

result is unlikely. The war would quickly be over. Oil installations and transport would escape. Let no one be fooled. Let all remember, from a world of past experience, that everything in war is uncertain. Those who speak with greatest certainty about a military action show only how little they are aware of their own limitations.

Like many others, I am reluctant, in any case, to trade blood (always that of other people) for jobs and economic advantage, even were the latter the present issue. But jobs and economic advantage will only be seriously at risk if, recklessly, we enlarge the conflict in the Middle East. . . .

## James E. Akins

### Conclusion

War is not inevitable. We are not living in a Greek tragedy where the gods have placed forces in motion which we cannot alter. Saddam Hussein has done a terrible thing and he must be allowed no profit. He will have none. I have said frequently here and elsewhere that he is not suicidal and I am sure that he is not seeking death. . . .

It would be gratifying to humiliate Saddam but I hope that is not the design of our policy. Equally, our policy should not be to save his face. I *hope* our policy is to avoid war, and if Saddam is able to leave Kuwait with a small measure of dignity, so be it.

Some of those who have testified recently in Congress and many who have spoken on television talk-shows oppose the current Bush initiative because they fear issues other than unconditional Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait might be discussed in Baghdad. My main fear has been that these "other issues" might *not* be discussed. My fear, however, has been almost completely laid to rest. It appears that Secretary Baker in Baghdad will repeat the Security Council Resolution, will assure Saddam we do not have a hidden agenda which includes an attack on Iraq after he is safely out of Kuwait. The Arab consensus is that the combined threat of war and offer of regional peace *will* be made and that Saddam, dignity intact, will accept. . . .

Still, the Middle East being the Middle East, it is too early to relax. It is both uncustomary and unwise to end a discussion of the Middle East on a positive note. While we can be certain that no further provocation will come from Saddam, there is no guarantee that there will be no terrible incident somewhere in Israel or in Saudi Arabia in the next six weeks that will lead us or the Israelis to conclude we have been stabbed in the back. This incident, if it were sufficiently ghastly, could result in an immediate attack on Iraq. Several groups in the Middle East—as here—do not want a peaceful solution. They advocate war and the destruction of Iraq—by us, of course. Arranging an "incident" would not be beyond their technical abilities. This may not happen, but we should be prepared for it. And before we respond with a blistering attack on Baghdad, we should be completely sure that the crime originated there.

# The ADL hawks war in the Gulf

by Jeffrey Steinberg

When syndicated columnist Pat Buchanan made his famous quip last August that only the state of Israel and its "amen corner" in the United States favor a Gulf war, he may have underestimated the extent to which British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and some senior Bush administration officials, including President Bush himself, were also chomping at the bit for a bloody clash. He certainly was not wrong in blasting such outfits as the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith and the ADL-allied *New Republic* magazine, for hawking a showdown with Iraq.

A sampling of some of ADL's recent public comments on the Gulf crisis and U.S.-Israeli relations paints a blood-curdling picture.

Over Oct. 25-27, 1990, the ADL held its annual National Executive Committee session in San Francisco. According to an ADL press release dated Oct. 27, the meeting was addressed by Rear Adm. Abraham Ben-Shoshan, the defense attaché to the Israeli Embassy in Washington. Admiral Ben-Shoshan warned that if "pushed into a corner," Saddam Hussein would attack Israel, and that Israel would answer such an attack with "no hesitation at all, with everything we have," a not-so-veiled reference to Israel's formidable arsenal of nuclear weapons.

Admiral Ben-Shoshan openly attacked the United States for spreading advanced technologies among the Arab states, warning the ADL executives: "The best American technology is going to the Middle East and we have to prepare ourselves to compete—not only against the best Russian, French, and European technology—but against the best American technology."

Barry Rubin, of the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee's (AIPAC) Washington Institute for Near East Policy, told the same gathering that the Bush administration is trashing Israel in an effort to win a "popularity contest with the Arab world."

*New Republic* editor-in-chief Martin Peretz told the ADL gathering that President Bush is not doing enough for Israel and may back down from taking the necessary military action against Iraq. "These are trying times for friends of Zion and Zionism itself," Peretz lamented. "Bush and Baker tilted

toward Iraq, even though Iraq started the war with Iran, bombed the *USS Stark*, and gassed not only Iranians, but the Kurds and Shi'ites of Iraq itself. When that policy failed, no one in the administration had the decency to repudiate it; there were no apologies, no resignations."

Labeling the Mideast a "rotten neighborhood," Peretz launched into a racist diatribe against Arabs for their "rent-a-crowd" populism and their routine use of "mayhem and murder." An ADL press release quotes the conclusion of the Peretz speech: "These [Arab attributes] are the impediments to the long-term prospects for peace in the Middle East."

### What 'low-profile' approach?

The tough war talk at the leadership gathering echoed a widely circulated document written by ADL National Director Abe Foxman and International Relations Director Kenneth Jacobson, titled "The Low-Profile Approach: Is It Worth It?" The two top ADL men questioned the so-called "low-key" approach being imposed on the Israeli government by the Bush administration, and warned that Washington had better remember that Israel is its only truly reliable regional ally. In effect, Foxman and Jacobson argued that Israel should be brought into the center of America's military plans against Saddam Hussein and that, as Reagan's Secretary of State George Shultz proved, a Washington-Jerusalem axis will not undercut U.S.-Arab collaboration:

"George Shultz understood how much Israel meant to the U.S., how American interests in the Arab world are not hurt by our relations with Israel, how so many of the Arab countries need the U.S. It is distressing to see the trends that appear to be undoing so much that was learned. . . .

"In fact, the U.S. insistence on a low profile by Israel is questionable on three levels. First, it rests on the false assumption that we must appease the Arab states; this distorts what has taken place in the Gulf crisis, which is that the U.S. saved the Arab world from the aggressor. Second, it prevents Israel, with all its military and intelligence capabilities, from making the kind of contribution that it could to the effort against Saddam. And finally, it has the effect of the U.S. appeasing the Arab world at Israel's expense."

If there was any doubt as to how ardently the ADL is peddling a desert bloodbath in which American GIs make the region safe for Greater Israel, they were dispelled on Nov. 14, when the ADL scheduled a dinner reception at New York City's Tavern on the Green featuring Henry A. Kissinger as the keynote speaker, addressing "The New World Order: Risks and Opportunities." An ADL spokeswoman told a caller that Kissinger's remarks were for ADL ears only and were not recorded or printed. Judging from Henry Kissinger's recent public displays of rug chewing at the prospect of any outcome to the Gulf crisis other than a war to the death with Saddam Hussein, it is not hard to imagine the kinds of comments he made behind closed doors with his cronies at the ADL.

## North gets subpoena in Roanoke trial

by Nora Hamerman

Lt. Col. Oliver North, who is walking away scot-free from his misdeeds in the Iran-Contra affair, will have to answer questions about the U.S. government's misconduct against Lyndon LaRouche and his political movement in the Roanoke, Virginia County Circuit Court. "Ollie" was served with a subpoena on Dec. 6, to give testimony in the trial of Anita Gallagher, Paul Gallagher, and Laurence Hecht, three collaborators of LaRouche who are the latest to be tried on trumped-up "securities violations" charges in Roanoke.

The subpoena to North was served at the request of defense attorneys, who were expected to begin their affirmative defense on Monday, Dec. 10.

Joseph Fernandez, North's business partner and the former CIA station chief in Costa Rica, physically attacked the process server while North was trying to evade service. A criminal complaint for battery and harassment has been sworn out before a Loudoun County, Virginia magistrate against Fernandez.

When a process server went to North's "Guardian Technologies" business in Loudoun County, North refused to come out of his inner office to accept the subpoena. After many hours, Fernandez came out of the building and yelled obscenities and physically menaced the process server. Later, after Sheriff's officers were called to the scene, one officer entered the building and came out and told the process server that North was no longer in the building. As the officers left, North sneaked out the door and got into his car without being served.

The next day, two process servers returned. Virginia law allows a subpoena to be served at a person's regular place of business by giving it to the person in charge of the business. When the process server gave the subpoena to the secretary and told her it was for North, Fernandez took the subpoena off the secretary's desk, shoved it into the jacket pocket of the process server, and pushed him out of the door, all the time shouting hysterically.

Joseph Fernandez was indicted by Independent Counsel Lawrence Walsh for his involvement in the Iran-Contra affair, but his case was thrown out when President George Bush and Attorney General Richard Thornburgh refused to release classified information to Walsh. Fernandez is now