

to acquiring a nuclear bomb.

Nuclear inspectors say no

In an obvious effort to counter this new propaganda ploy, the Iraqi government invited representatives of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) on Nov. 15 to verify that it has not been using its small stock of uranium to produce nuclear weapons. Iraq had obtained the uranium from France in 1976 to operate its Osirak nuclear reactor. In 1981, with the go-ahead of the Bush administration, Israeli planes bombed the facility.

Upon their return to their headquarters in Vienna, Austria, the IAEA team told a press conference on Nov. 26, that there is "no evidence" that the nuclear fuel Iraq has for civilian purposes is being diverted for military uses, and that all of its fissionable material has been accounted for. Even if Iraq were intent on developing a bomb, the inspectors told BBC, it is at least two years away from having such a capability, and possibly as many as ten.

The following day, Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger could only respond by claiming that the President's Thanksgiving remarks were "based on information that there is substantial, unguarded nuclear activity going on in Iraq."

Enter the ADL

For its part, the October issue of the Anti-Defamation League's *Latin American Report* claimed that the supposed Iraqi bomb was being built with the aid of Brazil, another Third World target of the Bush administration. The ADL frequently peddles Goebbels-style "Big Lies," on behalf of the U.S. and Israeli governments.

The ADL publication claimed that the "secret program to build an atomic bomb" dates back to 1975, when "the Brazilian military dictatorship" signed a nuclear cooperation agreement with Iraq. The report targets retired Brazilian Air Force Brigadier Hugo de Oliveira Piva, who had overseen a group of 21 Brazilian scientists working in Iraq (see interview in *EIR*, Dec. 14, 1990, p. 6). Previously, the ADL and the Mossad-connected Alan Friedman of the London *Financial Times* have focused upon joint work between Brazil, Argentina, and Iraq to develop the Condor II missile.

Meanwhile, while Bush ranted about Iraqi nuclear weapons, his own administration was involved in upgrading Israel's nuclear arsenal. On Nov. 30, the Bush administration revealed that it had approved the sale of the Cray Y-MP computer to the Israeli government's Weizmann Institute. The supercomputer had been banned from sale to non-NATO countries previously, for example, India, because of its potential use in designing larger nuclear bombs. According to Dr. Vanessa Hughessen of the Princeton University Center of Advanced Studies, as reported to the *Washington Post*, Israel might now develop an H-bomb in the 20-megaton range in less than a year.

'Iraq always sought a peaceful solution'

The cultural attaché at Iraq's Embassy, Maysar Y. al-Mallah, delivered the following presentation to a Schiller Institute anti-war teach-in in Chicago on Dec. 15. The presentation was delivered via videotape, because the U.S. State Department refused Dr. Mallah permission to leave Washington. After his presentation, however, he was able to converse with the conference audience via live telephone connection. See page 58 for a full conference report.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I wish I was with you this afternoon, face to face, not on cameras. We are recording this tape in order to let you know about our position concerning a very important issue to Iraqis and the American people. We are doing it this way because we haven't got any permission from the Department of State to travel to Chicago up till this moment.

I am going to concentrate my speech on the three issues concerning the crisis in the Gulf. The first will be historical background; the second is going to be Iraq and the crisis; the third one is going to be the U.S. government and the crisis.

Concerning the historical background, before World War I, 1914, Kuwait was an *alkathma* or administrative district, belonging to *Basra nathia* or a province. It was governed by the Sheikh of Kuwait in his capacity as an Ottoman chief administrative officer, responsible to the governor of Basra, which was and is an Iraqi province. According to the historical, political, and geographical references, Kuwait was part of Iraq, part of Basra, from the 18th century to the outbreak of World War I, and consequent to British occupation of Iraq in 1914.

During that long period, the ruler of Kuwait owed loyalty and obedience to the Ottoman Sultan. Maps, European or Ottoman, which were made at that time, put Kuwait within the territory of the Ottoman Empire. Ottoman flags remained flown in the city of Kuwait until 1914, when the British authorities forced its ruler to change it.

In 1913, on July 29, a treaty was signed in London, Britain, between the British and Ottoman governments regarding the question of Kuwait. The treaty defined the territorial and administrative rights and duties of the owner of Ku-

wait. It also defined the line for demarcation of borders. This was done without consulting the Iraqi people, of which the Kuwaitis were part. Since that action, up till now, Iraq did not agree with the Kuwaiti government on the border demarcations. Furthermore, Iraq has claimed Kuwait as part of Iraq on many occasions. No agreement between Iraq and Kuwait was reached concerning the dispute over the borders.

During the eight-year war between Iraq and Iran, the Kuwaitis moved their borders 70 miles up north into Iraqi territory. Iraq did not pay them any attention at that time, because of the war. After the war stopped, however, Iraq asked the Kuwaitis to pull back and to pay back the price of the oil which they took out from Rumailah fields, which are located on their very border. The Kuwaitis did not reply. Furthermore, they were hurting Iraq by selling more oil than their share, according to the OPEC quota. In fact, Kuwait was waging an economical war against Iraq by increasing oil production, so prices of oil would fall accordingly.

In summary, you can conclude that Iraq has historical claims on Kuwait as a part of its motherland. At the same time, however, Kuwait was conspiring and waging economical war against Iraq.

Iraq and the current crisis

Iraq went into Kuwait on Aug. 2, after the Kuwaiti regime refused to solve the conflict peacefully in a meeting with Saudi Arabia. After going into Kuwait, Iraq was ready to solve the problem peacefully and agreed to participate in a mini-summit to be held in Saudi Arabia. However, the American secretary of defense flew to Saudi Arabia and succeeded in convincing the Saudis to accept the idea that Iraq is going to attack Saudi Arabia and, according to that, they agreed to invite the American forces into their land. This is the reason why the Arab solution didn't work. And the summit collapsed as well.

This new situation meant that the problem became an international one, instead of being an Arab one. That is why Iraq brought about its initiative of solving all the Middle East problems once and for all.

The U.S.A. and its allies forced U.N. resolutions against Iraq, including economical sanctions, and they besieged Iraq by naval and ground forces. And they have been pushing ever since for military action.

Iraq always wanted to solve the problem peacefully and to have a dialogue concerning that. But the American administration wants Iraq to surrender and to be humiliated. The American administration should listen to Iraq in order to know why the Iraqi Army went into Kuwait, and furthermore, how the Iraqis would solve this problem.

But so far, in spite of a lot of calls from peace-loving people and societies and countries, not to go to the military option, no sign of doing so is clear from this administration. It is insisting that Iraq withdraw from Kuwait without any dialogue, or to use military power. Iraq rejected this, because

it simply means surrender.

You know exactly what is going on concerning putting a simple date for our foreign minister to go to Washington and for Secretary of State Baker to go to Baghdad. They agreed on receiving our foreign minister on Dec. 17, but they don't give us the right to put a certain date on receiving Secretary Baker.

America and the crisis

Concerning the American government situation: Simply why should America go to war? The American administration has justified sending the troops to the Gulf for the following reasons: one, to stop Iraqi troops from going to Saudi Arabia; second, to secure the flow of oil from the region; third, to deter aggression and maintain world order; fourth, to restore the Sabah family to power.

Later on, however, the administration added some other, different reasons to the above ones, namely, to secure the

"We do not have any intention to own nuclear weapons and our nuclear installation has been under U.N. inspection. Two or three weeks ago a delegation was inspecting those facilities and said that Iraq is not violating the U.N. regulation on that aspect. But we wish we had nuclear weapons, simply because Israel has a nuclear weapon, and by doing that, we might convince the Israelis to give away their nuclear weapon."

release of hostages; second, to destroy Iraqi military power; third, to prevent Iraq from controlling a high percentage of oil reserves; fourth, to create jobs in the United States; fifth, to prevent Iraq from developing a nuclear weapon; and God knows what else is coming.

To reply to those, we say, first, Iraq did not have any intention to invade Saudi Arabia. If Iraq had the intention, Iraq could have done it between Aug. 2 and Aug. 8, and that's the time when the American troops started to come to Saudi Arabia.

We didn't have any problem with Saudi Arabia. We had a non-aggression pact with Saudi Arabia and we used to consult the Saudis on most of the problems the Arab world has. One of those was the oil price and the oil flow and so

forth. So we never actually had any problem with Saudi Arabia.

The second claim: Iraq never threatened the flow of oil. Iraq always wanted to sell its oil and to buy in return American goods, namely, agricultural and industrial goods. So Iraq does not have any intention of stopping oil from coming to the European countries nor to the United States. And if you look at this issue and examine it, you will see that the Americans are importing only 12% of their oil from the region, from the Middle East, while the Japanese and the Germans are importing almost 75 to 80% of their needs from there. So they should defend the oil, if it is really the reason. However, we haven't seen the Germans or the Japanese doing that, simply because this is not the reason.

Third: Talking about aggression and world order, America as a superpower and one of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, should first ask other countries, like Israel, to obey and abide by previous U.N. resolutions, enforce the resolution and then ask Iraq to do so.

Israel, as you know, ladies and gentlemen, is occupying the West Bank of Jordan, Golan Heights of Syria, southern Lebanon and Gaza Strip since 1967. And many resolutions by the U.N. Security Council were taken, asking Israel to withdraw from those territories, and Israel refused to do so. Yet, we haven't seen any superpower putting sanctions against Israel nor sending troops to deter aggression.

Talking about world order, this is, as we understand it in Iraq and all the Arab countries and most of the Third World countries, a double standard by the U.S.A. Instead of stopping Israel from doing that, the American administration is helping Israel by financial and military aid up till this moment.

Restoring the Emir of Kuwait: Are you Americans defending democracy by restoring the Emir of Kuwait? I know most of you know a lot about the Emir of Kuwait, his regime and his way of looking at democracy and society. I can say it simply: The Emir family is a corrupted one and it is not defending democracy for the U.S.A. to stand and restore the Emir of Kuwait.

The other one is the hostage issue. Iraq has said it and said it more than once. We prevented those people from traveling because we thought that it would stop America and the rest of the world from committing aggression against Iraq. We did it, and we said later that, if any country assured us that it will never commit an aggression against Iraq, we would let their citizens go. We did it finally because we thought that the American people do understand now that war is not the right option and that war is not the right way to solve this problem. So we let those hostages out.

The other reason is destroying Iraqi military power. What good would that do for the United States? We are, as a power in the region, holding the balance of power in the area. As you know, ladies and gentlemen, Israel is another power in there, and the Israelis have all kinds of weapons, including

nuclear, chemical, and biological. So if Iraq is to be destroyed, what will happen to the area? Simply, what is going to happen is Israel will have nobody facing it, and Israel will take over more territory from the Arab world and it's going to be a catastrophe. The Israelis are bringing now 6 million Jews from the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries. So what's going to happen is an unstable area for decades to come, and nobody will appreciate that.

So Iraq is holding that balance, and Iraq is willing to negotiate, and Iraq is willing also to have any treaty on arms control, including all kinds of chemical and non-conventional weapons, if Israel does that. So actually, it is in nobody's interest to destroy the military power of Iraq.

To prevent Iraq from controlling a high percentage of oil, Iraq without Kuwait has the second highest reserve in the world, after Saudi Arabia. So Iraq doesn't have to have more oil to be a strong member in the OPEC or in the oil international club. Iraq is already there, and Iraq is a country which has a lot of oil. So this is another false justification.

But Iraq, however, would like to have fair price for oil and to have fixed price for oil for a long time, in order to know how to balance the budget and how to spend, and how to have the budget for the coming years. That's what Iraq is after, not to have oil selling for \$18 today and \$11 within two or three months.

One other reason was to create jobs in the United States. We say to this simply that we didn't take the troops to the Persian Gulf and we didn't put \$30 billion to be spent on those troops for the coming year, and also we are not the people who are putting together the budget for the United States. The United States is putting together its own budget and it can solve it easily by sitting and talking to Iraq and solve it peacefully and swiftly.

Concerning nuclear weapons, we have said many times that we do not have any intention to own nuclear weapons and our nuclear installation has been under U.N. inspection. Two or three weeks ago a delegation was inspecting those facilities and they came out with a report saying Iraq is not violating the U.N. regulation on that aspect. But we wish we had nuclear weapons, simply because Israel has a nuclear weapon, and by doing that, we might convince the Israelis to give away their nuclear weapon.

From our standpoint, as we see it as Iraqis, the main reason for going to war is the Israeli lobby in this country and its effects. The Israeli lobby, ladies and gentlemen, is pushing very hard toward American military intervention in the Gulf, in order to destroy the Iraqi forces and to overthrow its President. This is well expected from Israel, because, as you know, they are bringing 6 million Jews to Israel and they need more Arab land to occupy to settle those in and Iraq is not going to let them expand this time.

Israel cannot do the job now. That is why the Israeli lobby is pushing the Bush administration to do it for them with American blood and American people.