

Hussein warns Mideast war threat just like 1914

by Joseph Brewda

King Hussein of Jordan broke diplomatic protocol and publicly warned of the grave crisis facing his nation, the Middle East region, and the world, in a column published in both the Sept. 24 *Washington Post* and London *Guardian*. Hussein dramatically and correctly compared the present world situation to that of 1914 immediately prior to World War I. He warned that the now probable war that will erupt in the Persian Gulf cannot be confined to the Middle East, and he called upon the nations of the world to mobilize on behalf of a political rather than military solution to the crisis.

"I fear the current course of events could be a replay of 1914 . . . when the world stumbled into a war it did not want but could not stop," Hussein warned. "To repeat that scenario would be an inexcusable tragedy. . . . As for victors and spoils, Middle East wars have produced neither, only graveyards for false illusions and the seeds for future wars."

On Sept. 22, King Hussein had appeared live on Cable News Network and emphasized that "demonization of the Arabs, their culture, and their causes" was a critical factor in exacerbating tensions in the region. The Jordanian monarch said that while he believed that "friendship has to be reciprocated," this is not possible "if one side constantly holds the other in public scorn." He correctly denounced such attitudes as an attempt to "deny Arabs full potential in all areas of knowledge and development."

Peace initiatives could still stop war

A series of intense diplomatic initiatives undertaken by King Hussein and other Arab leaders might yet avert a new Middle East war. Unfortunately, President George Bush and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, like Adolf Hitler before them, seem bent on war to implement their "new world order."

King Hussein planned to meet with Iraqi President Saddam Hussein in Baghdad, Iraq on Sept. 27, together with the foreign ministers of Algeria and Morocco. The topic of discussion was to be a comprehensive Arab solution to the Gulf crisis which was reportedly agreed upon at an emergency meeting in Rabat, Morocco on Sept. 21, which included King Hussein, King Hassan of Morocco, and Algerian President Chadli Bendjedid.

The components of the plan are reportedly the following: Iraq would withdraw from Kuwait and release foreign nationals on its soil; Arab League troops, primarily Algerian, would be deployed into Kuwait to maintain the peace; Iraq would be granted long-term leasing of Kuwait's Bubiyan and Wabah Islands; and Iraq and Kuwait would jointly explore disputed oil fields. A key underpinning of the agreement would be regional and international guarantees that the plan would not be sabotaged, particularly by U.S. forces in the area. Reportedly, a regional security Gulf agreement, guaranteed by the Gulf Coordination Council, the Arab League, and the United Nations, would also be sought.

According to reports, the plan was approved by Saudi Arabia on Sept. 21, but the U.S. immediately intervened and forced the Saudis to rescind their agreement. Even before the Moroccan summit, unidentified Bush administration officials widely condemned the Jordanian plan as "face-saving," in comments to the U.S. press. The Bush administration continues to demand unconditional withdrawal by Iraq as part of its policy of provoking war.

This is not the first time that the Bush administration has sabotaged an Arab peace plan. An emergency summit between Saddam Hussein, the Emir of Kuwait, King Fahd of Saudi Arabia, King Hussein, and others, which had been planned for Jeddah, Saudi Arabia for Aug. 6, four days after

the Iraqi invasion, was also canceled under U.S. pressure.

Meanwhile, President François Mitterrand of France delivered a speech before the United Nations General Assembly on Sept. 24 which outlined a four-point proposal for the region. Mitterrand proposed that “guarantees” be given to Iraq once it “announces its intentions to withdraw [from Kuwait] and release the hostages.” Mitterrand proposed that Kuwait, once having regained sovereignty, “hold elections,” thereby implying that France would not insist on reimposing the hated Emir of Kuwait back on the throne. The French President also called for solving the other outstanding territorial disputes in the region, linked to negotiations over establishing a Palestinian state and ending Israeli and Syrian occupation of Lebanon. Mitterrand also called for negotiations on the possession of weapons of mass destruction in the region.

On Sept. 25, the U.N. Security Council passed another French-initiated proposal imposing an air blockade on Iraq, which opens the way to greater potential to create provocations for war. In commenting on that measure that day, which also includes the seizure of Iraqi ships on the high seas, the Jordanian newspaper *Al-Rai* reported that the measure was a “declaration of war agreed [upon] by Washington, Moscow, London, Paris, and Beijing.” It was widely noted in Amman, Jordan that the Mitterrand-initiated air blockade, which will also devastate Jordan’s economy, is part of an effort to destabilize Jordan. The overthrow of King Hussein and the declaration that “Jordan is Palestine” has long been one of Israel’s preferred solutions of the “Palestinian problem” and an option also apparently favored by Bush.

In a purported “Arab” response to King Hussein, Prince Bandar, the Saudi Arabian ambassador to the United States, issued a threatening “Open letter to King Hussein” which appeared in the Sept. 26 *Washington Post*. Repeating Bush’s rhetoric, the prince asserted that the world situation is rather comparable to 1939, and he compared Saddam Hussein to Hitler. Bandar was a leading figure in implementing Bush’s policy of arming Iran in the Iran-Iraq War.

Documentation

Hussein: ‘It’s not too late to prevent a war’

The following statement by King Hussein ibn Talal of Jordan appeared in the Sept. 24 Washington Post and London Guardian.

Is it too late to prevent another major war in the Middle East? Is the pace of events accelerating at such an uncontrollable rate that war is inevitable? Are the opposing parties so locked into

their positions that a peaceful solution is no longer possible?

It is the sad conclusion of many of those who live in the area, and who will be innocent victims of such a conflagration, that the answer is probably yes. And it is part of their despair that they are helpless to do anything about it.

One might ask how such a tragic turn of events could have occurred in the space of less than two months. Would there be any victors, and what would be the spoils? Are we embarked on a noble mission to establish a new world order of peace and justice and the abolition of aggression? Or are we witnessing a replay of the quixotic events of August 1914, when the world stumbled into a war it did not want but could not stop?

I am stubborn enough to believe there is still a chance to prevent war. I refuse to concede that events cannot be brought under control. And I cannot conceive that disputants would commit themselves to a war that is so contrary to their vital interests.

As for victors and spoils, Middle East wars have produced neither, only graveyards for false illusions and the seeds for future wars.

Let us hope that a new world order can be established, but its foundation must be based on conciliation, not conflagration, and on distributive, not selective, justice and morality.

I fear the current course of events could be a replay of 1914. To repeat that scenario would be an inexcusable tragedy. If the same effort by the world community in the present marshaling of military forces, the imposition of sanctions and the commitment of colossal sums of money were to be applied to a political solution, I am convinced it could be achieved.

It is very disturbing that some believe military action is the only solution. This is dangerously short-sighted. The effects of a war against Iraq will not be limited to the confines of that country. They would reverberate in every capital throughout the Middle East. They will create the very instability such action was designed to prevent. For these reasons, a political solution to the present crisis is imperative.

Since the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait did not occur in a vacuum, it cannot be solved in a vacuum. Any solution must address, if not simultaneously at least sequentially, the major underlying causes—namely, the dispute between Iraq and Kuwait, the imbalance of wealth in the area, the unresolved confrontation between Israel, Palestine and the Arab states, and the perilous escalation and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

All these problems are driven by political differences. To attempt to solve them militarily treats only symptoms, not the causes, and can only exacerbate the problems.

Because these problems are interrelated, piecemeal solutions are not the answer, as efforts over several years have demonstrated.

This is not as tall an order as it sounds, since proposed

LaRouche warns Bush policy means war

In a campaign statement issued on Sept. 25, Lyndon LaRouche, candidate for U.S. Congress in Virginia's 10th District, warned that "If George Bush and Margaret Thatcher are not stopped, we are headed for World War III." The following is edited from oral remarks.

I support fully the perception put forth by Jordan's King Hussein that what is going on in the Middle East is not a threat of a splendid little war between the United States, Israel, and Britain against Iraq; but is rather a situation very much like the conflict around Serbia in the Balkans just before the outbreak of World War I.

As Pat Buchanan has said: We are playing the same kind of game, so-called British balance-of-power game, which caused World War I, and implicitly therefore led to World War II.

The world is a hotbox: There are places ready to explode all over it. If the United States succeeds together with Israel and Britain in destroying Iraq, this will inflame the entire region and will set fire to other places all ready to explode. The world today is like a forest in a drought: Start a fire in one place and the fire may spread to the forest as a whole, and thus, to World War III—perhaps not World War III tomorrow, or the day after, but down the line. That is, we're putting into place the factors which, once they gel and become institutionalized, would be the basis for a perceptible World War III.

The underlying cause for all of this mess is economic. Some people say that President George Bush and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher have created the war in the Middle East—which they certainly did create—in order to take Neil Bush's picture off the front pages of the U.S. newspapers and to hide the economic dirt under

Margaret Thatcher's skirts. The British economy is collapsing, it's in a depression. The United States is *really* in a depression though some of the financial structures have not yet toppled, but are on the verge of doing so. But George Bush is not running to the Middle East *merely* to escape an embarrassing financial crash on Wall Street. Rather, the refusal of Bush, Thatcher, and others who think like them to change a 25-year-old policy of the post-industrial society, of the rock-drug-sex counterculture, of usury of the Paul Volcker type, of current monetary and financial policies such as the deregulation policies, or the Neil Bush policies at Silverado, the determination of George Bush and Margaret Thatcher to defend those policies against all change, against all reform, is the essential cause for the worldwide economic situation we face today. And it is the instability created by economic collapse and crisis in one form or another in every part of the world, especially the Americas, the developing nations, Britain, and Eastern Europe, that this is the route of war.

If we do not change these policies—as I have proposed again and again and again, and as I have been vindicated by my forecast again and again and again, when all the other fellows were wrong—we are indeed headed for World War III: not necessarily because of a war in the Middle East, which might be avoided this time, though it seems less likely all the time, but because the conditions which lead to world wars are building up around the economic debacle. And as long as George Bush and Britain can succeed in defending policies which should have been scrapped decades ago, this world is headed for war.

You want that? Well, you had better look at how you vote. You must have made a lot of mistakes when you went to the polls previously, because look what you have. You have this depression. You have this threat of World War III.

What did you do wrong? Did you listen to what the major liberal news media told you to listen to? Did you vote on impulse, the way you buy Wheaties in the grocery store? Did you fail to think?

Now is a pretty good time to start thinking.

solutions to some of these problems already exist in the files of those governments involved. The area is exhausted from the conflicts and tensions it has endured for decades. Most are appalled by the wasteful diversion of so much wealth and energy to the misfortunes of war. They are eager to join the rest of the world in its new march toward freedom, justice and prosperity. Despite the threat of war, the conditions for peace do exist. It is a moment of opportunity which we should all grasp.

Whatever political solution to the immediate crisis might

be devised, I believe it imperative that it include a substantial Arab input. Irrespective of the justice of any solution, there must not be room to misrepresent it as a resolution imposed from outside the area. This would only discredit its legitimacy.

Finally, there is one thing of which I am certain. The Middle East cannot afford another war. The world should not impose one on it. I am certain that it is not beyond the ingenuity of the leaders of this world to devise a peaceful solution to this crisis. God help us if they cannot.