

## Resistance rising to Bush's 'splendid little war'

by Kathleen Klenetsky

Galvanized by the real prospect that President Bush's adventure in the Persian Gulf could trigger World War III, a nationwide anti-war movement is beginning to take shape in the United States. Despite opinion polls showing that the majority of Americans supports the U.S. military deployment in the region, public criticism will almost surely skyrocket once American blood is shed.

Opposition to "Bush's war" is coming from wildly disparate individuals and organizations, ranging from former Attorney General Ramsey Clark to the Nation of Islam, and including such prominent conservatives as Patrick Buchanan and Joseph Sobran. While the critics differ in the details of their objections, or their solutions for the overall Mideast political crisis, they agree on one theme: that nothing which Iraq has done can justify a war which could cost thousands of lives, at best—or lead to a global thermonuclear holocaust.

### 'The time to stop World War III is now'

The International Caucus of Labor Committees held a conference near Washington, D.C., over the Labor Day weekend (see p. 60), which focused on how to organize forces around the world to prevent Bush's intervention from triggering World War III. Helga Zepp-LaRouche and her husband, political prisoner Lyndon LaRouche, issued statements to the conference, in which they emphasized that the U.S. intervention in the Gulf is part and parcel of an Anglo-American policy commitment to recolonize, depopulate, and loot the Third World, while simultaneously destroying the process of German reunification, which threatens Anglo-American political and financial power.

Both warned that present global political and economic conditions, means any war in the Mideast would almost certainly lead to an all-out armed conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The Anglo-Americans are dangerously miscalculating the Soviet response to their military intervention in the Gulf, said Zepp-LaRouche. London and Washington "believe they still can operate on the basis of their condominium with the Soviets," but that condominium no longer exists. The Soviets have already given a host of warnings that they do not like what the U.S. and Britain are up to in the Mideast, but the Anglo-Americans are ignoring those ominous signals.

"The point is," Mr. LaRouche commented, "as a result of Anglo-American delusions, combined with an Anglo-American commitment to direct raw materials and population wars, against the darker-skinned people of the Southern part of this planet, the Thatcher-Bush adventure in the Persian Gulf oil-producing region threatens to set off a chain reaction, leading toward a planetary World War III. . . . That is, as a result of the Anglo-American commitment to a malthusian, usury-based, world order [and] the North-South use of military force, for purposes of . . . key raw materials control, and population reduction wars, in support of IMF conditionalities, the actions taken by Thatcher, on the initiative of Thatcher, and supported by Bush in the Middle East, threaten to trigger a process leading into a planetary World War III. . . . The time to stop a war is when the fuse leading to the ignition of future World War III is lit: the time to stop the war is *now*."

### Bush: 'military dictator'

Former Attorney General Ramsey Clark in late August established "The Coalition against Intervention in the Mideast." In an interview with the Italian newspaper *Avvenire* published on Aug. 22, Clark warned that the prospects of a "North-South conflict are becoming more worrisome," citing the U.S. savage military invasion of Panama as an example of the North's growing indifference to the sovereignty of

small states in the Southern Hemisphere.

"Few presidential actions in our history have been as dangerous and arbitrary as President Bush's decision to send troops to the Persian Gulf," Clark wrote in the Aug. 24 *Los Angeles Times*. "He has abandoned all pretense of constitutional authority, made no gesture to obtain approval of Congress, offered no explanation of the source of his power to unilaterally commit American military forces to foreign territory. . . . A military dictator could not be less restrained." Clark concluded by asking: "How long will the people of the United States, with no voice in determining their destiny, risk the consequences of an Imperial Presidency?"

### **Conservatives jolt anti-war movement**

That is a very pertinent question, especially considering the extent of opposition coming from the conservative side of the political spectrum. Conservatives are deeply split over the wisdom of the U.S. military intervention. While such celebrities as Henry Kissinger and William Buckley are charging up San Juan Hill all over again, a number of influential figures have denounced Bush's adventure as immoral and dangerous to U.S. interests.

The first public blast from this quarter was fired by columnist Patrick Buchanan shortly after the troop deployment was announced. He targeted Britain's role in manipulating the United States into this war as it did in World War I. He deplored what he called the "neo-cons, ex-liberal Democrats who got their baptismal certificates at the Reagan transition office." Naming Henry Kissinger as the point man for the State Department functionaries now backing the British war drive in the Middle East, Buchanan wrote: "Perhaps the neo-cons will get their war. For the Israelis, who have been goading us to attack, are confidently predicting war will break out before this column appears."

Joseph Sobran, both a syndicated columnist and senior editor at Bill Buckley's *National Review*, has been hammering on the same nail. Ridiculing Bush's stated war aims, Sobran recently wrote: "Well, it can't be the oil we're so concerned about, since Bush was willing to boycott the very oil Hussein wanted to sell us. And though we may have a reasonable objection to the casual snuffing of Kuwaiti sovereignty, Kuwait has never been an exemplar of human freedom. Our reaction still seems wildly disproportionate to the provocation."

The situation in the Gulf is far less similar to Munich than it is to Sarajevo, stated Sobran, "where a single violent act, rippling through an irrational web of alliances, set off a war whose consequences were out of all proportion to the stakes, a war whose colossal absurdity paved the way for terrible tyrannies and an even worse war, whose result was the Soviet domination of much of Europe and a virtual third gigantic war."

On Sept. 4, Sobran joined several other leading conservatives who held a press conference in Washington to to an-

nounce the formation of the "Committee to Avert a Mideast Holocaust," characterized by its sponsors as a "coalition of conscience and reason against the shrill cries of those who are openly urging the President to initiate a major war." Members of the new committee include Llewellyn Rockwell, president of the Ludwig von Mises Institute, Phil Nicolaides, former deputy director of the Voice of America and Ron Paul, former U.S. congressman and Libertarian Party presidential candidate. Their news release charged that a Mideast war "would exact a terrible toll of military and civilian casualties; destabilize the entire region; alienate the Arab world; shatter the global consensus for a proportional response to Iraqi aggression; jeopardize the industrial world's access to oil; endanger friendly governments in the region; and wreak havoc on our economy. In short, it would do irreparable damage to our national interests." Phil Nicolaides said it was "preposterous" to think "it is necessary to topple Saddam Hussein." He called the U.S.-initiated embargo on food and medicine to Iraq is "against American values and principles," adding, "The implementation has gone overboard. People urged the impeachment of Reagan when he went into Grenada."

Thomas Fleming, another co-founder of the group, told the Sept. 5 *Washington Times*: "Neo-conservatives who six months ago were screaming about how we have to be sensitive to other cultures, nations and races, now are talking as if Arabs were subhuman scum, and that the best thing we could do for the universe is eliminate some portion of the Arab world."

### **Grassroots resistance**

Popular resistance to war is emerging in the form of demonstrations, especially in the black and Hispanic communities, where the prospect of fighting a colonial war against people of color has very little appeal. On Aug. 26, more than 6,000 Mexican-American students and activists from the Chicano Moratoria Movement marched in East Los Angeles to demand an end to U.S. military involvement in the Mideast, the right for unionized and decent jobs, housing, health, quality education, and community control of the police department. Movement leader Prof. Rudy Acuna denounced the fact that 47% of the U.S. troops stationed in the Persian Gulf are members of ethnic minorities. Referring to the Vietnam War, Acuna asserted, "It isn't that history repeats itself, but that the Anglo-Saxon elites never learn."

In San Francisco the same day, more than 500 Muslims rallied for peace in the Middle East. The marchers included Arabs and Arab-Americans, as well as Black Muslims. They carried signs calling for U.S. and Israeli forces to leave occupied land and for a negotiated settlement of the Iraq-Kuwait situation. Several religious organizations, including the 7.8 million member National Baptist Convention, the nation's largest black church, as well as the U.S. Catholic Bishops and the Evangelical Lutheran Church, have also expressed misgivings about U.S. policy.