

Towards a Framework of Global Warfare?

Washington Establishment Think Tank

By [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#)
Global Research, March 03, 2013

Region: [Middle East & North Africa, sub-Saharan Africa](#)

Washington's most influential establishment think tank The Brookings Institution has called upon the Obama administration to implement what is tantamount to a framework of Global Warfare.

According to Brookings Michael E. O'Hanlon, the US should intervene simultaneously through direct military action in both the Middle East and Africa, in two major geopolitical hubs, namely Syria and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The concept of waging simultaneous US led theater wars is nothing new. It is an integral part of US military doctrine. It was put forth in 2000 by the Project of the New American Century (PNAC), a neo-conservative think tank linked to the Defense-Intelligence establishment, the Republican Party and the powerful Council on Foreign Relations (CFR).

The PNAC's declared objective formulated in 2000 was to *"Fight and decisively win multiple, simultaneous theater wars"* in different parts of the World.

According to Brookings Michael E. O'Hanlon:

"there is a case for more assertive U.S. action in both Congo and Syria. ... [I]n Syria...the most likely scenario for U.S. troops resembles what the North Atlantic Treaty Organization did in Bosnia in the 1990s. First, we arm the weaker side. Then we support it with air strikes...Using the Bosnia precedent, and allowing for a population four times its size, up to 200,000 foreign troops could be needed in a post-war stabilization effort...

[W]e can as part of multilateral coalitions that intervene in both Congo and Syria at once. [sic] ([Michael E. O'Hanlon](#), Brookings Institution, February 2012, emphasis added)

What is being intimated is to "tone down" prevailing non-conventional and covert forms of intervention in favor of conventional theater wars involving the extensive use of air power and the deployment of US-NATO ground forces, under a R2P humanitarian mandate.

Direct military action involving the deployment of tens of thousands of US NATO forces in Syria would trigger conditions of a broader Middle East war, including the possibility of a confrontation with Russia and Iran, namely a framework of military escalation.

Similarly, US military intervention in the Congo, would create conditions for the militarization of the central African region, which is strategic in terms of its wealth of minerals, oil and natural gas.

A military operation in the Congo would also be a sequel to the war on Libya (2011) and the ongoing war on Mali and Niger, which is characterised by the deployment of coalition ground forces under the pretext of a counter-terrorism mandate. What is at stake is the conquest of strategic resources, including gold, uranium and natural gas.



The Congo is contiguous to the Sahel region. Direct US military intervention in the Congo could potentially lead to escalation over a large part of the African continent including the sub-Saharan Sahelian belt, Central Africa and East Africa. This process of global warfare applied to Africa is part of a US military and strategic “road-map”. It is a project of neo-colonial conquest by the US over a vast area.

This military agenda –implemented at the crossroads of the most serious economic crisis in modern history– is directly supportive of corporate interests in mining, energy, oil and gas, not to mention the multibillion dollar weapons industry, namely the US “defense contractors”.

The underlying war propaganda used to justify these military operations hinges upon NATO’s R2P. These operations would be conducted under a “peace-keeping mandate”, “with the full support of the international community”.*

Obama has an opportunity here to revalidate the Nobel Committee’s decision to award him its peace prize four years ago. It’s also an opportunity to show that the 2011 Libya mission, of which the president is justifiably proud, was not a one-off. Now, with his new Cabinet, Obama should seriously explore his options in both these tragic wars. [9Michael E. O’Hanlon op cit](#)

Thanks to Rick Rozoff, Stop NATO for bringing the Brookings article to our attention.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#), Global Research, 2013

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Prof Michel](#)

About the author:

Michel Chossudovsky is an award-winning author, Professor of Economics (emeritus) at the University of Ottawa, Founder and Director of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG), Montreal, Editor of Global Research. He has taught as visiting professor in Western Europe, Southeast Asia, the Pacific and Latin America. He has served as economic adviser to governments of developing countries and has acted as a consultant for several international organizations. He is the author of eleven books including *The Globalization of Poverty and The New World Order* (2003), *America's "War on Terrorism"* (2005), *The Global Economic Crisis, The Great Depression of the Twenty-first Century* (2009) (Editor), *Towards a World War III Scenario: The Dangers of Nuclear War* (2011), *The Globalization of War, America's Long War against Humanity* (2015). He is a contributor to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. His writings have been published in more than twenty languages. In 2014, he was awarded the Gold Medal for Merit of the Republic of Serbia for his writings on NATO's war of aggression against Yugoslavia. He can be reached at crgeditor@yahoo.com

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca