Milosevic hits Kosovars, as part of imperial ‘Great Game’

by Umberto Pascali

The terrible events taking place in Kosova at this moment can be seen from two very different levels. On one side, there is the unending bloodshed, the terrible suffering of the Kosovars, the civilian ethnic Albanian population who comprise more than 90% of the population of Kosova, many of whom have been forced to abandon their homes and villages in the middle of winter, a desperate exodus under the guns of Serbian dictator Slobodan Milosevic’s “special police.” And, there is the will of the Kosovars to have a human life, to govern themselves, to escape the degrading, stifling racism of Milosevic and his “Greater Serbia” nightmare. It is a racism that makes Kosova a sort of museum for the “superior Serb race,” where the “inferior Albanians” are barely tolerated after having been deprived in 1989, by Milosevic personally, of the autonomy they had had even under the regime of Yugoslavia’s Marshal Josip Broz Tito.

On the other side, there is the “Great Game” of those oligarchical groupings representing today’s version of the British Empire, that view Kosova as an experiment, to be used to implement their unreal and appalling new world order. Their goal is to reestablish a new division of the world after the end of the Cold War, a new global confrontation: Russia and China against the “West.”

As part of this scheme, a small oligarchical grouping is to control — through the old Roman imperial method of “divide and conquer” — the most important areas of the world. Above all, in the immediate term, this scheme is intended to prevent the creation of a coalition of the majority of the world’s nations, emphatically including the United States, into what Lyndon LaRouche has identified as the “Survivors’ Club” — a coalition of nations that could implement a New Bretton Woods global financial system and launch a period of unprecedented economic growth with ambitious projects such as the Eurasian Land-Bridge. This would be the end, historically, for those who dream of a new, world empire.

The Milosevic-Zhirinovsky axis

The slaughter in Kosova is being used, as has Milosevic’s bloody rampage throughout the territory of former Yugoslavia, to create an irreversible confrontation between Russia and China, and the United States. Serbia is formally an ally of Russia.

The advocates of “Greater Serbia” are closely interconnected to the most radical pan-Slavic, pan-Orthodox elements inside Russia. These factions’ belief structures have been manipulated in the past by the British Empire.

With the explosion of Kosova, the leadership of Russia was confronted with a terrible dilemma. On one side, Russia, prostrated economically by the devastation of the International Monetary Fund’s shock therapy, is desperate for every ally it can get. On the other side, the Milosevic gang (backed by its protectors in London, Paris, and Wall Street) is appealing to their “Russian brothers” to take sides against the United States, potentially the only ally with which, by uniting forces, Russia could have turned back the IMF onslaught.

In particular, Milosevic deployed the Deputy Prime Minister of rump Yugoslavia, the superchauvinist leader of the Serbian radical Party, Vojislav Seselj, to strengthen relations with the Russians. Seselj readily ganged up with deranged Russian fundamentalist and Member of Parliament Vladimir
Zhirinovsky, who has since become the Russian parliamentarian in charge of the Kosova question.

Zhirinovsky was even named as the Russian representative to the meeting of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) concerning Kosova. At a recent OSCE meeting in Copenhagen, Zhirinovsky stated that the ethnic Albanians of Kosova “do not exist.”

Seselj frantically plied every leadership grouping in Moscow for allies, from the State Duma (lower house of Parliament), to the Interior Ministry, to the Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church, Alexei II, with whom he had a meeting in Moscow. He has been pushing the idea that Serbia should join the Russia-Belarus political and military union, and that military collaboration between Russia and rump Yugoslavia should become a formal military alliance. A Duma delegation visited Belgrade just before the expiration of the NATO peace talks deadline, when military attacks on Serbia were expected to take place. Russian military advisers as well have been sent to Belgrade.

In parallel with the deployment of Seselj, every British asset in the United States seems to have been suddenly activated to create a casus belli between the United States and Russia. Exemplary was the delirious prose of Benjamin Netanyahu admirer, columnist Charles Krauthammer. “Why? Why in God’s name do we need Moscow’s permission to defend ourselves against a catastrophic threat from North Korea or Iran? Because of a piece of parchment (the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty) that is legally dead? Because the communist-dominated Duma, which opposes America foreign policy on everything from Iraq to Kosova, will be cross with us?” he raved in a recent column.

**U.S.-Russia relations**

Indeed, during the Kosova “peace talks” in Rambouillet, France, relations between Russia and the United States reached a dramatic moment, culminating in the unprecedented televised address of Russian President Boris Yeltsin on Feb. 18, the day before the first NATO ultimatum expired. “I conveyed to Clinton both by phone and by letter” that the bombing ultimatum against Belgrade “will not work,” Yeltsin said. “We will not let you touch Kosova.” There was no immediate reaction from Washington, but for a few media denials that the White House had acknowledged any message from Moscow.

Nobody in the West has a precise assessment of the factual situation in Moscow and the consequences of the war of nerves that escalates with each new bombing of Iraq. On Feb. 23, even the Washington Post commented on those day’s events. “The ferocity of Russia’s opposition to the use of force is causing some NATO members to question whether punitive airstrikes are worth jeopardizing the alliance’s fragile partnership with Moscow,” it said.

The ultimatum was postponed, and the spokesman for the White House National Security Council released some détente-style statements calling for a “credible threat of force” against Milosevic, but only as a footnote to a strong re-statement of the U.S.-Russia cooperation. Before the ultimatum expired, Italian Foreign Minister Lamberto Dini similarly stated that the deadline did not mean immediate military operations. The clash, for the moment, was defused.

**The military experiment**

The slaughter in Kosova is being used also to experiment with new military techniques and new military instruments devised after the collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989. What began to take shape during NATO’s search for a mission after the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, under the direction of the British military leadership, was the “new NATO.”

The Atlantic Alliance, a military organization whose formal raison d’être was the defense of the West from the Soviet Union, was dragged into a radical metamorphosis, ironically along the lines of the military, diplomatic, and economic global structure of what was the British colonial empire. While NATO assumed more and more “civilian” tasks, exemplified by the magic word, “peacekeeping,” it also abandoned its large military structures in favor of the creation of military corps that are highly mobile, quickly deployable, and highly sophisticated in armaments, communications, and intelligence.

Such corps are intended to intervene globally, anywhere in the world, at the first sign of a “crisis” that they are supposed to solve or, better, to “manage.” The showcase of the “new NATO” is the Allied Command Europe Rapid Reaction Corps (ARRC). In reality, the ARRC is the crown jewel of the British military. According to its original mandate, this 1,300-man general staff must be led by a three-star British general; its leadership and rank and file are dominated by British military officers. Currently, it is commanded by Lt. Gen. Sir Michael Jackson. Sir Michael has an intelligence background. In 1963, he was commissioned out of Sandhurst military academy into the Intelligence Corps, and he pursued a degree in Russian studies from 1964 to 1967, before being deployed to Northern Ireland.

**Target: the ‘non-status-quo’ states**

An official ARRC information sheet explains its existence: “After the disintegration of the Warsaw Pact and the end of the Cold War, NATO needed to reassess its role and place in the New World Order. At the Rome Summit in 1991, NATO’s new Strategic Concept was agreed. . . . The military emphasis moved away from the large in-place formations of the Cold War and instead focused on smaller, more flexible forces to be used in support of NATO crisis management strategy and to be ‘force packaged’ to suit.”

The February 1998 issue of the ARRC Journal insists on the new NATO philosophy that gave birth to the corps: “With
the end of the Cold War the East-West relationship moved from confrontation to cooperation. However, the challenges that we have to face are apparently as dangerous as the previous threat. The ingredients for security and stability are no longer purely military but include the economic, social, cultural and political elements vital for global security.

“Crisis that result from religious intolerance, floods of refugees, ethnic segregation or organized crime will need interlocking European security” (emphasis added).

A 1995 study by the RAND Corp., entitled “Out of Area or Out of Reach? European Military Support for Operations in Southwest Asia,” points to the ARRC as the most suitable for military operations there. “How suitable would the military forces of Europe be for a contingency operation in Southwest Asia in the next five to ten years? . . . Many European nations continue to conceive of their security in terms that focus on more immediate threats to their territory. Most envision out-of-area operations as involving modest crisis-response activities near their own frontiers, like the Balkans. . . . As a result only a small portion of each country’s military is organized” for such an operation.

The study describes a hypothetical country, but elsewhere talks explicitly about Iraq and “other anti-status-quo countries.” A very self-absorbed colonial mentality transpires from the study: “The Southwestern Asia envisioned is a very dangerous place. . . . Non-status-quo states can intimidate their moderate neighbors into passivity, denying a Western expedition regional support and the use of local facilities through political activity or threats of nuclear and biological reprisals.”

To make things more explicit, the RAND study incorporates the discredited “Clash of Civilizations” model: “Moreover, some of these potential adversaries can appeal to large sympathetic Islamic populations living in Europe, posing a threat of terrorism.”

Sir Michael is already in Macedonia

It is the ARRC that will be in charge of a Kosova transformed into a “NATO protectorate,” as the Feb. 3 London Times put it. In fact, despite the failure of the Kosova “peace talks” in Rambouillet, which were “frozen” on Feb. 23 after 17 days, the ARRC and General Jackson have already established their headquarters in Macedonia, which borders on Kosova. It is an astonishing development.

The NATO “peacekeeping” troops, i.e., the British ARRC, who were supposed to go to Kosova to police the province only following a formal request from the “two parties” (Kosovars and Serbs), were put in motion without any official or unofficial request. Meanwhile, the Kosova talks are not supposed to reconvene before March 15.

Two warships of the Royal Navy shipped out of Emden, Germany on Feb. 15, in the middle of the Rambouillet talks, loaded with tanks, armored vehicles, and artillery, headed for the port of Thessaloniki, Greece. They reached their destination in less than two weeks. The Rambouillet meeting ended with both sides refusing to sign any agreement, though the Kosovars asked for two weeks to discuss a possible agreement with their people. Milosevic and his men have been screaming, with both eyes turned toward Moscow, that they could not accept any foreign troops on their sovereign territory. The Kosovars are requesting the urgent presence of NATO troops, as the only way to defend themselves from the Yugoslav Army and the “special police.”

The Kosovars are insisting that the NATO troops be Americans, and are even requesting a formal commitment to that effect. But what they got, in Skopje, the Macedonia capital, was Gen. Sir Michael Jackson and his British ARRC. On March 3, Jackson officially announced in Skopje that he had set up there the provisional headquarters of the ARRC. Macedonia, itself believed to be on the verge of an ethnic explosion between the Albanian and Greek ethnic communities, has become the host of an unspecified number of NATO military forces (the large majority being British and French).

A conservative estimate suggests that Macedonia hosts the 1,100 men of the UN Preventive Deployment Force (Unpredep), stationed there during Milosevic’s aggression against Bosnia; the French-led “extraction force” sent there to rescue the OSCE unarmed observers in Kosova; and now, 3,000 British troops with the ARRC.

When asked what he will do if no agreement is reached, Jackson replied, “I am sure that the Contact Group [mediating the talks] and others will do everything they can to avoid that. . . . I cannot believe they will be willing to let the matter drift.” He stressed that his men should deploy in Kosova because “I am not sure that [Macedonia] can cope with very much more in terms of holding them [all the foreign troops amassed there]. So we will need to watch our timing very carefully . . . with a straight flow from the docks and airport into the deployment area.”

China’s veto

But a big blow to the military buildup in Macedonia came on Feb. 25, when China, as a permanent member of the UN Security Council, used its veto power to stop a resolution to renew the mandate of the UN peacekeeping forces in Macedonia. Russia abstained.

The Chinese veto—only the fourth time ever that China has used this power—on such a matter is considered by observers very indicative. Russia and China have been protesting the “new NATO strategy” that would deploy military operations all over the world without a mandate from the UN. This polemic has escalated in the wake of the bombing of Iraq, and NATO operations have become a quasi casus belli over Kosova.

The point, obviously, is not concern for the UN “rules,” but rather, the fact that once deprived of their veto power, Moscow and Beijing would be handed military faits accomplis.