

coup against Fujimori and new elections called, the United States would back it!

On June 4-6, 2000, the OAS General Assembly met in Windsor, Canada, where then-U.S. Secretary of State **Madeleine Albright** teamed up with OAS Secretary General **César Gaviria** and Canadian Foreign Minister **Lloyd Axworthy**, to try to force the concept of “preventive diplomacy” down the throats of Ibero-America’s nations, with Peru intended as the first victim. Gaviria, as President of Colombia from 1990-94, had facilitated the surrender of his country to the drug cartels, while Axworthy made a name for himself as Foreign Minister, by supporting drug legalization, endorsing the payment of ransoms to FARC kidnappers, and demanding that Fujimori negotiate a deal with the MRTA, which, in December 1996, had seized the Japanese ambassador’s residence and held scores of hostages. Their hopes of having the other nations of the continent rubber-stamp Fujimori’s overthrow were dashed, however, when such supranational meddling was overwhelmingly rejected.

In July 2000, Albright joined with George Soros’ World Forum on Democracy to sponsor a global conference, “Toward a Community of Democracies,” in Warsaw. While there, both Albright and Soros—as well as Albright’s human rights mouthpiece **Harold Koh**—met with failed Peruvian Presidential candidate and former World Bank official **Alejandro Toledo**. The contact was facilitated by **Diego García Sayán**, then executive director of the Andean Commission of Jurists, a de facto branch of Soros’s HRW, and a prominent drug legalization advocate who, together with Soros, had signed an open letter to UN Secretary General Kofi Annan in 1998, calling for an end to the war on drugs.

Although it was not their first meeting, it was at the Warsaw World Forum on Democracy that Soros channelled \$1 million to Toledo, to organize what became the bloody “Four Corners March” on July 28, 2000, during which violence was orchestrated to sabotage Fujimori’s re-election and set the stage for his overthrow. García Sayán would later become Justice Minister during the interim Paniagua government between Fujimori’s fall and Toledo’s June 2001 election, and he used that post to begin dismantling Peru’s defense and intelligence capabilities, which had been in the vanguard of Fujimori’s war on narco-terrorism. When Toledo came to power, he named García Sayán Foreign Minister.

Fujimori nonetheless continued to fight back. Speaking to a summit of the South American Presidents in Brasilia on Aug. 31-Sept. 1, 2000, the embattled Peruvian President appealed for the formation of a United States of South America, which unity—he argued—would enable the continent to achieve the economic progress to which they had a right, but which they had long been denied. The rest of Ibero-America, too intimidated by the destabilization tactics of the Project Democracy/Wall Street crowd, did not rally to Fujimori’s call. Just a few short weeks later, Fujimori was forced to call new elections, and eventually, to flee the Toledo regime and the country, under threat of imprisonment.

Appendix C

Perpetual War Faction’s Target: Saudi Arabia

The international support for Saudi Arabian Crown Prince Abdullah’s ground-breaking peace proposal in March 2002, triggered a desperate response from the neo-conservative utopians and right-wing Jabotinskyites inside the Anglo-American-Israeli combine. Instead of pursuing peace, these maniacs escalated their campaign for the United States to completely break with Saudi Arabia, for destabilization, a campaign of vilification, and even a U.S. war against the Kingdom’s House of Saud.

Nothing shows the secret agenda of these utopian war-mongers more clearly, than their hysterical rejection of the very mention of a full regional peace plan. The most explicit rejection was spelled out by Max Singer, a radical Malthusian and one of the heads of the Hudson Institute, which is now at the forefront in the drive against Saudi Arabia, for the ousting of Palestinian Authority President Yasser Arafat, and the slanders against Egypt. Under the headline, “Free the Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia, Singer wrote in the May 9 issue of the *Jerusalem Post*, “It is well within the power of the United States to make it possible for the E.P. to become . . . a new Muslim Republic of East Arabia.”

Singer’s importance lies in his being part of an anti-Islam Clash of Civilizations network that has targetted Saudi Arabia since *before* the Sept. 11 attacks, because of the Saudi Kingdom’s historic role in the Middle East. Singer’s hatred of any peace-promoting development policies in the Middle East extends to the historic meetings between President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and King Saud, to chart destiny of the Middle East, as part of FDR’s vision of a postwar world that would enjoy the end of British and European colonialism in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East. That anti-empire “real America”—today represented by U.S. Democratic Party Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche—is what the utopian war-mongers hate.

One of the Bush Administration’s warhawk “moles” told the London *Observer* on Oct. 14, 2001, that a “perpetual war”—war on Iraq after Afghanistan, and more wars after that—is the heart of the “war on terrorism.” The *Observer*’s “unnamed hawk” insisted, “*if it means we are embarking on the next Hundred Years’ War, then that’s what we are doing*” (emphasis added).

Bust Up Saudi Arabia

Singer’s May 9 article was hysterical about “the ‘peace plan’ of Crown Prince Abdullah [which] has put the Saudi

Kingdom at the center of Middle Eastern diplomacy.” That “peace plan,” and Saudi Arabia itself have to be broken up, he demanded, with a military operation that seizes “the Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia (E.P.), which lies along the shore of the Arabian Gulf and which contains all of Saudi Arabia’s oil fields.” Singer called for an sectarian Muslim war “against Wahhabism” (the dominant Islamic denomination in the Kingdom), which he says took over the oil-rich Eastern Province; that sectarian Muslim war can be fostered by the Anglo-American neo-imperial schemers. Singer’s big lie is that Saudi Wahhabism is the cause of Islamic extremism, including the Sept. 11 attacks, and is responsible for “the sight of Americans dying and running in fear on Sept. 11.” Singer readily agrees with Clash of Civilizations founder Bernard Lewis, Daniel Pipes, and Fouad Ajami (a long-standing “Islamic” advocate of eliminating Yasser Arafat), “that only the determined exercise of American power” will stop so-called Islamic terrorism.

As of July 8, 2002, no official member of the Bush Administration “mole hill” has dared to publicly espouse this policy in his or her own name. However, the Hudson Institute, which Singer founded, has been upgraded in influence, and is emblematic of that dangerous—and treasonous—current inside the administration. Conrad Black, the British Commonwealth’s billionaire magnate whose Hollinger Corp. media empire runs the London *Daily Telegraph* and the *Jerusalem Post*, joined the Hudson Institute board, as did one of the leading moles in the Bush Administration, Richard Perle, chairman of the Pentagon’s Defense Policy Board. Perle is also a prominent figure in Conrad Black’s Hollinger empire.

On June 18, following up Singer’s “declaration of war” on the Saudis, the Hudson Institute held a forum, to depict the Saudi Kingdom as a rogue state with no right to exist as a nation. The meeting on “Saudi Arabia and Terrorism,” jointly sponsored by Hudson and the Aspen Institute Berlin, located an attack on Iraq as an “opportunity” to begin the breakup of Saudi Arabia.

Fragmenting and conquering the Arab/Muslim world has been a goal of this geopolitical faction, for which Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Princeton Prof. Bernard Lewis are leading ideologues, and Saudi Arabia stands in their way. As both a longtime ally of the United States, and locale of Mecca, Islam’s religious center, it has the capability of becoming a force for peace between the Palestinians—and the rest of the Arab nations—and the Israelis, and it opposes attacking Iraq. Crown Prince Abdullah’s plan has made his nation a target of the political circles whose theories call for a perpetual religious war, a war which began on Sept. 11.

The utopian insanity was fully on display at the Hudson-Aspen meeting. Sen. Sam Brownback (R-Kan.), who has made a career of bashing Muslims, and is very close to Bernard Lewis, announced new legislation to deprive Saudi Arabia of military or financial support unless it “renounces terrorism.” Moderator Michael Barone, columnist with *U.S. News*

& *World Report*, pronounced the Saudis evil, and said the Sept. 11 hijackers were motivated by evil Saudi Arabian ideas. The Abdullah Plan was dismissed as a public relations ploy by Israeli fascist Dore Gold, who “handles” the American public relations portfolio for the Likud party, including former Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and current Prime Minister Ariel Sharon. Gold’s participation was seen as an official Likud representation, if by not the Israeli government, whose governing coalition is headed by Likud. It is no accident that the Likud party voted at its May 2002 convention, to “never” allow a Palestinian state, explicitly rejecting the Abdullah Plan and any peace-seeking by the Arab world. The Plan, adopted by the Arab League summit in March, called for all Arab nations to recognize Israel, in exchange for the establishment of a Palestinian state, and Israeli withdrawal to the 1967 borders.

David Pryce-Jones, senior editor of the *National Review*, portrayed Saudi Arabia and Iraq as tribal conglomerates, which should not be classified as nation-states. Simon Henderson, author of *After King Fahd—Succession in Saudi Arabia*, continued in this vein, proposing a U.S. military intervention in the Saudi Kingdom, to “protect”—this can only mean to grab—its oil supplies.

Chilling Response on Palestinian ‘Transfer’

At the June 18 meeting, *EIR* posed a strategic question to the Hudson Institute’s panel, and got a response with chilling implications for the Middle East. “There are reports circulating,” went the question, “that Sharon intends to forcibly transfer the Palestinians from the West Bank to Jordan under cover of a wider war—most likely an attack on Iraq—and, in collaboration with policy circles who want the upper hand in the United States, to declare Jordan to be ‘Palestine.’ Saudi Arabia would be broken up into religious and ethnic enclaves, and the United States would take over the oil fields in the East. People like Bernard Lewis support this. Does anyone on the panel support these imperial policies?”

British strategist Simon Henderson replied that he did endorse aspects of this policy. Pryce-Jones said, “This is a plastic hour; there will be an attack. If they go into Iraq, a plastic hour will develop. We are waiting on events. A dramatic outcome is possible. Saudi Arabia may be broken up. The Shi’ites may become an American dependency.” Then, half-jesting, Pryce-Jones added that Defense Policy Board Chairman “Richard Perle may take over [the administration]. The new order may be coming.”

The Hudson event was not a one-time blast against Saudi Arabia. The participants were chosen from a stable of “experts” who are on the payroll of a small group of U.S.-based institutions financed by the Olin Foundation, the Smith Richardson Foundation, the Bradley Foundation, and the Mellon Scaife family funds, with the purpose to *create* a Clash of Civilizations.

As honest scholars and historians know, the Bernard

Lewis/Samuel Huntington Clash of Civilizations is a *fraud*, created to give an excuse for a new global war against an “enemy image.” Stephen Schwartz, a speaker at the Hudson forum, wrote a Nov. 30, 2001 article for *National Review* online, the publication founded by right-wing Catholic William F. Buckley. In his article, Schwartz says, “To win a war, you must first identify the enemy. In our current war, the enemy’s name is Wahhabism . . . based in Saudi Arabia.” He said the United States should give “a series of ultimatums to the Saudis, or break friendly relations with them.”

Moderator Barone had written a June 3 article for *U.S. News & World Report* called “Our Enemies the Saudis,” which has been widely circulated in the Congress, including in hearings being held by right-wing fanatics like Rep. Dan Burton (R-Ind.) on Saudi repression of human rights and democracy.

David Pryce-Jones, another son of the British Commonwealth, based in Australia, spews out anti-Islam and anti-Arab filth on a regular basis, and also writes for *National Review* online. Calling the Saudi leaders weak-kneed “double-dealers,” he also advocates an American takeover of the “Eastern Province.”

Campaign Against Moderates

In effect, since Sept. 11, there has been a parallel, simultaneous trans-Atlantic attack by the Anglo-American utopians, and by their allies in Israel and Europe, against Saudi Arabia and also against Egypt, the other country which can play the most immediate productive role in achieving Middle East peace.

The campaign against Egypt came to the fore in Washington on Oct. 9, 2001, just several days after President George W. Bush first announced support for a “state of Palestine.” The lead editorial of the *Washington Post* blasted the “autocratic regime” of Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak, calling it “politically exhausted and morally bankrupt.” The *Post* said it is time for the United States to cut off its annual aid of \$2 billion, because “Egypt is the leading example” of countries that are the “largest single cause of Islamic extremism and terrorism.”

On Oct. 17, in a similar vein, the *New York Post* called Saudi Arabia a “pseudo-ally . . . in bed with Osama bin Laden.” The Saudis should be “dealt with” as soon as the Afghanistan war succeeds, the tabloid ranted. On Oct. 27, another *New York Post* article lied that Saudi Crown Prince Abdullah finances the Taliban and Osama bin Laden.

On Oct. 30, the *Wall Street Journal*’s lead editorial explained what it had in store for Saudi Arabia: to “seize the oil fields” after the expected collapse of the Saudi royal family. It is time to face the fact that a “more radical regime” could come to power in Saudi Arabia which would “force a decision on whether to take over the Saudi oil fields, which would put an end to OPEC.” On Nov. 2, Richard Perle, in an interview with Washington’s WTOP news radio, accusing the Saudi royal family of spending “billions of dollars on mosques and

schools around the world that preach hatred” of the United States.

On Nov. 8, the London *Economist* accused the “repressive, secretive, and undemocratic” regime of Saudi Arabia of supporting the Taliban, and the “extended royal family itself” of financing the “charities that finance terrorist groups, including al-Qaeda.” The *Economist* declared King Fahd and Crown Prince Abdullah to be reliving “the last days of the Shah in Iran.” On Nov. 19, the *Weekly Standard* said that Saudi Arabia is no true friend of the United States, and “in the event of a [radical] upheaval in Saudi Arabia, we [the United States] will take control, protect, and run the Kingdom’s oil fields.”

On Jan. 4, 2002, hack writer Ralph Peters wrote an op-ed in the *Wall Street Journal* called “The Saudi Threat,” which retailed the big lie that the Saudis finance “hate-filled Islamic terror” from “Michigan to Mindanao.” In the Jan. 9 *Jerusalem Post*, James Woolsey, a member of the Defense Policy Board, and former CIA Director under President Bill Clinton, said that “Saudi Arabia . . . deserves a very large part of the blame for Sept. 11,” and advocated that the United States freeze relations to nothing more than being “cordial.”

This is just a sampling of dozens of these kinds of anti-Saudi scribbles, since Sept. 11.

Antidote to Insanity

These insane attacks are not without opposition—within the United States, as well as internationally. As *EIR* has reported, the prestigious Middle East Policy Council held a June forum in Washington, supporting Middle East peace and the role of Egypt and Saudi Arabia in reaching it, and attacking the utopian warriors as calling for “irrational adventures.” Saudi officials have countered the lies, with eloquence and great detail, from interviews with U.S. television networks, to the pages of the *Wall Street Journal*. Yet, the Clash of Civilizations big lie persists. Attacks come from the highest levels of an alliance of rogue elements in the Anglo-American oligarchy, whose policy coup *begins* with the “big lie” that Osama bin Laden was the mastermind of the Sept. 11 attacks. That Osama bin Laden “hoax” is at the root of the Bush Administration’s disastrous war in Afghanistan and at the root of the utopians’ plans for “perpetual war.”

The antidote exists, and is the one defined clearly by Lyndon LaRouche. To stop the war drive, there must be two elements: First, the *delusion* of the well-being of the world financial system must be broken through. It is the oligarchy’s desperation to keep that delusion going, in the face of global signs of collapse, that drives their march to global war. Second, LaRouche has said that putting the blame on Osama bin Laden and Islamic terror for Sept. 11 is a fraud. Instead, LaRouche has identified that the Clash of Civilizations cabal and their conspiracy is enabling the terrorism.

The LaRouche antidote is the only hope that Saudi Arabia does not become another “case study” in the Anglo-American perpetual war.