

They number more than 45,000 men and have powerful logistics. They are mobile and have a high level of combat readiness and combat capability. In certain conditions, the SF could be supported by air-mobile units and detachments of the 18th Ground Corps. Nonetheless, the use of the special force in Afghanistan is complicated by a number of factors. In the opinion of the U.S. Command, the SF are capable of acting to a depth of up to 700-800 kilometers. This is the range of their transport capabilities and this is the radius of action for the tactical air force without which large-scale operations on Afghan territory are impossible. What happens to the SF when they have to act to a greater depth could be seen in the abortive raid to liberate hostages in the American Embassy in Tehran after the Islamic revolution in Iran.

Similar to the air-missile scenario, the SF will not be able to totally undermine the terrorist foundations. The SF cannot control the territory for a long period of time. At best, the special forces may wipe out or capture the main nucleus of the terrorist organization.

Big War. A full-scale war with the establishment of control over the greater part of Afghanistan's territory and destroying terrorist bases in other countries could solve the problem that is seen in the United States today. However, on the way to occupying Afghanistan, you should consider the experience of Great Britain and the Soviet Union. In their time, they were unable to solve this task, which didn't seem to be so complicated at the beginning.

In any case, in order to carry out such an operation, it will be necessary to deploy several hundred thousand men in close proximity to Afghanistan. And this once again raises the problem of finding new allies. Moreover, strategic deployment in itself, as was seen from the Desert Storm operation, will take a minimum of half a year even with the maximum of effort.

Purely military problems are dwarfed by the political problem. In reality, there are only two regions where a joint armed group from an anti-terrorist coalition could be deployed. They are Pakistan and the Central Asian republics of the CIS. In both instances, Washington will have to achieve a change in the political course of the potential allies.

Islamabad will have to turn 180 degrees in its policy toward the Taliban, and possibly estimate the reaction of its rival, India, and its ally, China. Russia, whose stand will be the key factor in allowing U.S. forces into post-Soviet territory, will have to make a very difficult choice with consequences difficult to foresee. These consequences will determine the country's vector of development for many decades, if not centuries.

Incidentally, most likely the subjects mentioned in the process would not be able to adopt such far-reaching decisions. This being the case, Washington's most probable tactic will be an air operation combined with limited SPF action, and it will be up to the future leaders of the West and Russia to solve the problem of world terrorism.

European Leaders Warn Against 'Flight Forward'

by Mark Burdman

Amidst the lust for vengeance and war being whipped up by CNN and a slew of deranged policymakers in the United States in the wake of the Sept. 11 atrocities in New York and Washington, a number of prominent figures in Europe have raised their voices, trying to inject a counter-trend of sanity into the situation. These individuals, while in solidarity with the United States, are terrified, that what 2004 Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche has characterized as a tendency toward "flight forward" in leading U.S. quarters, could plunge the world into disaster. They are concerned that precipitous action could be taken, on the basis of unproven allegations and false trails of investigation.

These European figures include current and former senior figures in government, military experts, and senior newspaper commentators.

There is an intense desire in Europe to avoid the "clash of civilizations" between Islam and the West, or between the "West and the rest," that has been advocated by American geopoliticians such as Harvard University's Samuel Huntington and former U.S. National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski.

The "clash of civilizations" concept is regarded as dangerous and insane, and one which threatens to create religious wars in Eurasia akin to what informed Europeans know as the 17th-Century's Thirty Years' War. It must also be kept in mind, that European nations have large Muslim populations on their soil, and if this situation heads in the berserker direction teleguided by Cable News Network (CNN) and promoted by American neo-conservative and related elements, then there will be unforeseeable domestic consequences, throughout Europe.

Andreotti: Beware 'Emotional Reactions'

Perhaps the most striking reaction among prominent Europeans, has been that of former Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti. Andreotti is one of the world's most tried and tested politicians, with extensive experience in matters of defense, intelligence, and terrorism. He was already a member of the Italian government in 1945, and has been Prime Minister seven times, as well as, variously, Minister of Defense, Foreign Affairs, and Economy. He was Prime Minister in the 1970s, when Italy was battered by a "strategy of tension," highlighted by the 1978 kidnapping and assassination of former Prime Minister Aldo Moro, an action which, informed

Italians know, was orchestrated by highest-level circles within the NATO structure, and among the circles of former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. In the words of the intelligence trade, Andreotti “knows where the monkey sleeps.”

After Sept. 11, Andreotti gave several interviews to the Italian press. On Sept. 12, he spoke to the Italian Catholic daily *Avvenire*, advising that “the West must keep its nerve, beware of emotional reactions.” He warned, “If there are unmotivated, disproportionate reactions, probably a mechanism would be unleashed, which would lead I know not where. And maybe this is exactly what the organizers of such disruptive undertakings want to achieve. . . . Pay attention, do not jump at hypotheses which seem easy. . . . Also because, almost certainly, they [the perpetrators of the Sept. 11 attacks] must have had internal collaboration. It seems difficult that all this was the work of occasional ‘travellers,’ arrived there just in time.”

Speaking to the Milan daily *Corriere della Sera* on Sept. 13, Andreotti insisted that he did not buy the story that Osama bin Laden is the author of the terror attacks: “I wonder who helped the terrorists in the United States. They must have remarkable support *in loco* [on site]. These are people who have flown an airplane, who have calculated the time to be right there on television; they are not improvising tourists. Terrorism does not grow only on this side of the ocean; Americans have already had Oklahoma City, let us not forget that.”

In an interview in Italy’s *Il Nuovo* on Sept. 14, Andreotti said that his judgments “depend maybe on my political experience, and on the history I have lived through. But I believe that one should never let oneself be carried away by emotions, even in the face of facts of such an immeasurable seriousness.”

On Sept. 16, the daily *Libero*, which has ties to elements within the current Italian government, became the first newspaper in Europe to cite charges made by LaRouche, that the Sept. 11 events were part of a domestic “covert operation,” part of an “internal coup d’état,” aimed at bringing the United States into war. On Sept. 20 and 22, Radio Radicale, a national radio station, aired a 45-minute interview with LaRouche, in which he described the nature of the crisis, his role in trying to resolve the crisis in a sane manner, and his advice about what European governments can, and should, now do.

German Leaders: ‘Economic Development, Not War’

Echoing Andreotti in some respects, was former German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel, in several interviews on Sept. 13. Kinkel said that showing Europe’s fundamental solidarity with the United States is one thing; quite another, is to draw concrete conclusions as to the authorship of the terrorist attacks. It must be absolutely proven, Kinkel insisted, that it was a *foreign-directed* attack on America, and one should not



German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder. Now is not the time for military adventures and a clash of civilizations, he said, but rather for dialogue and economic cooperation.

overlook the fact, that a domestic terrorist infrastructure has existed in the United States, with the right-wing “militias,” which maintain connections to active-duty military officers. One should be very cautious in using the term “war,” Kinkel said, because a “clash of civilizations” must be avoided.

Former German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, in a *Die Zeit* editorial, wrote: “It is urgent that the U.S., as well as the European governments, not fall into the trap of rumors and identify false culprits.”

Such advice has filtered into current German government circles. In interviews over the Sept. 15-16 weekend, President Johannes Rau, Chancellor Gerhard Schröder, Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer, and other officials emphasized that, under no circumstances, should the fight against terrorism be allowed to degenerate into a clash between the West and Islam. Instead, additional efforts should be made to broaden the dialogue with Islam, to cooperate with such governments as Egypt, Jordan, and Iran, and especially, to maintain close consultation mechanisms with Russia and China.

In respect to the latter point, it should be kept in mind, that former Chancellor Helmut Kohl had just completed an extraordinary diplomatic tour of both Moscow and Beijing, before Sept. 11, and had promoted closer German cooperation with Russia and China.

Intriguing formulations have come from Chancellor Schröder, a man who is susceptible to coming under the influence of German institutional forces, in the business-

economic and strategic-intelligence communities, in times of crisis. On Sept. 17, in the keynote address to the “Asia-Pacific Weeks” in Berlin, he said that concentration on the fight against terrorism must not lead into neglect of the “fight for culture” and for “economic development.” He pointed to Germany’s relations with China as offering a model for how cooperation can expand, citing as one among several examples, German firms building the Transrapid project in China.

The central event of the Asia-Pacific Weeks has been the Sept. 18-19 German-Chinese Economic Days, focussing on the development perspective for western China, and on the bigger joint projects, including the Transrapid in Shanghai and the Three Gorges Dam.

The German government website which reported these developments during the week of Sept. 17, also reported that a German-Chinese congress on Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, who played a seminal role in a “dialogue of civilizations” between Europe and China, has just been concluded. The congress included a presentation on Leibniz’s battle against the bestialist 17th-Century British philosopher Thomas Hobbes, and also an exhibit displaying 14 functioning machines that Leibniz designed, but was unable to build in his lifetime.

Over the past decade, Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have repeatedly stressed the importance of German-Chinese economic cooperation for the overall development of Eurasia. It is also noteworthy, that LaRouche’s chief philosophical forebear and “mentor,” is Leibniz.

On Sept. 19, Schröder made another interesting intervention. Speaking to the German Parliament, he insisted that now is not the time for military adventures and a clash of civilizations, but rather for dialogue and economic cooperation. While noting that civilizations are different, he stressed that there are universal values valid for all of mankind, like those “inalienable rights of man” enunciated by the American Founding Fathers, more than 200 years ago. Those rights are not in conflict with non-fundamentalist Islam, he said.

Schröder affirmed that Germany, as well as other NATO members, have assured the United States of Atlantic Alliance solidarity under Clause 5 of the alliance treaty, but military assistance according to that clause can only be given if it is proven that the terrorist attacks on the United States came from abroad. Germany is prepared to shoulder military risks, but is opposing adventures, and it thinks that any fixation on purely military measures would be wrong. Instead, a broader concept based on political, economic, cultural, and security cooperation must be formulated.

Védrine: Not A ‘Civilization Conflict’

In France, the political elites are being extremely prudent about being drawn into the drumbeat for war, led by CNN and friends. What has been stressed repeatedly, in one way or another, has been the necessity for preserving national

sovereignty in the field of action, and avoiding a clash of civilizations.

Typical of this, is Foreign Minister Hubert Védrine, who said on Sept. 13 that “we have to avoid the clash of civilizations. The Arab countries are also on a volcano with their Islamists. . . . The European allies of NATO have no desire to be led into a ‘civilization conflict.’ ” He rejected the idea, whether it come from the mouth of U.S. President George W. Bush or anybody else, that what is at stake, is a “monumental fight of good against evil.”

Like Confederate Generals In ‘Gone With The Wind’

As for Great Britain, while Prime Minister Tony Blair and his coterie are determined to demonstrate a 100% alignment with the United States, and the eternal nature of what is called the Anglo-American “special relationship,” British officialdom has made its reservations known, through a series of planted leaks to the media.

On Sept. 19, the very day that Blair was arriving in Washington, the London *Times* ran a front-page story, that Britain is “alarmed” by the talk, among certain senior Americans, about targetting Iraq and overthrowing Saddam Hussein. They warn that this would “destabilize” the entire Middle East.

Two days earlier, a senior British diplomat told *EIR*, that he and many of his colleagues were flabbergasted by the Sept. 16 assertion by Bush that the United States would be conducting “this crusade, this war on terrorism.” The diplomat wondered whose advice Bush was taking, since the word “crusade” has the most negative connotations among Muslims and others in the Middle East, whose history is significantly shaped by horror at the slaughters by Western Christian crusaders, beginning in the 11th Century. (Indeed, some days later, the White House disavowed the word.)

On Sept. 19, *Times* senior commentator Simon Jenkins, in a piece entitled “Christians Should Not Charge Into ‘Holy War,’ ” likened the war-mongers in the United States to the “Confederate generals in ‘Gone With The Wind,’ ” for whom “common sense is the stuff of treason.” Those now seeking “the purest act of vengeance since the Middle Ages” and a “cathartic act of violence,” are overthrowing all Christian values, while often invoking seeming Christian justifications, and are putting “reason in quarantine,” he said. He demanded that Christian leaders take bolder steps to head off what he sees as “the last war of the awful 20th Century,” rather than what President Bush is calling “the first war of the 21st Century.”

‘Falling Into An Incredible Trap’

Meanwhile, top figures in the European police, anti-terror, and intelligence milieux, are strongly questioning the line that “Osama bin Laden did it.” Jürgen Storbeck, director of Europol, said in a Sept. 15 interview with the London *Daily*

Telegraph, that “Bin Laden is not the automatic leader of every terrorist act carried out in the name of Islam. It’s possible that he influenced it; but he’s probably not the man who steered every action or controlled the detailed plan. As for the idea that, sitting in Afghanistan, he could have controlled the last phase of the operation, [this] is something we should not accept without a lot of doubt.”

Kay Nehm, Germany’s chief prosecutor, who directs the investigations into the radical Arab-Islamic underground in several German cities, strongly denied any “hard evidence pointing to the implication of bin Laden.” German and Swiss dailies, soon after Sept. 11, leaked an internal assessment by the German foreign intelligence service BND, that bin Laden’s organization was only one among many groups of Islamic terrorists, and that the role of Baku, Azerbaijan, as a pivot for terrorist connections among Central Asia, the Caucasus, and the Mideast, should be looked into more intently.

Among the hardest hitting comments were those of the German military’s Bundeswehr University Prof. August Pradetto, interviewed in the daily *Die Welt* on Sept. 19. Professor Pradetto stated that the year-long preparations that were required could not have been handled from Afghanistan. “Bin Laden is perhaps a component of the terror commando, but not not the crucial part.” Noting that the secret services of one or another country might be instrumental in the Sept. 11 events, Pradetto warned that “behind this is not blind destructive rage, but calculation. The attack on the most important symbol of the remaining superpower is a targeted provocation. Intelligence services know the reaction of their enemy in advance. The goal could be, to pull NATO into a war against the Islamic world, and we are on the verge of falling into an incredible trap.”

A similar point was made on Sept. 20, in the French daily *Le Monde*, by leading French expert on Islam and the Middle East Gilles Kepel. Under the headline “The Trap Of The Afghan Jihad,” Kepel insisted that what must be urgently clarified, before any precipitous action is taken, are the shady connections between “Islamic warriors” from the Afghan front and the U.S. secret services, emphatically including in the years following the end, in 1989, of the Islamists’ war against the Soviet Union, and the years since the Taliban takeover of Afghanistan. Precipitous “anti-terror” actions, he warned, could soon drag the West into the “clash of civilizations” which, ironically, bin Laden himself feeds upon.

**To reach us on the Web:
www.larouchepub.com**

Pope Counsels Against Revenge After Attacks

by Marianna Wertz

In the wake of the Sept. 11 attacks on the United States, Pope John Paul II, whose leadership, together with Lyndon LaRouche, in the past three decades, has been crucial to holding the world back from the portals of war, is urging that American leaders not allow themselves to be “dominated by hatred and the spirit of retaliation.”

On Sept. 22, the Pope will arrive for a three-day visit in the Central Asian nation of Kazakstan, separated only by Uzbekistan from Afghanistan, the central target of a planned American military strike against the Osama bin Laden organization. Though urged not to make the trip by those who fear for his safety, John Paul said that the trip is necessary now, as its purpose is to promote dialogue between cultures and religions.

On Sept. 12, the Pope sent a telegram to President George W. Bush, with the following message:

“Shocked by the unspeakable horror of today’s inhuman terrorist attacks against innocent people in different parts of the United States, I hurry to express to you and your fellow citizens my profound sorrow and my closeness in prayer for the nation at this dark and tragic moment. . . . I beg God to sustain you and the American people in this hour of suffering and trial.”

Later that day, the Pope dedicated his general audience, celebrated in St. Peter’s Square, to the tragedy in America. After again expressing his “profound sorrow” at the attacks, John Paul said:

“I add my voice to all the voices raised in these hours to express indignant condemnation, and I strongly reiterate that the ways of violence will never lead to genuine solutions to humanity’s problems. . . . How is it possible to commit acts of such savage cruelty? The human heart has depths from which schemes of unheard-of ferocity sometimes emerge, capable of destroying in a moment the normal daily life of a people. . . . Even if the forces of darkness appear to prevail, those who believe in God know that evil and death do not have the final say. . . .”

The Pope then directed prayers for the political and religious leaders in the United States, “in order that, not allowing themselves to be dominated by hatred and the spirit of retaliation, they do everything possible to keep weapons of destruction from sowing new hatred and new death and