

EIR Daily Alert Service

P.O. BOX 17390, WASHINGTON, DC 20041-0390

- Questions on Afghanistan
- British Retired Officer Wants To Court-Martial Biden for Afghanistan Decision
- Biden Gives Positive View of Withdrawal, as Regime-Change Warrior Ryan Crocker Erupts against Him
- Boris Johnson Pushing Biden on Aug. 31 Deadline for Afghanistan Evacuation
- *Observer* Commentator Argues, Biden Has Left Global Britain 'Impotent and Friendless'
- Pakistani Diplomat Sees China in Leading Role in Afghan Projects
- Commitment to 50% Electric Vehicles Is Being Discredited
- Blair Sent Our Troops into Afghanistan on 'Short-Lived Exercise' in 2001
- Czech President Calls NATO Legitimacy in Question
- U.S. Treasury Issues 'Guidance' to Multilateral Development Banks: No Money for Coal
- Source Indicates Greens in Next Government Means End of German Industry

EDITORIAL

Questions on Afghanistan

Aug. 23 (EIRNS)—Why did we get into a 20 years' war in Afghanistan?

The British Prime Minister told us the United States had to. Tony Blair came to Chicago two years before that war started, and said the United

States has to “protect” people from undemocratic governments London doesn’t like, by taking those governments out. The term “regime change” was born.

Clinton agreed? Did anybody say no?

Lyndon LaRouche did. He called it restoring the British Empire with U.S. forces. Nine months before the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks. LaRouche warned a major terror attack was coming in the United States to push the country into “emergency government,” and into war. That was Jan. 3, 2001.

But the 9/11 attacks were launched from Afghanistan by Osama bin Laden. Didn’t everybody agree on that?

LaRouche knew better. He said on radio, as those attacks were ongoing, that some other force, not Osama bin Laden, “let down the American security screen” and punctured it to make those attacks possible. Again—to push the country into “emergency government” and set it up for endless war.

Does anybody agree with that?

All the families of the victims of 9/11 gradually got the evidence that a foreign government—the Saudi Kingdom—helped take down that security screen for the hijackers. The 20 years’ commemoration of 9/11 is coming up, and those families wrote to President Biden: “Don’t show up! unless you declassify the FBI report on these Saudi operations first.” He may do it. And LaRouche said the Saudis would not have done that without a wink from the British.

So what did we do in Afghanistan?

Pushed out the Taliban government the U.K. wanted gone. Blair again. He told his Parliament it was “for the protection of our [British] people and our way of life, including confidence in our economy”; and he told “W” Bush it would be just “a short-lived exercise.” *The “Blair Doctrine,” the regime-change war policy, is the failure here.* And he was found by a Commission of Inquiry to have faked WMD intelligence about Iraq. But

the U.K.'s top military institute is still inviting *Blair* to speak on the 20th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks.

So Biden pulled American forces out.

For doing that, the former British commander in Afghanistan, a Lt. Col. Richard Kemp (ret.), demanded that the American President be, not just impeached—court-martialed as a traitor. You can read what he and Blair and other hysterical British officials said, below.

Biden a traitor to what?

To “Global Britain,” they said. Watch out for Tuesday’s G7 meeting, British Prime Minister Boris Johnson is chairing it. The British say: They will push the United States to stay and expand in Afghanistan. *And they want Biden out.*

What’s wrong with them?

This “Global Britain, and London world financial center, all depends on American muscle being directed by British brains. As Helga Zepp-LaRouche says, without U.S. muscle, “Global Britain” is just a pea-brain.

Then the United States should get out?

More than that. This is the chance to throw the table over and reconstruct instead of bombing, and instead of sending U.S. troops there to confrontations with China and Russia. Let engineers *go in* and build in that whole region, invest in developing it. Every country in that region agrees that Afghanistan, now, is where the United States and the other great powers could finally start to cooperate in new infrastructure projects and exports of capital goods and machinery.

By flipping the war script that way, maybe the United States could get finally get some justice, for what the British banks did to poor Richard Nixon and the U.S. dollar 50 years ago, on Aug. 15, 1971.

- Watch [Harley's Updates](#) with Harley Schlanger on Tuesday, August 24, 2021: Every weekday morning on [The LaRouche Organization](#) website, Harley will give you the strategic briefing you need to start your day.

UNITED STATES POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC

British Retired Officer Wants To Court-Martial Biden for Afghanistan Decision

Aug. 23 (EIRNS)—In the aftermath of the collapse of the idea of “Global Britain,” it’s not surprising that there would be Brits joining the calls in Washington for Biden’s removal from office. Lt. Col. Richard Kemp (ret.), CBE, who once commanded British troops in Afghanistan, said in a Sunday TV interview that Biden should be court-martialed for “betraying the United States of America and the United States’ armed forces.” Kemp apparently doesn’t understand that under the American constitutional system, there is no military authority that can court-martial the President. Or perhaps he does and is actually calling for a military coup in the United States.

“I don’t say this lightly and I’ve never said it about anybody else—any other leader in this position. People have been talking about impeaching President Biden,” Kemp told Fox News host Mark Levin. “I don’t believe President Biden should be impeached. He’s the commander in chief of the U.S. armed forces who’s just essentially surrendered to the Taliban: He shouldn’t be impeached. He should be court-martialed for betraying the United States of America and the United States armed forces.”

Kemp predicted China, which along with Russia “has all but recognized the Taliban” as the new government of Afghanistan, will join with neighboring Pakistan and Iran to further “enrich themselves by plundering” the war-torn country. China is also poised to use Afghanistan’s wealth of minerals and natural resources as a way to “hit against the West,” Kemp claimed.

“So the whole world just became vastly more dangerous. The U.S. government—President Biden humiliated the United States. He humiliated

the United States Army,” Kemp argued. “I think the consequences of what’s just happened and what’s still happening are absolutely devastating for the whole of the Western world.”

Biden Gives Positive View of Withdrawal, as Regime-Change Warrior Ryan Crocker Erupts against Him

Aug. 23 (EIRNS)—President Joe Biden spoke again about Afghanistan to the press and the nation on Sunday afternoon, Aug. 22. He reported that 28,000 individuals have been airlifted from Kabul since Aug. 14 by U.S. and NATO allies, i.e., during the week that the Taliban have been in apparent control in Afghanistan. This is a large number in a short time, but the President added that “We have a long way to go.” He acknowledged the government is discussing extending the Aug. 31 deadline for the last U.S. military forces to leave Afghanistan, but stressed he hoped not to have to do so.

U.S. forces at Kabul airport are prioritizing American citizens, Biden said; and then “Afghan allies, women, and journalists.” Interestingly to the journalists, he said they were implementing “plans to move Americans to places of safety, and then to the [Kabul] Airport.” The phrase was seized on like fresh meat in the short questioning Biden allowed to journalists after his remarks; it was interpreted to mean U.S. troops were deploying out beyond the airport, but Biden would give no elaboration.

The President’s only remarks on the Afghan internal situation were that “ISIS-K (the Afghanistan version) is a sworn enemy of the Taliban; they are fighting one another”; and that the Taliban, in his view, is not an army but “a ragtag force” whose leaders don’t necessarily have much control over street- and village-level fighters, who belong to different factions.

After what could have been taken as an overall positive picture of developments in Afghanistan, Biden could not resist motivating thus, his decision to withdraw forces on a hard deadline: “Moscow and Beijing would love nothing better than for us to be bogged down in Afghanistan.”

Echoing the furious British attacks on Biden for withdrawing U.S. troops, Ryan Crocker, a long-time, big reputation State Department diplomat bitterly attacked the President on “Face the Nation” Aug. 22 along with Trump’s UN Ambassador Nikki Haley. George W. Bush used to call Crocker “his Lawrence of Arabia” when he was Iraq ambassador and a partner of David Petraeus during the “surge.” He’s a regime-change warrior, with the distinction of having been ambassador both to Iraq and to Afghanistan at the peak of the Bush and Obama “troop surges” in each. Crocker said both Trump and Biden have caused “a complete disaster” in Afghanistan which “has created a global crisis” and “emboldened Islamic radicalism” especially in Pakistan. He opined that China and Russia are “high-fiving” over this, but will regret it soon; etc.

Boris Johnson Pushing Biden on Aug. 31 Deadline for Afghanistan Evacuation

Aug. 23 (EIRNS) —The leaders of the G7 will be meeting virtually at the instigation of British Prime Minister Boris Johnson on Aug. 24 to “discuss continuing our close coordination on Afghanistan policy and evacuating our citizens, the brave Afghans who stood with us over the last two decades, and other vulnerable Afghans,” a White House statement reported yesterday. “They will also discuss plans to provide humanitarian assistance and support for Afghan refugees.”

Johnson is expected to pressure Biden to extend the deadline from Aug. 31 to some later date. President Joe Biden himself reported yesterday that discussions are already underway to extend the deadline. “Our hope is we will not have to extend, but there are discussions,” he said, suggesting the possibility that the Taliban will be consulted.

U.K. Minister for the Armed Forces James Heappey confirmed that the U.K. was prepared to urge the Taliban to agree to extend the deadline, regardless of the U.S. decision. “Whether or not the U.S. can be persuaded to stay is a matter for the prime minister tomorrow at the G7 meeting, the conversation with the Taliban will then follow,” he told Sky News, reported the *Guardian*. “The Taliban will have a choice: they can either seek to

engage with the international community ... or they can turn around and say: ‘No, there’s no opportunity for an extension.’ This is not just the discussion that happens among G7 leaders tomorrow. It’s a discussion that then happens with the Taliban.”

Reuters reported last night that Johnson will also push for new sanctions on the Taliban. Britain believes the G7 should consider economic sanctions and withhold aid if the Taliban commits human rights abuses and allows its territory to be used as a haven for militants, according to a British government official and a second Western diplomat, both of whom spoke to Reuters on condition of anonymity. Asked whether he would support Britain’s push for sanctions if the Taliban committed abuses, Biden said, “The answer is yes. It depends on the conduct.”

“It is vital that the international community works together to ensure safe evacuations, prevent a humanitarian crisis and support the Afghan people to secure the gains of the last 20 years,” Johnson said on Twitter on Aug. 22. Sanctions against the Taliban are unlikely to be adopted immediately, one Western diplomat said. British Foreign Secretary Dominic Raab first raised the possibility of sanctions to pressure the Taliban last week.

Sen. Lindsey Graham, who has called for Biden’s impeachment, joined with retired neo-con Gen. Jack Keane last week in an op-ed in the *Wall Street Journal* in which they practically called for a re-invasion of Afghanistan. “It must be made clear to the Taliban that we are committed to helping those who sacrificed for us and will ensure their safe evacuation,” they write. “We must establish safe corridors not only in Kabul but throughout the country to move those who cannot make it to the capital.” Such a re-invasion would be coherent with British calls to go off the grounds of the Kabul airport to find people to evacuate.

Observer Commentator Argues, Biden Has Left Global Britain ‘Impotent and Friendless’

Aug. 23 (EIRNS)—[Andrew Rawnsley](#), chief political commentator of the *Observer*, writes in a commentary posted yesterday that Boris Johnson’s

“Global Britain” has been exposed as “impotent and friendless” by Biden’s decision-making on Afghanistan. The Anglo-American special relationship was declared to be “warm and friendly” after Biden took office and made his first phone call to Boris Johnson, but “Now we know differently,” Rawnsley laments. “When it came to the calls that mattered over Afghanistan, Mr. Johnson’s capacity to influence Mr. Biden was less than that of the president’s dog,” he continues. “The withdrawal of what remained of the NATO presence in Afghanistan was dictated by abrupt and unilateral decisions made in Washington. Ministers privately admit that not only did they fail to see a resurgent Taliban coming, they have been reduced to second-guessing what the United States will do next.”

The reaction of Conservatives in the House of Commons was intense. “Where is Global Britain on the streets of Kabul?” Theresa May angrily demanded of Johnson in Parliament last week. “I have never heard so much fury so ferociously expressed by Conservative MPs about the behavior of the U.S. Behind their hot anger was a cold fear: the foreboding sense of an impotent Britain friendless in a frightening world,” Rawnsley writes.

The future of “Global Britain” seems to be left hanging. “If we are entering an era of American disengagement, the questions are acute for a Britain that chose to estrange itself from the liberal democracies in its neighborhood at the same time as the U.S. was becoming a less dependable partner,” Rawnsley writes near the end. “Some plausibly conjecture that the future is a new world disorder in which the great powers jostle for predominance and norms of international conduct are trampled underfoot. This will be a rough place for a country in the north-east Atlantic with lots of vital interests around the globe, but not the means to safeguard them by itself and no one it can count on as an all-weather friend....”

“ ‘Very well, alone’ did good service for Winston Churchill as a wartime rallying cry in 1940. British impotence in Afghanistan demonstrates that it is an utterly hopeless strategy for survival in the 21st century,” he concludes.

NEW WORLD ECONOMIC ORDER

Pakistani Diplomat Sees China in Leading Role in Afghan Projects

Aug. 23 (EIRNS)—In a commentary today for the Pakistani daily *Express Tribune*, Dr. Manzoor Ahmad—Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the World Trade Organization (WTO) from 2002 to 2008; and Director, Liaison Office, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) to the United Nations from 2008 to 2010—looks at options for integrating Afghanistan into a “new economic partnership” with its Central Asian neighbors plus Iran and India, and naturally Pakistan. A crucial role will be played by the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), which will be extended into Afghanistan, he writes.

“China is already the biggest foreign investor in both countries. It is building the Sino-Afghanistan Special Railway Transportation Project and the Five Nations Railway Project connecting China, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Iran and Afghanistan. Pakistan could also join this project.

“China is also working on the \$4.4 billion copper extraction project in Logar province and oil exploration in the Amu Darya Basin. The jewel in the crown will be the extraction of rare-earth metals estimated to be worth between \$1-3 trillion.

“Since the takeover of the Taliban, China is the first country to indicate its willingness to contribute to post-war reconstruction and development under the BRI. These projects can give a further impetus to CPEC as the flagship project and highlight Pakistan’s role in Afghanistan’s reconstruction.”

COLLAPSING WESTERN FINANCIAL SYSTEM

Commitment to 50% Electric Vehicles Is Being Discredited

Aug. 23 (EIRNS)—The Biden Administration’s demand that 50% of U.S. motor vehicles be fully electric by 2030 is being defied by reality. The rash of reported vehicle fires and losses of power has caused Chevrolet to stop EV production and recall 69,000 Chevy Bolts, following recalls of more

than 130,000 EVs by Hyundai, Ford, Volvo and BMW. One well-publicized fire of a Bolt while charging—after it had been serviced in the recall in Spring 2021—was that of Vermont State Senator Timothy Briglin, who had been a strong advocate of the technology. On Aug. 21, General Motors, which made the electric motor for Chevrolet, expanded the Chevrolet recall to include all Bolt EVs.

Recalls with new technologies are common, but the problem of EV fires is a very serious one. They are extremely difficult to put out, repeatedly reigniting for many hours after being extinguished, typically require 10,000 gallons of water to be applied to do so, and have required special training in fire departments across the United States. The car's cable harness may still be carrying high voltage, much higher than in an internal combustion engine-powered vehicle. If the car is being charged in a garage when the lithium battery ignites, it sets the house on fire.

This is a minor problem, however, compared to the lack of electric power generation or transmission capacity to make mass conversion to EVs possible. The above problems come with 2 million EVs, out of 300 million vehicles, on U.S. roads—less than 1%, ABC News reports on the local Rochester network WHAM on July 22. The *EIR* Special Report “The Great Leap Backward: LaRouche Exposes the Green New Deal,” published in February, demonstrated that the goal of even 100 million EVs, if accompanied by continued shifting to wind parks and solar power farms in place of baseline plants, would require nominal installed electric capacity to increase by half, and 100,000 new miles of transmission lines be built.

One example is a study just released by the [Power Workers Union](#) of Ontario, Canada which finds that the province will have to increase its installed electric power capacity by at least 55 GW by 2050 to pursue electrified vehicles, buildings, etc. and reach the mythical “zero emissions.” That amount is four times Ontario's current total of nuclear, hydro, and “renewables” capacity. And it is probably an underestimate by as much as 25 GW, the report finds, particularly if the province goes through with the planned closure of the Pickering nuclear power plant in 2025. The report is

titled, “Electrification Pathways for Ontario To Reduce Emissions,” and was reported by the *World Nuclear News* on Aug. 20.

STRATEGIC WAR DANGER

Blair Sent Our Troops into Afghanistan on ‘Short-Lived Exercise’ in 2001

Aug. 23 (EIRNS)—Tony Blair’s diatribe of Saturday, Aug. 21, in which he denounced President Joe Biden’s withdrawal decision as “imbecilic,” is not being well received by everyone in the British establishment. “Blair has some front criticizing Biden when along with Bush he was responsible for the greatest loss of civilian life in war in the 21st century,” said former Labour shadow Chancellor (i.e., treasury minister) John McDonnell in a Twitter posting yesterday. “I also recall when he sent troops into Afghanistan he implied it would be a short-lived exercise. Liar or imbecile or both?”

Czech President Calls NATO Legitimacy in Question

Aug. 23 (EIRNS)—Czech President Milos Zeman has said that NATO has failed, referring to Afghanistan, and has questioned its legitimacy. He said his country should focus on national defense and quit wasting money. “The distrust towards NATO from a number of member countries will grow after this experience, because they will say—if you failed in Afghanistan, where is a guarantee that you won’t fail in any other critical situation?” Zeman demanded in an interview on Aug. 3 published by www.parlamentnilisty.cz.

GREEN NEW DEAL

U.S. Treasury Issues ‘Guidance’ to Multilateral Development Banks: No Money for Coal

Aug. 23 (EIRNS)—On Aug. 16, the U.S. Department of the Treasury announced a new fossil fuel energy guidance for multilateral development banks, which aims to extend the Davos edict against financing for coal—

and ultimately any “fossil fuel”—beyond private capital to include government institutions. This is the next step following the declaration made by G7 countries in June, which American President Joe Biden then incorporated in his Build Back Better plan, and later codified in Executive Order 14008, which puts climate change at the forefront of U.S. foreign policy.

In a posting on the Center for Strategic and International Studies site on Aug. 19, CSIS Senior Fellow for the Economics Program [Stephanie Segal](#) provides a detailed analysis: “Specifically, the United States will oppose all new coal-based and oil-based energy projects, with rare exceptions for the latter, for example in humanitarian crises or as backup generation for clean off-grid energy systems. Treasury will also oppose ‘upstream’ (exploration) natural gas projects and will support ‘midstream and downstream’ natural gas projects only if certain criteria are met....”

While the Treasury statement is technically a “guidance” and not a “mandate,” Segal makes it clear that it is likely to carry the weight of a Caesarean edict, because of U.S. prominence as a “stakeholder” in many of these institutions: “The United States is the largest shareholder at the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB, 30.0%), World Bank (15.8%), and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD, 10.1%).” In addition, it “holds the largest voting share, along with Japan, at the Asian Development Bank (AsDB, 15.6% each) and the second largest share behind Nigeria at the African Development Bank (AfDB, 7.6%).”

The Treasury action, Segal observes, will leave the world’s two primary remaining multilateral development banks—the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank and (BRICS) New Development Bank—along with “unilateral” lenders like Export-Import Bank of China and the China Development Bank, totally isolated as lending institutions, making it much riskier for them to make any such loans.

Source Indicates Greens in Next Government Means End of German Industry

Aug. 23 (EIRNS)—A source active for the interests of industry and infrastructure in Germany's East told the Schiller Institute in a phone discussion that it is widely feared that the Greens will be in the next German government, which implies that the exit from nuclear and coal will be sealed, with the exit from coal even coming in 2030 instead of 2038, which so far has been the target date.

The source said that it is evident to anyone who is not manipulated by the mass media that without letting the remaining six nuclear power plants run for several years, which means the suspension of the exit date for three of them by the end of this year, and the other three by the end of 2022, the required power will not be available for German industry. Nor will it be available for the millions of e-cars which are to be built in the coming years.

“If the nuclear exit is kept, it is the end for the industrial sites of Germany,” the source said, further conveying that the big hypocrisy in all this would be massive imports of power from Poland (generated by coal) and Czechia and France (generated by nuclear)—the open question being if Germany's neighbors will really be willing in the long run to help Germany out.