

allowing its powers to intervene militarily outside its western European area, and potentially anywhere in the world. NATO's bombing campaigns, first in Iraq and then in Yugoslavia, were moving toward Russia.

- At the same NATO meeting, British spokesmen in particular called for NATO to expand rapidly to include all, or nearly all, of the countries once part of the Warsaw Pact and even the old Soviet Union.

- On May 7, the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade was bombed "unintentionally" by NATO warplanes—in what may turn out to be a precise pre-figuring of an "unintentional" sinking of the premier Russian attack submarine *Kursk* by collision with a NATO submarine.

- In mid-May, the bombing of Yugoslavia contributed to the sacking of Russian Prime Minister Yevgeni Primakov and his government, after Primakov, en route to the United States on March 23, was insulted by Vice-President Al Gore and told to turn his plane around. The firing of Primakov was headlined "A Step Toward World War III" by *EIR* (May 21, 1999).

- In May and June, NATO countries' naval forces stopped and/or seized three different Russian oil tankers,

charging them with breaking the ten-year, genocidal blockade of Iraq.

- In June, the first indications came, in statements by senior Russian military officers, that the Russian military and the government of Putin were reacting to the NATO war-shift, by moving toward a shift in Russia's military doctrine, to allow for the possibility of a nuclear "first strike."

- In July 1999, began the fighting between Islamic guerrilla forces and Russian police and Army forces, in Dagestan, then in Chechnya (and during this year, near the Russian border with Uzbekistan). It is clear that the Russian Armed Forces and government considered the "Chechen War" to be instigated and supported by British assets and special forces within NATO. The war-fighting pressure was now at the borders of Russia.

- In August, the Russian Armed Forces officially adopted a new strategic doctrine, a so-called "first strike" shift in doctrine which allowed that Russia could *initiate* the use of tactical or strategic nuclear weapons, under conditions where the sovereignty or territorial integrity of Russia were threatened.

On Aug. 11, 1999, Lyndon LaRouche issued his urgent strategic warning, "Is World War III Coming?"

Is World War III Coming?

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The following statement appeared in the Aug. 20, 1999 issue of EIR.

August 11, 1999

Among those who are paying attention to reality, one of the two big questions of the day is, "Is Nuclear World War III Now Inevitable?" My answer is, that I believe it is not inevitable; but, the danger is serious enough that serious people will ask themselves that question.

The drive toward a nuclear world war comes from the British monarchy, as the policies of the current Prime Minister and 1931 Ramsay MacDonald look-alike Tony Blair typify this impulse. However, although the British monarchy is by far the world's dominant financial power, and also the world's presently leading political power, the thrust for war depends upon that monarchy's ability to push the world's leading military power, the U.S.A., into adopting London's current geopolitical adventurism.

It is from this standpoint, that we must understand the significance of madman Zbigniew Brzezinski's current policies, which are more or less identical to those of Brzezinski crony and U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. For maniacs such as Blair, Brzezinski, and Albright, the orchestration of the recent war against Yugoslavia was only the

prelude to a nuclear confrontation with Russia, in Transcaucasia and Central Asia more widely. Blair, Brzezinski, Albright et al., are depending upon their belief that this drive toward a nuclear confrontation with Russia is a strategic bluff, to which they are confident that Russia will back down. London's attempt to orchestrate a nuclear attack on India, by London-controlled assets in the Pakistan military, is part of the same post-Balkan-War thrust. There, in brief, lies the risk of an actual nuclear World War III.

What these nuclear maniacs, such as Blair, Brzezinski, and Albright, assume, is that Russia could not win such a war. They have asked themselves the wrong question. Perhaps Russia has no hope of winning such a war; but, perhaps the U.S.A. has no hope of winning it, either. Even if the U.S.A. might appear to secure a victory in such a showdown, just as the famous King Pyrrhus defeated the Romans in one battle, perhaps the U.S.A. would not long outlive the end of such a military confrontation.

Go back to 1905, where we may find a comparable case. Recall the discussions between the two cousins, Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany and Czar Nicholas of Russia, discussing the need to spoil their uncle's, King Edward VII's, clear intent to push them into war against one another. When the two cousins failed to prevent the British from manipulating them



Maniacs (left to right) Zbigniew Brzezinski, Tony Blair, and Madeleine Albright orchestrated the 1999 war against Yugoslavia, as the prelude to a nuclear confrontation with Russia.

into war against one another, the result was that both lost the war, and the Czar lost more than that.

The British monarchy's use of its assets in Turkey, to orchestrate a post-Balkans spread of warfare throughout Transcaucasia, and into Central Asia beyond that, has already erupted into open warfare in the north Caucasus, and threatens to pull fools in NATO into military deployments against Russia, in both Transcaucasia and in Central Asia. This would constitute a threat to the very continued existence of a Russia which is still a thermonuclear power. Russia's warfare capability would then go on alert status.

When one presents a chosen adversary with an absolutely hopeless situation, that adversary may find itself impelled to strike back in absolute desperation. As every qualified military professional since Machiavelli knows, what NATO is implicitly threatening to do, creates precisely the kind of military situation, in which the unthinkable may become the inevitable. When the fires of hatred are stoked to the highest possible degree in the passions of the intended military victim, all ordinary strategic and diplomatic calculations, especially the calculations of madly desperate fools such as Blair, Brzezinski, and Albright, are no longer controlling. There lies the short-term risk of an actual, early outbreak of nuclear war-fighting.

Now, look at another crucial element of the same strategic equation: the current world economic situation.

It is an open, repeatedly verified fact, that, since 1989, the U.S.A. and NATO as a whole, have lost the ability to conduct

regular warfare. The chief reason is economic. As in "Desert Storm," and as is shown in the resumed war on Iraq, and the recent war against Yugoslavia, NATO is not capable of fighting war to win with military force on the ground. The very adoption of the lunacy of "Air-Land Battle 2000" by the U.S.A. attests less to what the U.S. military forces can do, than what they have lost the capability of doing.

In the war against Yugoslavia, NATO did not fight war; indeed, both NATO and the President of the U.S.A. insisted, that this was a punishment expedition, not an actual war. What NATO's bombing attacks did, was to destroy the economy of most of the nations bordering the Danube east of Vienna. Once the British monarchy prevailed upon President Clinton to abandon the reconstruction perspective he had announced earlier, that entire region of southeastern Europe has been transformed into a bloody mass of attrition which will soon destroy, chain-reaction style, the entire economy of both northern and western Europe.

To assess the larger strategic realities in which the Blair-driven search for nuclear confrontation with Russia is situated, the war-threat becomes more immediately ominous than would be implied by the facts I have referenced thus far. We must take into account the strategic military implications of the presently onrushing meltdown of the world's financial system, including that of the U.S. economy.

Significantly, the British state apparatus (representing a much higher level than lackey Tony Blair) has announced a

special security program, named “Operation Surety,” to go into effect, beginning September 9, 1999. This operation is designed to anticipate a deadly social crisis’s eruption under the conditions of the world financial meltdown expected for the interval between September 9, 1999 and the close of the year. No one I know—and I do have many high-level sources in various parts of the world—can give me a definite date, other than “soon, perhaps next week, perhaps October,” for the expected date of the chain-reaction collapse of the world’s financial system. However, that kind of collapse, of a kind far worse than October 1929, is already onrushing; it is not something which could happen; it is something which, in fact, is already happening.

The intervention of the effects of this world financial collapse into the present strategic situation, automatically and immediately changes all of the determining parameters of the worldwide strategic situation. No existing government could last long enough to carry out a pro-warfare posture effectively under such circumstances.

Notable is the situation in Russia itself. Whatever else may happen there, and there are many possibilities, virtually all extremely dramatic ones, the present situation in Russia is not to be expected to last past the end of September, if that long.

Were I President of the U.S.A., I would know how to deal with this mess. Given the very advanced state of sundry presently ongoing world crises, I could not guarantee success, but I am the only figure who might have a chance of success.

The Kursk Was Target of NATO

by Paul Gallagher

All Russian military and other official accounts of the destruction of the *Kursk* and its crew, have converged on the hypothesis that the submarine, while engaged in the Russian all-ocean naval maneuvers, collided with a foreign submarine. At least three NATO submarines, two American and one British, are known to have been conducting general surveillance of the part of the Russian maneuvers taking place in the Barents Sea; but that is not the whole story. The *Kursk*, an attack submarine of the class known as “Oscar II,” was an object of special NATO attention.

During the Cold War, United States submarines enjoyed for 30 years the advantage of being quieter than their Soviet counterparts. Using this advantage, U.S. submarines routinely followed Soviet subs—in particular, Soviet subs which could launch ballistic nuclear missiles—for months at a time without being detected. Their purpose was to eliminate, as far as possible, the Soviet capability to use their major subma-

rines in time of war, either to launch a retaliatory nuclear “second strike,” or to stop U.S. carrier battle groups from attacking. The U.S. attack, or “hunter” submarines would pick up their Soviet surveillance “targets” coming out of the Barents Sea, by the time the Soviet subs entered the North Atlantic through the so-called “Greenland-U.K. Gap.”

In the course of this surveillance and stalking over decades, collisions occurred which were never officially acknowledged.

But during the Cold War, the rule of engagement for the U.S. submarine captains so engaged, was to break off pursuit and lose the Soviet sub, rather than let the surveillance be known by the Soviet side.

The Soviet Navy had much more difficulty employing this tactic, both because American submarines launch from Norfolk, Virginia or San Diego, California directly into deep and open ocean, and because the Soviet subs were noisier. But by 1990, this had changed: For example, Russian Commander of the Northern Fleet Oleg Yerofeyev stated on June 3, 1992: “In the end of last year and the beginning of this year we performed a search exercise with flying colors. For five days our new submarine was following [an] American strategic submarine and [this] was interrupted only by the order of General Staff. In other words, the Americans were unable to escape from us. Even this simple fact speaks volumes.”

Soviet Collapse

It is known, that after the collapse of the Soviet Union, this U.S. and NATO tactic, of attempting almost constantly to follow all major Russian submarines, continued without let-up. This military tactic continued in a new context: the Soviet Union had collapsed; the Russian economy was being looted systematically by Western financial interests and their junior-partner Russian “oligarchs”; Russia’s devastated economy had collapsed the Russian defense budget to the equivalent of \$5-10 billion annually. And as the global financial crisis worsened, NATO launched more and more direct strategic provocations toward Russia, seeking to humiliate and eliminate it as a superpower.

Yet the Russian nuclear navy introduced the new “Oscar II” attack submarines, including the *Kursk* in 1995, which caused consternation in NATO circles. The *Kursk* was one of the most advanced and robust attack subs in the world, extremely quiet, with the firepower potentially to destroy half an entire carrier battle group, and with two nuclear engines, to keep fighting if one were disabled. The U.S. “Seawolf” class attack submarine was developed during the 1990s specifically to try to regain the advantage in quietness, which had been lost to the likes of the *Kursk*.

Thus, in August, the *Kursk*, participating in Russian Navy all-ocean maneuvers which had been suspended for eight years, and which would see it break into the Atlantic and then enter the Mediterranean, would have been a particular target of submarine surveillance.

But more: NATO was seeking to humiliate these particu-