

Opposition to Iraq War 'Won't Go Away'

by Michele Steinberg

The year-long campaign that has been led internationally by U.S. Democratic Party 2004 Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche, to prevent an imperial war against Iraq, was boosted from an unexpected quarter—a behind-the-scenes faction of Britain's policy elite—on Jan. 9, when British Prime Minister Tony Blair's office put out an official statement that "January 27 . . . should not be regarded in any way as a deadline." The statement referred to the due date of the official report of the UN weapons inspectors in Iraq, as mandated in UN Security Council Resolution 1441. The Prime Minister's Office spokesman said that Blair had told his top ministers in a meeting that "the inspections team had only just acquired their full complement of inspectors in Iraq," and, "they should now be given the time and space to do their job properly."

Paralleling the London statements, U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell affirmed in Washington that Jan. 27 "is not necessarily a D-Day for decision-making." According to the Jan. 9 *Washington Post*, Powell said, "At that point, we will have to make judgments as to what to do next. What's the next step." On Jan. 7, in an interview with Public Radio International, Powell had stressed that "the President is anxious to find a peaceful solution. . . . The international community is looking for a peaceful solution." The U.S. is working with inspectors, "providing them information . . . and hope that they continue to do the kind of job they're doing now and intensify their work." Powell said he didn't think it possible to have a final result "after just two months."

There is much more behind the "dry as dust" statement from Blair's spokesman. First, a report exploded on Jan. 9 in the London *Daily Telegraph*—owned by Conrad Black, patron of the U.S. based "chicken-hawks"—that London was pressuring the United States to delay the war against Iraq until Fall 2003; which, if true, would indicate that the chicken-hawks' only ally had put on the brakes. The Prime Minister's spokesman strenuously denied the report.

But, even as the Blair government was announcing the deployment of troops and equipment to the Persian Gulf to demonstrate its support for a U.S.-led war, on Jan. 8, a virtual revolt was under way in Parliament. After an appearance by Blair, from which he left in haste after evading questions about whether he is committing Britain to war *outside* of the approval from the UN Security Council, the *Guardian* reported that "the veteran Labour MP and "father of the Com-

mons," Tam Dalyell, got up and asked for an emergency debate." (Dalyell's open letter to Blair follows). Dalyell argued that such a debate is the only way to know if war is supported by the "overwhelming conviction" of the population and if the "cause is just and . . . urgent for Britain." Even though the Speaker of the House refused the debate request, "about 200 MPs remained behind to listen to Mr. Dalyell. . . . This is an issue that won't go away," said the *Guardian*.

War Policy Isolated

As the new year began, opposition to the Iraq war, *and* to the imperial doctrine of "preventive war," began snowballing, with more and more senior political figures and governments saying that war should be taken *off the table*. And in the United States, the policy debate took a new turn, with an attack on the "axis of evil" diatribe in George W. Bush's 2002 State of Union speech, by Gen. Brent Scowcroft, the former National Security Adviser under President George H.W. Bush. Scowcroft was speaking on Jan. 5 on the CNN television talk-show "Late Edition." The next day, the *Washington Post* reported that Administration officials from President Bush "on down," were distancing themselves from the doctrine of "pre-emptive war," which was written into the White House "National Security Doctrine," put out in September 2002.

The preventive war doctrine was long advocated by the Israeli fascist grouping around Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, and was pushed on the United States by the pro-Sharon cabal around Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz and Defense Policy Board Chairman Richard Perle. Opposition to this doctrine is overdue, but it is still relegated to leaks and shadows. It was LaRouche who raised unique opposition to this policy as a violation of the American foreign policy tradition going back to President John Quincy Adams' idea of a community of principle among sovereign nations.

In July 2003, LaRouche's Presidential campaign distributed over 7 million leaflets before the November election, exposing the leaders of the utopian war drive in the Clash of Civilizations camp, and their association with Jabotinskyite fascists in Israel and the United States. In addition, the LaRouche movement distributed more than 100,000 copies of an *EIR* dossier exposing the role of the organized-crime-linked Senators John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Joseph Lieberman (D-Conn.) in running a coordinated campaign to blackmail the White House into starting an Iraq war. By October, several leading U.S. Senators, notably Robert Byrd (D-W. Va.) and Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.) attacked the idea of "preventive war" in the Senate debate—but few others.

On Dec. 31, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan used the occasion of an interview by Israeli military radio, to criticize the war rhetoric. He announced that "Iraq is cooperating and the inspectors have been able to do their work in an unimpeded manner, and I don't see an argument for military action now. We need to do everything to disarm Iraq, and the inspectors have been given fresh powers, which I think they are using well."



U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell continues to emphasize the effort to find a peaceful solution in Iraq. Jan. 27 "is not necessarily a D-Day" for an Iraq war, he said—in opposition to the pro-war "chicken-hawks."

In Germany, Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer said, in a year-end interview with *Der Spiegel* magazine, "We have to do everything for a peaceful resolution, even if our hope is growing smaller and smaller. Naturally, it depends on Baghdad's commitment to cooperate . . . [but] we must not accept any inevitability, just because troops are being massed. The German government will not deploy German troops for combat in a highly dangerous conflict, whose necessity as a last resort is not 100% convincing."

Fischer added, "The terrorism of Sept. 11 was the attempt to provoke the Western world into a Clash of Civilizations. To this day, I cannot recognize any link to the Iraq problem. We are tied up well enough with the war against terrorism. Therefore, it would be wrong . . . to proclaim regime change in Baghdad a supreme priority."

In late December, Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov and Deputy Foreign Minister Yuri Fedotov stressed that Russia's collaboration with the United States on Iraq is limited to Security Council Resolution 1441, on Iraq's not having weapons of mass destruction. Fedotov "reiterated Moscow's opposition to . . . 'regime change,' arguing that there is no basis in international law for such an attempt," reported the Russian news agency ITAR-TASS. He added that the UN inspectors' work was proving "constructive," and "now there is a chance to resolve the situation in the political sphere," including the prospect that sanctions could be lifted by the end of July 2003.

A profound attack on the idea of "preventive war" came from the Vatican, as Archbishop Renato Martino, chairman of the Pontifical Commission *Justitia et Pax*, presented the Pope's message for World Peace Day, Jan. 1, 2003. "Preventive war is a war of aggression, there is no doubt, and it cannot go under the definition of just war as a defensive war," he said

in a press conference on Dec. 17. "Defending oneself from an attack is a right for every state, but there must be an actual attack and not only the possibility of an attack." There was no doubt that the Pope's intervention was also pointed to Israel, where Sharon routinely sends out hit teams to "preventively" assassinate "suspected" terrorists.

Shift in the United States

How this international pressure can shift the balance in the United States, depends entirely on the international campaign coordinated by LaRouche, who has been critical in jamming up the drive for war in Iraq, since at least February 2002. In December 2002, LaRouche upped the pressure on Washington with his announcement of his Jan. 28, 2003 State of the Union webcast.

Then, on Jan. 1, in a New Year's message, he said, "There is no competent reason for the U.S. to continue its currently aversive policies toward Iraq or North Korea. . . ." The way to stop the war danger, said LaRouche, is for the Bush Administration to shift its policies, and take on the task of solving the terminal collapse of the global financial system.

Senior U.S. political figures are again speaking out against aspects of the mad utopian war frenzy. Former President Jimmy Carter denounced the "pre-emptive war" doctrine, and the Iraq war, when he accepted the Nobel Peace Prize. On Dec. 31, Warren Christopher, Secretary of State from 1992-97 under Bill Clinton, wrote a *New York Times* op-ed in which he said that President Bush should end the "fixation on Iraq," while pursuing a diplomatic solution to the North Korea crisis through coordination with South Korea, Japan, China, and Russia.

Then, on Jan. 5, Brent Scowcroft, who is very close to Bush senior, not only urged the diplomatic track with Korea, but added an attack on the "axis of evil" jargon. "The problem really started with the axis of evil," said Scowcroft, whereby Iraq, North Korea, and Iran "were dumped together with recipes that were supposed to handle the whole problem." Scowcroft said, "It's never been clear to me exactly why they were lumped together, other than it was a very catchy phrase in the State of the Union address." He added strong praise for South Korea's diplomatic efforts, warning, "One thing we have to remember is that we should not act in this area, about North Korea, except in the closest consultation with South Korea."

There is no question that Powell, Scowcroft, and other U.S. opponents of the Iraq war cannot defeat the utopian crazies without the crucial input of LaRouche.

Thus, over the next month, said LaRouche in a Jan. 4 interview, "what I'm going to do, in particular, I'm going to act as if I *were* the President. Because the country needs the kind of leadership, that this President does not yet have the knowledge and advice from his own, immediate circle, to know what to do. I know what to do. I may not know all the answers, but I know more answers than anybody else in the United States."