

Editorial

Not just a magazine

Since the end-phase of the collapse of the communist system in Europe in 1989-91, the world has been traversing an ever-faster spiral into World War III. By now, ten years later, the series of Iraq wars, Balkan wars, African wars, armed conflicts in the Subcontinent of Asia and in Central Asia, and Caucasus wars, among others—all still simmering, none ever resolved—are now converging to make World War III inevitable, at some point down the road.

The cause is not the fall of the Berlin Wall; rather, it is that precisely those processes which earlier led to the collapse of the Comecon bloc, are now bringing the whole post-1971 world financial system to immediate implosion and disintegration. Knowing this, City of London financiers, the British monarchy, and their allies and stooges on Wall Street and elsewhere, are triggering wars and conflicts, for the same general reason that they did so during the Great Depression of the 1930s: to prevent leading nations-states from joining together with the United States, for economic development. Such joining together into a “community of principle,” as John Quincy Adams and Lyndon LaRouche have termed it, would end the British oligarchical system forever. Rather than permit that, London is trying to fragment and destroy those nation-states, especially the U.S.A.

Although educated Africans, Asians, and Europeans are intensely concerned about these questions of war and war danger, Americans who are not *EIR* readers, with few exceptions, place more importance on their own next source of personal entertainment,

But those who *are* looking at these more important matters, ask how they should understand the phase-shift in the British destabilization of the North Caucasus and Central Asia, from the initial reports of insurgency in Dagestan, in late July to early August, which many leading Russians then blamed on (British assets) NATO, Kissinger, and Brzezinski, to the present situation of an apparent alliance of Russia and the NATO countries against “Islamic terrorism.”

From the beginning, this was the British “Great Game” (see *EIR*, Sept. 10, 1999), directed primarily, not just to breaking up Russia, but to breaking up the

Russia-China-India potential, and more especially the U.S. potential. This round of attempted breakup began straightforwardly with so-called “Islamic” mercenaries in Dagestan. More important than the subsequent shift of the scene of battle into Chechnya, were the simultaneous British “Islamist” destabilizations throughout Central Asia, including in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan.

What happened between July-August and today? It was that the British were forced to realize that LaRouche’s effective intervention in exposing the nature of the operation, found receptivity not only in Russia, but in the United States, India, and China as well. LaRouche created widespread recognition of the real nature of this operation. How did he do it? Much of this is known to readers of *EIR*, but other, less public channels had equal or greater effect.

The British were forced to realize that their first option now entailed a potential problem, with the possibility of a general counter-reaction. Reacting in anticipation of the impact of LaRouche’s exposure of their first option, the British counted on Washington’s hesitancy to take the problem on directly, as a British problem, and they regrouped around the idea of co-opting the Russians, via Washington, into a supposed united front against terrorist Osama bin Laden—this for the same, identical British strategic aim.

But, in being forced to adapt to LaRouche’s impact, the British have at the same time triggered processes which we are determined to intensify, which can disrupt this operation, using potentials in post-coup Pakistan, India, China (don’t be fooled by Jiang Zemin’s London visit: He has not sold out to the British), and potential effects in the United States.

Few readers understand the immediacy of our intervention: that we’re not just an abstract force in theory, with better policies, but we are seizing on opportunities which would not have existed but for LaRouche, and which depend, in turn, on his ability to come up with new flanking moves.

In fact, the question in the Caucasus and related areas is not so much a question of global political intelligence; it is first of all a question of pushing ahead with the LaRouche “Bretton Woods” Presidential campaign.