

Clinton himself has a very poor comprehension of both economics, and of the way in which economic policy's effects impact the population generally. It was the subject of foreign policy, which was his strong point of interest as a student; it is in the domain of foreign policy, that, until now, a significant part of the U.S. "establishment" finds the President's role a crucial one, and his continued incumbency worth defending. If the President destroys his credibility in foreign policy, as this proposed Iraq adventure would do over the months ahead, what happens to most of his present "establishment" allies, those influentials who have tipped the balance in defending him against both *Wall Street Journal* Republicans and *Washington Post* Democrats?

If Clinton goes, a potentially vulnerable Vice-President Al Gore, already targetted by Katharine Graham's *Washington Post*, is more vulnerable than was Dick Nixon's (recently deceased) running mate, Spiro Agnew, under somewhat analogous, post-August 1971 conditions. What happens to the poor United States, then? What happens to this poor, crisis-racked world, without the indispensable role which only a politically viable U.S. sitting President could supply?

Presently, the preponderance of evidence is, that just as President Richard Nixon was duped into committing his August 15-16, 1971 act of ritual political suicide, Clinton will be duped into bombing Iraq once again. It appears likely, at this moment, that Clinton will receive Britain's new "Ramsay MacDonald," Tony Blair, as that dumb, snarling knuckle-dragger, George Bush, received Britain's murderous Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.

This present *EIR* strategic study of the issue is, in part, our last-ditch effort to bring official Washington to its senses on this specific issue, and to save the Clinton Presidency thereby. It is also a summary of four special factors contributing to London's apparent success in foisting this wild-eyed scheme for bombing Iraq upon the President: 1) As was also the case in the British-created 1990-1991 Gulf War scenario, the present threat by London's puppet, Prime Minister Netanyahu's Israeli right-wing lunatics, to launch a "nuclear Armageddon" scenario, to bomb Iraq (and, Iran and possibly Sudan), under the cover of Israel's "nuclear umbrella," if the U.S.A. does not do it first. 2) The way in which such a savage action would turn the Islamic world against Clinton's U.S.A. 3) How virtually all of Eurasia would be quickly turned against the U.S.A., as George Joffe sensed might be the case. 4) How the "triangulation" hoax, foisted upon President Clinton during the May-August 1996 interval, works to make the President susceptible to manipulation by his enemies on certain points, including, but not limited to the Iraq policy announced during the "State of the Union" address.

This feature is also the first step to lay the basis for fallback options to be put into place, should the President go ahead with perpetrating such a folly as the proposed, London-created new warfare against the helpless nation and people of starved Iraq.

War policy vs. Iraq has a British author

by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach

There can be no doubt that the authorship of the policy for war against Iraq, is British. From the onset of the current crisis, it has been the British press which has conducted the propaganda campaign to justify military action, the British government which has led the drive inside the United Nations Security Council for resolutions against Iraq, and British assets in the infamous United Nations Special Commission (Unscm), who have created provocations aimed at eliciting hostile reactions from Baghdad.

British Prime Minister Tony Blair, en route to Washington, summed it up in comments to the press. Scarcely concealing his irritation at the suggestion the U.K. were merely "supporting" an American policy, Blair snapped, "This isn't Britain linking itself with U.S. policy. This is British policy. We want Saddam Hussein dealt with."

The autumn offensive

The current countdown to war began in October 1997, when the British presented a resolution in the Security Council, threatening further sanctions in the event that Iraq were found guilty of "repeated violations" of the UN resolutions. The pretext for the resolution, was the allegation by Britain that Iraq was violating existing UN resolutions, regarding weapons of mass destruction.

At the Oct. 24 vote, Russia, China, France, Egypt, and Kenya broke ranks, and refrained from supporting the move. Although Resolution 1134 passed, with 10 out of 15 votes, the split in the body was significant. The resolution called for preventing "all Iraqi officials and members of the armed forces" from moving outside their country, and arrogated to the august body of the Security Council, the right to decide who the persons were. This clause was what the Russians objected to most vehemently, leading them to threaten to use their veto power. In response, Britain and the United States refrained from pressing for immediate sanctions, postponing their implementation until April 12, 1998.

The British Ambassador to the UN, John Weston, was furious that three of the permanent members of the Security Council had betrayed the British. He abandoned the hall when the French delegate rose to speak, saying, "For certain countries, oil seems to be more valuable than blood."

Once the resolution had passed, it provoked the desired reaction from Baghdad, and Saddam Hussein, spying an opportunity to drive a wedge between the two camps in the UN,



Secretary of Defense William Cohen (left) and British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook. The British are making no secret of the fact that military action against Iraq is their policy.

announced on Oct. 29 that Iraq would no longer cooperate with the Americans in the UN inspection teams, which are commissioned with monitoring Iraq's compliance. Saddam threatened to expel all American members of the UN inspection teams in the country. At that point, on Oct. 30, the positions shifted again inside the UN; both France and Russia urged Iraq to comply, to avoid a military intervention, which the British had promptly proposed. The London *Times* of Nov. 3 said that Iraq was "facing the possibility of further airstrikes or Tomahawk cruise missile attacks against it [unless it] backs down" on its threat to expel all U.S. inspectors by Nov. 5. The paper claimed that the UN inspectors "were close to finding stocks of VX liquid nerve agent—ten times more dangerous than the nerve gas sarin—when Saddam announced the expulsions."

It was only due to the determined diplomatic efforts of the Russians, that the crisis was overcome, and military confrontation avoided. The inspectors were allowed back into Iraq on Nov. 20, but Saddam Hussein maintained his position, that certain sites, like the Presidential palaces, were beyond the Unscm mandate, on grounds of national sovereignty.

Desert Storm II

In January, the same scenario was unrolled again, again with the British taking the lead.

On the anniversary of the outbreak of the 1991 war, Jan. 17, the Iraqi leadership called for action to be taken, finally to define an end to the genocidal sanctions which have been imposed on the country since 1990. On Jan. 21, Richard Butler,

head of Unscm, demonstratively left Baghdad, allegedly in protest against constraints imposed on Unscm by the Baghdad leadership. The British press immediately went into a mobilization, cranking out stories on Iraq's supposed weapons arsenals, and propagating the line, that nothing but military action would succeed. On Jan. 30, Michael Binyon authored a piece in the *Times* of London, the mouthpiece of the British foreign policy establishment, in which he reported that "Britain has stepped up intensive consultations to prevent a new war with Iraq, but gave a warning yesterday that the options were narrowing." He reported that British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook was to meet U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright in London the following day, "to coordinate the allied response to President Saddam Hussein's refusal to allow United Nations inspectors access to 'sensitive' sites."

Cook had spoken on Jan. 29 with French Foreign Minister Hubert Vedrine, and on Jan. 27 with Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeni Primakov, both of whom expressed disquiet over the British moves toward military action. Nonetheless, the British Foreign Office said on Jan. 29 that "we want to achieve a peaceful situation," but "the options are narrowing." According to the same account, Cook and Albright were "anxious to give a display of public unity on Iraq," and would discuss "how a firm line can be maintained in the UN and among the West's former Gulf War allies." Because of lack of unity around the threatened showdown, even among the Security Council member-states, the United States, according to the *Times*, had threatened to "go it alone."

Britain also increased its military presence in the region.

As the *Times* said, the dispatch of *HMS Invincible* to the Persian Gulf, was “intended to send a message to Baghdad of Britain’s determination.” Earlier, another British aircraft carrier, the *Illustrious*, left for the eastern Mediterranean, and was to be joined by Royal Air Force ground attack Harriers, from Germany.

Foreign Secretary Cook added fuel to the fire, when he told Parliament that “we have not, nor will we, rule out force.” As the *Times* reported on Jan. 31, Cook had the following to say: “Without effective UN monitoring, Iraq could produce enough anthrax every week to fill two missile warheads and could, within weeks, be producing a large volume of nerve gas.”

Even following the extraordinary intervention by Russian President Boris Yeltsin on Feb. 4, who warned, correctly, that the course President Bill Clinton had charted toward a military intervention, could lead to World War III, Tony Blair asserted the primacy of Britain in policymaking. In banner headlines, the *Daily Telegraph* proclaimed, “Blair Rejects Yeltsin Warning.”

Blair, according to the account, said, “Painful experience has taught the members of the Gulf War alliance that the only way to deal with Saddam Hussein is to stand absolutely firm. That we will do.” Blair talked with Yeltsin on the telephone, and told him, according to the *Daily Telegraph*, “that the greater threat to world peace would be to allow Saddam to continue to build up weapons of mass destruction in defiance of UN resolutions.”

To buoy their claims that Iraq is the “greater threat,” the Blair government issued a dossier the same day, which purported to document the chemical weapons allegedly in Iraq’s arsenal. In a lengthy report on “Iraq’s Hidden Arsenal,” the London *Guardian* of Feb. 5 spelled out the “concerns” of Unscm. The Foreign Office paper, which was personally sent by Foreign Secretary Cook to every member of Parliament prior to his trip to the region, was correctly identified by the London *Financial Times* as a “publicity campaign” which was “a clear bid to get public backing for any British military action with the U.S.”

The dossier claimed that Iraq could still have Scud missiles equipped with chemical and biological warheads. In addition, “17 tons of growth media for biological weapons are unaccounted for—enough to produce at least three times the quantity of anthrax Iraq belatedly admitted to having, some of which was already loaded into missile warheads (100 kg of anthrax could annihilate 3 million people if efficiently dispersed).” And, the report continued, “More than 600 tons of chemical precursors, sufficient to make 200 tons of the persistent VX nerve agent, are also unaccounted for.” Finally, the report said that Unscm reckons that Iraq could build a nuclear weapon in five years, a long-range missile in a year, and biological and chemical weapons in “just weeks.” The dossier, according to the *Daily Telegraph*, said Iraq could produce enough VX nerve gas “to wipe out the world’s population.”

Richard Butler, agent provocateur

While the British press was preparing public opinion for war, Richard Butler was escalating his provocations, in an attempt to exacerbate tensions in Baghdad, and sabotage any diplomatic efforts to prevent war. Butler is an Australian, who has functioned as an *agent provocateur* since he was appointed chairman of Unscm, on May 1, 1997, and took office, on July 1. Butler, who has been Australia’s Permanent Representative to the UN since 1992, has a long career, as a diplomat in Bonn and Singapore, then ambassador to Thailand and Cambodia, and, as the representative to the UN in Geneva on disarmament issues, Butler has performed in the Iraqi theater like a bull in a china shop. As Dr. Musa Keilani, editor of the Jordanian weekly *Al Urdun*, summarized the case in a commentary for the *Jordan Times*, Butler was initially greeted as a welcome change, when he replaced the arrogant Swedish diplomat Rolf Ekeus last July. At the time, Keilani writes, there was optimism that the new official would “open a new chapter with Iraq,” as he had pledged to do. Instead, Butler has exacerbated tensions to the extreme.

First, Butler went on TV and “publicly referred to the massing of American forces in the Gulf.” Keilani writes, “There could not have been any mistaking the undertone of what Butler said then. It was as if he was willing the U.S. to launch military strikes against Iraq to shore up Unscm’s status and prove that the special commission that he heads was not a paper tiger.” Since then, Butler has maintained this provocative tone, and “it was only natural that the Iraqi press would hit him back and call him names, leading us all along in a vicious circle of accusations and counter-accusations.”

Keilani states, however, that no one expected this “veteran with decades of diplomacy . . . to make it a personal vendetta and shoot off assertions like Iraq has ready missile heads loaded with biological weapons.” He adds, “Nor is it acceptable that he would use the media as a forum to propagate his assertion.” Keilani asks, “If indeed the assertion was true, then why did he not report the matter to the UN Security Council . . . and what . . . was his place to declare that Iraq posed a direct threat to Israel?” Butler, instead of reporting to the UN, went to the *New York Times* “to announce not only that Iraq had biological weapons ready for delivery but also that the missiles could ‘blow away Tel Aviv.’” To top it off, Butler “told American Jewish leaders that 45 Iraqi warheads were unaccounted for, in another gesture that perhaps indicates malice.”

The obvious question to be asked, Keilani writes, is: “What is Butler trying to do? Start another war by provoking simultaneous American and Israeli military strikes against Iraq?” The obvious answer is: Precisely. Butler was put into the position he holds, and seconded by the British Foreign Office, in order to set up a confrontation situation, in which the British could motivate the United States to go for military strikes against Iraq.