

analysis and forecast stems entirely from a correct method of evaluating world events. . . .

The Middle East conflict was not a war over oil prices, nor did it originate from factors intrinsic to the region, although it is related to these. In truth, the war was a broad-based geopolitical maneuver, intended to first affect unified Germany and Japan, which ended up paying a part of the war bill, thereby extending somewhat the life of the bankrupt Anglo-American economy and its condominium with the Soviets. At the same time, the offensive was intended to destroy Iraq, the only country in the region not inserted in the strategic scheme of this condominium, by reason of the fact that Iraq is the simultaneous enemy of both Syria and Israel, in addition to being the country with the greatest demographic growth and vigorously pursuing a plan of autonomous technological development.

It is useful to review some of the developments which preceded the outbreak of the conflict. Go back to Nov. 9, 1989, when the unification of the German nation—which Anglo-American diplomacy had defined as long-term—became the number-one item on the world political agenda.

At the same time, the Soviet economic crisis had entered into a phase of accelerated collapse. The U.S.S.R. would require urgent foreign aid to be able to minimally stabilize its empire. This was clearly shown in the Group of Seven meeting, held July 9-11, 1990 in the U.S. city of Houston, where Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachov's appeal for economic aid was rejected under the influence of the Anglo-Americans. . . . One week later, July 15-16, German Chancellor Helmut Kohl went to Moscow to meet with President Gorbachov. . . . The two heads of state reached an agreement which accelerated Germany unification, in exchange for massive emergency economic aid to the Soviet Union.

The possibility of long-term economic agreements which began with this meeting—and which would make possible the development of a Eurasian heartland—raised the hysteria level of the press, especially the British press . . . against Germany, whose unification was already branded “the Fourth Reich.” On July 9, Britain's Trade and Industry Minister Nicholas Ridley, who lost his post only days later, managed to compare Kohl to Adolf Hitler.

Although President Bush declared that the German-Soviet agreements had been arranged earlier . . . this was, in fact, but a weak attempt to appear to be in control of the most important world development of the moment. The truth is that the unification of Germany and the development of Eurasia through great infrastructural projects—as urged in the Berlin-Paris-Vienna “Productive Triangle” proposal formulated by a team of researchers under Lyndon LaRouche—would make possible a certain stability of the Soviet bloc, while turning Germany, in alliance with other nations of Western Europe, into the centerpiece of world economic recovery. Something which was not—and is not—in the grand scheme of the Anglo-Americans, whose leaders are

determined to impose, through GATT, the same radical liberal-dogmas that have driven their nations into the severe economic depressions afflicting them today. . . .

From this standpoint, the outbreak of a conflict in the explosive Middle East, a conflict which had been readied much earlier, would be favorable to the interests of Washington, London, and Paris (this last, for chauvinist reasons of President François Mitterrand). Such a conflict would seek, essentially, to establish the authority of the United States President as the chief leader on the planet.

Strictly speaking, it was not a war in the Persian Gulf, but a massacre, a cruel exercise in vanity in the best style of the Roman Empire. . . . It is clear that if England and the United States—through economic warfare—created the basis for [Iraq's] invasion of Kuwait while simultaneously organizing a war government in their puppet state of Israel, the invasion by the U.S. and its allies had nothing to do with the supposed liberation of Kuwait, as was propagandized. It was, in fact, nothing but a justification for launching the “new world order,” whose main purpose is control of the world's natural resources and population growth, through “extra-jurisdictional” interventions by NATO, which practice was begun in 1982 during the Malvinas War and whose lessons were not correctly drawn at the time.

‘Desert Storm’ was a defeat for humanity

by Silvia Palacios

The following is a synopsis of the speech presented by EIR correspondent Silvia Palacios, at the ECEME symposium “Lessons of the Persian Gulf War.” Palacios spoke during the panel on “Ethical and Juridical Aspects of the Conflict.”

On the juridical and ethical aspects of the Gulf war, I would like to refer to the two fundamental principles which were destroyed: one, the principle of national sovereignty, which was replaced by the supranational power of the United Nations Security Council; and second, respect for the life and dignity of the human being. We are not talking about two accessory aspects to international relations or to ethical codes, but rather of two crucial principles upon which Western Christian civilization was based.

Seen from this standpoint, the so-called “victory” of the coalition of nations which carried out the “Desert Storm” military assault on Iraq was characterized by the Catholic Church as a “defeat for humanity”. . . .

President George Bush's supremacy in the conflict not only won the unanimous support of the permanent members of the Security Council, but also succeeded in consecrating an internal U.S. doctrine which unilaterally legitimizes the use of force, burying the principle of proportionality, while at the same time making possible the application of the concept of "limited sovereignty" to the countries of the Third World. I refer to the so-called Thornburgh Doctrine, which justified the invasion of Panama in December 1989. The actions sanctioned by the U.N. Security Council in the Persian Gulf were nothing less than the application of this doctrine on a global scale, the granting of extraordinary powers to decide the fate of a single nation of the South.

Such powers can be used again, in the best colonial style, and that prospect is foreseeable in at least two circumstances.

First, in any action that legitimizes the principle of "limiting national sovereignties," as was made clear in the deliberations that followed the cease-fire in the Gulf regarding the Kurdish problem. The Anglo-French proposal of creating a "Kurdish enclave" in northern Iraq, was also backed by former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, who publicly stated that the idea of national sovereignty, as understood in the 19th century, was now obsolete. The authors of the enclave proposal did not have merely the "solution" to a local problem in mind. According to the *Financial Times* of April 10, Soviet delegate Yuli Voronstov asked if something similar might be created in other regions, for example, "in the Brazilian Amazon."

Second, the superpowers on the Security Council have already suggested the need to extend that body's powers to such issues as the environment. This is the proposal of Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland, author of the report *Our Common Future*, which will orient deliberations at the Eco-92 ecology conference, to be held in Brazil next year.

The war against Iraq had no military sense. What occurred was a cruel experiment in de-industrialization and in depopulation. . . . Using unprecedented military force, the coalition headed by the Anglo-American axis placed Iraq—previously a promising Third World nation which was making an effort to achieve sovereign control over advanced technology—alongside the nations of Africa and other Third World nations which require humanitarian aid for their immediate survival. . . .

There are further ethical aspects of the conflict which merit analysis. One of these was the censorship imposed by the coalition leadership, with the complicity of the major news media worldwide. While a nation and its people were cruelly bombarded, the news services took on the role of psychological warfare technicians, repeatedly transmitting the idea that the attacks were "surgical." As part of this technique, one of the few scenes shown of the "real" effects of the war were two birds coated with oil, a presage of what could become an "environmental catastrophe." What an ab-

erration, defending animal life over human life!

As is now known, the indiscriminate bombardments intentionally destroyed all of Iraq's infrastructure, obeying a purpose that can only be described as genocidal. The exact number of civilian and military deaths is still unknown: 300,000 is the estimate. And the sanctions continue. . . . "Bombs today, death tomorrow," was the rule applied to Iraq, where the malthusian consequences of the destruction of infrastructure are all too evident: hunger, epidemics of cholera and typhoid, etc. Unless the sanctions are lifted, 170,000 children under five years of age will die in the coming weeks. Medical facilities which before the war met the needs of 90% of the population were destroyed. Before the war, Iraq's electrical generating capacity was 9,000 megawatts. Today, it is at 20% of that level.

One may well ask why there are no reactions by the international community? . . . As was stated here on Tuesday [June 24], there was an immense psychological warfare campaign, in which the "war was waged in the minds of the population, which was victim of a massive bombardment so that it would accept the war." The U.S. population has lost its ability to make moral distinctions. . . .

Bush new order means war against South

Following are excerpts of the speech presented by Lorenzo Carrasco on June 28, 1991.

To situate the topic we're discussing tonight, let me begin by mentioning a conversation I had with a Bolivian military friend at the beginning of the Gulf war. He recalled that wars are the midwives of human history, and asked what this conflict might engender. But, since this wasn't a war but rather the Mother of all massacres, what was born was an aberration. So, since 1982, as a result of Anglo-American machinations, we've been watching a different order emerge in this hemisphere. With the Malvinas War, we saw the launching of NATO's "out of area" deployments, which, since the Gulf war, have been called "extra-jurisdictional deployments." At the same time, we witnessed the demise of the hemispheric security system, the Inter-American Reciprocal Assistance Treaty (TIAR), as a result of U.S. collaboration with Britain.

Now, let's jump to Dec. 2-3, 1989, to the Malta summit between George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachov, at which they formally proclaimed the "end of the Cold War" which gave rise to a period of "hot wars" of the North against the South. That was inaugurated only two weeks later, on Dec. 20, with