

and ratified. Furthermore, such Presidential order could be challenged before the U.S. Supreme Court. I make a reference to 1942 *Ex Parte Quirn*, 317 U.S. 1 (1942), and other cases.

EIR: Has your committee been in touch with U.S. authorities? Has the U.S. Justice Department been cooperating with you to facilitate your mission? What do you expect from them?

Dr. Al-Nauimi: I have sent three letters, on March 25, 2002, to the President, Vice President, and Attorney General. We have received a reply from Mr. Bradford Prince, Associate Counsel to President George Bush, who replied on behalf of the President, stating that my letter would be forwarded to the Secretary of Defense and his General Counsel. We hope that we would soon receive a response from the Secretary or Defense Counsel, Mr. William Haynes.

I am an attorney for Yasser Esam Hamdi, who is a U.S. citizen by birth, and the Federal public defender has filed a petition, in cooperation with us, before the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, Norfolk Division, on May 10, 2002, against Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense, and Commander W.R. Paulette, Norfolk Naval Brig, Norfolk, Virginia.

EIR: You say that the work and intentions of your committee are not political. Is it possible to avoid the hot political issues, especially as the U.S. administration has been using the case of the detainees as a major part of its propaganda campaign in the so-called “war on terrorism”?

Dr. Al-Nauimi: Our committee is a non-political committee, and its intention is to defend detainees and POWs by using the legal mechanism rather than the political mechanisms. However, the U.S. government is a political government, elected by the American people, and we do respect that. But the U.S. government differs from the U.S. judicial body, although the propaganda, what they call the war on terrorism, is, more or less, from the U.S. point of view, an enforcement of their laws to prevent an act of terrorism. And our mission, as well, is to enlighten the U.S. government to the dark side of the consequences of the war on the humans they have detained, and to explain the reality and the facts of these individuals who were captured during the war in Afghanistan.

EIR: What do you think U.S. civil rights groups and the public should do in this case?

Dr. Al-Nauimi: I think the U.S. civil rights groups should stand with us and help us in defending those who have been detained by the U.S. military, and we should be given the chance to explain our cause before the American public. And we hope they will understand the humanitarian intention of our committee, to defend the human rights of the detainees in Guantanamo.

Bernard Lewis Drops His Scholar's Robes

by Scott Thompson

Dr. Bernard Lewis, professor emeritus at Princeton University, has upon two recent occasions dropped his scholar's robes to reveal the truth of *EIR's* charge that he has been one of the leading architects of the Anglo-American establishment's “perpetual war” policies for the Middle East. It is a matter of strategic importance that Muslims finally realize the Jekyll-Hyde nature of Dr. Lewis, who honed his skills at deception during World War II in British military intelligence.

At scholarly events such as one May 7 lecture and debate at the Library of Congress, diplomats from Islamic states fawned over Dr. Lewis, who waxed poetical about the unfortunate decline of Islam since the Arab Renaissance, which was at its height during the Dark Age in Europe. Except for his lying insistence that Islam failed because it lacked science (when, to take just one example, the 11th-Century scientist Ibn Sina was one of the greatest minds in history, in the field of medicine), anyone would have thought that Dr. Lewis had a passionate love for the resurrection of Renaissance Islamic culture. This scholarly dissertation and calm debate presented his “Dr. Jekyll” side.

However, the same Dr. Lewis's “Mr. Hyde” personality came flying out in an April 30 interview with this author, and in a revealing April 18 interview with the Public Broadcasting System's “Charlie Rose Show.” Dr. Lewis maintains:

- Palestinian Authority President Yasser Arafat is an irredeemable terrorist who must be replaced by unnamed “moderates.”
- The Oslo Accords were a strategic miscalculation by Israel.
- The House of Saud must be replaced in Saudi Arabia, since it is the chief funder of terrorism and is totalitarian in nature.
- There must be a “regime change” (Newspeak for coup d'état) in Iraq based upon the lessons of the Afghanistan War, regardless of the fact that Afghanistan has been proven to be quicksand, with no clear victor despite repeated invasions by Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States.
- The Iranian government must be overthrown, including the “Westernizing” President Seyyed Mohammad Khatami, whom Dr. Lewis proclaims to be a “clever fraud.”

This comes as no surprise to readers of the profile of Lewis that appeared in *EIR's* Jan. 25, 2002 feature, “‘Open Conspirators’ Behind September 11 Coup Plot.” We reported



“Clash of Civilizations” progenitor Bernard Lewis has long cultivated a Princeton scholar’s reputation in the Mideast; but his public demands to get rid of Yasser Arafat and the governments of Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Iraq immediately, are loud as those of any Washington warmonger.

that it was Lewis, writing in the September 1990 issue of *Atlantic Monthly*, who coined the phrase “A Clash of Civilizations,” which has become the new battle-cry for the utopian, perpetual-war camp. *EIR*, since nearly three decades ago, has exposed the “Bernard Lewis Plan,” for destroying the sovereign nation-states of the Middle East and dividing them into tribal and ethnic cantons: This policy underlay Carter Administration National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski’s own “Arc of Crisis” policy against the Soviet Union.

Eliminating Arafat

Appearing on the April 18 PBS “Charlie Rose Show,” Dr. Lewis said, that when “the Soviet Union disappeared . . . the PLO, Palestinian leadership, found itself in a very parlous position. . . . (They had also made the mistake of identifying themselves with Saddam Hussein.) . . . So they . . . were isolated, impoverished and enfeebled.

“Now at that time, the government of Israel made the decision to throw a lifebelt. They brought Arafat to these discussions in Oslo. . . . What went wrong? . . .

“Where they went wrong was in going public too soon, before they had really reached an effective agreement. And second, bring[ing] in President Clinton as mediator. . . . Now the crucial point, I think, was the offer made by then-Prime Minister [Ehud] Barak to Arafat. . . .

“Some people will tell you that this was an extremely generous offer, that he was offering more than any Israeli leader had ever before offered, even including compromises on Jerusalem. And one is irresistibly driven to the conclusion that he [Arafat] didn’t want peace and that the reason he rejected Barak’s offer was that there was a serious danger that peace might break out.

“Try to look at it in a different perspective. Arafat is a terrorist. He had been all his life a terrorist. . . . He was a pioneer in this new art of terrorism in the age of television. And the Irish and the Basques and others are his disciples.

“Now the question is, was this a step towards getting a peace process . . . or . . . was it a step towards the ultimate objective of the destruction of Israel? . . . The terrorist activities, as far as we know, are almost entirely planned, or at the very least, approved by him. . . . Asking Arafat to give up terrorism would be like asking Tiger Woods to give up golf. . . . And if the peace succeeds he would become the tin-pot dictator of a mini-state. His dream of establishing a Palestinian state is genuine . . . [but,] in the ultimate program there is no room for Israel. . . .

“I would agree with [Israeli Prime Minister Ariel] Sharon on this particular point, that Arafat is not and is never likely to be a peace partner. And that Arafat should be—dealing with Arafat should be seen as part of the war against terrorism. . . . For Arafat and his people, peace is a tactic; war is a strategy.”

Thus, Dr. Lewis makes himself a bedfellow of Sharon, demanding what even the Bush Administration has not yet agreed upon; namely, the elimination of Arafat as a partner, as he had been with slain Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin in what both partners called “the peace of the brave.”

Asked by this author who might replace Arafat, the so-democratic Dr. Lewis said: “He should be excluded from the political process. He has nothing to worry about. He’s definitely the richest terrorist in history. . . . There are more reasonable among the Palestinians, and to name them would be to sentence them to death. . . . This is an internal Palestinian affair, and I’m afraid that they have to do that themselves. What we can do is stop things from outside. I mean, why do you think the Iranians are exporting large quantities of arms, shiploads of arms? And, why do you think that Saddam Hussein raised the bounty from \$10,000 to \$25,000 for suicide bombers?”

So, Lewis proposes to exclude Arafat from the political process—as do both Sharon and fellow Likudnik, former

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu—while also preparing the overthrow of the Iraqi and Iranian governments, which he accuses of trying to “muddy the waters” of their own involvement with terrorism by standing behind Arafat.

‘Axis of Evil’

In his interviews, Lewis stood foursquare behind the Teleprompter-Reader-in-Chief’s State of the Union assertion that there is an “axis of evil,” including Iran and Iraq. Speaking about the escalation of violence by the Sharon-spawned Hamas, Lewis said, “The only thing I’m quite sure of is that the worsening of the situation in the last few weeks is directly inspired from Iraq and Iran. They are really worried about President Bush’s war against terrorism and against the ‘axis of evil.’ And, then the obvious tactic on their part is to create a diversion and muddy the waters. I mean this thing has been totally successful.”

Asked whether the “Afghanistan template” might be used against Iraq, by casting Dr. Ahmed Chalabi’s Iraqi National Congress (INC) in the role of the Afghan Northern Alliance, Lewis replied: “Well, I do think it would be much easier in Iraq. The free zone in the north is one-quarter of the total land area of Iraq, and that is far more than the Northern Alliance ever had in Afghanistan. . . . I don’t see this as a major military operation against Iraq. I see this as help for the Iraqis in the north, when they [the INC] proclaim an independent regime.”

What about the potential to overthrow the government of Iranian President Khatami? Lewis seemed to believe that it would be even easier than a “regime change” in Iraq: “I believe that he’s just one of the gang: a little more sophisticated than the others. He’s trying to preserve the regime. . . . The vote for Khatami was a vote against the leadership, and he has now forfeited most of the goodwill that he had won by appearing to offer an alternative. But, in fact, he’s not an alternative. And, he’s no better than the rest, which is to say a little more sophisticated. . . . All the indications that I have from my Iranian connections is that the regime is fragile and frightened, and could easily be tackled by the Iranian people, with purely symbolic help.”

House of Saud in the Crosshairs

Lewis also called for toppling the House of Saud, which he ridiculed as being “Made in England, 1925”: “Yes, I would go further and say that the entire Kingdom in its present form is in danger. I mean, remember, the Saudi Kingdom is not an ancient one.” Asked whether the United States should seize Saudi Arabia’s oil fields, if the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia fell, Lewis said: “At a certain stage it might be useful to, shall we say, set up a friendly regime in that area [chuckling]. But only if it becomes necessary.”

It should come as no surprise that it is Osama bin Laden, whom Dr. Lewis had previously praised, who, he told this author, was the chief enemy of the Saudi regime.

Violent Videos and The ‘Killing of Civilization’

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The high school murders by a “Counter-Strike”-addicted 19-year-old in Erfurt, Germany on April 26, and the renewed and sharpened call by Helga Zepp-LaRouche for an international ban on such games—echoed by other German political leaders and experts—have been reported in EIR’s May 17 and May 24 issues, along with background analysis by experts. As a result, Lyndon LaRouche and larouchepub.com have received many e-mail protests from younger and other persons attempting to defend those games which they play and design. Virtually all have tried to place the blame for the “new violence” by schoolchildren entirely upon their parents, exculpating completely the makers and marketers of killer videos. LaRouche has sent the following general reply to all these protesters (adding specific rejoinders to some). It is an important discussion for—as he notes—all four of the living generations affected by this growing crisis.

Today, I have received a passel of e-mail messages on the subject of my exposure of the role of point-and-shoot video games, of types which were originally designed for military training—games which have played a well-defined role in fostering the rising tide of “new violence” among minors. The well-documented recent case in an Erfurt, Germany high school, reflects a demonstrated connection between habituation to such video games, and slaughters such as that at Columbine, or Erfurt. The complaints against the conclusions of the experts, of which I am one, are not only groundless, but often exhibitions of wild-eyed, specifically juvenile types of hysteria. However, there is hope for those young people, if they could step out of the grip of the brainwashing-effects which such games induce, and examine their behavior in the adopted role of a bystander.

Therefore, I shall reply to your objections in two parts. First, I shall present a categorical description of the specific conditions which lead growing numbers of children and adolescents, in the U.S.A., Japan, and Europe, into the state of mind which the deadly potential of all point-and-shoot video games represents for the all-too-typical victim of membership in that generation. This first, generic portion of my reply to you I shall repeat, in reply to any message related to the same point. This must be undertaken at some, unavoidable length, but is more than worth the effort, since there are so many who have been victimized by that brainwashing, and since the