

Ottoman Empire diplomacy is now Moscow's method

by Phocion

An incredible cascade of Russian military and diplomatic deployments, from the Strait of Gibraltar to Malacca and Singapore—and points beyond—is currently accompanying the tremendous landslide of power transfer in the vast regions neighboring the Russian Empire, regions which once comprised the *cordon sanitaire* which was there to guard Soviet Russia's isolation.

"Cordon sanitaire" and "isolation" are now long gone. And "Soviet Russia" is changing its posture into the grand style of Imperial Russia.

Over the past 12 months, a dense maze of bilateral treaties, agreements, and understandings has transformed Russia's relations with the nations of North Africa, the Near East, Middle East, and beyond. A similar transformation is about to begin in Russia's relations with Western Europe, a transformation to be inaugurated with Politburo member Gorbachev's impending 10-day visit to London beginning Dec. 11, 1984.

The Ottomanization of the Maghreb

Exactly one year before Gorbachev's impending arrival in London, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz visited Rabat, Morocco, in a gesture which launched the Ottomanization, i.e., the return to satrapal administration, of the entire Maghreb region. During that visit to Rabat, George Shultz publicly warned King Hassan that the United States cannot compromise its good relations with Israel merely to curry favor with Arab governments. It was Shultz's way of saying that the Arabs should go seek friends in places other than Washington. Enraged Moroccan officials at the time harshly pointed to the fact that on that same day, Dec. 11, 1983, in

nearby Algeria, Russia's most famous soldier, Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov, was paying an official four-day visit.

Exactly one year after Shultz's treacherous Rabat trip, the entire Mediterranean Sea is beginning to take on the look of a Russian lake, spanned in multiple ways with a maze of bilateral treaties and agreements: Soviet-Syrian treaties of military cooperation making Syria a virtual member of the Warsaw Pact; Soviet-Libyan military, naval, and commercial treaties; Soviet-Greek naval and commercial treaties; Soviet-Algerian naval, commercial, and arms treaties; Soviet-Tunisian naval and commercial agreements; massive expansion of Soviet political control and influence over Cyprus; major Soviet-Jordanian arms agreements; Soviet-Maltese economic, military, and naval agreements.

These bilateral Soviet agreements with third parties are complemented by a second tier of other bilateral agreements among Russia's newly acquired partners, usually involving servicing Russian interests. Most of these are still "secret." For example: a secret Greek-Syrian military agreement which calls for joint Greek-Syrian military actions against Turkey, in conjunction with special facilities to the Russian Navy made available by both Greece and Syria; a similar special naval/military secret understanding between Greece and Libya involving special advantages to the Russian Navy; a third Libyan-Maltese pact of joint defense in conjunction with Russian naval rights; a three-way Syrian-Algerian-Maltese pact; and, of course, the act of political unity between Libya and Morocco—the fruit of George Shultz's treachery.

These Russian deployments in the Mediterranean are complemented and supported by growing Russian military influence in Ethiopia, Aden, Socotra island, Madagascar, the

Seychelles, Mozambique, Afghanistan, and so forth. Also, at approximately the same time as the Libyans mined the Red Sea with Russian-made sea mines, a systematic permanent activity of Russian submarines and mini subs was initiated on both sides of the Strait of Gibraltar and is maintained to this day. Thus, two of the three Mediterranean Sea "bottle-necks" have essentially fallen under Russian naval oversight.

The third, the Dardanelles Strait, is being subjected to a slightly different treatment and will occupy the center of attention at the next meeting of NATO defense ministers next week. Involving Greek-Turkish relations, the Dardanelles matter is going to be used by Lord Carrington as one of the main occasions for redefining European NATO's future relations with the newly assertive Russian Empire. The perennial Cyprus crisis will be Lord Carrington's next main occasion for his planned redefinition of world strategic relations.

A replay of the Congress of Berlin

What has been occurring in the last 12 months, between Dec. 11, 1983 and Dec. 11, 1984, under the supervision of the treacherous Secretary of State George Shultz, is eerily reminiscent of the transactions of the so-called Congress of Berlin during the summer of 1878. On that occasion, the managers of the Ottoman Empire of that period organized a sweeping and orderly transfer of all of Istanbul's imperial assets to the British Empire. These included the transformation of the island of Cyprus from an Ottoman possession to a British Crown Colony; the transfer of the Ottoman Viceroyalty of Egypt to British control; the recognition of British-interest supremacy in Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, Rumania, etc.; recognition of Britain's exclusive right to control the Dardanelles Strait; establishment of exclusive British control over the Suez Canal; exclusive British jurisdiction over Arab affairs both in Arabia Deserta and in Arabia Felix; exclusive British control over Ottoman finances; and, finally, recognition of British "responsibility" for the military defense of the Ottoman Empire.

In short, in the course of three months, all that which once was "Ottoman Empire" became, by a stroke of the pen, "British Empire." The transfer was presided over by a clique of Venetian and other Levantine "diplomats" then running the foreign affairs of the Sublime Porte, led by Ottoman Foreign Minister Caratheodory, the George Shultz of the 1870s. It had been ordered by the Ottoman Empire's "creditors committee," led by the Geneva-centered "Caisse de la Dette Ottoman" and Banque Ottoman, and their London business partners, primarily the Baring Brothers investment bank with which a string of 19th-century British foreign secretaries and prime ministers had been associated, from George Canning to Benjamin Disraeli.

George Shultz today and the entire Kissingerian State Department are engaged in a similar transfer of power and influence away from the hands of the United States and into the lap of Russia. Those who find this fact incredible or difficult to swallow are merely displaying their abject igno-

rance on the history of imperial politics and diplomacy. Shultz and Kissinger are not the first people in history who would hand to their own nation's ostensible chief adversary all of their own interests and assets. The Congress of Berlin was one such previous instance. The Peace of Utrecht of 1713 was another; England's 17th-century Act of Succession was nothing but a formal transfer of power into the hands of England's Genoese, Venetian, and Calvinist creditors.

More dramatically, the 1453 fall of the Byzantine Empire into Ottoman hands was merely a transfer of imperial power from the hands of the Paleologue dynasty into the hands of the Othman dynasty, arranged and enforced not by Turkish armies but by Genoa, Venice, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople, and the Byzantine Senate led by Lukas Notaras, the George Shultz of Byzantium, whose stated policy was that "the Othman dynasty is preferable to the Paleologue family" in running the affairs of empire.

As all Ottoman Sultans from 1453 insisted, their rule was a direct, uninterrupted continuation of the Byzantine Empire. In a strict juridical sense, the Ottoman Sultan was correct in claiming that he in fact was the Byzantine Emperor, which is to say the Roman Emperor, a title which remained in protocol style until the abdication of Sultan Abdul Hamid after World War I, i.e., long after the Hapsburg emperor, forced by Napoleon, had dropped the style of "Holy Roman Emperor."

The 1878 Congress of Berlin transferred all of the Ottoman, i.e., Byzantine imperial domains to British control. Since, for considerations of the period, the empty shell of the title of sovereignty was allowed to remain with the Ottoman Sultan, the English sovereign missed then on the opportunity of inheriting the style of Byzantine Emperor, i.e., Roman Emperor.

Lord Carrington's decoupling scenario

NATO's general secretary and Henry Kissinger's business partner, Peter Carrington, has been acting in such a way as to suggest that he intends to, in short order, transform the relation between the Warsaw Pact and the European component of NATO, from a relation of potential adversaries to a relation of an anti-U.S. condominium. For this plan of his, the pivotal role is played by the dramatically shifting power equation in the Mediterranean Sea—especially the Eastern Mediterranean, Red Sea-Arabian Sea zone.

Within this configuration, Carrington intends to employ the diplomatic levers available to him in the Cyprus crisis and in the now growing so-called Lemnos crisis. Mitterrand of France, Papandreou of Greece, and Qaddafi of Libya are all expected to play a special unique part in the unfolding of the drama. In this sense, the Nov. 15, 1984 meeting of these three at Elounda Bay, Crete, merits special attention. Contrary to general myths about this meeting, its principal orchestrator was Moscow. The sequence of events, from Moscow's vantage point, was as follows:

On Nov. 8, 1984, Russian Ambassador to Athens Igor Andropov instructs Greek Premier Andreas Papandreou to

proceed to Damascus, Syria and to Amman, Jordan. At the same time, Mitterrand's "special adviser" (and Mrs. Mitterrand's paramour), Regis Debray, proceeds to Moscow. In the next two days, Papandreou and Hafez Assad sign a secret protocol of joint Greek-Syrian military cooperation against Turkey. Hafez Assad gives to Papandreou a special invitation for French President Mitterrand to visit Syria. Hafez Assad then flies to Moscow. Andreas Papandreou goes to Athens and from there directly to Crete, where he meets with Mitterrand and Qaddafi—ostensibly over the Chad question. Libya's defense minister proceeds to Moscow, where he meets with Chief of Staff Marshal Sergei Akhromeyev, among others. Marshal Akhromeyev also meets with Syria's Assad.

Subsequent to the Elounda Bay meeting, Qaddafi goes to Malta and signs a mutual defense treaty with Maltese Prime Minister Dom Mintoff. Assad returns from Moscow to Damascus and Mitterrand visits Syria. Dom Mintoff in Valletta declares the mutual defense treaty with Italy null and void, and announces that he is going to Moscow Dec. 18. While in Syria, Mitterrand announces that Russia ought to be accepted as a major power in the Mediterranean and explains that he finds himself more often in agreement with Moscow than with Washington, D.C. From this point onward, the office of the President of France has become an apologist for Russian hegemony in the Mediterranean—a major success for the plans of Lord Carrington.

Meanwhile, a Russian naval flotilla drops anchor in waters near the Greek island of Lemnos, right off the Ionian coast of Turkey. Greek President Caramanlis goes off to Romania to revive, with Ceausescu, the momentum for a "European Nuclear-Free Zone," and the Greek Prime Minister, Andreas Papandreou, sends heavily armed Greek troops to the island of Lemnos, declares the "militarization" of Lemnos, and announces that the 88th Brigade, which he designates a NATO unit, now garrisoned on that island, will from now on be under the direct jurisdiction of NATO. What is the significance of this?

According to the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne, the Greek island of Lemnos and numerous other Greek islands near the Dardanelles Strait are declared "demilitarized," and Greece has no right to introduce armed forces there. According to the same treaty of Lausanne, the Republic of Turkey has exclusive responsibility for the military control of access to and from the Dardanelles. A quick consultation on the map of Lemnos' location will provide an explanation of the military importance of Lemnos for the Dardanelle Strait. A Russian-guided Papandreou challenges Turkey's military-treaty rights by means of Greek military units which he sneakily designates "NATO"—which, however, are supported by nearby Russian naval units. In effect, a Russian controlled unit has received NATO designation and has triggered a military-diplomatic crisis over who, whether pro-Russian Greece or pro-U.S. Turkey, will control access to and from the Mediterranean via the Dardanelles.

Apart from the Lemnos-Dardanelles problem, the Greek-Turkish relation is further plagued by the Cyprus crisis, now flaring up once again. However, since Russian-controlled Syria has now established full control over that half of Lebanon closest to Cyprus, the Cyprus crisis is fast becoming a Greek-Turkish-Syrian problem.

The entire complex of artificially orchestrated problems between Greece and Turkey, two NATO members, is increasingly demanding some kind of Russian participation for an eventual solution. In fact, these growing problems can only be solved through a major war or through a grand arrangement between Russia and a Carrington-dominated European NATO at the expense of the United States. This is the fulcrum Lord Carrington intends to use, with help from George Shultz, for the purpose of redefining Western Europe's relation with the Russian Empire as a relation not of adversary, but of condominium.

Carrington in fact has no qualms in transferring to Russia both British and Anglo-American imperial assets. He and his colleagues are acting in the style of Ottoman minister Carathodory and Byzantine minister Lukas Notaras. A quick look at the globe shows that numerous of the 19th-century British imperial assets are now in Russian hands: Malta, Aden, Socotra island, Seychelles Islands, Conakry, partially Singapore, partially Cyprus, temporarily Grenada, partially Guyana, and so forth.

For persons such as Carrington, Kissinger, Shultz, or the slightly more exalted oligarchs such as McGeorge Bundy, Harriman, et al., the overriding motivation for strategy and diplomacy is the exact opposite of national interests which ordinary citizens take for granted to be the cornerstone of all policy. These gentlemen's first concern is to preserve the imperial/satrapal manner of controlling world affairs. It the name of this overriding concern, they, just as all their predecessors through history, never have and never will hesitate to betray states, governments, nations, and dynasties in order to preserve imperial order above all else.

President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative more than anything else threatens to put an end to all such imperial orderings. To prevent this, George Shultz and certain others inside the Reagan administration are toying with treason, prepared to see the destruction of America's alliances and the success of Lord Carrington's plans. Ironically, removing these persons from power and proceeding with a national mobilization to build strategic space defenses will render the new and recent Russian imperial aggrandizement meaningless and ludicrous. Russia's imperial, 19th-century-style assets will only be assets if the world returns to the economic and technological status of the 19th century. With the implied technological and economic benefits of Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, the rapidly growing Russian Empire will be a mere malicious anachronism. But for this, Shultz and his ilk must be rendered "impotent and obsolete" in policy making.