

EIR Feature

Gore, British push world to brink of nuclear war

by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach

Unless a dramatic shift is effected in foreign policymaking in Washington, the world is threatened by the outbreak of regional wars, each of which could unleash a strategic confrontation, up to and including the exchange of nuclear weapons. This is the picture which emerges from the developments which have ensued from the watershed decision in December, on the part of the British and Gore's Principals Committee inside the U.S. administration, to proceed with unilateral aerial bombardments of Iraq. That decision, taken in Washington by the *golpista* government which has seized power from President Clinton, through the impeachment process, signalled a turning-point in world strategic affairs: It arrogantly declared to the world that the U.K. and the United States would move at will as an imperial power; and, it established the fact, as Secretary of Defense William Cohen remarked at the Wehrkunde meeting in Munich on Feb. 5-7, that the U.K. and United States would not "let their hands be tied" by dissenting views of the other permanent members of the UN Security Council.

The underlying dynamic

The dynamic behind the insane rush toward confrontation, lies in the unravelling of the world's financial and monetary structures. The crisis sweeping from Asia, through Russia, and into Ibero-America, has reached the point of no return. The financial elites identified in the British-American-Commonwealth (BAC) faction, who have utterly lost control over the crisis, have responded according to historical profile, by unleashing military aggression, in hopes that they may thereby reestablish an iron grip on world affairs.

If the facts on the ground of Iraq's battered terrain documented that international law had been torn to shreds by that December action, the subsequent statements and actions of leading proponents of the BAC left no doubt that the entire NATO doctrine had also been unilaterally rewritten, to suit the BAC grouping's strategic intentions.



Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen (left) listens as Gen. Henry H. Shelton, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (at podium), briefs reporters at the Pentagon on Aug. 20, 1998. Cohen, Shelton, and other members of Al Gore's Principals Committee, are fanning the flames of war in virtually every part of the world. Never, since the collapse of communism in Russia in 1991, has the threat of nuclear war been so great.

With the stepped up aerial aggression against Iraq in January, plans moved rapidly forward to enter the final phase of the operation against Iraq, elaborated by Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Henry Shelton: to ready ground forces for entering Iraq under cover of aerial bombardments and cyberwar, in order to establish a puppet regime, and overthrow the government in Baghdad.

It is estimated by military experts, that late March-early April is the time frame for opening what the British Foreign Office hit-man for the region has called the "final chapter" in the Iraq saga. At the same time, Israeli desperado Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu is gearing up for conflict with Lebanon and/or Syria. Israel Defense Minister Moshe Arens directed his general staff to review the Israeli Defense Forces deployment in Lebanon, and to present "alternatives." Arens said that he was "not convinced that the way to deal with the Lebanese problem is necessarily through negotiations." Defense analyst Ze'ev Schiff correctly pointed out in the Israeli daily *Ha'aretz*, that Arens, of the hawk faction, would risk war with Syria. At the same time, a contrived story appeared in the London *Times*, claiming that Syria had a "secret deal" with Iraq, "for the supply of military equipment," i.e., establishing Syria as a viable target for Israeli attacks.

Simultaneously, new theaters of war were being traced out on the world map. The madmen of the U.S. Congress—the same who had orchestrated impeachment hearings against President Clinton in the year-long cold coup d'état process—

have been working overtime to propagate hysteria over a "new Yellow Peril," in a racist diatribe against the People's Republic of China. Not one day has gone by since the Senate vote on impeachment, without there being a new twist to the propaganda war: The infamous Cox Commission report released to Congress in January, claimed to substantiate charges that China had gained access to military technology from satellite and computer exports, as well as through outright espionage. Conveniently, in February and March, following the sabotage of the Hughes satellite deal, on hoked-up charges of "dual use" dangers, a series of cases were constructed, purporting to show that Chinese spies were feverishly gathering intelligence in the nation's scientific institutions, including at Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico and at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California.

The immediate intent of the drumbeat against Beijing, is to sabotage the upcoming summit between Chinese Prime Minister Zhu Rongji and President Clinton. Together with the unilateral U.K.-U.S. bombardments of Iraq, the anti-China campaign aims to reverse Clinton's policy of a "strategic partnership," with both Beijing and with Moscow, and to replace partnership with confrontation.

The war theater designated in Asia is North Korea. Again, it is the clique of impeachers in the Congress, in coordination with the Principals Committee—Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, Cohen, Shelton, and Vice President Al Gore—who are fueling the flames of war against North Korea, some-

thing which would be utterly unacceptable to both Moscow and Beijing. In House International Relations Committee hearings on Feb. 25, committee chairman Benjamin Gilman (R-N.Y.) went so far as to assert that North Korea posed a security threat to America, saying, “We must now worry

about our safety in Seattle, not just Seoul.” The target of the ravings is Clinton’s 1994 “Framework Accord” with North Korea, regarding nuclear energy, an accord supported by both China and Russia. In the immediate term, Gilman et al. seek to prevent any steps that might be taken, by Clinton’s special

Only weeks away from a nuclear war?

What follows is the text of a mass leaflet released by the Lyndon LaRouche Committee for a New Bretton Woods, in a run of 500,000 across the United States. The same text is being mass-circulated in leaflets in Europe and Ibero-America, and, ultimately, on every continent.

March 7, 1999

The worldwide financial crisis has entered its terminal phase. Southeast Asia, Japan, Russia, Brazil, the financial derivatives bubble—these are all merely facets of the same general systemic collapse. But how is the international financial oligarchy—the beneficiaries of this bankrupt, plunder- and speculation-based system—reacting to the crisis?

Instead of implementing the urgently needed reorganization, and instead of protecting citizens and the real economy against the effects of the collapse, they are reacting just as financial oligarchies have always done in the past: Start a war—or, even better, a number of them—so that a wartime regimen can be used to get back in control!

Remember 1989-90? With the collapse of the Berlin Wall and Germany’s reunification, everyone was talking about a great historic opportunity for Europe—and with good reason. But then U.S. President George Bush and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher decided to launch the war in the Persian Gulf, for purely geopolitical reasons, in order to break Germany’s historic momentum, and in order to establish the “New World Order”—their new label for Anglo-American hegemony. The subsequent war in the Balkans was merely a continuation of the geopolitics of the Persian Gulf war, the chief aim being to prevent Germany from playing a pivotal role in the economic development of Russia and eastern Europe. For the same geopolitical reasons, following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the International Monetary Fund’s “reform policy” was devised to ensure that Russia’s industrial base would collapse, and that it would be degraded into a mere supplier of raw materials. Russia, quite understandably,

felt that it had been betrayed by the West.

The systemic financial crisis has now reached its critical phase. President Clinton, who had, and maybe still has, the potential to act in the tradition of Franklin D. Roosevelt and implement the necessary reforms, has been paralyzed by a year of continuous bombardment from the Lewinsky affair—a veritable information war in its own right. And even though the impeachment vote failed, this attempted putsch against the U.S. Constitution was relatively successful nevertheless: Al Gore and the so-called Principals Committee (Cohen, Shelton, Albright, etc.), acting on behalf of the financial oligarchy, have succeeded in assuming control over American policy-making.

A strategic earthquake

As the result of this coup d’état against the office of the President, a strategic earthquake occurred last December—an event that escaped the attention of the absolute majority of people in the West, particularly in the United States. As a result of the December military strike against Iraq, which British Prime Minister Tony Blair, Gore, and the Principals Committee had manipulated the United States and Great Britain into undertaking unilaterally—at the moment when the UN Security Council convened about the situation in Iraq—international law suddenly ceased to have any meaning. From then on, the only thing that counted, was unilateral Anglo-American hegemony. The reaction in Russia and China, and in many other parts of the world, was deep shock—and also a complete re-evaluation of their own security situation.

At the same time, the old NATO was secretly laid to rest in an unmarked grave. And suddenly, without any public debate in the U.S. Congress, in the British Parliament, or in the German Bundestag, the United States and Great Britain declared that NATO now had a new mission: to act as a global intervention force, requiring no UN approval, against so-called “rogue states.” Interventions were to be carried out through a combination of air strikes, special forces, and information warfare. The message which the December strike against Iraq was intended to convey, was clear enough: This will be the future form of warfare, potentially, against any state. The question for continental Europe suddenly ceased to be one of integration into the NATO structure, but rather one of submission under U.S.-British hegemony.

envoy, former Defense Secretary William Perry, to review U.S. policy toward North Korea, in terms of lifting sanctions and restoring diplomatic relations.

The policy pursued by the BAC is, instead, outright war. As revealed in a Seoul paper, a plan devised by Paul

Wolfowitz and Richard Armitage, formerly members of the Bush Defense Department, calls for a “two-stage approach”: the imposition of “Iraq-style” inspections in North Korea, and, if Pyongyang refused to comply, a U.S. military buildup in South Korea, combined with a blockade of North Korea.

Evidence is mounting that around the beginning of April, there will be an escalation of the warfare against Iraq, including mass bombardment, in parallel with deployment of ground troops, set to occur simultaneously with a Turkish military intervention into northern Iraq. The timing can be expected to coincide with a peaking of Israeli operations against Syria, the idea being to effect a “general cleanout” in the Middle East, in the course of which both Saddam Hussein and Syria’s Hafez Assad are to be eliminated. And in the event that the plan goes awry, use of tactical nuclear weapons cannot be ruled out.

And now, the unthinkable: The architects of this scenario are convinced that Russia’s reaction to a tactical nuclear strike in the Middle East and Central Asia, would be unpredictable. Part of this “war game” is therefore a limited exchange of nuclear strikes between Russia and the U.S.A., that would result in the combined loss of “only” about 50 million human lives on both sides. The calculation also includes a possible war between the U.S.A. and North Korea, according to former Bush adviser Robert Blackwill, who made this brutal announcement at a Center for European Integration Studies conference in Bonn on March 4. And, of course, nuclear weapons could play a role in North Korea, too.

As we have already indicated above, this “catastrophe scenario” is being played out against the backdrop of an impending systemic collapse of the entire international financial system.

Stop the insanity!

We must put a stop to this insanity! The matter must be brought up for inquiry in parliaments and congresses of every nation. Governments must immediately provide clarification on the following points:

- Are preparations currently under way for a new, escalated military strike against Iraq in early April, and, if so, what is the purpose of this war?
- Are parallel preparations under way in Israel for a war against Syria, using “Islamic terrorists” as a pretext?
- What is the significance of the new NATO doctrine that is to be officially adopted at the upcoming NATO summit in April? Do the United States and Great Britain have war plans that anticipate deployment of nuclear weapons in the near term?
- Does President Clinton know about such plans?

These questions — questions which will determine the very existence of our nations — must be clarified immediately.

But if humanity is to be saved from plunging into barbarism, the underlying cause of civilization’s present crisis must be removed as well. And that means that the bankrupt world financial system must be rapidly reorganized. President Clinton must exert the authority of the office of President of the United States, and must immediately convene a conference to establish a New Bretton Woods system. The present bankrupt financial system must be replaced by a new system that encourages production, instead of speculation.

A ‘Survivors’ Club’

Russia and China are not enemies of the West. President Clinton is correct when he states that the preservation of peace in the 21st century depends on the strategic partnership between the United States and China.

China, Russia, and a growing number of Asian nations have realized that they will only be able to survive, if they act to protect themselves against the effects of globalization and the world financial crisis, which for some time now have been spilling over into depression of the real economy. China, Russia, and India have therefore joined together into a “strategic triangle,” which other nations will now join. This strategic partnership represents no threat to the West; rather, these nations, constituting a kind of “Survivors’ Club,” are simply committing themselves to the same values and principles that at an earlier time were also the natural tradition of the United States and western Europe: national sovereignty, scientific and technological progress as the basis of all social wealth, and the state’s responsibility to ensure the general welfare of its citizens.

It is also in the best fundamental interest of the United States and Europe, that the Eurasian Land-Bridge be expanded — i.e., that Eurasia’s infrastructure and economy become integrated, so that it may function as the keystone for global reconstruction of the world economy. And that includes the industrialization of Africa and Latin America.

We call upon you, fellow citizen, to ensure that the response to this crisis is not war; instead, let our answer be a new, just world economic order!

Give us a call! Join us in a worldwide mobilization!

The plan also includes “preparations for a preemptive military strike on suspected nuclear facilities” in North Korea.

That such an option is being actively considered in Washington, was announced to a European audience on March 4 by Robert Blackwill, who blatantly announced, “There is a real chance of war between the U.S. and North Korea, a war on the Korean Peninsula that will have enormous economic consequences across Asia. . . . As we confront the rise of Chinese power, it will be very hard for the international situation.” Blackwill concluded with the suggestion, “Don’t be surprised about American unilateralism.”

And Defense Secretary Cohen, on tour in the Persian Gulf, told U.S. troops there that they should be prepared “to take on someone like Saddam, or be able to go to war in Korea if that should become necessary.”

‘There is a limit to the tyrant’s power’

If the unilateral U.K.-U.S. military aggression against Iraq in December threw down the gauntlet to Russia, China, and, implicitly, the entire “international community,” the challenge has not gone unanswered. From various capitals, voices are being raised, openly rejecting what is being increasingly perceived as the arrogance of Anglo-American power.

Most significant is the continuing development of a positive alternative to the underlying cause of the war danger—financial and economic breakdown. This alternative lies in the combination of forces in the “Survivors’ Club,” centered around China, Russia, and India, which have determined that they will not subject their economies and populations to the ravages of the breakdown crisis.

What has emerged, in addition to this positive dynamic, are rumblings of discontent among European governments, as well as in the various designated war theaters, against the strategic insanity of the BAC.

In the Middle East and Persian Gulf, for example, Defense Secretary Cohen was treated to an unprecedented, cold welcome from many of the Arab Gulf sheikhdoms which the BAC considers their property. During a tour of the region, Cohen was not able to hold a joint press conference with any of his hosts, except the Foreign Minister of Qatar, who openly attacked the U.S.-U.K. strikes against Iraq. Cohen had offered the Gulf states yet more military deliveries, including air-to-air missiles, as well as intelligence sharing on alleged Iraqi and Iranian missile launches. He furthermore advanced the cause of joint training and maneuvers of ground forces, which reportedly the Saudis accepted. But the response to Cohen was cold: In Bahrain, the content of Cohen’s briefing to the Emir, probably regarding the next phase in the war plans, was apparently so unacceptable, that the Emir immediately suffered a heart attack and died. When Cohen faced the press in the U.A.E., he was assailed by a torrent of hostile questions from reporters. Cohen was grilled on what he had said to American troops regarding their readi-

ness to go to war, even against North Korea. He was challenged on the legitimacy of the “no-fly zone”; he was asked if the United States were exploiting the Iran-Iraq danger, in order to sell weapons to the region; and so forth. When a question was directed to Sheikh Hamad, regarding support for the bombardments against Iraq, Cohen’s host replied, “We wish not to see Iraq being bombed daily.” Acknowledging differences with the U.S. policy, he stressed, “I cannot say we support the daily no-fly zone attacks.”

Reactions in Europe

In Europe, as well, signs of a sane rejection of war were to be seen. Most significant was the historic visit of Iranian President Seyyed Mohammad Khatami to Italy, the first of an Iranian President to Europe since 1979. Khatami’s talks with the Italian government at all levels, and his several public appearances, stressed the need for dialogue in place of conflict. As to the reason why Italy had been chosen as the first country on his European tour, Khatami pointed to the cultural heritage of Italy, especially to the Renaissance, as the basis for modern civilization. Following talks with political personalities, it was made clear that Iran agreed with Italy and France on the need to stop the military confrontation in the Persian Gulf immediately, and to seek peace.

The visit of the Iranian head of state to Italy was crowned by a personal meeting with Pope John Paul II, who has been campaigning indefatigably to prevent war. The historic meeting of the Shi’ite leader and the head of all Catholics, established the basis for a “militant ecumenism,” a profound exchange between Islam and Christianity, between Europe and Asia, directed toward securing world peace, through cooperation. Khatami’s visit was a direct challenge to the arrogance behind the dual containment policy. The fact that Italy and France had just signed a huge contract with Iran for development of oil fields a week earlier, was another slap in the face of the forces in the United States who uphold the absurd D’Amato sanctions.

Finally, reactions in Europe to the judicial barbarism shown by American authorities, in defiance of international law and the norms of morality, have been crucial. In response to the decision by American authorities to proceed with the execution of two German prisoners, sentenced to death, despite a ruling by the international court in The Hague, triggered a massive wave of protest in Germany. And, the incomprehensible decision to acquit the U.S. military pilot, Captain Ashby, responsible for the deaths of 20 persons killed in a ski gondola crash in Italy, led to the decision by Italian Prime Minister Massimo D’Alema to review the entirety of the Italian-American 1954 treaties in the context of NATO.

Such steps signal the beginnings of a movement stretching from Eurasia now into western Europe, which could organize forces who will say no to the arrogance of the BAC.