

## Editorial

### *LaRouche proven right on Mideast war*

On July 4, Lyndon LaRouche warned of the grave danger of war in the Middle East. At that time he expected that Israel would be directly involved in the fighting. While he had thought that such a war might not occur for six months, not three weeks later the area has indeed exploded. It should be noted that Anglo-American and Israeli intelligence sources vigorously denied LaRouche's hypothesis.

The developing scenario was already clear then, in outline. A deliberate campaign was being waged by the Israelis and British to isolate and provoke an outburst from Iraqi President Saddam Hussein. There had been major takeovers of the leading Israeli press by Bronfman-connected British interests, and the government in Israel had been captured by hard-liners who rejected negotiations with the Palestinians.

Notwithstanding the ostensibly regional nature of the conflict, LaRouche emphasized the role of the superpowers, with the former superpower Britain playing a key role in instigating a war scenario. Any disruption of the oil supplies would introduce an element of incalculability into the economic picture and make President Bush's attempt to cover over an escalating U.S. depression, more difficult. However, from the point of view of a certain faction in Britain, it is highly desirable to force austerity on the United States and clip the economic wings of the Germans.

LaRouche foresaw a sequence of events which would be orchestrated so that Israel would launch war. The desired end-result would be a condominium arrangement for the Middle East, with the Islamic-Arab "menace" as the primary target of what might turn into a major population war, even including an exchange of chemical or nuclear weapons.

Events as they are unfolding minute by minute, have again proven LaRouche to be correct.

The important thing is not the immediate events before us, but the criteria which LaRouche emphasized when he made his assessment several weeks ago. It is necessary to be absolutely clear that a certain faction in Britain is controlling both the Iraq side of this busi-

ness, and the Israelis. On the one side we have Bronfman, the Hollinger group, Robert Maxwell—all British-run; and on the other, we have Britain's Tiny Rowland controlling the Iraqis, as evidenced by his recent role "mediating" the release of a British nurse accused of espionage.

The murder of Dr. Gerald Bull, the president of Space Research Corporation, was a case in point of how the Iraqis were manipulated into launching the invasion of Kuwait. Bull was professionally assassinated as he left his apartment in Brussels, Belgium. He had been involved in modernizing weapons for the Iraqi government. While this was probably an Israeli operation, the British press began a campaign against the so-called Iraqi war drive at about the same time that the murder occurred, including a big press hype about the so-called Iraqi super-cannon. This was calculated to make the Iraqis feel isolated from Western support while they were threatened by the Israelis. The Israelis had threatened to launch a preemptive strike against the Iraqis. Iraq's move into Kuwait afforded them a certain advantage in face of a possible Israeli attack.

The Middle East has always been a place where "the Great Game" was played, to borrow Rudyard Kipling's term for intelligence warfare. To understand what is happening, we must identify the role of the grouping around Thatcher in Britain which is working with the cosmopolitan, or Bukharinite, faction in the Soviet Union, and which is presently controlling policy within the United States. Part of the Great Game is British control of the Israelis and the Iraqis.

This is balance-of-power politics played by experts: Play everybody against everybody, so that you come out on top.

To believe the propaganda against Saddam Hussein, comparing him to Adolf Hitler, is a grave error. The present war danger is very real, and with it the danger of a global, uncontrolled financial collapse. The danger, however, does not lie in how Iraq and Israel respond to each other, or Iraqi aggression against Kuwait, but in great power, balance-of-power politics.