

A Post-Sharon Nuclear Armageddon Plot?

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Lyndon LaRouche has issued a new warning: Some powerful desperadoes within very influential Anglo-American circles, now appear to be planning a detonator for a nuclear war within the entire Middle East region, and beyond. He warns, that, in short, these circles might choose to have Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon assassinated, thus turning him into the allegedly martyred victim of Islamic assassination, his death the pretext for either nuclear, or similar reprisals against such targets as Baghdad, Damascus, and Tehran.

The earlier *EIR* warning posted on July 10, that Prime Minister Sharon was operating on a calculated escalation to Mideast war, relying on Hamas terrorism as a tool of that policy, was echoed in the world's media in the days following; but, so far, without signs of comprehension of the longer-range motives of the higher-level, not necessarily Zionist circles encouraging Sharon, and also perhaps planning his early martyrdom. The threat of such developments not only exists as plausible, but the danger is increasing. LaRouche poses the question: Exactly how plausible is such a scenario for the near term?

One Likely Scenario

At the present time, Israel is embarked on a count-down toward a general attempt to expel the Palestinians into nearby Jordan, with accompanying measures intended to topple the Jordanian monarchy and terrify the neighboring nations into submission to a full-scale realization of the goal of Vladimir Jabotinsky's followers: "Eretz Israel" as a leading nuclear-weapons power.

As LaRouche has emphasized, in the medium term, Israel would be ruined and ultimately defeated by the state of irregular warfare it thus creates throughout the region. Nonetheless, the fanatics in Israel, who currently control the majority, are determined to go down that road now. At this point, those fanatics have support for this from certain circles in London and the U.S.A. At the point at which such a "war" is launched on a fuller scale by Israel, the pre-conditions for the orchestrated martyrdom of Sharon are ripe.

In the case of a prevailing belief in Israel, that Sharon had been martyred by complicity of some Islamic states of

the region, terrible exemplary reprisals would be taken rather promptly by the band of howling, wild-eyed fanatics who had just buried Sharon. Nuclear, or similar attacks on population-centers, such as Damascus, Baghdad, and Tehran, are currently pre-indicated targets for such actions.

The obvious weapons for this attack are conventional nuclear warheads, but we must presume that the Israeli arsenal features electromagnetic-pulse-effect weapons as well. Politically, the latter weapons, if available, would be the Israeli command's first choice. Nonetheless, such weapons, or chemical-biological substitutes, would deliver a global political shock, like that produced by conventional nuclear weapons, to the entire structure of the post-1962 global arms-control arrangements and associated mythologies. Such a state of affairs is not a place to which a living Sharon would wish to go. He might be wicked enough, but not stupid enough. Only the most fanatical of religious nuts would go to such levels. Why, then, would anyone in Washington or London wish to bring such lunatics into power?

LaRouche describes Sharon as like an organized-crime gangster, an evil, calculating figure, who, like Adolf Hitler, would go to almost any limit, if he thought he could bluff the world into tolerating his actions. However, Sharon is also a very practical sort of organized-crime type, who would balk at the insanity of using Israel's well-known nuclear weapons arsenal to achieve his present, regionally-bounded objectives of a Greater Israel state. Sharon may be mad in his own way, but, on the record of his past performance, he is the kind of ruthless madman who would operate within certain bounds, bounds which the religious fanatics behind him, are not likely to tolerate.

LaRouche has warned repeatedly, that Sharon's quality of feral prudence is not to be expected from among the wild-eyed fanatics likely to take command of Israel's nuclear arsenal on the pretext of Sharon's assassination. Behind the scenes, among those high-level Anglo-American geopolitical circles who developed the RAND Corporation's "nuclear chicken-game" scenario for the Middle East, decades ago, there are those who could, and would use the kind of Israeli "Masada complex" desperadoes inclined to take nuclear reprisals against capitals of nearby Islamic states. The only plausible basis for a "strategic nuclear chicken-game" scenario is religious warfare.

Sharon would not go that far, without a credible threat of strategic attack from Arab states. Therefore, if one intended Israel to launch such attacks, it would be necessary to replace Sharon, and replace him in a way which would ensure bringing into power the types behind the assassination of Prime Minister Rabin. The only motive for doing that, would be to detonate general religious war throughout most of Asia, which only an unprovoked nuclear, or similar form of assault by Israel would be likely to bring about.

Who would wish to do such a thing?

Why Sharon's Masters Consider Him Expendable

The obvious question is: Why would those same high-level circles which have been using Sharon until now, intend to have him play an early role as a martyr of what would be an allegedly Islamic assassination plotted in centers such as Damascus, Baghdad, and Tehran?

Enter exemplary lackey-like figures such as Zbigniew Brzezinski, Samuel P. Huntington, Madeleine Albright, her father, Josef Korbel, and, presumably also President Double-you's National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice. As Albright has bragged publicly, she and her father have based their careers on adherence to the ideas of the notorious H.G. Wells of *The Open Conspiracy* notoriety. As Secretary of State, Albright acted according to that dogma, as she bragged of this on one public occasion, in 1999. Brzezinski and Kissinger, whose careers were shaped by the direction of Nashville Agrarian neo-Confederate William Yandell Elliot, represent the same "geopolitical" ideology. These public figures essentially echo the higher circles by whom they are deployed.

Brzezinski is merely typical of the mental state of those circles whose logic would impel them to exploit an assassination of an Ariel Sharon as a detonator for what Brzezinski confederate Samuel P. Huntington has proposed to unleash upon all Eurasia as a "Clash of Civilizations" (Samuel P. Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs*, Summer 1993).

Brzezinski's consistent passion, since his role as National Security Adviser to President Jimmy Carter, has been his determination to use ethnic and religious conflicts in Asia, such as those deployed then, and now, from Afghanistan, to undermine and obliterate any political challenge to the world supremacy of Anglo-American world power. The Osama bin Laden problem of today is nothing other than a strategic outgrowth of what Brzezinski, and later Vice-President Bush and his British cronies conducted in Afghanistan back during the late 1970s and 1980s.

Echoes of such desperation-driven views, genetically akin to the widely publicized geopolitical passions of Brzezinski and Huntington, are to be read in Henry Kissinger's newly-issued book, reviewed in this issue (*Does America Need a Foreign Policy?* New York: Simon & Schuster, 2001), and in Zbigniew Brzezinski's own series of shrill attacks on the new China-Russia friendship treaty. The presently onrushing collapse of the world's present monetary and financial system takes such strategic speculations as theirs out of the policy think-tank board-rooms, and sets them into motion in real life, with real forces.

In former times, after the two world wars of the past century, we became accustomed to speak of "The Guns of August," the month when pending world wars tended to erupt. Now, as then, what inflames the passions of Brzez-

inski, Huntington, Kissinger, and similar types, is the looming threat of a general collapse of the world's present monetary and financial system. Then, as now, the drive toward war was motivated by the determination of the Anglo-American financier interest, to prevent the kind of economic and related cooperation throughout continental Eurasia typified by scientist D.I. Mendeleev's development of the Trans-Siberian Railroad.

To these circles, the "geopolitical threat" represented by Eurasian infrastructure corridor development, pivoted on an evolving Russia-China-India cooperation, as elaborated by Mr. LaRouche, could warrant unleashing the kind of global conflagration that only a post-Sharon Mideast nuclear conflict would provide.

The Threat Assessed

As we see in the present deployment of the Osama bin Laden who was created for the Afghan war launched under Brzezinski's stint as National Security Adviser, the objective presented by Brzezinski side-kick Huntington's "Clash of Civilizations," is to drive the Islamic world into a state of permanent homicidal rage against the rest of Eurasia. In all of ancient, medieval, and modern history, the only way in which such a permanent state of warfare can be sustained, is the kind of religious, or related ethnic warfare from which modern Europe freed itself by the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, a Treaty which Kissinger, for example, opposes as a model policy for the Middle East today.

As we should recall, when commander Wallenstein recognized that the religious war launched in 1618 must be brought to a peaceful conclusion, hopefully through negotiations with Gustavus Adolphus, Wallenstein was assassinated by the supporters of the continuation of that war, and the war continued for nearly two more decades as a result of that killing. Former Kissinger crony Sharon exhibits none of the relatively commendable qualities of a Wallenstein, but, he, too, would be inclined, even for purely practical reasons, to seek an honorable peace with Israel's Arab neighbors, if circumstances pressed him to the wall to do so.

The point is, the spirit of the murderers of Wallenstein live on today, and there are Kissingers who oppose the Peace of Westphalia, still today. Only by exposing the risk of the assassination of Sharon, are we likely to succeed in preventing it, by discrediting the myth of Sharon's martyrdom in advance.

★ LAROCHE IN 2004 ★

www.larouchein2004.com

Paid for by LaRouche in 2004.