

2012: The Quest for Empire and the Tragedy of the West

Introduction: Unions in Crisis

The West won the world not by the superiority of its ideas or values or religion, but rather by its superiority in applying organized violence. Westerners often forget this fact, non-Westerners never do.

Samuel Huntingdon, 'The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order', p. 51.



A Christian Church destroyed by NATO secularists

There have been many critics of the American political ideologist Samuel Huntingdon (+ 2008), for example, the authoritative French journal 'le Monde Diplomatique'. They considered that his famous 1996 book 'The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order', which appeared as the result of the end of the Cold War, legitimised the aggressive, American-led quest for empire. This aggression has since 1996 occurred against the Muslim world (Iraq, Afghanistan and Iran), and Orthodox civilisation (as in Serbia), the core of which, according to Huntingdon, is Russia. It seems strange that members of the French elite should criticise this ideology, when the French State itself behaved most aggressively in attempting to maintain its colonial empire. In the last century it committed genocide by the million, in Madagascar, Vietnam and Algeria, and, according to some, also arming the perpetrators of the 1994 genocide in Rwanda.

However, there is not a Western European institution or country that has not in the course of its history committed genocide in its quest for empire. This goes from Charlemagne (Saxons, Slavs, Basques etc) to the medieval Papacy (Southern Italy, England, the Crusades, the Teutonic Knights, the Inquisition, the Counter-Reformation, Uniatism), from Portugal to Spain (Latin America, Africa and Asia), from Poland (the Ukraine and Belarus) to France (worldwide), from Great Britain (worldwide) to Holland (Indonesia), from Austro-Hungary (Central and Eastern Europe, culminating in World War I), to Belgium (the Congo), from Italy (Ethiopia, Albania, Greece) to Germany, or rather Prussia, (Europe-wide in two European Wars, notably its genocide of 30 million Slavs in World War II). Only little Western countries like Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland appear to be more or less free of the charge of 'organized violence' to other countries - although Sweden has a very chequered history towards its neighbours and Denmark had its moments.

Thus, anti-Americanism on the part of Western Europe sounds more like hypocrisy and jealousy of American success rather than actual rejection of the core values which lie behind the US Establishment. Those values are, let us be frank, only exports from Western Europe to North America. Even the Deistic ideology behind the Secession of mainly English-settled American States from oppressive, Norman-founded and Hanoverian-run Britain was after all largely inspired by revolutionary forces in France and Britain itself. Moreover, the Western quest for empire and thirst for domination has not only been exported to North America. It also went to Western constructs like the old Soviet Union, set up as a result of Western intervention and the Western-organised coup d'état of February 1917 against the native system; to Japan, defeated by the USA in the 1941-45 war for supremacy over the Pacific and East Asia; and today to China, whose representatives now roam through Africa and Australia searching for minerals.

The Babylonian quest for empire, that is, for control over other countries, has been tragic for the Western world. This is not only because it has made itself hated by its victims or because it has led to suicidal wars of rivalry between Western European Powers, as in 1914 and 1939. In these Western Europe destroyed itself, ensuring the temporary domination of the USA and today its abject bankruptcy, leading it to beg financial support from China. No, there is another fatal aspect. This is that in order to do any of this, the Western world has always had first to enter into Unions, thus destroying itself, the identities of its own component peoples. These Unions have taken the form of Empires, whether 'Holy Roman', Papal, Portuguese, Spanish, Polish, French, British, Dutch, Austro-Hungarian, Belgian, Italian or German (or rather Prussian). Today, twenty years after the collapse of the Western-inspired Soviet Union, the two living Western Unions are the American Union (the USA) and the European Union, the future United States of Europe (USE). Let us look at something of the history of both of them, for, at the beginning of 2012, both are in crisis.

The United States of Europe

The Roman Empire...collected a pantheon of pagan deities and absurd myths with total freedom to worship those of one's choice - but on one condition, that of accepting the Emperor as a god. The Roman Empire thus contained within it the ultimate worldliness, the principle of worshipping a fallen man as a god. Neither medieval nor modern Europe can be understood without this background of 2,000 years ago, because Europe is haunted by this one, primitive

idea of unity, of a centralised, monolithic Empire, which it has tried and tries to implement in almost every generation.

Europe: Whither Goest Thou? (Chapter 60 of Orthodox Christianity and the English Tradition, 1993).



One Ring to Bind them all

Haunted by the pagan Roman Empire, the leaders of Western Europe who quested for empire have always wanted to restore its Union and technology. Like barbarian children imitating a barbarian adult, they forgot that its Union was imposed by brute force and torture. They forgot that its culture was not a culture of the spirit, but only a culture of the mind, of legalism, of engineering, of infrastructure, of know-how, of technology.

The first attempt at restoration was the 'renewal of the Roman Empire' by the semi-barbarian ruler, 'Charlemagne' at the turn of the eighth and ninth centuries. He was ably supported in this task by his centralising ideologists, who constantly harked back to the pagan Roman Empire based in Old Rome and who came mainly from Muslim-occupied Spain. Once Charlemagne had been crowned 'Emperor', his subjects formed the 'First Empire', the 'First Reich'. However, his war-based 'Empire' was ephemeral and soon collapsed into barbarian statelets. His centralising filioque ideology was discredited by the Christian Roman Empire in New Rome, situated on the cusp of Europe and Asia, as soon as they heard of it, but only several decades after Charlemagne's death.

The next attempt at European Union took place in the eleventh century under aristocratic Germanic popes in Old Rome. They first separated from the Church, then based in New Rome, and ruled over Western Europe with brute force, imposing their will with shock-troops in Italy and England, in the Crusades, through the Teutonic Knights and in the Inquisition. Their decadence and cruelty were so great that almost all the northern half of Western Europe rejected their claimed authority and later broke away from them at the Reformation. Atlantic-looking Portugal and Spain then tried to form Unionist Empires, no longer in Europe, but in what in recent years has been called 'The Third World'. The genocide committed by the 'conquistadors' and the exploitation by the merchants of both lands are well-known to history.

Then came the turn for the quest for empire of the Atlantic-facing North. The firm foundations for the Union of a worldwide empire were laid by the puritanical discipline of the regicide Cromwell, who committed genocide in civil wars throughout the British Isles, first in England and then in Ireland. On these foundations was launched the coup d'état called 'The Glorious Revolution' of 1688, which gave power to 'the merchants of the earth' (Rev. 18, 3), so launching modern capitalist mercantilism. The Irish and then the Scots (through the 'clearances' – i.e. ethnic cleansing, also carried out largely by Hanoverian troops) were the first notable victims. If Union and empire could not be imposed by brute force within the British Isles, how could they be imposed overseas? Then came massacres carried out by English settlers against the natives of North America, then in 1776 by Hanoverian and British troops of those very settlers, then mass murder in China (through opium), in the Russian Crimea, in India and in Africa, then among the Boers and, only sixty years ago, in Kenya. Great Britain relaxed only when its Unionist Empire collapsed and became a Commonwealth.

One hundred years after Britain, Napoleon, who took over France after the next regicidal 'Revolution' of 1789, another failed bourgeois coup d'état exploited by an upstart, was the next to be inspired by the idea of Union. He too had himself crowned by the Pope, just like Charlemagne a thousand years before him. However, the Napoleonic project to 'unite' (i.e. control) Europe was shattered in Moscow. After the fall of the Napoleonic Empire, France looked to the Mediterranean and Africa and then to Asia, in order to create an empire under Napoleon III. In this matter, France, like Great Britain, was keenly imitated by other lands in Western Europe. But what could Non-Atlantic and Non-Mediterranean countries like Prussia do to build an empire?

Nearly one hundred years after Napoleon, and basing himself on Napoleon's uniting of German States, in 1871 Bismarck created a 'German Revolution', a 'second Empire', a 'second Reich'. This meant the unification of what came to be called Germany. Trampling underfoot with Cromwell-like militarism and discipline the culturally strong but politically weak German principalities of Central Europe, the second Reich went on to create a German Empire overseas. Not content with this, in 1914 the Reich provoked the Europe-wide Kaiser's War. As we know, within three generations of Bismarck's failed scheme and a generation after 1914, there came into being a 'Third Empire', a 'Third Reich', and the disaster of Hitler's War, another project to unite (i.e. control) Europe, also shattered in Moscow.

Each time that a Western European nation tried to set up an imitation Roman Empire, called by a Roman name, such as 'Britannia', and cloaked in Roman rituals and symbols like Emperor

Napoleon, it set about destroying the sovereignty of other nations. The sovereign nation-state was not to blame for this; it was precisely states which were dissatisfied with their sovereignty and that of others which wanted to become Unionist Empires that were to blame. The whole problem was caused by a lack of respect for sovereignty. By 1945, exhausted, bombed into ruins and bankrupt, Western Europe realised that a European Empire could not be set up by military means, but only by economic means. The architect of this quest for a new European Empire was a man called Jean Monnet and his inspiration was in the Federal USA.

So it was that eventually his project, backed by the Federal USA, gave rise to a Federal Germany, which then extended its Federalism to Europe, to the EU, through the dreaded euro. Foreknowing that the euro, monetary unity, would fail without political unity, the powers in charge therefore knew that once the euro had been accepted, it would impose political unity – which was their aim all along. Therefore, sovereignty, the sovereignty of the nation-state, had to be destroyed. International debt caused by the European Union would therefore be labelled by the Unionist propagandists as ‘sovereign debt’, even though, or rather because, its cause was exactly the opposite of sovereignty. It cannot be long now until the constantly renamed EU (European Coal and Steel Agreement, Common Market, EEC, EC, EU) will come to be called the USE, the United States of Europe. And its inspiration is clearly in the United States of America. But how did American States themselves come to form a Union?

The United States of America

America is a great country, but greed and sensuality will be her downfall.

St John of Shanghai



Bombing them into 'Freedom'

The United States of America was formed as a result of another coup d'état, a 'Revolution', much inspired by the ideas of the French Revolution, which occurred only thirteen years after the American one. Its leaders offered a New Jerusalem, but it was a false New Jerusalem, whose whole founding ideology, exported to North America from Western Europe, can be seen on any one-dollar bill. The USA is Europe's colony as much as the Soviet Union ever was. If Europe's symbol is twelve stars, the Soviet symbol was a red star, America's symbol is a white star. But how did a voluntary Confederation of Free States in North America become a single country, a centralised Republic? How did we go from saying 'the United States are' to 'the United States is'?

There is little doubt that the turning point in the process was Lincoln's War of 1861-1865, known variously as the American Civil War or the Second War of Secession. This consolidated the USA in the nineteenth-century European sense. It was then that the concept of Confederation was transformed into a Union, as some 620,000 Americans died. This was not in a mythical war to abolish feudal slavery. That was ending anyway, despite the support of the North for it, and other countries had abolished it in peace years before. They died in a war launched by capitalist bankers and their hired politicians in the industrialised North to conquer an agricultural and secessionist South. This was the War which the Great Centraliser, Abraham Lincoln, fought to enslave Americans to a Federal Union, ending the dream of individual liberty in favour of an American Empire.

In order to do this, Lincoln the Unionist dictator, placed himself and his government above the law, established a Secret Police, jailed some 13,000 Northern citizens without trial as political prisoners, imprisoned opposition newspaper editors and shut down their newspapers, censored all telegraphic communications, nationalised the railways, used Federal ('Union') troops, many of them criminals recruited from US or European prisons, to meddle in elections, confiscated firearms, massacred between 300 and 1,000 rioting New Yorkers, devastated town after town and wrecked 40% of the American economy, generally subverting constitutional government. His most successful General, Sherman, declared that 'death is mercy' to all secessionists. Union generals did not hesitate to close and burn down hundreds of Southern churches, their priests and ministers imprisoned for refusing to say public prayers for Lincoln. It was a 'holy war', a jihad, for the tyranny of Unionism and empire; the enemy to destroy was the freedom of Confederation.

The early twentieth-century writer Francis Bellamy, an avowed socialist and strong advocate of centralised government, was later to write the US Pledge of Allegiance against all who still thought of secession. 'One nation, indivisible' are the words which Americans are forced into repeating today. Yet, originally, the States were founded as a Free Confederation, from which anyone could secede. The Pledge of Allegiance is Unionist propaganda for the American Empire. But Lincoln's War destroyed all free Confederacy. As General Lee wrote prophetically to the English libertarian, Lord Acton, on 15 December 1866: 'The consolidation of the states into one vast republic, sure to be aggressive abroad and despotic at home, will be the certain precursor of that ruin which has overwhelmed all those that have preceded it'.

This was the end of the hopes of Washington, Jefferson ('that government is best which governs least'), Madison and of most of the New England founding fathers and their Confederal hope. Lincoln did what all centralised government powers did, before, at and after him. His recipe was the same as that of all the later, failed twentieth-century collectivist ideologies. It was the beginning of what Eisenhower was much later to call 'the military-industrial complex', the 'American System' and the largest political patronage system ever created, a system that confiscates nearly half of national income in taxes, more than was taken from medieval serfs.

Little wonder that Marx wrote to Lincoln to congratulate him on his re-election in November 1864. Little wonder that Lincoln has been compared to Bismarck and Lenin, because Lincoln granted himself dictatorial powers in order to usher in a highly centralised state, just as the other two also did. Little wonder that Hitler in *Mein Kampf* not only praised Bismarck, but also expressed, like Lincoln, his hatred for independent, sovereign states acting as a bulwark against a unified, centralised State, which is what he strove for, German-wide and then Europe-wide. The end of the rights of Confederal states meant that Americans had to give up the idea of government by consent. It was replaced by the European mercantile tyranny whereby citizens owe obedience to a centralised State – the very thing that so many European settlers had gone to America to escape.

Sure enough, the quest for an American empire that led to 620,000 dead out of a population of 30 million led the Union of the States to its next massacres, just as General Lee had prophesied. First there was that of the Sioux 'Indians' in 1862. General Pope, whom Lincoln had put in charge of that greatest massacre in American history, stated: 'It is my purpose to utterly exterminate the Sioux... They are to be treated as maniacs or wild beasts'. As soon as Lincoln's War was over, General Grant planned to invade Mexico, then President Grant wanted to take over Santo Domingo, next a campaign of genocide was waged against the Plains 'Indians', victims of government-subsidised railways, under Generals Sherman, Sheridan and Custer. Then came talk of extending 'the American empire' to China.

In the late nineteenth century the Philippines were taken over from Spain, followed by Puerto Rico and Guam. It was only a step to US intervention in the Great European War in 1917 – as soon as US capital had knocked Russia out of it. Then came the 1940s battle for supremacy, both in the Atlantic, leading to NATO, and in the Pacific. So America went from a constitutional republic to a consolidated empire, a centralised, militaristic State, which threatens and meddles in the internal affairs of every nation in the world as 'the world's policeman', under the feeble excuse that it is bringing 'freedom and democracy'. Here are echoes of the Nazi concentration camp slogan 'Arbeit macht frei': 'Work makes free'. Yes, there is freedom, but you will be bombed back into the Stone Age and starved into wage slavery first.

Conclusion: Survival in Crisis

Hypocrisy, double standards, and 'but nots' are the price of universalist pretensions. Democracy is promoted, but not if it brings Islamic fundamentalists to power; non-proliferation is preached for Iran and Iraq, but not for Israel; free trade is the elixir of economic growth, but not for agriculture; human rights are an issue for China, but not with Saudi Arabia; aggression

against oil-owning Kuwaitis is massively repulsed, but not against non-oil-owning Bosnians (sic). Double standards in practice are the unavoidable price of universal standards of principle.

Samuel Huntington, 'The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order', p. 184.



Holy Orthodoxy Restored (2011)

The Western world is distinguished from Orthodox Christendom and her Church by the experience of feudal slavery, which began visibly with its stone castles in the eleventh century, then by the rebirth of paganism known as the 'Renaissance', which led by reaction to the individualistic protest movement known as the Reformation, which was followed by a new rebirth of rationalist paganism known as the Enlightenment, with its capitalist Industrial Revolution. In other words, Orthodox Christendom and her Church are distinguished from the Western world by her Tradition of continuity, going back to the Apostles, Martyrs and Church Fathers, to the Saints. Orthodox Christendom, today much diminished by the persecutions of Crusaders and Mongols, Ottomans and compromises forced on it by the modern Western world, by barbarians from East and West, is still miraculously alive. Its core is Russia, which by itself is three-quarters of the Orthodox Christian Commonwealth, the 'Orthosphere'.

Theologically speaking, Orthodox Christendom and her Church are distinguished from the Western world by our adherence to the original Scriptural, Apostolic and Patristic confession of the Holy Trinity (Jn. 15, 26). This is the Faith that proclaims belief in God the Father, from Whom is generated the Son and from Whom proceeds the Holy Spirit. No others who call themselves Christians confess this Faith. This Faith they have lost, consciously or unconsciously,

through faithlessness. This Orthodox Trinitarian model of unity in diversity and diversity in unity has always been the model for relations within and between the Orthodox Christian peoples of the Orthodox Christian Commonwealth, for as long as we kept our Faith and did not fall into Western-style nationalism (the Balkan Wars) or Western-style Unionism (the Soviet Union). The Orthodox Faith is the Faith of Confederation and Commonwealth, not of Papal Unionism or, by reaction to that, that of Protestant Individualism.

Today, the core of Orthodox Christendom and her Orthodox Church are still not free of the vestiges of old, tyrannical (Soviet) Unionist reflexes (as can be seen in the very name, the Russian 'Federation' and in current protests). Neither is the core free from the extreme reaction to those tyrannical Unionist reflexes, as can be seen from the separatist and splintered former Soviet Republics, which often behave like teenagers with tantrums. Nevertheless, the core of Orthodox Christendom and her Church have been raised from the tomb after the Communist Golgotha and now walk free in the blinding light of the Resurrection. If the people of the Church do come back to the full life in Christ after the Church's Golgotha, throwing off the sleep of the tomb and the grave-clothes of death, it may be that She can bring all of Northern Eurasia as well as other peoples together, not into another cursed Union, but into a Confederation, a Confederacy, a Commonwealth.



The Golden Calf

In this way, the world can be rebalanced. East and West can overcome their polarisation through the restoration of the third pole, that of the Divino-human life of the Church. Indeed, it may be

that the current project to 'unite' (i.e. control) Europe will again be shattered in Moscow. Invaded by the West four times in the last 200 years since 1812, having shattered Napoleon's, Kaiser Wilhelm's, Hitler's and then Lenin's attempts to create tyrannical Unions, Russian Orthodox Christendom and her Church now face tyrannical Unions in Western Europe and America. A Confederation of Orthodox Christendom, spread from Carpatho-Russia in the West to the shores of the Pacific in the East, which together shouts 'Christ is Risen' and which has already survived four attempted Unions and lived to tell the tale, may be the only hope for the future. Either the Apostolic confession of the Holy Trinity without compromise, or else Hell; this is the choice that faces mankind.

Archpriest Andrew Phillips

St Peter, Metropolitan of Moscow and All the Russias
21 December/ 3 January 2012