

Gore ignored the volumes of evidence that Iraq's defense programs had been inspected many times, and destroyed—evidence provided by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and by UNSCOM itself. He ranted, "How many people is [Saddam Hussein] going to kill . . . ? He's already demonstrated a willingness to use these weapons. He poison-gassed his own people. He used poison gas and other weapons of mass destruction against his neighbors. . . . So, this is a way to save lives."

Gore's fixation on overthrowing Saddam Hussein has nothing to do with the report by UNSCOM's Richard Butler, but with a raw hatred of Iraq, and the very idea of development for countries of the Third World, especially through use of nuclear energy.

In a speech in September 1991, after then-Senator Gore had thrown his full support behind Bush's Desert Storm, Gore revealed his ulterior motive: "In general, the world does not need the contributions of Iraqi space science or of Iraqi work in nuclear physics—practical or applied. The United States should work to completely block future Iraqi activity of any kind in these areas, to the extent they are dependent upon equipment, services, or training—including university training—available from any country with advanced capabilities. . . . There is no way to think about certain branches of science and engineering in Iraq except as tap roots for . . . mass destruction."

How Britain and Israel set up the Iraq trap

by Joseph Brewda

A network of British and Israeli agents and assets within the highest levels of the U.S. government was responsible for the United States' disastrous Dec. 16-19, 1998 war on Iraq. *EIR* has determined that this network, operating through a constellation of think-tanks and former U.S. government officials, especially from the Bush years, maneuvered through the offices of Vice President Al Gore, to finally push Clinton into the anti-Iraq decision.

As reported below, a series of meetings—which excluded Clinton—were held by cabinet officials and their Zionist mafia-linked underlings, who made detailed military and political plans against Iraq. Then, while returning from his ill-fated and fruitless trip to Israel and Gaza, Clinton was presented with the *fait accompli* of an Iraqi war-plan, using the hoax of Australian diplomat Richard Butler's report that the government of Iraq had "refused" to cooperate with Butler's UN Special Commission (UNSCOM)—in a mere five instances out of 427 inspections!

The purpose of the moves to trigger this war, by these British/Israeli traitors, is to pave the way for the Vice President Al Gore to become President, whom Britain and Israel hope to install as soon as possible. The Iraq action was conceived as a set-up of Clinton, based on a controlled environment of lying reports on Iraq, and cover-ups for the expected domestic and international blowback from the projected assault that leaves Clinton isolated and vulnerable.

Britain and Israel's aim is to preclude the possibility of a New Bretton Woods financial system, based on renewal of the kind of policy that President Franklin D. Roosevelt had during World War II, for U.S. cooperation with Russia and China against British imperialism, as Lyndon LaRouche has advocated. Typifying the dangerous game afoot, Heritage Foundation analyst Ariel Cohen exclaimed that Russian Prime Minister Yevgeni Primakov's call, in the aftermath of the strikes against Iraq, to form a "strategic triangle" among Russia, China, and India, to economically develop an Asia continent ravaged by the International Monetary Fund, is an effort to "gang up on the U.S."

Secondly, Britain and Israel hoped the raid on Iraq would provoke terrorist attacks within the United States, and against U.S. interests worldwide, which could be linked to Iraq, and lead to further destabilizations. They also hoped to discredit and destabilize moderate Muslim countries friendly to the United States. The U.S. bombing of a civilian pharmaceutical factory in Khartoum, Sudan, in August 1998, misidentified as a chemical warfare site, was done for the same British and

"Long before Paula Jones, long before Monica Lewinsky, there was a conscious decision, made in London, that there would be a full-scale campaign to destroy Bill Clinton, and to destroy, once and for all, the credibility of the office of the Presidency of the United States."

—Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.



A 56-minute video featuring LaRouche, *EIR* Editors Jeffrey Steinberg and Edward Spannaus. **\$25** postpaid

Order number EIE 98-001

EIR News Service P.O. Box 17390 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390
To order, call 888-EIR-3258 (toll-free). We accept Visa or MasterCard.

Israeli geopolitical aims.

The 70-hour war against Iraq involved at least 250 raids and 425 cruise missiles, according to press reports, almost double the total number of missiles used in the 45-day Desert Storm war in 1991. Targets comprised 30 sites said to be involved in producing weapons of mass destruction, 33 airfields or defense installations, 20 communications nodes, and 10 sites used by Republican Guards.

Why was this done? And why at this time? According to the U.S. State Department, it was necessary to strike Iraq because Richard Butler, the Australian diplomat who directs UNSCOM, had issued a derogatory report on Iraq on Dec. 15.

But, as reported in the Jan. 1, 1999 issue of *EIR*, the Butler report is an internationally recognized hoax! Butler alleges that the Iraqi government refused to allow his team to inspect five sites out of the 427 site-inspections that were requested since Nov. 17. In one case cited, Butler condemns the Iraqis for making the simple request that the number of inspectors be limited to ten at any one time, rather than the 30 Butler demanded.

Moreover, according to a *Washington Post* interview with National Security Adviser Sandy Berger, and other administration sources, the decision to prepare to bomb Iraq was taken on Nov. 15, the very day that President Clinton had aborted the U.S. bombing mission against Iraq, and forced his cabinet and British Prime Minister Tony Blair to accept Iraq's pledge to allow inspections by UNSCOM. So, even before Butler returned to Iraq with his inspections, and long before his report, the plans for the next attack against Iraq were set.

Among the most vociferous critics of Clinton's "back-down" were the British—Prime Minister Blair made repeated calls to Clinton on Nov. 13 and 14, attempting to force him to change his decision; British Foreign Minister Robin Cook wrote a blistering article for the Hollinger Corp.'s *Daily Telegraph*; and Lady Margaret Thatcher—who, as Prime Minister, "stiffened" George Bush for the original 1991 Desert Storm—derided Clinton for being weak, according to another commentary in the *Telegraph*. Thatcher chairs the International Advisory Board of the anti-Clinton Hollinger Corp. media empire.

By Nov. 19, when Clinton was on his way out of the United States to visit Japan and South Korea, British Defense Minister George Robertson arrived in Washington for a series of meetings to follow up discussions concerning an attack on Iraq. Again, Clinton was absent from the planning.

By mid-December, when the plans for the attack were being finalized, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, Defense Secretary William Cohen, and Berger knew Butler's report was a hoax, and that the strike would cause a diplomatic fiasco—but went ahead anyway.

Expected outrage

The unilateral decision by the United States and Britain to bomb Iraq, undermined the agreement among the five permanent members of the UN Security Council (the United

States, Britain, Russia, China, and France) that such actions would only be taken following the unanimous decision of all 15 members of the Security Council. The result was heated outrage from Russia, China, and France—just as Britain and Israel had planned. Russia recalled its ambassadors from the United States and Britain, for the first time since World War II. The chief of the Russian Defense Ministry International Military Cooperation Department, Gen. Leonid Ivashov, told Itar-Tass that "Russia will be forced to change its military-political course" as a result of the war, threatening that Russia "may become the leader of the world community that disagrees with the U.S. diktat."

Chinese Ambassador to the UN Qin Huasun denounced the raid, saying, "There is absolutely no excuse or pretext to use force against Iraq."

Reactions among all Arab and Muslim states were severe. While the Clinton administration says it does not advocate a "clash of civilizations," they said, it is only Muslim countries that are labeled outlaw states and attacked, while actual outlaw states, such as Slobodan Milosevic's Serbia, get off scot-free. Japan was one of the only nations aside from Israel, to have supported, if quite reluctantly, the Anglo-American attack.

Meanwhile, some factions in Britain have already distanced themselves from the raid, as speeches in the House of Commons such as those of former Defense Minister Lord Denis Healey, and outpourings from the Royal Institute of International Affairs, indicate. Britain often successfully convinces its dupes throughout the world that it has been forced to play second fiddle to America, and, given a choice, would be a far more accommodating power to deal with. And one of the leading Israeli agents in the anti-Iraq process, American Scott Ritter—who the Iraqi government had denounced as an Israeli agent—is fanning the anti-American flames, telling everyone that the Clinton administration and Butler "broke the trust" of the UN Security Council.

Nor did the attack undermine the impeachment proceedings against Clinton, as those who say that Hollywood's scenario movie "Wag the Dog," serves as a model would claim. In fact, split-screens on CNN and other television networks simultaneously showed the bombing of Iraq and the impeachment debate, as did side-by-side front-page layouts in the nation's printed press, indicating that the Iraq attack, if anything, may serve to hasten Clinton's demise.

Setting the trap

In an interview with *Washington Post* reporter Barton Gellman on Dec. 19, National Security Adviser Berger admitted that the strike would rebound against the United States. However, he said it was necessary to strike Iraq, because "to have failed to do so not only would have lost UNSCOM, but would have lost the credible use of force."

Berger said the timing of the assault was based on the idea that there was a favorable "constellation of forces." If the United States had waited, Berger explained, Russia, France,

and China would have pressed to begin a “comprehensive review” of Iraq’s performance, with an eye to weakening or ending the sanctions. “Suddenly you’re in February and there’s no predicate,” he explained. “There’s no predicate for the world, and there’s no predicate for the American people: ‘Why are you all of a sudden attacking Iraq?’ ”

Besides, if Iraq were not attacked, Berger said, “it’s only a matter of time before [Saddam Hussein] develops WMD [weapons of mass destruction], and fires it at Riyadh, and fires it at Kuwait, or fires it at Israel.”

According to administration officials cited by Gellman, planning for the December attack began on Nov. 15, only hours after Clinton announced that he was calling off strikes on Iraq that had been planned at that time, following a British resolution rammed through the UN Security Council on Oct. 31.

Clinton was clearly not convinced of the inevitability of military action at that time. He had given an order for the air strikes on Nov. 13, which he rescinded, and then reinstated, on Nov. 14. He finally revoked the order, and called off the bombing, on Nov. 15.

But, while Clinton broadcast to the nation that he had cancelled the attack because Iraq “agreed to meet the demands of the international community to cooperate fully with the UN weapons inspectors,” other developments were afoot.

Simultaneous with that broadcast, Berger was chairing a meeting of the so-called “principals” group, the cabinet-rank foreign policy advisers to the President. While two of the “principals,” Gore and Albright, were out of the country (see accompanying article, p. 27), Gore was presumably represented by his National Security Adviser, Leon Fuerth. President Clinton did not attend.

There, the *Post* reports, the “principals” ordered the Pentagon to draw up a war plan, and deploy forces in the Persian Gulf on a “24-hour trigger.” They also came up with an air-tasking order defining what Berger described as a “70-hour operation,” which is precisely what later occurred.

“The decision was made on the 15th,” Gellman quotes an unidentified participant at the meeting. “I remember Sandy ending that meeting by saying, ‘I expect we’ll be using force within a month.’ ”

But in order to go ahead with a strike, a pretext had to be found. And this is where Butler came in. The Australian diplomat began his provocations within a week. On Nov. 21, Butler had already issued a statement that Iraq was in violation of its agreement, because it would not turn over specific documents. Between Nov. 21 and 23, the Iraqis wrote several letters to the UN Security Council, reporting that the documents did not exist.

Clinton was again not so enthusiastic to intervene over Butler’s renewed “crisis.” On Nov. 22, while visiting Seoul, South Korea, Clinton stressed, “It’s important we don’t over-react.” But between this statement and the Dec. 16 bombing, things had changed in Washington: Impeachment was on a

fast track, and Gore was itching for power.

Butler was an apt choice for carrying out such provocations. As the Australian Ambassador to the UN, Butler oversaw the multi-party effort to forge the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, whose intent was to ensure that only the “Perm 5” and Israel could have nuclear weapons. UNSCOM has also served as a vehicle for those Israelis who oppose Mideast peace. In September 1998, former UNSCOM official Scott Ritter admitted to the *New York Times* that he was tasked to carry out Iraqi searches by the deputy director of Israeli Military Intelligence. He also admitted that he was under FBI investigation for leaking U.S. classified documents to Israel.

In January 1998, in the midst of an earlier Iraq crisis, Butler told the *New York Times*, without any evidence, that Iraq had enough anthrax and botulin toxin “to blow away Tel Aviv.”

But although Clinton initially rejected the efforts to order a U.S. bombing of Iraq over Butler’s charges, the countdown for the attack had already begun.

Appropriately enough, the final decision to go ahead with the strike took place in Israel, at a Dec. 13 meeting at which President Clinton was again not present.

According to the *Post*, the meeting at the Jerusalem Hilton, which issued the final order for the attack, was comprised of Secretary of State Albright, Assistant Secretary of State for the Near East Martin Indyk, National Security Council official Bruce Reidel, and Berger. Joining them, by secure video-link from Washington, were Defense Secretary William Cohen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Henry Shelton, Al Gore’s adviser Leon Fuerth, and CIA director George Tenet.

Following the meeting, Berger and Albright went up to Clinton’s suite in the hotel, and informed him that the group recommended a strike. Clinton told them, “Go ahead and let’s get ready.” On Dec. 15, Berger reports that the decision “was reinforced” with the President, aboard Air Force One on the return to Washington from Israel. On the next day, Dec. 16, the air strikes were launched.

The case of Assistant Secretary Indyk

The use of Israeli operatives inside the U.S. government to carry out policies contrary to U.S. interests, is, of course, an old story. The case of Jonathan Pollard is exemplary. As *EIR* pointed out at the time, Pollard was likely the fall-guy for a larger network linked to Ariel Sharon, dubbed by U.S. intelligence circles as the “X Committee,” which was never uprooted from the foreign policy establishment.

An article in the Israeli daily *Maariv*, the unofficial mouthpiece of the Israeli Defense Forces, on Nov. 7, 1997 emphasized that Gore and his aides have been particularly close to Israel. “Gore and Netanyahu have spoken not a little recently,” Ben Caspit wrote; “they also write to each other. A month ago, Gore wrote to Netanyahu, and received a detailed reply in writing within a few days. He wants to be the next American President, and he needs the Jewish lobby for this, Jewish money and

Jewish influence in America. Besides, Gore is also pro-Israel, some say a Zionist, for a long time now.”

It has even been suggested in State Department circles that Gore’s aide, Leon Fuerth, might be a Mossad mole. According to a June 16, 1998 article in the *Washington Post*, Fuerth “sputtered with anger upon being told that some officials in the State Department believe he is the conduit by which inside information is passed to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.”

A case in point of how a suspected Israeli agent infiltrated the U.S. government, to fulfill Israeli—and British—policy objectives, is that of Likud Party-linked Assistant Secretary of State for the Near East Martin Indyk. A former Australian intelligence official directing Mideast policy, Indyk is also the founding chairman of the Washington Institute on Near East Policy (WINEP), the think-tank of the American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), Israel’s main cash-cow and lobbying operation in Washington.

The evidence is that Indyk was groomed early for his task. Born in England to Australian parents, Indyk first travelled to Israel in 1968, immediately after Israel’s successful war of conquest against its Arab neighbors. He returned to Israel in 1973 to study at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, returning back to Australia in 1975 to get his doctorate in international relations at the Australian National University. His thesis: “The Power of the Weak: The Ability of Israel and Egypt to Resist the Policies of Their Super-Power Patrons.”

Upon obtaining his degree, Indyk was immediately appointed Australia’s Deputy Director of Current Intelligence at the Office of National Assessments (the Australian equivalent of the U.S. National Security Council), where he directed Australian intelligence policy in the Mideast. While in that post, Indyk first began to work with career diplomat Richard Butler.

Indyk left his Australian government post in 1979, to become a media consultant for Israeli Prime Ministers, and Likud leaders, Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir.

In 1982, Indyk emigrated to the United States to become the founding director of AIPAC’s first research department. The department is now led by Michael Lewis, whose father, Prof. Bernard Lewis, is a top British intelligence Mideast hand, and Mossad collaborator. In 1985, Barbi Weinberg, the wife of AIPAC President Larry Weinberg, put together the cash pool that Indyk needed to form WINEP. The reason AIPAC needed such a think-tank, he explained, was that the existing think-tanks in Washington were “too anti-Israel.” WINEP quickly became the main conduit of Israeli position papers into the U.S. Congress.

In 1993, Indyk was appointed Special Assistant to the President, and Senior Director of the Near East and South Asia, running the Mideast section of the NSC—the same job he earlier had for Australia. The position, which does not require Congressional approval, did require expediting his citizenship, which he received only eight days before taking

office. He is the first individual ever appointed to the NSC who had held an official position in a foreign intelligence service.

It was Indyk who first publicly enunciated the administration’s “dual-containment policy”—an aggressive posture simultaneously toward both Iraq and Iran, with a strong emphasis on economic boycotts. As one of the first Clinton administration foreign policy initiatives, it ensured that disastrous Bush administration precedents in the region would continue, to the benefit of British geopolitical interests, and Britain’s puppets in Israel.

In the aftermath of the 1993 announcement of that policy, the Israeli Foreign Ministry established a special section on Iran, detailed to operate in liaison with Leon Fuerth.

Indyk also took charge of the 1993 Oslo peace process. Working with him in that assignment was State Department Counselor Dennis Ross, Indyk’s former colleague at AIPAC and WINEP.

In the spring of 1995, Indyk became the U.S. Ambassador to Israel, during the buildup for the assassination of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, one of the architects of the Oslo Accords, that fall. In 1997, he returned to the United States to become Assistant Secretary of State for the Near East, where he directs U.S. policy towards the Mideast. “You have no idea what it’s like,” one former U.S. official complained. “You try to brief Indyk on Morocco or the United Arab Emirates, and he immediately interrupts, asking, ‘How does this relate to Israel?’ Don’t Morocco and the U.A.E. have enough problems of their own, without asking about their relation to Israel?”

Indyk is not the only suspected Israeli operative planted in high-level positions bearing on Mideast policy.

For example, there is Stuart Eizenstat, who, as Undersecretary of State for Economic Affairs, oversees the U.S. embargo against Iraq, Iran, Libya, and Sudan, among other concerns. A former board member of the American Jewish Committee, and recipient of numerous Anti-Defamation League awards, Eizenstat has also served as a member of the board of the Israeli-intelligence-tied Israeli Discount Bank.

Then there is Tom Dine, the chairman of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, who also directs Radio Free Iran and Radio Free Iraq. Dine was the executive director of AIPAC from 1980 to 1992, where he worked closely with Indyk and Ross, and Likud’s Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir. He was ousted from AIPAC in 1992, after Prime Minister Rabin fought for the removal of U.S. Zionist organization officials who were hostile to peace with the Arabs.

Indyk et al. also work closely with Congressional Republicans on shared Israeli concerns. There is a basis for doing this. Former House Speaker Newt Gingrich’s chief of staff, Arne Christiansen, for example, was the former legislative director of AIPAC. Gingrich’s wife, Marianne, was a former paid lobbyist for an AIPAC outfit. Through such “bipartisan” support, Gingrich was able to appropriate \$100 million for his “Iraq Liberation Act,” despite the opposition of the Clinton administration, to fund covert operations against Iraq.