

Blair incites US to further aggression

BY SYED MOHAMMAD TARIQ PIRZADA

Had he been alive today, Pope Urban II (1096-99), would have certainly envied the unmatched Blair zealotry in his latest crusade to incite the US to new aggression against Arabs in the Middle East. When he ended his 40 minutes July 17 address before the joint session of US legislature, the tenor, language, and the tone of Mr Blair represented a carrier of hate with, at no cost, would settle for anything less than the crucifixion of states or societies inheriting Muslim civilization.

Calling Middle Eastern states "the states of terror", the Blair salvo spared not a single state, not even the perennially loyalists. He kept arousing fanaticism in congress, as his rhetoric went on a rampage against the Arabs. "There are states, in the Middle East, supporting terrorists", said Blair, reminding the US that, after Iraq, it must not relent against the remaining enemies. He made his case scaring the Americans that "terrorists and WMD have joined hands".

Again Middle East was the focus. Then he added that "There are shadows of darkness in the Middle East", clearly implying that they have to be cleared through the well tested pre-emptive strike doctrine. His bottom line: "The deadly virus of terrorism is bent on world destruction", thundered Mr Blair in this powerful line as his incontinent crossed all limits against the virtually defenseless Arabs.

The world may not have seen such a venom against a people - the Arabs

in particular - and the US may not have been incited as intensely against a whole civilization before. But this has happened indeed. Though, he denied a little latter that there was no clash of civilizations, yet the hatred, Blair poured into the ears of US congress against what he characterized as the "terrorist Arab states" was more than enough to contradict his earlier assertion. Then, he sharpened his focus attacking Syria and Iran as a threat, telling a receptive Congress, in effect, the target names for the next campaign.

The British are honest to Israel as its founding fathers, and thus, Mr Blair could not ignore his duty. He angrily demanded that "the Arabs must recognize Israel, as he went on to say that, we will not compromise on Israel". He never made a detour to the Israeli withdrawal from all the Arab territories e.g., Syria, Jerusalem, and the rest. As to the Arab leaders, one has to wait, or one may never know, how the moderate US allies like Saudi Arabia and the rest, would react to the Blair disdain.

The Blair visit to the US, with his onward escape to South Korea, Japan and China comes at a time when the Blair-Bush deception over WMD in Iraq, stands fully exposed. What he has sought to do through this visit is exactly what Richard Nixon has sought to do, a diversion of public attention, through his visit to Middle-East in the middle of the Watergate scandal that led to his resignation in

Why would history want to forgive a mammoth crime of aggression?

Middle East Nelson 30 July

the early seventies. Should Blair stay in power after an illegal war, and a blatant aggression against Iraq, is a question to be answered by the British themselves. But if national honor is still a material value for the Britons, of which much is already lost under Blair, then finding a new leadership, and withdrawal from Iraq are the starting points.

Looking back about a year or more, one may be reminded of Blair visit to the White House around February, 2002 when he, by his admission in one of his speeches late last year, told the US president to deal with the Iraqi WMD threat. He has been consistently making the argument that before the North Korean threat is eventually met, we, the US and UK, have to establish our credibility by demonstrating the firmness of our resolve on Iraq. "Iraq is the test case, Iraq is the test case". He kept hammering on the Iraqi threat to the security of the free world - a world that is primarily limited to the ethnic Anglican regimes in the US and UK, and that does not include the dear "old Europe" of Germany and France, as singled out by the US Defense Secretary.

Now that the twilight period of the Bush-Blair tenures has seemingly begun in their respective countries, as they stand exposed on the non-existent WMDs in Iraq, the Blair address to the US Congress, and also the following Bush-Blair press conference were noticeably reeking with a sense of guilt partly for betraying their people, and partly for decimating the credibility and the image of their countries all across the world.

"History will forgive the US and UK for waging war on Iraq even if it was uncertain whether Baghdad posed threat from WMD", says Mr Blair in his admission of crime, but the question is why would history want to forgive a mammoth crime of aggression against a nearly unarmed country. His pathetic reason: "Let us say one thing. If we are wrong, we will have destroyed a threat (Saddam's Iraq), that, at least, is responsible for inhuman suffering and carnage. That is something I am confident history will forgive".

As Bush and Blair justify aggression against Iraq through a dance in semantics - the so-called forgiveness of history since that is the only refuge the two can run for - their cover-up exercise might not help as the unsparing forces of time, the conscience of their seething electorates, and the possible Muslim resistance in Iraq, might successfully pre-empt the invasion of amnesia - the much sought forgiveness by history they are banking on.

The two cavaliers are in serious trouble at home. Mr Bush has to bear the rigours of the campaign for presidential elections in November 2004, while Mr Blair could be voted out of power any time for the lack of confidence he is facing both in the British Parliament and among the British people. Mr Bush needs complex diversions to nonplus his voters in the weeks and months to come.

Such diversions could take the form of limited military or quasi-military interventions somewhere in the Middle East. A regime change, or a regime control in an already encircled Syria, or a surgical strike against Iran's nuclear/misile facilities cannot be discounted as necessary diversions to extricate both Mr Bush, and Blair from the WMD crises.

Blair may not survive his political woes but his crusade to incite the US to a third aggression particularly against another Muslim state has a clear message for all the leaderships from Musharraf to Crown Prince Abdullah to Hosni Mubarak: It's not your allegiance but Washington's interest that counts. Musharraf may legitimize US aggression under any cover, Abdullah may smile next to Bush in Egypt, and Mubarak may play the Arab leadership card. We are depending on the US but the US is not depending on us. The way the 9/11 Congressional report has stabbed Riyadh holding its leadership responsible for terrorist attacks is a grim reminder. Do not make the aggression inevitable.