divide and conquer (divide et impera)* is a major political statement. Friedman and Brezinzski draw on Halford Mackinder: should Germany and Russia ally, "the empire of the world would be in sight."¹⁰ The US-

⁷ "In cognitive warfare, the human mind becomes the battlefield. The aim is to change not only what people think, but how they think and act." See: Countering cognitive warfare: awareness and resilience. URL: https://www.nato.int/docu/review/articles/2021/05/20/countering-cognitive-warfare-awareness-and-resilience/index.html (accessed: 12.04.2023).

⁸ Strangely explained by the US publisher as "China's Master Plan to Destroy America" while the two former colonels base their analysis on the first Iraq war or the Asian financial crisis of 1997.

⁹ Chicago Council on Global Affairs, February 4th, 2015: "The primary interest of the United States for which we have fought wars for centuries, the first world war, the second, the cold war, has been *the relationship between Germany and Russia, because united, they represent the only force that could threaten us.* Ten days ago, General Hodges, commander of U. S. forces in Europe, visited Ukraine to announce that U. S. trainers would now come officially, not unofficially. He gave medals to Ukrainian fighters, which is against army regulations that do not allow decorating foreigners, but he did it, showing that it was his army. Then he went off to tell the Baltic countries that the Americans were going to pre-position armor, artillery and other equipment in the Baltic countries, Poland, Romania, and Bulgaria." See: G. Friedman "…c'est cynique, immoral, mais ça marche." Extraits du discours. URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=emCEfEYom4A ; https://newcoldwar.org/stratfor-chiefs-most-blatant-coup-in-history-interview-from-dec-2014 (accessed: 12.04.2023).

¹⁰ See: Halford Mackinder: The Pivot and the Heartland by Brian Blouet. URL: https://mackinderforum.org/halford-mackinder-the-pivot-and-the-heartland/ (accessed: 12.04.2023).

¹ Thatcher M. The Downing Street Years. N. Y. : HarperCollins, 2012.

² See: *Musitelli J.* François Mitterrand, Architect of the Great Europe: The European Confederation Project (1990–1991). URL: https://www.cairn-int. info/article-E_RIS_082_0018--francois-mitterrand-architect-of-the.htm (accessed: 12.04.2023) ; *Dumas R.* Un projet mort-né : la Confédération européenne // Politique étrangère. 2001. № 3.

³ The word "family" sounds here inappropriate. Nevertheless, the private background Sarkozy's family makes sense, as Eric Branca explains in his book *L'ami américain*. Frank George Wisner is the central person. He married Nicolas Sarkozy's mother-in-law, Christine de Ganay, the first wife of his father, Pal Sarkozy. F. G. Wisner is the son of Frank Gardiner Wisner (1909–1965), one of the founding officers of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and played a major role in CIA operations throughout the 1950s. Frank George was officially a diplomat in strategic embassies or in major missions, he worked for or with the CIA, some assert. Later a businessman. Every summer, the young Nicolas was on holiday with the Wisner Family, with his half-brother and half-sister.

⁴ See: Codiriger plutôt que subir. URL: https://www.lemonde.fr/idees/article/2009/03/12/codiriger-plutot-que-subir_1167067_3232.html (accessed: 12.04.2023).

⁵ See: Interview with General Sir Rupert Smith. URL: https://www.icrc.org/ en/doc/assets/files/other/irrc_864_interview_rupert_smith.pdf (accessed: 12.04.2023).

⁶ "The term political warfare described the synchronized use of any aspect of national power short of overt conventional warfare – such as intelligence assets, alliance building, financial tools, diplomatic relations, technology, and information dominance – to achieve state objectives." (See: https:// crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IF/IF11127).

manufactured coup in Ukraine in 2014 was a masterpiece on the Eurasian chessboard. The word "Ukraine" means precisely "march" (Welsh marches), border. It could have remained a friendly bridge between East and West, instead of a bloody divide. In line with the American agenda, Barroso forced the Ukrainian government to choose the West against the East.¹

The researchers and academics are obliged to self-censorship, especially the younger ones. The west mistrusts its own values and principles. Former ambassador Jean de Gliniasty writes: "To put it bluntly, the word 'values' often hides the ideological industrial, financial, commercial, and military expansionism of interests that are not always our own, and above all the dissolution of our own national criteria of appreciation. It is, at best, part of 'soft power' and, at worst, an accompaniment to 'hard power'."² The slogans replace the arguments, the manufactured emotions³ substitute for reason. De Gliniasty goes on: "We need to think before we make anathemas <...> The values invoked risk making us forget that the first mission of diplomacy is to ensure the security of the country it serves. <...> Having actively participated in the destruction of secular regimes that 'held' their populations, we realise, amidst the din of the attacks, that the promotion of our values did not protect us: for if we resisted for a while in Iraq, we were, on the contrary, the driving force behind military interventions, to the point of frightening some of our Western partners, who had reflected and changed. <...> It is true that we were still the inventors and 'custodians' of the right of humanitarian intervention, which became the 'responsibility to protect,' the last fires of which were extinguished with the regime of the Jamahiriya and the ignominious death of Muammar Gaddafi under the blows of an international coalition dedicated, at the outset, to the protection of the rebellious inhabitants of Benghazi who had been promised a bloodbath by their leader. After these apparent military successes and their consequences (increased destabilisation of the Sahel, influx of migrants, terrorism...), the responsibility to protect is no longer as obvious as it was before the Libyan crisis. <...> The balance sheet of the values policy in the Middle East is heavy. In less than fifteen years, five secular regimes have been wiped off the map in the name of Western values <...> The result of our policy in the Middle East has been, in the end, the weakening of secularism, which we recently made one of the pillars of France's values. We will undoubtedly be the first to suffer from this."

US leaders strangely defend themselves from the charge of unilateralism by referring to the "backbone" of multilateralism. Just before attacking Iraq 2003, the US mission to the UN in Geneva (for which Edward Snowden worked) released a document from Assistant Secretary of State for

Arms Control Stephen G. Rademaker promoting "effective multilateralism": "On behalf of my government, however, I reject any suggestion that the United States is not committed to multilateral means of achieving policy goals. To the contrary, properly understood, our policies are profoundly multilateralist. If current U.S. policy differs at all from U. S. policy in the past, it is a result of our recognition that, in the post-Cold War era, multilateralism is more important than ever, and that without leadership - without backbone – multilateralism is predictably condemned to failure. In a number of recent instances where we thought it necessary, we have chosen to provide the leadership - the backbone - required for multilateralism to succeed. Our insistence that multilateralism be effective may not always make us popular, but it hardly makes us unilateralist."⁴ This is the same idea that Brzezinski's dilemma "global domination of global leadership".

The US leaders and their EU followers must change their frame of reference in terms of "Leadership", "Primacy", "Backboned Multilateralism", "Rogue States", "Rulesbased (International) Order", Liberal International Order, Free Market capitalism⁵ (selective) Values, (selective) Human Rights, Right of Intervention, Human Security through USA led NATO⁶, double standard around practices.

The time has come to build a united world, based on compatible or common principles, to be achieved through negotiation and respect, not through force or threat.

In pushing the EU and even other neutral countries like Switzerland to take unilateral coercive measures⁷ called "sanctions" against Russia, then receiving "countersanctions", the USA reached their goal, namely, to weaken the European economy and currency, to separate Europe from Russia. They will strengthen NATO with the new members Finland and Sweden. The Russian counterattack is to strengthen the partnership between Russia and China, bringing together the BRICS and the SCO.

As a genuine patriot and European, the visionary Charles de Gaulle promoted another Europe: "We shall thus create between Europeans, from the Atlantic to the Urals, relations, links, an atmosphere, which will first of all remove their virulence from the German problems, including that of Berlin, then lead the Federal Republic and your Eastern Republic to draw closer together and to combine, and finally will keep the Germanic grouping framed in a Europe of peace and progress where it will be able to make a new career."⁸

¹ Dusan Sidjanski strongly disagrees with Barroso on Russia and Ukraine (https://www.rts.ch/play/tv/pardonnez-moi/video/jose-manuel-barroso--du-san-sidjanski?urn=urn:rts:video:6270785).

² Pour dire les choses franchement, le mot "valeurs" cache souvent l'expansionnisme idéologique industriel, financier, commercial et militaire d'intérêts qui ne sont pas toujours les nôtres, et surtout la dissolution de nos propres critères d'appréciation nationaux. Il fait partie, dans le meilleur des cas, de la "puissance douce" et, dans le pire, de l'accompagnement de la "puissance dure" (*Gliniasty J. de.* La diplomatie au péril des "valeurs". L'inventaire, 2017. P. 59).

³ Redeker R. Télévision : le commerce narcotique des émotions de synthèse. URL: https://frontpopulaire.fr/articles/television-le-commerce-narcotiquedes-emotions-de-synthese_ma20064 (accessed: 12.04.2023).

⁴ See: *Rademaker S. G.* The Commitment of the United States to Effective Multilateralism. URL: https://2001-2009.state.gov/t/isn/rls/rm/17744.htm (accessed: 12.04.2023).

⁵ Kissinger H. Perils of Globalism. URL: https://www.washingtonpost.com/ archive/opinions/1998/10/05/perils-of-globalism/0625afe6-c467-4c9abe07-76bea075649a/ (accessed: 12.04.2023).

⁶ Chinkin C., Kaldor M. International Law and New Wars. Cambridge Uni. Press, 2017.

⁷ Zayas A. de. Unilateral coercive measures are illegal and counter-productive. URL: https://www.ohchr.org/en/2014/05/intervention-alfred-de-zayasunilateral-sanctions and https://www.schweizer-standpunkt.ch/news-detailansicht-en-recht/unilateral-coercive-measures-are-illegal-and-counterproductive.html (accessed: 12.04.2023).

⁸ Nous créerons ainsi entre Européens, depuis l'Atlantique jusqu'à l'Oural, des rapports, des liens, une atmosphère, qui d'abord ôteront leur virulence aux problèmes allemands, y compris celui de Berlin, ensuite conduiront la République fédérale et votre République de l'Est à se rapprocher et à se conjuguer, enfin tiendront l'ensemble germanique encadré dans une Europe de paix et de progrès où il pourra faire une carrière nouvelle (see: *De Gaulle Ch.* Mémoires d'espoir I. Editions rencontre. Plon, 1970. P. 243–244).



Source: Hérodote. 2005. № 3 (118).1

Do the European peace activists, academics, researchers, citizens have a part to play in this game?

Anyway, they must. A bottom-up process must intersect with the top-down movement of officials and diplomats. The Franco-German reconciliation could serve as a model. There is a lack of Charles de Gaulle and Adenauer. Let us hope they come.

We, the citizens, and academics, continue to work, to understand, to explain. That is why I am grateful to our colleagues in St.-Petersburg for organizing the 21st International Likhachov Scientific Conference "Dialogues and Conflicts of Cultures in the Changing World".

We, the citizens, researchers and academics, must protect our nations, unite against any empire, build a real democratic Europe. We need to build it on a stable basis.

Charles de Gaulle's² grandson, Pierre de Gaulle³, actively advocates friendly relations with Russia.

¹ *Lacoste Y.* Dans l'avenir, une très grande Europe de l'Atlantique au Pacifique? URL: https://www.cairn.info/revue-herodote-2005-3-page-202.htm (accessed: 12.04.2023).

² D'Encausse H. C. Le Général de Gaulle et la Russie. Fayard, 2017.

³ Entretien avec Pierre De Gaulle. Peut-on séparer la France de la Russie? URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uGrHroCCFB0 (accessed: 12.04.2023).