

International Intelligence

Russia's Primakov Opposes 'War of Civilizations'

Former Russian Prime Minister Yevgeni Primakov has echoed some of the ideas contained in Helga Zepp-LaRouche's call for a Dialogue of Civilizations, based on the best elements of each culture. In an interview with the daily *Izvestia* on Nov. 5, headlined "A War Against Islam Could Lead to the Disintegration of Russia," Primakov warned that a "new division of the world" along religious lines, which has emerged as a growing danger due to U.S. policies since the Sept. 11, 2001 terror attacks, could lead not only to a global confrontation, but also to the destruction of many nations, and "the loss of the most positive accomplishments of civilization."

Primakov denounced the attempts by some circles in the United States and Europe, to portray Islam as a "threat," and to insinuate that "the roots of terrorism are in the Koran." There is a big difference, he said, between the desire, in many parts of the Arab world today, to revive the fundamental principles of Islam, and extremist tendencies that lead to terrorism.

North Korea Underlines Readiness To Make a Deal

North Korean Ambassador to the United Nations Pak Gil Yon said on Oct. 25 that his government is ready to cool tensions, if Washington will recognize its national sovereignty and allow it to rebuild the economy. The statement was released by the Pyongyang Foreign Ministry.

The statement confirms Lyndon LaRouche's Oct. 19 statement, that North Korea had admitted to having a secret nuclear weapons program as a "bargaining chip" with Washington (see "N. Korea Offers a 'Silk Road' Bargain to the United States," *EIR*, Nov. 1).

Ambassador Pak charged the White House with preparing a pre-emptive strike against North Korea, by including it in the "axis of evil," along with Iraq and Iran. "This

is a clear declaration of war," Pak said. Pak charged the United States with stockpiling nuclear weapons in South Korea that have threatened the North for nearly half a century. As a result, Pak said, North Korea "was left with no other proper answer." Pak said that Pyongyang "was entitled to possess not only nuclear weapons, but any type of weapon more powerful than that, so as to defend its sovereignty and right to existence."

Even so, North Korea now wants a "non-aggression treaty" with the United States, including a U.S. pledge not to attack North Korea first; respect for the country's sovereignty; and the right to economic development, before relieving America of its "security concerns," Pak read from the statement.

He accused the United States of failing to fulfill terms of a 1994 accord under which the North agreed to suspend an earlier nuclear weapons program and shut down its nuclear power plants, in exchange for new reactors which never arrived, because the United States was "calculating" that the North Korean government "would collapse sooner or later." Indeed, former U.S. Ambassador Robert Gallucci, one of those who negotiated the 1994 accord, told *EIR* in 1996 that his team had no intention of delivering the reactors to the existing regime, which they were counting upon to collapse.

Saudi Foreign Minister Says 'No' to Iraq War

Saudi Foreign Minister Saud al-Faisal told CNN on Nov. 3 that his country would not allow use of its airspace or military bases in a war against Iraq. In an interview with CNN, al-Faisal said, "We will cooperate with the Security Council, but as to entering the conflict or using the facilities as part of the conflict, that's something else." When asked by reporter Christiane Amanpour, "So, that's a 'no'?" al-Faisal responded emphatically, "no." He added that Saudi Arabia would "support the political sentiment" of a possible war against Iraq, but was hopeful that this could be avoided by working through the United Nations, because Iraq has

"made a very clear and unambiguous promise to the Arab countries that it will abide by the United Nations resolutions. . . ."

The Foreign Minister warned against a foreign occupation of Iraq. "History tells us that whatever change you believe you can bring to the country that you occupy, you can never make a permanent change through occupation by a foreign force in the country. . . . Iraq is not Japan. Saddam is not the Emperor Hirohito, and I don't know if the general that's going in, is going to be [Douglas] MacArthur." The Minister rejected the targeting of Saudi Arabia as "evil" by Washington neo-conservatives, as well as charges made by the New York Council on Foreign Relations that his government had turned a blind eye to anti-Western fundraising by individuals or charities. The CFR report is "long on accusation and short on documented proof," he charged.

The day after the interview was aired, al-Faisal added the qualification that *if* Iraq "refuses the implementation" of new UN resolutions concerning inspections, Saudi Arabia would be obliged to cooperate with the UN, but it is a "sovereign right" to make that decision when the time comes.

Brits Can't Afford To Send Troops to Iraq

Great Britain cannot afford to send troops to the Persian Gulf, Finance Minister Gordon Brown told the Defense Ministry, the *Daily Telegraph* reported on Nov. 2. Brown is the leading political rival to Prime Minister Tony Blair.

"Defense chiefs are furious over the suggestion that they might have to cut the force numbers they believe they need to fight a war, in order to fit into a Treasury-imposed straitjacket," the *Telegraph* wrote.

The Treasury has ordered military planners to come up with new strategies, after it was worked out that the British contribution to a U.S.-led war on Iraq would cost £3 billion (\$4.69 billion), according to senior defense sources. This is £500 million more than the British deployment in the 1991 Gulf War. Half of the money would be the cost of

MAURITIUS, an Indian Ocean nation which currently holds a seat on the UN Security Council, recalled its Ambassador to the UN on Nov. 1, after he “gave the impression that Mauritius was against the U.S. draft resolution on Iraq,” according to Foreign Minister Anil Gayan. Under the terms of Mauritius’ foreign aid accord with the United States, Mauritius is stripped of its sovereignty, barred from doing anything to “undermine” U.S. national security interests.

BRAZILIAN President-Elect Luiz Inácio “Lula” da Silva invoked U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in an interview to the *Washington Post* on Nov. 3. Asked whether he preferred “the free market or socialism,” Lula replied: “I don’t think the state has to manage companies. I remember what President Roosevelt did with the Tennessee Valley Authority. The state’s role is to plan, stimulate development with incentives and, if necessary, provide funding in partnership with the private sector.”

DR. ROWAN WILLIAMS, Britain’s next Archbishop of Canterbury, warned that war against Iraq could lead to nuclear conflict. In an interview with the *Daily Telegraph* on Nov. 5, Williams said, “The exact calculation of what weaponry might be employed by a cornered Saddam Hussein is uncertain; and so is the retaliation that might then be provoked in the region from its sole nuclear power, Israel.” An attack by the West is likely to “risk the lives of hundreds of thousands in a region that could rapidly and uncontrollably spiral down into chaos.”

NEW AFRICAN, a London-based monthly, published a dossier by *EIR*’s Uwe Friessecke in its November issue, titled “Rwanda—The Rejected Testimony.” The testimony exposes the roles of Rwandan President Paul Kagame, Uganda’s Yoweri Museveni, and their Anglo-American backers, in the genocide in Rwanda since 1990 (see *EIR*, July 26, 2002).

deploying an armored division to Kuwait to oppose the Iraqi Republican Guard.

“They have told the planners at PJHQ [Permanent Joint Headquarters] to come away and come up with a plan that does not involve deploying ground forces,” a senior defense source told the *Telegraph*. “People at the very top are extremely angry about all this,” another source was quoted. “Instead of working out what you need to do the job and then costing it, everything has to be costed first and the job tailored to fit the money.”

Military planners put the cost of a British contribution to an operation that lasts more than a year, and involves a post-war occupation force, at as high as £15 billion. “The Treasury said we can’t afford it,” a senior defense source was quoted. He noted: “Well, that will look great for Tony Blair, the only allied leader who has actually been asked to send forces.”

Queen Intervenes To Block Palace Scandal

Britain’s Queen Elizabeth II intervened personally to bring a sudden and sensational end to the trial of former royal butler Paul Burrell, only days before he was to testify in court on charges that he had stolen hundreds of items from the estate of the late Princess Diana, British newspapers reported on Nov. 2. The Queen is reported to have “suddenly recalled” that, soon after Diana’s death, she had met Burrell, and that he said he had kept numerous items belonging to Diana. This “sudden recollection,” reportedly occurred while the Queen was going to a commemoration service for the victims of the Bali, Indonesia bombing. The case had been going on for 18 months prior to her intervention.

There is wide speculation that the Queen’s memory recovery has to do with concern, that Burrell would say damaging things on the witness stand, about the circumstances leading up to Diana’s death, and/or that Princes Philip and/or Charles could have been called as witnesses.

Labour Member of Parliament Paul Flynn declared that “the most likely reason” for the Queen’s intervention “is that when

Paul Burrell came to give evidence, he was going to provide information which would be damaging to the royal family.” Criminal lawyer Anthony Scrivener told the press, “I think there’s more to it than the explanation we’ve been given. I don’t think the story they’ve put holds together.” Harold Brooks-Baker, a publishing director, stated that the Queen had to act, to avert the “constitutional crisis” that would have ensued, had a member of the Royal Family been called on to testify.

Venezuelans Demand End To Chávez Dictatorship

Tens of thousands of Venezuelans marched through Caracas on Nov. 4, to present electoral authorities with 2.2 million signatures, nearly twice the required number for a referendum to be held on Hugo Chávez’s despised government. The Chávez regime has said that it will not hold the referendum.

According to the Venezuelan Constitution, as written by the Chavistas, a non-binding referendum on matters of national importance can be called, if 10% of the electorate—1.2 million people—present a petition for that. The 2 million signatures represent one-sixth of the registered voters of Venezuela. Although non-binding, were Chávez to lose the vote, his already-precious political legitimacy would be severely weakened—particularly in the “international community.”

Belligerent Chávez supporters, armed with rocks and sticks, clashed with the petitioners, leading to at least 75 wounded by rocks and rubber bullets. The Chavistas were eventually dispersed with teargas by National Guardsmen. Chávez himself continues to insist that early elections would only be called if the Constitution were amended by the National Assembly, where his forces still hold sway.

Electoral authorities have until Dec. 4 to validate the petitions and set a referendum date, which by law must occur within 90 days. The opposition CTV and Fedecamaras—labor and business organizations—threatened an indefinite nationwide strike if the referendum is not allowed to take place.