

from the Chamber, and I feel very, very strongly about it.”

Meanwhile, some London sources are speculating that the “dossier” caper had been so macabre and crude, that it may have been an intentional effort to hasten Blair’s demise—perhaps even including Blair’s chief spin doctor, 10 Downing Street Press Office Alastair Campbell.

### ‘Biggest Issue Since Hitler Invaded Sudetenland’

The problems for Blair have opened on another front, as elements of the British monarchy move against his war policy. Some weeks ago, reports surfaced in the UK, that the heir to the throne, Prince Charles, had been dis-invited to the United States, and was cancelling a scheduled end-February/late-March visit there, because the Bush Administration would have been irate over his privately expressed views opposing the war. On Feb. 9, the *News of the World* tabloid reported that “a serious rift has opened up between Prince Charles and the government” over Iraq, and over Blair’s repeated subservience to those in Washington promoting war. The tabloid further reported that, on Feb. 3, Prince Charles had visited France to meet French President Jacques Chirac, who is against war with Iraq.

On Feb. 10, Harold Brooks-Baker, publisher of *Burke’s Peerage*, which documents the individuals and families of the British aristocracy, told *EIR*, “What Charles is doing, raises the question most dramatically since the 1930s, of what a member of the royal family can comment on about politics. In the 19th Century, the demarcation lines had been relatively clear. But in the 1930s, the Duke of Windsor created a terrific uproar, when he spoke out against the suffering of the miners in Wales. Now, we have Charles’ clear view, against this war. One thing is certain. The Prince of Wales is in tune with the views of the vast majority of the British population, about this war. The population is not in tune with Blair. The vast majority, are either outright against an Iraq war, or support what Chirac and [German Chancellor Gerhard] Schröder are doing. The number of people who support Blair’s blind following of America, on Iraq, is probably lower than 10%.”

Brooks-Baker stressed that Charles’ visit to Chirac “is definitely part of all this. I can’t tell you what the monarch herself is thinking, but the Prince of Wales is enunciating a clear position. You have to understand, that the Iraq war is the biggest issue facing this country since Adolf Hitler invaded the Sudetenland. . . . What Charles is doing is dividing the royal family from the government, more and more and more. Our Prime Minister is out on a limb, and the only way to draw back from the limb, is to somehow persuade Bush to wait for the United Nations process to play itself out. The problem is, Bush doesn’t seem to be disposed to want to do this. This all makes for a highly volatile political situation, which is far more dangerous than most people realize.”

## Iraq War: Goodbye to African Development

by David Cherry

When South Africa’s ambassador to the UN corrected the U.S. ambassador, in a Security Council debate on war against Iraq on Jan. 27, it was a high point in South Africa’s intense campaign to prevent the war—a war that South Africa says, correctly, will do incalculable harm to the continent and the world.

U.S. Ambassador John Negroponte had insisted to the UN Security Council that Iraq must follow the South African model of disarmament—referring to its voluntary dismantling of its nuclear weapons program under International Atomic Energy Agency supervision, beginning in 1989. But South African Ambassador Dumisani Kumalo spoke next, and pointed out that South Africa’s case proves what Negroponte’s government denies: that it takes time for the inspectors to do their work—it took two years in South Africa’s case. The inspectors in Iraq, Kumalo said, must have the time they need. South African President Thabo Mbeki echoed the point to the press the next day in Pretoria.

The Security Council meeting that day was unprecedented in not being held behind closed doors. It was, again, South Africa’s Dumisani who had urged—on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, which South Africa currently chairs—that UN arms inspectors release their findings at a Security Council meeting open to all ambassadors. The result was that about 100 countries spoke out, and the proposal for war took a pounding.

### General African Opposition

African governments—including ones with strong U.S. ties—have made clear their opposition to the war plans imposed on Washington by the cabal of Cheney, Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz, and others of the Utopian faction. Ethiopian Prime Minister Meles Zenawi, in an interview published Jan. 31, said that any military intervention into Iraq should only come with UN approval.

The same week, *New Vision*, the government-owned newspaper in Uganda, ran an editorial noting that “the cost of the Iraq war will be high.” And for what? “The United States will have set a very dangerous precedent for the future . . . that powerful nations can invade weaker ones that they dislike even if they present no real threat.”

Months earlier, Assistant Secretary of State Walter Kansteiner made a stopover in Conakry to offer the government of Guinea a “new partnership for economic develop-

ment” in exchange for Guinea taking a hard line—as a rotating member of the UN Security Council—against Iraq. Guinea has had good relations with the United States. But a source close to Guinean President Lansana Conté told Agence France-Presse that this was not likely to work. Guineans would have difficulty understanding why their country should have anything to do with a U.S.-led war on Iraq, the source said. Most Guineans are Muslims. So are many others in Sub-Saharan Africa.

The case against the war, as presented by South Africa, rests on three pillars: the lack of any justification, first and foremost; the economic consequences; and the proliferation of terrorism worldwide that would result. President Mbeki said at the Feb. 3 summit of the African Union (AU), of which he is currently chairman, that the war would “set back development and progress years, and perhaps decades.” He recalled the quadrupling of the oil price at the time of the Arab-Israeli War in October 1973. “That is the origin of this African debt which cannot be paid now. You have seen what is happening now as regards oil and the financial markets generally; the uncertainty which has arisen around this, has pushed up the price. . . . It is clear if we get back to that situation of high prices of oil, the same thing will happen again. And so all of these things we are talking about, African development, Nepad [New Partnership for Africa’s Development], and so on, we would have to say goodbye to those as a direct consequence.”

“Very frankly,” Mbeki continued, “we don’t see what positive results can be achieved out of this in a situation in which, as far as the [African] Union is concerned, it is possible to resolve the matter of weapons of mass destruction without resort to war.”

Thanks in part to the long South African campaign, the AU summit of heads of state—through the AU Central Organ for handling conflict—said no to the war, declaring on Feb. 3 that “a military confrontation in Iraq would be a destabilizing factor for the whole region and would have far-reaching economic and security consequences for all the countries of the world and, particularly, for those in Africa. . . . The territorial integrity of Iraq should be respected and . . . any new decision on the matter should emanate from the UN Security Council.”

## Mandela Goes After Bush

Mbeki has been backed up by former South African President Nelson Mandela, who caught the world’s attention on Jan. 30 with his angry remarks to the International Women’s Forum in Johannesburg. “What I am condemning,” he said to great applause, “is that one power, with a President who has no foresight, who cannot think properly, is now wanting to plunge the world into a holocaust.” Citing the atomic bombing of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, he asked, “Who are they now to pretend that they are the policemen of the world?” Mandela ridiculed British Prime Minister Tony Blair, calling him the American “foreign minister” for his supporting role in the

war drive.

Naturally, there were some in the press who branded Mandela an ingrate. Hadn’t President Bush, in his State of the Union Message on Jan. 29, promised a large increase in spending in the fight against AIDS in Africa? As if the promised increased spending would mean anything if African economies are crushed by a massive oil price hike—adequate nutrition is the most important “medication” for preventing and treating AIDS. Thus, Bush has no policy against AIDS. In fact, *EIR* was reliably informed that Bush’s AIDS proposal was swotted up in the few hours between Lyndon LaRouche’s State of the Union Message and Bush’s, because people in the White House were eager to steal some of LaRouche’s fire.

Another major figure in the South African campaign is Deputy Foreign Affairs Minister Aziz Pahad, who is charged with strengthening South Africa’s ties with all Middle Eastern countries. As a result of his work, a group of South African businessmen participated in the 2002 Baghdad International Trade Fair. When a visit to Iraq by Mbeki was under consideration in November 2002, Pahad was accused of “hobnobbing” with Iraq by Joe Seremane, deputy leader of South Africa’s British-oriented Democratic Alliance, who said such a visit would jeopardize benefits from the U.S. Africa Growth and Opportunity Act. Pahad answered that the government would not cower under pressure from people outside the country who want to “control us.” “We have relations with all countries in the world. And if the same principle [of guilt by association] is applied fairly, we will then have no relations with anyone.”

## Counterattacks on South Africa

South Africa’s effectiveness in leading the opposition to the war can be seen in two scurrilous counterattacks by the British and U.S. press. In Fall 2002, the British *Spectator* and the U.S. *Insight on the News* charged that “Mr. Mandela’s country” was selling aluminum tubes for uranium centrifuges to Iraq. The South African Department of Foreign Affairs responded on Oct. 10, “These allegations . . . are not only factually incorrect, but may prove to be libellous. These futile attempts are aimed at discrediting the South African government and former President Nelson Mandela.” Mandela offered his own uncomplicated response to the charges telling *Newsweek*, that the United States, not Saddam, threatened world peace. The accusations disappeared.

A new smear popped up in the *Wall Street Journal* on Jan. 31. “U.S. and British officials and non-proliferation experts, are alarmed by mounting evidence that germs and other substances . . . are still being stored—and possibly transferred out of the country—in violation of South Africa’s treaty obligations,” the *Journal* huffed. These substances, it went on, should not even exist! (Except at Fort Detrick, Maryland, Porton Downs, U.K., and Nes Ziona, Israel.) The sketchy story seemed to be based on a sting against a South African scientist whose main interest is in developing an antidote

to anthrax.

An earlier attack came from the British-steered South African Institute of International Affairs in late June 2002. Its Deputy Director, Moeletsi Mbeki, told the Foreign Correspondents Association of South Africa, “The weakness of South Africa’s foreign policy is that it often does not address the concerns of the country’s major constituencies, but rather what the government thinks is important in the world.” It’s a false dichotomy, but as for the government addressing what it thinks is important in the world, South Africa is guilty as charged!

## Vatican Peace Effort Grows, Despite Italian Government Betrayal

by Claudio Celani

A major role in the global war-prevention effort is being carried out by Pope John Paul II, who sent his special envoy, Cardinal Roger Etchegarray, to Baghdad on Feb. 9, soon after the Pope and his collaborators conferred with visiting German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer in Rome. The Pope was the first to learn from Fischer about the new Franco-German proposal for strengthening the inspections in Iraq, subsequently supported by Russia and China. The mission to Baghdad by Cardinal Etchegarray, the chairman emeritus of the *Justitia and Pax* Council, was to convince Saddam Hussein to accept it. Next, Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister Tariq Aziz, a Christian, is expected to visit Rome, to bring word of Iraq’s decision.

The Pope seems to be rejuvenated by the effort to stop the war, wrote a London *Times* correspondent on Feb. 10.

Fischer came out visibly impressed by his audience on Feb. 7 with the Pope, Vatican “Prime Minister” Cardinal Sodano, and “Foreign Minister” Monsignor Tauran. He told the press: “We have a common preoccupation with the war in Iraq. My interlocutors were interested in knowing the various positions on [U.S. Secretary of State Colin] Powell’s report in order to study the situation”; that is, to prepare for the battle at the Security Council.

### The Pope’s Divisions

Everybody knows Stalin’s famous quote: “How many divisions does the Pope have?” Without military divisions, but with the strength of human reason and faith in God, the Pope is mobilizing against the war. In the days preceding and following the diplomatic catastrophe of Secretary Powell’s Feb. 5 appearance at the UN, the Pope’s divisions moved onto

the battlefield.

The artillery fire was led by a major editorial document published under Vatican imprimatur by the Jesuit magazine *Civiltà Cattolica*, which demolished the so-called doctrine of “pre-emptive war” and the arguments given for its application against Iraq. The document blasted Washington’s “sort of messianic vocation in favor of the human race” shown by its pursuit of “the creation and the buildup of the ‘Kingdom of Good’”—overthrowing dictatorial states which allegedly threaten U.S. security, including its economic security and energy supplies. It is argued, the magazine wrote, that Iraq is such a threat because it has concealed weapons of mass destruction from UN inspectors. “In reality, the reason to militarily attack Iraq is seen as weak by many.”

*Civiltà Cattolica* added that of the 91 violations of UN resolutions so far, 59 have been committed by U.S. allies: Israel 32, Turkey 24, and Morocco 16.

The Vatican-authorized article pointed to the real reason for an attack against Iraq: the insane “Chicken-hawks” and their utopian doctrine. This “seems to be the geopolitical position occupied by Iraq in the Middle East,” first of all “the necessity on the side of the U.S.A. to have secure access to Iraqi oil.” But “for the U.S.A., some remark, it is not only a matter of having access to the immense reserves of Iraqi oil but rather also of ‘stabilizing’ the whole Mideast region.” According to “a position in the U.S. administration, prominently represented by R. Perle, chairman of the Defense Policy Board, and by P. Wolfowitz, Deputy Defense Secretary, ‘the occupation of Iraq should be the occasion of democratizing and introducing Iraq to modernity and globalization. This would catalyze a deep reform of the entire Arab world.’ ”

But, the article warned, a “pre-emptive war” is justified only if there is “an actual aggression or at least an imminent one. . . . As concerns Iraq, there is neither an actual military attack against the U.S.A., nor is the threat of an imminent military attack plausible. One must instead say, that it is Iraq which is the object of American and British air attacks in the two no-fly zones.”

The argument that Iraq could supply terrorists with weapons of mass destruction and therefore this must be “prevented,” *Civiltà Cattolica* wrote, is “a very dangerous argument, because it would open the way to endless war. . . . If every country that feels threatened were, in order to ‘prevent’ the threat of being attacked, to militarily attack first the threatening country, there would be endless wars all over the globe. . . . Think only about the controversy between Pakistan and India over Kashmir. . . . Under a moral profile, pre-emptive war, like any other war, is to be morally condemned.”

### A Lesson in Global Strategy

*Civiltà Cattolica* reminded its readers that the U.S. Catholic Bishops, in a letter sent by their chairman, Wilton D. Gregory, to President George Bush on Sept. 12, 2002, condemned a war on Iraq. The article concluded with a lesson in global