

Gore, Bush, and McCain all beat the war drums

by Michele Steinberg

The Nov. 19 issue of *EIR* featured as its cover story a foreign policy essay, "Will the U.S.A. Keep Its Sovereignty?" by Lyndon LaRouche, one of the three leading Democratic Party Presidential pre-candidates. The same issue published the transcript of LaRouche's two-hour dialogue on Nov. 9 on the Internet with diplomats from 22 nations, defining a policy of hope for the coming decade.

Contrasted to LaRouche's comprehensive vision of a United States with its sovereignty and national mission fully restored, several other Presidential candidates have, in recent days, advanced their foreign policy agendas, and, to put it kindly, most of their visions are "less than meets the eye."

In fact, Steve Forbes, John McCain, George W. Bush, and Al Gore, in particular, are setting forth policies that if carried out would have only one result: war.

On a daily basis, American voters are pounded with extremist rhetoric accusing China of threatening the Panama Canal, of targetting Los Angeles with nuclear missiles, and stealing nuclear secrets; accusing Russia of war crimes, and being a nation of thieves. The effect is to render Americans unable to think strategically. In foreign policy, a "new McCarthyism" is raging in the Conservative Revolution-dominated Congress, and over the media airwaves, where Presidential candidate television "info-mercials" have already begun airing in New Hampshire and other states which have primaries in early 2000.

The ferocity of the attacks against Russia, China, and the Third World by the "Big Three" Republican candidates—Bush, McCain, and Forbes—has even alarmed Pat Buchanan, now running for the Reform Party nomination, who said, in his address to the Cato Institute on Nov. 23, "Our Republican elite offers only a bellicose echo."

The rhetoric is coming from the same foreign policy estab-

lishment of Trilateral Commission globalists who have damaged U.S. foreign policy since Zbigniew Brzezinski ran the "Trilateral" Presidency of Jimmy Carter in 1976. It's just "old wine in new bottles," as the following rundown shows: for George W. Bush, it's "Daddy's team," including former Secretary of State George Shultz, Richard "Prince of Darkness" Perle, former Undersecretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, and former National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft; for McCain, it's Henry Kissinger (and the latest McCain threat is that he would ask Brzezinski, ostensibly a Democrat, to join his team); Forbes is taking his foreign policy ideas from the neo-conservative think-tanks, including the Center for Security Policy and the Heritage Foundation, which are British to the core).

Ironically, Al Gore has the same policies as enunciated by these fanatical "Cold Warriors," who at every opportunity blast Clinton's "strategic engagement" with China. Gore had his weekly identity crisis early during Thanksgiving week. On Nov. 22, he "reinvented" himself, in a statement wherein he disassociated himself from his role as Vice President. But, Gore's campaigning on an "anti-Clinton foreign policy" has been documented by *EIR* over the last year: Gore lambasted Clinton for cancelling the bombing of Iraq in November 1998; Gore's closest Congressional backers, such as Rep. Norman Dicks (D-Wash.), have played a major role in the anti-China actions in Congress; without prior clearance, Gore *cancelled* the first-time meeting the President was to have with then-Russian Prime Minister Yevgeni Primakov on March 23, 1999, on the eve of the Kosovo war—the last chance for U.S. and Russian leaders to have found a peaceful solution.

In contrast to the Gore/GOP line, LaRouche has captured the support of fellow international statesmen, who see in his campaign a policy with which the United States can be a

positive leader in the 21st century. One of the most dramatic indications of the international friendship that LaRouche engenders, is the letter of endorsement from José López Portillo, the former President of Mexico (1976-82) (see p. 64).

Bush: the clown prince

When the Founding Fathers were struggling with writing the Constitution, they denounced the concept of an American nobility. George “Dubya” is not only a “son of a Bush,” but the son of “Sir George Bush,” who was dubbed a knight in 1993 by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II for his “service to the Empire” in the war against Iraq.

It is *against* that kind of foreign submission that Article I, Section 9 of the U.S. Constitution was written. It says, “No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign States.” G.W. Bush’s heritage as the son of a Knight of the British Empire is as alien to the interests of the United States as is his foreign policy — and as dangerous.

On Nov. 19, in his second major foreign policy speech, Bush virtually declared war on China and Russia: “If they become America’s friends, that friendship will steady the world. But if not, the peace we seek may not be found.” From the outset of his speech, Bush blasted China, saying, “China is a competitor, not a strategic partner. . . . We must deal with China without ill will — but without illusions. . . . This means keeping our pledge to deter aggression against the Republic of Korea and strengthening security ties with Japan. This means expanding theater missile defense among our allies. . . . [We] deny the right of Beijing to impose their rule on a free people. I have said before, we will help Taiwan to defend itself.” Bush said that China has to be kept in “check,” and that “China’s government is an enemy of religious freedom and a sponsor of forced abortion — policies without reason and without mercy.”

Bush also spared no effort in delivering threats against Russia, saying, “When the Russian government attacks civilians, killing women and children, leaving orphans and refugees, it can no longer expect aid from international lending institutions. The Russian government will discover it cannot build a stable and unified nation on the ruins of human rights.”

So extremist was Bush’s language that both President Clinton and a top Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman, Sun Yuxi, criticized Bush for defining U.S.-China relations as adversarial. In a news wire from Beijing, Agence France Presse reported that Sun Yuxi told journalists: “A statesman with a vision and sense of responsibility must see clearly the overall interest of China-U.S. relations.” To Bush’s comment that China “will be unthreatened, but not unchecked,” Sun said, “Any attempt to have China checked does not conform to the fundamental interest of the people of the Asia Pacific.”

The ‘Vulcans’

While Bush’s bellicose language and tough guy posture fits his profile as a bully, *not a word* of this speech was written by the candidate. According to an Associated Press report, Bush had to verify with an aide his statement that Russians “are killing civilians” in Chechnya. The entire speech was written by the “Vulcans,” the nickname adopted by the eight-core-member foreign policy team co-chaired by President Bush’s former National Security Council official Condoleezza Rice. “Vulcan” is the Roman Empire’s name for the Greek god Hephaestus, blacksmith to the gods of Mt. Olympus, who was ordered to forge the “fettters unbreakable of adamantine chain” that bound the god Prometheus to a rock in Aeschylus’ tragedy *Prometheus Bound*. Prometheus was punished for giving fire (knowledge) to man against the wishes of Zeus.

The other co-chair of the Vulcans is Paul Wolfowitz, who is best known for drafting a plan to assassinate Iraqi President Saddam Hussein and to invade Iraq with an exile army modelled on the Cuban “Bay of Pigs” fiasco. Other Vulcans include Bush-league operatives in the national security establishment and Defense Department: Richard Armitage, Robert Blackwill, Stephen Hadley, Dov Zakeim, Robert Zoellick, and Richard Perle, a member of the “X Committee,” the Israeli espionage operation that reportedly controlled convicted spy Jonathan Jay Pollard.

Bush and his “Vulcans” are not that original. On Nov. 12, Steve Forbes gave virtually the same speech on China. Forbes’s rantings have been praised and are being distributed by the Center for Security Policy, a one-man show run by Frank Gaffney, the former assistant to Perle, which has a big advisory board. Gaffney has also been identified as a member of the “X Committee.”

The third of the “Big Three” Republicans is Sen. John McCain (Ariz.), who is breathing down Bush’s neck in New Hampshire. Polls show that McCain could win the first primary, and deliver the kind of psychologically destabilizing blow to Bush that Buchanan delivered to the elder Bush in 1992, leading to the eventual defeat of Bush by Bill Clinton. But McCain offers no alternative to the incessant challenges to world stability but endless verbal confrontations with China and Russia. Washington sources report that he is the “repository” for traditional Republicans who dislike the Bush dynasty, and realize that “Dubya” is a personal disaster. However, McCain retains Kissinger as his foreign policy guru, and says that Theodore Roosevelt, the Anglophile who ushered in a century of war and catastrophe, is his “personal hero.” In several statements since his TV appearance on Face the Nation on Nov. 20, McCain has stated his intention to run a “bipartisan” foreign policy team — by adding Brzezinski. McCain knows full well that to the current Russian leadership, tweedledum-ber Brzezinski is a “red flag,” one who is demanding that Russia give up claim to Chechnya, or be faced with ultimate military action by the West.