

After Helsinki: the deeper issues behind the 'Iraq crisis'

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The following is from an analysis released exclusively to EIR on Sept. 10, 1990.

President George Bush left a Sept. 9 Helsinki press conference with Soviet President Gorbachov wearing something much less attractive than egg all over his face.

George had sought the so-called working meeting on an emergency basis with Gorbachov. He had sought what he should have been forewarned would not occur: that is, to induce Gorbachov to change Russian policy away from existing Russian policy of no financial aid to the United States for the Middle East military operations, and opposition to the U.S. unilateral use of military force putatively in enforcement of U.N.O. sanctions against Iraq.

During the press conference, President Gorbachov made it explicitly and indisputably clear repeatedly, that between the Soviet Union and President Bush, *there was no agreement reached on these issues*. President Gorbachov professed to be going for a political solution, to avoid war at all possible costs in the Middle East.

Now, to understand why Bush's diplomatic defeat was such a catastrophe, we have to understand the true, deeper issues behind what is called the Iraq crisis.

The issue is not really Iraq at all. If we go back to November of 1989, and trace events down to the present, we see that the same British Intelligence which controls the government of Israel, controls a number of Arab governments, and also otherwise coordinates or manipulates other Arab governments, boxed Iraq, step by step, into a situation where, to all

intents and purposes, President Saddam Hussein of Iraq had no choice but to act exactly as he did, in occupying Kuwait.

All of this was nothing but a setup as a pretext for the British furtherance of policy, which was under way fully, since the NATO out-of-area discussions and Malvinas War of 1982.

What has been aimed at for decades, by the relevant faction of British Intelligence, that is, the owners of the notorious Henry Kissinger—since, in fact, 1946 (no later than that)—has been the establishment of an agreement between the Anglo-American powers and Moscow, under which agreement, in effect, the two sets of superpowers establish a one-world empire. Not dissolving or merging the two empires together, but running the world on the basis of agreements which both superpowers come to make together, preferably in the context of the United Nations Security Council.

That has been the policy of the Anglo-American faction involved, since no later than 1946. It was openly expressed by Bertrand Russell in his famous item in the October 1946 issue of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, and was underscored more heavily by Leo Szilard and others at the second, Quebec City conference of the Pugwash Conference.

Now that the so-called condominium had been established, that is, in 1989, at the Malta conference, and through other channels, it was deemed possible to proceed with the North-South operations, which have always been, particularly since 1982, the British policy for implementation of a one-world agreement, a condominium agreement.

It was assumed, or the gamble was made, that a weakened Moscow would accede to Anglo-American demands on this account. At the same time, another factor introduced itself, to accelerate the Anglo-American thrust toward what became today's momentary Iraq crisis.

The unexpected: Germany reunified

Unexpectedly and unpleasantly from the Anglo-American standpoint, the world was suddenly faced with reunification of East and West Germany into a single Germany: a Germany which would become obviously, all other things being equal, the leading economic force in the world, and the center of Western continental Europe, as the world's leading economic force. It was also obvious that Russian needs and Eastern European needs would make such a Western Europe, a Germany-centered Western Europe, the dominant factor in shaping the history of the entire Eurasian continent, as well as other parts of the world.

This, the British could not stand. In point of fact, Great Britain went to war twice in this century, World War I and World War II, to *prevent* what they saw as the German economic domination of the Eurasian continent. They were not about to put up with a new threat of this type.

At the same time, it was obvious that the Anglo-American financial and monetary system was moving toward collapse. So, the Anglo-Americans behind this particular move, this Iraqi development, were pushed to accelerate their plans, by the pressure of two oncoming developments. One was the implications of the reunification of Germany, and the second was the more or less simultaneous onrush of financial and monetary collapse of the Anglo-American economies or economic sectors.

So, they rushed in.

The policy for this onrush is called the shifting of the military objectives of the United States and Britain away from the East-West conflict of the Cold War period, to a North-South conflict.

The objective of the North-South conflict is essentially usury, and malthusian population reduction.

In other words, the military purpose of the Anglo-American operations aimed at the southern part of the planet, is both to reduce radically, by famine and disease, the size of populations of people with slightly darker than pink skins, and, at the same time, to secure control of the principal, most crucial raw materials, in southern Asia, Africa, and Ibero-America. That's what the Iraq operation is all about.

The area around Iraq represents about 60% of the nominally proven oil reserves of the world: Whoever controls that area controls, to a large degree, the destiny of the planet's economy.

The United States made clear from the beginning with this deployment, under the urging of British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, of course, that it intended to *permanently*

station troops in that region, and that it was shifting troops from Western Europe, principally Germany, into the Middle East, for the long haul: for a long stay—to control, not only the petroleum reserves of that region, but to use Saudi Arabia and so forth, as the jumping-off place for other military deployments, in adjacent Third World regions.

The Iraq provocation was used to create a pretext under which British intelligence could deploy George Bush and American forces into that region, to set this policy into motion. London has not been bashful about stating clearly that the objective of this is to establish NATO out-of-area deployment.

That means: You take the member-nations of NATO, use their military forces under combined Anglo-American command, to dictate, and deploy the forces of continental Europe, Japan, the United States, Britain and so forth, and deploy them for these population reduction—i.e., genocidal and raw materials wars—in various parts of the southern regions of our planet.

That is what Moscow rejected.

Why Moscow balked

Now, we do not assume that Moscow has the noblest of motives for rejecting the Bush policy, and attempting to sabotage it. But, the problem was, for Moscow, that Mr. Bush and Mrs. Thatcher underestimated Soviet power to the point that they thought they could disregard Moscow. Bush and Thatcher prematurely announced that they were going ahead with their military operations, that they no longer regarded Moscow as a superpower, and that in fact, the United States under British direction was going to become the policeman of the world, demanding military support, and financial support for its military operations, from other countries.

That is where Moscow balked. That is where the Soviet military balked, and that is where no Soviet leader, including President Gorbachov, dared not balk, with the KGB and Soviet military snarling and growling in his direction.

So, the Soviet government took the position, on this ground, first of all, that it would not support this kind of U.S. operation. Number two, it would support no military operation, except through a U.N.O. Security Council joint military command, in which Moscow participated in the direction of the military command. That, Bush refused to accept. Therefore, the condominium, for which Bush and his predecessor Reagan, had worked so hard, under Henry Kissinger's direction, and British direction, fell apart at George's feet, during that televised/radio broadcast press conference in Helsinki.

U.S. bankruptcy

There are other issues, which are coming up fast. The United States is bankrupt. Not only is it bankrupt, but we can no longer produce our own physical needs, let alone meet

the physical needs for high technology of other parts of the world. Britain is in pretty much the same state of affairs.

Although there's much talk about Japan's technological potential, in point of fact, the center of the world's economy is Western continental Europe, particularly centered around a now-famous Triangle, Berlin-Vienna-Paris, in which 92 million people, approximately, represent the heart of the world's greatest productive potential. And all of Europe, moving eastward toward the Urals, representing a market of about 500 million people, all centered in a market of about 1.2 billion people, is the core of the world's economy.

The military purpose of the Anglo-American operations is both to reduce radically, by famine and disease, the size of populations of people with slightly darker than pink skins, and, at the same time, to secure control of the most crucial raw materials, in southern Asia, Africa, and Ibero-America. That's what the Iraq operation is all about.

This is the area from which Russia, or anybody else who needs physical economic development, must turn (with some auxiliary help from Japan), if their economies are to develop, indeed, are to survive.

Therefore, Moscow, whether it likes it or not, has an urgent interest in the success, particularly the economic success, of German reunification—precisely at the time that the Anglo-Americans, including the Bush administration, have repeatedly, through Carla Hills and Robert Mosbacher and others, insisted that the new enemies of the United States include Japan and West Germany, or Germany as a whole now.

So, Moscow finds itself, in a sense, in the position where the economic success and the political success of the German economic program are in the most urgent interest of Moscow—as a matter of fact, a Soviet survival interest. *Without German help, there is no Russia:* not for long, the whole thing will collapse.

Therefore, apart from Moscow's rejection, of being cast aside as a no-longer superpower, and of accepting the United States as the world's single ruler, Moscow also has a vital interest in the success of Western Europe.

What Moscow will tend to do now, is not necessarily for noble reasons, but for practical ones, to attempt to ally itself politically, on issues of cleavage between Western Europe and the Anglo-Americans.

That means that the likelihood of continued subsidies of a bankrupt Anglo-American monetary and financial sector, is coming to an end. This means, that the great financial collapse of 1989-92, is now more or less immediately fully on.

Economy-building as a weapon of peace

It is time to speak of alternatives: alternatives to the condominium policy, alternatives to the evils of malthusianism and usury, which is what the Anglo-Americans represent today. It is time to speak of global economic development. It is a time to end our toleration of the malthusians' attempt to destroy the economies of all the nations of the world and, in the process, kill many people, genocidally, through hunger, or even famine and epidemic disease. It is time to use economic development, as in the Middle East, as a weapon of peace, as a weapon of nation-building, of economy-building: a weapon of peace.

We require for that purpose a change from the kinds of monetary and financial policies, which the United States has moved into, step by step, over the period since the assassination of President John Kennedy.

We must go back to being the United States again: the United States of George Washington, of Alexander Hamilton, of the Careys, of the German-American Friedrich List, the America of President Abraham Lincoln, the America of President James Monroe, and all those other Presidents and leaders such as Henry Clay, who have fought for what used to be called "the American System of Political-Economy," which means national banking, a healthy regulation of interstate commerce, including banking, a healthy regulation of foreign trade, and a policy of protecting prices of valuable, indispensable sections of our economy, such as agriculture, to promote the development and security of prosperous, small entrepreneurial firms, such as high-technology, family-owned farms, or high-technology machine tool shops, and so forth.

The kind of economy, based on high-technology, technologically progressive, small farms and industries, on which the whole of our political and economic strength in the past, the strength of big industry, as well as small, has depended.

If we go back to that policy, the policy upon which this United States was founded, at the same time make those economic and related policies the basis for our international relations, then our foreign policy, and our domestic policy, will come into a more perfect agreement, and the interests of the United States, and of all of its citizens, would be much better served.

Perhaps, therefore, the defeat of President George Bush in his Helsinki conference, is good news after all.