

## Blair hawks Gulf war to destroy Clinton Presidency

by Jeffrey Steinberg

With “friends” like British Prime Minister Tony Blair, President Clinton hardly needs independent counsel Kenneth Starr to make his life miserable. For the past ten months, Blair has been doing everything in his power to lure the President into a no-win military action against Iraq, intended to isolate the United States from Russia, China, and the majority of nations of the Islamic world and the developing sector—precisely the combination of sovereign states that the President must align with, to implement the New Bretton Woods global financial reorganization, that is urgently required to lead the world out of a looming dark age.

Blair is currently starring in a tragicomic replay of Baroness Margaret Thatcher’s successful effort to lure George Bush into the Persian Gulf War of 1991, a war that was no small factor in Bush being voted out of office 16 months later.

But, as Lyndon LaRouche warned early this year (see *EIR*, Feb. 13, and an *EIR* video Special Report, “Assault on the Presidency”), the consequence of President Clinton being lured into the Anglo-Israeli Iraq trap would likely be his early impeachment.

The Bush-Thatcher 1991 “brave new world order” war on Iraq set a geopolitical trap that has been repeatedly used by London to distract the Clinton Presidency on almost every occasion that the President has either: moved to box in the war-crazy Netanyahu regime in Israel; attempted to focus on a solution to the global financial crisis; or intervened to advance any one of a number of U.S. regional peace initiatives that threatened flanks of Britain’s imperial “Great Game,” in the Balkans, Northern Ireland, or the Great Lakes region of Africa.

### Blair’s war cries

On Nov. 14, as President Clinton was meeting with his national security advisers at the White House to assess Iraqi’s

promise to allow United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) weapons inspectors to resume their work, the British Prime Minister spoke with Clinton *nine times*, imploring him to go to war, according to the British Broadcasting Corp.

The President had already given orders to begin the bombing and missile attacks, but had called off the action moments later, when an Iraqi letter to United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan arrived at the White House.

The previous day, according to one news account, President Clinton, in his capacity as rotating president of the United Nations Security Council, had asked Secretary General Annan to contact the Iraqi government, and offer them one last chance to reverse its Oct. 31 decision to no longer cooperate with the UNSCOM inspectors. The Iraqi letter to Annan was, thus, a direct response to President Clinton’s last-minute effort to avert use of force. The President had been told by Joint Chiefs of Staff war planners that an estimated 10,000 Iraqi civilians would be killed in the bombing and missile attack that had been planned. While this was of no concern to Blair, the issue of more innocents dying was a matter of grave concern for the President.

Blair stormed out of 10 Downing Street, upon learning of the President’s stand-down order, and howled at British reporters that Saddam’s letter was “unacceptable.” Several hours later, President Clinton’s National Security Adviser, Sandy Berger, told a packed White House press gallery that Saddam’s letter contained “conditionalities” that were “unacceptable” to the United States. The crisis was back on, and several hours later, President Clinton again approved the launching of an attack on Iraqi sites—only to once again receive a communiqué from Saddam, this time unequivocally reversing the UNSCOM expulsion. On Nov. 15, the President, in a brief nationally televised address from the White House, pronounced the Iraqi “clarification” acceptable.



*President Bill Clinton (left) and former President George Bush. The Bush-Thatcher 1991 war against Iraq has been used repeatedly by London to disrupt the Clinton Presidency and divert it from actually vital world issues.*

## **Try, try again**

For the fourth time in twelve months, the British and their Israeli cohorts had failed to lure President Clinton into the “Iraqi monkey trap.”

Nevertheless, Blair was unrelenting. On Nov. 18, the *Daily Telegraph*, flagship publication of the Hollinger Corp. media cartel that has been in the forefront of the assault on the U.S. Presidency, published a blood-curdling commentary by British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook, vowing that Britain was “ready to bomb not bluff,” and that Britain was also prepared to back a “Contra”-style secret war to overthrow the “dictator of Baghdad.” In the same issue, the paper’s Washington correspondent Hugo Gurdon noted that, over the previous weekend, as President Clinton was deciding whether to bomb, Blair had been the “most hawkish” of the world leaders with whom the President had conferred. Blair gave an interview to the *New York Times*, also on Nov. 18, reiterating his “tough on Saddam” posture.

While it would be a mistake to say that Tony Blair was the only player pressing President Clinton to push the button

and launch the most serious military action against Iraq since the close of the 1991 Persian Gulf War, Blair’s role in the ongoing effort to sink the President in an Iraq quagmire has been pivotal.

Blair, from the day he was installed in office by the British Crown and the Privy Council, has been cultivating a personal tie to President Clinton, aimed at reviving an Anglo-American “special relationship” that had been all but buried during the first years of the Clinton Presidency. After British Prime Minister John Major had been caught red-handed, illegally funneling British intelligence dossiers on Clinton to the 1992 Bush re-election campaign, Clinton’s long-standing dislike for the British Establishment, nurtured by his personal unpleasant experiences as a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford in the late 1960s, turned to outright political animus toward “Perfidious Albion.” Blair was chosen, as if out of central casting, to repair the damage.

Thus, for the past two years, Blair has been built up by the British and American media as Clinton’s “soul mate” in the “Third Way” political camp. LaRouche, by contrast, has identified Blair as a political reincarnation of Britain’s most overtly fascist political leader of the 20th century, Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald. Blair’s every move has confirmed LaRouche’s assessment. (See article, p. 57.)

Unfortunately, President Clinton has not always seen the Ramsay MacDonald parallels as clearly as he should. Were it not for President Clinton’s apparent soft spot for the British Prime Minister, it would have been far more transparent, that everyone pressing him to launch a new Persian Gulf adventure to get rid of Saddam has been a long-standing enemy.

## **All the President’s enemies**

The case of Richard Perle is exemplary. The former Reagan administration Defense Department official was long suspected of being a member of the “X Committee,” the yet-to-be-identified network of Israeli spies inside the upper echelons of the U.S. defense and intelligence establishment, which helped direct the espionage efforts of convicted Israeli spy Jonathan Jay Pollard. Pollard was steered, from Tel Aviv, by Ariel Sharon, the current Israeli Foreign Minister and leading war-hawk.

Perle is a director of the Hollinger Corp., the de facto London “war room” and chief propaganda organ for the six-year effort to destroy the Clinton Presidency, through “Troopergate,” “Filegate,” “Monicagate,” and so on. Hollinger’s *Sunday Telegraph* Washington bureau chief (1992-97) Ambrose Evans-Pritchard was the most out-front Clinton-slayer, fabricating and spreading every piece of filth that could be conjured up against Clinton. Evans-Pritchard boasts of his involvement in building a “Get Clinton” underground movement, and acknowledges that, all the while, he was a stringer for British secret services.

Perle has been the most outspoken critic of the Clinton administration’s failure to dump Saddam Hussein. In the

weeks leading up to the President's latest showdown with Iraq, Perle told an audience at the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) that the CIA's chief of operations should be fired because he failed to mount a successful covert campaign to overthrow or assassinate Saddam.

Perle is also a leading adviser to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, through the Institute of Applied Strategic and Political Studies, a Jerusalem- and Washington-based think-tank. Shortly after Netanyahu came into office, Perle drafted a policy study on how the Israeli government could subvert and overturn the Oslo peace accords. And recently, the London *Independent* revealed that Perle was the chief foreign policy adviser to Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.).

Grouped around Perle is the entire Washington-centered neo-conservative apparatus, including AEI, the Heritage Foundation, the Zionist lobby's Washington Institute for Near East Policy, the *American Spectator*, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, and other "X Committee" suspects including Frank Gaffney, Michael Ledeen, and Douglass Feith. All receive regular generous cash flows from Richard Mellon Scaife, the "Daddy Warbucks" of the anti-Clinton insurgency. Also not to be overlooked in the "Kill Saddam" lobby is the Christian Evangelical apparatus of fanatical "Temple Mount Christian Zionists," led by televangelists Pat Robertson and Jerry Falwell.

Every one of these institutions and individuals, apart from their public hostilities to the President, has been deeply involved in the effort to destroy the Israeli-Palestinian peace process, from the moment that Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat signed the initial Oslo Accords at a White House ceremony in September 1993.

Left to their own devices, these notorious Clinton-haters could not convince the President to leave the deck of the *Titanic*.

Hence, the pivotal role of "Tinny" Blair. Hence, the urgency of President Clinton breaking, immediately and decisively, with the British, if he is to ever step out of the Persian Gulf "monkey trap."

## The 'Bibi' and Saddam show

*EIR* has prepared a detailed chronology of the past ten months, which demonstrates conclusively that the ongoing "Iraq crisis" has been orchestrated from London, with the Netanyahu government in Israel and other Israeli assets playing a pivotal role in baiting the trap for President Clinton. The fact that the most recent phase of the Iraq showdown kicked off just days after President Clinton successfully boxed in the Israeli Prime Minister and extracted his signature on the Wye Plantation Accords, reviving the Oslo peace process, provides a clue as to the finger-tip control that the Anglo-Israeli apparatus has over the Iraq business.

When President Clinton scored a dramatic Election Day victory on Nov. 3, severely setting back the London-directed

impeachment attack, the Iraq war gambit became a matter of urgency for the President's enemies in the London Club of the Isles, the hub of the international financial oligarchy.

How was the trap sprung? A series of ham-fisted Israeli provocations were launched, from within the UNSCOM inspection team, that were calculated to provoke a predictable reaction from Saddam.

The grid shows that, from the beginning of 1998, one of the most active "props" in the Anglo-Israeli scheming was UNSCOM inspector Scott Ritter. Ritter has openly admitted that he is an asset of Israeli intelligence, and a conduit for Israeli-cooked intelligence into the UNSCOM inspection apparatus.

On Oct. 11-12, the *Washington Post* published an exhaustive dossier on Ritter, detailing his recruitment by Israel, his betrayal of U.S. policy interests, and his emergence, in August 1998, as the provocateur of the current Iraq standoff. The dossier is widely believed to have been provided to reporter Barton Gelman by sources inside the Clinton administration, who have been furious at Ritter's Israeli-directed dirty tricks.

Zbigniew Brzezinski, the mentor of Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, went on national television in the United States in October, as the crisis was moved toward a showdown, to denounce Ritter as an Israeli agent and a betrayer of American interests in the Gulf.

Ritter, a 1991 Gulf War veteran and now in the Marine Corp. reserves, has been with UNSCOM since its inception.

In addition to Ritter's Israeli pedigree, which is itself a provocation, UNSCOM director Richard Butler staged another dirty trick in the weeks leading up to the Oct. 31 Iraqi cutoff of cooperation with UNSCOM. Butler, according to Iraq's Deputy Prime Minister Dr. Tariq Aziz, allowed three or four top Israeli military intelligence operatives, all well-known Iraq specialists, to enter Iraq under phony papers, including false UNSCOM identification cards. This was tantamount to allowing UNSCOM to be used as a cover for Israeli espionage!

This action by Butler was no act of naivete. In fact, the Iraq crisis that began a year ago could not have been staged without Butler's active involvement.

A career Australian diplomat who had served in sensitive ambassadorial posts before representing Australia at the UN disarmament talks in Geneva, Butler became Australia's Permanent Representative to the United Nations in 1992. On July 1, 1997, Butler took over as head of UNSCOM. Almost immediately, he violated all protocols and began issuing inflammatory statements to the Israeli press, charging that Iraq had massive stockpiles of biological and chemical weapons, and enough delivery systems to "blow away Tel Aviv." Butler's waltz with the Israeli media was done behind the back of the United Nations Security Council, and should have resulted in his immediate dismissal from the UNSCOM post. But, by that point, the Israeli and British media were already off and running.

## Kissinger gaffe repeated

With Butler as a source of inflammatory and highly dubious “evidence” of Iraqi weapons violations, the British Foreign Office has been churning out a steady stream of war propaganda since February. This produced one serious gaffe which reopens the question of British Foreign Office penetration of the U.S. State Department. On Feb. 4, British Foreign Secretary Cook released a white paper, titled “The Iraqi Threat and the Work of UNSCOM,” which began with a litaney of Butler’s wild, unsubstantiated claims of Iraqi biological-chemical weapons of mass destruction. Eight days later, the United States Information Agency (USIA) released a document, “Fact Sheet: Iraq’s Record With UNSCOM,” which began with two pages, virtually taken verbatim, but without attribution, from the Cook white paper. Not since the days of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger has the British

intrusion into the U.S. State Department been so flagrant.

As we go to press, President Clinton is travelling in Asia, and the Iraq showdown has subsided. But, British and Israeli propagandists, and their agents in Washington, are continuing to press ahead, for bombings, and for a full-scale “Contra” campaign on the ground in Iraq. As one of his last acts as Speaker, Newt Gingrich, Netanyahu’s close ally on Capitol Hill, had rammed through a bill providing \$97 million to fund an Iraqi “Contra” movement to overthrow Saddam. Some \$2 million of the fund has already been allocated to USIA, to launch “public diplomacy” in support of the currently non-existent Iraqi “Contras.” If terms like “Contra” and “public diplomacy” don’t send chills down the spines of national security planners in the Clinton administration, then they ought to take a refresher course on the lessons that should have been learned from the Iran-Contra fiasco.

---

# How the British Israelites sprang the Iraq trap on Clinton

by Michele Steinberg

From the moment of the diplomatic settlement of the first Iraq crisis of 1998 in February, the government of British Prime Minister Tony Blair, acting on behalf of the British Empire’s Privy Council, has been the primary provocateur stirring up an Iraq crisis, not to destroy the regime of Saddam Hussein, but to wreck the government of President Bill Clinton.

This chronology provides a picture of how the British have run their propaganda, lies, and penetration of the U.S. policy apparatus to provoke an Iraq showdown. The two key British assets are, first, Israeli intelligence, which runs a vicious pressure campaign through the American side of the Likud/extreme right wing, allied with the so-called Christian televangelists of the Pat Robertson and Jerry Falwell stripe; and, where that falls short, espionage, with operatives such as convicted spy Jonathan Pollard. While a pressure campaign mounts for Clinton to free Pollard, his yet-to-be-identified controllers in the United States continue to develop new Pollards, through a network of think-tanks, publications, and recruitment of active duty military personnel. And, second, the media empires, led by the British giants, the Hollinger Corp., and the Rupert Murdoch chain, interfaced with *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*.

Their aim: a Middle East war, preferably now, which can serve to 1) keep the Clinton administration politically off-balance; 2) provide a pretext for Israeli Prime Minister Benja-

min Netanyahu to back out of the Wye Plantation agreement, and, ultimately, the Oslo Accords entirely; and 3) paint any chosen Third World country, through their propaganda outlets, as the new “boogeyman,” against whom the United Nations’ club of sanctions and military strikes can be wielded.

For the first time in decades, the British manipulation is not an “invisible hand”; it is out in the open, including assets such as their Hollinger Corp. empire, the Israeli Temple Mount Likud Party fanatics, the UN Special Commission (UNSCOM), and the U.S. neo-fascist network of Newt Gingrich and the Conservative Revolutionaries in the U.S. Congress.

The events of Nov. 14 encapsulate the British role: After Clinton had temporarily aborted the military strikes on Iraq, it was Blair who rushed out of 10 Downing Street sputtering to the news media that the Iraqi communiqué received by UN Secretary General Kofi Annan was “unacceptable.” Blair’s pressure on the White House to act was constant: The Prime Minister’s office announced that Blair had been on the phone with Clinton eight times that day; the British Broadcasting Corp. (BBC) said it was nine times. And, the more Blair ranted for the United States to bomb Iraq, the more Iraqi voices from Baghdad blamed the United States for abusing them.

While the attack on Iraq has been momentarily averted, it is clear that the British are increasing the pressure on the