

substantiate the report and lots to call it into question. There the matter rested—until last Summer, after the Bush Administration made the decision for war in Iraq.

Cheney, in a speech on Aug. 26, 2002, claimed that Saddam Hussein had “resumed his effort to acquire nuclear weapons.” At the time, CIA analysts were involved in a knock-down, drag-out argument with the Pentagon on this very point. Most of the nuclear engineers at the CIA, and virtually all scientists at U.S. government laboratories and the International Atomic Energy Agency, found no reliable evidence that Iraq had restarted its nuclear weapons program.

Estimates Changed for Cheney

But the Vice President had spoken. Sad to say, those in charge of the draft National Intelligence Estimate took their cue and stated, falsely, that “most analysts assess Iraq is reconstituting its nuclear weapons program.” Smoke was blown about aluminum tubes sought by Iraq that, it turns out, were for conventional weapons programs. The rest amounted to things like Hussein’s frequent meetings with nuclear scientists and Iraq’s foot-dragging in providing information to UN inspectors.

Not much heed was paid to the fact that Hussein’s son-in-law, who supervised Iraq’s nuclear program before he defected in 1995, had told interrogators that Iraq’s nuclear capability—save the blueprints—had been destroyed in 1991 at his order. (Documents given to the United States this week confirm that. The Iraqi scientists who provided them added that, even though the blueprints would have given Iraq a head start, no order was given to restart the program; and even had such an order been given, Iraq would still have been years away from producing a nuclear weapon.)

In sum, the evidence presented in last September’s intelligence estimate fell far short of what was required to support Cheney’s claim that Iraq was on the road to a nuclear weapon. Something scarier had to be produced, and quickly, if Congress was to be persuaded to authorize war. And so the decision was made to dust off the uranium-from-Niger canard.

The White House calculated—correctly—that before anyone would make an issue of the fact that this key piece of “intelligence” was based on a forgery, Congress would vote yes. The war could then be waged and won. In recent weeks, Administration officials have begun spreading the word that Cheney was never told the Iraq-Niger story was based on a forgery. I asked a senior official who recently served at the National Security Council if he thought that was possible. He pointed out that rigorous NSC procedures call for a very specific response to all Vice Presidential questions and added that “the fact that Cheney’s office had originally asked that the Iraq-Niger report be checked out makes it inconceivable that his office would not have been informed of the results.”

Did the President himself know that the information used to secure Congressional approval for war was based on a forgery? We don’t know. But which would be worse—that he knew or that he didn’t?

Profile: Aaron Friedberg

Cheney Adds China-Basher To National Security Staff

by Mike Billington

As of June 1, Professor Aaron Friedberg, who heads Princeton University’s Center of International Studies, moved to the White House on a one-year contract to work as Vice President Dick Cheney’s Deputy National Security Advisor with a focus on China. As *EIR* reported on June 8, Friedberg is a notorious China-basher, a founding member of the neo-conservative “Project for a New American Century” (PNAC), and one of Leo Strauss’s “Ignoble Liars.” Friedberg will fit right in among the stable of Strauss followers in Cheney’s office—if Cheney is not first impeached or forced to resign for Iraq War intelligence frauds.

A review of one of Friedberg’s public documents on China policy, “The Struggle for Mastery in Asia,” published in the American Jewish Committee’s *Commentary* for November 2000, provides evidence that Friedberg’s assignment is to create the conditions, during the coming election year, to reverse the relatively good relations which have characterized Bush Administration China policy since 9/11, and to prepare a full-scale confrontation in the second term. The neo-conservative cabal which seized power over the Bush Administration after 9/11 tolerated friendly relations with China, guided by Secretary of State Colin Powell, more out of necessity than choice, while they orchestrated the Iraq War and the adoption of the pre-emptive war doctrine. Now, in keeping with the McCarthyite assault on Powell and the State Department by Newt Gingrich—who acts as a stalking horse for Cheney and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld—Friedberg is being called on to bring China policy under full neo-conservative control.

The Only Threat to the Only Superpower?

Friedberg, in his 2000 *Commentary* article, anticipated Gingrich’s accusation that the State Department is refusing to implement the foreign policy of the President, and also breaching America’s actual imperial mission. Friedberg stated, as an assumption, that China “will seek ultimately to displace the United States as the preponderant power in the region,” and that “to permit a potentially hostile power to dominate East Asia would not only be out of line with current U.S. policy, it would also mark a deviation from the fundamental pattern of American grand strategy since at least the latter part of the 19th Century.”



Aaron Friedberg has gone from Princeton University into Vice President Cheney's office to prepare a U.S. confrontation with China during 2004.

EIR has shown (“Chicken-Hawks as China-Hawks,” *EIR*, May 23) that the neo-conservatives, in keeping with the Samuel Huntington’s “Clash of Civilizations,” have every intention to target China as well as the Islamic world. A series of RAND-centered studies in the 1990s, headed by Zalmay Khalilzad and based on the Paul Wolfowitz/Dick Cheney doctrine that U.S. foreign policy must preserve the position of the United States as the one and only superpower, identified China as the only potential long-term threat to the American imperial vision. In keeping with that outlook, Friedberg’s *Commentary* article asserted, that as China becomes more developed, “the United States will be faced with a challenge with which it has not had to cope in over a century: a strategic rival that is economically and technologically dynamic, deeply engaged in the world economy, and whose total output may come eventually to approach America’s own.” The United States will of necessity “find itself engaged in an open and intense geopolitical rivalry” with China, which “in several important respects is already under way.”

Even RAND’s Khalilzad, in a response to Friedberg’s *Commentary* article, thought Friedberg had gone overboard, in insisting on a containment policy aimed against China’s economic development. But Friedberg does not shy away from that position, declaring, “The bottom line is simple: One way or another, China’s economic growth will provide it with an increasing array of instruments with which to try to exert influence on other countries and, if it chooses, to carry forward a strategic competition with the United States. . . . To this end, the People’s Republic of China will use every instrument at its disposal, including especially its growing economic clout.”

Nor does Friedberg conceal his belief that the greatest threat to his military/strategic road map to Hell comes from those elites who believe that America’s self-interest lies in fostering peace and development through expanded economic relations. “Throughout the 1990s and down to the present,” wrote Friedberg, about both the George H.W. Bush and Clinton Administrations, “there was a strong politi-

cal inhibition against considering China a future military rival.”

To overcome this mentality of “engagement,” argues Friedberg, will require extraordinary means, since “a sufficient political consensus may not exist in the United States to support even limited sanctions.” Just as 9/11 served the neo-cons as a justification for implementing their imperial designs, so Friedberg insists that only a “sudden, severe crisis could galvanize American domestic opinion, overwhelm the objections of business groups and others with a strong vested interest in continued commercial contacts, and lead to the imposition of near-total restrictions on imports, exports, and capital and technology flows.”

It should not be doubted that Cheney and the Straussian nest in his office—now including Friedberg—are capable of creating, out of nothing if necessary, just such a “sudden, severe crisis” regarding China, as they did against Iraq, and are currently creating against Iran and Korea. Friedberg even references the “accidental” U.S. bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade in May 1999, as a miniature case in point.

Indeed, such “shock therapy” is not intended only as a means to confront China, but is equally necessary to overcome republican sentiments within the United States itself. In his book *In the Shadow of the Garrison State*, Friedberg argues that transforming America into an empire, which he euphemistically calls “state-building,” requires recurring shocks: “Crises are critical in American political development, because the sources of resistance to state-building are so strong. . . . Without a sufficiently intense galvanizing atmosphere of crisis, attempts at state-building are doomed to fail. In such cases, despite the exertions of aspiring state-builders, the institutional and ideological obstacles in their way will prove immovable. . . . Emergency justifications are acceptable only for as long as an emergency is generally agreed to be under way.”

The Friedberg case again demonstrates that Americans who believe in the republican principles of government and nation-building imbedded in our Constitution, must act immediately on Lyndon LaRouche’s call to remove Cheney and his office of Straussian fanatics from any position of power and influence in the Bush Administration.

For more information about the “Straussians,” and about China’s actual policy, see our website:

www.larouchepub.com