

## EIR presents "On Eurofascism," by Russian Academician and Presidential Advisor Sergei Glazyev

June 27, 2014

The June 27 issue of the weekly *Executive Intelligence Review* features "On Eurofascism," a guest commentary from Academician Sergei Glazyev, advisor to President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin. The article by economist Glazyev, who was closely involved in Russian diplomatic and economic cooperation efforts with Ukraine in recent years, provides a unique window onto Russian strategic thinking about recent months' events in and around that country, viewed in terms of both the interests of Ukraine's population and Russia's own national security concerns.

"We should not mince words," Glazyev says, and he himself does not. He writes, "Current events in Ukraine are guided by the evil spirit of fascism and Nazism, though it seemed to have dissipated long ago, after World War II. Seventy years after the war, the genie has escaped from the bottle once again, posing a threat not merely in the form of the insignia and rhetoric of Hitler's henchmen, but also through an obsessive *Drang nach Osten* [drive toward the East] policy. The bottle has been uncorked, this time, by the Americans. Just as 76 years ago at Munich, when the British and the French gave Hitler their blessing for his eastward march, so in Kiev today, Washington, London, and Brussels are inciting [Right Sector leader] Yarosh, [Svoboda Party head] Tyahnybok, and other Ukrainian Nazis to war with Russia. One is forced to ask, why do this in the 21st Century? And why is Europe, now united in the European Union, taking part in kindling a new war, as if suffering a total lapse of historical memory?"

The term "Eurofascism" is no mere rhetorical flourish. "I insist on this definition," writes Glazyev, "which is historically and conceptually accurate."

Academician Glazyev dissects the Association Agreement (AA) between Ukraine and the European Union, the last-minute rejection of which by President Victor Yanukovich in November 2013 triggered the coup process that ousted him three months later. From the standpoint of law and of economic interests, Glazyev argues, the AA—which post-coup President Petro Poroshenko intends to sign on June 27—will end Ukraine's sovereignty and subject it to "Euro-occupation." This process may have "so far ... occurred without an invasion by foreign armies," says Glazyev, but "its coercive nature is beyond any doubt."

He says that violence during the coup, including "criminal attacks against law enforcement personnel, and government building seizures, accompanied by murders and beatings of a large number of people," were able to happen because of support from the USA and Europe. "Just as the fascists [in 1941] stripped the population of occupied Ukraine of all civil rights," he adds, "the modern junta and its American and European backers treat the opponents of Euro-integration as criminals, groundlessly



Above: Sergei Glazyev. Right: Latest copy of the EIR magazine.



accusing them of separatism and terrorism, imprisoning them, or even deploying Nazi guerrillas to shoot them."

Glazyev describes how the drive in recent years to induce Ukraine and other Central European countries to enter into Association Agreements with the EU was packaged as "the European choice." He writes, "This mythical 'European choice' was artificially counterposed to the Eurasian integration process, with Western politicians and the media falsely depicting the latter as an attempt to restore the USSR."

The author analyzes the spread of what he calls "Russophobia" by Western governments and media, as being a tool to prevent Eurasian economic cooperation. Drawing on history and his own background as a Russian born in Ukraine, Glazyev insists that the current "Ukrainian Nazism" is an artificial construct, and that "Ukrainian exclusionary nationalism and fascism, cultivated from abroad, has always been aimed at Moscow."

Glazyev sees the Ukraine crisis as "a real war, organized by the United States and its NATO allies," elaborating: "It is a war we didn't notice for a long time, but it was prepared gradually.... It is not even a war for Ukraine, but a war against us: against Russia." At the same time, he says that the problem "is not America, not the American people, but the organizers of a string of wars, beginning with Iraq, then Yugoslavia, then Libya, the rest of North Africa, Syria, and on to Ukraine." The group responsible, he writes, is "a handful of deranged radical extremists, the so-called Neocons, who ... are real misanthropes and Satanists, prepared even to drop the atomic bomb!"

The article "On Eurofascism" was released by Academician Glazyev to a wide range of international media earlier this month. A shorter version had appeared in online publications in the USA, Canada, and India. The EIR version of this article has been substantially expanded, with the author's permission, using parts of his recent interviews in the Russian media to provide more in-depth discussion of Ukraine's economy, its history, and the author's view of the United States.

GUEST COMMENTARY

# On Eurofascism

by Sergei Glazyev

Part 1 of 2

*Sergei Glazyev is an Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, and Advisor to the President of the Russian Federation.*

*This guest commentary was written and made available to publications in the USA and Europe, before the June 7, 2014 inauguration of Petro Poroshenko as President of Ukraine. The version printed here incorporates, with the author's permission, passages from his March 21, 2014 interview with Radio Radonezh, a Russian station. Subheads have been added.*

Current events in Ukraine are guided by the evil spirit of fascism and Nazism, though it seemed to have dissipated long ago, after World War II. Seventy years after the war, the genie has escaped from the bottle once again, posing a threat not merely in the form of the insignia and rhetoric of Hitler's henchmen, but also through an obsessive *Drang nach Osten* [drive toward the East—ed.] policy. The bottle has been uncorked, this time, by the Americans. Just as 76 years ago at Munich, when the British and the French gave Hitler their blessing for his eastward march, so in Kiev today, Washington, London, and Brussels are inciting Yarosh, Tyahnybok, and other Ukrainian Nazis to war with Russia. One is forced to ask, why do this in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century? And why is Europe, now united in the European Union, taking part in kindling a new war, as if suffering from a total lapse of historical memory?

Answering these questions requires, first of all, an accurate definition of what is happening. This, in turn, must start with identifying the key components of the events, based on facts. The facts are generally known: [former Ukrainian President Viktor] Yanukovich refused to sign the Association Agreement with the EU, which Ukraine had been under pressure to accept. After that, the United States and its NATO allies physically removed him from power by organizing a violent coup d'état in Kiev, and bringing to power a government that was illegitimate, but fully obedient to them. In this article, it will be called "the junta."

The goal of this aggression was to gain acceptance of the Association Agreement, as is evidenced by the fact it was indeed, prematurely, signed by the EU leaders and the junta only a month after the latter had seized power. They reported (the document bearing their signatures has not yet been made public!) that only the political part of the agreement has been signed, the part that obligates Ukraine to follow the foreign and defense policy of the EU and to participate, under EU direction, in settling regional civil and military conflicts. With this step, adoption of the Agreement as a whole has become a mere technicality.

## The 'Euro-Occupation' of Ukraine

In essence, the events in Ukraine mark the country's forcible subordination to the European Union—what may be called "Euro-occupation." The EU leaders, who insistently lecture us on obedience to the law and the principles of a law-based state, have themselves flouted the rule of law in



Economist and Presidential Advisor Sergei Glazyev (left) with President Vladimir Putin, are shown here at the "Ukrainian Choice" conference in Kiev, Summer 2013.

this case, by signing an illegitimate treaty with an illegitimate government. Yanukovich was ousted because he refused to sign it. This refusal, moreover, needs to be understood in terms, not only of the Agreement's content, but also of the fact that he had no legal right to accept it, because the Association Agreement violates the Ukrainian Constitution, which makes no provision for the transfer of state sovereignty to another party.

According to the Ukrainian Constitution, an international agreement that conflicts with the Constitution may be signed only if the Constitution is amended beforehand. The U.S.- and EU-installed junta ignored this requirement. It follows that the U.S. and EU organized the overthrow of Ukraine's legitimate government, in order to deprive the country of its political independence. The next step will be to impose their preferred economic and trade policies on Ukraine, through its accession to the economic part of the Agreement.

Furthermore, although the current Euro-occupation differs from the occupation of Ukraine in 1941, in that, so far, it has occurred without an invasion by foreign armies, its coercive nature is beyond any doubt. Just as the fascists stripped the population of occupied Ukraine of all civil rights, the modern junta and its American and European backers treat the opponents of Euro-integration as criminals, groundlessly accusing them of separatism and terrorism, imprisoning them, or even deploying Nazi guerrillas to shoot them.

As long as President Yanukovich was on track to sign the Association Agreement with the EU, he was the recipient of all kinds of praise and coaxing from high-ranking EU officials and politicians. The minute he refused, however, American agents of influence (as well as official U.S. representatives, such as the Ambassador to Ukraine, the Assistant Secretary of State, and representatives of the intelligence agencies), together with European politicians, began to castigate him and extol his political opponents. They provided massive informational, political, and financial aid to the Euromaidan protests, turning them into the staging ground for the coup d'état.

Many of the protest actions, including criminal attacks against law enforcement personnel and government building seizures, accompanied by murders and beatings of a large number of people, were supported, organized, and planned with the participation of the American Embassy and European officials and politicians, who not only “interfered” in Ukraine’s domestic affairs, but carried out aggression against the country via the Nazi guerrillas they had cultivated.

The use of Nazis and religious fanatics to undermine political stability in various regions of the world is a favorite method of the American intelligence agencies. It has been employed against Russia in the Caucasus, in Central Asia, and now even in Eastern Europe. The Eastern Partnership program, which the U.S. encouraged the Poles and EU officials to initiate, was aimed against Russia from the outset, with the objective of breaking the former Soviet republics’ relations with Russia. This break was supposed to be finalized by contracting legal Association Agreements between each of these countries and the EU.

### The ‘European Choice’

In order to provide political grounds for these agreements, a campaign was launched to fan Russophobia and spread a myth called “the European choice.” This mythical “European choice” was then artificially counterposed to the Eurasian integration process, with Western politicians and the media falsely depicting the latter as an attempt to restore the USSR.

The Eastern Partnership program has failed in every single former Soviet republic. Belarus had already made its own choice, creating a Union State with Russia. Kazakhstan, another key Eurasian country (though not formally an Eastern Partnership target), likewise chose its own path, forming the Customs Union with Russia and Belarus. Armenia and Kyrgyzstan have decided to join this process. The province of Gagauzia has spurned the adoption of Russophobia as a cornerstone of Moldovan policy; the Gagauz referendum, rejecting European integration in favor of the Customs Union, challenged the legitimacy of Chisinau’s “European choice.” Georgia, the only republic to have made a relatively legitimate decision in favor of Association with the EU, paid for its “European choice” with the loss of control over a part of its territory, where people did not want to live under Euro-occupation. The same scenario is now being imposed on Ukraine—loss of a part of its territory, where the citizens do not accept the leadership’s “European choice.”

The coercion of Ukraine to sign the EU Association Agreement became entangled with Russophobia, as a reaction of the Ukrainian public conscience, wounded by the decision of the people of Crimea to join the Russian Federation. Since the majority of Ukrainians still do not automatically think of themselves as divided from Russia, there has been a strong push to inculcate a perception of this episode as Russian aggression and the annexation of part of their territory. This is why Brzezinski talks about the “Finlandization” of Ukraine, as a way to anesthetize the brains of our political elite during the American operation to sever Ukraine’s ties with historical Russia. While under anesthesia, we Russians are supposed to accept a feeling of guilt for our mythical oppression of the Ukrainian people, while the latter are force-fed loathing for

FIGURE 1  
Novorossiya (New Russia), c. 1897



“We Russians are supposed to accept a feeling of guilt for our mythical oppression of the Ukrainian people,” Glazyev writes, “while the latter are force-fed loathing for Russia, with which they have allegedly battled for ages over Little Russia and Novorossiya.”

Russia, with which they have allegedly battled for ages over Little Russia and Novorossiya (Figure 1).<sup>1</sup>

Only a superficial observer, however, would see the current anti-Russian hysteria in the Ukrainian media, so striking in its frenzied Russophobia, as a spontaneous reaction to the Crimean drama. In reality, it is a piece of evidence that the war being waged against Russia is now entering an overt phase. For two decades, we were fairly tolerant of the manifestations of Nazi ideology in Ukraine, not taking it too seriously, in view of the apparent absence of clear preconditions for Nazism. The lack of such preconditions, however, was completely compensated by the persistent sowing of Russophobia through support for numerous nationalist organizations. The discrepancy between their ideology and historical accuracy does not bother the führers of these organizations. In return for a pittance from NATO member countries, they are completely unrestrained in painting Russia as the enemy image. The result is unconvincing, because of our common history, language and culture: Kiev is the mother of all Russian cities, the Kiev-Pechersk Lavra is a major holy site of the Orthodox world, and it was at the Kiev-Mohyla Academy that the modern Russian language took shape.

We cannot forget the historical importance of Little Russia (Ukraine) for us. We have never divided Russia and Ukraine, in our minds. I myself grew up in Ukraine; we never felt differentiated by ethnic origin, not at school, or in our neighborhood, or at work. We were together as one people, speaking the same language, sharing the same faith and understanding of the meaning of life. And all of us—Russians, Ukrainians, Jews, and other ethnic groups living in Zaporozhye and throughout most of Ukraine, with the exception of the far western part—knew that we were one people, although we were aware there were some Nazis out there in the forests of western Ukraine, who still didn’t understand that the war was over. Even in Soviet times, when I happened to visit Lviv, I was struck by people’s hostility to speaking in Russian. Since I am fluent in Ukrainian, it wasn’t a problem

for me, but I couldn't fail to notice: As long as you spoke with them in Ukrainian, that was all right, but if you switched to Russian, the tension was palpable.

Wild lies have been employed, playing on tragic episodes in our common history, such as the Revolution and the Civil War, as well as the Holodomor famine of the 1930s, which are falsely attributed solely to Russian tyranny. Russophobia, based on Nazism, is being made the cornerstone of Ukraine's national identity.

### 'Ukrainian Nazism'

This article is not concerned with exposing the objective absurdity of the Ukrainian Nazis' hysterical Russophobia, but rather with establishing the reasons for its re-emergence in the 21st Century. This requires an awareness that such "Ukrainian Nazism" is an artificial construct, created by the age-old enemies of the Russian world. Ukrainian exclusionary nationalism and fascism, cultivated from abroad, has always been aimed at Moscow. At first it was promoted by Poland, which viewed Ukraine as its own borderland, and established its own vertical power structure to administer it. Then came Austria-Hungary, which invested large amounts of money over a long period of time, to encourage Ukrainian separatism.

During the German fascist occupation, these separatist tendencies were the ground in which the Bandera movement and the *Polizei* sprang up, aiding the German fascists in establishing their order in Ukraine, including though punitive operations and enslavement of the population. Their modern followers are now doing likewise: Under the guidance of their American instructors, guerrillas of the Banderite Right Sector are conducting punitive operations against the population in the Donbass, helping the U.S.-installed junta "cleanse" cities of supporters of greater integration with Russia, and assuming police functions for the establishment of a pro-American, anti-Russian order.

It is obvious that without steady American and European support, neither the coup d'état nor the existence of the Kiev junta would have been possible. Unfortunately, as the famous dictum goes, "history teaches us, that history teaches us nothing." This is a catastrophe for Europe, which has more than once had to deal with instances of the proto-fascist model of government that has now taken shape in Ukraine. It involves, essentially, a symbiotic relationship between the fascists and big capital. A symbiosis of this type gave rise to Hitler, who was supported by major German capitalists, seduced by the opportunity, under the cover of national-socialist rhetoric, to make money from government orders and the militarization of the economy. This applied not only to German capitalists, but also Europeans and Americans. There were collaborators with the Hitler regime in practically all the European countries and the United States.

Few people realized that the torch

marches would be followed by the ovens at Auschwitz, and that tens of millions of people would die in the fires of World War II. The same dynamic is playing out in Kiev now, except that the shout of "Heil Hitler!" has been replaced by "Glory to the heroes!"—heroes whose great feat was to execute defenseless Jews at Babi Yar. Moreover, the Ukrainian oligarchy—including the leaders of some Jewish organizations—is financing the anti-Semites and Nazis of Right Sector, who are the armed bulwark of the current regime in Ukraine. The Maidan sponsors have forgotten that, in the symbiotic relationship between Nazis and big capital, the Nazis always get the upper hand over the liberal businessmen. The latter are forced either to become Nazis themselves, or to leave the country. This is already happening in Ukraine: The oligarchs who remain in the country are competing with the petty führers of Right Sector in the domain of Russophobic and anti-Muscovite rhetoric, as well as in grabbing the property of those of their fellow businessmen who have fled the country.

The current rulers in Kiev count on protection from their American and European patrons, pledging to them daily that they will fight the "Russian occupation" to the last standing "Muscovite."<sup>2</sup> They obviously underestimate how dangerous Nazis are, because Nazis truly believe they are a "superior race," while all others, including the businessmen who sponsor them, are viewed as "subhuman" creatures, against whom violence of all sorts is permissible. That is why Nazis always prevail, within their symbiotic relationship with the bourgeoisie, who are then forced either to submit, or flee the country. There is no doubt that if the Bandera followers are not forcibly stopped, the Nazi regime in Ukraine will develop, expand, and penetrate more deeply. The only thing still in doubt will be Ukraine's "European choice," as the country reeks more and more of the fascism of 80 years ago.

*To be continued...*



"Many of the protest actions, including criminal attacks against law enforcement personnel and government building seizures, accompanied by murders and beatings of a large number of people, were supported, organized, and planned with the participation of the American Embassy and European officials and politicians." Here, neo-Nazi "protestors" in the Maidan, January 2014.

### Footnotes:

1. Malorossiya ("Little Russia" or "Lesser Russia") is a term dating back to Greek place-names for the areas populated by eastern Slavs, nearer ("Lesser Russia") and farther north ("Greater Russia") of the Black Sea. It has been used at various times to denote all of modern Ukraine or, chiefly, northeastern Ukraine or the left bank of the Dnieper River. Novorossiya ("New Russia") was introduced in the 18th Century for lands acquired by the Russian Empire under Catherine II in wars with the Ottoman Empire. These included the Black Sea littoral from the Dniester River to Crimea, the Sea of Azov littoral eastward nearly to the mouth of the Don River, and lands along the lower Dnieper.

2. Moskal, or "Muscovite," is a derogatory Ukrainian term for a Russian.