

Anglo-Americans Prepare New War Against Iraq

by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach

When George W. Bush was campaigning, one of the most embarrassing incidents which befell him, occurred in an ad hoc exchange with a New England journalist, who asked him to name several foreign heads of state. Young Bush could not reply. His ignorance of simple geography has since been summed up in his comment about Nigeria, that it is an important continent.

Yet, despite this well-rounded lack of knowledge about the world, there is one name of a head of state he does know, and knows as well what state he leads: Iraqi President Saddam Hussein. Indeed, since the Nov. 7 elections, it has become cliché in certain press circles, to remark on the coincidence of George W. Bush's ascension to the Presidency, on the tenth anniversary of the war against Iraq which his father led, under the rubric of Operation Desert Storm.

At the same time, the crescendo of press opinions, in favor of a new assault on Iraq, should not be mistaken as another expression of herd instinct among unimaginative journalists. On the contrary, the literal drumbeat which has been growing, for young Bush to finish the job his daddy left undone, should be taken deadly seriously. It signifies a commitment on the part of political circles in London and Washington, to explode the Middle East region as a whole, and soon.

The Propaganda

The public-opinion-shaping started with a *New York Times* piece, two days after the inauguration, which asserted that "satellite photos" had documented the existence of factories, officially producing castor oil brake fluid, which were also producing a by-product, a "deadly biological toxin called ricin." Since Bush had pledged to take serious action against Iraq, were it to be shown that the country is producing biological or chemical weapons, the *Times* said that new reports of such allegations constituted a "test of Bush's pledge" to be tough.

Richard Beeston picked up the same story a day later in the London *Times*, as Bush "Faces Saddam Weapons Challenge." Beeston quoted an unidentified American source saying that if Bush acts, "It will not be a pinprick, it will be strong and decisive." And the article concluded, "Bush may have no option but to act if he wants to contain Saddam."

The same day, Jan. 23, the London *Daily Telegraph*, organ

of the same Tory faction which ten years ago organized Sir George Bush the Elder to launch the war, ran a prominent commentary by Richard Butler, the discredited former head of the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM). Butler, who was caught spying for British, American, and Israeli intelligence under the cover of his UN weapons inspections team in Iraq, entitled his piece, "Bush Should Start Where His Father Left Off: With Saddam." There was nothing new in the article, except its timing. Butler argued that the war against Iraq, and the sanctions, were justified and effective. However, he added, now that the UN inspectors have been expelled, and Russia and France have shown support for Iraq, there is need for action.

"Saddam is undefeated," Butler wrote. "The new President Bush, George II, is about to enter a new world. It will not be the new world order of which his father spoke." Bush "should address this problem early, starting where his father left off—with Saddam. He must make clear to the Russians and the French that, whatever their allergy to American power may be, it must not be expressed in terms of support for Saddam. . . . Arms control must be restored and, if that means redesigning the focus of sanctions, then that should be considered. Britain must be robust in containing Saddam's addiction to weapons of mass destruction," and so forth.

Just days later, on Jan. 28, the same British daily reported on an Iraqi military engineer, a defector, who claimed that he had helped Saddam Hussein build two atomic bombs. The defector, who had allegedly been hiding out in Europe for two years, suddenly surfaced, to report, "There are at least two nuclear bombs which are ready for use. Before the UN inspectors came, there were 47 factories involved in the project. Now there are 64." In addition to the figures, the defector provided names of persons in charge of the project, all the way up to the Presidential palace. The bombs, he said, had been built in Hemrin, in the northeastern part of the country. He said that international inspectors were "alarmed," and would doubtless demand access to the area. The *Telegraph* concluded by noting, "Colin Powell . . . and Vice President Dick Cheney are known to favor a radical approach in dealing with Iraq."

In the estimation of Lyndon LaRouche—the only political figure, anywhere in the world, who forecast the first war against Iraq in July 1990, prior to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait—it is the intention of the Bush Administration to attack Iraq. A new military move would probably be carried out in tandem with Israeli actions, under a new Ariel Sharon government. This could mean the immediate implementation of Sharon's well-known policy option, to expel the Palestinians from the West Bank, into Jordan. Syria, Lebanon, and Iran would also be targetted. Such aggression would rapidly transform the religious conflict, set off by Sharon in Jerusalem on Sept. 28, 2000, into religious war throughout the Islamic world. This, as LaRouche has recently restated, would make Samuel Huntington's Clash of Civilizations a reality.

The Push for Dictatorial Powers

Those political forces in London and the Bush team who are planning this, are acting according to crisis-management methods, in the illusion that they can wield military power, to deflect from the onrushing economic and financial breakdown crisis; and can exploit the sense of emergency, to establish dictatorial powers inside the United States, as well as vis-à-vis the rest of the world.

As Butler clearly stated in his commentary, one leading feature of a new war against Iraq, would be to discipline Russia and France, both permanent members of the UN Security Council, which have actively challenged the UN sanctions regime. Russia had led the way in reestablishing international air links with Iraq, by flying into Saddam Hussein International Airport in Baghdad last Summer. Russia has sent high-ranking government delegations to Baghdad, to consolidate far-reaching deals, especially in oil. The most recent such visit occurred on Jan. 29, when Russian Minister of Energy and Fuel Alexander Gavrin arrived with a delegation.

France has also been adopting a critical posture toward the sanctions regime, and has joined the “airplane diplomacy,” by sending a plane into Baghdad — something which does not sit well with Washington. Interestingly, the political force inside France which has lined up with the Bush regime, against the French government’s overtures toward Baghdad, is the Green Party.

As the Paris daily *Le Monde* reported on Feb. 7, the French Green Party organized a seminar in Paris on Feb. 5, with various Iraqi opposition groups (the Supreme Council for the Islamic Revolution in Iraq [SCIRI], Saawa, the Communist Party, and Kurdish groups), intellectuals, and others. Among them were the Human Rights Alliance, and the Coalition for Justice in Iraq, a group of 200 non-governmental organizations from 24 countries; also present were Amnesty International and the International Federation of the League of the Rights of Man. Amin Bakhtiar, of the Human Rights Alliance, argued that they should not allow the human suffering provoked by the embargo, to overshadow the “crimes” of the government. Bakhtiar rejected calls for lifting the sanctions, and instead proposed “humanizing” them.

The other proposal, supported by all the participants, was to put Saddam Hussein on trial at an international tribunal. They proposed that an expert commission be formed by the UN Secretary General, or the Security Council, to review the 14 tons of documents seized in the north by Kurdish forces, together with the report of UN Special Rapporteur Van de Stoel on Iraq, and see if the charges of crimes against humanity are substantiated. Thus the Green Party joins the INDICT initiative, launched by intelligence-linked circles in Great Britain, to haul Saddam Hussein in front of an international court, and thus remove him from office.

In the region, the Bush Administration’s action would shatter the dense network of political, diplomatic, and espe-

cially economic cooperation agreements, that have come into being. In these arrangements, which include pipelines, transportation links, and trade and economic development projects, Iran and Iraq have enhanced relations with Jordan, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Morocco, and Saudia Arabia, all of which were formerly aligned with the Anglo-Americans, most of them as members of the 1990-91 coalition against Iraq (see Hussein Al-Nadeem, “Economic Cooperation Outflanks Political Differences in Mideast,” *EIR*, Feb. 2, 2001). Iraq has been gradually, but steadily, reintegrated into the Arab world; most recently, on Jan. 27, Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak visited Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, reportedly as part of a mediation effort between them and Iraq. Mubarak had received Iraqi Vice President Taha Yassin Ramadan shortly before, to discuss this initiative toward reconciliation.

The Fast Track

Two developments in Washington in early February indicate that the Bush Administration is indeed on a fast track against Iraq, especially in reaction to the growing rejection throughout the world of the U.S.- and British-imposed sanctions that are killing hundreds of thousands of Iraqi civilians, especially children.

On Feb. 5, the Administration announced that it had released \$4 million to the London-based Iraqi National Congress, led by the notorious huckster, Ahmed Chalabi. The funds are earmarked specifically for use *inside* Iraq for “gathering evidence” in order to indict Saddam Hussein and other Iraqi government officials for “war crimes.” The open use of U.S. funds for funding insurgency inside Iraq is a provocation that puts the crisis on an even faster track.

Bush has also nominated Paul Wolfowitz, author of a detailed war plan to overthrow Saddam Hussein and launch civil war inside Iraq, to be Undersecretary of Defense.

If, as expected, the Bush team opts for war, in coordination with military actions to be taken by the Sharon regime in Israel, it will not be a matter of “finishing up the job that daddy left undone.” There would be no glorious march on Baghdad, to remove Saddam Hussein from power. Instead, there would be a regional catastrophe, with ramifications throughout the Islamic world. And there would be a response from Russia, perhaps very different from what the authors of the computer-spun scenarios would like to believe.

**To reach us on the Web:
www.larouche.com**