

expand the debate on Iraq in the Security Council. After South Africa (which holds the current NAM presidency) requested a wider debate allowing non-Security Council members to present testimony, Germany agreed, giving rise to daily showings of opposition to the war. Of the 50 nations testifying from Feb. 18-20, only a handful supported the insane axioms of the drive for war.

Two countries having a key logistical role in a possible U.S. war—Qatar and Turkey—came out strongly for a peaceful resolution, and giving more time to inspections. Qatar, the command headquarters for the U.S. military in the Gulf, announced on Feb. 19 that it had called for a summit meeting of the OIC in Qatar to discuss “reaching a peaceful solution.” Adding a shocker, Qatar’s UN envoy said, “we would like to set on the record” that Qatar notes and objects to the double standard set at the UN by the United States regarding Israel. Qatar said, “Resolutions must be implemented by Israel, which possesses an arsenal of nuclear weapons,” and the UN should “subject the Israeli nuclear installations” to the inspections of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Iran, always cited by the warhawks as the proof that “Iraq attacks its neighbors,” told the Security Council that “the prospect of another destabilizing war in our immediate vicinity is a nightmare scenario of death and destruction . . . a catastrophe . . . beyond imagination.” Asserting that the 1980-88 Iran-Iraq War gave Iran unique authority to speak on the issue, envoy Javan Zaria added, “one outcome is almost certain: Extremism stands to benefit enormously from an uncalculated adventure in Iraq. The prospect of appointing a foreign military commander to run an Islamic and Arab country is all the more destabilizing and only indicative of the prevailing illusions.”

### Exit Strategy

There is no question that the war may still be prevented. Virtually the entire world’s population, and most governments, oppose it. Inside the United States, opposition continues to spread, where more than 120 city councils and county governments have passed strong resolutions opposing the war, including Los Angeles on Feb. 21. In the Senate, Robert Byrd (D-W.V.) and Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) introduced a resolution to rescind the October 2002 vote by Congress that gave Bush the okay to attack Iraq. In addition, authoritative voices besides LaRouche, notably the Pope, are seeking a “face-saving exit strategy” for President Bush, to stop a war at this late hour. None other than Zbigniew Brzezinski, one of the original authors of imperial policy of the Rumsfeld-Cheney crew, came out against unilateral war in the *Washington Post* on Feb. 19, warning that a forced regime change in Iraq “may be purchased at too high a cost to America’s global leadership,” and that “Iraq does not represent a global security threat.” The United States should give the UN inspectors “several months” to complete the work, Brzezinski said.

In an interview with *Time* on Feb. 16, French President

Jacques Chirac declared that Bush “would have two advantages if he brought his soldiers back. I’m talking about a situation, obviously, where the inspectors say now there’s nothing left—and that will take a certain number of weeks. . . . If Iraq is stripped of its weapons of mass destruction and that’s been verified by the inspectors, then Mr. Bush can say two things: first, ‘Thanks to my intervention, Iraq has been disarmed’; and second, ‘I achieved all that without spilling any blood.’ In the life of a statesman, that counts—no blood spilled.”

There are other indications of a shift. The Washington website *Capitol Hill Blue* reported on Feb. 20, that some Bush Administration strategists are urging the President to look for an “exit strategy” from a “no-win” situation where the United States does not have the UN Security Council votes for its resolution. Republican Congressional leaders are also said to be telling Bush privately that he is losing support in Congress for a go-it-alone war. “The President’s war plans are in trouble, there’s no doubt about that,” an adviser to House Speaker Dennis Hastert (R-Ill.) was quoted. “Some Republican members want a vote on military action and some of those say they would, at this point, vote against.”

## Facing Global ‘No War,’ U.S. Plays ‘Monopoly’

by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach

At a Schiller Institute conference in Washington on Feb. 15, Democratic Party Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche warned that within the next two to three weeks, the decision whether to wage war against Iraq would be made in that city against a backdrop of a changed world, where the “overwhelming majority of the human race” has spoken—directly or indirectly—to say that the war against Iraq “shall not happen.” He referenced the outpouring of tens of millions of people onto the streets of the world’s major cities that day, and the stunning opposition at the UN Security Council on Feb. 14, when Secretary of State Colin Powell delivered his second pro-war speech.

LaRouche’s projected timeframe was confirmed by Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak during a visit to Berlin on Feb. 18, when he told press: “The U.S.A. gives [Saddam Hussein] two to three weeks. Saddam must realize this.” Mubarak added that although the inspections should be allowed to continue, “there must be a limited time” established. Egyptian diplomatic sources confirmed to *EIR* that Mubarak’s statements were closely coordinated with the Bush Administration.

Within these parameters, the United States and U.K.,

along with Spain, presented a second resolution to the Security Council on Feb. 24. The carefully worded text, worked out in consultation with Spanish Prime Minister José María Aznar, as well as Prime Minister Tony Blair in Britain and Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi in Italy, did not explicitly contain a declaration of war, but de facto established the *casus belli*. The resolution proclaims “false statements and omissions” in the Iraqi report on its weapons programs; asserts “the threat Iraq’s non-compliance with Council resolutions and proliferation of WMD [weapons of mass destruction] and long-range missiles pose to international peace and security”; and in its key conclusion, states: “under Chapter VII of the UN Charter” (which authorizes military action) the Security Council: “1: *Decides* that Iraq has failed to take the final opportunity afforded to it in resolution 1441. 2: *Decides* to remain seized of the matter” (emphasis added). The world’s political leaders recognized that if the resolution were to be approved, the United States and U.K. would consider it *carte blanche* for military action.

There is no guarantee that the new resolution will pass, however. On the contrary, the international opposition to military action has continued to expand since the Feb. 14 Security Council session. As soon as the new resolution had been presented, a memorandum drafted by France, and co-signed by Russia, Germany, and China, also was delivered to the Security Council. In it, the three veto powers and Germany asserted that a new resolution is unnecessary. Stating that the inspections had yielded results, it laid out a plan for step-by-step disarmament, setting clear guidelines for every aspect of the process. The memo proposes that on March 7, the inspectors present a plan, defining priorities and a timeframe for disarmament. Further reports on their progress should follow every three weeks, and a conclusive evaluation should be made in four months, i.e., in early July. The memo clearly states that the military option can be only the last means.

French President Jacques Chirac and German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder had met on Feb. 24, immediately after the new U.S.-U.K. resolution was presented. Chirac said: “We see no reason in this context to change our logic, which is a logic of peace, and to switch to a logic of war.”

## The Grand Bazaar

Considering that Syria will vote against the new resolution, and Germany will likely abstain, the U.S. and U.K. hope for a simple nine-vote majority, while preventing France, Russia, and China from exercising a veto. It has become a matter of armtwisting, bribing, and intimidating the governments in the UN Security Council. Led by Colin Powell, top U.S. diplomats have been travelling to Security Council member nations, while President George W. Bush himself is heavily engaging in direct and phone diplomacy. Walter Kansteiner, Undersecretary of State for African Affairs, made visits to the capitals of the three African nations in the Security Council, Angola, Guinea, and Cameroon. Powell met with

the top Chinese leadership, in hopes of getting a commitment against a veto. On his way to Asia, Powell called the foreign ministers of Chile, Mexico, and Bulgaria, to persuade them to vote “yes.”

At what price? According to a Feb. 21 summary in the London *Times*, the carrots being offered include the following: Mexico is promised improved immigration regulations; Bulgaria should get U.S. support for entry to the European Union and increased military cooperation with NATO; Africa (Angola, Guinea-Conakry, Cameroon) are promised development aid and increased international status; Chile, a stronger hand in talks on U.S. trade tariffs; and Russia is offered guarantees on \$10-12 billion of Iraqi debt, as well as possible oil contracts. Beijing, visited by Powell on Feb. 24, is vulnerable on its exports to the U.S. markets.

Nothing else compares to the fantastic agreements being offered to Turkey, which are supposed to *appear* to include tens of billions of dollars in loans and aid; access to cheap Iraq oil; and permission to invade northern Iraq with U.S. forces and take control of some part of it, an act which could easily be a “war within the war” between Turkey and the Kurdish forces. But such a “deal” is suicidal for Turkey, its economy, its desire to enter the EU, and its stability. Despite weeks of this “monopoly game,” as of Feb. 27 Turkey’s parliament still would not vote to allow the U.S. military forces—waiting just offshore in Navy ships—to enter Turkey for the war.

The big stick is also being wielded. Undersecretary of State Marc Grossman reportedly said in Mexico City, “Any country that doesn’t go along with us will be paying a heavy price.” As reported by the *Washington Post* on Feb. 25, the American lobbying thrust is that the only issue is “whether council members are willing to irrevocably destroy the world body’s legitimacy by failing to follow the U.S. lead.” This is according to senior U.S. and diplomatic sources. And, Undersecretary of State John R. Bolton, “told the Russian government that ‘we’re going ahead,’ whether the council agrees or not, a senior Administration official said.”

The French publication *Canard Enchaîné* on Feb. 26 cited one French diplomat who said, “It is hard to imagine the crusading spirit that reigns at the Pentagon and White House,” referring to the pressure tactics being deployed at the UN. It cites the case of Pakistan, saying that Washington has threatened to take sides with India in the Kashmir conflict, if Islamabad is not forthcoming. More plausible is a warning embedded in a *Washington Post* lead editorial on Feb. 25, to the effect that if President Musharraf does not toe the line, he could be out. Musharraf has been called personally by President Bush on the matter and visited by U.S. CENTCOM chief Gen. Tommy Franks.

The veto powers have not been given a slightly more cordial treatment. On Feb. 25, U.S. Ambassador to France Howard Leach stated in a television interview, that a French veto would be considered an “unfriendly act.”