

Kissinger, Brzezinski Are Still Peddling London's 'Great Game'

by Jeffrey Steinberg

For the past 30 years, grand politics in the United States has been defined by the running conflict between those who wish to revive the American philosophical tradition in foreign and economic policy, and those pushing for the United States to surrender to London and fully join a new Anglo-American imperium.

By far the leading, most consistent, and, often, sole proponent of the former policy orientation, over this entire period, has been Lyndon LaRouche. Two of LaRouche's leading adversaries, throughout, have been the U.S.-based "Tweedle-dee" and "Tweedle-dum" of Anglo-American geopolitics, Henry A. Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski.

LaRouche is renowned throughout the world as the author of the Eurasian Land-Bridge, a proposal to revive, in even more advanced form, the late-19th-Century American-led efforts to build vast infrastructure corridors across Eurasia, a program modelled on the United States' own Transcontinental Railroad success, which LaRouche has described as, in the words of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, eliminating "18th-Century British colonial methods."

Brzezinski and Kissinger promote precisely those "18th-Century British methods" that produced two world wars during the 20th Century, and 50 years of disastrous Cold War, to defeat the efforts to promote Eurasian development (see p. 23 for LaRouche's account of his own role in launching the Eurasian Land-Bridge policy). Now, as then, Brzezinski and Kissinger, on behalf of the Anglo-American oligarchy, prefer a global plunge into war and a genocidal dark age, to the realization of LaRouche's Land-Bridge. The banner under which Brzezinski and Kissinger peddle this new Eurasian geopolitical warfare is the "Clash of Civilizations," a pop-cult label for the same British "Great Game," promoted, since the Summer of 1993, by Brzezinski's Trilateral

Commission and Jimmy Carter Administration underling Samuel Huntington.

The events of Sept. 11 have once again placed this conflict between the policies of LaRouche, on the one side, and Kissinger and Brzezinski, on the other side, in the category of "life-and-death" matters for the United States, and for civilization as a whole. The pivotal nature of this conflict was, in large measure, the principal subject of Russian President Vladimir Putin's extraordinary recent diplomacy (see this week's *Feature*).

Even as investigators in the United States and throughout the world search through mountains of evidence, in pursuit of the ground-level operatives, field commanders, and ultimate authors of the strategic covert warfare attack against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, fault lines have already emerged over the question of what kinds of action should be taken in response. LaRouche has been on record, since February 1985, with a detailed proposal for an all-out war against the transnational narco-terrorist apparatus, which perfectly defends the sovereignty of all participating nation-states (see below for excerpts from that 1985 LaRouche plan), and which model corresponds, almost precisely, to the post-Sept. 11 requirements.

For Kissinger, Brzezinski, and Brzezinski's longtime henchman Samuel Huntington, the response is to promote the "Clash of Civilizations," by launching a war in Central Asia and in the Near East that would soon degenerate into an out-of-control religious war engulfing the planet. The essential backdrop to the Kissinger/Brzezinski push for global conflagration is the imminent final collapse of the post-Bretton Woods global financial and monetary system, which has been driven into irreversible bankruptcy by the policies of the Anglo-American financial establishment.



Who is harboring terrorists? Is it, perhaps, that “symbol of American financial resolve and patriotism,” the President of the New York Stock Exchange, Richard Grasso? Here is the infamous “Grasso Abrazo”: the Wall Street mogul embraces narco-terrorist Rail Reyes, head of finances for the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), during a June 1999 visit to Colombia.

CNN Promotes War Of Civilizations

Indicative of this “Tweedle-dee/Tweedle-dum” war drive was the joint appearance Sept. 23 on Cable News Network (CNN) by Kissinger and Brzezinski, during which the two competing Harvard University protégés of Nashville Agrarian William Yandell Elliott, tripped over each other’s feet to promote the idea of major wars in Central Asia and the Persian Gulf, in response to the Sept. 11 attacks.

Kissinger denounced the idea of attempting to make any progress toward Middle East peace between Israel and the Palestinians, prior to an all-out military assault against “the terrorists,” citing Israel’s 1973 Yom Kippur War victory, and the first Bush Administration’s 1991 Persian Gulf War against Iraq, as the kinds of actions required *before* a Mideast peace deal. “For Israel to make concessions before a big success has been achieved against terrorism,” Kissinger warned, “will enable the terrorists to say that after they bombed New York and killed thousands of people, America exacted concessions which we wouldn’t do before and would establish anti-American terrorism as a method for dealing with the Arab-Israeli conflict.”

In earlier televised interviews in Germany, and in a Sept. 13 *Washington Post* commentary, Kissinger had implicitly advocated the use of nuclear weapons against a list of “rogue states.” Kissinger’s rantings about limited nuclear war were a throwback to the 1958 Pugwash call by Kissinger ally Leo Szilard, the H.G. Wells protégé who advocated world government, via such limited nuclear engagements, in the context of

wars aimed at population reduction and control over global energy resources.

Brzezinski’s comments on the Sept. 23 CNN broadcast were even more revealing. While paying lip service to the idea of cooperation with Russia, Brzezinski pointedly warned against any concessions to Moscow: “We shouldn’t pay them politically because a lot of these networks were established in the ’70s, nurtured in the ’80s, trained and armed. And hence, the Russians now have a stake also in dealing with this problem before [it] turns against them with full force.”

The Afghansi Mujahideen

What was Brzezinski referring to in his not-so-veiled threat to Moscow? Brzezinski’s remarks certainly did not escape leading policymakers in Russia, who have been faced with major destabilizations in the Caucasus and the Caspian Sea/Central Asia regions for the past years, all of which have been loudly promoted by Brzezinski as a means of

forever destroying Russia as a great nation.

Brzezinski was referring to the vast army of irregular warriors, drug- and gun-traffickers, etc., that was “nurtured, trained, and armed” as part of the American, British, and Israeli “Afghansi mujahideen” campaign of 1979-90. At the time, the covert war in Afghanistan against the Soviet Red Army was promoted as a Western response to the Christmas 1979 Soviet military invasion of the Central Asian nation. But a more careful look reveals that Brzezinski and others in the Trilateral Commission-run Carter Administration were fully committed to the promotion of a “Crescent of Crisis” along the southern tier of the Soviet Union, long *before* the Christmas 1979 military actions by Moscow—actions that were, in large measure, provoked by the Anglo-American overthrow of the Shah of Iran, and the installation of the Ayatollah Khomeini regime in Tehran in February 1979.

It was Brzezinski himself who spilled the beans on the pre-existing Anglo-American designs, in a now-famous Jan. 15, 1979 *Time* magazine cover-story headlined, “The Crescent Of Crisis: Troubles Beyond Iran,” which began with a most revealing Brzezinski statement: “An arc of crisis stretches along the shores of the Indian Ocean, with fragile social and political structures in a region of vital importance to us threatened with fragmentation. The resulting political chaos could well be filled by elements hostile to our values and sympathetic to our adversaries.”

Despite Brzezinski’s recognition of the hostile nature of

Huntington's 'Clash Of Civilizations'

In the Summer of 1993, Samuel Huntington, who served as Zbigniew Brzezinski's Deputy National Security Adviser during the disastrous Jimmy Carter Presidency (1977-81), penned an article for the New York Council on Foreign Relations' journal *Foreign Affairs*, promoting the idea that, in the post-Cold War world, future conflict, up to the level of global warfare, would arise from the struggle between "the West" and "the rest," particularly the struggle against the spreading influence of Islam and China.

When Huntington's diatribe first appeared in *Foreign Affairs* — it would later be the subject of a book by the same author, *The Clash of Civilizations And The Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996) — leading officials of the Clinton Administration soundly denounced the idea of a clash between the West and Islam.

Other leading world figures, from LaRouche, to Pope John Paul II, to Iranian President Mohammed Seyyed Khatami and Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir bin Mohamad, counterposed a "dialogue of civilizations" to the crass geopolitical war schemings of Huntington, Brzezinski, Kissinger, and a gaggle of neo-conservative Zionist lobby loudmouths, typified by the *Washington Post's* Charles Krauthammer, the *New York Times's* William Safire, and the Hollinger Corp.'s Richard Perle, who propagandized for Huntington's "Clash."

Nevertheless, since the events of Sept. 11, the insane rantings of Huntington have been revived, with a vengeance, by the same Anglo-American-Israeli apparatus who are advocating a full-scale war against the 1.4 billion Muslims on this planet.

On Sept. 17, in an interview with Germany's weekly newspaper *Die Zeit*, Huntington warned that if "Islamic states show solidarity with the criminals, the danger will grow that there will actually be a 'clash of civilizations,' and not merely a struggle of civilized societies against the powers of evil." — *Jeffrey Steinberg*

the Afghansi networks, which he promoted, the *Time* story concluded with a clear signal of the operation Brzezinski et al. were in the process of unleashing: "In the long run there may even be targets of opportunity for the West created by ferment within the crescent. Islam is undoubtedly compatible with socialism, but it is inimical to atheistic Communism. The Soviet Union is already the world's fifth largest Muslim nation. By the year 2000, the huge Islamic populations in the border republics may outnumber Russia's now dominant Slavs. From Islamic democracies on Russia's southern tier, a zealous Koranic evangelism might sweep across the border into these politically repressed Soviet states, creating problems for the Kremlin."

Those "problems for the Kremlin" were certainly one included element in the background to the assault against the American people, launched on Sept. 11, 2001. But, now, as then, Brzezinski remains an enthusiastic advocate of the deployment of those dark age irregular-warfare forces — at minimum, against Russia. The cartoonish idea that the authorship of the Sept. 11 attack lies with Osama bin Laden, who was a mid-level paymaster for the U.S., British, and Israeli "Afghan mujahideen" operations, was thoroughly dispelled by LaRouche in his Sept. 11 radio interview with Salt Lake City host Jack Stockwell (see *EIR*, Sept. 21, 2001).

As we reported in a Sept. 10, 1999 *Feature* — nearly two years to the day before the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon — entitled "Brzezinski Plays Britain's 'Great Game' In Central Asia," Brzezinski has never aban-

doned his "Crescent of Crisis" policy. In his 1999 book, *The Grand Chessboard*, Brzezinski revised and extended his "crescent" idea to what he labelled the "Eurasian Balkans," a reference to the fault-line region of Central Europe that had been exploited by British geopoliticians to block continental cooperation from the time of World War I through the post-Soviet era. But, for Brzezinski, the oblong area defined as the "Eurasian Balkans" represents a far more important zone of world conflict.

In *The Grand Chessboard*, Brzezinski ranted, "In Europe, the word 'Balkans' conjures up images of ethnic conflicts and great-power regional rivalries. Eurasia, too, has its 'Balkans,' but the Eurasian Balkans are much larger, more populated, even more religiously and ethnically heterogeneous. They are located within that large geographic oblong that demarcates the central zone of instability . . . and that embraces portions of southeastern Europe, Central Asia and parts of South Asia, the Persian Gulf area, and the Middle East."

Brzezinski made no bones about Anglo-American efforts again to pursue a Great Game in that region: "The Eurasian Balkans form the inner core of that oblong . . . and they differ from its outer zone in one particularly significant way: They are a power vacuum. Although most of the states located in the Persian Gulf and the Middle East are also unstable, American power is that region's ultimate arbiter. The unstable region in the outer zone is thus an area of single-power hegemony and is tempered by that hegemony. In contrast, the Eurasian Balkans are truly reminiscent of the older, more familiar

Balkans of southeastern Europe; not only are its political entities unstable, but they tempt and invite the intrusion of more powerful neighbors, each of whom is determined to oppose the region's domination by another."

Brzezinski concluded his war mantra: "The Eurasian Balkans . . . are of importance from the standpoint of security and historical ambitions to at least three of their most immediate and more powerful neighbors, namely, Russia, Turkey, and Iran, with China also signaling an increasing political interest in the region. But the Eurasian Balkans are infinitely more important as a potential economic prize: an enormous concentration of natural gas and oil reserves is located in the region, in addition to important minerals, including gold. . . . An independent, Turkic-speaking Azerbaijan, with pipelines running from it to the ethnically related and politically supportive Turkey, would prevent Russia from exercising a monopoly on access to the region and would thus also deprive Russia of decisive political leverage over the politics of the new Central Asian states."

While spouting his typical geopolitical filth, Brzezinski also betrayed the underlying motive for his latest drive to

destroy Russia, in concluding chapters of *The Grand Chessboard*: to prevent the realization of LaRouche's Eurasian Land-Bridge.

"Potentially," he wrote, "the most dangerous scenario would be a grand coalition of China, Russia, and perhaps Iran, an 'anti-hegemonic coalition' united not by ideology but by complementary grievances. It would be reminiscent in scale and scope of the challenge posed by the Sino-Soviet bloc, though this time China would likely be the leader and Russia the follower. Averting this contingency, however remote it may be, will require a display of U.S. geostrategic skill on the western, eastern, and southern perimeters of Eurasia simultaneously."

It was precisely this insane, imperial geopolitical outlook that Russian President Putin denounced, when he spoke in Germany in recent days, about the need to bring to an end—once and for all—the mentality and the actions of the disastrous Cold War era, actions that are typified by Brzezinski and Kissinger's geopolitical rantings, and by the "Clash of Civilizations" response, advocated by Kissinger, Brzezinski, and Huntington, to the events of Sept. 11.

Why The Real Name Is 'Osama bin London'

by Michele Steinberg

Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak was asked by the Sept. 22 issue of the French newspaper, *Le Figaro*, why he said that London is "the greatest base of terrorism in Europe." Mubarak revealed that warnings that he personally, and his government's intelligence services, had delivered to Britain and the United States, about their harboring known terrorist groups and individuals, had gone unheeded. Mubarak said, "I had warned [then Prime Minister] John Major, who didn't listen to me. I repeated it this week to the BBC, when they asked me questions about people to whom Great Britain granted asylum. I sent a message to [Prime Minister] Tony Blair recommending he be cautious."

When the *Le Figaro* interview turned to the United States and the 1993 World Trade Center bombing by networks associated with Sheikh Abdul Omar Rahman—who was a fugitive from Egyptian justice—Mubarak said, "The Americans accepted [Rahman] because he had assisted them in the fight against the Soviet invader [in Afghanistan]. I had warned them that they could not trust such an individual. They asked

me: 'Do you want us to send him back to you?' I answered them: 'Are you joking! Keep him in your country, I don't need him. But one day he will make you pay dearly for your hospitality.' Three months before the bombing . . . Rahman was still the good friend of the Americans."

During British Foreign Secretary Jack Straw's visit to Iran the same week, London's *Daily Telegraph* acknowledged that Iranians blame Britain for terrorism and irregular warfare in their country, and even suspect some British institution's hand behind the networks involved in the Sept. 11 disasters in the United States.

For the readers of *EIR*, the statements by Mubarak are not new. On Jan. 11, 2000, *EIR*'s editors prepared a memorandum for Secretary of State Madeleine Albright called "Put Britain On The List of States Sponsoring Terrorism," using the information provided by Egypt, and nine other nations—Israel, France, Algeria, Peru, Turkey, Germany, Libya, Nigeria, Yemen, Russia, and India. The memo documented their protests to Britain over London's giving asylum, funding, and free rein to terrorist recruitment, fundraising, and training. The memorandum was delivered to top U.S. officials of the Defense Department, Justice Department, the FBI, the CIA, and both Houses of Congress. Had the lengthy dossier been taken seriously, and had the warnings of *EIR* and its founder, Lyndon LaRouche, been heeded then, the tragedy of Sept. 11, 2001 might have been averted.

But of great concern, is that the evidence pointing to London, and from there to the rogue elements of the Anglo-American-Israeli geopolitical interests, not be ignored this time.