

Muslims inflamed against Bush's 'New World Order'

by Joseph Brewda

When the U.S. Pentagon finally reported on Jan. 28 that some 80-100 Iraqi warplanes had flown to Iran over the previous few days, U.S. propaganda mouthpieces such as the *New York Times* could only term the deployment a "puzzle." Just hours before, the media and U.S. government spokesmen had been gloating that Iran, which fought a bitter eight-year war with Iraq which ended in 1988, supported Anglo-American war policy. Despite some subsequent clumsy attempts to depict the organized flights as a "defection," even Pentagon spokesman Lt. Gen. Thomas Kelly admitted that day that "it could be a plan to save these aircraft. . . . I don't know what kind of arrangements Iraq has reached with Iran."

In fact, the war is spreading, just as *EIR* said it would. It is already clear, as we go to press on Jan. 31, that even if Iran does not enter the war, it will aid the Iraqis against the Americans—whom the Iranians denounce as the "Great Satan"—over the coming days. "There will be many surprises coming in this regard," one well-informed Arab in the region reported, chuckling, "you will see."

On Jan. 29, as Pentagon spokesmen were scratching their heads, the Iranian Parliament overwhelmingly passed a resolution demanding that U.S. forces immediately evacuate the Gulf as part of a comprehensive peace plan. The resolution had been submitted by Parliament Speaker Mehdi Karrubi, who had been one of Iraq's fiercest enemies in the Iran-Iraq war.

Earlier, on Jan. 24, Ayatollah Khamenei, the successor to Ayatollah Khomeini, denounced the United States for committing war crimes against the Iraqi people. "They have no qualms about dropping thousands of tons of bombs over cities and on the heads of children, the sick, the defenseless, and innocent civilians," the Ayatollah stated, "and yet they consider the showing of a pilot of a downed plane on television to be against that or this convention and they resort

to sensationalism and a hue-and-cry over this." Iranians of various political persuasions believe that if the United States were to decisively win the war against Iraq, Iran would be the next target.

In projecting these kinds of developments on Jan. 17, just after the war began, political prisoner Lyndon LaRouche emphasized, "To win a war you must be able to contain it. George Bush has started a war, and by starting it, has unleashed a spread of war, which he can no longer contain. Therefore, there is no possible way, in the present constellation of forces, that the United States could win the war against Iraq—because the war is not against Iraq. The war involves that which has not been contained, and could not be contained."

Shock effects throughout the world

America's bombardment of Iraq, which as of Jan. 30 has totaled some 30,000 sorties, is spreading hatred against the Anglo-Americans throughout the Arab and Muslim world—including in those states which are officially part of Bush's 28-nation coalition.

- In Turkey, now on the verge of an official war with Iraq, tens of thousands of pro-Iraqi protestors took to the streets after Friday prayers on Jan. 25 in 17 cities, despite an official ban on demonstrations. Ten thousand protested in Batman, the site of a major air base, while a 15,000-person demonstration in Tatvan, near the Iraqi border, led to the Turkish military firing on the crowd. Popular slogans included "Down with the U.S.," "Down with Israel," and "No Muslim blood for oil." President Turgut Özal, whose pro-war policy is in overt contradiction to Turkish national security concerns, might be in big trouble with Turkey's military, some sources say.

- Turkey's collaboration with the United States also

helped spark a 30,000-person demonstration in Athens, whose population fears that the U.S. has promised to support Turkish claims to various Greek territories as a reward for entering the war. Many Greeks are demanding that Greece also quit the coalition.

- In Pakistan, Chief of Staff Gen. Mirza Aslam Beg praised the “resilience of the Armed Forces of Iraq” in an address to the Pakistani officer corp in Rawalpindi on Jan. 28. Beg has repeatedly accused the U.S. of sabotaging a peaceful solution to the crisis. Under pressure from Beg, the Pakistani Senate has called for an immediate ceasefire and cessation of hostilities.

- In Indonesia, the Nahdlatul Ulama, the country’s largest Islamic organization, condemned the United States on Jan. 22, stating, “We deplore the action of America and its allies against the Iraqi annexation of Kuwait. The actions are out of balance with their attitude toward Israel’s annexation of Palestine territory in the 1967 war.” T-shirts featuring Saddam Hussein are already a hot sales item in this, the world’s most populous Islamic country.

- In Malaysia, where 90% of the population is against Bush’s war, Prime Minister Mahathir bin Mohamed stated on Jan. 24, “We agreed that Kuwait should be freed, but never agreed that Iraq should be destroyed.” The Malaysian government had supported the U.N. resolution.

Heat is on coalition-member governments

Meanwhile, it is already clear in the Arab world proper that America is finished in the region, as state after state—their capitals filled with anti-American demonstrators—denounce Bush.

- In Egypt, whose current government has sent some 40,000 troops into the Gulf to do U.S. bidding, sentiment against the war is rapidly increasing. On Jan. 29, more than 300 journalists staged a brief strike in protest of the destruction of Iraq, in which even writers for the two government newspapers participated. As an interview with Egyptian Parliament opposition spokesman Rifaat el Saeed shows (see page 40), U.S. claims that all of Egypt adores George Bush are an exaggeration.

The situation in the Maghreb—Algeria, Tunisia, and Morocco—is developing very quickly, where calls for war against France, a coalition partner, made in the Algerian Parliament on Jan. 30, are just one example.

- In Morocco, a nationwide general strike against the U.S. war on Jan. 28 called by the country’s two labor federations, was officially endorsed by King Hassan II, despite the fact that Morocco has 1,500 troops in the Gulf under the Anglo-Americans. The government urged citizens to “observe this day of solidarity with the brother Iraqi people in contemplation, discipline, and responsibility.” High on the list of the strikers’ demands were calls for “a sign of solidarity with the Iraqi people,” and a Moroccan pullout from the coalition.

- In Tunisia, President Zine Abidine Ben Ali on Jan. 28 denounced the U.S. “destruction and devastation of Iraq” as “intolerable,” adding that the intent of the war was to ensure that Iraq “remains forever condemned to foreign dependence with no proper place in this so-called new world order.”

- In Algeria, a 400,000-man demonstration on Jan. 18 has pressured the government into further support of Iraq. On Jan. 24, the Algerian People’s Assembly issued a resolution denouncing U.S. actions as a “threat” to “not only the destiny of the Arab and Islamic peoples, but that of peoples in the whole world. The framework of the U.S. plan aims at imposing a new political map which only serves the interests of the mighty. . . . We will act with all determination to halt this diabolical plan which aims for total destruction.”

Europe will pay heavily

While most of the Arab and Muslim reaction has initially focused against the United States; it is also clear that the governments of Britain, France, and Italy—and Western Europe generally—will not be able to evade their responsibility for the imperialist war.

An editorial in the Jan. 24 *Jordan Times* entitled “Deep wounds, long memory,” is evidence of the feeling in the Arab world.

“Much hope was pinned during the run-up of the Gulf crisis to the explosion of the war on Jan. 16 that the European countries, particularly France and Italy, would somehow break free from the American-inspired move toward the war option and would have the guts to stand up and tell Washington that the use of force was not the answer to the problem. As it turned out, the hopes were ill-founded. . . .

“While one can understand the European approach, which rules out the acquisition of territory by force . . . it is indeed very difficult to comprehend the apparent vengeance with which the European allies in the anti-Iraq coalition are battering an Arab country. If that is not enough, then one only has to look at some of the gleeful war communiqués issued from Paris, Rome, and London. . . .

“It may be naive at this point to issue a fresh reminder to the Europeans that they would indeed be the net loser in the bargain if the U.S. were to achieve its strategic, military, and economic objectives in the Middle East: that of acquiring total domination of Arab oil resources, output, and international prices as well as doing away with Arab military power. . . .

“No matter which way the Gulf war turns out, the wounds inflicted by the Europeans on the Arab mind and heart will not be easily healed. And the Arabs do not have a short memory.”

Of course, the fact that the entire Arab and Muslim world will be inflamed for generations against the United States and the European NATO countries will not ease the strategic disaster facing the West, which, while engaged in this genocidal war, has left a militarily stripped-down Western Europe wide open to Soviet domination.