LaRouche: Targetted Killings Are 'Nazi-like'

On June 9, Lyndon LaRouche was asked to give an assessment of the claims by George W. Bush, Tony Blair, and Donald Rumsfeld, that the death of Iraq-based al-Qaeda leader, Musb al-Zarqawi, was a "victory" in the war in Iraq. The questioner also pointed out that U.S. Congressman John Murtha (D-Pa.) has said that Iraq has moved to a full-scale civil war and U.S. troops must leave, and that Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.) has called for withdrawal by the end of the year.

LaRouche replied: "I would make a very simple statement, in part, on this, though it requires more attention, of course. I would say, well, since we have an act of murder committed—and this was simply an act of murder, which settled absolutely nothing. Killing individuals does not settle issues of this type. Whether he was, or was not, a Shia agent or whatever, is irrelevant. That killing was a

Nazi-like act of murder, and that is what we've been protesting against in the United States, and talking about the barbaric acts, about some action organizations in military and operation sections in the CIA in the past. This is what we said we must not do. You do not go out and take out people for political reasons, because they're your enemy! Because what you do is you sow dragon's teeth. You spread the disease. You spread the conflict. We didn't *have* to do it. Somebody wanted to do it because they had a political ego trip they wanted to make. Period!

"Now, that is all the more reason for supporting Kerry's motion. Because the United States government under the present administration can't be trusted with anything that looks like war, or occupation of war. We've got to get the United States government out of that area, for the simple reason that one of these Congressmen will simply not say: The U.S. government under its present Presidency can not be trusted with the conduct of war, or the declaration of war. It's corrupt, we should have impeached it! And whatever happens to us, if we don't impeach it or get it out some way, we're guilty of everything it does."

It is not surprising that this latest round of violence began when Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert returned from Washington, where he held a well-publicized meeting with President George W. Bush and spoke before Congress. Not well reported was his meetings with Vice President Dick Cheney and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, both of whom support the most extreme Israeli positions, especially that of right-wing former Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. Revealing the intentions of Cheney's office towards Israel and Palestine, has been the "amen chorus" of neo-con think-tanks in the Cheney orbit, including the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA), the Center for Security Policy, and the American Enterprise Institute, which are spewing out hysteria against the elected Hamas government, and against Israel's withdrawal from illegal settlements in the Palestinian territories.

Immediately on Olmert's return from the United States, a new round of Israeli military attacks on Palestinians began, including "targetted" assassinations that have killed numerous civilians.

Prisoners' Letter Vs. Unilateralism

Prior to his departure for Washington, the issuance of the "Prisoners' Letter," authored by imprisoned Fatah and Hamas leaders, laid out a common program for unity between the two organizations, which would have provided the basis for opening up negotiations. (See *EIR*, "Israelis See Palestinian Letter As Opening for Peace," June 9, 2006.)

Subsequently Palestinian President Abu Mazen convened

a national dialogue conference, bringing together all the Palestinian factions, where the prisoners' letter would serve as a basis for National unity. After the Hamas leadership balked at adopting the letter, Abu Mazen called for putting the letter before a referendum, to be held at the end of July. Although criticized by Hamas, Abu Mazen's call has strong support throughout the Palestinian population. It also had support from a former head of the Mossad, a former head of the Shin Bet, and other Israelis.

As soon as Olmert returned from Washington, however, he publicly attacked the prisoners' letter as representing nothing that could promote peace or provide a basis for negotiations. "The referendum is an internal game between one faction and the other," Olmert said. "It is meaningless in terms of the broad picture of chances towards some kind of dialogue between us and the Palestinians. It's meaningless."

Olmert also attacked Abu Mazen (Mahmoud Abbas) saying, "Mr. Abbas will not be able to get away by saying I forced a referendum that accepted a program which is far behind the basic principles that the international community has defined anyway."

It is surprising that Olmert has been able to make such uncompromising statements, after his convergence plan, calling for *unilateral* withdrawal from part of the West Bank without negotiations with the Palestinians, received a cool response during his recent official visits to Great Britain and France. Neither British Prime Minister Tony Blair nor French President Jacques Chirac would endorse Olmert's plan, and they called for a negotiated settlement with the Palestinians.

60 International EIR June 23, 2006