

Clinton Bush-leaguers hit Iraq, predict Islamic terror

by Joseph Brewda

Ever since President Bill Clinton capitulated on May 22 to British and French demands that he do nothing to prevent their ally Serbia from completing its conquest of Bosnia-Herzegovina, the White House has seemed desperate to find some pretext to reassert U.S. power. This, and little else, is the reason for the U.S. bombing of Somalia beginning on June 12 and the cruise missile attack on Baghdad, Iraq on June 27. The FBI bust of an "Islamic terrorist ring" on June 23, that was allegedly intending to blow up U.N. headquarters, is part of the same effort, especially as U.S. government sources are pointing the finger at Sudan as responsible for the plot.

But rather than projecting U.S. power, this effort has demonstrated U.S. weakness, and has earned the ridicule or gleeful agreement on the part of those European governments that would like to encourage the U.S. decline; it has generated hatred throughout the rest of the world. For example, Russia praised Clinton's attack on Baghdad, claiming it was justified by the doctrine of "self-defense." Russia, now dramatically reemerging as a world power, and threatening a military intervention into Estonia, intends to justify its own intervention on the same pretext.

Addressing this situation on June 30, American statesman Lyndon LaRouche stressed in a radio interview that he had repeatedly warned last spring that Clinton had to move against Serbia, not only to stop the Balkan war but to prevent the destabilization of Europe. "The failure to move into Bosnia in April," he analyzed, "with lifting the arms embargo and . . . an air assault on some of these artillery positions of the Serb fascists, and then postponing that into May, and then backing down in May, changed the geometry of the situation, where the Clinton administration lost its entire dynamic. In that situation, the Bush-leaguers around Washing-

ton were able to say, in effect, you've got to do it like Bush. You've got to get your popularity back by hitting Iraq. So the Bush-leaguers got a go-ahead to hit Iraq."

But the sideshow flopped

On June 27, U.S. warships fired 23 cruise missiles at Iraqi intelligence headquarters in Baghdad, using the excuse that the United States had "compelling evidence" that the Iraqi government had attempted to kill former President George Bush while he toured Kuwait in April. Speaking before a meeting of the U.N. Security Council the next day, U.S. Ambassador Madeleine Albright claimed that the attack was legally justified under Article 51 of the U.N. Charter, which provides for "self-defense." Yet, U.S. representatives have consistently claimed that Bosnia does not have the right, under the same article, to arm itself against Serbian aggression.

Labeling the assassination story a "fabrication," Iraqi U.N. Ambassador Nizar Hamdoun challenged any government to provide evidence substantiating the plot. The story, he told the Security Council, was simply cooked up by Kuwait and the United States "to justify its [U.S.] aggression."

While the British, French, and Russian governments have all strongly praised the attack on Baghdad, even such staunch U.S. allies as Turkey and Egypt have been forced to distance themselves from the action, given the horrifying contrast to U.S. behavior vis-à-vis Bosnia. The new Turkish prime minister, Tansu Ciller, characterized the cruise missile attack as being solely a matter between Iraq and the United States that "does not directly relate to Turkey." Turkey would back international coordination against terrorism, "but," she emphasized, "an example of this should be given in Bosnia as well." Similarly, Egyptian Foreign Minister Amr Moussa stated, "I hope U.S. policy positions will be as firm toward the crimes

the Serbs of Bosnia-Herzegovina are committing.”

As one might expect, the Kuwaiti government endorsed the action, but other Persian Gulf states evaded official comment. Some, through their semi-official press organs, even denounced it. “Nobody has kind thoughts to offer on the obvious double standards employed by the United States. A couple of Tomahawks—in fact, probably the threat alone—would have sufficed to break the siege of Sarajevo,” commented the *Khaleej Times* of Dubai. Bahrain’s *Akhbar al Khaleej* noted that the United States was “harming its relations with Arab governments by arbitrary behavior toward the Arabs.” The reaction of the rest of the Islamic world was harsh, as typified by the Arab League, which expressed its “extreme regret at the military strike.”

States subject to possible Russian aggression were also quick to denounce the attack. “It would be very bad if someone assumed he was a world policeman,” said Polish President Lech Walesa. The Ukrainian Foreign Ministry said that “this action goes beyond the range of measures of punishment for terrorism.”

In a lame effort to explain away the difference in the U.S. responses on Bosnia and Iraq, Deputy Secretary of State Clifton Wharton said on June 27 that there is “a difference between a direct attack upon the United States and its international interests and a situation in which there is a collective approach to the situation in Bosnia. . . . In the Bosnian case,” he explained, “it has been an issue before the United Nations in which all of those nations are involved in decisionmaking. In this particular case it was a specific incident with regard to the United States alone.” Wharton’s statement followed his meeting with Indonesian President Suharto, who had harshly condemned the action.

Also on June 27, the U.S. Navy announced that it had redeployed the aircraft carrier *Theodore Roosevelt* from the Adriatic, where it had been stationed for possible action against Serbia, to the Persian Gulf. The implications of that further retreat was not lost on Moscow, either.

Islam, the new enemy image

The White House is, as if by default, adopting Islam as the new enemy image, now that the Russian threat is supposedly dead. This replacement of the Russian enemy image with that of the Muslim enemy image, is also the work of Britain, France, and the British puppet-state of Israel.

So, on June 23, the Clinton Justice Department announced that it had “smashed” a supposed Muslim fundamentalist plot to blow up U.N. headquarters and assassinate various figures such as U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali and Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak. A triumphant FBI told press that it had decided to make the arrests, after a five-month investigation, because “the subjects were actually mixing the witches’ brew,” that is, the explosives. The eight people arrested were alleged followers

of exiled Egyptian cleric Sheikh Omar Abdel Rahman who were said to also be implicated in the World Trade Center bombing of Feb. 26. The sheikh will be extradited to Egypt; the “Islamic Group” of Egypt has already threatened “reprisals” against U.S. interests worldwide.

To enhance the environment, the ABC News program “Nightline” on June 24 said that the conspirators, most of whom are Sudanese nationals, were aided by the Sudanese mission to the U.N. Citing government sources, news anchorman Ted Koppel said that Sudan has now become a “surrogate” for four other Mideastern alleged “state sponsors of terrorism”—Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Libya. As with the World Trade Center bombing, the specifics of the plot were not credible—for example, using a Sudanese government car to carry explosives into the U.N. The Sudanese government has denied the claims.

Preparations to make the Islamic enemy image a dominant theme of the Clinton administration were publicly launched on Feb. 24, when Israeli President Chaim Herzog traveled to Britain to expound on the threat. Herzog told BBC that Israel was engaged in a “major battle against Iranian-controlled Islamic fundamentalism. . . . It’s true that there’s no Soviet Union now threatening,” he explained, “but there are all sorts of lunatic states like Iran and Iraq and so forth, which could upset the balance in the world.” Two days later, the World Trade Center was bombed. Around that time, more attention was paid to the shootings of CIA officials in Langley, Virginia on Jan. 25, attributed to a Pakistani Muslim. Naturally, most of the experts interviewed on this threat, such as Cable News Network’s Wolf Blitzer, are closely tied to Israel.

Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin has now emerged as another promoter of the Islamic threat. Fundamentalists, backed by Iran, are establishing a worldwide “infrastructure of terror,” Rabin told reporters on a visit to France on July 2. “Have no illusion. They will not hesitate, whenever needed outside the Middle East, to use terror,” he warned. “We are seeing now a unique phenomenon—the rise of Khomeinism without Khomeini throughout the Middle East and North Africa.” Fundamentalists have also taken over Sudan, and have made it “a springboard for spreading and assisting all other movements” around the world, he added.

Seconding Rabin is Yossef Bodansky, director of the House Republican Task Force on Terrorism. The former editor of the Israeli Air Force magazine, Bodansky’s new book, *Target America: Terrorism in the U.S. Today* (New York: Shapolsky Publishers), put out in April, had the same line. “The World Trade Center bombing was only the beginning,” the dust jacket reads, “the terrorists are coming—and no Americans will be safe!” Bodansky, who the Israeli press has cited as implicated in the Jonathan Pollard-Mossad spy scandal of 1985, is part of the same circuit as Martin Indyk, who left his post as head of the research arm of the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee to become the chief of the Mideast division of Clinton’s National Security Council.