

BUSH RENEWS HIS WAR MANIFESTO

Prof. Dr. Muhammad Saleem*

Abstract

In this brief article, our objective is to survey the pre-war to pre-war (i.e. from Iraq to Iran), National Security Strategies of George W. Bush and assess their implications for the global peace. Attempt in also made to show the impact of Israel Lobby on the U.S foreign policy.

In Sept 2002, while preparing for a preemptive strike on Iraq, Bush in his pre-war National Security Strategy underlined that the old policy of “Containment & deterrence” that served the U.S so well during the Cold War was no longer relevant. The global situation, he emphasized, had drastically changed. Communism, our adversary during the Cold War, was gone and had been replaced by militant Islam, the new threat to our global interests. In the Cold War the Soviets were convinced that nuclear war was no option, as it would entail mutual death and destruction of both the warring sides. Brutal terrorists of today, however, have no such qualms or considerations. They are our more determined ideological enemies and are anxious to use against us all sorts of weapons of mass destruction including the nuclear weapons. Moreover, these trans-national terrorists are not alone; they are fully sponsored by some rogue states especially the “axis of evil”. Iraq, in particular, is seriously contemplating on transferring these WMD to Osama bin Ladin and his al-Qaeda organization who, in turn, plans to use them to kill our people-men, women, and children – in our own cities and streets. Given this geo-political scenario, and the vicious intents of our sworn enemies, we would be ill advised to wait and see the storms to overtake us. Prudence recommends that we should aggressively exercise our natural right of self-defense and go for preemptive strike to eliminate the potential dangers that may threaten us (or our allies) now or in the near future.

*Prof. Dr. Muhammad Saleem is the Dean of Social Sciences in Qurtuba University of Science and Information Technology, D.I.Khan (Pakistan)

Again in March, 2006 (i.e. after three years of invasion & occupation of Iraq), Bush without any sense of guilt or resentment, restates his National Security Strategy and reaffirms his war-manifesto and his total commitment to his doctrine of pre-emption. (May be this time around, he is engaged in another pre-war strategy indicative of his plans for Iran invasion). In any case, he reiterates that the U.S. forces would stay on in Iraq way beyond 2008, his own term in office. And probably some future President may contemplate the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq. Also, he underscores his resolve to advance the cause of U.S imperialism by expanding the services of NATO and by furthering the active involvement of other centers of power as well. It is important to note that even though Bush is unwilling to surrender his preemptive doctrine, he is inclined to pacify his European critics by asserting; “we must be prepared to act alone if necessary while recognizing that there is little of lasting consequence that we can accomplish in the world without the sustained cooperation of our allies and partners”. All free nations, he expects, would stand together for freedom, because all free nations share an interest in freedom’s advance. He firmly expresses his resolve to “end tyranny and promote effective freedom” in the world. He holds that to “advance freedom & human dignity through democracy is the long-term solution to the transnational terrorism of today”. It is another matter though that Bush is unwilling to embrace democracy and democratic elections if they flush out Islamists, such as. Hamas of Palestine or Mehmood Ahmedinejad of Iran, to power. On the contrary, he insists, that the world should buy his brand of democracy which, of course, is introduced through bombs and bullets, war and violence, and brings to power people like Hamid Karzai of Afghanistan, or Hosni Mubarak of Egypt, or similar other spineless characters around. Let us now turn to the above stated National Security strategies and assess their implications for global peace.

Bush and His War Manifesto:

In spite of Colin Powell's prudent advice that Bush should not allow himself to be "bullied" into Iraq war, he found it hard to resist the mounting pressure of his neoconservative hawks led by Dick Cheney, Rumsfeld, Condi Rice and pushed the United States to a senseless war in Iraq. Powell's contentions were that more than ten years of brutal "sanctions" and relentless imposition of "no fly zones" had virtually destroyed the Iraqi economy and paralyzed its defense potentials to such an extent that Saddam was no longer a threat to the U.S. or his own immediate neighbors.¹ He further stressed that probably it would be easy to invade and occupy Iraq but very difficult to govern the country and keep it united. His apprehensions were that this needless invasion would turn Iraq into a "Cauldron" and destabilize the entire Middle East. Bush, he suggested, would be well advised to stay away from this kind of adventurism, which would simply open Pandora's Box of trouble for him and the country at large. Colin Powell further underscored that Iraq had never been involved in any kind of terrorist activities nor had Saddam been a great admirer of Osama bin Laden and his vision of "global jihad". Powell emphasized that given this background, it would be very difficult to find a moral, legal or political justification for this war. While concluding his conversation, Powell bluntly added: "Mr. President: I hope you do understand the full implications of this war". Bush responded: "yes he does". In any case Bush spurned aside Colin Powell's sane advice and later admitted to Bob Woodward (his interviewer and the author of *Plan of Attack*; and *Bush At War*) that he was not seeking Colin Powell's advice; instead, he was just informing him of his own decision -ultimate decision, he underlined, was the sole prerogative of the President himself. Looking in the hindsight, one would hardly fail to appreciate the political acumen of Colin Powell. But unfortunately, he was not able to make any impact on Bush and his war policy for two reasons: firstly, because he was black and was probably taken on the Bush Cabinet primarily to appease the Blacks rather than exploiting his talents for the good of the state and secondly because he was not a blind follower of the neo-conservatives and their brutal philosophy of war & violence. As such, he was

marginalized and was mostly used as a field worker rather than an architect of foreign policy of the United States.

Victory in Afghan war & that too won so cheaply (only \$ 70 million were spent to buy the loyalties of the Afghan war-lords & to use them to dethrone the Taliban regime & disperse al-Qaeda Leadership) intoxicated the Bush administration and turned them giddy with excitement. As a result, his war cabinet found it increasingly difficult to resist the temptation to go after Iraq notwithstanding the fact that there were no reasonable justifications for this war.² Some critics hold that after 9/11, if not from the very beginning of his presidency, Bush was mulling for Iraq invasion.³ Delay was caused solely because he was looking for an appropriate “political context” to sell his war. Eventually he was driven into it by his neo-conservative colleagues who persuaded him that frenzy of the masses could be whipped by false propaganda that Saddam was only days away from nuclear weapons and was all sold out to pass them on to Osama bin Ladin & his al-Qaeda organization who, in turn, would use them to kill our children in our own cities & streets.⁴ These false and fabricated contentions, however, were not supported by UN inspection teams of Hans Blix and others.⁵ They were loudly proclaiming that they had not found any smoking guns in Iraq. Bush, Dick Cheney & other neo-cons however, were determined to dismiss & discredit these findings (of UN inspectors) and were hell-bent to impose military solution on Iraq.⁶ In order to support their war plans. Bush advocated that their old policy of “containment & deterrence” that was useful in the Cold war had become redundant under the changed circumstances.⁷ For instance, during the Cold war, the Soviets were convinced that nuclear war was no option as it would entail mutual death & destruction. Muslim terrorists, he underlined, were a different brand altogether. They were not inhibited by any of these considerations. On the contrary, they were seriously looking for WMD & were eager to use them against us & our allies with a view to inflicting maximum losses on us. What they had already done on 9/11 could be recalled in this context. Prudence, therefore, recommends that we

should not wait till the storms overtake us. Instead, we should exercise our natural right to self-defense & go for a preemptive strike to eliminate the potential dangers that may threaten us (or our allies) now or in the near future.⁸ Bush advanced the same logic in his consultations with Tony Blair, the British Prime Minister. Blair observed that personally he was all convinced of Bush's logic & rationale (for war) & was willing to sponsor an all-out war against Iraq. But so far as British public was concerned, he would desperately need some "political contest" to sell this war. Approval of the Security Council, he insisted, could be a real boost. In order to satisfy Blair's concerns, Bush felt obliged to take the case to Security Council. In fact both he & Colin Powell did their best to seek a Security Council license for Iraq invasion.⁹ Their plans however, were frustrated when France threatened to veto the resolution (pending before Security Council) if it was pressed for voting.¹⁰ Of course, Bush failed to get the license for the war, but he did succeed in helping Blair to sell his war to the British people by creating a false impression that they did try to avoid the war. But when nothing worked, they felt constrained to rush to arms as a last resort. By maneuvering of this kind the stage was finally prepared for war based on sheer lies & fabrications. Of course, both Bush & Blair kept pleading that their decision to go to war was based on hard & incontrovertible evidence gathered by their intelligence agencies. In March 2003 the coalition forces launched their air strikes & on May 1, 2003. Bush triumphantly declared that the "mission in Iraq had been accomplished". It is a strange irony that even after three years of occupation, the super power is still busy in this war without any reasonable clue to the weapons of mass destruction; or any irrefutable evidence of active contacts between Saddam Hussain & Osama bin Ladin, two of the oft trumpeted justifications for the war.¹¹

As the original grounds for war were totally dismissed & discredited by the people around the world as sheer lies of Bush & Blair (especially after the leakage of the minutes of Tony Blair's war council meeting at Ten Downing Street) both of them have advanced new justifications for war.¹² Now they

proclaim that it was their moral imperative to rid Iraq of Saddam Hussain & his tyranny & introduce “democracy and freedom” in Iraq & present it as a model for the Greater Middle East.¹³ The fact of the matter is that both these leaders are busy in reassuring themselves and their respective nations that the coalition forces are winning the war in Iraq. And their troops will rush home, the moment the Iraqis are enabled to hold on to power & defend themselves against the insurgents. In their heart of hearts though, they are thoroughly convinced that ground realities belie their statements & that Iraq has turned into another Vietnam. They are just planning to rush out of Iraq under a smoke screen of victory of democracy & freedom. As a parting gift, they may push the entire Middle East to Shia-Sunni sectarian war.

Renewal of War Manifesto:

In March 2006 that is after three years of Iraq occupation Bush reaffirms & renews his war manifesto in yet another statement on National Security Strategy. He states “our strong preference and common practice is to address proliferation concerns through international diplomacy in concert with key allies and regional partners. If necessary, however, under long standing principles of self-defense, we don’t rule out the use of force before attack occur...we can’t afford to stand idly by as grave dangers materialize. This is the principle and logic of preemption. The place of preemption in our National Security Strategy remains the same”.¹⁴

As this statement shows, Bush still exhibits unflinching commitment to preemptive doctrine and announces that his policy would remain the same. He still declares that war in Iraq would go on even beyond 2008, his own term in office and only some future President (of the U.S.) may contemplate on withdrawal of the U.S. troops from Iraq. It may be underlined that Bush, unlike Nixon, is psychologically handi-capped. Since Vietnam war was not initiated by Nixon, but was inherited as a legacy from earlier administrations, he could freely declare the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. On the contrary, Bush is himself the architect of the Iraq war even when predominant majority of

the people around the world were opposed to his reckless decision. Given his cowboy mentality and his psychological inhibitions, he can't admit with open heart that his decision was wrong/faulty & that he is willing to retrace his steps and withdraw the troops. After all white House is not a church nor is Bush engaged in any confessional statement. Hence no wonder that he is still asking his nation to make more sacrifices and give him more time to take this war to victory. Ground realities, however, are not supportive of his imperialistic ambitions. For instance, as of now, more than 60% Americans believe that it was an absolute blunder to send troops to Iraq. A Jewish historian goes even further & contends that Bush's blunder is of a singular nature. No other ruler, during the last 2000 years, has ever committed a blunder of this kind. Now more than 50% Americans want that the troops should be immediately withdrawn. Even 75% soldiers fighting in Iraq believe that the U.S. should leave Iraq within a year. Those who were once certain that the U.S. would win in Iraq, has gone down from 79% to 22%. Already the United States has received the body bags of around 3000 soldiers. Likewise, they have received over 20000 soldiers-wounded so seriously that they may never recover and resume their normal life even after a prolonged medical treatment. Financially, the war has claimed more than \$250 billion and the figure may mount up as the war continues. Politically, this war has bitterly polarized & divided the country. The U.S. Patriot Act is another serious blow to the basic liberties and civic rights of the citizens. It appears that Bush has asked his countryman to sacrifice their liberty for the sake of their security. Whereas, the age-old experience confirms that those who sacrifice their liberty to ensure their security end-up in losing both. Some critics contend that probably Bush is busy introducing "democracy & freedom "in the Muslim world while denying it to his own people.

But that is just one-side of the story. On the other side brutalities & atrocities of coalition forces have claimed the lives of more than 200,000 Iraqis – men, women, & children. And those who are still alive are crawling under the shadow of death & destruction and are subjected to most inhuman torture, disgrace and

humiliations. In brief, Iraq, the cradle of human civilization, is completely destroyed; schools, colleges, universities, houses, and museums, food, water, electricity, virtually everything that could preserve and sustain human life, is demolished. Only Oil-refineries, the main concern of the U.S and its allies, are still intact. In spite of this incredible death and destruction-insurgency is on the rise. Jihadis, wave after wave, are pouring in from all directions. With every passing day, they are growing not only in confidence and numerical strength, but also in their war strategy. They are learning from their mistakes and are now avoiding concentration of their forces at any point. They are spread around, divided in small units. They hit the enemy hard & melt into the local community. Anticipating the eventual out-come of the war, commanders of the coalition forces have repeatedly informed their respective governments that they cannot deliver them any military solution. Bush administration is severely criticized. People have launched massive demonstrations to express their disapproval, their resentment and their anger over this illegal and immoral war of aggression. Fresh recruitments for armed services have become increasingly difficult. Some critics hold that the Bush Administration was doomed to failure in Iraq right from the beginning mainly because they didn't deploy the requisite fighting force to this war. As a result, the U.S. forces were unable to seal the borders and control the situation. Besides if the Bush administration was to be believed, their intelligence agencies deceived them twice; once before the war, & once after the war. Their pre-war deception was related to their false reporting that Saddam was sitting on huge piles of WMD; and that there were active contacts between Saddam & Osama bin Laden where the latter was likely to be used for attacking the United States and its allies. Their post-war failure relates to their inability to detect and report well on time that insurgency was on its way. This failure was particularly disastrous and ruinous as it had turned possible victory into a positive defeat (in Iraq). Insurgents are quite confident of their success. Coalition forces, on the other hand, are losing their heart and are unable to move around and impose any law & order in the country. Insurgents don't want to negotiate with the invading forces or their commanders. While the

U.S (&its allies) are running around to seek more partners to this war. That also indicates as to who is losing the war and smelling the defeat.

When Bush & Blair saw the defeat writ-large, they did everything possible to push the country to Shia-Sunni sectarian war. They are also prompting ethnic tensions. Unfortunately, Iraq has already been divided on ethnic & sectarian grounds. Kurds were encouraged to establish their own autonomous and independence province during the long years of sanctions. Shiites have gained supremacy due to demographic edge and recent constitutional arrangements have further strengthened their monopoly over political power and oil revenues. As of now, they are running the Govt. and are fully patronized by the occupying forces as well. Sunni Arabs are the only ones left alone to fight for their survival. As a matter of fact, they are sandwiched between Shia militias with its death squads (fully helped by the Interior Ministry) on the one hand, and invading armies, on the other. Insurgency is attributed exclusively to Suni Arabs and they are subjected to all sorts of atrocities. Americans, as we said carlier on, are doing their best to push not only Iraq but also the entire Middle East to Shia-Sunni sectarian war and violence; Even though publicly they plead innocent and are contending that they are the ones holding the lid on sectarian war and violence.¹⁵ It is matter of common knowledge that on the average over 150 persons are losing their lives per day because of civil strife.¹⁶ Under these circumstances, Bush's pronouncements that Iraq (& Afghanistan) are moving from dictatorship to democracy; and that they have evolved their own constitutions and have elected leadership; and are enjoying the blessings of freedom and liberty sound like adding insult to injuries. Of late, Bush administration is feeling that by removing Saddam from power, they have strengthened Iran- as Iraqi Shia regime is heavily pro- Iran. Now the U.S. is therefore, urging the Shia leadership to be inclusive and accommodative in their approach and give due and proper participation to Sunnis (& Kurds as well). They are also urging them to raise a supra-body that may supervise the revenues earned from oil and then distribute it on equitable basis amongst all three major

factions of the country. Unfortunately, the Shia leadership is not conceding to many of these demands; The United States is blaming Iran for creating difficulties in Iraq. Of course, Iran has its own agenda and its own ambitions for the Middle East. Mehmood Ahmedinejad did refer to some of these elements in his inaugural presidential address. Iran U.S. clash on nuclear issue has added a new dimension to the volatile situation in this region.¹⁷ The United States and the West are doing their best to create a Shia –Sunni sectarian war in the entire Middle East.

Under these circumstances, Bush's insistence that preemption is the back-bone of his defense strategy ignites new apprehensions. It looks that Bush is getting ready for another preemptive strike and this time Iran is likely to be its victim. In fact, Bush is busy in resurrecting the old arguments that he fabricated for justifying his Iraq invasion. He is propagating that Ahmedinejad is a "potential Hitler" of 21st century and is posing a serious threat to world peace. He is blaming Iran for violating the NPT agreements. Bush insists that he would not allow Iran to get these strategic weapons and threaten another world war. Seymour M Hersh, a distinguished journalist, in one of his recent article; "The Iran Plans", published in the New Yorker, has stated that Bush has already identified 400 targets that would be blown out by the U.S air force thro' bunker-busters and similar other devices. He also states that the U.S. agencies are busy recruiting man-power from minority groups such as, Kurds, Azeris & Baluchis so that they could help the U.S. to defeat Iran & effect a regime change. S.M. Hersh further points out that well informed observers are of the opinion that in Iran- U.S. dispute there is "much more (at stake) than the nuclear issue". That is just a rallying point and there is still time to fix it". The real issue is "who is going to control the Middle East and its oil in the next ten years". So the world is waiting for the other shoe to come down.

It appears that the world has still to pay more prices for the crusading zeal and the "messianic vision" of G.W. Bush. Already he has stated that God asked him to go and attack Afghanistan. Likewise, God also asked him to go and attack

Iraq. Probably his God is urging him now to go after Iran. Unfortunately, Bush has still 2 years of stay in the White House. Apparently he enjoys a hot-line contact with God (of war & violence). It is quite possible that his God may ask him to blow out this planet before he is driven out of the White House. There is great danger that Bush may force the world to share the common grave unless something substantial is done to avert this catastrophe. Let us now turn to the implications of these strategies.

The preemptive doctrine, the central theme of Bush's National Security Strategies, is to the world, what the United States Patriot Act is to its own citizens. Just as the Patriot Act wants the U.S. citizens to sacrifice their liberty and freedom for ensuring their security and survival; the preemptive doctrine wants the nations of the world to sacrifice their sovereignty, freedom and independence in order to safeguard their survival and security. The message of preemptive strike against Iraq was that Iraq-like defiance could lead to Iraq-like fate that is, total destruction. In essence the preemptive doctrine is a coercive element of the U.S. foreign policy and its objective is to promote its global imperialism. On its way towards the realization of its objectives, the U.S. initially managed to put two of its presumed arch enemies, that is the communists and the Muslims, to fight against each other in Afghanistan. And when the Soviets along with their Communist empire were drowned in the blood of the Afghans/Muslims, Americans immediately turned around to fight against the Muslims in the Gulf war. American ideologues, the Jewish lobby fully assisted by the neo-conservatives, and the Christian Zionists urged Bush senior to go after the Muslims and conquer the East as well (for so long as militant Islam is knocking at our doors we can't feel secure). Now in the second round of Gulf war, Bush-junior is trying hard to combine both the forces of communism and of capitalism to fight against the Muslims. The Bush Administration is relentlessly working to isolate and divide the Muslims on ethnic and sectarian grounds. Their final aim of course it to destroy them and squeeze them out of existence. Jihadists, the invisible and elusive force, on the other hand, are

brimmed with confidence that if they could defeat Communist empire with the blessing of God, they could also defeat the capitalist empire with His outpouring mercy. So the war goes on in Iraq and Afghanistan and may extend to the entire Middle East, including Iran and Syria.

America's preemptive war, it may be underlined, was not just a war against Iraq, it was also a war against, international law, the UN Charter, the sovereignty of nations, the dignity of man and the sanctity of his basic rights. Under these circumstances, what happened at Abu Gharaib jail and other jails under the U.S. control in Cuba and Afghanistan should come as no surprise.¹⁸ American conduct in these jails indicates the moral bankruptcy of the United State and marks the beginning of their decline. This preemptive strike has in fact pushed the entire world to the Hobbesian state of nature, where the U.S. super-power, left alone in the jungle, is madly running around shouting at different nations "you are the next". In the cold war era, there was some lurking fear that local wars could escalate into global wars and spell disaster for the entire world. Hence both sides were restrained. With the defeat of the Soviets in Afghanistan however, that fear is gone. And as a result, the U.S. initially wants to rob the Muslims of their oil and other natural resources. Also, she wants to demolish their defense potentials especially their nuclear capabilities. And with this robbed money, the Americans plan to reinforce & back-up their super war-technology with super economy; and then to crush the emergence or re-emergence of any new or old power that may threaten their hegemonic interests.¹⁹

In this global war for global imperialism, the United States leadership expects the European Union to support its geo-political ambitions and remain cooperative and submissive. Americans are reminding the Europeans that they are in fact their old benefactors as they saved them from the brutalities of Fascism and Nazism, It is mainly because of their sacrifices that the Europeans are now enjoying the blessings of "perpetual peace" and prosperity whilst the Americans are still fighting their wars against the terrorists of global reach. As a

natural quid-pro-quo, it is expected of them to approve of the war manifesto of the U.S. and support its ambitions of global imperialism as recompense to their past and present services.

Likewise, the U.S. is warning the Russians, its old adversary, to stay in line and support the popular struggle for freedom and democracy in their own country and also in their neighboring Central Asian, and East European, states. Bush insists that Putin shouldn't revert or slide back to totalitarianism, communism and controlled economic system. Further, he contends that it is in the best interest of the Russians to support America in its war against global terrorism. In this way they, too, can enjoy a free-hand to rush their own Chechnya separatists.

The U.S. message to China is no different either. Bush concedes that China has allowed economic freedom to its people. But adds that unless they also allow them religious and political freedom, their efforts to modernize their country will remain half complete. Bush warns China to stay away from imposing any military solution on Taiwan, In spite of some improved trade relations with China, the country is still characterized as an emerging threat to the U.S. interests. The U.S presence in Iraq, in Central Asian states, in Afghanistan, in Pakistan, its ten years nuclear pact with India, its old romance with Taiwan and Japan, are all meant to "contain and control" China and prevent it from posing any serious threat to the U.S. and its global imperialism.

It may be underlined that the Israel Lobby, particularly after 9/11 played a crucial role in determining the foreign policy of the United States. (See for a detailed account a joint work of John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt: *The Israel Lobby And U.S. Foreign Policy – March 2006*.²⁰ In this scholarly discourse, the learned authors have offered a comprehensive documentary evidence in support of their thesis. Their thesis is that the Israel Lobby fully assisted by the neo-conservatives and the Christian Zionists, is using the American muscles and the military might for promoting and advancing the

Israeli agenda in the Middle East while the U.S. Administration is unable to pursue its own national interests, First, the lobby “bullied” Bush to Iraq war, and now its urging him to go after Iran and Syria as well. In their own words “Maintaining U.S. support for Israel’s policies against the Palestinians is a core goal of the Lobby but its ambitions do not stop there. It also wants America to help Israel remain the dominant regional power. Not surprisingly, the Israeli government and pro-Israel groups in the United States worked together to shape the Bush administration’s policy towards Iraq, Syria and Iran as well as its grand scheme for reordering the Middle East”.

The report briefly traced the genesis of modern day Israel. The report holds that in the late 19th century, there were only 15000 Jews in Palestine: now they are over 6.2 million. In 1947-48 war of independence, the Israeli Jews have driven more than a million Palestinians into exile – committed an ethnic cleansing and virtual genocide – and those who are left behind are languishing as second-rate citizens (almost slaves) in their own country which they and their ancestors inhabited for more than 1300 years. Israeli, the report contends, is not a democratic state where citizens regardless of their color, caste or creed could enjoy equal rights. Instead, it is a Zionist and racist state where gentiles or non-Jews are condemned to second-rate status: and even marriage ties cannot alter this position and qualify a person to equal citizenship rights.

Further, the report claims that Americans especially after six days war of 1967 (between Israel and Egypt, Syria, and Jordan) have identified themselves with the Israel assuming it as the under-dog. While in actuality, Israel was and is quite a force in conventional war and is also the only state in this region fully laced with nuclear arsenals. Hence after, the Americans have poured in all sorts of help & assistance to Israel. For instance, the U.S. has offered over \$ 140 billion in financial aid upto 2004 (its yearly assistance is \$ 3 billion. In per capita terms, the U.S. gives each Israeli a direct subsidy worth about \$500 per Year).²¹ It may not be out of place to mention here that after the ravages of World War II the U.S. offered \$15 billion to Japan and \$29 billion to Germany

for their reconstruction under Marshall Plan.²² Diplomatically, the Americans have assisted the Israeli Jews in wartime & promoted their interests in the so-called peace negotiations. Americans have vetoed 32 times the UN-Security Council Resolutions critical of the Israeli nuclear arsenals, which is prompting other countries of the region, such as Iran to go nuclear for their survival & security.²³ Americans presume that it is their binding moral obligation to help the Israelis because they have gone through Hitler's holocaust. Now if Hitler subjected the Jews to genocide & the Europeans remained silent on this holocaust, it was none of the fault of the Palestinians. It is a strange irony that the creation of Israel opens the door for another genocide, the genocide of innocent Palestinians. It is obvious that one crime cannot be wiped out by committing another crime. Americans will be well-advised to follow an even-handed policy in the Middle East. The report underscores that there is absolutely no moral or strategic justification for the unqualified & blind support for Israel. The U.S. would be well-advised to follow its own enlightened national interests rather than promoting the interests of Israel.

The report enquires that if there is no moral or strategic justification for this kind of support, how is it that America is heavily tilted towards Israel.²⁴ Their answer is that it is because of the power and pressure of the Israel lobby. Now lobby exercise its power in three different ways.

(i) Power of the Purse: In the first instance, the lobby tries to exert its power of the purse. They offer political bribes both to the Democratic and Republican nominees for the presidential position as well as the contestants for the membership of the Congress & the Senate. These bribes are given dignified name & are called donations for running the election campaigns. Reports are that 60% funds thus collected are the contributions of the Israel lobby, Politicians seeking different offices, therefore, can't dare to antagonize the lobby by going against their wishes. Secondly, the Jewish turn out for voting in the national elections is almost cent per cent. Moreover, the Jewish population is

concentrated in some of the key states, such as, California, Florida, Pennsylvania, New York, etc. & these states can positively influence the outcome of national elections.

(ii). Power of the Press (Manipulating the Media): American Jewish community has almost a full control over the print & electronic media. Most of the major news-papers & the weekly magazines are owned by the Jewish lobby. Major Television Channels are likewise manned and managed by the Jews. So nothing hostile to the Israel interests could get published or publicized through the press or media. In this fashion, they manipulate & control the public mind by offering them only controlled information. Further, as they control the media they can easily make or break the future of a politician if he/she tries to step on their toes or run counter to their wishes. Moreover the lobby is running nearly ten different Think-Tanks of international repute. Their research reports also contribute towards the manipulation of political debates in the country. Nothing hostile or inimical to the interests of Israel or the Jewish community could ever see the light of the day. Congressional Staff (one congressman is allowed to hire 25 persons as his personal staff for briefing him on national & international issues so that he could participate effectively in the Congressional debates. Likewise a Senator can hire 40 persons for a similar job) are mostly Jewish by their origin. They too play a crucial role in conditioning the mind of their respective congressmen or the Senators. They too help realize the objectives of the Israel lobby

(iii) Intimidation & Elimination: The third strategy of the lobby is to monitor the academia, i.e. the professors and intellectuals engaged in teaching in colleges or universities of the country. Since they too can influence the young minds, they are kept under constant vigilance by the lobby. If they ever make any critical observations concerning Israel or Israeli lobby they are harassed and intimidated by the lobby. And if they don't mend their ways & seal their lips they run the risk of personal or professional elimination. Usually they silence a critic by charging him of anti-Semitism.

(iv) The report contends that the Jews were largely responsible for dragging America to world war I & World war II . Likewise they recently pushed the U.S. into Iraq war as well. In fact, both Israel and Israel lobby were deeply involved in manipulating the intelligence reports where they painted an alarming picture of Saddam and his nuclear weapons. And when Baghdad fell in March 2003, not only the Prime Minister of Israel Mr. Sharon but also the entire nation along with their American supporters, that is the Israel lobby were pressurizing Bush to go after Syria and Iran as well as, because they were no less dangerous to the world peace. As the elections have flushed up the hard-liners in Iran and Mehmoed Ahmedinejad has openly questioned the authenticity of the holocaust & has recommended that Israel should be wiped out of the map. Iran has attracted exclusive attention of the lobby & is quite likely to be the next target of the U.S. pre-emptive strike. Bush is busy recycling the same old arguments that he once used against Iraq. Ahmedinejad is labeled as the potential Hitler of the 21st Century & if he is allowed to develop nuclear weapons, he could be a serious threat to world peace. The lobby is pressurizing Bush to go for an early pre-emptive strike. And in order to maintain their pressure they contend that if Bush acts like a proverbial cat – keen to eat the fish but afraid to enter the water-then Israel may take initiative and opt for a preemptive strike on their own. Iran invasion, it may be observed, may promote Israel's regional agenda and help her move towards reordering the entire Middle East: but it will be highly counter productive to the national interests of the United States.

For instance, the U.S. would be further alienated in the Muslim world. Even non-Muslim countries of the region are likely to be drawn into this war. Iran may choke the flow of oil by blocking the Gulf. Obviously it will damage the industrial revolution in India & China. The entire Middle East, Turkey , Russia, Japan, China & India besides Afghanistan & Pakistan are likely to be gravitated towards this war.

Our authors rightly suggest that even if Iran and Iraq become nuclear powers, they should not be a matter of deep concern for the United States. If the U.S. could live with nuclear power of Russia, China, Great Britain, France, India, & Korea, it should have no problem with Iraqi, Irani, or Pakistani nuclear weapons either. But as these presumed nuclear weapons in Iraq or Iran are a direct threat to Israel, the U.S. is driven by the lobby to go for a preemptive strike (s).

The report recommends that the U.S. may feel obliged to protect the security of Israel (if that is at stake) but it should not become a party to its genocidal efforts and regional aspirations and that too at the expense of our own long-term national interests. Fact of the matter is that the U.S. is made the target of the terrorist attack because of its policy towards Israel vis-à-vis the Palestinians and not the other way around. The U.S. therefore should openly discuss and debate the role of Israel lobby (and of Israel state) in our foreign policy. The report concedes that the lobby has a legal and moral right to plead for its interests: but it has no legal or moral right to silence its critics through intimidation and elimination. Further, the U.S. should adopt an evenhanded policy in the Middle East if it is keen to eliminate terrorism & extremism in the Muslim world.

It is really unfortunate that centuries old horror of annihilation has gone into the national psyche of the Jewish community. As a result of this cumulative suffering they have developed a persecuting mania. They think that the entire world is conspiring to kill them and wipe them out of the map. Obviously a sick mind or a nation of this kind would prefer to exercise a pre-emptive strike, that is, try to kill others (presumed enemies) before they could kill them. Now this persecuting mania or fear is coupled with the military might of a super power, and the lobby is further exploiting the crusading zeal of Bush & his Administration. When all these elements are joined together they obviously make the most dangerous combination. As a result, it is not just the Muslim world that is in danger the whole world is likely to be blown out. We must do something real fast to avert this danger. One pertinent step could be to expose

the vicious role of Israel and of Israel lobby in the foreign policy of the United States. This may help us to change the war manifesto of the G.W Bush rather than changing the whole world to ruins.

END NOTES

- 1 . The **Iraqi no-fly zones** (NFZs) were proclaimed by the United States, United Kingdom and France after the Gulf War of 1991 to protect Kurds in the north and Shiite Muslims in the south. Iraqi aircraft were forbidden from flying inside the zones. The policy was enforced by US, UK and French aircraft patrols until France withdrew in 1998. The NFZ operations had the effect of reducing Iraqi ability to counter air strikes prior to the 2003 invasion of Iraq.
- 2 . Prior to the invasion, the United States' official position was that Iraq was in violation of UN Security Council Resolution 1441 regarding weapons of mass destruction and had to be disarmed by force. See: Powell, Colin (February 5, 2003). U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell Addresses the U.N. Security Council. Whitehouse.gov. Retrieved on 2006-05-25.
- 3 . "Plans For Iraq Attack Began On 9/11", *CBS News*, Sept. 4, 2002. Retrieved on 2006-05-26.
- 4 . Iraq was occupied in 2003, mainly basing on this reason however, post war occupation forces could not find any trace s –linking Saddam with Al Qaida and WMD. Recently USA's Senate Committee has formally declared that Saddam's Iraq has no link with Al Qaida.
- 5 . "Washington Post: Blix Downgrades Prewar Assessment of Iraqi Weapons", *Washington Post*, June 22, 2003. Retrieved on 2006-06-01.
- 6 . "We used to say in the Clinton administration, when it came to the use of force, '*With others when we can, alone when we must.*' Bush administration puts it the other way around: '*alone when we can, with others when we must.*'". See Stephen Murdoch, "Preemptive War: Is It Legal?". Aavailable at: http://www.dobar.org/for_lawyers/washington_lawyer/january_2003/war.cfm
- 7 . President Bush *Remarks at Graduation Exercise of the US Military Academy West Point, New York*. available at : <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020601-3.html>, p. 2
- 8 . *The National Security Strategy of the United States* The White House, September 2002. Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nssall.html>
- 9 . "US, Britain and Spain Abandon Resolution", *Associated Press*, 2003-03-17. Retrieved on 2006-08-06.
- 10 . The United Kingdom and United States attempted to get a U.N. Security Council resolution authorizing military force, but withdrew it before it could come to a vote after France, Russia, and later China all signalled that they would use their Security Council veto power against any resolution that would include an ultimatum allowing the use of force against Iraq
- 11 . "Iraq war illegal, says Annan", *BBC News*, 16 September, 2004. Retrieved on 2006-05-25.
- 12 . Prior to the invasion, the United States' official position was that Iraq was in violation of UN Security Council Resolution 1441 regarding weapons of mass destruction and had to be disarmed by force. See: Powell, Colin (February 5, 2003). U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell Addresses the U.N. Security Council. Whitehouse.gov. Retrieved on 2006-05-25.

-
- ¹³ . In his March 17, 2003, address to the nation, U.S. President George W. Bush demanded that Iraqi President Saddam Hussein and his two sons Uday and Qusay leave Iraq, giving them a 48-hour deadline. See: Global Message. Whitehouse.gov. Retrieved on 2006-06-07.
- ¹⁴ . US National Security Strategy, March 2006.
- ¹⁵ . According to IBC, "Anti-occupation forces/insurgents" killed 9.5% of civilian victims, "unknown agents" killed 11%, and "post-invasion criminal violence" accounted for 36% of all deaths. These numbers show that most of Iraq's civilians were not falling because of the sectarian violence during the first two years, and that most Iraqi civilians were killed because of the post-occupation security void. IBC defines insurgents as, "Those who target U.S.-led forces, ordinary police and other security forces, military installations and support workers for U.S.-led forces."
- ¹⁶ . In a congressionally-mandated quarterly report, the Defense Department said on Friday that the overall attacks in Iraq rose 24percent to 792 each week and the daily Iraqi civilian casualties increased by 51 percent to nearly 120 over the past three months.
- ¹⁷ . Justifying US intentions against Iran Mr Steve writes “ *The Iranian regime’s true intentions are clearly revealed by the regime’s refusal to negotiate in good faith; its refusal to come into compliance with its international obligations by providing the IAEA access to nuclear sites and resolving troubling questions; and the aggressive statements of its President calling for Israel to “be wiped off the face of the earth.”*. See: “ Threat Watch “ , available at: <http://rapidrecon.threatswatch.org/2006/03/national-security-strategy-200/>
- ¹⁸ . Amnesty International, Beyond Abu Ghraib: Detention and torture in Iraq, March 6, 2006. See: <http://web.amnesty.org/library/index/engmde140012006>
- ¹⁹ . New WPO Poll: Iraqi Public Wants Timetable for US Withdrawal, But Thinks US Plans Permanent Bases in Iraq," World Public Opinion, January 31, 2006. Available at: http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/articles/home_page/165.php?nid=&id=&pnt=165&lb=hmpg2.
- ²⁰ . John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt: *The Israel Lobby And U.S. Foreign Policy – March 2006. London Review of the Books*, Vol. 28 No. 6 dated 23 March 2006. Available at: <http://www.lrb.co.uk/v28/n06/contents.html>
- ²¹ . John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt: *The Israel Lobby And U.S. Foreign Policy – March 2006*. op cit.
- ²² . ibid
- ²³ . ibid
- ²⁴ . ibid