Russian, Indian, and Iranian speakers voiced support for the more differentiated Franco-German position than for the simplistic Anglo-American position.

The position of President George Bush was, in any case, further eroded by the boasting of Sen. Joseph Lieberman's (D-Conn.), who remarked at Munich that the present American policy on Iraq was actually based on a joint initiative by McCain and himself—the Iraq Liberation Act: "You might therefore say that when it comes to Iraq, President Bush is just enforcing the McCain-Lieberman policy."

Iranians Urge Dialogue of Civilizations

Iran's first-ever invited speaker at Munich, Deputy Foreign Minister Gholamali Khoshroo, said on Feb. 9 that the West has been wrong to see the events of Sept. 11 as an attack by Islam on America as the leading power of the West. There still is an inaccurate Western concept of Islam, of what it means in culture, civilization, society, Koshroo said. Iran, for its part, is deeply concerned about the militarization of international security policies since Sept. 11, as it is about the increased presence of foreign troops in the Persian Gulf region and Afghanistan. And although it seems that an Iraq war is likely, Iran still holds that war must be prevented.

As victims of Iraqi chemical weapons during the 1980-88 Iraq-Iran War, the Iranians might generally be believed to have a just motive for a war of revenge against Baghdad; but Khoshroo stressed that Iran is against such a war. It also opposes a forced regime change in Baghdad, because of the impact it would have on the humanitarian situation of the civilian population inside Iraq, on the neighboring countries, and on global crude oil prices. It has gone largely unnoticed, Koshroo said, that not only Iran, but the other states in the Persian Gulf, in January officially voiced their opposition to a war. When discussing the situation of Iraq, its immediate neighbors must be consulted, Khoshroo urged.

Before the Iranian diplomat, Brajeesh Mishra, India's national security advisor, had criticized the present, Western obsession with al-Qaeda, which he said was preventing a broader discussion about other, perhaps more dangerous aspects of global terrorism. The "coalition against terrorism" which the United States rallied after Sept. 11, 2001, is not qualified to deal with the problem in a competent way, as it "includes states that are part of the problem," Mishra said. He reiterated India's proposal for an international United Nations charter against terrorism—which has, as Russian Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov confirmed at the Munich conference, the official support of the Russian government.

And the representative of China, Gen. Xiong Guangkai, deputy chief of the Chinese general staff, urged the West to overcome double standards and cooperate in the formulation of a more precise definition of, and more efficient fight against, the plague of terrorism in all its variants.

Eurasia, apparently, does not share the Rumsfeld approach to military affairs and security.

Will There Be Regime Change in Britain?

by Mark Burdman

The massive opposition in Great Britain to a war against Iraq, while the collapse of the British and world economy is demolishing whatever remaining illusions of "normalcy" and "prosperity" still exist, has created a situation in which tectonic shifts in the British political landscape can be expected. One question being asked in informed quarters is whether Prime Minister Tony Blair might be dumped before an anticipated war with Iraq could begin, and whether this might be the kind of shock that would seriously slow or stop the war momentum.

Another crucial issue now emerging is the role of the British monarchy, given consistent reports that Royal heir Prince Charles is mobilizing, privately, against the pro-war policies of the Bush and Blair regimes.

'Nightmare for Tony Blair'

The relevant matter was posed by senior London *Guardian* commentator Martin Kettle, on Feb. 11, in an article entitled "Blair Should Beware of Regime Change in Britain." He began, "It is not just Baghdad, but London, that is threatened with regime change." Kettle insisted that an air of "unreality" hangs over Blair's 10 Downing Street, as the Blair regime rushes into a "folly" that could easily be avoided, if it would back alternatives to a military solution for dealing with Iraq.

The latest opinion polls show the magnitude of the disaster facing Blair, especially because such polls are used as much to shape public opinion as they are to monitor it. The Feb. 11 London *Times* headlined, "Voters Desert Blair Over Iraq." The article stressed that support for the Blair-led Labour Party "has fallen to its lowest level for more than a decade," because of Blair's Iraq policy. It noted that while most Britons polled regard Saddam Hussein as an active threat, nine out of ten want weapons inspectors to be given more time, and a majority are sympathetic to the Franco-German position opposing war. A special poll conducted by the BBC, released on Feb. 12, showed that fewer than one in ten would support a war without further United Nations authorization.

Pointing to such polls, and to expectations that at least 1 million people would turn out for country-wide anti-war demonstrations on Feb. 15, the *Financial Times* lead editorial on Feb. 13 was headlined, "The Nightmare for Tony Blair."

Indeed, Blair looks like he is suffering from an advanced

case of insomnia. The front page of the Feb. 13 *Independent* ran a photo of him, staring glassy-eyed into space, under the banner headline, "Under Siege From Every Side." The *Independent* reported that on Feb. 12, one of Blair's own Cabinet Ministers, International Development Secretary Clare Short, attacked U.S. policy toward Iraq; and that on the same day, in the Parliament, 26 Labour Party MPs spoke on Iraq, and 19 of them attacked Blair's backing for a U.S.-led war. War opponent Alan Simpson said that the Blair government "should be more concerned with the prospect of the disintegration of the Labour Party, than engaging in a war which the public believe to be quite immoral."

Former Labour minister Glenda Jackson told Germany's *Spiegel On-Line* on Feb. 13, that she had given up all hope in her own government, and that the only chance for peace rested with the initiatives of the French and German governments. She affirmed that this was the worst domestic crisis in Great Britain since the British-French-Israeli Suez War fiasco of 1956.

Another sign of the times, is that leaders of five British trade unions warned, on Feb. 10, that if Blair propels Britain into war with Iraq, the country could face "massive" industrial strike action, in protest.

Blair and his entourage have responded to the anti-war ferment with extraordinary security alerts and domestic deployment of troops. On Feb. 12, a contingent of 450 troops and 1,700 extra police, together with tanks, were deployed to Heathrow Airport, as Cabinet ministers announced that Britain was under immediate threat from Osama bin Laden's al-Qaeda. This "news," not coincidentally, followed the release of the new "Bin Laden tape," the which, American and British officials falsely insist, proves that there are operational ties between al-Qaeda and Iraq. Labour Party chairman John Reid said on Feb. 12, that Britain is facing the greatest security threat since Sept. 11, 2001.

The reaction throughout the U.K. to such dire pronouncements has been one of cynicism and skepticism. Within hours, Reid issued a second statement, claiming that he had been "misinterpreted." Charges flew throughout the UK that the security threat had been staged to build up a mood of panic to force support for a Gulf war and to discourage people from coming out on Feb. 15 to demonstrate, especially as the government's claims were that terrorist acts would most likely occur on that very date, the last day of the Muslim *Eid* holiday.

'The British People Have Been Deceived'

The British government's credibility hit rock-bottom, after its "Iraq dossier" caper of the week of Feb. 3. This is the dossier about which U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell proclaimed, in his Feb. 6 address to the UN Security Council: "I would call my colleagues' attention to the fine paper that the United Kingdom distributed yesterday, which describes, in exquisite detail, Iraqi deception activities." It was revealed worldwide, beginning Feb. 7, to have been significantly plagiarized from an academic report written by an Iraqi-American graduate student, about the situation in Iraq—in 1991! Elements of the plagiarized text had been altered by Blair's spin doctors, to bolster the case against Saddam Hussein.

On Feb. 9, the London *Independent* reported that the British intelligence agencies oppose the premises underlying the campaign for a war with Iraq, and their personnel resent the "politicization," misuse, and falsification of their work to support conclusions they actually oppose. A British intelligence officer was quoted: "You cannot just cherry-pick evidence that suits your case and ignore the rest. . . . Yet that is what the P[rime] M[inister] is doing." A U.S. intelligence source told the paper that "partisan material is being officially attributed to these agencies."

The intelligence professionals struck back by leaking to BBC a classified British Defence Intelligence Staff (DIS) document written in January, with the assessment that there are *no* current links between the Iraqi regime and al-Qaeda, to contradict a main point of Colin Powell's UN citation of the British government's analysis. The *Independent* was told, "A DIS document like this is highly secret. Whoever leaked it must have been quite senior and had unofficial approval from the highest levels of British intelligence."

On Feb. 10, the Blair government's behavior was challenged by Labour Party parliamentarian Tam Dalyell, the longest-serving member of the House of Commons (known as "the Father of the House of Commons"), and the most vocal opponent of the war. Dalyell was suspended for the day when he insistently demanded responses from the Blair government about its "Iraq dossier." Dalyell was told to leave, after he refused to obey speaker Michael Martin's repeated requests to sit down as he raised "points of order" on the subject.

The furor began when several Parliamentarians demanded a statement on the "dossier," and after Dalyell's request for an emergency debate had been rejected. Raising a point of order, Dalyell said, "This is a matter of trust and deceit—Parliament has been deceived. The British people have been deceived . . . on a matter which is the basis of peace and war." Dalyell argued, that the UK was on "a motorway without exit, to war." Soon thereafter, he was told to leave the Commons.

Earlier, Dalyell had complained that plagiarizing an out-of-date Ph.D. thesis "reveals a lack of awareness of the disastrous consequences of such a deception. This is not a trivial leak, it is a document on which is the basis of whether or not this country goes to war, and whether or not young servicemen and servicewomen are to put their own lives at risk, and indeed [the lives of] thousands, tens of thousands of innocent civilians."

Outside the Commons chamber, Dalyell stated, "I think I am the first Father of the House ever to have been asked to go

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-