

IS THE U.S. BEING SET UP FOR FUTURE MILITARY ACTION IN OTHER COUNTRIES?

THE RESULT OF THE SEPTEMBER 11, 2001 TERRORIST ATTACKS

The terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001 resulted in the United States becoming involved in military action in other countries as a response to the terrorist attacks. It seems possible that if the United States experiences another terrorist attack, the goal of the attack will be for further or continued military action in other countries by U.S. forces as well as an assault against the United States itself.

SEPTEMBER 11, 2001: AN ATTACK ON THE US AND THE US ECONOMY

The attack against the United States on September 11, 2001, was not only a terrorist attack on the United States against the nation and its people, but an economic target. With the targeting of the World Trade Center and the New York City area that included the New York Stock Exchange, this was an attack that affected and damaged the entire U.S. economy, which was one of the goals.

What has been seen since is military involvement in other countries as a response to the September 11, 2001 attacks, and involvement in these countries, that has an economic component as well.

THE HAMBURG CONNECTED HIJACKERS

Although Afghanistan was where U.S. forces were sent soon after the September 11, 2001, in fact, most of the hijackers who were involved in the planning and implementation of the September 11, 2001 attacks were centered in Germany. Three of the primary hijackers, those reported to have been the ringleaders and three of the reported pilots in the attacks, Mohamed Atta, Marwan al Shehhi, and Ziad Jarrah, were immigrants who lived in Hamburg, Germany. In the 9/11 Commission report, it notes that these three hijackers, and a fourth person, Binalshibh were heavily involved in the planning and implementation of the attacks. The report notes a pattern of these three hijackers traveling between the U.S. and Germany numerous times, and in some cases, to make contact with Binalshibh in Germany. As well, Jarrah, from the UAE had entered Germany as a student on a military scholarship to Germany from the UAE some years before. Although the contacts between these people and their living for years in Germany was documented and known to numerous people, including their families, there was little or no documentation that these hijackers had spent time in Afghanistan or in Pakistan.

One indication of what kind of attention the alleged hijackers from the Hamburg cell in Germany got prior to September 11, 2001, is indicated in an article published not long after the attack, on November 23, 2001, in the Christian Science Monitor.

In this article, the reporter quotes from a high-ranking German officer, who told him, “we had no suspicions that there was an al-Queda cell in Hamburg. We knew there were some Islamic extremists in the city, but these young men were totally unsuspecting. They didn’t so much as get a parking ticket.”

Although two people were charged and convicted by the German government with being directly connected to the September 11, 2001 hijackers, they were soon released. They were Mounir al-Motassadek, who was convicted of being an accessory to the more than 3,000 murders. Mr. Motassadek operated a bank account under the hijacker Shehhi’s name, which was used to fund flight lessons in America and provide the expenses for American visa applications for the group. Abdelghani Mzoudi had been found to have transferred money to pay for flying lessons for one of the September 11th, hijackers.

In February, 2004, a German court acquitted Mzoudi, and released him on his own recognizance. In March, 2004, a German appeals court threw out Al Motassadek’s conviction, although the charges had not changed, nor the findings that he had power of attorney over the bank account of reported hijacker, Shehhi, and had handled funds for the living expenses of three of the hijackers, including Atta while they lived in the U.S., preparing for the September 11th attacks. The original arrest warrant’s “urgent suspicion” that al-Motassadek was guilty of

being an accessory to murder, was downgraded to “adequate suspicion”, and he was released from prison in April, 2004.

NATO RESPONSE TO SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Although the U.S. military actions in Afghanistan have been represented as being a U.S. mission, and solely a U.S. response to the September 11, 2001 attacks, it has instead been fully a coalition mission. A day after the attacks, on September 12, 2001, NATO stated that it was satisfied this was an attack against the United States, and called for the involvement of NATO in response.

A NATO document pertaining to the terrorist attacks on September 11th states: “the September 11 terrorist attacks on New York and Washington thrust not only the United States but also the entire NATO alliance into the fight against terrorism. Less than 24 hours after the attacks, NATO invoked for the first time, article 5 of the Washington Treaty – it’s collective defense clause – declaring the attacks to be an attack against all NATO members. The Alliance subsequently deployed aircraft and ships in support of the United States. Since then and following other tragic attacks, NATO has been engaged actively in the campaign against terrorism on both the political and military fronts.”

What is notable about the response of NATO is that it occurred before the United States itself stated that there was or would be a military component as a response to the attacks on September 11, 2001. And that there would be a military response in a: “campaign against terrorism” because of the attacks on September 11, 2001.

THE COALITION IN THE WAR ON TERRORISM

In regard to the involvement of foreign country’s military advisors and liaisons in the United States after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, and in the period involving both the Afghanistan war and the Iraq war, is what General Tommy Franks had to say in his autobiography, “American Soldier”, co-authored by Malcolm McConnell. In “American Soldier”, General Franks writes of his job as CENTCOM commander from the year 2000 until 2003, “Within a few weeks after the September 11, 2001 attacks, he writes, in speaking to Colonel Michael Hayes, “State thinks that we may well have a few friends in this operation,” I explained. “I’m betting that we’re actually going to see a large coalition form. That means allied reps liaising with this headquarters, here at MacDill, (MacDill Air Force Base in Tampa, Florida, regional headquarters for CENTCOM) We’re going to have to put them someplace.”

“..... office space, housing, vehicles, and parking,” Michael offered.

“When Michael began that September afternoon, neither of us realized that within three months, our “Coalition Village” near the MacDill flight line, would eventually consist of 68 single and double wide trailers, housing the offices of 52 nations in what President Bush described as the Global War on Terrorism.”

In speaking of Colonel Hayes and his work in terms of the coalition, General Franks noted, “The work Michael did built the coalition literally. Without his ability to organize a plan and navigate an incredible maze of local and international finance, CENTCOM could not have functioned as it did.”

Writing of what occurred on September 12, 2001, the day after the terrorist attacks, General Franks writes, “Late on the afternoon of September 12, CENTCOM’s senior staff filed into my office....Gene Renuart J – 3 Director for Operations.....The assignment gave him valuable experience not only with airpower but also with multinational coalitions, which would be an asset in the months ahead.

In writing of the involvement of coalition countries for the planning for the Afghanistan war, Franks writes, “Completing the arrangements for active military participation from coalition allies – especially high skill European, Canadian and Australian Special Operations Forces, was another element of phase one. I was very encouraged by the role these allies were performing.”

In writing of four phases in which the war in Afghanistan was to be conducted, General Franks wrote of phase four, “Phase 4 was the final stage: Establish capability of coalition partners to prevent the reemergence of terrorism and provide support for humanitarian assistance efforts. This phase would develop over a three to five year period. In this regard, I was pleased that our allies had already pledged their support. It would be a strong coalition, not only the United States.” Although the people of the United States had been told that the United States and our forces were going to Afghanistan in order to capture those responsible for the attacks on September 11, 2001, instead, it’s clear that there were other, longer-term goals for the war in Afghanistan.

PLANNING FOR THE AFGHANISTAN WAR

In a photograph in “American Soldier” what is shown is a picture of a horseshoe shaped conference table, with the national liaison’s from different countries being briefed as to the operations in the Afghanistan War. Under the picture, the caption notes, “Briefing the Coalition’s Senior National Representatives on Operation Enduring Freedom, CENTCOM Main Conference, MacDill Air Force Base, 2001.” This picture shows a number of national coalition representatives viewing a visual presentation of the situation in Afghanistan and some of them taking notes.

This was far different than the input and the treatment of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are headquartered in Virginia.

What was noted in General Frank’s autobiography, is instead of the inclusion of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Army, Navy, Marines and Air Force being apprised and involved in decision-making and being kept updated in regard to what was occurring in Afghanistan, is the inclusion of foreign military commanders and the deliberate exclusion of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff from the decision making process and also no willingness to allow any input at all. While the picture in “American Soldier shows foreign national coalition

representatives, being fully updated as to what was happening in Afghanistan, this was not the case for the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Instead how their involvement which was fully their right, duty and responsibility was treated is indicated by Frank's description of what occurred in regard to Afghanistan. Although as noted the number of foreign military commanders in Florida from other countries, this didn't include the U.S.'s top generals, who are all supposed to be consulted and involved in the military planning and use of the personnel of their respective services, and kept fully apprised of everything that is being done militarily that includes the U.S. military and the servicemen and women of the different services.

Although all military decisions for the United States military are to be made by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chiefs of Staffs of the different services of the U.S. military, what General Franks, who was the head of CENTCOM, a regional commander who did not have the authority in the U.S. military chain of command, describes in this autobiography, is decision making that was made with a number of foreign coalition partners in the Afghanistan war, deliberately excluding the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President and Secretary of Defense and Pentagon officials from their duties and roles as the sole decision making body who decide where and how the U.S. military is to be deployed.

An example of the difference in how these foreign coalition partners were treated by General Franks and how much input they had in contrast to how the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff were treated, is illustrated in the following passage: "At the Pentagon that afternoon, things got busy fast. First I had to return calls to partners in the growing coalition and potential allies in the area of responsibility, (the middle east). Then Gene and I would fine tune the target sets with the Defense Intelligence Agency and CIA. We had to move right along because I had a meeting scheduled with the secretary of defense."

What is notable about this passage is that Franks noted fine tuning military targets with the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency and the CIA after returning calls to partners in the growing coalition, however he had not at that point spoken with any of the U.S. Service Chiefs, or the president or the Secretary of Defense about any of the plans or the targets that were being developed.

In fact, all of these people are fully part of the chain of command in terms of the planning of military operations and to exclude them was illegal and unconstitutional.

It's also disturbing the attitude that General Franks displayed toward the U.S. Service Chiefs and their wanting to even be apprised of the military plans involving their four services, when instead, they are supposed to be fully part of the planning process. Franks says in his autobiography that he was told, "Tom, the Chiefs have requested that you and your J-3 brief them in the Tank....along with the Secretary. It's SOP before taking a plan across the river to the White House."

"Damn it!" I said.

Judging from Hugh's expression, he wasn't too pleased either. I was prepared to present a concept to the Secretary, not a formal OPLAN to the Service Chiefs. Hugh Shelton needed to keep the Chiefs on board and I knew it. But my intuition

told me that briefing them in front of the Secretary would be a “bridge too far”. The Chiefs were likely to “posture”, and the Secretary was likely to become frustrated. I suggested to Hugh that we brief twice, once for Secretary Rumsfeld, and later for the Service Chiefs.

“No time Tom. This will be a good chance for all the key players to get to know each other better. We can make it work.

The Gold Room, when we arrived, Secretary Rumsfeld was standing at the head of the table, surrounded by the Chiefs of Staff.

“We’ll sure as hell get back every one of those briefing papers before we leave, I thought. It soon became clear however that security would be only one problem in the Tank this afternoon.

Once the Chiefs had scanned the stacked pages, and Gene Renuart had begun to explain phase 1 of the campaign concept, Hugh Shelton asked for “opinions” from the Chiefs. He could not have recognized the trouble that simple question would create.

One after another, the Chiefs offered their views of the concept We endured half an hour of this aimless dialogue, a waste of time that neither the Secretary nor I could spare.

The Chiefs must have noticed, too; at length they began directing their glances and their caveats toward me. “Don’t take this wrong, Tom....Just to play the devil’s advocate.....” And so it went.

Gene Renuart plowed ahead, his bald pate growing red.

“That’s not particularly helpful, General,” Rumsfeld finally said, staring coldly at the offending Chief.”

Still they persisted. Rumsfeld looked pointedly at his watch.

“I’d had enough. “Look,” I said, standing to sweep up the briefing charts before me on the polished tabletop. “We have a lot of work to do, Mr. Secretary, “I’ll put this concept together tonight and have it to you in the morning.”

The room was silent.

“We’re finished for today,” Rumsfeld said.”

That was the sole input that Franks noted that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had in the planning of the Afghanistan war. They had no input, were not asked for any input, were not allowed any time to review the plans being made and were not allowed to keep information regarding the plans. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, those who are the top generals of the different U.S. military services, are supposed to be fully involved in the planning of U.S. military operations.

As noted in “Chain of Command” by Seymour Hersh, what occurred in Afghanistan was a situation where U.S. troops were ambushed and killed because the area in which U.S. forces were being deployed, had not been checked, or cleared before U.S. forces were inserted. The Air Force Chief stated that the Air Force had not been included in the planning of the mission which resulted in a suboptimal performance. In the case of the Marines, in an unprecedented and massively disturbing situation, the Marines were excluded from an operation, because there was conflict over security measures not being taken and the area not being secured before the operation.

IN AFGHANISTAN:

When coalition forces entered Afghanistan in the fall of 2001, it was a country that had experienced a series of militia wars since the end of the Afghan - Soviet war. Different militia groups formed and fought for over ten years in Afghanistan, killing large numbers of people and destroying much of the country. The Afghanistan war was only part of the conflict that had been ongoing for a long time in Afghanistan, as Afghanistan was cleared and the Afghan people dispossessed area by area with civil wars, very similar to what had occurred in Yugoslavia. The Taliban, who had been originally welcomed by the people of Afghanistan as they fought against a militia group that was destroying parts of the country, then began aggressing against the Afghan people and waging war against them as previous militias had. U.S. involvement in Afghanistan after the attacks on September 11, 2001 was in the middle of a long ongoing conflict, and in that sense, was like the involvement of the U.S. in Bosnia, and Kosovo after the conflict in Yugoslavia had been ongoing for years. The U.S. was one of a long line of countries that had been used to fund the various militias in Afghanistan, including European countries, the EU, Saudi Arabia, Russia, Pakistan, Iran and others.

CONFLICT IN THE AFGHANISTAN – CENTRAL ASIA REGION

One of the purposes for the military actions in Afghanistan might be seen in a meeting that General Franks had with Fahim, who had become the leader of the Northern Alliance after Massoud was assassinated. Franks describes meeting Fahim and a man introduced as his “minister of finance”. He noted that Fahim had come to the meeting to bargain. He held the largest, best equipped opposition force in Afghanistan.” He notes that the interpreter has a British accent, then continued, “His plans made good tactical sense. If Fahim did in fact have the loyalty of all the Northern Alliance Commanders, he was poised to destroy enemy concentrations across the north and open a vital land bridge to Uzbekistan. With that route clear, we could support opposition forces via a passable highway system that ran all the way through Central Asia all the way to Europe. Vital humanitarian support could flow to the beleaguered Afghans. General Franks, in speaking with Northern Alliance leader Fahim notes he said, “But what do you need,” I pressed. Fahim conferred with his finance minister, “what kind of additional logistical... and financial support can you provide? Hank, (an aide accompanying General Franks), laid out a computer printout listing ammunition, communications gear and medical supplies. “I need an airfield big enough for C-130’s” “And if you had your supplies?” Hank asked. An agreement was reached for 5 million dollars for the entire north. General Franks noted, “Good to his word, Mohammed Fahim Khan delivered the vital towns of the north, Taloqan, Konduz and Herat fell in rapid succession.” What is notable is why a “goal should

be a “passable highway system that ran all the way through Central Asia all the way to Europe.” If Afghanistan was secure, there would be no need. It is also notable that in the years since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, there has been ongoing conflict not only in Afghanistan itself but indeed all along a corridor from Afghanistan, through Central Asia and the Caucasus to Europe. That includes areas that have experienced a great deal of militia violence against the Central Asian, Caucasus and Russian governments since the fall of the Soviet Union, and includes conflict in the Central Asian republics, Chechnya, Ossetia, Azerbaijan and Armenia. This route also follows pipelines from the Central Asian countries to European countries, such as Germany. And like Afghanistan, it is an area that both U.S. and other countries’ military forces, including NATO, have been involved in since the September 11, 2001 attacks.

Mohammed Khan was not the only one who the U.S. dealt with in northern Afghanistan and neighboring Central Asian countries. After the attacks on U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, the U.S. began trying to gather information and establish connections to Afghanistan using neighboring countries. One of the neighboring countries was Tajikistan. In dealing with Tajikistan, the U.S. used Japan as a “go-between” with the Tajikistan government as Japan has extensive dealings and economic ties to Central Asia and had developed relationships with Tajikistan. The U.S. didn’t, as noted in “Jihad: The Rise of Militant Islam in Central Asia” by Ahmed Rashid who writes, “the United States enlisted the help of the Japanese government to broker greater cooperation from Tajikistan. Japanese envoys in Dushanbe managed to convince the government to allow U.S. Special Forces to use Tajikistan’s air bases to provide the United Front with communications and intelligence.” In “Jihad” it also noted that Tajikistan is not the only neighboring country in Central Asia that Japan has extensive ties with. Rashid writes, “Japan was an important aid donor and investor in Central Asia”, the book recounting the situation where four Japanese geologists were kidnapped by IMU militia leaders in Kyrgyzstan. In regard to the hostage taking, Rashid notes, “The Japanese hostages were finally released. Although both the Japanese and Kyrgyz leaders insisted no ransom had been paid, western diplomats reported that Japan had secretly paid two to six million dollars to Kyrgyz officials, who then delivered it to the IMU. Ahmed reports that, at the start of the Afghan war, “When a U.S. led military alliance began bombing Taliban defenses and Al Qaeda training camps on Oct 7, few reports of the defenders mentioned that the man who was reputedly commanding the Taliban forces in Taloqan, in Northeast Afghanistan was Juma Namangani, the military leader of the IMU.

THE BONN CONFERENCE ON AFGHANISTAN

The clear involvement of foreign countries in the war in Afghanistan is notable in the discussions that were held in Bonn, Germany between November 27 through December 5, 2001. In regard to this conference, it was noted by the participants, “The United Nations Talks on Afghanistan on the Petersberg near

Bonn reached a successful conclusion on December 5, 2001 with the signing of the Afghan agreement. Federal Chancellor Gerhard Schroder and Federal foreign minister, Joschka Fischer participated in the signing of the agreement and expressed their appreciation for the mediation efforts of the UN and the work done by the representatives of the various Afghan groups in negotiating this successful outcome. The federal government was the conference's host, but did not act as mediator or facilitator. The fact that the meeting was held in Bonn is a reflection of Germany's broad involvement, for example as chair of the humanitarian Afghanistan Support Group, whose annual conference began on December 5 in Berlin, the traditionally close relations with Afghanistan, and Germany's neutral position in relation to all parties concerned. The talks opened on November 27 with a message from UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, read out by UN Special Representative Lakhdar Brahimi, and with an urgent call for a historic compromise from Federal foreign minister Fischer.

The negotiations on the Petersberg took the form of a series of plenary sessions and direct talks between the participants, the representatives of the United Nations and the international observers. Brahimi had presented the participants with a draft framework agreement on December 2, 2001."

The people of the United States had been told that the reason for waging war in Afghanistan was in order to capture those responsible for the September 11, 2001 attacks. They were also led to believe that there was no contact with the groups in Afghanistan who might be responsible for the attacks on September 11th. With this meeting what was noted was the "traditionally close relations with Afghanistan" and Germany's "neutral position in relation to all parties involved". At the same time that Germany quite clearly had contact with a number of different factions in order to be able to get them to "form an agreement" about Afghanistan's future, the conflict was still going on in Afghanistan, including a number of future operations that would involve the lives of American military personnel. This agreement laid out the framework for the future of Afghanistan as an "Islamic democracy" that would be "divided into provinces" something that Afghanistan had not been in the past, yet a structural form of government in terms of both "Islamic Democracy" and a divisible, "provincial" form of government, making it more likely that the country would break apart along sectarian division lines as it appears also is occurring in Iraq. This agreement was not done at the U.N. headquarters in New York, but privately in Bonn. Nor was it a development and structure that the people of Afghanistan had a chance to choose. What is notable as well is what was being determined. The sole reason for the U.S. engagement in Afghanistan was because of reported Al Qaeda and Taliban ties. It appears that there were no agreements made to try and assure that the Taliban were not still in or had any connection to the Afghanistan government. Instead there was nothing about the Taliban or Al Qaeda in this agreement although that was the only reason that the United States and other coalition military forces, including Germany, had for being in Iraq.

In "Chain of Command" by Seymour Hersh, he says of the Bonn Conference, "At a conference of various Afghan factions held in Bonn, the administration's Hamid Karzai, was named chairman of the interim government. (His appointment

as president was confirmed six months later at a carefully orchestrated Afghan tribal council known as a Loya Jirga.) It was a significant achievement but there were major flaws in the broader accord. There was no agreement on establishing an international police force, no procedures for collecting taxes, no strategy for disarming either the many militias or individual Afghans, and no resolution with the Taliban.”

Given that the resolution with the Taliban was the sole reason for the U.S. and coalition military involvement in Afghanistan as a result of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, it is difficult to know what was resolved in the Bonn conference. One of the agreements however was the formation of an Afghanistan government, that was a provincial form of government, the country being split into provinces which Afghanistan had not had prior to this time.

COALITION FORCES AND NATO IN AFGHANISTAN

What is also significant about the invasion and military operations in Afghanistan, is that although almost all nations were widely supportive of the decision to invade Afghanistan and a number of other countries had forces that entered Afghanistan as part of a coalition with U.S. forces, United States forces, and Afghan resistance forces, were the only forces that experienced much military action or significant casualties. The U.S. was sequestered as a fighting force with the Afghan militias fighters, while the other foreign nation’s forces were sequestered separately with each other, as is now true with the U.S. and Iraqi fighters, and though there were military forces of a number of other nations present in Afghanistan as part of a coalition, it’s difficult to know what the reason for their presence was or what they were contributing in this action, as is presently the case in Iraq.

Although coalition military commanders were involved in the inclusion and planning of the Afghanistan operations, and large numbers of foreign coalition militaries were in Afghanistan with the U.S. military in what was termed a coalition, these coalition military forces were not included with U.S. forces in fighting in Afghanistan, instead, U.S. forces were sequestered by themselves with Pakistani militia members, and received much higher casualty levels in Afghanistan than any other country’s forces.

In fact, that appears that that is not a coincidence but planned use of U.S. troops by foreign NATO commanders and that this policy is continuing in Iraq and may be planned for further continuance in Afghanistan.

In a Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty piece by Ahto Lobjakes, on February 13, 2006, it was noted that “the NATO-led International Security Force (ISAF) will begin the next phase of it’s expansion into Southern Afghanistan in March. In stage three, ISAF troops will move into Provincial Reconstruction Team bases in provinces like Helmand and Kandahar. NATO officials tell RFE/RL they are preparing to stay in Afghanistan for as long as a decade, providing the UN Security Council agrees to extend the ISAF mandate that long. They say ISAF wants to raise it’s profile, but they also insist that ISAF troops do not want to take

on a counterinsurgency role alongside U.S. – led combat forces in Operation Enduring Freedom.

ISAF's commanding officer, Italian General Mauro Del Vecchio says the move to the south by ISAF will be "sensitive and delicate".

During the next year, ISAF plans to deploy 6,000 troops into Southern Afghanistan. They will be staffing bases for at least four joint civilian-military Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) in the south. In some areas, ISAF will outnumber the combat troops of the U.S. – led Operation Enduring Freedom.

But General Del Vecchio insists that ISAF troops do not want to engage in combat against the remnants of the Taliban and Al Qaeda. As a result of objections by France, Germany and other European allies, ISAF will limit its work with Operation Enduring Freedom to a supporting role."

The only reason for any foreign troops to be in Afghanistan is to fight the Taliban and Al Qaeda. And in fact, the countries of NATO and NATO ISAF forces have stated that they are only in Afghanistan for the purpose of fighting the war on terrorism and Al Qaeda. There is no other purpose for being there, and those things necessary to secure the country; a police force, a judicial system and actions to control the militias, such as the Taliban were not a primary factor in the Bonn Conference negotiations and agreement so the question is, why was that agreed upon and what are NATO and coalition forces doing in Afghanistan if they are not interested in helping to fight terrorism, or the Taliban or Al Qaeda?

NATO OCCUPATION IN AFGHANISTAN

The article continues, "ISAF troops are expected to be fully deployed at two PRT's in Kandahar and Helmand by July. Canadian ISAF troops already began moving to Kandahar from a base in Kabul in September. Australia and four European countries in NATO also are sending troops to the south: Great Britain, the Netherlands, Denmark and Estonia.

NATO's civilian representative for Afghanistan, Hikmet Cetin, tells RFE/RL that he hopes the alliance will make a formal decision on Stage Four, a further expansion of ISAF into eastern Afghanistan, before the end of this year.

"After Stage Three what you need is a political decision," Cetin Says. "Because the United States will stay in Stage Four and at that point NATO will have to make a political decision. And the sooner the better I would say, because you cannot make too much separation between the east and the south (of Afghanistan)."

NATO military officials have expressed some doubts about whether a decision can be formalized this year on expanding ISAF into eastern Afghanistan."

There is no reason given in the article for why U.S. troops would be staying in "Stage Four" or why the NATO civilian representative would be the one saying that US forces would stay in Afghanistan in the future for "stage four". Nor did

the NATO commander explain why the United States, and only US forces would be “fighting a “counter insurgency” “in the future” although large numbers of European NATO led and primarily staffed troops would be moving into the area and are already there in large numbers. These are military troops and there is no reason given as to why other military troops in the region would not also in the region experience “insurgencies” which would require “counter-insurgency” actions by them, and furthermore, why they would not be involved with the United States in fighting counter insurgencies. As well, up to this time, and although there are European NATO-led troops in the region, what has not been seen in Afghanistan is much insurgency against those troops and no reason is given in this article as to why “counter-insurgencies would suddenly occur”, and why they would involve “U.S. troops and why European NATO led troops would not be involved in fighting these “insurgencies” What is also disturbing is that this “description” of U.S. troops fighting insurgencies, while surrounded by other country’s troops, including European NATO troops is exactly what has been occurring in Iraq for the last three years with the United States experiencing massive numbers of attacks against their forces. Although there are other country’s troops in Iraq, including military representation from all the NATO countries, most of them have not been involved in fighting insurgencies that have been directed against U.S. and Iraqi forces and the Iraq people themselves.

As well is the purpose being given by NATO commanders as to what the purpose of NATO and coalition troops in Afghanistan is. As the NATO commander noted, they mentioned having NATO stay in Afghanistan for at least ten years militarily. This was in 2006, over four years after coalition forces entered Afghanistan and there was no reason given as to why NATO military forces should still be in Afghanistan for the next ten years. Particularly since the NATO and ISAF troops are not engaged in fighting the militias such as the Taliban that are attacking the people of Afghanistan and Al Qaeda who it is claimed have been in Afghanistan and it has been claimed are responsible for terrorist attacks in the U.S., Britain, Spain, Indonesia, and other countries. Instead, it appears that the purpose of being in Afghanistan by NATO, coalition and US troops is to occupy the country of Afghanistan.

EUROPEAN UNION INVOLVEMENT IN AFGHANISTAN

Not only NATO but the EU it was noted in the Radio Free Europe article is making plans for a long term combined “civil military occupation” of Afghanistan, stating, “The European Union, one of Afghanistan’s largest aid donors, is closely monitoring developments. The EU considers stability and security in Afghanistan a vital issue. One reason is that Afghan drug lords produce about 80 percent of the heroin that is sold illegally in Europe.

Fransesc Vendrell, the EU’s special representative for Afghanistan, tells RFE/RL that he has been lobbying EU countries to contribute as many troops as possible to the ISAF mission.

“So, the issues of security, governance, human rights, and reconstruction are linked together,” Vendrell says. “And we need now forces in these provinces,

international forces that will enable the Afghan government to extend its authority progressively in the various provinces where there are serious problems.”

Direct EU Involvement More Likely

Vendrell also says the EU is increasing its own direct involvement in Afghanistan. “There is a second possibility which is only now been approved – just now – and is not happening yet,” he says. “this is the possibility of channeling some (European) Commission money to a Provincial Reconstruction Team for use by the PRT in their own civil-military projects.”

Other details about funding also have become an issue as ISAF’s expansion into the south moves forward. British troops plan to leave Mazar-e Sharif in March. They will hand over the PRT in the northern city to Swedish troops and a base at Mazar-e Sharif’s airport to Norwegian troops.

But London also wants to take most of the related NATO funds with it to develop the Kandahar airfield a major logistical and supply base in southern Afghanistan.

This has rankled Germany, which already has spent 40 million Euros (\$48 million) on new facilities at Mazar-e Sharif and needs another 30 million euros to complete that project.

There is no reason given in this article as to why London and Germany are developing Afghanistan airports in the country of Afghanistan and not the Afghanistan government. As well, the U.S. is a heavy funder of NATO, and no reason is given why Britain and Germany are making decisions about the disposition of NATO funds in Afghanistan and not the Afghan government, particularly in areas such as the Afghanistan airports.

CONTINUED VIOLENCE IN AFGHANISTAN

One of things mentioned about the attacks on northern areas of Afghanistan was that it would help create a “passable highway system for aid from Europe to Afghanistan, hardly a justifiable reason for military conflict. And not the reason for which coalition forces were in Afghanistan. As well, after U.S. left Afghanistan in larger numbers and the NATO forces in Afghanistan were under joint German-Dutch command in 2003, what has occurred in Afghanistan is a great deal of increased violence against aid workers.

Noted in Seymour Hersh’s book, “Chain of Command,” he writes, “In the summer of 2003, a coalition of seventy nine human rights and relief organizations wrote an open letter calling for better security in Afghanistan and warning that the presidential elections there, then scheduled for June 2004 was imperiled. For the majority of the Afghan people, security is precarious and controlled by regional warlords, drug traffickers and groups with terrorist associations. The situation is getting worse and there is no comprehensive plan in place to halt the spiral of violence.”

Statistics compiled by CARE International showed that eleven aid workers were murdered in four incidents during a three-week period ending in early March 2004, and the rate on physical assaults on aid workers in Afghanistan more than

doubled in January and February compared with the same period in the previous year. Such attacks, a CARE policy statement suggested, inevitably led to cutbacks in Afghanistan humanitarian and reconstruction programs. In early 2003, for example, according to the Chicago Tribune, there were twenty-six humanitarian agencies in Kandahar, the main Afghan city in the south. By early 2004, there were fewer than five. The situation has not improved since.

Not only aid workers have been targeted in the continuing aggression of militias, including the Taliban in Afghanistan. The primary target is the Afghan people who have continued to be aggressed against by Afghan militias. Although it was noted in the Radio Free Europe article, that one of the reasons for coalition involvement in Afghanistan is the drug trade from Afghanistan to Europe, instead that has only increased since NATO takeover of control of Afghanistan since 2003.

In fact, not only is there little humanitarian relief, this is a conflict that is not being covered by the world's press, most of the reporters having left after 2003 as well.

THE TURKMENISTAN – AFGHANISTAN - PAKISTAN PIPELINE

Before the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States, a number of oil and gas deals were made with surrounding neighboring Central Asian countries such as Turkmenistan.

On December 27, 2002, after the major invasion of Afghanistan had occurred, and attention was being turned to Iraq, it was reported that a long delayed \$3.2 billion natural gas pipeline known as the Trans-Afghanistan Pipeline, which would carry gas from energy-rich Turkmenistan to Pakistan, which would be built and operated by a consortium, had been finalized in a framework agreement. It would be one of the first major investment projects in Afghanistan in decades.

This long delayed agreement was in connection to countries that are working to move gas and oil from Turkmenistan and possibly other Central Asian oil and gas rich regions. Just one consortium that had been set up on October 25, 1997, between Unocal Company and CentGas Consortium, included oil companies from Japan, South Korea and Pakistan. The breakdown of the shares of the consortium were: Unocal 54.11%, Delta Oil 15%, Turkmenistan 7%, Indonesia Petroleum (Japan) 7.22%, CIECO TransAsia Gas Ltd. (Japan) 7.22%, Hyundai Ltd. (South Korea) 5.56%, Crescent Group (Pakistan) 3.89% (Delta – Saudi funded), as reported in "Fahrenheit 9/11".

At the time, it was noted by Dr. Zaher Wahab, of Afghanistan, that Delta and Unocal, as well as Russian, Pakistani and Japanese oil and gas companies had signed agreements with the Turkmenistan government, which has the fourth largest gas reserve in the world.

On February 16, 2004, Prime Minister Karzai signed a treaty with Pakistani leader Pervez Musharraf and the Turkmen dictator, Niyazov, to authorize construction of a 3.2 billion gas pipeline through the Herat-Kandahar corridor in Afghanistan.

On December 22, 2001, Hamid Karzai was made the interim Prime Minister of Afghanistan. What was notable about Hamid Karzai was that both he and President Bush's special envoy to Afghanistan, Zalmay Khalilzad, were previously on Unocal's payroll. Unocal, a company long tied to, and invested in, by the Bush family. Khalilzad later became the U.S. ambassador to Iraq.

This pipeline is being built to bring oil from the oil-rich Central Asian republic of Turkmenistan, just north of Afghanistan, through Afghanistan and Pakistan. This is only one of the pipelines, that is being built through Afghanistan and Pakistan.

In regard to this pipeline, it is notable that the four NATO regional phases of military operations in Afghanistan follows the Herat to Kandahar corridor. It is also notable that this pipeline doesn't end in Afghanistan but continues on through Pakistan. At the same time in recent months there has been an increase in conflict in the Afghanistan and Pakistan border regions that is "matching" the fulfillment of the four phases of military operations in Afghanistan itself. It appears that quite possibly the U.S. and other coalition forces are being set up for further military action and conflict moving into Pakistan itself.

IRAQ:

The last major operation that U.S. forces were involved in, in Afghanistan, was Operation Anaconda, which ended in the spring of 2002. What occurred at the same time was the planning for another military operation – in Iraq.

IRAQ WAR PLANNING

Although the war in Iraq has been often described as being of "U.S. origin", in fact the planning for the invasion occurred somewhere else.

In General Tommy Franks's autobiography, in speaking of the planning of the Iraq war, Franks writes, "Ramstein, Germany, March 21, 2002. The screen went dark, the lights of the conference room came up, and I stood at the head of the table. It was late afternoon on Thursday, March 21, 2002 at the end of a long day working Iraq options with CENTCOM's component commanders at NATO's Warrior Prep Center across the autobahn from Ramstein air base...

This was the first time my ground, air, naval, and Special Ops commanders had sat down with my staff directors and me to discuss the shape and scope of a possible military operation to remove the regime of Saddam Hussein.

I looked around the conference table. We were wearing "Euro-casual" civvies for security reasons, but each of us had a mas nametag on his sport coat or sweater. "I see Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps on your name tags," I said, "But the tags I want to see will read JOINT – all the services acting together as one."

"..... If we have to fight them in Iraq," I told them, "we'll do it as a joint team. We will not take orders from the Service Chiefs in Washington. I will take my orders from the Secretary of Defense....and you will take your orders from me. No time for Service parochialism."

“I held up my hand, “One last point. What we discussed today goes no further than the people in this room. This command does not leak..... I could see that my message had registered.

Okay I said, “let’s go get a beer and eat some schnitzel.”

In “American Soldier”, there was no explanation as to why General Franks, who was headquartered in Tampa, Florida, would be in Germany for the development of the plans for the Iraq war. Nor was NATO involved in the early part of the Iraq war, NATO forces and NATO not having decided to enter Iraq until May of 2002, after the initial conflict to gain control of Iraq had been fought. Germany presented itself as a country that was against the attacks and against invading Iraq.

Franks writes of a Los Angeles times article, that later came out in May of 2002, that stated, “the emerging Iraq plan was never officially brought into “the tank” for discussion among the heads of all the services. Franks writes that he became upset about the article and added that “on March 29th, we had briefed the Service Chiefs – in the Tank. Dick Myers had kept the Chiefs on a tighter rein. Franks also reports that he said to Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld the next afternoon, “if I sound angry, it’s because I am,” I reminded him of just how much compartmented material had appeared in the Arkin, (the author of the L.A. Times article) story. “I’d like everyone in OSD and the JCS who knows the details of our planning process to be polygraphed and prosecuted if they’re discovered to have leaked Top Secret Information.”

What Franks described was a plan that had been deliberately formulated without any input from the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff. General Franks noted a process where the plans for the Iraq war were deliberately formulated in Germany, with no input from the U.S. Service Chiefs, located in Washington, D.C., noting that the Service Chiefs were later informed after the plans had been drawn up and that Dick Myers, the Chairman had kept them on a “tighter rein”.

Being briefed on March 29, 2002 after the plans had been formulated in Germany on March 21, 2002, the Service Chiefs had been given no chance to have input into the plans at all, the decision making capacity in regard to the formulation of war being deliberately taken out of their hands. As well, Frank’s statement about how he would like everyone who knows the details of our planning process to be polygraphed and prosecuted to be disturbing, as those who were supposed to be doing the planning were not even involved, nor was the President, Secretary of Defense or various Pentagon officials who are supposed to be included in the planning. In fact, it’s illegal and unconstitutional for decisionmaking to be made about the U.S. military which does not fully include these personnel and Congress as well.

Some months later in Iraq, what was also occurring was heavy arming of weapons of Iraq, by other countries, one of the predominant ones being Germany. Iraq had been under U.N. sanctions for it’s war against Kuwait and as a result other countries were prohibited from selling weapons to Iraq. Instead as Bill Gertz in his book “Treachery” notes, “in November of 2002, Iraq held the Baghdad International Exhibition. More than 1,200 companies from more than 49

countries, including France, Germany, Russia, Turkey, China, Spain, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, Iran, Saudi Arabia and the UAE took part in this trade fair. No American firms were present. At this trade show, Iraq signed some \$500 million in contracts with companies from Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Iran, France and Germany.

According to Bill Gertz, "The International trade fair Iraq held in November, 2002, made it clear that Iraq was aggressively pursuing arms.

Saddam's government gloated over its ability to entice foreign nations, and Germany in particular, to cut deals with Iraq. At the time of the fair, an article in the government-run newspaper, Iraq Daily stated, "Iraqi-German relations have witnessed a notable improvement after the firm, positive stand of Germany in rejecting the launching of a military attack against Iraq by the U.S. Accordingly, President Hussein has ordered top priority to German companies to enter the Iraqi market." According to US officials, several cases of illegal arms related exports from Germany to Iraq were under way during this time period and after. Although some cases were uncovered, they were but a small sample of what was occurring at the time.

COALITION FORCES IN IRAQ

What is being seen in Iraq in terms of coalition forces is a very similar situation to what has occurred in Afghanistan. While U.S. forces are segregated with Afghan military forces, other country's coalition forces are segregated from the United States. Although other country's forces, notably Britain, have also experienced a number of casualties, for the most part, the other coalition forces have been segregated to areas where they have experienced few casualties and little combat. What has also occurred is that there is little evidence that the majority of these forces are actively involved in combating Iraq insurgencies, just as has been the case in Afghanistan. At the same time, just as in Afghanistan, it's difficult to know why these forces are there or any foreign military forces are there, including the United States, since Iraq, like Afghanistan, has had a vote and established a country.

NATO

As well, as in Afghanistan, NATO is involved in Iraq, all NATO countries being represented with military forces there as well as a number of coalition forces. However, there is no note of NATO forces being involved in the fighting of insurgencies, just as is the case with Afghanistan, nor other coalition forces.

In an Associated Press article on June 12, 2003, it stated that "NATO officials, said the alliance may also strengthen its role in Iraq, perhaps using Afghanistan as a model. In that instance, NATO gave logistical support to a German/Dutch led peacekeeping force in Kabul before taking charge of the operation in August."

In a CBS report on February 22, 2005, it was reported that "NATO alliance planners said that they hoped to "expand a training military academy in Iraq to 160 instructors, which they say is adequate for the current phase of the mission.

They hope for a further expansion in September to allow NATO to help run a military academy outside the Iraqi capital, if they can find the troops and money needed. NATO officials said France was the last to come on board and will contribute just one officer to help coordination of NATO's military headquarters in Southern Belgium. But Paris is also considering a financial contribution to the mission and has offered to train 1,500 military police in Qatar, outside the NATO program.

At a press conference held at the Heritage Foundation on November 28, 2005, Evan Galbraith, the defense advisor to the U.S. mission to NATO, said that, that a NATO Iraq Defense Academy had been opened, which had graduated 700 Iraqis. He said that there were 200 trainers from all the various allied nations. Galbraith said that the NATO Iraq Center had representatives from 26 allied nations in NATO. And he said that they were all eager to get involved, and that "they want to get themselves engaged in an area with great economic promise."

Although the United States is spending a great deal on the cost of military operations in Iraq, as well as the cost in human lives, Galbraith, in response to a question asked about NATO participation, "why weren't other countries contributing financially, and with people, and "standing shoulder to shoulder with the Americans, why are they dipping their toe in apprehensively." Galbraith in reply, laughed and said, "when they tell you it's not the money, it's the money." Galbraith also said that these countries spent very small amounts of their national budgets on defense or military, some of them only 1.2 percent. As well, Galbraith mentioned that Germany would have political problems in Germany being involved and that it was a very "delicate situation".

While some countries are spending 1.2 percent of their national budget on their militaries, the U.S. is the country funding the NATO missions being commanded by other countries, the U.S. spending a majority of its domestic national budget on the defense budget, 51 percent. A massive sum of money, and money over which the U.S. has no control over how it's being spent.

Although NATO presented its coalition with the United States as being due to "fighting terrorism" after the September 11, 2001 attacks against the United States, in fact, there has been no evidence of NATO forces, fighting terrorism or insurgencies in either Afghanistan or Iraq, including against reported Al Qaeda attacks in both countries. It appears instead that the September 11, 2001 attacks were used as a means for NATO and coalition forces to both enter and continue occupying Afghanistan and Iraq.

NATO's purpose historically, has been as a defense treaty between the nations of Western Europe and the United States and Canada, to protect western European countries from Soviet aggression. What NATO is being used for now is far different. And the United States is no longer included in any decision-making about U.S. forces with or in NATO or any decision-making about NATO at all.

This decision was made by the North Atlantic Council, the decision making body of NATO. These decisions are made in secret, without oversight in the Supreme Headquarters of NATO, in Brussels Belgium. It is formed by, and by numbers decision making is controlled by European countries. There is no oversight in these decisions to use these forces and what is also being developed

is not only the use of NATO forces, represented by NATO members but the inclusion of “partner country’s forces” that NATO directs in operations with NATO forces.

At the same time, what is also being seen is a deliberate exclusion of the United States as a decision making member of NATO though still expected to contribute financially to NATO.

In fact, what was seen in the summer of 2003 after the initial phase of the Iraq war was the “Berlin Plus Agreement.” The description of this agreement is: “Berlin Plus agreement is a short title for comprehensive package of agreements between NATO and EU, based on conclusions of the NATO Washington Summit. It is comprised of the following major parts:

- a. NATO – EU Security Agreement
- b. Assured Access to NATO planning capabilities for EU led Crisis Management Operations (CMO)
- c. Availability of NATO assets and capabilities for EU-led CMO Procedures for Release, Monitoring, Return and Recall of NATO Assets and Capabilities
- d. Berlin Plus
- e. Terms of reference for DSACEUR and European Command Options for NATO
- f. EU – NATO consultation arrangements in the context of an EU led CMO making use of NATO assets and capabilities
- g. Arrangements for coherent and mutually reinforcing Capability Requirements

All parts are tied together through the so-called “Framework Agreement” which consists essentially of an exchange of letters between SG/HR and SG NATO, dated March 17, 2003. Since that day, the “Berlin plus” package has been in effect and serves as the foundation for practical work between EU and NATO. In that, the view of EU led CMO makes use of NATO planning support or NATO capabilities and assets for the execution of any operation.”

This “Framework Agreement”, the exchange of letters leading to the Berlin Plus agreements were made at the time that the initial phase of the Iraq war was commencing.

In terms of the origination policy point of this decision for the “intertwining of the European Union and NATO in decision making, is noted under “SHAPE – EU Cooperation,” (SHAPE is the operational headquarters of NATO in Belgium), “In Helsinki 1999, the European Council decided that the European Union should have the autonomous capacity to take decisions and where NATO as a whole is not engaged, to launch and then to conduct EU-led operations in response to international crises, in support of its “Common Foreign and Security Policy” (CFSP) With the signing of the “NATO-EU Declaration on ESDP (European Security and Defence Policy)” 16th December 2002, a basis was established between the two organizations to cooperate in the areas of Crisis Management, Terrorism, Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the Development of

plans, to assure EU access to NATO's planning capability for its own military operations..."

What also occurred soon after, on June 19, 2003 was the "decommissioning" of the U.S., or Atlantic side of NATO. In a ceremony on June 19, 2003 it marked the end and "decommissioning of the U.S. or Atlantic involvement in NATO" and the start of what the Atlantic based NATO was being changed to, Allied Command Transformation, (ACT).

In a speech given at Norfolk, Virginia to mark this change, it is reported on the European SHAPE website, though not the NATO one, that, "As NATO's strategic command based in the United States for the last 51 years, Allied Command Atlantic (ACLANT) has represented the western pillar of the symbolic Trans-Atlantic bridge linking Europe to North America. Today, this chapter in history was closed as SACLANT was decommissioned and the new NATO Strategic Command, Allied Command Transformation (ACT) was established. This historic event is part of the most extensive command structure revision in the history of NATO."

Although the U.S. was "decommissioned from any decision-making capability in NATO, the United States is contributing massive sums of money to NATO and NATO led and NATO connected military operations. At the same time, large numbers of foreign NATO military personnel are moving into the United States after the U.S. was cut from any decision-making, into Norfolk Virginia, without the decision to do so being made by the United States, just as foreign coalition forces have been moving into other U.S. military bases and centers in the United States, including CENTCOM, the regional command involved in the Afghanistan and Iraq and a newly formed in 2002, Northcom, which is a new domestic U.S. Homeland Security connected military center for the United States that is being staffed by not only U.S. military but by military personnel from other countries as well. In fact, it appears that a foreign military occupation situation is being set up by NATO in the United States, as well as Afghanistan and Iraq.

OIL DEALS IN IRAQ

As well, it's difficult to know who and what NATO represents. The Berlin Plus agreement detaching the United States from decision-making in NATO was brokered in Berlin. Although NATO is presented as being comprised of European countries, Evan Galbraith, the defense advisor to the U.S. mission in NATO did not appear to be involved in working for the U.S. at all. Instead, at the Heritage Foundation press conference on November 28, 2005, Galbraith spoke of "a huge oil play" in Iraq. He said that he had meetings with Japanese companies who were anxious to get in on it in Anbar Province and they were talking about a pipeline to Aqaba. Japan is not part of NATO and Galbraith gave no reason as to why as the U.S. NATO representative, he was working with Japan and Japanese companies for oil deals in Iraq. At the same time that Galbraith was setting up oil deals for Japan and Japanese companies, U.S. military forces were busy fighting insurgents in Anbar whose violence against the Iraqi people and American troops, and U.S.

troop's response was serving to clear the Anbar province region. A region that at that very time, the NATO adviser was brokering oil deals in for Japan.

In a Japan Times article with Sakai Keiko on January 17, 2005 who is the Director of Areas Studies at the Japanese government affiliated Institute of Developing Economies, in response to a question about Japan's interest in oil from Iraq, she responded, "Japan does want oil from Iraq. Iraq's oil is particularly suitable for Japanese refineries---especially the varieties of light petroleum, Kirkuk Light Crude and Basra Light Crude. Japan's been buying lots of oil from United Arab Emirates because it is similar to Iraqi oil, but ideally it wants the Iraq variety.

Anbar Province is not the only region in Iraq that oil deals are being made in.

In the book, "Bad News" written by CBS foreign correspondent Tom Fenton, he noted that "some Arabs believe that there may be a strategy to have Iraq split into three separate sections. In the wake of the invasion, the Kurds have been allowed to occupy Kirkuk and slowly annex it with a heavy influx of Kurds from Kurdistan. These Kurds have forcibly seized civic control of the Kirkuk area, including it's land deeds office, where they burned many documents to hide original land ownership records. Quickly moving into the region in large numbers, it's thought that they will soon change the population balance. With a population census of Iraq having been postponed, other minorities believe that by the time it's taken, with the newly migrated Kurdish population, it will justify Kirkuk's absorption into the Kurdish zone. They believe the process is a precursor for allowing the division of Iraq into three separate zones of Shiites, Sunnis and Kurds, with the Kurds getting oil-rich Kirkuk to make them financially viable."

In fact, Kirkuk is not a region where Kurds have been predominant nor in fact, has that been the case for Kurdistan itself. Kurdistan is a region with home to many different groups of people as is the case for all of Iraq, where the people consider themselves Iraqis first. Although they consider themselves Iraqis, the country is being split by regional militia conflict, and starting to involve neighboring countries, such as Turkey in the area called Kurdistan. However, Kirkuk, an oil rich region of Iraq, has been cleared, in this case by Kurdistan militias, and in a process similar to what was noted in terms of Anbar Province, and Basra, which were both being attacked while oil deals were being made the same is true for the Kirkuk area.

In a January 15, 2006 article in the Guardian, it was noted that in Kurdistan, which "had been the least volatile since 2003, overseas investment is beginning to trickle in..."

It was noted that the regional government is promoting green, mountainous Kurdistan in glossy adverts on CNN as "the other Iraq". Two airports offer direct flights from Frankfurt, Stockholm and many Middle East destinations, allowing investors, and eventually, they hope tourists, to bypass the dangers of Baghdad."

It was reported that "Kurdistan recently signed a contract with a Norwegian company, DNO, to drill in an unexploited oilfield – Baghdad protested that it didn't know anything about the contract and questioned it's legality. In an

article in USA Today, by Cyrille Cartier, December 9, 2005, it was reported that “about nine foreign oil companies are active in Iraq’s Kurdish region.” It was also noted that DNO was the first to deal directly with the regional government in the Kurdish north instead of going through the ministry in Baghdad. In addition, it is noted in the article that “most of the oil production in the north is around the city of Kirkuk, just outside the Kurdish controlled region.”

In the Iraq Constitution, it states specifically that Iraq’s resources belong solely to the people of Iraq as a nation, and that international agreements have to be agreed upon by a number of Iraq government national officials. This is deliberately not being done and the national Iraq government is being bypassed to make deals with local officials. As well, although Germany made a point of not being available to go to Iraq in a capacity to help militarily, it does have commercial flights in and out of Iraq, in the Kurdistan region, as does Sweden, the U.S. doesn’t.

THE SPREADING CONFLICT

What is notable about conflict in Iraq in different regions is that it started in regions in which oil deals have been made and the conflict is now “following the pipelines”. For example, as noted, conflict started in Kirkuk, Anbar and Basra provinces and is now spreading to Turkey, the oil pipeline route from Iraq and Kirkuk toward Europe.

This matches what is occurring in Afghanistan, with the coalition military actions occurring after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks centered in Afghanistan, and the northern region for, as noted, a “clear passageway to Europe”. Heightened conflict is also being seen in the corridor to Europe from Afghanistan, along with greatly increased NATO and coalition forces involvement throughout this whole corridor.

At the same time, heightened conflict is beginning to be seen in both the Afghan-Pakistan border region and in Pakistan itself, which is a terminus to water from the Central Asian countries pipelines. This too, in terms of heightened conflict is following the gas pipeline routes, in this case, from Central Asia, through Afghanistan and Pakistan to Asia.

SUDAN

These are not the only regions where this pattern is being seen. In southern Sudan, after numerous militias cleared millions of people off their lands in southern Sudan, what occurred afterward as reported by the U.S. ambassador to Sudan from 1993 to 1995, Don Petterson, in his book “Inside Sudan – Political Islam, Conflict and Catastrophe”, noted that European countries and Japan which he noted “moved together”, made oil deals with the Sudanese government for the land in the south of Sudan on which the people had been cleared by militias. In that case as well, what has been seen is the violence caused by a large number of various militias, the SPLA and Lord’s Resistance Army to name just two in the south of Sudan is spreading north in Sudan into Darfur, where another militia, the

Junjaweed is attacking and clearing that region of large numbers of people. At this point the conflict is spreading into neighboring Chad and this too, is a situation where the conflict is following the pipeline route.

IRAN

Iraq isn't the only country that the countries of Japan and Germany are making oil deals in. They are also making oil deals with Iran. Iran is another country that is under U.N. sanctions due to the hostage taking of U.S. embassy personnel in 1979. Although U.S. energy companies are barred by U.S. sanctions from doing business in Iran, European and Asian companies, including Japan and Germany are setting up offices in Teheran seeking not only to invest in Iran's oil and gas fields, but also to consider options for export routes from Central Asia.

In regard to Japan's interest in Iranian oil, in an interview in Japan Times by Sakai Keiko, the Director of Area Studies at the Japanese government affiliated Institute of Developing Economies, in answer to the question, "Let's factor in other oil producers in the region. The U.S. has expressed reservations about Japan strengthening its ties with Iran, reportedly suggesting that Japan should buy from Libya instead." She responded, "that is a very sensitive issue. For the sake of Japanese energy security Japan has to look elsewhere beyond Saudi Arabia. Japan is now focusing its attention on Iran. Whether or not oilfields there produce any good oil, co-development with Iran would have symbolic values. Hence, Japan-Iran talks are progressing."

In terms of German investment, In a January 14, 2006 AFP article out of Berlin, it reported, "German energy giant E.ON plans to work with Iran on gas projects despite opposition from Europe and the U.S. to Tehran's nuclear activities which resulted in a showdown at the U.N. Security Council.

"We cannot deny that Iran has the second largest gas reserves in the world," E.ON boss Wulf Bernotat told the financial newspaper, Handelsblatt, according to an advance copy of an interview to be published Monday.

E.ON has been looking into cooperating in the Nabucca gas pipeline project which is in the negotiation stage. The pipeline would deliver gas to Europe from Iran from Turkey."

Other economic and business ties have been established between these countries and Iran as well. For instance, the German airline, Lufthansa has a number of daily flights into Tehran.

Although it is reported that there is "opposition from Europe and the U.S. to Tehran's nuclear activities, in this article, in fact, Germany has been the primary country pushing both other European countries and the United States in seeking sanctions against Iran for its uranium enrichment program.

THE URANIUM ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

Bill Gertz in his book, "Treachery", notes that, "On October 4, 2003, the CIA alerted German and Italian authorities to the fact that the German flagged ship, BBC China was bound for Libya with parts for Libya's nuclear program. The vessel had set sail from Dubai to Libya. The U.S. government contacted the ship's owner, the German company BBC Chartering and Logistic GmbH... and asked for help blocking the shipment, diverted to Italy. This shipment was of a uranium enrichment process that appears to have originated at URENCO, a conglomerate of German, Dutch and British companies. Seymour Hersh, in his book "Chain of Command" notes that Pakistan's Dr. Abdul Q. Khan, who headed Pakistan's nuclear weapons program, had worked in the Netherlands for an organization that was part of URENCO's centrifuge project in the mid 1970's. As noted, by Gertz, the network of suppliers, is spread between different predominantly European countries, which is indicative of this consortium as the source. The suppliers also include Japan, as noted in an Associated Press report on February 13, 2006 by Hiroki Tabuchi, who reported, "the International Atomic Energy Agency discovered machinery manufactured by the Japanese corporation, Mitutoyo at nuclear related sites in Libya during inspections in December 2003, and January 2004. The equipment was shipped to Libya via Dubai by SCOPE precision engineering, a Malaysian maker linked to an international nuclear trafficking network, Kyodo news agency reported." The article notes that this company was linked to the proliferation network of centrifuge parts that were seized en route to Libya in 2003.

Not only was this uranium enrichment program connected to Iran and Libya, this same program has been connected to North Korea.

In Gertz's book "Treachery", he writes of a transaction in 2002 where German companies and the German government were involved in shipping a uranium enrichment program to North Korea.

Gertz writes, "What was learned about the transaction was that early in 2002, Yun, a North Korean agent, representing Nam Chon Gang Corporation, a North Korean import-export company, sent a letter to Hans-Werner Truppel at the German export firm, Optronik GmbH K&B and Company. Yun claimed to be purchasing aluminum for fuel tanks for Chinese commercial aircraft, on behalf of Shenyang Aircraft Co, producing a letter with the Shenyang Aircraft logo on it.

In reality, Yun, who wrote letters both from Pyongyang and an apartment in Beijing, was buying materials for a covert program to build nuclear weapons inside North Korea.

The specialty aluminum that North Korea was seeking for their nuclear weapons program was controlled for export. Under a system called the Nuclear Suppliers Group, member states, among them, Germany, require exporters to obtain licenses before selling goods that can be used for nuclear arms programs. As the assumption with these specialty aluminum tubes would be that they would be used in process to obtain highly enriched uranium by North Korea, the Chinese aircraft maker was used as a front.

Truppel, the German exporter, called a company known as Jacob Bek GmbH, a subsidiary of the Thyssen-Krupp Group. Thyssen-Krupp then ordered the tubes from British Aluminum Tubes, a German subsidiary of the British firm, Luxfer, which makes specialty aluminum products. German authorities informed Truppel that he would need a license.

Truppel went ahead with the North Korean deal. The Hamburg company, Delta Trading contracted with the French shipper CMA CGM to send the cargo to North Korea. On April 4, the French ship, Ville de Virgo sailed from Hamburg carrying the aluminum tubes.

But the North Korean procurement effort had come to the attention of the U.S. intelligence community. The CIA contacted it's counterparts at German intelligence. Although the tubes had already left Germany, the German Customs Criminal Investigation Agency, known as ZKI, tracked the shipment down. American and German authorities alerted the French government that nuclear arms related material was on it's way to North Korea and French officials ordered the ship diverted to an Egyptian port.

Based on the size of the shipment, intelligence officials believed that North Korea was planning to make a cascade of 3,500 to 4,000 centrifuges, which would be enough for North Korea to produce 90 kg of highly enriched uranium a year. One atomic bomb, requires less than 25 kgs. of this weapons fuel to create a devastating blast. According to US officials, the aluminum tubes the North Koreans tried to purchase matched the specifications of the specialty tubes used in the G-2 design gas centrifuge.

After the discovery of it's shipments to North Korea earlier in 2002, the German government, in a late 2002 report on domestic security noted: "One can assume that (North Korean) embassy personnel are still involved in the acquisition of sensitive goods," the German Interior Ministry stated in it's report. "Because the previous practice to organize the export of such goods via European third countries is hardly possible any more due to extensive checks, attempts are being made to carry out such exports via China or Singapore. Not infrequently, North Korean front companies in China are given as the recipient."

NORTH KOREA

Iran is not the only other country that Germany is increasing diplomatic ties with. Another one is North Korea. Germany as well as other European countries and the EU itself established diplomatic ties with North Korea. They did not establish diplomatic ties with North Korea until 2002, after the 2001 terrorist attacks. North Korea, is another country that this same uranium enrichment program that purchased this same uranium enrichment process from Germany.

It is also another country that it appears that the U.S. is being pressured in opposition and conflict with. Japan has been the country which has initiated U.N. sanctions against North Korea for it's uranium enrichment program, just as Germany has been the country that has introduced sanctions against Iran.

Both Iran and North Korea and possibly Pakistan as well are all countries that to all apparent, the U.S. is being set up for conflict with, and by to all apparent, the governments of Germany and Japan who are benefiting from it.

THE UNITED STATES

At the same time, these countries, both as part of, and including other foreign NATO and coalition military personnel, are also continuing to move increasing numbers of military commanders and military personnel into the United States itself, in what appears to be the setting up of foreign occupation of the United States, using the attacks against the United States as the reason for their presence and continued movement into the United States.

By: Elaine Cullen