

agement from eastern Central Europe, the future character of the Soviet Armed Forces;

- German unification, the absorption of the former East German Armed Forces;
- France searching to find its new place within Europe;
- Britain's new "inside" role in Western Europe under the Major-Hurd regime;
- the "Single European Community Market" and the approaching "political union" of the EC;
- the Gulf crisis and Mediterranean security;
- the future security policy of the former East European "satellites" and the political, economic, and ethnic crisis potential in the Eastern Europe-Balkans area;
- the future role of the European Free Trade Association states, like Sweden's "revolutionary" application for EC membership.

A convoluted debate

The new European security debate is exceptionally convoluted. The various European nations are deeply divided among one another, and within, on the content and the insitutional character of a European security. Some favor expanding the "security dimension" of the European Community in the context of the "Political Union," which would gradually transform the EC into a "European Confederation." Some, especially the Major-Hurd government in Britain, have since Thatcher's demise adopted the WEU as a fallback option, a sort of "ersatz NATO." France and Germany too favor a strengthening of the WEU, but emphasize its independence from NATO. There exist also proposals for a "neo-Gaullist" continental European "Defense Union" outside the WEU, the EC, and NATO, obviously the most intelligent concept. An appropriate and revealing characterization of the muddled European security debate is a statement of the German government. It proclaims that European security should be achieved by a *Geflecht ineinanderkreisender Institutionen* ("a weave of institutions which are circling around each other") (sic), that is, a not-specified goulash of EC, WEU, CSCE, and NATO plus something new.

Yet, beyond all this awesome confusion, there is a net strategic vector: Europe is in the process of *transcending* NATO. The historical rule, that military alliances exist as long as the sum of common interests supersedes the sum of conflicting and divergent interests, applies for NATO too. This equation for NATO has moved into the minus. The sneaky and potentially devastating British adaptation to a "pro-WEU" position and no longer betting everything on NATO is symptomatic. De facto, in historical terms, NATO is fading away. Beyond NATO, the future of European-American relations in economic, political, and military terms is being wrecked by the Bush administration's neo-imperial policy of the "New World Order" and the indecisive, confused response of West European governments, which utterly lacks any Grand Design.

Immediate 'Iraqi nuclear bomb' is hoax

by Joseph Brewda

Within a week of the publication of several national opinion polls showing that the U.S. population thought that the possible development of an Iraqi nuclear bomb was the most (and maybe even the only) convincing argument to go to war, George Bush began raising the specter that Iraq might soon have nuclear weapons. Speaking to U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia on Thanksgiving Day, Nov. 22, Bush claimed, "Those who would measure the timetable for Saddam's nuclear program in years may be seriously underestimating the reality. . . . Every day that passes brings Saddam one step closer to realizing his goal of a nuclear weapons arsenal."

Having found that talk about "Saddam . . . worse than Hitler," "protecting Saudi Arabia," and "creating jobs," didn't make it, Bush's propaganda advisers had hit on a new ploy. Whatever the Iraqis may ultimately do, the timing of the "Iraqi bomb" scare has everything to do with manipulation of Western public opinion, and the London press which began the drumbeat around this issue has as much as admitted that.

The Iraqi government says that it has no intention of developing a nuclear bomb, since it has already developed a chemical bomb, a "poor-man's nuclear bomb," a better weapon, as Iraqi spokesmen have put it, than a nuclear bomb in some respects. On the other hand, it is well known, and even admitted by the Bush administration, that Israel has nuclear bombs—perhaps as many as 20—as well as chemical and biological weapons. Its arsenal had been developed by the U.S., beginning with the Johnson administration.

Even before Bush's assertion, the London *Sunday Times* launched the propaganda campaign. "Iraq may have a nuclear capacity in two months," the paper claimed on Nov. 18, supposedly based on its access to a secret U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency report. This DIA estimate, says the paper, "has caused serious concern in Washington. If Iraq does get a nuclear weapon before war breaks out, the United States will inevitably have to revise its war plans. . . . Some Pentagon officials now argue that any further delay in going to war will allow Saddam time to 'go nuclear.'" According to the paper, the DIA claimed that Saddam has launched what it calls "Iraq's Manhattan Project," in a desperate attempt to acquire a nuclear weapon.

Former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher also warned the House of Commons that week that Iraq was close

to acquiring a nuclear bomb.

Nuclear inspectors say no

In an obvious effort to counter this new propaganda ploy, the Iraqi government invited representatives of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) on Nov. 15 to verify that it has not been using its small stock of uranium to produce nuclear weapons. Iraq had obtained the uranium from France in 1976 to operate its Osirak nuclear reactor. In 1981, with the go-ahead of the Bush administration, Israeli planes bombed the facility.

Upon their return to their headquarters in Vienna, Austria, the IAEA team told a press conference on Nov. 26, that there is "no evidence" that the nuclear fuel Iraq has for civilian purposes is being diverted for military uses, and that all of its fissionable material has been accounted for. Even if Iraq were intent on developing a bomb, the inspectors told BBC, it is at least two years away from having such a capability, and possibly as many as ten.

The following day, Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger could only respond by claiming that the President's Thanksgiving remarks were "based on information that there is substantial, unguarded nuclear activity going on in Iraq."

Enter the ADL

For its part, the October issue of the Anti-Defamation League's *Latin American Report* claimed that the supposed Iraqi bomb was being built with the aid of Brazil, another Third World target of the Bush administration. The ADL frequently peddles Goebbels-style "Big Lies," on behalf of the U.S. and Israeli governments.

The ADL publication claimed that the "secret program to build an atomic bomb" dates back to 1975, when "the Brazilian military dictatorship" signed a nuclear cooperation agreement with Iraq. The report targets retired Brazilian Air Force Brigadier Hugo de Oliveira Piva, who had overseen a group of 21 Brazilian scientists working in Iraq (see interview in *EIR*, Dec. 14, 1990, p. 6). Previously, the ADL and the Mossad-connected Alan Friedman of the London *Financial Times* have focused upon joint work between Brazil, Argentina, and Iraq to develop the Condor II missile.

Meanwhile, while Bush ranted about Iraqi nuclear weapons, his own administration was involved in upgrading Israel's nuclear arsenal. On Nov. 30, the Bush administration revealed that it had approved the sale of the Cray Y-MP computer to the Israeli government's Weizmann Institute. The supercomputer had been banned from sale to non-NATO countries previously, for example, India, because of its potential use in designing larger nuclear bombs. According to Dr. Vanessa Hughessen of the Princeton University Center of Advanced Studies, as reported to the *Washington Post*, Israel might now develop an H-bomb in the 20-megaton range in less than a year.

'Iraq always sought a peaceful solution'

The cultural attaché at Iraq's Embassy, Mayser Y. al-Mallah, delivered the following presentation to a Schiller Institute anti-war teach-in in Chicago on Dec. 15. The presentation was delivered via videotape, because the U.S. State Department refused Dr. Mallah permission to leave Washington. After his presentation, however, he was able to converse with the conference audience via live telephone connection. See page 58 for a full conference report.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I wish I was with you this afternoon, face to face, not on cameras. We are recording this tape in order to let you know about our position concerning a very important issue to Iraqis and the American people. We are doing it this way because we haven't got any permission from the Department of State to travel to Chicago up till this moment.

I am going to concentrate my speech on the three issues concerning the crisis in the Gulf. The first will be historical background; the second is going to be Iraq and the crisis; the third one is going to be the U.S. government and the crisis.

Concerning the historical background, before World War I, 1914, Kuwait was an *alkathma* or administrative district, belonging to *Basra nathia* or a province. It was governed by the Sheikh of Kuwait in his capacity as an Ottoman chief administrative officer, responsible to the governor of Basra, which was and is an Iraqi province. According to the historical, political, and geographical references, Kuwait was part of Iraq, part of Basra, from the 18th century to the outbreak of World War I, and consequent to British occupation of Iraq in 1914.

During that long period, the ruler of Kuwait owed loyalty and obedience to the Ottoman Sultan. Maps, European or Ottoman, which were made at that time, put Kuwait within the territory of the Ottoman Empire. Ottoman flags remained flown in the city of Kuwait until 1914, when the British authorities forced its ruler to change it.

In 1913, on July 29, a treaty was signed in London, Britain, between the British and Ottoman governments regarding the question of Kuwait. The treaty defined the territorial and administrative rights and duties of the owner of Ku-