Such actions, compounded by the planned stationing of U.S. ballistic missile defense installations in Poland and the Czech Republic, and Britain's constant stream of hate propaganda against outgoing Russian President Vladimir Putin, are fueling a future military confrontation, once again, in the heart of Eurasia.

A New War of the Pacific

In South America, as detailed below, London is activating a longstanding scenario-on-call for provoking border wars—this time involving Venezuela and Colombia, and potentially drawing in Ecuador, Nicaragua, Chile, and Argentina. As Lyndon LaRouche warned at the beginning of the year, London reacted violently to the inauguration of the Bank of the South, knowing that it was modeled on LaRouche's own 1982 blueprint for Ibero-American integration and development, Operation Júarez. To kill off the Bank of the South, London activated their latter-day Simón Bolívar, Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez, to promote the narcoterrorist FARC insurgency against Colombia. When Colombian military forces launched operations against FARC safe-havens along the Colombia-Ecuador border, Chávez stepped in, with a Jacobin outburst that set the entire region into conflict. As of this writing, the situation is precarious.

Key to the South American destabilization is London's Dope, Inc. operations, which have built up a cocaine-based underground economy, that fuels insurgency through billions of dollars in dirty money. Washington sources report that under Chávez, Venezuela has become a major port-of-exit for cocaine, while the country's oil revenues have been used, in turn, to further bankroll a spreading narco-insurgency, aimed at breaking up several nations. The vast funds generated by the narco-economy—estimated to be well-beyond $1 trillion annually—ultimately flow into Anglo-Dutch offshore financial havens, which, in turn, fuel the assault on sovereign governmental control over currency and credit.

According to U.S. intelligence sources, recent intercepted communications between top FARC commanders and European government ministers, have opened some eyes in Washington to the London-led European assault against the United States, an assault abetted from within the U.S.A. by the antics of the Bush Administration, and such London loyalists as Felix Rohatyn and George Shultz, who openly extol the British East India Company model of private mercenary armies, and oligarchical control over world finance.

Will patriotic U.S. institutions rally, in time, to defeat the onrushing drive for war and fascism, coming out of London? Will these institutions take LaRouche's lead, and line up with other leading sovereign world powers—Russia, China, India—to amass the forces to defeat the British empire once and for all?

The Kosovo Crisis

British Move To End Sovereign Nation-State

by Elke Fimmen

As Lyndon LaRouche warned last December, when the UN Security Council split on the issue of independence for Kosovo, the principle at stake is the sovereign nation-state, which was established with the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. Now, after the province of Kosovo declared independence from Serbia on Feb. 17, and after Serbian protests in Belgrade and northern Kosovo, the full dimensions of the consequences of this British-orchestrated crisis are unfolding. This includes a Western course of increasing confrontation with Russia, as well as a spiralling effect, to activate so-called "frozen conflicts" around the world—with dangerous repercussions for the integrity of national sovereignty, both in Europe and worldwide.

At an informal Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) Summit in Moscow on Feb. 22, Russian President Vladimir Putin described the recognition of Kosovo's unilateral declaration by several major world powers as a "terrible precedent." He warned it would "break up the entire system of international relations, a system that has not taken just decades, but centuries to evolve," leading to a "whole chain of unpredictable consequences." Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov had stressed earlier, in a phone call to U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, that the "consequences of independence for Kosovo can lead to the destruction of world order and stability." And a commentary in RIA Novosti on Feb. 22 correctly pointed out that, "the world is swiftly being driven away from the Westphalian order of international relations," which, in the 17th Century, "had stopped half a century of religious wars in Europe and provided for the basic principle of national sovereignty—the territorial integrity and non-interference with the domestic affairs of the sovereign states."

In answer to a e-mail question from an ethnic Albanian Macedonian citizen, in late February, Lyndon LaRouche had underlined the fact, that the push for unilateral independence was "an entirely British imperial operation," in which "nominally U.S. assets," such as Richard Holbrooke and the "H.G. Wells-legacy of his former boss, Madeleine Albright" have been used. As if to prove that point, Holbrooke blamed Russia for backing "extremist elements" who were inciting violence in Belgrade, a claim which was rejected by the U.S. State Department. The Foreign Ministry in Moscow issued a sharp rebuttal to Holbrooke's statements.

Russia, of course, well remembers the role of Holbrooke and Albright in orchestrating the completely unnecessary 1999 NATO-led war against Yugoslavia over the issue of Kosovo—which Tony Blair in a speech in Chicago, in the middle of that war, glowingly portayed as the precedent of his new doctrine of imperial "liberal interventionism," which would end the era of sovereign nation-states forever.

Reactions to the declaration of independence by Kosovo in other areas of the world, where national sovereignty is disputed, were immediate, including in Abkhazia and South Ossetia, two "frozen conflicts" in the Transcaucus, which had declared (unrecognized) independence from Georgia in 1991, and which lean towards Russia. Chechnya welcomed the Kosovo developments as supporting its own struggle against Russia. The Basque independence movement declared, that Kosovo was "a lesson" for them, and Flemish "foreign minister" Geert Bourgeois of the N-VA party, which wants to separate from Belgium, announced it would send a delegation to Kosovo, "to explore common means" to develop their institutions.

In China, the Chinese Foreign Office criticized the recognition of Kosovo by Taiwan, and disputed its authority to do so. This, on the backdrop of a referendum to take place on March 22, on whether the island should be recognized by the UN as "Taiwan." In the Islamic world, in addition to other problems, inter-communal conflicts are in constant danger of being activated (e.g., problems with Berber unrest in Morocco and Algeria, large or significant Shi'ite populations in Bahrein, Saudi-Arabia, Qatar, and the UAE). And in Bolivia, President Evo Morales warned in a speech Feb. 19, that an "autonomy referendum" of four federal states inside Bolivia could lead to a "Kosovo-style division of the country."

In the Wings: More British-Led Provocations

Kosovo was—and still is—subject to UNMIK (United Nations Mission in Kosovo), which bases itself on UN Security Council Resolution 1244, being supported by up to 17,000 KFOR (NATO) troops. Now, the situation is becoming blurred, as to who is legally responsible. Russia, and of course, Serbia, completely dismiss the legality of the planned EULEX (EU Rule of Law) mission, according to which 2000 European Union "experts"—policemen, judges, and other administrative personnel—are to be deployed, to "assist" the Kosovo institutions, starting formally in June. The real intention behind pushing the Kosovo authorities to declare independence quickly, instead of contuining to struggle for a joint solution with Serbia, was thus clearly, to put a "government" in place as quickly as possible, which then could "invite" the EU, since the only legal road to move forward, through the Security Council, was blocked.

According to the plans of EUPT, the European Union Planning Team, headed by former British diplomat Roy Reeve, the EU and its EULEX mission shall take over major responsibilities from UNMIK. Reeve vehemently denies that the EU mission is creating another "protectorate." Reeve is a good example of how British establish control mechanisms over crucial geostrategic areas. As a Soviet specialist, he worked for the British diplomatic service from 1966-99, was stationed in the British Embassy in Moscow from 1968-71, and was a member of the British delegation to the Geneva Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE, now OSCE) from 1978-81. Then, he headed Political Affairs in Northern Ireland (1983-85); and after other assignments in South Africa and Australia, he was, from 1995-99, British ambassador to Ukraine. After his early retirement from diplomatic service, from 1999-2003, he headed the OSCE Office in Yerevan, Armenia, after which he led the OSCE mission to Georgia, before being appointed in December 2007 to be head of EUPT for Kosovo.

State Department/Michael Gross

Kosovo's declaration of independence threatens to spark a new Balkan war, which could draw Russia into confrontation with the West. Here, Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov meets with U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice in Washington on Feb. 2, 2007.

Reeve's prior appointments to Georgia and Armenia are significant, since these crucial areas, which have their own ethnic-breakaway situations, are now responding to Kosovo's unilateral declaration of independence. The OSCE mission, which Reeve led in Georgia, also monitored the sensitive border between Georgia and the Chechen Republic, as well as the border with Ingushetia and Dagestan.

The strong resistance by Russia has apparently now thrown a monkey wrench into the scheme to push through the planned EU mission. UNMIK, even if it wished to, will not be able to simply hand over responsibility, because a UN Security Council decision is necessary for its mission to formally end, and Russia insists on this. Now, in an obvious attempt to further circumvent the missing legal basis for the EU mission, and to "create facts on the ground," an "International Steering Group" (ISG) was constituted in Vienna on Feb. 29, supposedly to guide the development of Kosovo's institutions according to the so-called "Ahtissari plan" for international "supervised independence." But this has already been rejected by Serbia, Russia, and China. This group has no legal mandate, and is

constituted only by those countries, which support Kosovo's unilateral declaration of independence from Serbia.

So far, 15 EU and NATO countries have joined, including the former Kosovo contact group (minus Russia)—the United States, Germany, France, Italy, and Great Britain. Also participating in the ISG so far are Austria, Sweden, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, Denmark, Finland, Switzerland, Belgium, and Turkey. Even Australia and Japan have been invited, in an obvious attempt, to create the illusion of a broad international support, UN-style! Designated to run the show for the ISG in Kosovo, is EU special envoy, Dutch diplomat Pieter Feith. Russian Foreign Ministry spokesman Mikhail Kamynin immediately called the ISG "contradictory to UN decisions" and said, this move could have "unpredictable consequences."

Ahtisaari, former UN envoy for Kosovo, had early on rejected further negotiations between Kosovo and Serbia and pushed for independence from Serbia. The former President of Finland wrote an article in October 2007 on "empowering Europe," by greatly strengthening the EU's foreign policy, especially to confront the "belligerent" Russia of President Vladimir Putin. His co-writers were former German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer, who had forced German support for the NATO-war against Yugoslavia in 1999 (which paved the way for future German military involvement outside of NATO-territory), and two other imperial-minded representatives of the newly founded European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR), including Mark Leonard, a close collaborator of Tony Blair.

Pieter Feith, in a interview in Kosovo TV in early March, tried to avoid concrete answers to an impatient Kosovo-Albanian interviewer, about what exactly the EU and ISG presence would look like. However, according to reliable reports, the situation for the Kosovo-Albanians, many of whom of course had hoped for self-government, will now become even worse than before. Under UNMIK, each ministry and institution had "advisors" in their offices, most of them British. Now, according to reliable reports, Feith plans to assume a position of colonial viceroy, by having all laws and regulations placed before him, before any action can occur at all. Under these plans, Kosovo will be reduced to the misery of an ever more impoverished free-trade zone in a globalized world, playing a subservient role in an imperial EU-NATO structure.

The very fact that all of this is happening in Europe, despite the refusal of EU countries, such as Spain, Greece, Slovakia, and Cyprus, to recognize the statehood of Kosovo, is a scandal in itself. It gives a foretaste of the even more dictatorial manner, in which future political and military decisions are to be pushed through in Europe, were the Lisbon Treaty to be ratified, as well as of the character of the planned new post of a "high representative of foreign policy" for Europe.

Russia Avoids Confrontational Course

Russia, which at present upholds the principles of international law, fortunately, has not let itself be pulled into a confrontation *modus operandi*, which obviously British geopoliticians are hoping for. Military options have been categorically ruled out by Russia, and Moscow has also warned Belgrade against military actions. For the time being, the Serbians will try to opt for intensifying links to their ethnic minority in northern Kosovo. It is unclear, how far this will go, also in light of the shaky government coalition in Belgrade. There are warnings from the Russian side, that a split along ethnic lines of the heavily Serbian-populated northern Kosovo is already playing out. Indicative of this were recent announcements by the Serbian state railway company to retake control over the northern Kosovo railroad connections.

In the region itself, Russia seems to give emphasis to the economic aspect. In a brief visit to Belgrade on Feb. 26 by Foreign Minister Lavrov and Dmitri Medvedev, outgoing CEO of Gazprom, and now the newly elected President, even offered options for reconciliation between Serbs and Kosovar-Albanians in the context of infrastructure projects in the Balkans, for example in the natural gas sector. Medvedev and Serbian Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica signed a draft agreement on the South Stream project, a gas pipeline transporting natural gas from Russia to Italy, through Bulgaria, Serbia, Hungary, and Austria. Medvedev stressed that taking Serbia on board, was important to make "the project feasible, complete, fruitful, and mutually beneficial," and "particularly important, as regards the situation in Serbia today." He said, this was "essentially an element of our moral, material, and economic aid to the state." Kosovo is also invited to take part in the project, which would improve and secure its gas supply. On Feb. 28, a contract on the South Stream project was also signed with Hungarian Prime Minister Ferenc Gyurcsany, following talks with Putin in Moscow.

The South Stream project plans to transport 10 billion cubic meters of Russian gas annually across the Black Sea, with the first deliveries scheduled for 2013. Jointly built by Gazprom and Italy's Eni, South Stream is a rival project to the Nabucco pipeline backed by the EU and U.S., which would pump Central Asian gas to Europe via Turkey, bypassing Russia. That project also involves Bulgaria, Romania, and Hungary, but as they are frustrated over the slow progress of the Nabucco project, they decided to take part in South Stream at the same time. The fact, that they would not join the anti-Russia policy of the EU, has much enraged the European bureaucracy which insists on "either, or."

Thus, the lines for Europe in the Balkans are clearly drawn. Will its nations submit to becoming a "post-modern" empire along British geopolitical dictates—or, as EU-advisor Jacques Rupnik at a recent conference in Paris said, "a substitute for an empire"? European nations, on the other hand, can still adopt LaRouche's perspective of Eurasian-wide economic development of sovereign nation-states, in the context of a "New Bretton Woods" agreement, thus averting the steep fall into a new dark age.