

Brazil participated. Speakers included Bolivia's Minister of Transportation and Communication, the Governor of Mato Grosso, and people from the CAF, Brazil's National Economic Development Bank (BNDES), and the Latin American Association for Integration.

According to Serafim Carvalho, the man who conceptualized the conference, the approach adopted by businessmen and associations of South America's midwest, is to focus on the completion and improvement of already existing inter-regional axes, because these require less investment and are more easily accomplished. The resulting expansion of trade would then drive forward undertakings of greater scope in the future, involving the entire continental area lying between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

With this idea, the FIENTM developed a project on the logistics of regional transport for the area encompassing the six Brazilian states of Mato Grosso, Mato Grosso do Sul, Goiás, Tocantins, Acre, and Rondonia, Brazil's Federal District, all of Bolivia, the south of Peru, the north of Chile, all of Paraguay, and the north and northeast of Argentina. The study was presented to the Governor of Mato Grosso, Dante de Oliveira, at the closing of the conference.

This author spoke at the Sixth Conference on "Transport Infrastructure and Environmentalism," and demonstrated that the campaigns against the waterway and highway projects of South America run by Prince Philip's World Wildlife Fund and its satellite NGOs (non-governmental organizations), follow a geopolitical agenda designed in London with the aim, precisely, of impeding the physical integration of the South American countries. Such environmental campaigns are nothing more than a modern version of the old British geopolitics toward the La Plata River region, which led to the Triple Alliance War against Paraguay (1865-70) and the War of the Pacific against Peru and Bolivia (1879-81). Thus, it is no surprise that, still today, our countries each fend for themselves along their coasts.

Enrique García, CAF executive president, identified the damage inflicted by these NGOs against the infrastructure projects, in his speech to the Presidents gathered at the South American summit. García pointed out that "the growing influence of the NGOs on decision-making on infrastructure . . . in practice, means a slower process in obtaining" international financing, compounding the already great difficulties resulting from the global financial crisis.

To reach us on the Web:
www.larouche.com

Brzezinski Again Lights the Geopolitical Fuse for War

by Scott Thompson

On Aug. 29, during the annual assembly in Paris of French Ambassadors from around the world, French Foreign Affairs Minister Hubert Védrine made his harshest attack yet on the policies of the Anglo-American oligarchy. In particular, as the accompanying article highlights, he singled out the "neo-unilateralism" epitomized by former Carter National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski's article "Living With a New Europe," in the Summer 2000 issue of a neo-conservative journal named *The National Interest* (TNI).

This was the second in a recent series of articles in *TNI* by the influential and dangerous geopolitician Brzezinski, covering the major regions of Eurasia. The other two were "Living with China" (Spring 2000) and "Living with Russia" (Fall 2000).

Taken together, these are both an update and plan of implementation of Brzezinski's 1997 book, *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy And Its Geostrategic Imperatives*. As *EIR* has reported, the gist of that book was that, in Brzezinski's words, with "the defeat and collapse of the Soviet Union" at the conclusion of what was in reality the British-orchestrated Cold War, "the United States [has emerged] as the sole and, indeed, the first truly global power."

Within this diatribe, Brzezinski claimed that "the chief prize" for the winner of the Cold War, the United States, is Eurasia. He boasted that the United States has now formed an empire that is on a scale greater than either *Pax Romana* or *Pax Britannica*. In addition, Brzezinski displayed his lust for a Cecil Rhodes-style grab for the oil, natural gas, and other riches of Transcaucasia and Central Asia after they split off from the former Soviet Union.

In his book, he praised the British geopolitician Halford Mackinder and his German counterpart Karl Haushofer, despite the fact that these two individuals helped to provide the figleaf for the Anglo-American oligarchy's manipulations that launched both World War I and World War II. Both in *The Grand Chessboard* and in his three recent articles, Brzezinski appears to be following in the footsteps of these Anglo-American oligarchical lackeys, to advocate policies that would light the fuse for World War III. He states that he "who controls Eurasia controls the world," so the United States must make it the hallmark of its national security policy to

“prevent the emergence of a dominant and antagonistic Eurasian power.”

Especially in his three *TNI* pieces, Brzezinski spells out the policies to keep Europe, Russia, and China—or, any combination thereof—from challenging U.S. hegemony over Eurasia, which he believes will last “for at least a generation.” Brzezinski, who is today probably more widely read by the Eurasian elite than by the American population, puts forward policies that will only deepen the hatred and disgust expressed toward the United States by the nations of Eurasia. His writings thereby foster the climate that statesman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. described in his October 1999 videotape “Storm Over Asia,” where he forecast that unless the United States comes to its senses (and quickly), the world will stumble into World War III through miscalculation.

‘Europe: A U.S. Protectorate’

In the Summer 2000 issue of *TNI*, Brzezinski speaks of the “New Europe” as if it were nearly a colony of the United States: “The transatlantic alliance is America’s most important global relationship. It is the springboard for U.S. global involvement, enabling America to play the decisive role of arbiter in Eurasia—the world’s central arena of power.” Bad as this characterization may seem, Brzezinski continues: “Currently, Europe—despite its economic strength, significant economic and financial integration, and the enduring authenticity of the transatlantic friendship—is a *de facto* military protectorate of the United States.”

He continues: “It is not only the fact that the alliance between America and Europe is unequal, but it is also true that the existing asymmetry in power between the two is likely to widen even further in America’s favor. . . . As a result, the United States is likely to remain the only truly global power for at least another generation. And that in turn means that America in all likelihood will also remain the dominant partner in the transatlantic alliance for the first quarter of the twenty-first century.”

Speaking further of this lunatic claim, Brzezinski describes Europe as a virtual marcher-lord satrap, when he notes in the same article: “U.S. policymakers should keep in mind a simple injunction when shaping American policy toward Europe: Do not make the ideal the enemy of the good. The ideal from Washington’s point of view would be a politically united Europe that is a dedicated member of NATO . . . committing [increased military] funds almost entirely to the upgrading of NATO’s capabilities; willing to have NATO act ‘out of area’ in order to reduce America’s global burdens; and remaining compliant to American geopolitical preferences regarding adjacent regions, especially Russia and the Middle East; and, accommodating on such matters as international trade and finance. The good is a Europe that is more of a rival economically . . . while lagging in real political-military independence, that recognizes its self-interest in keeping America deployed on the European periphery of Eurasia,

even while it chafes at its relative dependence and half-heartedly seeks gradual emancipation” (emphasis added).

Brzezinski further warns that unless Washington manages this situation with geopolitical finesse, then there is “the potential to drive the Germans and the British into the arms of the French” against the U.S. role as post-Cold War hegemon. But, after describing the 60,000-man Eurocorps that is being built as “made less out of steel and concrete and more out of *papier-mâché*,” Brzezinski gloats that “Europe will continue to need America to be secure.”

He again peddles NATO expansion, which in *The Grand Chessboard* he had suggested would be appropriate to contain both Russia and Germany.

In this essay, Brzezinski puts it more diplomatically as follows: “In the meantime, a basic strategic priority of the United States should be continued expansion of NATO. NATO enlargement offers the best possible guarantee of continued transatlantic security ties. It serves to create a more secure Europe, with fewer areas of geopolitical ambiguity, while increasing the European stake in a vital and credible alliance.” Brzezinski names several potential candidates for NATO membership including many parts of Central Europe, the Baltics, and so forth—despite Russia’s understandable insistence that this is a most dangerous strategic shift.

Russia’s relationship with Europe, discussed in his essay “Living with Russia,” must take the following form: “The policy of effective engagement should be deliberately designed to make that choice Russia’s only choice.”

Addressing this also in “Living with a New Europe,” Brzezinski states: “An expanded EU overlapping with NATO can encourage Russia’s positive evolution by dampening old imperial temptations. Russia may then recognize its own interest in accommodating and becoming associated with NATO. If it does not, then a larger NATO will provide the needed security for Europe.”

Essentially, by these means, Brzezinski is prepared to dictate terms to Russia on how it must either become a junior partner affiliated with NATO, or else face military containment on parts of its northern, eastern, and southern *glacis*. The Russians have been adamant in their rejection of this “containment” design from the United States and the Britain of manic war-monger Tony Blair.

‘Russia Like the Ottoman Empire’

In “Living with Russia,” Brzezinski writes that Russia today is still collapsing in a fashion similar to “the collapse of the Ottoman empire.” Arguing that Russia’s “epiphany must come from within,” he claims that it may take a generation to get rid of all the “*apparatchiks*,” such as President Vladimir Putin.

Moreover, recalling his Carter Administration policy of promoting an Islamic fundamentalist “Arc of Crisis” around what was then the Soviet Union, Brzezinski writes that “to the south [of Russia] prospects are, if anything, even more

ominous.” Pointing toward the nine states in that region populated almost exclusively by Muslims, he notes, “Unless handled with great skill and genuine moderation by their formerly imperial neighbor, their political awakening could acquire a fervent anti-Russian cast, of which the Russian mishandling of Chechnya might be only a harbinger.” Given the Anglo-American oligarchical efforts to re-play Britain’s imperial “Great Game” and keep Russia out of this region, it should be no surprise that in *The Grand Chessboard*, Brzezinski described this vital region as “The Eurasian Balkans.”

Nowhere does Brzezinski mention his own role as a highly paid consultant to BP-Amoco, in the effort to grab the gold, oil, and other raw materials riches of this region. But, in “Living With Russia,” he does perpetrate the “Big Lie” (given the emergence of the “Shanghai Forum” as a nascent alliance of Russia with Central Asia), that “the Kremlin’s attitude in this regard is still based on the old Leninist zero-sum approach: It is better for the non-Russian areas not to develop economically if such development entails a Western presence. That is why direct access of the newly independent states to the global economy through multiple pipelines from the Caspian Sea region is viewed by the current Russian elite with almost as much hostility as that shown toward Ukraine’s flirtation with NATO.”

In fact, Brzezinski goes on to express some panic that the Russians may be winning the “Great Game” in this region.

‘Living with China’

Perhaps the most important feature of Brzezinski’s “Living with China” article, is that he says that the “one China” policy agreed to by President Clinton and every American President in the postwar period, ought to be changed to “one country, many systems.” This, he argues, would permit both Taiwan and Tibet a far greater degree of autonomy than is even tolerated in Hong Kong, which was stolen from the Chinese by the British during the 19th-Century Opium Wars.

He threatens that if China does not seek peaceable means for reunification after several hundred years of colonialism by the Anglo-American oligarchy, then “U.S. national interest would be engaged.”

“It follows that Taiwan will, and should, continue to have prudently measured access to the necessary U.S. military wherewithal for self-defense,” Brzezinski writes.

And, he argues, “Direct talks with the Dalai Lama [by Beijing] would represent a significant step in the right direction, and continued U.S. support for the Tibetan people is thus in order.” Although Brzezinski is clear that Washington must support Taiwan militarily, he is vaguer on how the U.S. might intervene further into Tibet.

Put Brzezinski in a Straitjacket!

British asset Brzezinski was trained at Harvard in British geopolitics by the same racist Nashville Agrarian, William Yandell Elliott, who trained Sir Henry Kissinger. Elliott had

been an explicit spokesman for Cecil Rhodes’s “English Speaking Commonwealth,” as laid out in Rhodes’s infamous Last Will and Testament.

In 1972-73, Brzezinski had been a co-founder with David Rockefeller of the Trilateral Commission. By the time of the 1975 Trilateral Commission meeting in Kyoto, Japan, which constructed the framework for making peanut farmer Jimmy Carter their puppet President, Brzezinski was executive director of the Commission. (It was also at the Kyoto meeting that Brzezinski’s protégé, Samuel P. Huntington, took a leading role in presenting the main report, entitled *The Crisis of Democracy* (New York: New York University Press, 1975), which espoused a policy some called “Facism with a Human Face”). Brzezinski went on to become President Carter’s National Security Adviser, holding that position throughout the Carter Administration.

Brzezinski has long been considered “looney tunes” by many, and his nickname amongst some Washington *cognoscenti* is “Woody the Woodpecker.” Nevertheless, British lackey that he is, he is also the chief mentor and consultant to Secretary of State Madeleine “Madmeddling” Albright.

TNI: A Neo-Con Project

One glance at the advisory board of the neo-conservative *TNI* demonstrates the *gravitas* of Brzezinski’s pieces in it: Its chairman is British-Canadian media mogul Conrad Black, who has called for the Super-NAFTA joining of the United States with Great Britain. Other advisory board members include: Samuel P. Huntington; Francis Fukuyama, Huntington’s sidekick on the editorial board of the National Endowment for Democracy’s *Democracy Quarterly* (it was Fukuyama who proclaimed “the end of history” after the cessation of the Cold War); Sir Henry Kissinger, who confessed his British agency in an infamous 1982 speech before the Royal Institute for International Affairs (RIIA-Chatham House); American Enterprise Institute senior fellow Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, who recently emerged as a leading member of the Lebanese Study Group, which proposed a “Gulf War-style” engagement with Syria to get it out of Lebanon — a plan which would totally sabotage any hope for Middle East peace; and, former Bush Administration Undersecretary of Defense for Policy Paul D. Wolfowitz, who is a leading foreign policy adviser to GOP Presidential candidate George W. Bush, and has repeatedly called for a new Persian Gulf War to finish off Saddam Hussein.

With such lackeys of the Anglo-American oligarchy on its advisory board, it is no wonder that France’s Védérine made a special point of citing Brzezinski’s latest threats in *The National Interest*. If either Vice President Al Gore, Jr. or Texas Gov. George W. Bush enter the White House, it is likely that either one of this two-headed freak show will implement many of the policies for which Brzezinski is the spokesman, which have lit the fuse for World War III. That prospect has the leaders of most of the world’s nations very worried indeed.