

[brussels builds a monster]

Europe's Living Dead

Resurrecting the EU Constitution could mean socialism for the continent.

By Peter Hitchens

LONDON—You might have thought that creating a constitution without a country was like building the roof first and the walls afterwards. But that is the way the architects of the New Europe like to proceed, and surprisingly often, it almost works. For various reasons, the political elites of this messy, fractious continent have been so anxious to construct their Union that they have ignored the way their strange structure creaks and shudders in the slightest wind, muttering, “It may be a mess, it may be costly, but it’s worth it.”

We will return to why they think it is worth it (they are wrong), but first let us sum up the state of things in Old Europe 65 years after the tragic fall of France and 190 years since the far from tragic Battle of Waterloo, in which Britain managed once again to frustrate European unity.

The planned Constitution was dealt a terrible blow by the voters of France and the Netherlands, who surprised and angered their rulers by decisively rejecting it in twin referendums. They were not supposed to do this. Referendums in Europe are quite unlike the proposition votes in the U.S., where the people tell the government what to do. Here they are designed, timed, and worded by governments in the hope that the people will endorse what their rulers want. This is why they are banned in modern Germany. Adolf Hitler made frequent use of

plebiscites to confirm his actions, and the device is still viewed with suspicion by many thoughtful Germans. The problem with this is that, since their political, academic, and media elites are wholly committed to the European idea, German voters have never had any way of expressing their strong doubts about the abolition of their currency and their sovereignty.

So, in a way, the French and Dutch have knowingly broken the rules because they have no other way to speak about what deeply concerns them. Their rejection is important precisely because it is a true reflection of a real misgiving. When this has happened in smaller, more easily frightened nations—the Irish Republic and Denmark—they have simply been told to go and do it again until they come up with the right answer, which they eventually do. But France and the Netherlands are founder members of the European Union, who have done well out of it and are simply not supposed to behave in this way. And both are stiff-necked, proud peoples who, if told to vote again, will simply produce an even louder “no” than before. Technically, the constitution ought to be dead. Technically, these rejections cannot be overcome. But if you believe that the juggernaut of European supranationalism can be halted by a little democratic resistance, you will believe anything.

The EU is determined to turn itself into a new type of state, never before seen on the planet, and its leaders believe it can wriggle round this problem given time and will. France’s President Jacques Chirac and Germany’s Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder, both widely despised at home and almost certainly doomed as leaders of their countries, are frantically trying to revive the limp cadaver of the Constitution. Their main argument is that the voters of France and Holland did not really know what they were doing or intend to produce this result. It is said that they were showing how much they loathed Jacques Chirac (which they were), or how sick they are of the growth of intolerant Islam in their midst (which they are), or how discontented they are with the levels of unemployment (which they are).

The one thing that would certainly kill it without hope of resurrection would be a third “no” from the voters of Britain. A vote was promised by Tony Blair before the last general election. Were it to be held, it would, without doubt, produce the most resounding rejection of all. Since they were tricked into joining the EU in a shamelessly rigged and dishonest referendum in 1975, most of the British have longed for a chance to show their resentment against a project that has brought them no good and a great deal of harm. However, it now seems to have been cancelled.

Blair is always promising referendums on European matters to prevent them from becoming election issues. In theory, he is for the European Union and the opposition Conservatives are more or less against it. In theory, that should be a serious electoral disadvantage to him since the majority of British voters are hostile to the EU. So he cunningly ensures that it is never an issue at election time by pledging a plebiscite. But the promised referendums—one on abolishing sterling and joining the euro, the other on the Constitution—never happen, mainly because if they did, Blair would lose them. It is a very odd form of government.

Currently, we in Britain are being told that there is no point in voting on a Constitution that appears to be dead. That would be convincing if our European partners would only admit that it is dead. But they pointedly do not. The president of the European Commission, Jose Manuel Barroso, astonished Britain's most famously aggressive TV interviewer, Jeremy Paxman, by refusing to pronounce the last rites after the double

Cohn-Bendit, once the famous "Danny the Red" who raged on the Paris barricades in May 1968. Another is the German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer, a violent street fighter from the same era, of whom photographs exist showing him wearing a helmet in the midst of a fearsome assault on a Frankfurt policeman. A former French premier—and supporter of the Constitution—Lionel Jospin belonged to a Trotskyist sect in the 1960s and denied his past allegiance until a former comrade provided indisputable proof. Blair's government is also stuffed with former Communists, Marxists, and Trotskyites of various brands, many of them simultaneously unrepentant and reticent about their pasts. It is always difficult to tell just how much of their Leninist baggage these people have dumped and how much of it is still in an attic somewhere, kept in case of need. But there are several interesting resemblances between the European ideal and the Marxist fantasy of a world without nations or patriotism, controlled by a vanguard elite.

PRESIDENT CHIRAC AND CHANCELLOR SCHROEDER HAVE SEIZED THE OPPORTUNITY TO LAUNCH A NEW ATTACK ON BRITAIN, STRENGTHENING THE VIEW AMONG SOME BRITISH CONSERVATIVES THAT ONE OF THE PURPOSES OF THE EU IS TO DIMINISH AND ULTIMATELY DESTROY BRITAIN'S POWER AND INDEPENDENCE.

"no" vote. An unbelieving Paxman—who like much of Britain's media elite has yet to grasp the insouciant arrogance of the EU—clearly could not credit what Barroso was saying when he insisted that it was not all over. Barroso, like many of the prominent figures in the new European elite, is a former Marxist (in his case, a Maoist).

Another prominent supporter of the Constitution, for example, is Daniel

There are other interesting parallels between the old USSR and the new EU. Both suffer from economic five-year plans, both are or were governed by an unaccountable and secretive cabinet—the Politburo in Moscow, the Council of Ministers in Brussels. Both are or were immensely, hopelessly corrupt—the EU's auditors have refused to sign the books for years. And both had or have a powerless assembly of well-rewarded

placemen, without any concept of opposition or accountability, as a fig leaf for their authoritarian natures.

Barroso, the chief bureaucrat of this strange organism, plainly takes the view, satirized by Bertolt Brecht after the East German riots of 1953, that the people have failed the state and it is therefore necessary to elect a new people—or at least to find a way of showing that the people did not really mean what they said. In the meantime, all proceeds as if nothing had happened.

Implementation has not stopped. On what is called a "special legal basis" the offices of a new president of Europe are being established; a new European diplomatic service is being created; a European Defense Agency is already in operation; a European Space Agency has held its first meetings. National vetoes on immigration policy, supposedly only abolished once the Constitution comes into force, have already been gotten rid of on the spurious grounds of urgency, always the standard excuse of the instinctively lawless. The European Charter of Fundamental Rights, supposedly brought into force by the Constitution, is already being applied to all EU legislation.

Meanwhile, far from being chastened by the experience, President Chirac and Chancellor Schroeder have seized the opportunity to launch a new attack on Britain, strengthening the view among some British conservatives that one of the purposes of the EU is to diminish and ultimately destroy Britain's power and independence, for the very understandable reason that Britain has since the 16th century frustrated every scheme for European continental unity, from Philip II of Spain to Hitler and Stalin.

The current quarrel is about Britain's enormous contribution to the European Union. As one of the richest and most successful countries, Britain has been

compelled to hand over nearly \$300 billion to Brussels in the last 20 years, and its current annual subscription is around \$15 billion. Many members pay nothing at all. Britain's heavy impost is partly the result of its relatively healthy economy, thriving precisely because it has so far avoided many of the EU's reforms, especially the single currency. Many others gain hugely in subsidies, especially France, whose inefficient farmers are the biggest winners from the grotesque Common Agricultural Policy. It has been calculated that this scheme is so expensive that it could pay to cover the entire European continent in good-quality carpet. This is why Margaret Thatcher demanded and got a rebate in 1984, without which Britain would pay even more.

Now, so that the EU can bribe its recently arrived East European members into compliance with their new masters, there are plans to increase the budget and reduce the British rebate. Blair has been told that resistance will be seen as anti-European at this delicate moment. For not only is the Constitution in trouble, but its twin project, the euro, is wobbling too. German politicians and bankers have had secret discussions about going back to the Deutsche mark because of the miserable effects of currency union on their economy. They always knew there would be a price to pay but did not think that it would involve the highest unemployment since the days of the Weimar Republic. Most observers expect that Blair will give way on the rebate, mainly because he is hopelessly outnumbered—Britain has no real friends in the EU—but also because he is ultimately anxious to please. He also knows that if he does not, the EU will find some way to punish him. The old national veto, which once protected the independence of all EU members, has now been abolished in so many different areas

that it is all too easy for a powerful group of members to gang up on another and force it into things it does not wish to do.

Americans, used to almost complete national sovereignty, ought to find it shocking that a country such as Britain, not long ago a global power in her own

GERMAN POLITICIANS AND BANKERS HAVE HAD **SECRET DISCUSSIONS ABOUT GOING BACK TO THE DEUTSCHE MARK** BECAUSE OF THE **MISERABLE EFFECTS OF CURRENCY UNION** ON THEIR ECONOMY.

right, is now reduced to this position. Many in Britain, and increasingly in the rest of Europe, feel the same way. The EU was conceived in the shame and devastation that followed 1940. France decided that it could no longer fight German domination of the continent. Germany resolved that it would no longer seek that domination by military means. The other nations of the continent, almost all of them having either suffered rape or tyranny in the first half of the 20th century, saw good reasons to collaborate.

But the original architects of the project wanted to go much farther than mere collaboration. They sought to found the world's first multinational state not created by conquest. They were Jean Monnet, Robert Schuman, and crucially the Italian Altiero Spinelli, who recognized that Hitler's defeat of the pre-war European powers had made this new thing possible. He wrote in 1941 from his prison island, "The collapse of the majority of the states of the continent under the German steamroller has already placed the destinies of the European populations on common ground: either all together they will submit to Hitler's dominion, or all together they will enter a revolutionary crisis after his fall."

His clarity is impressive—just what one might expect from a Communist militant, which he was until his death in 1986. He added, "The multiple problems which poison international life on the continent have proved to be insoluble: tracing boundaries through areas inhabited by mixed populations, defense of

minorities, seaports for landlocked countries, the Balkan question, the Irish problem, and so on. All matters which should find easy solutions in the European federation." He hoped there would be a European armed force, but each state would retain just enough sovereignty for national matters.

The program of European union was driven forward with much American encouragement and helped immensely by the success of Marshall Plan aid. The federalist activists continued, piece by piece, to draw power irrevocably from Europe's nation-states, to abolish their frontiers, to drain authority from their parliaments, to merge their legal systems slowly but inevitably under one law and one supreme court, to unify indirect taxation and harmonize business and employment laws. We all even have the same passports. It became associated, wrongly, with the prosperity created by Marshall aid and, even more outrageously, with the peace that resulted from NATO's effective deterrence of Soviet power. Before the collapse of the Warsaw Pact, this program was limited. As a result, it was popular—or at least not unpopular—in most of its core countries.

Only in Britain, the one major European nation that had not been subju-

gated or fallen into tyranny, were its demands on sovereignty and its attacks on liberty resented and disliked and increasingly seen for what they were.

This has all now changed. The attitude known as Euro-skepticism has suddenly spread far beyond Britain, as the referendums show. Germany has suffered greatly because of the botched reunification following the fall of the Berlin Wall. Though it bans plebiscites, voters in a solidly Social Democratic region have just humiliated the ruling Social Democrat party. This is a political avalanche, as if Chicago or Boston had gone Republican. West Germans resent the endless subsidies they pay to their Eastern compatriots. The Easterners, in turn, are far from grateful. Their jobs have vanished, and their devastated

murdered, the country's heart and mind underwent a sort of earthquake, perhaps the most fascinating mass political conversion of modern times. The Dutch doublethink has come to an end and has been replaced with a robust determination, even among liberals, to defend their way of life. It is at least consistent now.

The immigration issue is also very much alive in the other EU countries. Some fear being displaced by cheap, skilled labor from new EU members such as Poland, where wages are far lower than in the old core of the EU. Some are increasingly concerned by the rapid and visible growth of Islam, as huge new mosques arise amid the industrial cityscapes of Northern Europe and Muslim voters become an important constituency. Others are alarmed by the

the Union may have persuaded many Western Europeans that they have had enough of supranationalism. They begin to see, once again, the forgotten virtues of going to hell in your own handcart, of governing your own borders and being able to dismiss your own government when it fails you.

Some Americans yearn for a power to counterbalance the imperial-global presidency of George W. Bush. Other Americans love their union so much that they think its principles can be applied here too. They are mistaken in both hopes. European opposition to Bush was not principled defense of ancient ideas of sovereignty and just war but cynical pursuit of favors and contracts from oil states, combined with a nervousness about the growing numbers of Muslim voters. As for the Union, even 13 colonies from the same stock, sharing the same God and the same laws, and speaking the same language, mistrusted each other enough to place clear, gruff, unambiguous limits on federal power. In all the many pages of the EU Constitution, no such limits appear. Indeed, a centralized tyranny would easily be able to subvert this atrocious, prolix document. And, as we British can tell you, living under Europe's blue and yellow flag means an endless, insidious attack on the foundations of liberty we both share, based upon Magna Carta, *habeas corpus*, the presumption of innocence, jury trial, common law, and the first Bill of Rights (ours). Any superstate created on this basis would be a menace to its own people and, if it became militarily and diplomatically potent, to any free state within its range or influence.

Rejoice at the wounding of this plan. But do not yet assume that it is dead or buried. ■

Peter Hitchens is a columnist for the London Mail on Sunday. He is the author of The Abolition of Britain.

IF EUROPE INCLUDES TURKEY, THEN WHAT DOES EUROPE—A CONTINENT ALWAYS DEFINED BY POLITICS RATHER THAN BY GEOGRAPHY—MEAN? TURKEY IS NOT CHRISTIAN. IT IS MUSLIM AND DAILY BECOMING MORE SO.

cities are emptying of young people. They either yearn for the secure days of Communism—and vote for the party that used to imprison them—or flirt with sordid but alarmingly professional neo-Nazi movements.

France, whose lavish social safety net has begun to fray because it is simply too costly to maintain, and which likewise suffers from increasing unemployment, associates much of this with the arrival of the single currency.

The ludicrously permissive Netherlands is caught in a trap set for liberals. Its multicultural principles insist that it must welcome Muslim immigrants from North Africa. Its ultra-tolerance is affronted by the fierce intolerance of these Muslims for its relaxed way of life. When the anti-Muslim, flamboyantly homosexual politician Pim Fortuyn was

failure of the EU to control its borders and coasts, as economic migrants brave terrible journeys to flee North Africa.

Now that the Union stretches from the Irish coastline to the Russian frontier, and includes nations and peoples terribly impoverished by half a century of Communist rule, it has entirely lost the feeling of cozy prosperity that used to envelop it. The proposal, strenuously supported by Washington, to admit Turkey to the EU strikes many as simply wrong. If Europe includes Turkey, then what does Europe—a continent always defined by politics rather than by geography—mean? Turkey is not Christian. It is Muslim and daily becoming more so. It is stretching things quite a bit to say that it is a law-governed democracy. It may be in many ways an impressive country, but the proposal to bring it into

Blacklisted Cancer Treatment Could Save Your Life

Baltimore, MD—As unbelievable as it seems, the key to stopping many cancers has been around for over 30 years. Yet it has been banned. Blocked. Kept out of your medicine cabinet by the very agency designed to protect your health—the FDA.

In 1966, the senior oncologist at a prominent New York hospital rocked the medical world when he developed a serum that **“shrank cancer tumors in 45 minutes!”** 90 minutes later they were gone. Headlines hit every major paper around the world. Scientists and researchers applauded. Time and again this life-saving treatment worked miracles, but the FDA ignored the research and hope he brought and shut him down.

You read that right. He was not only shut down—but also forced out of the country where others benefited from his discovery. That was 39 years ago. How many other treatments have they been allowed to hide? Just as in the case of Dr. Burton’s miracle serum these too go unmentioned.

Two-Nutrient Cancer Breakthrough

Decades ago, European research scientist Dr. Johanna Budwig, a six-time Nobel Prize nominee, discovered a totally natural formula that not only protects against the development of cancer, but people all over the world who have been diagnosed with incurable cancer and sent home to die have actually benefited from her research—and now lead normal lives.

After 30 years of study, Dr. Budwig discovered that the blood of seriously ill cancer patients was deficient in certain substances and nutrients. Yet healthy blood always contained these ingredients. It was the lack of these nutrients that allowed cancer cells to grow wild and out of control.

By simply eating a combination of two natural and delicious foods not only can cancer be prevented—but in case after case it was actually healed! “Symptoms of cancer, liver dysfunction, and diabetes were completely alleviated.” Remarkably, what Dr. Budwig discovered was a totally natural way for eradicating cancer.

However, when she went to publish these results so that everyone could benefit—**she was blocked by manufacturers with heavy financial stakes!** For over 10 years now her methods have proved effective—yet she is denied publication—blocked by the giants who don’t want you to read her words.

What’s more, the world is full of expert minds like Dr. Budwig who have pursued cancer remedies and come up with remarkable natural formulas and diets that work for hundreds and thousands of patients. *How to Fight Cancer & Win* author William Fischer has studied these methods and revealed their

secrets for you—so that you or someone you love may be spared the horrors of conventional cancer treatments.

As early as 1947, Virginia Livingston, M.D. isolated a cancer-causing microbe. She noted that every cancer sample analyzed (whether human or other animal) contained it.

This microbe—a bacterium that is actually in each of us from birth to death—multiplies and promotes cancer when the immune system is weakened by disease, stress, or poor nutrition. Worst of all, the microbes secrete a special hormone protector that short-circuits our body’s immune system—allowing the microbes to grow undetected for years. No wonder so many patients are riddled with cancer by the time it is detected. But there is hope even for them ...

Six-time Nobel Nominee’s Two-Nutrient Cancer Breakthrough Revealed

Turn to page 82 of *How to Fight Cancer & Win* for the delicious diet that can help stop the formation of cancer cells and shrink tumors.

They walked away from traditional cancer treatments...and were healed! Throughout the pages of *How to Fight Cancer & Win* you’ll meet real people who were diagnosed with cancer—suffered through harsh conventional treatments—turned their backs on so called modern medicine—only to be miraculously healed by natural means! Here is just a sampling of what others have to say about the book.

“We purchased *How to Fight Cancer & Win*, and immediately my husband started following the recommended diet for his just diagnosed colon cancer. He refused the surgery that our doctors advised. Since following the regime recommended in the book he has had no problems at all, cancer-wise. If not cured, we believe the cancer has to be in remission.”

—Thelma B.

“I bought *How to Fight Cancer & Win* and this has to be the greatest book I’ve ever read. I have had astounding results from the easy to understand knowledge found in this book. My whole life has improved drastically and I have done so much for many others. The information goes far beyond the health thinking of today.”

—Hugh M.

“I can’t find adequate words to describe my appreciation of your work in providing *How to Fight Cancer & Win*. You had to do an enormous amount of research to bring this vast and most important knowledge to your readers.

“My doctor found two tumors on my prostate with a high P.S.A. He scheduled a time to surgically remove the prostate, but I canceled the appointment. Instead I went on the diet discussed in the book combined with another supplement. Over the months my P.S.A. has lowered until the last reading was one point two.”

—Duncan M.

“In my 55 years as a country family physician, I have never read a more ‘down to earth,’ practical resume of cancer prevention and treatments, than in this book. It needs to be studied worldwide for the prevention of cancer by all researchers who are looking for a cure.”

—Edward S., M.D.

“As a cancer patient who has been battling lymphatic cancer on and off for almost three years now, I was very pleased to stumble across *How to Fight Cancer & Win*. The book was inspiring, well-written and packed with useful information for any cancer patient looking to maximize his or her chances for recovery.”

—Romany S.

“I’ve been incorporating Dr. Budwig’s natural remedy into my diet and have told others about it. Your book is very informative and has information I’ve never heard about before (and I’ve read many books on the cancer and nutrition link). Thanks for the wonderful information.”

—Molly G.

Don’t waste another minute. There are only a limited number of books in stock—and unless order volume is extraordinarily high we may not be able to print more life-saving copies. Claim your book today and you will be one of the lucky few who no longer have to wait for cures that get pushed “underground” by big business and money hungry giants.

To get your copy of *How to Fight Cancer & Win* visit our website at www.agorahealthbooks.com/P6F6K or call **1-888-821-3609** and ask for code **P6F6K** to order by credit card. Or write “Fight Cancer —Dept. P6F6K” on a plain piece of paper with your name, address, phone number (in case we have a question about your order) and mail it with a check for \$19.95 plus \$5.00 shipping to:

**Agora Health Books
Dept. P6F6K-680SFCBK
P.O. Box 925
Frederick, MD 21705-9838**

If you are not completely satisfied, return the book within one year for a complete and total refund—no questions asked. This will probably be the most important information you and your loved ones receive—so order today!

ID# P6F6K

©2005 Agora Health Books, LLC

Aid and Comfort

Chinese nuclear proliferation at American taxpayer expense

By Timothy P. Carney

AS THE WHITE HOUSE pressures Iran and North Korea to suspend their nuclear-weapons programs, the Bush administration is offering a record subsidy deal to the arm of the Chinese government that has equipped Iran and Pakistan with vital nuclear-weapons technology.

The China National Nuclear Corporation (CNNC) is the Chinese government agency in charge of both nuclear weapons and nuclear power. Westinghouse Electric, a partly American company, is one of three firms bidding to build the four new nuclear reactors CNNC plans to construct in two of China's eastern provinces. As an enticement to CNNC, the U.S. Export-Import Bank—a federal agency that subsidizes American exports—has offered \$5 billion in loans and loan guarantees to China, if they'll go with Westinghouse.

U.S. intelligence has repeatedly caught CNNC transferring or intending to transfer nuclear-weapons technology to Pakistan and Iran. Now Ex-Im is offering taxpayer money to subsidize that same Chinese agency.

In fact, taxpayers are already subsidizing CNNC. The Clinton administration approved Ex-Im loans so that the Chinese would employ Bechtel for reactors it built at the beginning of this decade.

Aside from the five major nuclear powers—the U.S., Russia, China, Britain, and France—India and Pakistan are the two countries that have detonated nuclear weapons. Pakistan can thank CNNC for its nuclear capability.

In early 1995, Capitol Hill and the White House were sent into a minor frenzy after a *Washington Times* article

by intelligence correspondent Bill Gertz reported CIA findings tying CNNC to Pakistan's infamous nuclear scientist A.Q. Khan. Gertz reported, "According to intelligence sources, the CIA recently notified the State Department that China sold 5,000 ring magnets to the A.Q. Khan Research Laboratory in Kahuta, Pakistan, last year."

Ring magnets are necessary components of the high-powered centrifuges that can enrich uranium from its natural state to weapons-grade matter. The Clinton administration tacitly confirmed this report, imposing temporary limits on U.S. trade with CNNC, but lifted them upon a commitment from China not to distribute more nuclear-weapons materials.

A 2002 report from the Congressional Research Service (CRS) attributes the Clinton administration's immediate retraction of sanctions to "considerations of trade interests of U.S. corporations with business in China." Sure enough, Bechtel at the time was helping CNNC build nuclear plants—also with Ex-Im support. Many other U.S. companies rely heavily on their trade with China, which is often aided by U.S. government subsidies.

Undeterred by their commitment to the U.S., China continued to arm Pakistan. In 1996, the *Washington Times* reported that the Chinese Nuclear Energy Industry Corporation (CNEIC), a wholly owned subsidiary of CNNC, had equipped Pakistan with special furnaces for weaponizing uranium and plutonium.

Pakistan detonated a nuclear weapon in May 1998 in response to India's nuclear capability. Yet most worrisome may not be Pakistan's use of the technol-

ogy but its distribution of it. Pakistan, like India, Israel, and Cuba, is not a party to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

Although A.Q. Khan is something of a hero to many Pakistanis, the Pakistani government, under U.S. pressure, arrested Khan in 2004 for shipping centrifuges to Libya. Khan's desire for centrifuge materials was long known in the intelligence world—he was convicted in absentia in 1983 for stealing designs for a uranium centrifuge from the Dutch labs where he had worked. (The conviction was later overturned on a technicality.) Khan admitted after his arrest that he had sold nuclear weapons technology on the black market to North Korea and Iran as well as Libya.

After leading the international hunt for Khan—who had received his technology from China—the Bush administration has continued doing business with his supplier, CNNC.

CNNC has also done business with Iran's weapons program. The *Washington Post* reported in 1995 that CNEIC intended to sell Iran equipment for enriching uranium. China followed that report with another pledge that it would not help Iran's weapons program, but the CIA reported in 2002 that it was uncertain this pledge was holding up, according to CRS.

In 1998, the *Washington Post* also reported that CNEIC offered Iran's nuclear agency "a lifelong supply" of hydrofluoric acid, used in both uranium weaponization and the preparation of deadly sarin gas. Protests from Washington stopped the sale, according to CRS.

The U.S. government's declared interest in this deal centers on 5,000 jobs in