

Netanyahu's nuclear blackmail of the U.S.

by Joseph Brewda

The British monarchy is currently orchestrating a threatened Israeli nuclear showdown with Iraq. Its purpose is to blackmail President Bill Clinton into taking preemptive military action against Iraq, to block an "out of control" Israel from acting on its own. The British fear is that without this additional threat, a wavering Clinton might yet break free of their plan to lure him into a U.S.-Iraq war. But regardless of what Clinton does, they may launch an Israeli-Iraqi showdown, and possible military conflict.

British orchestration of the Israeli Armageddon scenario emerged on Jan. 27, when Australian diplomat Richard Butler, the head of the United Nations Special Commission, told the *New York Times*, completely out of the blue, that the Iraqis had enough anthrax and botulin toxin "to blow away Tel Aviv." He added that the missiles Iraq could use for that purpose "were very crude, but they work." Butler's earlier complaints, that Iraq has blocked his UN inspection teams from examining Saddam Hussein's palaces, provided the pretext for setting up the current crisis.

Iraqi Foreign Minister Saeed al Sahaf denounced Butler's *New York Times* claim the next day, saying it was meant to give the United States a pretext to attack. "We were shocked by the outrageous statements by Mr. Butler," he said, which "emphasized that Mr. Butler is not neutral." Information Minister Human Abdul Ghafar reported, "Iraq will not use weapons of mass destruction, for the simple reason that Iraq does not possess any of these weapons," adding that even when Iraq had chemical weapons, in the 1991 Gulf War, it never used them.

Since Butler's statement, the London *Times*, mouthpiece of the British foreign policy establishment, and the British-owned Hollinger Corp.'s *Jerusalem Post*, have been orchestrating an international press campaign to the effect that an "out of control" Israel might strike Iraq, including with nuclear weapons.

That Britain would push such an Israeli nuclear chicken game, was foreseen by American statesman and Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche, who warned of it last fall.

On Nov. 12, 1997, LaRouche warned in an interview with the "EIR Talks" radio program, that "Under British direction, the present virtual dictator of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, will launch a *nuclear Armageddon scenario* for the Middle East, which will resemble the 1962 Missile Crisis of the Soviet Union and the United States."

LaRouche specified, in an intelligence memorandum that day, that the purpose of the British scenario, was not a "limited-goal action within the immediate theatre in which the primary action is situated." The goal was its global effect, "a wildly, multiphase ricocheting effect," to ruin the potential of the United States, in partnership with China, in taking the lead in forcing through the bankruptcy reorganization of the collapsing monetary system, and replacing it with new one, based on an agreement among nation-states, to ensure economic recovery. The "source of the threat" LaRouche emphasized, "is thus not Britain's Israeli puppets, but the British monarchy itself."

Butler's hoax

The London *Times* escalated Butler's scare campaign on Jan. 29, two days following his *New York Times* statement, when it reported, without any evidence, that the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency had warned Israel of the accuracy of Butler's assessment. The paper further reported that Israel was prepared to launch a nuclear attack against Iraq in response.

"With tension mounting in the Gulf, the CIA has given a warning that Iraq is likely to fire Scud missiles armed with non-conventional warheads at Israel, if attacked by the Americans," the paper said, in a lead article entitled "Israel 'Threatens Nuclear Reply' to Iraq Germ Attack."

"Benjamin Netanyahu, the Israeli Prime Minister, called an emergency meeting of his inner security Cabinet to discuss potential responses to the Iraqi crisis," it added, saying that following the meeting "Israeli officials issued a tough warning to Baghdad, implying that President Saddam Hussein could expect a nuclear response to any chemical or biological attack."

"Surely Iraq must know that it will not pay to attack Israel, and that Israel has all the means necessary to make such an attack very, very dangerous for Iraq—much more dangerous for Iraq than it is for Israel," the paper quoted Netanyahu's communications director David Bar-Illan (also the former editor of the *Jerusalem Post*).

The *Times* then added the following lallaploozza: "Western security sources said that the likely response to any chemical or biological attack on an Israeli target, would be the dropping of an Israeli neutron bomb on Baghdad. Such weapons, which exist in Israel, but have never been publicly acknowledged, kill anything living within a limited range, with limited damage to property."

Unfortunately for the British establishment, however, not everyone in Israel agrees with such scenarios. Among these are Defense Minister Yitzhak Mordechai, who, when asked by the *Jerusalem Post* on Feb. 2 about the *Times* report, stated, "These reports are stupid. I don't know where they are coming from." Israeli Defense Force Chief of Staff Gen. Amnon Shahak, a reported critic of Netanyahu's war provocation policies, told the Knesset (parliament) on Feb. 3, that "the proba-



Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and President Bill Clinton, in 1996. Netanyahu is refusing Clinton's demand that Israel comply with the Oslo Accords, and, during a January 1998 visit to Washington, he participated in an anti-Clinton rally with Bush-linked evangelists.

bility that Saddam Hussein will try to involve Israel in the dispute is, in our estimation, very, very low.”

The British press has uniquely claimed that the Clinton administration has given Israel the go-ahead to carry out such counterstrikes. According to the Feb. 2 London *Times*, U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has informed the British government that “the United States will permit Israel to defend itself in the event of an attack on Iraq,” which it said, “raises the possibility of a wider war.”

That same day, Uri Dan, longtime mouthpiece for Israeli cabinet strongman Gen. Ariel Sharon, wrote in Australian publisher Rupert Murdoch's *New York Post*, that Clinton has signed a Presidential directive “allowing the United States to drop atomic bombs on Iraqi weapons sites, if Hussein launches a major biological attack on Israel.” The State Department has denied the accuracy of the report.

Earlier chicken games

British efforts to provoke an Israeli nuclear chicken game, in response to the global financial breakdown crisis, emerged last fall, just as LaRouche had warned, when Britain began pushing an Israeli showdown with Iraq, Iran, and Sudan, at the same time as it was trying to manipulate the United States into attacking the same targets.

The trigger for such a crisis at that time, LaRouche stated, was to have been bloody terrorist actions against Israel, by British-controlled, nominally “Islamic” terrorist gangs, with the purpose of mobilizing Netanyahu's two prime constituencies on behalf of war: his lunatic clique within Israel, and the British-Israelite, evangelical cults based in the British Com-

monwealth and the United States, typified by televangelists Pat Robertson and Jerry Falwell.

Since then, *EIR* has led an international campaign exposing British control over international terrorism. The related efforts of Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak, and other leaders of the Islamic world, to expose this fact, taken after the London-headquartered Islamic Group's massacre in Luxor, Egypt, on Nov. 17, have made it more difficult for Britain to use terrorist gangs for such purposes.

One of the first to push the nuclear conflict scenario, was British intelligence official Kenneth de Courcy, and his son Joseph, publicists of *Intelligence Digest*, a mouthpiece of the British-Israelite cult, which reported in its November 1997 issue that Netanyahu was considering preemptive nuclear attacks on Iran, over its alleged acquisition of a nuclear missile capability. It also said that a strike on Syria, allegedly already possessing chemical and biological warheads, was also being considered. A Nov. 16 dispatch in the London *Sunday Times*, claiming that Iraq was secretly making “poisonous gas” in Sudan, for the benefit of both countries, added that nation to the Israeli hit list.

A bellicose article in the Nov. 7 issue of the Israeli daily *Maariv* was another contribution to the nuclear Armageddon push at that time. “Sooner or later Iran will have missiles capable of reaching Israel, on which they will be able to load chemical, biological, or nuclear warheads,” Ben Caspit wrote. “There is also no doubt as to the essence of the response: It must be made clear to the Iranians that the moment they decide to make use of this weapon—the return strike will be severe and fatal. And here lies the dispute:

how to do so. Israel demands immediate action. The Americans are hesitant.”

Shortly following that threat, Netanyahu travelled to Britain, where he told the House of Commons on Nov. 14, that “if the supply of Russian technology is not stopped, then within a year, Iran will become self-sufficient and would be able to create missiles of its own.” *Jane’s Defense Weekly*, the British defense establishment outlet, lent its aid to the scenario when it wrote that Iran would be a nuclear power in four months.

Netanyahu’s trip to Washington later that week, where he was to have met Vice President Al Gore to talk to him on the Iranian nuclear threat, according to *Maariv*, was less well received. In an unprecedented snub, President Clinton refused to meet him, because of Netanyahu’s continuing efforts to rip up the Oslo peace accords negotiated by his murdered predecessor, Yitzhak Rabin.

Netanyahu returned to the United States on Jan. 19, where he staged an anti-Clinton, anti-Muslim hate rally with Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, and other Bush-linked evangelicals, who yearn for a Mideast Armageddon to bring on the “Rapture.” During his meeting with Clinton, Netanyahu adamantly refused the President’s demand that Israel comply with the Oslo Accords. The trip had been called the “last chance” for the peace process, by both the Egyptian government and the Palestinian Authority. Netanyahu’s defiance provoked newspapers in almost every Muslim country to write that Clinton had completely capitulated to Israel, enhancing the ability of Britain to set up the United States for the blame for any Israeli atrocity.

Documentation

Responses from the Mideast

Egypt

President Hosni Mubarak: “Time Not Right,” Egyptian Radio Network, Jan. 31. “President Hosni Mubarak has called on the international community to make further diplomatic efforts to resolve the Iraqi crisis. In a statement to Jalal Duwaydar, chief editor of *Al Akhbar* newspaper, he said the time is not right for any military operations, and the use of force would increase tension in the region. President Mubarak said it is important to make greater efforts to find alternatives that lead to respecting the UN Security Council resolutions.

“On Richard Butler’s statements that Iraq possesses weapons capable of destroying Tel Aviv, President Mubarak said that Butler was not successful in that regrettable state-

ment, which suggests, that what is being done, seeks not to implement the UN resolutions, but to serve Israel alone, irrespective of the negative impact on world security and stability, and on the interests of the states of the region.”

Jumhuriyah, the government paper, on Feb. 1, said that hitting Iraq would cover up for Clinton’s scandals. “U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright’s recent statement, that the United States is running out of patience with the crisis between Baghdad and the UN inspection teams tasked with destroying Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction, confirms our expectations. We speculated that President Bill Clinton would resort to the solutions that are always ready for facing his domestic crises, namely, military actions against Iraq, even if the United States acts alone, in order to create a hullabaloo that covers up his sex scandals. What really is noticeable is that the United States has apparently decided to coordinate this strike with Israel. The energetic Secretary even announced that Iraq has biological weapons, threatening Tel Aviv, without providing a single piece of evidence.

“We assert to the Americans, that hitting Iraq this time, will have grave consequences for all the Middle East, including U.S. interests themselves. No one agrees to the humiliation of the Iraqi people still further. We also assert that the ‘hullabaloo’ that will be created by such an aggression, will not cover up the President’s nauseating scandals.”

Jordan

Crown Prince Hassan fears civil wars would result from an attack on Iraq, according to statements reported by MBC TV, from London, on Feb. 1. “Once again we are talking about destabilization in the region. Why? Is it about Richard Butler’s inspection teams’ entry into the sensitive Iraqi installations? Does Iraqi pride rest on a principled stand that is securing a decent living for the Iraqi people in this manner? We are talking about escalating strikes, which means total devastation. For what reason? For preventing inspectors from visiting the palaces, of which there are scores it seems.

“The region cannot live through a continual crisis, nor can it shoulder the cost. Therefore, I believe that the coming strike will be more devastating than any one before it. On our part, we have contacted our friends around the world, in a bid to find a solution to the crisis, and to ward off a military strike on Iraq. I believe that the coming conflict will bring with it a widespread devastation, and maybe internal conflict, or civil wars. Therefore, we hope we will not witness this nightmare in the coming weeks or months.”

Saudi Arabia

Riyadh al Jazirah, the government paper, on Feb. 1, said that diplomacy is the solution to the Iraq crisis. “It is now clear that the United States is exercising immense pressure on its Western allies and friends in the Arab states, to secure their support for its belief that the diplomatic efforts with the Iraqi regime to resolve the crisis of weapons inspectors did

not produce any result, and that a military option is now necessary, to force this regime to implement the UN resolutions, and allow arms inspectors to visit any site where they suspect weapons of [mass] destruction or material used to produce them may be concealed.

“A military strike will provide a pretext to the Iraqi regime, which has now exhausted all its energy and reached a low point of despair and hopelessness, to stop any relationship or cooperation with the UN commission charged with arms inspections. This may mean another complication to the crisis, which will make it difficult to find a solution in the near future, and which may prolong the sanctions that are harming the Iraqi people, and not the rulers.

“We also believe that intensifying political and diplomatic pressure against the Iraqi regime, and besieging the regime with such pressures, will force it to implement the UN resolutions as quickly as the world community wishes, to lift the sanctions that are imposed on the brotherly Iraqi people.”

Qatar

Doha AlRayah, the government paper, on Feb. 1, said that the United States is opposed to a diplomatic solution. “The fact is that the United States did not give, and does not want to give, diplomacy a chance. By moving so rapidly toward the use of force, it leaves no chance or time for diplomacy to succeed. Madeleine Albright announced that the potential strike is going to be a major one. Britain said it will not evade its responsibility. And so, Washington and London agree on a military

strike that we believe will only bring further instability to the region and more power for the Iraqi regime. Nothing will change, but the suffering of the Iraqi people will increase, and more Iraqi children will die for nothing. The only advantage of an attack on Iraq would be to lessen the impact of the American President’s sexual scandal.”

Turkey

Deputy Prime Minister Bulent Ecevit warned of “grave consequences” of a strike on Iraq, the newspaper *Hurriyet* reported on Jan. 31. He told the press on Jan. 30, “A new military operation against that country, before all diplomatic avenues are tried, and exhausted, may produce very grave consequences for the region, especially for Turkey.”

Palestine

Al Quds, the newspaper of the Palestine Liberation Organization, in Jerusalem, on Feb. 2 condemned the United States for using a double standard. “The United States is continuing to exert efforts on all levels, to mobilize international support for inflicting a military blow on Iraq, under the slogan of implementing the resolutions of international legitimacy, despite the fact that diplomatic efforts are being exerted by Russia, and other quarters, to solve this crisis in a peaceful manner. The same United States is still renegeing on international resolutions pertaining to the Palestinian cause, and even on the Palestinian-Israeli agreements, which bear the signature of its representatives, in an attempt to create pretexts, and raise ‘ideas’ or ‘proposals,’ which are contradictory to what



Egyptian Prime Minister Hosni Mubarak and President Bill Clinton. Mubarak warns that U.S. action against Iraq will have a disastrous effect on the entire region.

has been agreed on, so that it can become closer to the hard-line Israeli government's position.

"What is happening now can only strengthen the conviction of any Arab that the United States is pursuing a double standard policy, by its flagrant bias toward Israel, and its attempts to conceal the real causes that endanger the peace process, while spreading all its weapons against the besieged Iraqi people. This means also that further blows will be inflicted on U.S. credibility, and its role in sponsoring the peace process."

Iran

The Iranian Defense Minister warned of an oil grab, the Iranian Republic News Agency reported on Feb. 2. "Iranian Minister of Defense and Armed Forces Logistics Rear Admiral Ali Shamkhani said on Monday, that the current tranquility and security prevailing in the Persian Gulf, thanks to the cooperation and goodwill of the neighboring littoral states, are on the verge of collapse with the U.S. new armada deployment. Shamkhani called on the Islamic states, especially the regional states, to stand against the U.S. military provocations in the region. He appealed for cooperation among the Islamic states, to help resolve the crisis in the Persian Gulf, and prevent the U.S. from waging a new war. Shamkhani termed the U.S. claims to the leadership of the world, as illogical, and said the White House has attempted to escalate tension and war in the Persian Gulf, to find an easy access to the energy resources of the region."

Syria

Al Bath, the ruling party newspaper, predicted more wars if Iraq is attacked, as reported by the Syrian News Agency on Feb. 1: "The newspaper *Al Bath* has urged the U.S. administration to resort to compromise solutions which (the world hopes) would restore rationality, and not to do anything reckless with regard to Iraq. The paper emphasizes that the use of force will expose Iraq and the region to new dangers, further complicate the problem, and leave the door wide open for bad options.

"The paper points out that Washington's enthusiasm for military action derives from numerous U.S. objectives and designs, the least among which is to take over the international decisionmaking process, and leave out the major role played by the United Nations. However, the paper adds, the international community's enthusiasm for diplomatic solutions prevents Washington's policy from being implemented. The position of the international community proceeds from several facts, chief of which is that the use of force will cause even greater suffering for the Iraqi people, under the embargo already imposed on them.

"The paper notes that Arab states have affirmed their total rejection of using force against Iraq. The use of force will be an unjustified hostile act, that will return the region to the cycle of violence and tension."

Lebanon

Foreign Minister Faris Buwayz warned of repercussions of an attack on Iraq, Radio Monte Carlo reported on Feb. 3. "Although we urge Iraq to comply with the UN resolutions, we are surprised at the current muscle-flexing, that we do not witness when it comes to the implementation of other UN resolutions. We do not see similar muscle-flexing, when many other UN resolutions are not implemented. Nor do we see it, when Israel refuses to sign the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. This makes us feel that UN Security Council Resolutions are selectively implemented, and are backed by military power only selectively, and according to the wishes of some parties. Hence, we do not think that a military strike will solve the problem. Indeed, we warn of the negative repercussions that such a military strike might have."

Yemen

Parliament Speaker Shaykh Abdallah al Ahmar sees an anti-Islamic bias, *Al Sharq al Awsat* reported on Feb. 2. "Any strike against Iraq, or for that matter against any other Arab country, is a strike against all the Arabs, and any insult to Iraq is an insult to the entire Arab nation. The Americans' aim is clear. They will never be content until they obliterate the identity of the Arab and Islamic nation. This is because the United States considers the Muslims and the Arabs to be the enemy, now that Communism has ended."

The Science of Christian Economy

And other prison writings by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Includes

In Defense of Common Sense, *Project A*, and *The Science of Christian Economy*,

three ground-breaking essays written by LaRouche after he became a political prisoner of the Bush administration on Jan. 27, 1989.

\$15

Order from:

Ben Franklin Booksellers, Inc.

Toll free (800) 453-4108 (703) 777-3661 fax (703) 777-8287

Shipping and handling: Add \$4 for the first book and \$.50 for each additional book in the order. Virginia residents add 4.5% sales tax. We accept MasterCard, Visa, American Express, and Discover.

