

added] and gave Britain the appearance of disintegration on an almost Hapsburg scale. If the country was to be held together, the credit of authority had surely to be maintained. And that was not easily done in November 1918. The war had ended unsatisfactorily. Social divisions had been exploited by the various factions to manipulate the press throughout the war, while military deficiencies had been appallingly clear to many of the 5 million who had worn Khaki and returned in a disgruntled, unsettled state of mind.”

Then, as now. Up to the neck in an unprecedented crisis of the Anglo-Saxon economies, fearing the industrial might of reunified Germany, the British aristocracy pushed their American ally to war with Iraq, killing countless civilians and risking world war, merely to keep British control over Gulf oil, and thereby, over continental Europe as a whole. Then, as now: Those historians who would cover up the slaughter of the Iraqis had better get down to their scribbling now.

Two post-mortems on the Gulf war

by Nancy Spannaus

Iraq, Military Victory, Moral Defeat

by Thomas C. Fox
Sheed and Ward, Kansas City, Mo. 1991
192 pages, paperbound, \$9.95

Desert Mirage, The True Story of the Gulf War

by Martin Yant
Prometheus Books, Buffalo, N.Y., 1991
228 pages, hardbound, \$22.95

Both of these books are attempts by men who are not very oriented to the world of intelligence, to convince Americans that the war against Iraq was wrong. Fox, who has been the editor of the *National Catholic Reporter* since 1980, takes a moral, philosophical approach. Yant exposes a number of the dirty lies which the U.S. government told to explain the war, in a not-unsuccessful effort to show that the public version was created by government lies.

I find Yant's book to be the more effective, although it is not very hard-hitting. Its understatement may help provoke doubts in a certain layer of the population. Yant's major point, however, is to prove that the press lied by covering up for the U.S. overkill, and unfortunately most Americans think that is just fine. What is perhaps most interesting for the potential of future backfire against the perpetrators of the atrocities, however, is the fact that Ohio Democrat Sen. John Glenn has written the foreword, urging the pursuit of the truth, no matter how ugly it is.

That is not to say that Yant, a journalist in international affairs for the *Columbus Dispatch*, Ohio, doesn't include explosive information; he does. For example, he discusses the Army War College report which casts doubt on the now much-accepted story about Saddam Hussein having gassed the Kurds. But he doesn't give it much prominence—and one fears that many may miss the bombshell altogether.

EIR's Feb. 8 issue contained three pages of excerpts from the report, which was written in spring of 1990. In the March 15 issue, a U.S. military analyst, who asked to remain anonymous, told us: “One of the questions we are going to have to ask [about the U.S. policy of seeking confrontation with viable developing sector nations], is how do our friends out there see this? I am working with a foreign officer on a project, and . . . I have asked him, ‘What does this say as a message to you? Does it say that if you choose to go out and start nuclear research, we're going to bomb the hell out of you?’ He says, ‘We have to consider that now.’ I said, ‘Okay, how about your fertilizer plants, do you expect international inspectors to come in to see that you're not making chemical weapons?’ He says, ‘We have to consider that.’ So we have a major diplomatic task ahead of us, and that is to reassure people that they can make peaceful progress and no one is going to be looking over their shoulder.”

Yant also presents some effective material on the “turkey shoot” bombings of the Iraqi soldiers (plus civilians) in retreat at the end of the war. Amazingly, he gives virtually no attention to the “bomb now, die later” strategy taken by the Americans of destroying Iraq's infrastructure, so that this developing country would be reduced to Stone Age standards of living. Given the amount of material available on this in the public domain, this is a big omission.

Catholic pacifist outlook

Fox's book proceeds from the standpoint of a Roman Catholic pacifist, who joined the anti-war movement at the time of the Vietnam War, and looks at United States policy as a continuous pursuit of militarism. For non-pacifists, it has a more limited appeal.

One very useful aspect, however, is its chronicling of some of the policy statements made during the course of the buildup to this unjust war, especially from the Vatican. One tends to forget just how much opposition there was to Bush's Hitlerite bombing campaign, in the current political climate.