



BüSo

The BüSo's proposal for a new deutschemark bill for Germany features Friedrich Schiller and Clara Schumann, along with the German Constitutional statement affirming the democratic and social state.

ability, to prepare the psychological environment for such an aggressive war. He is holding "Islamic extremists" responsible for the recent attacks on London. Blair, naturally, is saying nothing—for one thing, totally neglecting the question of who were the real architects of the terrorism—about the fact that Islamic extremism is the long-term result of the policies of Zbigniew Brzezinski and Bernard Lewis.

These two geopoliticians played the so-called "Islamic card" against the former Soviet Union in the 1970s. At that point, Anglo-American circles trained Islamic Mujahideen for the war in Afghanistan, and in that way created the first radical-Islamic networks which spread out after the collapse of the Soviet Union, into the region that ranges from Afghanistan to Chechnya. And Blair obviously also says nothing about the fact that many terrorist organizations have maintained their headquarters in London for many years—with the apparent and often-criticized toleration of the British government.

In an eerie repeat of the propaganda campaign which led to the war against Iraq, Iran is currently being accused, in a flood of articles and books, of similar things that Blair, Cheney, and Co. had thrown at Iraq: That Iran is working on the production of weapons of mass destruction, that it controls international terrorism, and so on. The most hair-raising example of this propaganda is the book, severely criticized by the *Washington Post*, by U.S. neo-conservative Kenneth Timmerman, *Countdown to a Crisis: The Coming Nuclear Conflict with Iran*. Every conceivable kind of villainy is attributed to Iran, from complicity in the attacks of Sept. 11, to the attempt to procure nuclear weapons to menace the United States and Israel.

The Battle in the United States

Particularly important, then, is the fact that the U.S. National Intelligence Council, in some respects the umbrella organization of the different U.S. intelligence organizations, has come out with an official evaluation in direct opposition to the White House. Iran has no separate military nuclear

program, it says, and the civilian program is at least ten years away from the possibility of producing fissile material for atomic weapons.

Therefore, the revelations of former UN Weapons Inspector Scott Ritter are very informative: He recently reported that he had been given information by government circles at the end of last year, that the Bush government absolutely wanted to reach the appearance of peace in Iraq by June of 2005, because the Pentagon had instructions to be ready at this point for a massive air attack on Iran. That in the face of these circumstances, Iran announced that it would resume its work on the nuclear site in Isfahan, notably under the supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency, may perhaps not be the most diplomatically prudent step to take, but it is certainly understandable.

The international community must do everything conceivable to head off the escalation of the Iran issue. Unfortunately, only an effective opposition within the United States can actually stop this war plan, but we must strengthen this opposition. One of the strongest alarm signals is the "recess appointment" of John Bolton to be the new American Ambassador to the United Nations. Bolton, who in the past has spoken out openly for "preventive war," would obviously be in place if the Bush-Cheney government wants to bring the Iran question before the UN Security Council. If a motion for sanctions fails, because of a veto by one of the permanent members of the Security Council, the United States would proceed unilaterally against Iran—exactly the same scenario as in the case of Iraq.

However, there is one decisive difference: An atomic attack on Iran would, with very high probability, be the beginning of an asymmetrical world war, with apocalyptic dimensions. Upon an American nuclear strike, Iran, a country with 70 million people and considerable military might, would react with counter-strikes, by which neither the U.S. troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, nor Israel, should be surprised. One good question is whether at this point of military escalation, the "red line" for Russia, China, or India would have been crossed.

Orderly Withdrawal of German Army From Afghanistan

The dramatic sharpening of the crisis around Iran urgently demands a re-evaluation of the stationing of German soldiers in Afghanistan. A clear-headed analysis of the original objectives of this deployment shows clearly that the situation in Afghanistan has run out of control. At any moment there could be a catastrophe; for example, a huge attack or assault on the Germany Army troops deployed in Afghanistan, or the aid organizations working there.

The German troop deployment in Afghanistan must be newly examined, not only in the face of its obviously questionable motivation, which led to the demand for German

troops, according to Article 5 of the NATO Charter. It is also a fact that the originally planned economic reconstruction of Afghanistan has not happened. In the absence of economic development, drug cultivation has reached record levels. Afghanistan is up to 80% under the control of powerful warlords, who control the drug cultivation and trade.

The embitterment of the population is growing, and it could turn against the German troops, who before long could be perceived as nothing but occupation forces. Because the United States, instead of drawing the country onto its side through economic development, is now militarily going against the drug lords, the fuse for a huge explosion in Afghanistan has already been lit.

What's the reason for a deployment in Afghanistan, where the German Army primarily sits in its barracks, and basically only protects itself? And the argument that a big contingent of German troops has been stationed in Afghanistan and therefore the Bundeswehr [German Army] cannot be stationed in Iraq, has become, in view of the untenable situation of the United States in Iraq, pretty feeble.

One further reason for a new evaluation lies in the fact that the overall situation in Central Asia is becoming ever more opaque. Uzbekistan permits the use of the formerly German bases as a transshipment point to Afghanistan, but the summit of the "Shanghai Cooperation Organization," to which Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgystan, Kazakstan, China, and Russia belong, has unmistakably drawn up a timetable for the pullout of foreign troops from these countries.

It's questionable whether Afghanistan can be stabilized under current conditions. In any case, essential German security interests are not being defended in the Hindu Kush. In reality, there were never any essential German security interests that would have justified the stationing of the German Army. At present, the Bundeswehr and the German aid organizations are sitting in Afghanistan in a trap, but fortunately it has not yet definitively snapped shut. The command of the hour should be, to set in motion an orderly retreat of the Bundeswehr as well as the aid organizations out of Afghanistan, without delay. We still have a chance which we should not waste. If the point of an American war against Iran arrives, it will be too late.

This does not mean that we must abandon Afghanistan to its fate. But a realistic opportunity for the economic buildup of the country can only come, if the completion of the Eurasian Land-Bridge is put on the agenda of the Eurasian governments. Only if there is an overriding interest in the economic development of all the participating nations, will the conditions for the solution of the problems of Afghanistan be created. And only when the powerful states of Eurasia work together, can the drug cultivation and drug trade, which serve today as one of the most lucrative financial sources for international terrorism, be dried out. The Afghan population would surely rather pursue agriculture and develop industry, than be



EIRNS/Daniel Buchmann

The LaRouche Youth Movement organizes in Duisburg, Germany. Zepp-LaRouche's campaign is reaching out to the youth in particular, the "no future" generation which desperately needs the solution she offers.

slaves of the drug lords.

The Afghanistan policy of Germany is one of many political topics on which it becomes obvious that there can be no pragmatic solution within a system which is built on false axioms. The CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union], when it came to a decision on the Afghanistan deployment of the Bundeswehr, demanded absolute subordination to the policy of the Bush-Cheney regime, in order to prove German "alliance-capability"—and that in spite of the questionable nature of the reasons which had to be advanced for this deployment, and in spite of considerations of international law. And if it were up to Mrs. Merkel [neo-con and CDU Chancellor candidate], then even more German soldiers would have died by now—including in Iraq.

Today a far-reaching vision for a peace policy for all Eurasia is necessary. That is exactly what the completion of the Eurasian Land-Bridge means. On the assumption that the war policy of Bush-Cheney and the neo-cons in the United States can be stopped, we must immediately put Eurasian integration through economic cooperation on the agenda.