

The Globe Is on Fire

by Nancy Spannaus

To those who are hysterically committed to ignoring the ongoing disintegration of the world financial system, there is an equally strong compunction to ignore the growing dangers in the world strategic situation. Yet an overview of hotspots, taken on a global scale, and with a view to the frequency of the eruption of such crises over the past ten years, shows clearly that the world is descending into chaos which is leading toward a new kind of world war.

In February, *EIR* featured a review of the global war situation, under the title of “Nation-States Disintegrate Under Assault from London.” There we documented the actors and the scripts which the international financial oligarchy, largely run from Britain, have set into motion in order to make the world “free” for their looting needs. From Africa, to Ibero-America, to eastern Europe and Asia, we identified 40 nations that were already in a state of collapse, due either to financial assault, narco-terrorism, wars, or the spread of diseases and “natural” disasters.

As we said at the time, it would be absurd to think that the collapse of the nation-state system, with its sovereign commitment to protecting the general welfare of populations, was an accident. Rather, it was clear that the geopolitical and financial devotees of “globalization” were committed to the destruction of that system, and that British-sponsored mercenary gangs and others were actually being deployed to push this destructive process along. Every major nation in the world, the United States included, was being targeted for splintering into little pieces.

Today, about three months later, the deterioration of the global situation is shocking. *None* of the hotspots we identified in February has been cooled out; they have in most cases—like Chechnya, the Balkans, and Colombia—only gotten much worse. But at least ten major new conflicts, or national collapses, have erupted, creating the basis for the

further spread of chaos and suffering, to the point of the collapse of civilization itself.

The African Case-Study

There is no question but that the continent of Africa represents the most “advanced” case of this process, with most of the nations of Sub-Saharan Africa already pulverized through economic hardship and ongoing wars. One international peacekeeping force after another has been sent in, to no avail, because the conditions for a real peace—including support for the very existence of sovereign nation-states—are not being put forth by any major power, and whenever a nation seeks to defend its sovereignty, it is generally attacked as “authoritarian” or “corrupt.”

The former colonial powers in Africa, particularly the British, are quite blatant about their intentions. They have set their sights on effectively *recolonizing* the continent, through taking control of the raw materials, often by means of mercenary bands comprised of “retired” counterinsurgency officers. A look at the situation in Sierra Leone, where the diamond and gold mines are the prize being fought over by conflicting groups, gives one a hideous, but accurate sense of what is at stake. Many of these gangs are, in effect, copying the actions of mercenary gangs, like Britain’s Executive Outcomes, which had previously been deployed into the area on behalf of the major mineral cartels. The fact that U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and the British demanded that the Sierra Leone government form a coalition government with the murderous Revolutionary United Front—after Foday Sankoh, the criminal leader of the RUF, had been arrested and convicted of high treason—as an alleged “peacekeeping” measure, shows how extremely counterproductive outside inputs have been. The outcome—the new round of chaos that began early May—was predictable.

We identified the Sierra Leone crisis, as one of many which have been going on for more than a decade, in the February report. All are continuing to boil, or simmer, and now at least *four* others have broken out. First, there was Mozambique, an International Monetary Fund (IMF) “model” state, which had been destroyed to the point where floods devastated the country and its infrastructure, killing thousands. Then there is the targetting of South Africa, both through attempts to impose economic conditions, and with the international propaganda blitz against President Thabo Mbeki (see article in this section). And most recently, we have the resurgence of war between Eritrea and Ethiopia, both nations suffering from extreme IMF-supervised poverty, which cannot protect their people, and are driven into periodic wars.

None of these wars and evaporations of nation-states in Africa are immediately going to spill over into other continents, some will console themselves. But that belief is not only immoral, but wrong. Africa represents the direction that all continents are headed, including those inhabited by countries with those famous “weapons of mass destruction.” The victory of the “empire” model there, will ensure disaster everywhere.

Shooting Wars in Asia

The other area of the world where a significant number of new conflicts has erupted since February is Asia, where we previously identified Indonesia, North Korea, and Afghanistan as the leading victims of the globalization process. In recent months, armed conflict has emerged once again in Sri Lanka, in the Kashmir border region between India and Pakistan, and in the Philippines—with the potential for conflict across the Taiwan Strait looming as a possible detonator for superpower conflict in the not-so-distant future.

The conflicts in Sri Lanka, the Philippines, and the Kashmir region can all be traced directly to meddling by British-backed terrorist gangs, some also connected to the so-called Afghansis, which were deployed by the Bush networks against the Soviets during the 1980s. As we detailed in our last issue, the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) are part of the London terrorist nexus, with the group’s master planner centered in London. They seek to split up Sri Lanka. As for the Philippine groups, the Abu Sayyaf and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front, who are now challenging the government by holding foreign hostages, they were directly spawned by veterans of the Afghansi networks. These groups are demanding a breakup of the Philippines, with the formation of a separate Islamic state.

The major terrorist organizations inside Pakistan and in the northwestern areas of India, particularly in Jammu and Kashmir, are direct offspring of the Afghansi operation, or have been built in reaction to it; they receive funding and political protection through London. Thus, the British maintain a string which they can pull at any point that the Indian and Pakistani governments take action toward a lasting peace—

which development would challenge the geopolitical objectives of the British. Given the nuclear weapons capability of the two nations, and their international alliances, playing with fire in this region could easily yield a major explosion.

As for the Chinese situation, the provocations coming from the side of the Taiwanese independence faction can be traced to Anglo-American circles, and their allies in the extreme nationalist circles in Japan, all of whom are willing to risk war in order to “contain” China. The aggressive stance of the independence faction, has not yet succeeded in provoking Beijing, but the moves have definitely increased the tendency for closer ties between the mainland Chinese and the Russians. Could the Chinese be provoked into war? Should anyone be willing to say that they could not be provoked into war to defend their sovereignty? This, again, is an area where the chance for miscalculation is very great.

Not ‘One Big War’

It would be foolish for anyone to say that the lack of an obvious U.S.-Russian strategic confrontation flashpoint means that there is strategic stability. Look, for example, at the ring of fuses that have been lit around that precariously positioned nuclear superpower. The Balkans, for example, where Russian troops are still stationed, remains a tinderbox. Central Asia, all the way down to Afghanistan, is still a theater of war of direct concern to the Russians. And then, there are the Baltic states, which certain NATO circles are agitating to become the next members of the Western military alliance, an action which would be intolerable to the Russians.

Already, the Russian Foreign Ministry and other spokesmen are charging that there is a “rise of fascism” in Latvia, while the Latvians are denouncing the evolution of “hysterical nationalism” in Russia. A vicious circle is developing, in which the more the Russians attack Latvia, the more the Latvians, as well as the Lithuanians and Estonians, want to join NATO, and, then, Russian attacks can only intensify.

Within this environment, institutions like the New Atlantic Initiative, founded in the early 1990s by Margaret Thatcher, rush in to promote economic disintegration (through privatization), and polarization by their NATO policy. At its April 28-30 conference in Bratislava, Slovakia, the NAI, according to a participant closely linked to the U.S. State Department and to the British Foreign and Commonwealth Office, a former very senior FCO figure, Dame Pauline Neville-Jones, told attendees that “NATO should be enlarged by a ‘big bang’ approach. That is, instead of stretching out the matter of NATO entry, country by country, and over considerable periods of time, all the relevant countries in Europe should all be brought in, at once, and all together—including the Baltic states.” All the sweet talk in the world by Russian President Vladimir Putin is not going to mask the fact that such a strategic threat will lead toward East-West confrontation.

If we wait until these wars and conflicts have reached the “hot phase,” it may be too late to stop them.