

accurately call it their victory.

## Will the Real Christians Stand Up?

On July 1 Bauer made his first trip to Israel, where he delivered a letter to Sharon. Speaking in the name of “Christians” like Dr. James Dobson, Chuck Colson and Rev. Jerry Falwell, this letter pledges total support for the fascist policies of the current Israeli government.

In reality, as *EIR* has documented, the so-called Christian evangelicals do not speak for Christians in the United States. The major Christian denominations—Catholic, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Methodist—have all gone on record attacking the recent outrageous Israeli assaults on the Palestinians, and on the Church of the Nativity. The National Council of Churches has also raised its voice, as have the Christian Churches in the Occupied Territories.

Yet, the national news media of the United States have been dominated by the Christian Zionists, who, in their alliance with Israel’s right-wing Likud party, promote a violently pro-Israel line. The roots of this alliance go back to 1977, when Likud’s Menachem Begin took power, and powerful financiers, who promote both the Likud and the U.S. evangelicals, decided to foster it. A study was produced by the Institute of Contemporary Jewry at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in 1978, called “American Fundamentalism and Israel,” which obviously served as a guidebook to deepening the ties between the two.

Likud’s parody of Biblical themes—claiming that God gave the land occupied by the Palestinians exclusively to the Jews, and that the Jews have a divine right to settle anywhere in Eretz Israel—was opportunistically applauded by the Christian Zionists of various “dispensationalist” and “millennialist” strains, as consistent with their own distorted theology and Biblical interpretation. That reading is that the re-establishment of Biblical Israel is a fulfillment of prophecy, portending the Second Coming of Jesus Christ.

When Likud came to power again in 1996 with Benjamin Netanyahu’s victory, Netanyahu moved quickly to mobilize the American Christian Right, including bringing evangelical and fundamentalist leaders to Israel for a tour and conference at which they pledged their support for the Likud agenda.

As of today, that agenda has been exposed for all with the will to see, as a program copied directly from the Nazis—of Warsaw Ghettos, mass expulsion, and destruction of a people. The next step would be the detonation of a wider war in the Middle East, which would expand into a worldwide religious war of unimaginable horror. Those who support that agenda, are no more “Christian” than Adolf Hitler.

### For further reading:

- Scott Thompson and Michael Minnicino, “British Israelites and Empire,” *EIR*, Nov. 1, 1997.
- Anton Chaitkin and Nancy Spannaus, “Pat Robertson: End-Times Cultist, British Agent,” *EIR*, Nov. 21, 1997.

---

## Case Studies

---

# When ‘War on Terror’ Supports Terrorism

While the Bush Administration has pronounced the “war on terrorism” to be the number-one issue since Sept. 11, on the agenda of all the world leaders, a careful review of how it has pursued that war reveals some dramatic cases of double-speak and hypocrisy, and, in Ibero-America, an outright capitulation to the very narco-terrorist forces that comprise the leading component of the irregular warfare apparatus stalking the planet today. Here are the cases where that hypocrisy presents the greatest danger.

- In the case of Saudi Arabia, the “moles” inside the Bush Administration, in league with several prominent Washington think-tanks and tax-exempt foundations, is promoting the very overthrow of the House of Saud that has been the stated goal of al-Qaeda and Osama bin Laden. Thus, the neo-conservatives, Christian Zionists, and Jabotinskyite agents in the administration and Washington think-tanks—led by the Hudson Institute—are working in league with the very “new international terrorist apparatus” that they pretend to be combatting.

- In Colombia and Peru, the Bush Administration has, so far, failed to reverse the disastrous policies of former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, and her allies on the Wall Street, who, during the Clinton Administration, abetted the narco-destabilizations of both Colombia and Peru. Albright boldly declared that there could be no effective war on narco-terrorism in Colombia, and she, therefore, embraced the idea of granting the narco-terrorist FARC a demilitarized zone, from which they waged a terror war against the Colombian people, and ran the biggest cocaine and heroin cartel in the hemisphere. Wall Street’s official endorsement of that policy came in the form of the infamous “investment embrace” between the chairman of the New York Stock Exchange and the financial leader of the FARC, which took place in the DMZ jungles in 1999.

Albright is an avowed proponent of George Soros’ Well-sian “Open Society.” In the case of Peru, Albright joined with Soros in promoting the overthrow of President Alberto Fujimori, installing Alejandro Toledo, a World Bank bureaucrat, as the President.

The brief case studies that follow are intended to supplement the profile of the Malthusian, Jabotinskyite, and Christian Zionist “mole hill” inside the Bush Administration, which must be purged, if there is to be any sanity reintroduced into American foreign and national security policy during the next three years.

In addition to targeting the Persian Gulf and Ibero-America, some of the same moles are promoting a shift in U.S. policy on the Korean Peninsula and in the Indian Subcontinent. As the result of their efforts, both regions are also on the verge of war and chaos.

- The drive to destabilize the Indian Subcontinent began at the end of 1998, and came in direct response to the official visit to New Delhi, by then-Russian Prime Minister Yevgeni Primakov. During that visit, Primakov gave his personal endorsement to the proposal, long associated with Lyndon LaRouche, for a strategic triangle of scientific and technological cooperation among Russia, China, and India. The LaRouche “strategic triangle” idea was a cornerstone of his Eurasian Land-Bridge proposal for bringing peace, stability and prosperity to the entire Eurasian land-mass, through the buildup of development corridors, with high-speed rail and other transportation links, massive construction of energy and other vital infrastructure, and the establishment of agro-industrial centers.

Initially, the Rand Corp. and the Cato Institute, two leading Washington Beltway think-tanks, launched vicious attacks against the Primakov proposal, falsely describing it as an attempt to build an anti-American alliance in Asia. India was seen as the weak link of the triangle, given the long history of British colonial manipulation, and the legacy of that manipulation in the always simmering conflict between India and Pakistan, over the disputed territory of Kashmir. Since October 2001, the U.S. war in Afghanistan has served to trigger rapidly worsening India-Pakistan tensions.

The presence of nuclear weapons on both sides of the India-Pakistan conflict has posed a particularly grave danger that any military brush-fire conflict between the two nations could rapidly degenerate into the first use of nuclear weapons since Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This crisis could erupt at any moment, and there are utopian war-planners in Washington who would delight in provoking such a nuclear exchange, as a means of destroying any prospects for erecting LaRouche’s Eurasian Land-Bridge.

- The Korean Peninsula has been targeted for identical reasons by the same utopian madmen. Like the Indian Subcontinent, the Korean Peninsula is a crucial area for the Eurasian Land-Bridge. In his recent travels to Seoul, Russian President Vladimir Putin had supported the completion of the South-North Korea rail line, which would link up to the Trans-Siberian Railroad, and provide a completed transportation corridor, running from the Pacific Far East all the way to the Western European port of Rotterdam.

Key to the Land-Bridge advancement has been the “Sunshine Policy” of South Korea’s President Kim Dae-jung, who will leave office late this year. As already detailed in this report, several of the most prominent moles in the Bush national security apparatus—including John Bolton and J.D. Crouch—are on record as favoring a hard military confrontation with North Korea.

---

## Appendix A

---

# Narco-Terrorism Spreads War in South America

Colombia today is under siege by the world’s largest and wealthiest drug cartel, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC). The FARC deploys its assassins and explosives experts into Colombia’s cities, its chemists to cocaine and heroin labs around the country, its billions into the world’s stock and other financial markets, and its “ambassadors” into the global terrorist underground. It uses its army of 20,000—made up largely of kidnapped children, impoverished and desperate peasants, and lumpenized cast-offs from the Medellín and Cali drug cartels of the 1980s—as a battering ram against the nation’s political, economic, and military institutions, while destroying energy and communications towers, pipelines, aqueducts, and bridges, to isolate and balkanize the nation, the better to dominate it.

During the long years in which the FARC has been building an army intended to rival the Colombian Armed Forces, official Washington has prattled endlessly about “human rights,” “civil conflict,” and “negotiating the peace,” while furiously denying the mountains of hard evidence documenting that narco-terrorism does indeed exist. In fact, the FARC could have been stopped in its tracks years ago, by a firm agreement between Bogotá and Washington to shut down its drug-money pipeline and arrest and extradite its leaders as drug traffickers. Instead, the narco-terrorists were protected and encouraged by “utopian” elements within the State Department and Wall Street and London financial circles. They saw the FARC not only as a crucial source of drug money to reinflate their sagging monetary system, but also as a useful weapon for dismantling Ibero-America’s nation-states, and capturing its vast natural wealth—precisely the agenda set forward in Henry Kissinger’s 1974 NSSM-200.

Who are these new imperialists in Washington?

- Former U.S. Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs **Peter Romero** served during the Clinton years as the point-man for the State Department’s Ibero-America policy under **Madeleine Albright**. As Secretary of State, Albright’s role was to enforce the utopian agenda inside the Clinton Administration, in continuation of her father’s close friendship and collaboration with leading utopian figure Zbigniew Brzezinski. Romero did Albright’s footwork in Ibero-America.

In 1998, Romero hosted a “peace seminar” in Cartagena, Colombia, whose goal was to pressure the country—and especially its military—into negotiating a power-sharing ar-



Guess who loves narco-terrorism? Here, New York Stock Exchange Chairman Richard Grasso embraces FARC money-man Raúl Reyes—the infamous “Grasso Abrazo”—in Colombia in 1999.

rangement with the FARC. Later that year, he sent Undersecretary of State for Andean Affairs Philip Chicola to Costa Rica, to hold secret and illegal meetings with the FARC’s financial chief “Raúl Reyes,” even though the FARC had been formally listed by the State Department in 1997 as a Foreign Terrorist Organization. Romero’s subsequent deployment (see below) is especially revealing as to the subversive role he played from his post at State.

- Romero’s efforts were buttressed by the 1999 deployment to Colombia of then-Assistant Secretary on Democracy, Human Rights and Labor **Harold Koh**, who had been a board member of **George Soros’** Human Rights Watch until his appointment at State. Soros is the leading funder of drug legalization initiatives, both in the United States and globally. Koh held a high-profile conference in Medellín in April 1999, designed to force a renewal of “peace talks” between the government and the terrorists, after the FARC threw a tantrum over alleged military support for paramilitaries. Koh embraced the FARC’s chief demand for a purge of key military figures who opposed negotiating with terrorists.

- Romero’s service to the utopians continued after his departure from the State Department in 2001, when he became a partner at the New York-based investment firm Violy, Byorum & Partners (VBP). It was the high-powered VBP, headed by co-founder and native Colombian **Violy McCausland**, which hosted the visit to Colombia of the Millennium Club of 13 leading international business magnates in January 2000, to set up a dialogue with the FARC, discuss mutual interests, and supposedly, to facilitate a “negotiated peace”

in Colombia. President Andrés Pastrana deployed Finance Minister Juan Camilo Restrepo to meet with the FARC leadership in their jungle hideout, and then flew him that same day to the lush resort city of Cartagena, to place the FARC’s position on the table before the prestigious Millennium Club.

- Among the Millennium Club hot-shots gathered in Cartagena were New York Stock Exchange Chairman **Richard Grasso**—who had, together with Finance Minister Restrepo, offered a hearty embrace to the FARC’s “Raúl Reyes” during a tête-à-tête in the Colombian jungle in June 1999; America Online founder **Jim Kimsey**; former American Express CEO **James Robinson**; and a host of other “friends of peace.” Not present at the Millennium meeting, but nonetheless a close business associate of VPB, is **Gustavo Cisneros**, of the Venezuelan Cisneros clan, which has been repeatedly exposed for its links to drug money-laundering interests.

Grasso had told the press after his first visit to Colombia, that the FARC had proved quite savvy about the financial world, and that they had discussed “mutual investment opportunities.” He told the media that he had invited the narco-terrorists to “come walk the Stock Exchange” with him.

- A senior partner at Violy, Byorum & Partners is **Rudolf Hommes**, a radical neo-liberal and former Colombian finance minister, known for having “opened up” the country’s economy from 1991-94, key years for the FARC’s takeover of the narcotics trade, and for the collapse of real production in the country. Hommes was appointed by Colombian President-elect Alvaro Uribe Vélez as a key member of his transition team, following the Presidential election in May 2002.

- Another important figure in VBP’s Millennium Group is former AOL founder **Jim Kimsey**, who together with his AOL sidekick **Joseph Robert, Jr.**, flew down to Colombia’s FARClandia a few months after the first Millennium meeting, to further expand on the “investment opportunities” originally floated by Wall Street’s Grasso in 1999. After Kimsey and Robert returned from their trip to Colombia’s cocaine heartland, they whitewashed the FARC in a commentary for the March 20, 2000 *Washington Times*, in which they insisted that the FARC had promised that they “could and would cooperate in ending drug trafficking.”

Kimsey is not only a close friend of Richard Grasso, but also of U.S. **Gen. Wayne Downing** (ret.), described by the *Washington Post* last November as “the most famous terrorism fighter you’ve never heard of.” Formerly a leader of the Army Rangers, Downing until recently coordinated the Bush Administration’s post-Sept. 11 war on terrorism, and, according to the *Post*, regularly takes advice from fellow former Army Ranger Kimsey. The *Post* quotes Kimsey, that if you want to fight terrorism, “You’ve got to think like the Mafia thinks. No, it isn’t going to be fair. You’re going to whack ’em at home. You’re going to do stuff to their families. You’ve got to play dirty. You’ve got to get in bed with dirty people.” (Downing’s “philosophy” is detailed in the body of this report.)

# Peru Is Again Thrown Into the War Zone

During the 1990s, Peru was a model for the world on how to carry out a successful war against drugs and terrorism. Not only did President Alberto Fujimori succeed in reducing area under drug cultivation by 70% during his 11 years in office, but he also succeeded in defeating the two-headed hydra of narco-terrorism in that country, the Shining Path terrorists and the Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement (MRTA). And he was determined to share that success with his fellow Ibero-Americans. In February 1999, Fujimori addressed the Inter-American Defense College in Washington, D.C. on the need to rally regional support for neighboring Colombia's fight against narco-terrorism, and against power-sharing negotiations with the FARC. He received a standing ovation.

Determined to prevent the spread of such Fujimori-styled national resistance to Colombia, Brazil, and other Ibero-American nations targeted by narco-insurgencies, the same "utopian" policy formulators inside the U.S. State Department, Wall Street, and the City of London, who drove Colombia into the arms of the FARC narco-terrorists, conspired to overthrow Fujimori and do to Peru what they had done to Colombia. In 2001, Fujimori was toppled by this combination of foreign interests.

Today in Peru, terrorists and drug traffickers have been released from their jail cells in droves. Heroes of the war against narco-terrorism—most notably the military commanders who led the 1997 hostage rescue at the Japanese ambassador's residence in Lima—are now facing arrest and imprisonment for it. The national intelligence service has been dismantled, and political and judicial persecution is being used to reduce and emasculate the Armed Forces, along with any other dissident voices in Peru. The government is packed from top to bottom with drug-legalization advocates and terrorist sympathizers. Shining Path has joined forces with elements of Colombia's FARC and is making a comeback in several parts of the country. To facilitate that comeback, government drug-eradication efforts government have just been halted.

Nearly nine years ago, in September 1993, **Paul Soros**, the brother and partner of mega-speculator and drug-legalization financier **George Soros**, published an advertisement in the *New York Times* in which he spelled out the international financial elites' strategy to annihilate Peru's Armed Forces and overthrow Fujimori: "When one can be certain that it [military influence on the government] is truly ended, investment values will rise 30, 40, even 50%. In Latin America, whenever the army as an institution is part of the power struc-

ture, all investments are discounted, because it introduces an element of instability. As an investor, one likes stability."

Fujimori's 1999 appeal to Ibero-Americans to follow his lead, enraged the utopians. **Luigi Einaudi**, veteran State Department enforcer and current U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States (OAS), who is also known as "Kissinger's Kissinger in Latin America," told Senate hearings in May 1999, that Fujimori's regime violated "the rule of law" and posed an "authoritarian" threat to democracy in the hemisphere. **Elliott Abrams**, infamous for his role in then-Vice President George H.W. Bush's "Iran-Contra" arms-for-drugs operations in the 1980s, and today "democratization" hand in President George W. Bush's National Security Council, also testified at the hearings, on the need to cut U.S. funding to Peru's anti-drug intelligence service.

The OAS then joined the fray, defending Peru's imprisoned narco-terrorists as victims of human rights infractions, denouncing the Fujimori regime as "undemocratic," and imposing sanctions against Peru for its anti-terrorist measures. **Arturo Valenzuela**, then on the U.S. National Security Council, urged that Einaudi's long-standing proposal for the OAS to implement "preventive diplomacy" (i.e., multilateral intervention), be approved, which was immediately echoed by the pro-drug-legalization Washington think-tank **Inter-American Dialogue**. London's leading financial magazine *The Economist* branded Fujimori "an outlaw."

As Fujimori prepared his bid for a third term in the 2000 Presidential elections, vowing to defend Peruvian national sovereignty and to "extinguish every vestige of terrorism from the country," the campaign for his overthrow heated up, with the State Department, the subservient OAS, and myriad "human rights" think-tanks like Soros' Human Right Watch (HRW) leading the charge.

In mid-May 2000, the State Department's **Peter Romero**, who facilitated the FARC's power grab in Colombia, told reporters during a New York Council on Foreign Relations meeting, that it was imperative for the OAS to adopt Einaudi's "preventive diplomacy" approach. The OAS "democracy clause" allowing for multinational intervention into a country after a crisis has erupted, was insufficient, he said, speaking explicitly about Peru. "We can't wait that long." That CFR forum in defense of narco-terrorism was, not accidentally, financed by, among others, **Violy Byorum & Partners** (see Appendix A).

The blatant foreign intervention notwithstanding, a whopping 70% of the Peruvian electorate turned out to vote, and Fujimori was re-elected to the Presidency on May 28, 2000.

One day later, Elliott Abrams began telling all who would listen, "If Fujimori . . . declares himself President for five more years, he will be a pariah. We will take the lead in organizing Latin American and European democracies to isolate him and his government, block Peru's access to international financial institutions, and end bilateral and multilateral cooperation." In an interview with José Vivanco, head of Human Rights Watch, Abrams insisted that if there were a

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 overwhelming 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 scribblings, 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.