

British Mideast subversion also aimed at Clinton

by Edward Spannaus

The renewed crisis in the Persian Gulf, which surfaced around the reported Iraqi troop movements on Oct. 7, has little to do with Iraq as such, but comes in the context of British efforts to destabilize Saudi Arabia, and to derail the Middle East peace process.

This also meshes with British efforts to bring down President Bill Clinton, as Lyndon LaRouche stressed in his weekly interview with "EIR Talks" on Oct. 12.

"London believes," LaRouche said, "that if it can destabilize the Middle East, for example by getting the United States involved in military actions to tighten up the situation around Iraq, that that will bring down Clinton." It could happen that way, LaRouche said, because if Clinton were to get involved in something like what George Bush did against Iraq, the entire Clinton policy structure could collapse. "He's already in trouble because of the way this Haiti business is going," LaRouche added.

How to look at it

To understand what's going on with Iraq, LaRouche insisted, you can't just look at the isolated issues, or the pieces. "Look from the top down. See what the overall global issues are, how they intersect the 'Crossroads of Civilization' called the Middle East; look then at the oil issues. Look at the conflicts between London and the United States over oil, over deals with Saudi Arabia, including weapons deals. Take it from the top down," he cautioned, "otherwise it becomes a bit muddled."

LaRouche began his discussion of the Middle East by noting that the whole global financial and monetary system is headed toward a crash. "There is going to be a collapse now, but whether a blowout's going to occur, is another question. It could be postponed till next spring, or it could be

put off, for various reasons, for a year or so," he said.

Then, looking at Saudi Arabia, LaRouche first pointed to the longstanding conflict between certain U.S. interests and British interests, over who is going to get the greatest benefit out of the Gulf region petroleum flows. "This is the key to the whole Iraq situation," he said.

Within Saudi Arabia, there is a division, with one faction of the Saudis under the influence of British intelligence. "I don't mean MI-5 or MI-6," LaRouche interpolated. "I mean *real* British intelligence, up at the royal level."

Then, there is a pro-American faction on the other side. All this has now come to a head. "The Saudis are in serious trouble," LaRouche said. "The British have orchestrated a religious movement for destabilization of Saudi Arabia. They have done it against, presumably, the American interests. There is also a liquidity crisis. Because of the collapse of the world economy, there is less consumption of petroleum product, and the price of petroleum is dropping. Therefore, the Saudis are in trouble."

Indicative of what the Saudis are facing, is reported in an article in the Oct. 8-14 issue of the London *Economist* entitled "Challenge to the House of Saud"—which was written before the current Iraq crisis emerged. "Squeezed between debt, an unusually outspoken Islamic opposition and a looming succession problem, the insulated kingdom could be beginning to show signs of pre-revolutionary stress," said the London magazine.

The article contends that the Saudi regime "is rattled by the new surge of Islamic dissent." The *Economist* stated that the Islamists are not "organized as a revolutionary force," but they do hope to take advantage of good timing. With the regime being short of money and unable "to keep its people happy in the way that they have grown accustomed to," the

article continued, the succession “is no longer as simple as it was. King Fahd and Crown Prince Abdullah are both in their 70s; at some point the crown should pass to grandsons. The question is at which point. The answer could split the family.”

A number of sources have also told *EIR* that the Saudi succession issue is key to what is happening around the Persian Gulf right now, particularly in light of British efforts—using BBC and their “Islamic fundamentalist” assets—to reenact in Saudi Arabia what they did to set up the fall of the Shah of Iran in 1979.

The issue of Iraq, therefore, has to be seen, first, in the context of the British destabilization of Saudi Arabia and its looming succession crisis, and then, secondarily, in the context of oil. “The London crowd does not want Iraq’s oil being sold on the world market, at a time that the prices of petroleum, which are controlled, are already depressed,” LaRouche said.

It would be greatly advantageous from the British point of view, and especially the City of London point of view, “if the entire Middle East were to suffer a small war or destabilization to cut down the flows of oil from the Gulf, because this would immediately increase the income flows from Britain’s possession of North Sea oil.”

Mideast peace is threatened

But, LaRouche emphasized, the specific, immediate issue in the Middle East is the question of the Rabin-Peres efforts for Middle East peace.

“The question of whether we’re going to get peace in the Middle East, depends upon the success of economic development coming out of the political cooperation for this purpose, between the Rabin-Peres government, and Arafat’s PLO; and, also, cooperation with Jordan,” LaRouche continued.

“In order for this to succeed, Israel and the other states immediately involved in this peace effort must secure stable political relations with their Middle East neighbors, a stability which hangs basically upon Israel’s relations with the Palestinians around Arafat, but also includes, ultimately, the stability of Iraq.”

But, what is happening to Iraq? “Iraq is being destroyed by a kind of U.N. Organization genocide. That’s the only thing to call it,” LaRouche insisted. “Don’t call it ‘sanctions.’ That’s double talk, that’s immorality. What’s going on are ‘sanctions’ which are depriving the Iraqi people of food and medical care.

“The Iraqis, who have built up their infrastructure again, because of the *lack of food*, because of the *lack of medicine*, because of the *high death rates*, the shrunken children, all these problems, are in a desperate situation.

“Some people in Europe and elsewhere say this is insane, this is immoral. You cannot continue the sanctions against Iraqis, because it’s *genocide, pure genocide*, just like the United Nations Organization is running against the Bosnians

in former Yugoslavia. It’s genocide; and the UNO is running *genocide*. They’re running it in Iraq, they’re running it in Bosnia. And the United States thus far, for various kinds of political reasons, set into motion by Thatcher and Bush, has not gotten off that kick.”

Now, LaRouche said in completing his analysis of the Middle East situation, “Israel has reached the point that it requires stability on that flank, for the sake of Middle East peace. Everybody in the Middle East requires that stability.”

A number of well-informed sources have advised *EIR* that the Israeli government views the stability of Iraq as critical for the success of the overall Middle East peace process. Israeli officials are said to fear that if Saddam Hussein were to be overthrown, within a year or two, an Iranian-backed radical Islamic fundamentalist regime would come to power in Baghdad. This would pose a far greater threat to Israel and stability in the region than any threat represented by Saddam Hussein.

Many sources have reported that there have been secret Israeli-Iraqi contacts in recent weeks. Some exposure of the contacts came from British sources determined to squelch such potential cooperation.

Other ongoing channels of negotiations involve the French and the Russians, who are openly campaigning for an end to the embargo. There was also considerable sentiment within the Clinton administration in late summer for a lifting of the embargo—or at least not to block such a lifting—but this dissipated, under considerable pressure from Britain and elsewhere, during September and early October.

Clinton’s response

President Clinton has so far avoided the most treacherous elements of the trap being set for him by the British. It is important to note that the exaggerated and almost-hysterical reports of Iraqi troop movements all initially came out of London, and U.S. officials were compelled to react to the wild claims being disseminated by CNN and other news media—claims, for example, that there were “80,000 Iraqi troops” about to cross the Kuwaiti border. In fact, according to the Pentagon, there were about 50,000 Iraqi troops *already* in the Basra area, and only another 14,000 moved into the area, for a total of 64,000. At all times, these Iraqi troops were at least 20 to 30 miles from the Kuwaiti border.

Fortunately, the immediate Iraq crisis appears to have been diminished without any bloodshed or loss of life. On the morning of Oct. 13, Gen. J.H. Binford Peay, commander-in-chief of the U.S. Central Command, said that “we have defused the crisis,” but noted that the crisis “is not past.”

Despite the acknowledged withdrawal of Iraqi forces from the Basra area, U.S. troops continued to be deployed into the Persian Gulf area—albeit at a somewhat slower pace than planned. Much of the air power and a portion of the ground troops will be stationed in Saudi Arabia, according to the Defense Department.