

Britain's Blair Demands A Thirty Years War

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Feb. 3—Former British Prime Minister Tony Blair gave an interview to BBC today, in which he called for a “generation of war” against al-Qaeda and other jihadist groups all over the globe. Blair compared the global war on terrorism to the 45-year Cold War between the West and the Soviet Union, and heaped praise on French President François Hollande for deploying French troops to Mali to beat back a jihadist insurgency that was purportedly threatening to take over the country’s capital Bamaka. His statement directly reflected the British Empire’s policy of “permanent war”—which, under current circumstances, is leading to thermonuclear confrontation with Russia and China, in an attempt to crush their sovereign independence.

Blair neglected to mention that both Britain and the United States have been fueling this permanent war, by allying with al-Qaeda and other Anglo/Saudi-backed jihadists in the overthrow of Qaddafi in Libya and in the ongoing effort to overthrow the Assad government in Syria. The former prime minister is the author of the doctrine of the “post-Westphalian” permanent global war doctrine, and has been a key controller of President Obama on behalf of the British Crown.

It is no coincidence that the escalation towards general war comes at a moment when the trans-Atlantic financial system is reaching a hyperinflationary breaking point. A decrepit financial empire is seeking to hold on to power, by spreading chaos and war among its potential challengers. (See *Economics* for our coverage of the exposure of massive derivatives losses at Italy’s Monte dei

Paschi of Siena bank and the German Deutsche Bank.)

Blair’s psychotic rantings resonated at the annual Munich Security Conference (Feb. 1-3). NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen delivered a Blair-esque speech in which he declared that NATO would deploy wherever Alliance interests were threatened. He declared that he looked around the globe and saw an “arc of crises stretching from the Sahel to Central Asia,” and vowed that NATO’s future mission, following the withdrawal from Afghanistan, would be global in scope, would deploy special operations forces, rapid reaction forces, and missile defense capabilities to secure NATO dominance.

In fact, as our story in this section on Australia and the “Asia pivot” documents, the NATO threat to crush national sovereignty and enforce a global financial dictatorship, extends to the Pacific Basin as well.

All told, the Munich Conference involved a gang-up against Russia and China, highlighted by a late night panel on Feb. 1 (see below), where an asset of multibillionaire British agent George Soros, Kenneth Roth of Human Rights Watch, held the Russian government accountable for the 60,000 deaths in Syria’s civil war based on Moscow’s support for the Assad government. The next morning, in a panel on the European security environment, Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov skewered the permanent war gang by asserting that the only legitimate military actions were those approved by the UN Security Council, and that the West was *supporting* terrorist networks in Libya and Syria, the very forces that have been carrying out a terror war against



EU Photo



Munich Security Conference

The imperial marching orders for permanent war issued by Britain's Tony Blair (left) are being implemented on the ground by, among others, Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak (above), shown here at the Munich Security Conference on Feb. 3.

the West and other regions (see below).

The conflict was out in the open, and the danger of rapid escalation is imminent.

Israel's Attack on Syria

As the Munich Conference was about to take place, Israel was engaging in an illegal military action inside Syrian territory, an action that Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak endorsed. On Jan. 29, Israeli fighter jets invaded Syrian air space to bomb at least two targets—a military research facility outside Damascus and a truck caravan that Israel claimed was carrying advanced Scud missiles to Hezbollah in Lebanon.

No evidence has been presented to verify the Israeli claim of Hezbollah rocket smuggling. Under any circumstances, the Israeli action was a flagrant violation of international law, aimed at escalating the two-year destabilization of Syria by NATO, Saudi Arabia, and Qatar. What is far worse, the Israeli bombings were the first direct military actions by an outside power against Syria since the start of the destabilization. Israel has threatened to carry out further attacks.

It has been confirmed that there are Russian advisors at Syria's advanced air defense sites, and if Syria attempts to shoot down incoming Israeli fighter planes the next time they attack, the situation could quickly escalate. NATO has already deployed Patriot missile batteries along the southern Turkish border with Syria.

Clearly, the Israeli attack means that the situation in

Syria indeed a hair trigger for general war, potentially drawing in NATO, Russia and even China. The immediacy of the threat of general war may have prompted the designated leader of the Syrian opposition, Sheikh Moaz al-Khatib, to offer for the first time to directly negotiate with the Assad government. At Munich, Iranian Foreign Minister Ali Akbar Salehi met with al-Khatib (see below).

But U.S. Vice President Joe Biden and UN Special Envoy to Syria Lakhdar Brahimi insisted

that the precondition for any arrangement to end the fighting in Syria, was that President Bashar al-Assad step down. This is not going to happen.

And Now Iran, Africa...?

As the conference was winding down, Iran and the UN Permanent 5 countries plus Germany announced that there would be a meeting to discuss Iran's nuclear program in Kazakhstan on Feb. 25. Outgoing U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta also told NBC-TV that Iran has still not made a decision to build a nuclear bomb, echoing Vice President Biden's remarks in Munich that there is still "time and space" to negotiate a deal with Iran to avert military confrontation.

However, Israel's Barak shocked the Munich audience with a rant against Iran, in which he essentially declared that the time for talks has run out, that war is on, and no further attention would be paid to any critics.

The African continent is simultaneously set to explode. The French military intervention into Mali, fully backed by the Cameron government in Britain, is no quick in-and-out operation. Full-blown destabilization is spreading from Libya to Mali and throughout North Africa. Algeria, one of the few Maghreb countries to explicitly oppose the London-Paris-Washington overthrow of Qaddafi, is a prime target for Western-backed regime change, according to senior African diplomats. It is here in North Africa that Tony Blair's generational war is already underway.

Russia's Lavrov Denounces NATO Interventionism

Here are excerpts from the speech by Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov at the Munich Security Conference on Feb. 2.

...It is impossible not to notice the symbolism of the date of this meeting. Seventy years ago, one of the most frightful, bloody, and fateful battles of the Second World War ended: the Battle of Stalingrad. Hundreds of thousands of my compatriots gave their lives for the victory on the banks of the Volga, not only in defense of their homeland; they also fought for the sake of world peace, as did all of our Allies.

To prevent a recurrence of the tragedy of world war, efforts were also focused on diplomacy, which resulted in the creation of the United Nations. However soon afterward, the "Cold War" drew a dividing line across Europe, postponing for a long time the possibility of building a system of collective security, as embodied in the UN Charter. . . .

We must recognize that not in words, but in deeds, we are still very far from a truly collective Euro-Atlantic architecture, which would rest on a solid foundation of international law. There is still a desire for relations in Europe to be built around political-military issues—not on the principles of the OSCE [Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe] and the NRC [NATO-Russian Council], but by promoting a NATO-centric security concept, as though there were no alternatives.

We believe that such a narrow bloc approach does not help, and it is difficult for us to understand it based on objective and rational considerations; it is unlikely to provide an orientation for policies in today's global world, where we face common threats. It is time to look comprehensively and thoroughly at the full range of relations in the Euro-Atlantic area and try to identify the convergence of ideas and remaining differences between us, including with respect to conflicts in other parts of the world that affect the security of us all.

If we look at the regions that are the most unstable

today—the Middle East, North Africa, the Sahel—it is hard to avoid the sense of some kind of curvature of space. Many questions arise about the approaches of some of our partners with regard to the "Arab Spring." Does support for acts of regime change justify terrorist methods? Does it make sense to fight those in one conflict that you are supporting in another? If you illegally supply weapons to a conflict zone, how do you insure yourself against those weapons being turned against you? Which rulers are legitimate, and which are not? When is it permissible to work with authoritarian regimes (whether secular or not very), and when is it permitted to support their violent overthrow? Under what conditions is it necessary to recognize forces that have come to power in a democratic election, and in what conditions should contact with them be rejected? What criteria and standards determine all of this? . . .

We hope that by 2015, when we mark the anniversary [of the Helsinki+40 process], we will have succeeded in developing a common agenda that does not reflect mutual recriminations, but the determination of all of us to concentrate on reaching our common strategic objectives, based on the principle of indivisibility of security.

The issue of BMD has become an important test of the match between real deeds and solemn declarations of commitment to this key principle. We are all at risk of losing yet another real opportunity to build a unified Euro-Atlantic space. Russia proposes a simple and constructive approach: to work out strict guarantees that the U.S. global BMD system is not directed against any member country of the OSCE, and clear military and technical criteria for evaluating compliance with the stated objectives of the BMD system: the neutralization of missile threats coming from outside the Euro-Atlantic region. . . .

It is also important to clarify the definition of NATO's mission in the new circumstances, not to interfere in this process, but so that we can understand it. Progress towards a genuine partnership between Russia and NATO is still hampered by attempts to exploit the idea of the Soviet threat, which has now been converted to the idea of a Russian threat. Phobias are very tenacious, and we see how the process of military planning incorporates this thesis. Even with the deficit in financial resources, there is increasing military activity in northern and central Europe, as if these regions face growing security threats. . . .