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The present NATO operations targeting Transcaucasia and Central Asia for a potential nuclear war with Russia, are modelled upon the 1988 plans of the Thatcher government for what became the 1990-1991 luring of Iraq’s President Saddam Hussein into the incoming Bush Administration’s role in that NATO “out-of-area deployment” known as “Desert Storm.”

A working, high-level, British-directed group within NATO, the same package which created all of the Balkan crises of 1988-1999, has assigned a Turkey flanked by longstanding British relics of the Nineteenth-Century “Great Game” operations in Central Asia, to continue London’s NATO operations in the 1999 Balkan war into direct attacks on Russia in Transcaucasia and Central Asia. It is typical of Zbigniew Brzezinski’s earlier roles, that he and his extended family connections, including Secretary Madeleine Albright, should be playing key supporting roles for the British monarchy’s staging of the potential nuclear war over games currently played in Transcaucasia and Central Asia.

In an October 1988 TV broadcast, I first referenced the building threat of Balkan wars. I have been informed of the fact that the 1999 NATO Balkan war was launched by London, with aid of London’s asset Albright, with the intent of using that war as a stepping-stone to a nuclear showdown with Russia in Transcaucasia and Central Asia. The NATO assumption has been, that a weakened Russia must back down to such a show of force directed against it by NATO-coordinated military forces. The agencies behind this calculated nuclear strategic bluff have certain inside information which assures them that they will have assistance from inside Russia in bringing about the strategic capitulation leading to the total fragmentation of Russia as it exists now. Theirs is an hysterical folly, which could possibly have no result but nuclear war with Russia.

For the purposes of such a potential nuclear war, the British monarchy and its assets within NATO, have relied chiefly upon Turkey as the key strategic player against Russia in both the Transcaucaus and Central Asia. However, the British monarchy has reactivated all of its Transcaucasia and Central Asia ethnic and religious-factional assets from the days of Al-Afghani, back in the Nineteenth Century. The Arab factions thus used by the British monarchy are merely auxiliary to the principal military responsibility for the targeted pan-Turkic region. It is NATO member Turkey’s projected deployment of ground forces into the region, which is the on-the-ground NATO capability assigned to occupy the oil-bearing region centered around the Caspian Sea. It is the British monarchy’s putting Turkey in the line of fire, in this way, which shows how foolish the relevant NATO planners have been in relying over-much on pinpointed British assets within Russia’s ruling structures.
To understand the complexities of this situation, one must go back to no later than the strategic conflict between me and Vice-President George Bush, during the interval 1986-1988, especially during the period of October-November 1988, when I issued my televised address on the prospects for the impending reunification of Germany.

In reading Scott Thompson’s report, that follows, these background considerations must be borne in mind.

An oily family: the Brzezinskis and the ‘Great Game’ in Transcaucasia

by Scott Thompson

In his book The Grand Chessboard, and in recent pieces in Foreign Affairs, former Carter National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski has transformed geography into a religion known as “geopolitics.” He has been propounding the same geopolitical doctrine as that of Britain’s Halford Mackinder and Germany’s Karl Haushofer, which was the figleaves for British orchestration of World Wars I and II to halt Eurasian economic integration. In his book and in his business dealings, Brzezinski is promoting the idea that there is a “zone of instability” that encompasses the Transcaucasia and Central Asia—in which his Hobbesian approach toward manipulating tribal and ethnic instabilities dating back to Lord Palmerton and the Oxford University-educated founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, Al-Afghani, might be the trigger for World War III.

Brzezinski has resurrected the “Great Game,” which pitted, notably, Britain, Russia, and the declining Ottoman Empire in continual warfare against one another for control of this region. At the same time, Brzezinski and family have joined with Anglo-American oil interests for a Cecil Rhodes-style grab of the significant raw materials, including oil, natural gas, and gold, that the region offers. One of the central themes of Brzezinski’s geopolitics is to deny any influence whatsoever over this former region of the Soviet Union to newly emergent Russia—no matter what the consequences are militarily.

For a more comprehensive treatment of the geopolitical lunacy of the Brzezinski doctrine outside the region of Transcausia and Central Asia, see Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., “Mad Brzezinski’s Chessboard,” EIR, April 2, 1999, and an article by this author, “A Lexicon of ‘Brzezinskisms’: Brzezinski Testifies Against Himself,” EIR, April 9, 1999.

Both articles make clear that Brzezinski, who was known to some in the Carter administration as “Woody the Woodpecker,” followed that school of British geopolitics identified with King Edward VII’s soulmate, Halford Mackinder, which was designed to block the integration of the Eurasian landmass into an engine of scientific and technological development. In The Grand Chessboard, Brzezinski praises the geopolitics of Karl Haushofer, the Anglophile Thule Society mystic who personally conducted his idea of “Drang nach Osten” (“Drive to the East”) into Adolf Hitler’s Mein Kampf, where it was intended to pit Hitler’s Germany as a marcher lord against the Soviet Union, in a drive for what Hitler called “Lebensraum” (“living space”). Once again, the geopolitical goal was to halt the unified development of the Eurasian landmass.

In The Grand Chessboard, Brzezinski addresses, from the same geopolitical standpoint as that which underlay World Wars I and II, how to keep Russia from re-exerting hegemony over the Transcaucasia and Central Asia, while keeping the region destabilized and grabbing its raw materials.

‘The Eurasian Balkans’

In The Grand Chessboard, Brzezinski writes: “Russia’s loss of its dominant position on the Baltic Sea was replicated on the Black Sea not only because of Ukraine’s independence, but also because the newly independent Caucasian states—Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan—enhanced the opportunities for Turkey to reestablish its once-lost influence in the region. . . . The emergence of the independent Central Asian states meant that in some places Russia’s southeastern frontier had been pushed back northward more than one thousand miles. The new states now controlled vast mineral and energy deposits that were bound to attract foreign interests. . . . Supported from the outside by Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia, the Central Asian states have not been inclined to trade their new political sovereignty even for the sake of beneficial economic integration with Russia, as many Russians continued to hope they would. . . . For the Russians, the specter of a potential conflict with the Islamic states along Russia’s entire southern flank (which, adding in Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan, account for more than 300 million people) has to be a source of serious concern.”

According to Brzezinski, the Transcaucasia and Central Asia are, for Russia, the equivalent of the Balkan tinderbox for