

Psycho Bush heads toward genocidal war

by Nancy Spannaus

Like a self-defined werewolf driven to commit murder every full moon, President George Bush is working himself up toward a new orgy of blood as the new year approaches. The last orgy occurred in Panama, when Bush deployed U.S. troops on Christmas to carry out the mass murder of civilians in the name of "fighting drugs." Now the President is aiming for an attack on Iraq, despite warnings from his military advisers that the action could result in the deaths of 70,000 Americans, on top of an untold number of Arabs.

The policy which the President is implementing is being outlined explicitly by former secretary of state Henry Kissinger and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL). It calls for the destruction of the military (read industrial) capability of Iraq, as a precedent for United Nations policing of the Third World to ensure that there is no successful industrial development. As such, the policy is the implementation of Henry Kissinger's 1970s diplomacy on behalf of malthusian genocide for non-white peoples of the South.

So far, there appears to be no serious disagreement within the Anglo-American Establishment, nor the other permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, with the Kissinger-Bush policy. But there does seem to be a certain amount of concern that Bush himself is a defective instrument for implementing such a policy. Bush is acting more and more like an obsessive psychotic, who is unable to take the consequences of his actions into account.

In London, the elite has just decided to get rid of its own megalomaniacal mediocrity, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, because of her untrustworthiness. Will the U.S. side make the same decision about the unstable George Bush? That's a decision patriots and world citizens cannot afford to leave to our Establishment, but rather must take action to

determine themselves.

The Kissinger-ADL policy which Bush is implementing in the Gulf is nothing less than insane. It is on the same level of insanity that the policies of Adolf Hitler were: the willingness to sacrifice millions of lives in order to satisfy the lust for power.

This reality is evident practically every time Henry Kissinger puts a pen to paper, or testifies in public. As a proven tool of the Anglo-American banking establishment, Kissinger enunciates the goals of that grouping with a certain professionalism. Underneath all the geopolitical gobbledygook, the objective is to destroy the Third World.

Kissinger's malthusian plan

In the 1970s, Kissinger carried out this objective by working closely with his British masters and Moscow, in order to decapitate genuine nationalist governments in the Third World. The weight of the United States was put behind increasingly explicit malthusian policies of the United Nations and the International Monetary Fund. The result was many coups, murders of Third World leaders, the buildup of Soviet aggressive capability, and economic devastation.

By 1982, it was decided by Kissinger's masters that it were better that such policies be administered through a "neutral" international body, rather than the United States—in particular through the United Nations. As you can see by Bush's preemptive actions in the Gulf, and by Kissinger's current advice, this idea has been accepted by Kissinger only to the extent that the U.N. gives the United States free rein.

Thus Kissinger is presently arguing consistently for a preemptive strike against Iraq by the United States. As he said in his testimony in the Senate Nov. 28, his nightmare

would be if Saddam Hussein were to withdraw from Kuwait without the U.S. having destroyed his military-industrial complex. That malthusian objective is Kissinger's *sine qua non*. In addition, he pontificates that the United States allegedly cannot afford to withdraw any of its 400,000-plus troops, because that would be a threat to "international stability," nor can it keep them in the Gulf too long because of the growing rage building up within the Arab populations. His horror is a peaceful settlement—that the sanctions would succeed in forcing negotiations between the U.S. and Saddam Hussein!

One is reminded of Kissinger's stated position on the previous Iran-Iraq War: It should go on as long as possible so that the two destroy each other.

It is also well-known that Kissinger doesn't care how many American soldiers are killed in reaching his policy objectives. Just look at Vietnam.

Kissinger's advice is being backed up by a pressure campaign by his drug lobby friends at the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. The ADL, which functions as thugs for the same Anglo-American banking establishment as Kissinger does, is insisting that "the world's struggle against Saddam Hussein [is] a Jewish struggle." This lie is backed up by a vociferous ADL campaign in support of the current made-in-Britain fascist policy of the Israeli government against Palestinians and Arabs, which could accurately be called a demand for *Lebensraum*.

Of course, the spreading religious war which would be detonated by a U.S. strike against Iraq would be the worst possible thing for Israel's security—but that doesn't seem to bother the ADL.

Vicious lies

In following the Kissinger policy, George Bush is ignoring the advice of competent military advisers and a large grouping of establishment political opinion. To do so, he has to lie.

The biggest lie is that the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait was the cause of the United States military deployment. As has been pointed out repeatedly by leading U.S. political figure Lyndon LaRouche, the Iraqi invasion had absolutely nothing to do with the deployment, which had been planned by 1988 at the latest, and was intended to solidify the policy of NATO out-of-area deployments to control raw materials. So far, only the Iraqis and former U.S. ambassador to Saudi Arabia James Akins have been direct about this fact.

The second lie is that Saddam Hussein intended to act against U.S. interests by controlling so much of the world's oil supply. Many critics have declared this to be insane—Saddam not only would have wanted to sell oil to the West, but never would have raised oil prices as much as the embargo has.

The third lie is that Saddam Hussein is a threat to Americans. The hostages are being held, as everyone knows, in order to prevent a U.S. attack, and Saddam Hussein is releas-

ing them increasingly in response to civilized approaches. He has even offered to release all of them, in exchange for negotiations. The result is, as syndicated columnist Charley Reeves wrote in an article that appeared in the Nov. 25 *Houston Post*, that Saddam Hussein comes across as a "calm and reasonable" head of state, while George Bush looks like a "megalomaniac dictator."

The fourth lie is the alleged threat of nuclear capability by Iraq within the immediate future. This assertion has been debunked by the International Atomic Energy Association, and innumerable energy experts, including U.S. government experts. Yet Bush appears to have decided that this is the only way to jack up the American population in support of a military strike—and he is lying through his teeth.

EIR will have more to say about the fifth lie next week, as our staff compiles the real story about the human cost of a Gulf war. Suffice it to say that some military experts are saying it would be a "holocaust."

The lessons of Thatcher

In a statement issued Nov. 25, presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche urged that "Mr. Bush and his friends should recognize the similarities between the causes of the fall of British Prime Minister Thatcher and the condition of the Bush administration itself. Three things are outstanding about both administrations: mediocrity, megalomania, and overloading the decision-making circuits. Essentially, Margaret Thatcher was going bonkers under a combination of these three conditions, and Bush is moving in the same direction."

It is clear that broader circles around the administration are beginning to recognize Bush's unstable mental situation. Many were appalled at his decision to meet with Syrian President Hafez al-Assad, a certified terrorist controller. Others were dumbfounded at the arrogance which resulted in the near shoot-out between Swiss security guards and the U.S. Secret Service during Bush's trip to Geneva to meet Assad.

It should also be noted that Thatcher's removal from office may not have removed her controls from Bush in the Gulf situation. According to a tape released by a Conservative Party insider on Nov. 28, Thatcher told President Bush after her resignation that she was convinced "he won't falter and I shan't falter. It's just that I shan't be pulling the lever there. But I shall be a very good back-seat driver." Asked if she meant in the British government, British political correspondent Michael White said no, "she was referring to George Bush!"

So far, however, no one of international stature seems willing to take on the crazy man Bush, but heads of state are instead kowtowing to his lunatic drive toward war. It is appeasement of Bush—not appeasement of Saddam Hussein—which will likely lead to a new international world war and genocidal disaster. As LaRouche said, "somebody had better stop this mess before it runs out of control altogether."