er against the condominium's policies.

Enrico Mattei: The late head of the oil company Ente Nazionale Idrocarburi (ENI) wanted Italy to have an independent energy policy. His country was to serve as a bridgehead between Europe, the Middle East, and Africa. Died in 1962, in a suspicious air crash.

John F. Kennedy: He wanted to conduct disarmament negotiations with the Soviet Union from a position of strength, and was at loggerheads with the Anglo-American

In an earlier statement on Herrhausen's assassination, Fletcher Prouty wrote the following lines, which should give some pause for thought: "His death at that time . . . and the astonishing circumstances of his death . . . resemble the assassination of President Kennedy in 1963."

establishment in numerous other policy areas assassinated in 1963. Assassinated in 1963.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto: The former prime minister of Pakistan called for the convening of an international conference to discuss debt reorganization. Hanged in 1979.

Indira Gandhi: Before her assassination, she was likewise steering a course toward a new debt arrangement. Assassinated in 1984.

Aldo Moro: With his "government of national unity," he wanted to lay the basis for a sovereign national policy for Italy. Assassinated in 1978.

Detlev Carsten Rohwedder: His policies in the Treuhandanstalt—the trust charged with putting the assets of the former East German regime into productive private hands moved more in the direction what Herrhausen had proposed for Poland, and contrary to a policy of privatization at any cost. Assassinated in 1991.

This list could be continued with quite a number of others. But the crucial question will be whether people in positions of responsibility stop complaining about the loss of personalities such as Herrhausen, and instead decide to understand the message of which Fletcher Prouty spoke, and to draw the proper conclusions.

Following the sensational revelations by Prouty—who continues to judge the Kennedy murder from the standpoint of someone who witnessed the discussions at the Pentagon at the highest level—the most obvious next step would be to reopen the investigation of the Herrhausen case.

Israel, Turkey likeliest pawns in new wars

by Joseph Brewda

The U.S. and British governments seem intent on launching a new war in the Mideast by hook or by crook, with Iraq being one, but not by any means the only, possible target. An Israeli strike against Lebanon, a Turkish move into Iraq, or alternatively Syria or Iran, or a U.S. surgical strike against Libya or Iraq, are among the apparent scenarios under consideration. But because the situation in the region has become so unstable, wars unforeseen by even the Anglo-American gamemasters might soon occur.

Israel set to blow up

One way the Anglo-Americans might spark a war is through Israel. The bombing of Israel's embassy in Buenos Aires, Argentina on March 17, which left 10 dead and 76 wounded, is being used to whip up the Israeli population into a killer rage preparatory for its own supposedly independent strike against Iraq, Syria, or some other target such as Sudan, possibly by the end of April.

"The Lord will avenge your spilled blood," intoned Israeli Foreign Minister David Levy screamed at the funeral of two Israeli diplomats who had been killed in the embassy bombing. Earlier, Levy claimed that the "Teheran-Damascus axis" was responsible for the bombing, although both governments had denied responsibility. A communiqué by the Iranian-run, Syria-Lebanon-based Islamic Jihad claimed credit for the blast on March 18, only to be contradicted by another alleged communiqué from the same organization a few hours later.

"This is our vow: waging war on them to the death," Levy said, in an apparently general reference to all the enemies of Israel, including Iraq. Earlier in March, Israeli Chief of Staff Ehud Barak called for Israel to go it alone and strike Iraq which, he railed, might soon threaten the region with nuclear weapons. On March 20, the Israeli newspaper Davar said an "independent" Israeli strike on Iraq was under discussion as it "more or less suits the interests of both the Israelis and the Americans." There is also talk in Israel of striking Sudan, which the Israeli and Anglo-American press have increasingly labeled as the new world headquarters of Arab terrorism.

In purported response to the bombing in Argentina, the Israelis have also blockaded and isolated the entire Occupied Territory of the Gaza Strip—as they had done immediately prior to the Anglo-American war on Iraq last year. Mean-

42 International EIR April 3, 1992

while, the Lebanese government fears an attack. "Israel has set precedents in the past in avenging attacks through military strikes in Lebanon," one Lebanese official told Reuters news agency, "now it has a strong pretext for doing the same."

A new Turkish move?

Meanwhile, a Turkish crackdown on Kurdish towns in its own southeastern territory bordering Iraq, beginning the weekend of March 21-22, is rapidly escalating into a potential civil war in the region, with Turkish jets bombings its own villages there.

Over the weekend, Turkish troops reportedly massacred some 100 ethnic Kurds in seven villages, triggering large-scale fighting. According to some Turkish claims, President Turgut Özal, a longtime Anglo-American tool, intentionally provoked the conflict in order to undermine the government of his rival, Prime Minister Suleyman Demirel. Özal, who has told Turkish media that "from now on, the Kurdish insurrection can only be suppressed with a bloodbath," may even be attempting to provoke a military coup, in alliance with elements of the military.

On March 24, Demirel, who, unlike Özal, had opposed Turkey's participation in the Persian Gulf war, asserted that the only way to deal with the crisis is to "build a wall along the border with Iraq so tight that not even a bird could get through it." Turkish jets are already bombing Kurdish villages in Iraq.

According to one report from Turkey, the Anglo-Americans favor a Turkish invasion into Iraq, minimally to create a so-called Turkish-controlled "security zone" along the border similar to what Israel has created in Lebanon. Reportedly, the United States is considering calling for lifting sanctions on the Kurdish regions in northern Iraq, while sanctions are maintained against the rest of that besieged state. These northern oil-rich regions would eventually be incorporated into an expanded Turkish state.

In early April, Turkey's interior minister will travel to Damascus to protest Syria's alleged sponsorship of Kurdish terrorist training camps in the Bekaa Valley in Syrian-controlled Lebanon. A similar claim, regarding Syrian sponsorship of anti-Israeli groups in the same location, is made by Israel. Turkish-Israeli relations have been considerably strengthened over recent years.

In addition to employing proxies, however, the Anglo-Americans might opt for directly engaging their own forces through a United Nations strike on Iraq or Libya. On March 19, the Iraqi government handed a note to Rolf Ekeus, head of a special U.N. commission, agreeing to U.N. Security Council demands that it dismantle any industrial capacity which could be used to build weapons of mass destruction, making a hit on Iraq apparently less likely for the moment. Libya, on the other hand, remains a top target, especially if the Anglo-Americans or Israel contrive a new "Arab" terrorist incident which kills a lot of Americans.

Carlos Menem fears anti-IMF backlash

by Cynthia Rush

When the embassy of Israel was bombed and destroyed in Buenos Aires on March 17, presumably by Arab terrorists, Argentina's Foreign Minister Guido Di Tella told the media that this occurred in his country because it is "so important." President Carlos Menem's alliance with the United States and his policies of economic "modernization" have ushered the nation into the "first world," the minister rhapsodized.

Having attained this status, he went on, Argentina must now expect more such attacks. If the country were unstable, racked by violence, labor strikes, and other upheaval, no one would even consider targeting Argentina, Di Tella argued. It is because of its "progress" that Argentina was hit.

The reality behind Di Tella's convoluted reasoning is quite different. In a manner of speaking, Argentina today is a target, not because it is "important," but because of Menem's obscene alliance with the Anglo-American powers, and his spitting on the country's tradition of non-alignment in its foreign policy.

When he first took power, the Argentine President boasted of his strong ties to the Arab world. But he abandoned those without a second glance, when he embraced Israel and joined the forces of the new world order in last year's genocidal war against Iraq.

This, combined with the devastation of the Argentine economy and people through the International Monetary Fund's "adjustment" policies, hasn't made Carlos Menem the most popular man around. In fact, the government's commitment to British-style free trade has begun to provoke the same type of resistance among labor and business circles visible in several other Ibero-American countries—especially since the attempted nationalist military coup in Venezuela last Feb. 4.

On March 19, the Argentine Industrial Union (UIA) declared "war" on Finance Minister Domingo Cavallo because his free trade policy has flooded the country with foreign imports with which domestic products cannot compete. A few days earlier, the minister's tax reform package, a key element in his deal with the IMF, suffered setbacks in the Congress, forcing him to seek other ways of raising the revenue he promised the Fund.

EIR April 3, 1992 International 43