

Bush's drive for Gulf war meets stiff resistance

by Kathleen Klenetsky

A groundswell of opposition to George Bush's war drive in the Middle East is spreading throughout the United States, galvanized by his declaration at a Nov. 8 press conference that the U.S. has gone on the offensive in the Gulf. Now that all pretenses that Operation Desert Shield was merely a defensive maneuver have been dropped, significant new forces are mobilizing against the imminent threat of a military conflict.

A broad spectrum of the American population—liberals, conservatives, church groups, congressmen and senators, Vietnam vets, former military officials—are vocally protesting Bush's inexorable move toward what Margaret Thatcher euphemistically calls the "military option."

Leading spokesmen for the Establishment who share the same overall imperialist orientation as Bush, have begun to voice public opposition to his actions in the Mideast. Fear is mounting in these layers that Bush may be turning into a Frankenstein, impelled by personal considerations to undertake an initiative with the potential for unleashing an uncontrollable global holocaust, one that could ultimately bring down the Establishment, along with the rest of the world.

Arthur Schlesinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Cyrus Vance, and others have weighed in with criticisms of the administration's handling of the crisis. The thrust of their arguments was summed up by James Reston, a leading Establishment spokesman, in the Nov. 13 *New York Times*. "My President right or wrong' in such circumstances is a little like saying, 'my driver, drunk or sober,'" Reston commented. "President Bush keeps saying he is 'running out of patience' with Hussein but history hasn't been very kind to impatient warriors. . . . Bush's comparison of Hussein to Hitler . . . is ridiculous, and the growing assumption of inevitable war is at best premature and at worst dangerous."

Unfortunately, Bush seems unfazed by the protests against his lunatic adventurism, providing further evidence of his dangerous, flight-forward state of mind.

In part, Bush is drawing strength from the Nov. 6 U.S. elections, where, although the Republicans stumbled, the electorate failed to deliver Bush a message strong enough that it could not be ignored. While resistance to U.S. policy in the Gulf is rising by the day in Europe, official circles there fear war is inevitable unless the American people mount an extraordinary effort to convince Bush that he will be finished politically if he orders U.S. troops into battle.

Anti-war sentiment among the populace is definitely on the rise. A poll cited in the Nov. 13 *USA Today* shows that the approval rating of Bush's handling of the Gulf conflict has plummeted from 82 to 51%. Some congressmen report that letters from constituents initially supported the U.S. deployment, but now are running from 5-1 to as high as 10-1 against. According to House Foreign Affairs Committee chairman Rep. Lee Hamilton (D-Ind.), Americans are "very, very uneasy about the prospect for war in the Gulf."

The shift in the population's attitude has contributed to the new upsurge in criticism of Bush coming from Congress. Twenty-two members of Congress, led by Rep. Ronald Dellums (D-Calif.), announced Nov. 13 that they will sue the President in federal court to prevent the United States from going to war without a congressional declaration of war.

Bush's decision to send massive reinforcements to the Gulf has triggered a mini-rebellion on Capitol Hill. "There are a lot of members who aren't necessarily opposed to war," said one observer, "but they are uneasy about the lack of support for war out in middle America. They don't want the U.S. to use force, unless there is a consensus. They don't want another Vietnam."

Congressional criticism of the President has become increasingly pointed and personal. "If George Bush wants his presidency to die in the Arabian desert, he's going at it very steadily and as if it were a plan," Sen. Daniel P. Moynihan (D-N.Y.) warned Nov. 12. "He will wreck our military, he will wreck his administration, and he'll spoil a chance to get

Call for teach-in to stop war in the Gulf

The Schiller Institute and the Food for Peace organization issued the following call Nov. 11 for a national anti-war teach-in to be held in Chicago, Illinois on Dec. 15-16.

The United States is heading into a war in the Gulf which could break out at any moment. Such a war will obliterate whole nations causing mass deaths and destruction. The promise of the freedom movements in Eastern Europe would be smashed through a war which will destroy the economies of Europe. Worse, as it spreads throughout the region and spills into the southern republics of the Soviet Union, it could lead to World War III. This is insane.

Behind the threatened outbreak of war is a decades-long policy commitment of a degenerate Anglo-American financial elite which has corrupted our institutions of government. It has nothing to do with the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. Anglo-American policymakers have created an economic depression by diverting resources out of production for the last 25 years to benefit private speculative financial interests. Today, the U.S. is left with the ruins of an economy which is daily creating masses of homeless, unemployed, and desperate people. . . . This degenerate elite has determined since at least the 1982 war over the Malvinas Islands to create a "new world order." They mean to use the military might of the United States to grab the world's raw materials, oil, and strategic minerals, and to gain control over food supplies. To accomplish this, NATO is to be deployed in military operations to seize control of the raw materials and strategic minerals in the

developing sector. An added feature of this policy commitment is to start wars which will kill off darker-skinned peoples for "population control." . . .

In the name of free trade, these imperialists are attempting to eliminate national sovereignty over food through the U.N.-sponsored GATT talks now ongoing in Geneva. What is being discussed at these talks is nothing less than the destruction of the world's food supplies by forcing governments to stop supporting the family farmer.

Since the last Food for Peace conference one year ago, mankind has taken a major step forward. On Nov. 9, 1989, the Berlin Wall came down. This brought the world new hope. As foreseen by the economist and imprisoned political leader Lyndon LaRouche, the economic breakdown in the communist economies unleashed revolutionary processes throughout the world. A similar breakdown is now occurring in North America, which means that "freedom movements" will break out here and other parts of the globe. The hopes of these freedom movements must be realized through economic reconstruction. This means we must mobilize for an economic recovery in the United States so that we can not only help the newly freed nations of the East, but alleviate the poverty here in the United States, in the Gulf, and other parts of the developing sector. The alternative is mass starvation and war.

Come to the Anti-War Conference. . . . An anti-war strategy will be discussed based on the principles of peace through development. A new political alliance must be forged drawing upon the lessons of the Eastern Europe freedom movements and the American civil rights struggle. The conference will be held in the form of teach-ins on the causes and solutions to the present crises: the path to war in the Middle East; who's to blame; the GATT talks and the worldwide collapse of agriculture; and perspectives for economic development through great infrastructure projects throughout the world.

a collective security system working. It breaks the heart."

The day before, Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.), chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, told CBS's "Face the Nation": "The last thing we need is to have a war over there, a bloody war, and have American boys being brought back in body bags and yet not have the American people behind them. . . . The President has a real obligation to explain why liberating Kuwait is in our vital interests."

Amidst demands from some quarters that Congress reconvene to debate U.S. policy in the Gulf, the leaders of Congress's Foreign Affairs and Armed Services Committees have announced that they will hold hearings in the near future. How seriously they will attempt to deter war in the Mideast remains to be seen.

America's Roman Catholic Bishops have added a new element to the burgeoning anti-war movement in the churches. At their annual convention in Washington the week of Nov. 12, the bishops voted overwhelmingly to endorse a letter which Archbishop Roger Mahony of Los Angeles sent to Secretary of State James Baker urging diplomatic means to solve the Gulf crisis.

Mahony's letter, which posed the question of whether a Gulf conflict would fit the Augustinian definition of a "just war," was similar to one which Archbishop Basil Hume wrote to the Nov. 8 London *Times*, arguing that, "It would be wrong . . . to abort any constructive, internationally supported initiative by embarking prematurely on a military strike."

Many bishops said that Mahony's letter wasn't strong

enough. New York's John Cardinal O'Connor said he had "anxieties even apart from the dangers of war," such as the high financial cost of such a venture at a time when the U.S. is in such bad economic shape.

At a peace meeting at Catholic University in Washington, D.C. Nov. 13, several bishops expressed even stronger views. Bishop Thomas Gumbleton of Detroit held up a copy of a report issued by the Pentagon in early 1988 ("Discriminate Deterrence"), which laid out a new military policy for North-South wars. "This is the outline of government policy," said Gumbleton. "They feel they have to wage war in the Third World in order to capture the valuable natural resources there. This presents the specter of bloody war confronting us now."

Bishop James Sullivan of Virginia told the meeting, "The Persian Gulf has become Bush's personal war," adding that he has learned that "the U.S. government has sent over 40,000 body bags to the Gulf."

Protestant and Jewish organizations are also organizing anti-war efforts. The American Baptist Churches, U.S.A., the Church of the Brethren, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and several other religious groups placed an ad in the Nov. 8 *Washington Post* addressed to Bush, stating: "We emphatically oppose the United States taking any offensive military action in the current crisis," since "war in the Middle East would be a human, political, and economic catastrophe" which would result in a "a massive loss of lives."

Christian church officials convened a meeting with representatives of Jewish organizations on Nov. 4, to tell them that many churches were preparing to mount strong opposition to the war, and to try to avoid that opposition from becoming a Christian versus Jewish affair because of Israel's demands that the U.S. attack Iraq.

One participant, Rev. John Pawlikoski of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, believes that Christian denominations may come out against the Bush policy "more strongly than they opposed Vietnam."

Former Navy Secretary James Webb leveled a harsh warning at Bush during a Veterans' Day observance at the Quantico National Cemetery. "If the President wishes for war, he should heed the lessons of Korea and Vietnam, and ask the Congress to declare one. The alternative has no place in a democracy. No man should have the power, on his own prerogative, to send thousands of young men and women to their potential deaths against an enemy that has not attacked them, on behalf of a non-democratic nation with which we have no formal alliance."

Former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who formed an anti-war coalition last August, was in Baghdad, Iraq. He told the Iraqi newspaper *Al-Jumhuriyah* Nov. 12 that the U.S. should "stop being the world's policeman," and described the international blockade of Iraq as a "flagrant violation of international law."

LaRouche associates begin Roanoke trial

The opening arguments in the trial of three associates of Lyndon LaRouche began in Roanoke, Virginia Nov. 13, with defense attorneys telling the jury that the defendants were innocent of all charges and were instead the victims of the "Get LaRouche" task force. They called the task force a powerful and frightening group of government, private, and media interests which wants to silence a political voice. This task force was so committed to silence these defendants, the jury was told, that one of the prosecution's key players, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL), went so far as to try and bribe the very judge sitting on this case.

Paul Gallagher, his wife Anita Gallagher, and Laurence Hecht are charged with violations of the Virginia securities laws. They are among 16 individuals who were indicted by the Virginia branch of the federal-state task force which has run the frame-up of LaRouche and his associates. The case is being heard before Roanoke County Circuit Court Judge Clifford R. Weckstein, who has refused to disqualify himself even though he has close ties to the ADL.

In his opening statement, defense attorney Don Randolph told the jury that LaRouche and his associates were the target of a conspiracy comprised of government prosecutors, the ADL, the secret "Iran-Contra" network of Oliver North, the media, and prominent figures in the Anglo-American Establishment such as New York investment banker John Train and former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger.

Randolph had told jurors during jury selection that the case would be about LaRouche, and that since many jurors said they had a negative impression of LaRouche, but could not recall what he stands for, therefore his ideas should be known to them. He described how LaRouche had correctly forecast major political and economic developments since 1971, and spoke about LaRouche's warnings of a Middle East war, the savings and loan crisis, the 1987 stock market crash, the development of the AIDS crisis, and the collapse of electric power production. He also told jurors they would hear evidence about LaRouche's role in the development of the Strategic Defense Initiative and his role in the War on Drugs.

Randolph told the jury about how the "Get LaRouche" task force adopted the theory that the ends justifies the means; that they would do anything to stop this movement, including bringing an illegal involuntary bankruptcy action, intimidating witnesses, destroying evidence, and conducting financial warfare. He told jurors that two federal judges have since ruled that the government's actions were in bad faith.