

Editorial

Britain prepares 'Iraq trap' for Clinton

The British government is stepping up its campaign to lure an embattled U.S. President into ordering air strikes against Iraqi sites, allegedly housing chemical and biological weapons. The primary target of such a bombing campaign in Britain's eyes, would not be Iraq, however, but the Clinton Presidency itself.

As *EIR* has emphasized, Britain has been attempting to provoke a Mideast war crisis, preferably a nuclear crisis, since last fall, as part of a plan to break the power of the U.S. Presidency, the only institution capable of acting against British imperial designs in the global financial breakdown crisis, now spreading from East Asia to Russia and the Americas.

"There'll be one final round of diplomacy, and then an ultimatum, and then we act," an enthusiastic London *Daily Telegraph* quotes an unidentified member of Clinton's National Security Council as saying, following round-the-clock meetings on the latest Iraq "crisis." The crisis was allegedly caused by Iraq's refusal to allow UN inspection teams, led by Britain's Richard Butler, from entering any building there at will, notably Saddam Hussein's palaces.

A November 1997 crisis, over Iraq's demand that the UN inspection teams not be made up almost entirely of Americans, was defused by Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov, who persuaded Iraq to readmit the U.S. inspectors—much to the consternation of British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook, and such British lackeys as Sir George Bush and Newt Gingrich. Now, moves for a military showdown are again in motion, despite signs that a compromise could be easily obtained.

Individuals not scared away by disingenuous condemnations of "conspiracy theories," might consider, that the same *Daily Telegraph* heralding the call for a strike against Iraq, has played the leading role in orchestrating the assaults on the Presidency since 1993, including the recent Monica Lewinsky affair. The chairman of the paper's Advisory Board, former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, oversaw the 1990-91 war against Iraq, drawing in her puppy George Bush on behalf of a geopolitical plan to prevent reunified Germany from joining with post-Communist Russia in a Eurasian

development program that would have smashed the power of Britain's financier oligarchy. Today, the circumstances have changed, as the British bankers scramble to deal with the financial meltdown in Southeast Asia; but the British policy of using the U.S. government as an instrument, and a fall-guy, for its imperial manipulations, remains the same.

This synthetic crisis comes at a time when the Mideast faces very real crises, however, most especially that caused by Israel Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's continuing refusal to abide by the Oslo peace accord, and his attempt to push the region toward war. All the Arab states, including Kuwait, have made it clear that they are opposed to any further military adventure against Iraq, which has already lost 1 million people through eight years of UN sanctions. Britain and France stand ready to pick up the pieces, if the United States were so foolish, as they hope, to further discredit itself in Arab eyes by a go-it-alone bombing raid.

Meanwhile, the *Times* of London chuckles that Israel is even considering a neutron bomb attack on Baghdad, over Iraq's alleged threat to use chemical and biological weapons against Israel. The unique source for this particular Iraqi threat, is the UN's British diplomat, Richard Butler.

Commenting on this developing crisis, Lyndon LaRouche told "EIR Talks" on Jan. 28 that if Clinton falls into the British trap of bombing Iraq, it will have consequences beyond his comprehension. "Any destabilization, such as, for example, a bombing of Iraq, or something like that," LaRouche stated, "would accelerate, politically, would accelerate the conditions of crisis, and would lead to uncontrollable situations globally."

"So if the President were to go with this kind of stuff, for example, on the bombing of Iraq, that would be a terrible mistake," he further emphasized, "which could lead to the doom of his Presidency in very short order, because of the chain-reaction effects of such an operation, which he thinks of, in a sense, as a freebie. He's wrong. He's being wrongly advised. It's not a freebie. This can set off chain-reaction effects throughout the world, which are beyond, obviously, his present comprehension."