

LAROCHE DEMANDS IMPEACHMENT

# Obama's Afghan Policy Is Tantamount to Treason

by Jeffrey Steinberg

April 4—Lyndon LaRouche is demanding President Barack Obama's immediate impeachment or resignation from office, for crimes that are "tantamount to treason," starting with his Afghanistan policy. "American soldiers are being sent to Afghanistan to be shot by an enemy that the President is defending," LaRouche charged. "By refusing to go after the opium trade, which is the logistical and financial backbone of the Taliban insurgency, the Obama policy is giving those narco-insurgents a free hand to kill American soldiers."

President Obama's personal complicity in the opium treachery was demonstrated on March 28, when he made a 24-hour unannounced visit to Kabul, to scold Afghan President Hamid Karzai for his government's "corruption," but never mentioned the opium and heroin trade, which accounts for over 90% of the world's supply, and bankrolls the very Taliban insurgency that the Administration purports to be combatting.

"American soldiers are dying in Afghanistan, fighting an enemy that thrives on the opium trade, that the President refuses to target," LaRouche declared. "That kind of policy is tantamount to treason, and warrants the President's immediate impeachment. It cannot be tolerated."

LaRouche also called for the immediate dismissal of Gen. Stanley McChrystal, the U.S. and NATO commander in Afghanistan, who has been pivotal in the dis-

astrous Obama policy.

In stark contrast to the Obama policy, the Russian government has called upon the United States and NATO to collaborate on a full-scale war on the Afghan opium and heroin trade, which is the backbone of a global narco-insurgency, now running wild in Eurasia and the Americas, and which has been the cause of at least 1 million drug deaths from Afghan heroin overdoses over the past decade alone, according to United Nations data.

Two weeks before President Obama's Kabul visit, Victor Ivanov, the head of the Russian federal anti-narcotics agency, spoke at a conference in Kabul, demanding a comprehensive campaign to eradicate the Afghan opium trade. Ivanov cited UN statistics, showing that the Afghan opium trade generated at least \$65 billion a year in criminal revenue, and was the principal source of funding for the Taliban insurgency, as well as terrorist organizations operating across Eurasia, into the Russian North Caucasus.

As reported on Russian television on March 15, Ivanov's call was explicitly challenged by a British military officer, Richard Connelly, who was quoted: "Nobody knows better than Afghan politicians do, the history of their people and their way of life. Therefore the best thing is for them to decide themselves, what to do with the plantings. Without participation from the



USAF/TSft. Efren Lopez

*“American soldiers are dying in Afghanistan, fighting an enemy that thrives on the opium trade, that the President refuses to target,” Lyndon LaRouche charged. Shown: A U.S. Army officer and his Afghan interpreter discover a pile of dried poppy plants in Badula Qulp, Helmand Province, Afghanistan, Feb. 12, 2010. The evidence is everywhere.*

international forces.”

Such rhetorical nonsense has been used by the British for the past decade, to aid and abet the Afghan opium trade, which is the lifeblood of Britain’s offshore financial operations, centered in such locales as Dubai and the Cayman Islands, where the drug profits are laundered and invested.

A week after his Kabul speech, on March 24, Ivanov presented a detailed proposal at the NATO-Russia Council meeting in Brussels (see *Documentation*), for a comprehensive international campaign to wipe out the

drug scourge, starting with the eradication of Afghan opium, of trafficking organizations, and of the money-laundering infrastructure. The Ivanov proposal was summarily rejected by the U.S. and NATO.

### **LaRouche Targets London**

Then on March 29, suicide bombers carried out two attacks on the Moscow subway system, killing 38 people and injuring 100. Russian security services linked the attacks, as well as follow-on attacks in the North Caucasus region, to Chechen-based terrorists, who are part of the global apparatus bankrolled by the Afghan opium and heroin trade.

LaRouche identified the strategic objectives behind the terrorist attacks on Russia, in a statement on March 31: “Based on the facts presented, from what we believe to be competent sources, this is a threat to the Russian people, in order to demonstrate that the Russian government cannot protect the people. It’s an attempt to discredit the Russian government, and show its vulnerability. I am looking at complicity, behind the scenes, by British intelligence.

“This is not a couple of loose nuts. This action has a mission orientation. That mission is to discredit the government’s ability to provide security, and it is particularly aimed at Vladimir Yakunin, president of Russian Railways.”

Indeed, the recent attacks come from the same Caucasus-based Anglo/Saudi-sponsored networks, funded by the Afghan opium trade, who were responsible for the November 2009 bombing of the Moscow-St. Petersburg Nevsky Express Train.

In the wake of the U.S. and NATO rejection of the Ivanov proposal, and particularly the Moscow subway bombings, the Russian government has responded with appropriate anger. Moscow knows perfectly well that the refusal of the Obama Administration to move against the Afghan opium trade guarantees that the terrorist networks targeting Russia will have the logistical and financial support to continue their destabilization.

LaRouche characterized the Obama policy, particularly following the President’s Kabul visit, as a radical “phase shift” in the global strategic situation. Coming just days after U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton

successfully completed year-long negotiations with her Russian counterpart, Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov, on a nuclear arms reduction treaty, President Obama's Kabul trip and the associated refusal to take on the Afghan opium apparatus, represented sabotage of the potential for U.S.-Russian cooperation, a potential that cannot be repaired so long as President Obama remains in office.

While the nuclear arms reduction treaty is still scheduled to be signed in Washington in the coming days, the damage has been done.

### **GOP Psycho-Sexual Impotence**

To be sure, the U.S. government's policy of de facto support for the Afghan opium apparatus did not begin with of President Obama. Successive U.S. administrations, going back to 1979, have either boosted the Afghan opium trade, or turned a blind eye to its presence. When the George W. Bush Administration invaded Afghanistan in October 2001, following the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld explicitly rejected proposals from some of his top military commanders to wipe out the opium trade.

Under the U.S. occupation, the Afghan opium business skyrocketed, to the point that, as of 2007, Afghanistan was producing 95% of the world's opium and heroin. In 2007 alone, Afghanistan produced 8,200 metric tons of opium, 160% of world consumption!

LaRouche noted: "The Afghan opium and heroin trade, which is synonymous with the Taliban insurgency, is not entirely new. While the current White House policy of collusion with the Afghan drug lords demands that President Obama be sent to early retirement, it is equally the case that the Bush Administration followed the same disastrous recipe. As the result, the Republican Party is completely impotent, to fight against President Obama's Afghan treachery. The Bush legacy hangs around their neck."

### **An Open Secret**

In March 2009, Richard Holbrooke, President Obama's special envoy for Afghanistan and Pakistan—and a former business partner of drug legalizer George Soros—announced that the Obama Administration was abandoning all efforts at opium eradication in Afghanistan, claiming that the program was "inefficient," "costly," and was driving Afghan farmers into the arms of the Taliban. While Holbrooke was echoing the long-standing British policy of sabotaging any meaningful

anti-narcotics effort in Afghanistan, evidence was accumulating that the Afghan opium trade was the lifeblood of the Taliban and allied insurgencies, and that any counterinsurgency strategy that did not start with its eradication was doomed to fail miserably.

Several months after the Holbrooke announcement, the United States Institute for Peace (USIP), a Congressionally established and publicly funded research agency, published a 36-page dossier, "How Opium Profits the Taliban," by Gretchen Peters, which spelled out how the Taliban had evolved into a narcotics cartel. From the local level to the Taliban top leadership, widely believed to be operating out of Quetta, Pakistan, near the Afghan border, the insurgency is now synonymous with the narcotics trade.

And with that total integration, a level of brutality, previously not seen, has taken hold. Peters, a former ABC News correspondent in Pakistan and Afghanistan and the author of a 2009 book on the Taliban and the Afghan opium trade, wrote: "The drug economy brings an increased level of brutality—a viciousness that seems far more senseless to many who live under it. . . . The Taliban, which used to ban TV entirely, began releasing a grisly video series showing their fighters beheading men they accused of spying for the Americans. It culminated in an April release featuring a knife-wielding child executioner who looked barely 12 years old. There were also reports of Taliban soldiers gouging out eyes or gutting enemies they captured in battle."

In her USIP study, Peters wrote: "Opium has long played a supporting role in the Afghan conflict, and today the drug trade has moved to center stage. Not only have narcotics corrupted the Afghan government, they have also begun to transform—through deepening ties between insurgents and drug traffickers along the Pakistan-Afghanistan border—the nature of the insurgency from one based on ideology to one increasingly driven by profit. Insurgent commanders from the district level up to the top leadership have expanded their involvement vertically through the drug trade. . . . As the core Taliban in the south and other extremist groups such as al-Qaeda have become more closely tied to crime along the Pakistan-Afghanistan border, levels of violence have increased. Additionally, insurgents have diversified into other criminal activities, including kidnapping for ransom, extortion, and, in some areas, human trafficking. The more complex the criminal networks become, the more difficult it will be for the coalition of foreign forces in Afghanistan to fight them."

## Opium Politics

The Peters USIP study was based exclusively on publicly available material, and on interviews with scores of Afghan eye-witnesses to the transformation of the Taliban into a narco-terrorist organization, in the mold of the Colombian FARC or the Peruvian Shining Path (Sendero Luminoso).

An even more widely circulated profile of the Taliban and the Afghan opium and heroin trade appeared on March 30, in Salon.com, written by Alfred McCoy, author of *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia* (1972).

McCoy began his exposé with a devastating account of the U.S. military mission in Helmand Province, the center of the Afghan opium enterprise:

“After a year of cautious debate and costly deployments, President Obama finally launched his new Afghan war strategy at 2:40 am on Feb. 13, 2010, in a remote market town called Marja in southern Afghanistan’s Helmand Province. As a wave of helicopters descended on Marja’s outskirts spitting up clouds of dust, hundreds of U.S. Marines dashed through fields sprouting opium poppies toward the town’s mud-walled compounds.

“After a week of fighting, U.S. war commander Gen. Stanley A. McChrystal choppered into town with Afghanistan’s vice-president and Helmand’s provincial governor. Their mission: a media roll-out for the general’s new-look counterinsurgency strategy based on bringing government to remote villages just like Marja.

“At a carefully staged meet-and-greet with some 200 villagers, however, the vice-president and provincial governor faced some unexpected, unscripted anger. ‘If they come with tractors,’ one Afghan widow announced to a chorus of supportive shouts from her fellow farmers, ‘they will have to roll over me and kill me before they can kill my poppy.’

“For these poppy growers and thousands more like them, the return of government control, however contested, brought with it a perilous threat: opium eradication.

“Throughout all the shooting and shouting, Ameri-



USMC/CWO3 Philippe Chasse

*Adm. James Stavridis identified the human disaster that Britain’s new Opium War has wrought in Russia, where, just last year, some 30,000 Russians, between the ages of 18 and 24, died from heroin usage. Shown: an Afghan poppy farmer watches an AH-1W Cobra helicopter fly over his field in Farah province, Afghanistan, March 8, 2009.*

can commanders seemed strangely unaware that Marja might qualify as the world’s heroin capital—with hundreds of laboratories, reputedly hidden inside the area’s mud-brick houses, regularly processing the local poppy crop into high-grade heroin. After all, the surrounding fields of Helmand Province produce a remarkable 40% of the world’s illicit opium supply, and much of this harvest has been traded in Marja. Rushing through those opium fields to attack the Taliban on Day One of this offensive, the Marines missed their real enemy, the ultimate force behind the Taliban insurgency, as they pursued just the latest crop of peasant guerrillas whose guns and wages are funded by those poppy plants.”

McCoy’s account of the new Obama/McChrystal counterinsurgency doctrine graphically exposed the folly of the current U.S. strategy. The bulk of the report, however, catalogued the consequences of a 30-year war, waged on Afghan soil, which transformed a once-stable, remote agricultural nation into the world’s opium field. As the normal economic life of the nation was disrupted, the farmers found themselves at the mercy of the opium lords, who in many cases forced them to produce at the point of a gun.

When the Taliban seized power in Kabul in 1996, Afghanistan was already producing 75% of the world’s opium. The Taliban regime collected an estimated \$100



million a year in revenue from taxes on the government-sanctioned opium crop. Heroin labs in and around the city of Jalalabad boosted the Taliban's take.

McCoy reported: "During the 1990s, Afghanistan's soaring opium harvest fueled an international smuggling trade that tied Central Asia, Russia and Europe into a vast illicit market of arms, drugs and money-laundering. It also helped fuel an eruption of ethnic insurgency across a 3,000-mile swath of land from Uzbekistan in Central Asia to Bosnia in the Balkans."

In July 2000, Taliban leader Mullah Omar ordered a ban on opium production, for reasons that are still hotly debated. Almost overnight, poppy production, and with it, the Afghan economy, collapsed—by 94%.

The temporary rift between the Taliban and the legions of opium lords who had secured the group's consolidation of power in Kabul, benefitted the Bush Administration, in October 2001, when Bush launched the invasion of Afghanistan, to overthrow the Taliban and drive al-Qaeda, literally, underground. Opium lords who had prospered under Taliban rule prior to July 2000, lined up behind the Bush-Cheney invasion, and by the end of the first year of the U.S. occupation, opium production had soared back up to 3,400 metric tons. By 2007, Afghanistan was producing 93% of the world's opium, estimated by the UN at 8,200 metric tons.

## The Generals Speak

If journalists like Peters and McCoy are capable of documenting the true state of affairs, where is the U.S. government?

Not all of America's top military commanders have adopted General McChrystal's "Made-in-London" mantra that the U.S./NATO coalition must first defeat the Taliban and al-Qaeda military forces, before taking on the opium trade. Gen. Barry McCaffrey (ret.), who served President Bill Clinton as head of the White House Office on National Drug Control Policy, has conducted a series of fact-finding missions to Afghanistan and Pakistan, and has published his reports in memoranda to Col. Michael Meese of West Point.

General McCaffrey's latest mission to Afghanistan was in November 2009. His Dec. 5, 2009 report featured the following blunt assessment of the opium plague in Afghanistan and its implications for the U.S. mission there:

"The \$3.4 billion opium crop of 7,700 metric tons (2008) produces weapons and supplies for the Taliban and al-Qaeda, corrupts the police and civil authorities,

diverts land from food (two million drug workers) and has addicted a significant percentage of the population. Left unaddressed—the heroin menace will defeat our strategic goals in this campaign.

"Afghanistan is now the most damaged narco-state on the face of the earth. There are at least 920,000 drug users causing abject misery among widows, orphans, the unemployed, the poor. A new UN study will soon suggest there may be as many as two million drug users....

"The current notion that we can ignore the growers as simple farmers trying to survive—and focus our counter-drug strategy only on law enforcement against the cartels—is painfully naive. These huge criminal Afghan heroin operations if not defeated will corrupt legal governance, addict the population, distort the economy, and funnel immense resources to the Taliban and terrorist groups.

"The solution is three-pronged. First, work on alternative livelihood agricultural crops. Second, have the Afghan political leadership confront the opium issue as un-Islamic and one that destroys their culture. Third, *destroy the crops. Without the last—nothing will work*" (emphasis added).

Adm. James Stavridis, the current head of the U.S. European Command and the NATO Supreme Allied Commander for Europe (SACEUR), has echoed McCaffrey's assessment, and delivered a de facto endorsement of Russian anti-narcotics chief Ivanov's warning that the terrorist threat across all of Eurasia is inextricably tied to the Afghan opium and heroin trade.

Addressing a conference of American ambassadors from the Black Sea region at his Stuttgart, Germany headquarters on April 1, Stavridis declared, "When I look at the [Caucasus region] in general, as we see with the recent subway bombings ... I'm worried about that as a zone of terrorism." As reported in *Stars and Stripes* on April 3, "During Thursday's conference, Stavridis and his diplomatic counterparts looked for ways to better coordinate efforts to promote cooperation in the region. The flow of narcotics, particularly heroin from Afghanistan, human trafficking, and weapons smuggling, are some of the factors that contribute to growing instability in an area where regional rivalries have historically limited cooperation.

"For instance, he said, more needs to be done regarding heroin flowing into the region from Afghanistan. Stavridis said that heroin is to blame for the deaths of some 30,000 Russians last year between the ages of

18-24. ‘That in and of itself is a humanitarian disaster,’ Stavridis said. ‘And the profit and the money from that goes right back to the Taliban in Afghanistan.’ Heroin made from Afghanistan poppy crops generates from \$100 to \$400 million each year for the insurgency.”

Admiral Stavridis focussed on the need for greater American-Russian cooperation, including on Afghan drug production and its consequences across Eurasia.

### The Heart of the Beast

LaRouche today called for an immediate and massive American eradication program, to replace the failed McChrystal “counterinsurgency” strategy. “Bomb the poppy fields now,” launch a full-spectrum war on drugs, including to top-down elimination of such British offshore dirty-money havens as Dubai and the Cayman Islands. “It is the British opium war policy, now targeting all of Eurasia and all of the Americas, to sustain an already hopelessly bankrupt British offshore financial empire, that is the true enemy.”

LaRouche warned that the global dope trade and the flows of dirty money are the lifeblood of the London-centered financial system. “London will react desperately the moment they see the United States and Russia working together to take down their dope empire,” he said.

As for the program to defeat and replace Dope, Inc., LaRouche presented it concretely in 1985, when he outlined a 15-point war plan.<sup>1</sup>

LaRouche warned, in the current context, that London is already putting in place an option of assassinating President Obama, as a means of throwing the United States into chaos. He also warned that the United States and Russia, in combination, must deliver an unmistakable, preemptive message to Israel: Under no circumstances are you to attack Iran. London’s other chaos option is to get Israel to bomb Iran, creating an even bigger global disaster.

“Only a strong alliance between Washington and Moscow,” he said, “which would be instantly joined by both China and India, can bring down the British offshore financial empire of drug money, terrorism, and unbridled speculation. That is why President Barack Obama, who has shown himself so far to be a pawn of the British financial interests, must be removed from office, through prescribed Constitutional means.”

1. [http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2008/2008\\_20-29/2008\\_20-29/2008-29/pdf/12-13\\_3528.pdf](http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2008/2008_20-29/2008_20-29/2008-29/pdf/12-13_3528.pdf)

---

## Documentation

---

### Russia’s Ivanov: Let’s Jointly Fight Afghan Drugs

*April 1—Victor Ivanov, chairman of Russia’s State Anti-Narcotics Committee and director of the Federal Service for the Control of Narcotics, gave this speech at the enlarged ambassador-level session of the Russia-NATO Council in Brussels on March 24. The following day, the Russian Foreign Ministry denounced NATO’s refusal to eradicate the opium crop in Afghanistan, accusing the United States of “conniving” with Afghanistan’s drug producers with this decision. Subheads have been added; emphasis is from the Russian transcript.*

---

### Lines of Cooperation Between Russia and NATO Aimed at Eliminating the Global Phenomenon of Afghan Drug Production

---

Dear NATO Secretary General,  
Dear Delegates,

Quite soon, on May 9, the whole world will celebrate the 65th anniversary of the victory of the Allies in World War II. One of the symbols of the unfading spirit of that prominent coalition will be, in particular, the Victory Parade in Moscow’s Red Square, involving NATO military personnel (up to a company of soldiers equipped with modern armaments).

It looks as though a new, broad coalition—but anti-drug, instead of anti-Hitler—should be set up. This is indicated by both the importance of keeping up traditions of partnership and cooperation, and the absolute fact that drug production in Afghanistan, which is phenomenal in terms of its scope, has become a *fundamental, damaging factor* for our countries’ populations.

We are professionals who realize the need for an adequate response to the threat that has emerged, and its scope, as well as for effective solutions to be taken for the sake of our peoples.

The other day, I returned from Kabul, where I discussed this problem with representatives of anti-drug



Russian “drug czar” Victor Ivanov is shown speaking here in Washington on Sept. 24, 2009.

institutions (those of Russia, ISAF countries [NATO’s International Security Assistance Force], and Afghanistan), as well as the UN mission.

## Huge Drug Production

Therefore, let me say a few words about official estimates of Afghan drug production, which is a common challenge for our 29 countries. According to the UNO, 100,000 people die of Afghan heroin every year. *About 1 million people have died from Afghan drugs* during the first decade of this century, while 16 million have suffered mentally or physically. International heroin consumption in 2008 amounted to: 21% in Russia (70 tons), 26% in Europe, excluding Russia and Turkey (88 tons), 6% in the U.S. and Canada (22 tons). Thus, *the countries represented at today’s event account for more than half* of all globally consumed heroin. Our countries account for a greater part of the world opiate market: approximately \$20 billion in Europe, out of the total of \$65 billion; \$13 billion in the Russian Federation; \$8 billion in the U.S. and Canada; i.e., our countries account in total for 59% of the world opiate market.

Speaking of the threats and challenges facing our countries, we should compare figures showing losses among our citizens from events in the Central Asian region.

It is shocking that annual civilian losses in the NATO

countries due to heroin overdoses are *50 times higher than their military losses in Afghanistan*. This is confirmed by the data provided by UNODC [UN Office on Drugs and Crime] Director Antonio Costa regarding the annual death of 10,000 citizens of the North Atlantic Treaty countries caused by Afghan drugs.

It is obvious that military operations in the region should be aimed, not at self-protection, but at *protecting these countries’ own citizens*, who also happen to be the taxpayers that are paying for their military men’s operations.

It should be stressed that, besides direct damage to the lives and health of our citizens, Afghan drug production is forming and consolidating *transnational organized crime in Eurasia*, as well as—and this is extremely dangerous—providing huge financial resources and recruitment

potential for terrorist and extremist organizations, illegal infrastructure, and supplies of armaments, explosives, and communications facilities aimed at operations against the civilian population.

## The International Response

At the same time, *the lack of results* of international anti-drug efforts in the region over a long period of time—*actually for eight and a half years*—has provided strong evidence of the inadequacy of the approaches that have been applied to ensuring security.

In summary, one can state that, in general, the existing architecture is not only ineffective, but *even has a negative result*. For example, the decisions of the Jan. 28 London Conference, on reintegrating a part of the Taliban into the power structure, indicate that there is an intensifying process of reassessment of the level and type of threat from this movement, while the role and significance of large-scale drug production keep growing steadily, and are *multiplying its negative and life-threatening consequences for the world in general*.

Under the conditions of globalization, there is an obvious need not to just pick discrete threats from among the broad spectrum of challenges, but also to *formulate a new security philosophy*. At the present time, a linear, or even primitive approach, of focusing

the total international force-potential on solving one problem, taken by itself—e.g., terrorism—is absolutely insufficient; this may be stated in the context of the evaluation by such prominent politicians as the head of the British Foreign Office, *David Miliband*, and others, to the effect that “*the war on terror*” was a mistake that may have caused “*more harm than good*.”

Issues concerning hierarchy and priority of threats must be addressed, within the security architecture, in such a way that elimination of some of them not give rise to new, much more dangerous threats, as has happened in the case of Afghanistan. Therefore, the new security starts not with a linear definition of a list of threats, but with the calculation of the risks and consequences of the international community’s response to such threats. Global policy is a *sphere of absolute risks*—i.e., absolutely unexpected and sometimes highly painful consequences can result from quite trivial and ordinary solutions and actions.

The term “risk” is of Greek origin (*risikon*), meaning “cliff”—i.e., a high degree of an unfavorable outcome, if you’re on the edge of a precipice.

Consequently, the planning of new steps and solutions by international institutions, in response to threats, must be accompanied by reflection on the outcomes of the solutions previously executed. An overview of the events of the last decade convinces us that *there has been a serious failure* in the application and character of joint efforts on the part of the international community, in implementing key UN resolutions.

Political imperatives to combat the drug menace were established in 1998. As a result, opium production in Afghanistan decreased 12-fold. 2,693 tons of opium were manufactured in 1998, but 185 tons in 2001. New enforcement solutions, adopted by the international community in the significant year 2001, resulted in a drastic growth of opium production—by 40-fold, in fact. Thus, using medical terminology, we can state that *the medicine proved to be more harmful* than the diagnosed disease.

When evaluating the architecture of global and Eurasian security, we should stress the priority of eliminating Afghan drug production. The stability of both Eurasia and the world as a whole depends on the efficacy of joint efforts in this area.

## Cooperative Security

Probably we already have all the necessary grounds to introduce quite a *new type of security into interna-*

*tional politics: anti-drug security*. What we need is cooperative responsibility and cooperative security projects.

It is for these reasons that *Russia views NATO as its key partner in fighting the Afghan drug threat*. Moreover, NATO took command of the ISAF on Aug. 11, 2003, and is essentially operating on behalf of the global community, alongside another NATO member, the U. S.A., which, since Oct. 7, 2001, has been implementing *its own* Operation Invincible Freedom.

Thus, taking into account the principle of joint and shared responsibility, *it is NATO that is fully responsible* for normalizing the situation in Afghanistan, including the elimination of drug production.

But, *Russia is not willing to stand aside*.

The Russia-NATO Council, as well as the bilateral Medvedev-Obama Presidential Commission, within which there is already an actively working anti-drug group, jointly presided over by Mr. Gil Kerlikovsky and myself, provide a good basis. Along the lines of this Russian-American working group, it could be expedient to form *a joint Russia-NATO group*, aimed at elaborating a common approach to fighting Afghan drug production.

## Russia’s Proposal

In the current situation, I would like to present to the Russia-NATO Council the main provisions of *Russia’s plan for the elimination of Afghan drug production*, as a practical basis for consolidating the efforts of Russia and the NATO member-states:

1. Raising the status, through the UN Security Council, of the problem of Afghan drug production to that of a threat to global peace and security.

2. Elaborating and implementing the program of Afghan economic development, through developing infrastructure, first and foremost for the energy and electricity industries, as well as creating a sufficient number of jobs (at least 2 million) for Afghan citizens.

3. Eliminating the cultivation of opium poppy through the eradication of crops by well-tested methods, and raising the efficiency of these efforts from 3% to not less than 25%.

4. Adding to the “UN Sanctions List” those landlords who provide their land for growing poppy. For this purpose, organizing a special cadastral registration of the territory of Afghanistan’s southern provinces.

5. Introducing into the ISAF mandate the compe-



tence and obligation to eradicate opium poppy crops in Afghanistan.

6. Providing the necessary level of trust, in order to develop operative collaboration, intelligence data exchange, including information on the location of drug laboratories, precursor supplies, movement of intermediate products, etc.

7. Joint, well-coordinated efforts aimed at training Afghan Drug Police (during the current year, Russia will train 225 policemen under the program of the Russia-NATO Council).

Taking into consideration the number of proposed points, *I suggest naming this plan "Rainbow-Two: Russia-NATO."* Implementing this plan may require *creating an international commission or agency* for the elimination of Afghan drug production, with clearly established goals for the next five years. If this plan is supported and approved, I believe the anti-drug coalition which takes shape will receive an effective instrument and will succeed.

Incidentally, *"the big success"* of *Operation Moshtarak*, in the evaluation of the UN Secretary General and our colleague Mr. Rasmussen, has made it possible to liberate Helmand Province from armed insurgents; this is the province providing over 75% of Afghanistan's drug production. Thus, already today we can see unique opportunities for *implementing point 3 of the proposed plan*, to eliminate 60% of the world's drug production.

Thank you.

## Russians See Foreign Financing of Attacks

April 4—Russian specialists, as well as the population at large, are looking intently at the factor of foreign funding of the ongoing spate of terrorist attacks on the country. This morning's bombing of a freight train in Dagestan was officially declared an act of terrorism.

The LaRouche Political Action Committee release, "LaRouche: Look to British Intelligence Behind Moscow Bombings," issued immediately after suicide bombers killed 29 people in the Moscow subway system, has been published in Russian on dozens of

websites, blogs, and Internet forums, drawing mostly approving comments from many readers. Some of those joining the discussion cite the British role in instigating conflicts in the Caucasus, going back to the 19th Century.

Speaking to the Rosbalt news agency on April 1, Vadim Mukhanov, a senior researcher at the Center for Caucasus Studies of the MGIMO (the Foreign Ministry's university), stressed that "our" terrorists "have sources of funding abroad," especially in the Middle East. While Saudi Arabia-based Wahhabite funding channels to Chechen and other North Caucasus radicals are well known, other Russian figures are looking deeper, to the British connection. It was reliably reported already two years ago, that the 2007 heightening of tension between Moscow and London was connected with Russian security agencies' discovery of a "British trail" in the destabilization of the North Caucasus.

*EIR* presented a relevant dossier, beginning with the April 12, 1996 cover story, "British Monarchy Rapes Transcaucasus, Again," which was updated in *EIR* of Sept. 10, 1999, in conjunction with publication of Lyndon LaRouche's strategic video, "Storm Over Asia," on the renewal of British imperial geopolitical schemes throughout Eurasia. *EIR* drew attention to the coherence of the London-sponsored North Caucasus Common Market plan and the radical separatist North Caucasus Caliphate scheme—and the overlap of some personnel between the two projects.

After the recent Moscow subway bombings, Vice-Speaker of the State Duma Vladimir Zhirinovsky also brought up the London connection. "The explosions in the Metro are a continuation of the plan for struggle against Russia, which is worked out in London both by the special services and by our former compatriots," said Zhirinovsky. "It's also certain forces from the U.S.A., who are unhappy that there will be some improvement in relations between our countries. . . . And it also is the North Caucasus, which remains in a state of latent terrorist threat. There may not be major fighting there, but the centers have remained, there are unemployed people, there's drugs and there's dollars. They all go off to Islamic universities in Cairo, and so forth, and it's known what they study—how to do subversion."

Gen. Leonid Ivashov (ret.), former head of the Ministry of Defense international department, in a March 29 interview, cautioned against being too sure the at-

## The Caucasus



EIRNS/John Sigerson

tacks were planned in the North Caucasus, even if that was the staging ground. “The situation in the Caucasus is socially, economically, and politically the most beaten down in Russia,” said Ivashov, “and there you have the most grotesque version of the clan relationships which have been imposed on Russia. . . . But, I wouldn’t jump to the conclusion that the organizers are sitting in the Caucasus. Of course, suicide bombers can be recruited. But the ultimate ‘customer’ is most likely somewhere higher up, maybe abroad, maybe here in Russia.”

### Saudi/British Geopolitics

Behind the mindless acts of terrorism lurk the machinations of two external forces, represented by the Saudi Arabia-spawned Wahhabism, and the British policy to weaken Russia. Training of these terrorists, along with the Uzbek and Uighur Chinese terrorists, was carried out in Pakistan’s tribal area of North Waziristan. There were reports that since last August, these terrorists began moving towards their home bases, to step up jihad against the governments of Central Asia and Russia.

According to a high-level Indian intelligence contact, who follows terrorist activities in the region, reports from the Caucasian region of Russia indicate that jihadi terrorists continue to be active in the Ingushetia region, bordering Chechnya. In February, at least 20 insurgents were reportedly killed by Russian security forces in Ingushetia. Many Chechens work as security guards and manual laborers in the commercial establishments of Moscow. Pro-al-Qaeda Chechens sometimes use them for creating sleeper cells.

It should be stressed that those who are training the Chechens are Wahhabis, who are virulently anti-Shi’a, involved in violent dismantling of sovereign nation-states and installation of a supranational Caliphate. Many of these trainers are of Chechen origin, whose ancestors settled hundreds of years ago in Jordan and other Southwest Asian countries. Imbued with the ultra-orthodox Wahhabi version of Islam, they have become, in essence, terrorists working for Saudi Arabia and Britain, to undermine all sovereign nations in Central Asia, and Russia.

## Obama War To Defend The Opium Traffickers

by Michele Steinberg

April 1—In a special edition of the LaRouche PAC Weekly Report of March 31 (published in this issue), Lyndon LaRouche said that the center of the strategic battle against the British Empire is Afghanistan.

“Remember, . . . there’s a war going on in Afghanistan,” LaRouche stated. “In this war, the United States, under the present President, *is defending the right of the drug-traffickers to continue to operate without interference.* We’re fighting a war—we’re sending troops in, to kill and be killed in Afghanistan, in order to protect the drug-traffickers! These drug-traffickers are also the major source of support for control of Russia. Because they harm Russia, . . . like the recent

[bombings] that just happened in Moscow. These are things which were *done*, and are being done against the United States, by killing our troops, in Afghanistan—with the President’s permission, and encouragement!

“At the same time, the same forces, the same group of people who were behind 9/11, are operating against Russia, too, now. And will operate against other nations.

“And Obama is practically committing an *act of treason*, by sending U.S. troops into area, *to be killed*, by the logistical force *which Obama is defending*. If that isn’t tantamount to treason, I don’t know what is.”

While the U.S. protection of the British-sponsored opium production in Afghanistan started under the Bush-Cheney Administration, it was Obama who ended *all eradication of opium*, and ended the efforts to eliminate the drug lords and traffickers who fund the Taliban and other insurgencies.

The background to Obama’s treason, from Spring 2008 to the present, is summarized here:

---

## Chronology

---

**Spring 2008:** *EIR* researchers begin exposing the opium-protection policy in Afghanistan, after receiving detailed briefings from veterans of the Afghan War, who describe that the military targetting of the “narcokhans” (drug lords), opium and heroin warehouses, or drug traffickers is absolutely forbidden under NATO rules of engagement. Only “terrorists” and “insurgents” can be militarily targetted, and a decision by the NATO Council in Brussels would be required to change the rules of engagement. The Bush-Cheney Administration had totally backed the British, who occupied the opium-producing areas of Southern Afghanistan, and whose policy is to protect the opium fields and trafficking.

Under the direction of LaRouche, *EIR* publishes a series of articles and special reports documenting the connection of the opium traffic to the financing of both al-Qaeda and the Taliban. *EIR* identifies the role of Dubai—a British-run money-laundering banking center—and other offshore banking havens, as the centers that must be closed down to cut off the logistical flow to al-Qaeda and the Taliban.

**Aug. 1, 2008:** *EIR* reports: “There is now full recognition within U.S. military circles that the commanders

of the Taliban, and Taliban’s al-Qaeda allies, are funding their armies—as *EIR* warned more than a decade ago—with opium and heroin trafficking, as well as a newer, burgeoning empire in hashish production. One U.S. intelligence source stated that more than \$100 million a year, directly from the opium grown in Afghanistan alone, goes directly to the Taliban, for its military operations.

“The source put the overall monetary value of the Afghan opium trade now accounting for 93% of the world’s opium production last year at approximately \$160 billion. . . .”

**July 27, 2008:** Thomas Schweich, a former top counter-narcotics official in the State Department, steps forward to expose the opium empire in Afghanistan that had grown under the NATO occupation. In a *New York Times Magazine* feature article, Schweich writes, “Over the next two years [from July 1, 2006], I would discover how deeply the Afghan government was involved in protecting the opium trade by shielding it from American-designed policies. While it is true that [Afghan President Hamid] Karzai’s Taliban enemies finance themselves from the drug trade, so do many of his supporters. At the same time, some of our NATO allies have resisted the anti-opium offensive, as has our own Defense Department. . . . The trouble is that the fighting is unlikely to end as long as the Taliban can finance themselves through drugs and as long as the Kabul government is dependent on opium to sustain its own hold on power.”

Schweich reports that the Bush Administration’s backing for Karzai’s insistence that aerial eradication of opium fields be ended, was fatal to the counter-narcotics effort. He shows how forcing the U.S. anti-drug forces to use manual eradication has led to U.S. troops fighting farmers and tribal leaders, when the U.S. forces tried to seize opium fields. Such manual eradication was deliberate sabotage by the British and the Bush Administration. Competent anti-drug experts in the U.S. knew, from the successful experience in Colombia, that other effective non-lethal means were possible.

**July 30, 2008:** Gen. Barry McCaffrey (USA, ret.), the former head of the Office of National Drug Control Policy under President Bill Clinton, submits his report on Afghanistan to Col. Michael Meese at West Point.

*EIR* endorses McCaffrey’s findings in an Aug. 7 press release, and reports: “McCaffrey writes: ‘Afghan-

istan is in misery.’ Sixty-eight percent of the population has never known peace, life expectancy is only 44, and Afghanistan has the highest maternal death rate in the world. . . . The atmosphere of terror cannot be countered mainly by military means. We cannot win through a war of attrition. . . . Afghanistan will not be solved by the addition of two or three more U.S. combat brigades from our rapidly unraveling Army.’

“Instead, McCaffrey argues that, in addition to building up the Afghan security forces, economic measures are also required. He calls for the deployment of a ‘five battalion Army engineer brigade . . . to lead a five-year road-building effort employing Afghan contractors and training and mentoring Afghan engineers. . . . The war will be won when we fix the Afghan agricultural system which employs 82% of the population. . . . The war will be won when the international community demands the eradication of the opium and cannabis crops and robustly supports the development of alternative economic activity.’

“McCaffrey pointed to the tremendous growth in the poppy crop since the U.S. invasion in 2001 and warned that ‘Unless we deal head-on with this enormous cancer, we should have little expectation that our efforts in Afghanistan will not eventually come to ruin.’”

**August 2008-January 2009:** *EIR* publishes feature articles continuing to detail the Afghanistan opium/heroin traffic connection to terrorism, including the November 2008 attack by Islamic extremist narco-terrorists on Mumbai, India. The LaRouche movement organizes among elected officials, and military and intelligence professionals, to force a change in Afghanistan strategy to eliminate the opium traffic, and thereby cut off the logistics for the Taliban and al-Qaeda.

**Jan. 16, 2009:** *EIR*’s cover story on how to combat the drug trade is published under the title, “Drive the Narcos Out of the Americas.” It includes excerpts from a Fall 2008 report by General McCaffrey on Mexico, which called for a joint U.S.-Mexico anti-drug fight, “Colombia Nearly Disappeared by Negotiating with Narcoterrorists,” and “How Drugs Can Be Wiped Out, Totally” (which explains how crops can be wiped out using high-tech, non-lethal methods); LaRouche’s 1985 fifteen-point plan to combat narcoterrorism; and “George Soros, Britain’s Drug Kingpin Waging War Against the Americas.”

**January 2009:** There is a short-lived victory for the

anti-opium strategy in Afghanistan, with the news that Gen. Bantz John Craddock, Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR), the highest military commander in Europe, had approved NATO military operations against drug traffickers, narco-lords, and drug refineries and warehouses in Afghanistan. But, on Jan. 28, the German news weekly *Der Spiegel* reports on a leaked classified NATO document, in which Craddock approved the targetting of narco-traffickers and the bombing of narcotics laboratories in Afghanistan. After a violent backlash from several NATO countries that support legalization of drugs, the policy is shelved, and shortly thereafter, Craddock’s rotation as SACEUR ends.

## Enter Obama

**March 2009:** Obama’s Special Envoy for Afghanistan and Pakistan, Richard Holbrooke, announces in Brussels that the poppy eradication effort in Afghanistan has been ended because it is “wasteful” and is driving Afghan farmers “into the arms” of the Taliban, because it destroys the farmers’ livelihood. Holbrooke downplays the significance of drug money in financing the insurgency, and lies that the United States and NATO will focus efforts on interdicting narcotics shipments, and on stopping money laundering. No such actions are carried out against the Afghanistan dope trade, and instead the Taliban insurgents continue to make major gains in Afghanistan—financed by dope money.

A George Soros-linked pro-legalization website, [www.stophthedrugwar.com](http://www.stophthedrugwar.com), gleefully welcomes Holbrooke’s denunciation of opium eradication, and claims the decision as a victory for the march towards drug legalization. Holbrooke had been a business partner of Soros, the world’s leading drug legalizer, in a biomedical company.

**May 11, 2009:** Obama suddenly fires Afghanistan commander Gen. David McKiernan, and replaces him with Gen. Stanley McChrystal. McKiernan was widely reported to have been favorable to SACEUR General Craddock’s decision to target narcotics operations and laboratories.

With the Holbrooke declaration and the McChrystal appointment, any effective U.S./NATO operation against the dope traffic that is financing the Islamic extremist terrorist operations, from Afghanistan to the Northern Caucasus to Moscow and Mumbai, India, is ended.