

of the Brooklyn chapter of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, had provided financing and military training to Kahane's JDL cadres during a period when the group was carrying out bombing attacks and other acts of terrorism against Soviet government officials in the United States in protest over Soviet restrictions against Jewish emigration.

Morgenthau openly acknowledged in interviews at the time that he had founded the group at the personal behest of his close friend Ariel Sharon. Morgenthau is also a long-standing member of the National Commission of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith.

Some bizarre allegations

Whether or not the claims by defense attorneys that El-Sayyid Nosair was the innocent victim of a "plot" by some of Kahane's own patrons or followers to eliminate the rabbi and blame his death on Arab "extremists" are true or not, the jury apparently was not convinced by the prosecution that Nosair actually pulled the trigger. According to press accounts of the trial, no fewer than 16 witnesses, mostly close associates of Kahane, testified that they were in the room when the shooting occurred. But none of them could decisively say that they saw Nosair pull the trigger.

In the Nov. 5 article, defense attorney William Kunstler told the *Village Voice* that Nosair had previously met with Kahane in New York City to discuss "religion and politics." That earlier meeting, set up by Kahane's own security people, may explain why Nosair was permitted to attend the Kahane lecture. That report, however, flies in the face of other media accounts linking Nosair to the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood group Al Jihad and to the Abu Nidal terrorist organization.

The Al Jihad group was behind the assassination of Egyptian President Anwar Sadat in November 1981.

Although since the death of Rabbi Kahane, the Jewish Defense League has all but disappeared from sight, and the Kach Movement in Israel has been supplanted by other radical organizations like the Gush Emunim and the Temple Mount Faithful, prospects of a terrorist response to the Nosair acquittal can not be ruled out. During the 1985 wave of Jewish underground violence in the United States, U.S. law enforcement specialists discovered that the JDL was little more than a front for radical elements within the Israeli Defense Forces and Mossad, who deployed trained paramilitary specialists to carry out the actual bomb attacks in the United States. Thus the capability for carrying out sophisticated terrorist acts in the name of the JDL still exists with or without Kahane or his loyal followers.

According to some Middle East specialists, the Sharon wing of the present Israeli government is dead set against any territorial concessions that might lead to the creation of a Palestinian entity on the West Bank of the Jordan River. They are already looking toward another Middle East war and could resort to terrorism as a means of furthering their goals.

Establishment media 'trash' George Bush

Will Bush be the Gorbachov of 1992? President George Bush's popularity is not just slipping in the polls these days. Even the Anglo-American political establishment, concerned about the decreasing viability of a Bush reelection bid, has begun to take pot-shots at his presidency. Bush's response to the (finally admitted!) economic crisis by undertaking a flag-waving Asian tour to bludgeon the Japanese on trade policy, an attempt to "play to the gallery" of a xenophobic electorate, became the object of ridicule in the national and international press. The following are a few examples of the way George Bush has been run through the wringer since November.

In many cases, EIR differs in fundamental or secondary ways with the viewpoint of the attacks printed below; we offer this documentation to invite readers to reflect on the same media's adulatory coverage of a Bush who could "do no wrong" in his allegedly masterful handling of the Gulf war, one year ago. At that time, EIR was one of the very few voices in the press that not only criticized Bush, but also warned of how ephemeral his "success" would prove to be. The Washington Times, New York Post, and most of the London press were most feverish worshipers of the George Bush personality cult one year ago and even more recently. In this sample, we spare you the numerous attempts to "out-Bush" Bush, e.g., various congressional reprimands about his failure to topple Saddam Hussein or to batter our allies sufficiently, some of which lunacy is covered elsewhere in this issue. We also do not report the electronic media, which have been especially fierce. Perhaps the Jay Leno jokes targeting Bush—unheard of one year ago—are the clearest sign of the times.

The Times (London), Nov. 3—A feature by Washington correspondent Joe Klein, argues in a parody of Bush, "There is this *thing* in the air, a mosquito buzz of dissatisfaction . . . a hint of an intimation of vulnerability: that *Bush can be had*. . . . It's Bush: The act is wearing thin. The foreign policy is receding from center stage now." The growing concern Klein correctly notes is the worsening economy, and in that light Bush is losing support as the nation's voters see Bush "always making comments from a golf cart, or up in Maine, riding around in his powerboat—doing country-club things while

average folks are getting pretty damn scared about the economy.”

Neue Zürcher Zeitung (Switzerland), Dec. 15—“It is impossible to know where the President will find a bipartisan solution for the fundamental structural problems in the 1992 election year. Bush has failed to correct the mistakes of the Reagan era in time. Now he threatens to give away the economic future of the U.S.”

Neue Osnabrücker Zeitung (Germany), Dec. 21—Bush and his administration are the ones to blame most for the outbreak of the Balkans war, charged Rudolf Dressler, vice-chairman of the opposition Social Democrats in the German parliament. He said that Bush’s lack of interest in the situation in disintegrating Yugoslavia was paralyzing the EC, NATO, as well as the United Nations. “If Yugoslavia had oil reserves like Kuwait,” Dressler said, “Bush would have paid attention to the situation there long ago, certainly.”

Financial Times (London), Dec. 23—Columnist Anthony Harris headlines his year-end el, “No welcome for the Woman of the Year”: “The Woman of the Year is not such a familiar face on your television screen,” writes Harris, “since she is some 2,000 years older; but Nemesis is even more dominant. The goddess of retribution has been terrorizing Washington and London. She has destroyed her corporate victims, and claims a seat on the board of every major bank and insurance company.”

Harris castigates the inability of policymakers in the “English-speaking world” to cope with reality, since they have not understood the severity of the economic crisis. George Bush is no longer the “effortless victor of the Gulf” and “acting President of the world,” continues Harris, who says Bush must be measured against his conduct of economic policy. “The classics had an explanation—those whom the gods love, first they make mad. The only rough modern equivalent is drearier: those who do not study history are destined to repeat it,” says Harris. “What we are repeating is indeed the disaster of 1929-32 and beyond.”

International Herald Tribune (Paris), Dec. 23—Columnist William Pfaff calls English Prime Minister Major and Bush “Prisoners of Failed Theories” and denounces their incompetent handling of their depressed economies. “The system is stuck. That is John Major’s problem, and Mr. Bush’s problem as well. Both are doing what the theorists have told them to do, but stagnation and contradiction are the result. They are indeed prisoners of economists past—mad voices in the air—and this threatens to prove politically fatal to each.”

Guardian (London), Dec. 31—The year 1991 saw the collapse of Gorbachov, and is now seeing the rapid fading of a

George Bush who is heading toward electoral defeat in 1992, writes senior commentator Hugo Young. As recently as late February, Bush was acting like a “latter-day Napoleon,” seeking to “impose the American imperium on Iraq.” It appeared as if Bush, John Major, François Mitterrand, Gorbachov, etc. “personified a seemingly unalterable order.” But, “at the end of 1991, this image of political leadership was shattered,” and all of this species are exposed as “leaders helplessly engulfed in events bigger than they are.”

According to Young, “the impotence of Bush is more revealing than that of his former counterpart [Gorbachov]. . . . The decline of Bush in the six months between spring and autumn looks more like the unmasking of an American nightmare. . . . From warrior command Bush has slipped to neurotic insecurity.” The United States is beset by “unemployment, poverty and drugs; illiteracy, violence, grossly deteriorating health care. Such pervasive problems, long and deeply rooted in American life, now expose this once-best riding captain as a politician so weak that he dare not confront his country with the truth about them. From being a shoo-in in July, Bush has descended toward defeat.”

Washington Times, Jan. 1—“Most Japanese seem not so much frightened of an American juggernaut as they are embarrassed for the United States. ‘Is this a presidential state visit by the world’s leading power or an election campaign road show?’ ” asked a Japanese housewife who has lived in the U.S. “ ‘I think this kind of trip is beneath Mr. Bush.’ ”

“Such signs of irritation have been mixed with a condescending sympathy for Mr. Bush’s domestic problems. ‘Bringing along industry leaders to political summit talks is quite out of the ordinary, but Bush is in such a difficult position that he cannot afford to be concerned about appearances,’ ” said a university professor. “His Texas bluntness was not appreciated by the Japanese, to put it mildly. Even the U.S.-owned *Asian Wall Street Journal* ridiculed the trip.”

New York Post, Jan. 3—Bush the “Gorbachov of 1992?” So argues black commentator Thomas Sowell, a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution. Pragmatism, like everything else, has its limits,” and both Bush and Gorbachov have created “intolerable levels of uncertainty, with their willingness to play everything by ear.” Sowell cites George Washington, who “said it best: ‘Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the just can repair.’ People will rally to a standard, even if the odds don’t look good.”

Even with Ronald Reagan, Sowell notes, it was: “What you see is what you get.” With Bush, it is: “Now you see it, now you don’t.” Bush, like Gorbachov, has frittered away “a once impressive popular support. Whether Bush follows Gorbachov into oblivion in 1992 will depend not only on his own actions, but also on whom the Democrats nominate to run against him.”