England—Washington's "Trojan Horse" in the EU

The growing might of the European Union and the prospects of its evolvement into a powerful global rival are making the US fidget. Washington apparently does not want Western Europe to gain enough strength to challenge American global leadership. And that sparks quite a few disagreements between the partners of the Euro-Atlantic relations, where the appreciation of the euro represents the most challenging problem for the US. The euro is shaping into a strong dollar competitor in the global payment system, diverting a significant part of the financial flow from the US market, adversely affecting the already overburdened American budget and countering America's desire to dictate fixed prices on oil and other raw materials. Today the European currency zone is the largest in the world and includes rich economies-consumers of expensive world market goods. Having entered into association agreements with dozens of countries, the European Union is continually expanding its “trading zone.” Quite a few Latin American, Asian, Eastern European and North African countries are reducing the share of contracts in dollars and switching to the euro instead. But since such a trend might cause the demise of the “era of the dollar” as the world’s only currency, Washington is applying various political and financial levers in order to undermine the euro and the economies of the countries of the EU to hinder this process. Recent Washington's sanctions against a number of European banks and large EU companies in particular, Volkswagen, can serve as an example illustrating this US policy.

This is why the United States is taking steps to assure its geopolitical superiority to Western Europe and actively involving its "loyal friends," particularly Great Britain, to achieve its objectives.

It is not a revelation that in the 21st century Great Britain has (de facto) been servicing the needs of the US. This trend especially vividly manifested itself in the last few years of Tony Blair's premiership. Just a few facts: London's active participation in Washington's military campaign in Afghanistan in 2001; the support of the US invasion of Iraq in 2003 and the White House's policy of expansionism; and the development of Britain's foreign policy, particularly its relations with Russia, China and the countries of the Middle East. Great Britain continues to remain the closest ally of the United States, especially in the North Atlantic Alliance.

On July 15, 2007 in an interview to the BBC, David Wright Miliband, the then foreign minister of Great Britain, made a bold statement about the "special relations" between London and Washington, calling them “the most important bilateral relations Great Britain has.” Answering the reporter's question of why that was the case, he frankly answered, "Because it is the richest and most powerful country of the world. But primarily because it is wiser to ally with the US than to oppose it."

Great Britain also plays a special role in the American EU policy, "remaining an intermediary between Europe and the US," according to the sincere statement made by Tony Blair shortly before the visit of George Bush to Europe in 2002. The White House employs Great Britain to manipulate EU policy to gain advantages as well as to assure the united Europe adopts decisions that are beneficial for the US in terms of economy, finance, politics, etc. As David Cameron admitted in one of his recent speeches, “Great Britain adopted a "bootlicking" policy in its relations with US in the Blair time.” But isn't the UK acting in a subservient manner in its relations with the US today as well? And how independent from the White House is PM Cameron's policy-making, including in respect to the EU?

An exemplary answer to these questions would be the four emphatic demands David Cameron has recently delivered
to the leadership of the European Union as a "ransom" for Great Britain's participation in the EU:

- To obtain an explicit statement from EU authorities that Britain will be kept out of any move towards a European superstate. This will require an exemption for the UK from the EU's founding principle of "ever closer union".

- An “explicit statement” from Brussels that the euro is not the official currency of the EU so that Great Britain can protect the status of the pound sterling as its legitimate currency.

- To vest the British parliament with the authority to block any European Union directives and reconsider the EU's legislative initiatives;

- A new structure for the EU itself. The block of 28 nations must be reorganised to prevent the nine countries that are not in the eurozone being dominated by the 19 member states that are, with particular protections for the City of London, which is the business centre of Great Britain’s capital.

At first glance these demands can be viewed as a commitment of Cameron's conservative government to achieve maximum privileges for its country. However, no other country of the EU—and they all pursue their national interests and want to get privileges as much as Great Britain does—has raised such point-blank demands. And the demands themselves are suspiciously akin to the interests of the White House wishing to weaken the euro and the EU as a whole.

And in these circumstances, accusations that PM Cameron attempted a "very risky dismantling" of the European Union (see) made by the foreign minister of France Laurent Fabius, can hardly be seen as ungrounded.

However, it is up to the Europeans to work out a final decision on whether to meet Cameron's "demands" or not. It is also up to the Europeans to choose whether to subserviently follow the policies the US authoritatively hands down or to live in a union independent from Washington and other third powers in accordance with the definition of the union articulated at the time the Treaty of Maastricht was being formalized in 1992.
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