

Iraq Is a Fuse, But Cheney Built The Bomb

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

September 20, 2002

As said two days ago, in a first-impression reading, the two relevant documents issued by the George W. “43” Bush White House as draft U.S. policies, echo the fabled King Canute’s wild, and useless ranting against the wind and the waves. The first document is a fraudulent blank check payable to Infamous Folly; an unconstitutional, proposed draft U.S. Declaration of War against Iraq. The second, is a meandering, incoherent, but deadly potpourri of White House Presidential utterances, pasted, after the style of Georges Braque, on a sheaf of paper, “The National Security Strategy of the United States.”

The following three, crucial sets of facts concerning these two wretched documents are most notable.

Fact #1: The existing proof is, that neither of these two documents has been prompted in any way by factually defined, recent developments within the Iraq-controlled portions of the area within that nation’s borders, nor the fraudulent claim by the Administration, that the U.S. “war on terrorism” is a reaction to the attacks on the U.S.A. by any of the nations or organizations fingered as “rogue states,” since Sept. 20, 2001.

The fact is, that the policies contained within those two fraudulent documents were first surfaced during Spring 1990, as emissions of a task force directed by then-Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, a task force then headed by Paul Wolfowitz, Lewis Libby, and Eric Edelman. Although unsuccessful—until now—they represent the persisting, mad obsession of Dick Cheney and his Chickenhawk accomplices over the course of no less than the past dozen years.

Fact #2: The evidence since 1992 is, that the policy uttered in those documents, is not a reflection of 2001-2002 developments, but is merely another of many re-warmings of the previously failed work product embodied in a September 2000 revival of the previously suppressed Cheney doctrine of 1990. This was a policy of Vice Presidential candidate Dick Cheney, designed as a global strategic doctrine intended to govern the foreign policy of a 2001-2005 Bush Administration.



"Vice President Dick Cheney's recurring wet dreams of a U.S. worldwide Roman Empire" . . . are made more dangerous by Ariel Sharon's plans for "Palestinian removal" in a general Mideast war. The threat to civilization, says LaRouche, "demands that Cheney's prompt resignation be sought, and accepted." Here, Cheney with Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon (left).

Fact #3: This doctrine, pushed repeatedly by Cheney and his Chickenhawk accomplices since 1990, had no notable success in securing adoption until the events of Sept. 11, 2001. Although no actual proof of the authorship of the Sept. 11, 2001 physical attacks on New York City and Washington, D.C., has been presented by any government, without those attacks the previously unsuccessful policies of Cheney and his Sharon-allied Chickenhawks could not have been brought forth as the two new Bush Administration doctrines now. Solely as a result of the psychological impact of Sept. 11, 2001, Cheney, his Chickenhawks, and Ariel Sharon are now being given the war they have desired so passionately, so obsessively, over a dozen years to date.

Demand Cheney's Resignation

What a remarkable set of coincidences!

I have merely summarized three sets of facts which are each and all heavily documented, and undeniable.

If the U.S.A. is foolish enough to adopt the policies proposed in these two documents, the consequences for both the world, and the United States itself, will be early, often, and awful. As I emphasized two days ago, it must be acknowledged that, for all the rags and tatters of its ruined and collapsing economy, the now virtually bankrupt U.S. Government still has the kill-power to ruin any Middle East targets on which it is willing to spend between \$2-3 trillions during the remainder of the George "Belshazzar" W. Bush's quixotic term as President. In other words, it has the power to destroy, even perhaps obliterate the fuse, but it could not conquer the bomb of perpetual warfare which the burning of that fuse

would set off.

Such a war, once launched by the U.S.A., will degenerate quickly into an echo of Europe's 1618-1648 Thirty Years War. That war, like all religious wars known to Europe since the beginning of the Crusades, is the type of war which ends, not with peace, but with a burning-out of the territories and peoples of all those nations drawn into its maw. Then and now, those heathen packs of right-wing, nominally Christian gnostics, or pro-fascist Jews of a similar bent, which launch such wars—like Adolf Hitler more recently—unleash the kinds of destructive force which, like the United States' 1964-1972 war in Indo-China, ultimately ruin the perpetrator and his allies alike.

Let the cowardly slaves of the mass media be warned. It were better to defeat such follies as those of Cheney and his Chickenhawks—as did El Cid, even in death—than to bequeath such nightmares as these fraudulent policies to present and future generations. Shall the future measure the honor and courage of the American people, by our Congressional and other cowards' flight from an apparition of Chickenhawks? Or, will men and women of honor cease their cowardly quaking, and rally around me in saving our nation and its sacred Constitution from these wretched and Hellish creatures?

In summary, Vice President Dick Cheney's recurring wet dreams of a U.S. worldwide Roman Empire are, in and of themselves, the world's greatest single threat to the continuation of civilization in any part of this planet today. These facts demand that Cheney's prompt resignation be sought, and accepted.

LaRouche Demands Cheney's Resignation

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr. based his Sept. 22 demand for Vice President Dick Cheney's resignation on newly accumulated evidence that Cheney, and a team of his longtime underlings, have willfully lied to the American public, Congress, and the President, about the circumstances under which they have promoted war against Iraq; and have promulgated a dangerous new national security doctrine for the United States, based on the abrogation of the basic principles of international law and the Constitutional principles of the American Republic. The basic facts of the case are clear.

The White House's Sept. 19 proposed Congressional resolution on Iraq, and "The National Security Strategy of the United States of America," issued Sept. 17 over President George W. Bush's signature, have been presented as a "new" national security doctrine, forced by the events of Sept. 11, 2001, and by Saddam Hussein's persistent pursuit of weapons of mass destruction, which he is purportedly about to unleash against American targets and/or share with terrorists. The common feature of the draft war powers resolution and the "National Security Strategy" is that they promote a doctrine of American unilateral pre-emptive military action.

But as LaRouche wrote on Sept. 22, "The existing proof is, that neither of these two documents has been prompted in any way by factually defined, recent developments within the Iraq-controlled portions of the area within that nation's borders, nor . . . the attacks on the U.S.A. by any of the nations or organizations fingered as 'rogue states' since Sept. 20, 2001."

The doctrine of preemptive war, which Bush Administration hawks claim is an outgrowth of 9/11 and the imminent threat posed by Saddam Hussein, was actually written in 1990, by Paul Wolfowitz, I. Lewis Libby, and other utopians. It was triggered by the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the prospect of the Anglo-American utopians moving unfettered to their goal of world imperium, in the image of H.G. Wells' book *The Open Conspiracy*.

Details of 1990 Pre-emption Doctrine

This was documented in an April 1, 2002 *New Yorker* magazine article by Nicholas Lemann. In "The Next World Order," Lemann reported:

"After the fall of the Berlin Wall, Dick Cheney, then the Secretary of Defense, set up a 'shop,' as they say, to think

about American foreign policy after the Cold War, at the grand strategic level. The project, whose existence was kept quiet, included people who are now back in the game, at a higher level: among them, Paul Wolfowitz, the Deputy Secretary of Defense; Lewis Libby, Cheney's chief of staff; and Eric Edelman, a senior foreign-policy advisor to Cheney—generally speaking, a cohesive group of conservatives who regard themselves as bigger-thinking, tougher-minded, and intellectually bolder than most other people in Washington. . . . Colin Powell, then the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, mounted a competing and presumably more ideologically moderate effort to re-imagine American foreign policy and defense. A date was set—May 21, 1990—on which each team would brief Cheney for an hour; Cheney would then brief President Bush, after which Bush would make a foreign-policy address unveiling the new grand strategy.

"Everybody worked for months on the 'five-twenty-one brief,' with a sense that the shape of the post-Cold War world was at stake. When Wolfowitz and Powell arrived at Cheney's office on May 21st, Wolfowitz went first, but his briefing lasted far beyond the allotted hour, and Cheney (a hawk who, perhaps, liked what he was hearing) did not call time on him. Powell didn't get to present his alternate version of the future of the United States in the world until a couple of weeks later. Cheney briefed President Bush, using material mostly from Wolfowitz, and Bush prepared his major foreign-policy address. But he delivered it on August 2, 1990, the day that Iraq invaded Kuwait, so nobody noticed."

Lemann continued: "The team kept working. In 1992 the *Times* got its hands on a version of the material, and published a front-page story saying that the Pentagon envisioned a future in which the United States could, and should, prevent any other nation or alliance from becoming a great power. . . . Controversy ensued about the Bush Administration's hawks being 'unilateral'—controversy that Cheney's people but an end to with denials and the counter-leak of an edited, softer version. . . ."

The "softer version" was the parting-shot, January 1993 "Defense Strategy for the 1990s: The Regional Defense Strategy," issued by Cheney. Lemann also noted that another member of the Cheney team, Zalmay Khalilzad, published a short book, putting forward the same thesis several years into the Clinton Administration, under the title *From Containment to Global Leadership?*, which featured the same call for the United States to take preemptive steps to "preclude the rise of another global rival for the indefinite future. . . . It is a vital U.S. interest," Khalilzad preached, "to preclude such a development—i.e., to be willing to use force if necessary for the purpose."

Buttressing the basic point of the Lemann story on the Cheney "Team B" exercise in the Spring of 1990, Jim Lobe wrote about the Spring 1992 Cheney draft Defense Planning Guidance (DPG), which promoted the same preemptive war doctrine, causing a factional firestorm inside Bush 41's team.

Lobe wrote, in several online news publications in early September 2002, "When excerpts of the document first appeared in the *New York Times* in the Spring of 1992, Sen. Joe Biden, now chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was particularly outraged, calling it a prescription for 'literally a Pax Americana,' an American empire. . . .

"The document argued that the core assumption guiding U.S. foreign policy in the 21st century should be the need to establish permanent U.S. dominance over virtually all of Eurasia." Among the strategies spelled out by Wolfowitz and Libby: "Deterring potential competitors from even aspiring to a larger regional or global role," and taking preemptive action against states suspected of developing weapons of mass destruction.

Lobe reported, "The draft, leaked apparently by a high-ranking source in the military, sparked an intense but fleeting uproar. At the insistence of then-National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft and Secretary of State James Baker, the final DPG document was toned down beyond recognition."

Lobe then made the crucial link which Lyndon LaRouche had elaborated one day earlier during his Sept. 11, 2002 webcast (see *EIR*, Sept. 20): "Through the nineties, the two authors and their boss, then-Pentagon chief Dick Cheney, continued to wait for the right opportunity to fulfill their imperial dreams.

"Their long wait came to an end on the morning of Sept. 11, 2001, when two hijacked commercial airliners slammed into the World Trade Center towers in Manhattan and a third into the Pentagon outside Washington.

"And the timing could not have been more ideal. Dick Cheney had already become the most powerful vice president in U.S. history, while the draft's two authors, Wolfowitz and Libby, were now Deputy Defense Secretary and Cheney's chief of staff and national security adviser, respectively."

Lobe noted, "Advocates of the new paradigm are part of a coalition of three major political forces, which include right-wing Machtpolitikers, like Rumsfeld and Cheney, mainly Jewish neo-conservatives closely tied to the Likud Party in Israel, and leaders of the Christian and Catholic Right."

Project for the New American Century

Yet another piece of evidence supporting LaRouche's webcast analysis: The Sept. 15 issue of the Scottish *Sunday Herald* published an article by Neil Mackay, titled "Bush Planned Iraq 'Regime Change' Before Becoming President." Mackay wrote that "a secret blueprint for U.S. global domination reveals that President Bush and his cabinet were planning a premeditated attack on Iraq to secure 'regime change' even before he took power in January 2001."

Mackay referred to the September 2000 report, "Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources For a New Century," by the rabid neo-conservative think-tank, Project for the New American Century (PNAC). He quoted from the section of the 90-page report dealing with Iraq: "The

United States has for decades sought to play a more permanent role in Gulf regional security. While the unresolved conflict with Iraq provides the immediate justification, the need for a substantial American force presence in the Gulf transcends the issue of the regime of Saddam Hussein."

The PNAC study precisely repeated the language of the 1990 and 1992 Cheney Defense Department studies, promoting a "blueprint for maintaining global U.S. preeminence, precluding the rise of a great power rival, and shaping the international security order in line with American principles and interests." It is not surprising that the study so closely followed the Pentagon studies of a decade earlier. Two of the principal participants in the task force that produced the document were Paul Wolfowitz and Lewis Libby. Others included Robert Kagan, William Kristol, and Dov Zakheim (now Pentagon Comptroller).

The Introduction to the PNAC's Sept. 2000 study was unabashed about the fact that it was based entirely on the Cheney Defense Department studies from the early 1990s. The Introduction stated, "In broad terms, we saw the project as building upon the defense strategy outlined by the Cheney Defense Department in the waning days of the Bush Administration. The Defense Policy Guidance (DPG) drafted in the early months of 1992 provided a blueprint for maintaining U.S. preeminence, precluding the rise of a great power rival, and shaping the international security order in line with American principles and interests. . . . The basic tenets of the DPG, in our judgment, remain sound." This is hardly a surprising conclusion, given that the two primary authors of the Cheney DPG, Paul Wolfowitz and Lewis Libby, were participants in the group.

Indeed, the September 2000 study stated: "At present the United States faces no global rival. America's grand strategy should aim to preserve and extend this advantageous position as far into the future as possible. There are, however, potentially powerful states dissatisfied with the current situation and eager to change it, if they can, in directions that endanger the relatively peaceful, prosperous and free condition the world enjoys today. Up to now, they have been deterred from doing so by the capability and global presence of American military power. But, as that power declines, relatively and absolutely, the happy conditions that follow from it will be inevitably undermined. Preserving the desirable strategic situation in which the United States now finds itself requires a globally preeminent military capability both today and in the future."

Reviewing this book of evidence against the Cheney cabal, LaRouche noted that while there is no evidence placing responsibility for the 9/11 attacks on the doorsteps of this group, it is undeniable that no one else gained as much from them. From 1990, when the policy was first promoted, in response to the imminent collapse of the Soviet Empire, through to Sept. 11, 2001, the doctrine of imperial pre-emption and unilateral American military supremacy had been

promoted by this group of utopians, but persistently beaten back, by combinations of military traditionalists and other institutional forces inside the United States, appalled at the idea of the U.S.A. abandoning its heritage for a British or Roman pursuit of world empire. The Cheney-Wolfowitz-Perle-Sharon gang moved, in the wake of 9/11, to pursue their Well-sian nightmare.

Utopian War Doctrine: A Decade in the Making

by Jeffrey Steinberg

As the following timeline demonstrates, the so-called “new” National Security Strategy for the United States, presented in the Sept. 17, 2002 document issued under the signature of President George W. Bush, is not new at all. The formulations contained in the Bush document are derived 100% from published documents, devised by the utopian imperial faction inside the Dick Cheney Pentagon in the 1990-92 period, in response to the collapse of the Soviet Union. The same content reappeared under various sponsorships throughout the 1990s and in September 2000—all prior to the events of Sept. 11, 2001.

May 21, 1990: Paul Wolfowitz, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Policy, made a presentation before Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, arguing that the United States must pursue a national security policy of denying any other nation or group of nations the ability to challenge America’s military supremacy, in the aftermath of the demise of the Warsaw Pact. The Wolfowitz doctrine was prepared by Wolfowitz, I. Lewis Libby, and Eric Edelman, at Cheney’s behest.

Feb. 17, 1992: Patrick Tyler published an article in the *New York Times*, “Pentagon Imagines New Enemies To Fight in Post-Cold War Era,” revealing a draft text of a Defense Planning Guidance, prepared by Wolfowitz for Cheney, which repeated the call for the United States to establish long-term unassailable military supremacy over the globe, including the use of pre-emptive force to block any nation from achieving the capacity to undermine that American dominance. “The world order is ultimately backed by the U.S.,” the document declared.

1993: Zalmay Khalilzad, another member of the Cheney-Wolfowitz Pentagon team, enunciated the doctrine in a book, *From Containment to Global Leadership?*, demanding that the United States “preclude the rise of another global rival for the indefinite future . . . to be willing to use force if necessary for this purpose.”

July 8, 1996: Richard Perle, close ally of Wolfowitz, delivered a report to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, to be the basis for a July 10, 1996 Netanyahu speech

before a joint session of the U.S. Congress. The report, “A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm,” advocated abrogation of the Oslo Accords, annexation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip, and a war against Iraq, to divide the Arab world and create a permanent rift between the United States and the Arabs, to establish a new Washington-Tel Aviv axis of military domination over the Near East and Persian Gulf. Principal authors of the study, which was prepared for the Jerusalem-based Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies (IASPS), were Perle, Doug Feith, David Wurmser, Meyrav Wurmser, and Charles Fairbanks. Fairbanks is a longtime associate of Wolfowitz, and, in effect served as Wolfowitz’s representative on the task force. IASPS produced two in-depth studies to facilitate implementation of “Clean Break”: “Coping With Crumbling States: A Western and Israeli Balance of Power Strategy for the Levant,” and “Succession in Saudi Arabia: The Not So Silent Struggle,” which spelled out detailed strategies for destabilization and “regime changes” in Iraq and Saudi Arabia.

Feb. 19, 1998: Richard Perle and former Congressman Stephen Solarz (D-N.Y.) sponsored an open letter to President Bill Clinton, demanding military action to overthrow the Saddam Hussein regime, and replace it with the Iraqi National Congress, headed by convicted swindler Ahmed Chalabi. The letter was co-signed by 40 leading neo-conservatives, including Doug Feith, Zalmay Khalilzad, David Wurmser, and Paul Wolfowitz, who were all involved in either the 1990 Pentagon study and/or the 1996 “Clean Break” study.

September 2000: The Project for the New American Century issued a report, “Rebuilding America’s Defenses: Strategy, Forces, and Resources for a New Century,” which repeated the 1992 Defense Planning Guidance call for U.S. global military supremacy and the use of pre-emptive military force to defeat any challenges to that supremacy. The report was prepared by a task force that included 1992 co-authors Wolfowitz and Libby, along with Eliot Cohen, Robert Kagan, William Kristol, and Dov Zakheim.

Documentation

World Responses to U.S. Preemptive War Doctrine

Western Europe

Neil Mackay, “Bush Planned Iraq ‘Regime Change’ Before Becoming President,” *Sunday Herald*, Glasgow, Scotland, Sept. 15:

“A secret blueprint for U.S. global domination reveals that President Bush and his Cabinet were planning a premeditated attack on Iraq to secure ‘regime change’ even before he took

power in January 2001.”

Mackay refers to the September 2000 report, “Rebuilding America’s Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources For a New Century,” by the Project for the New American Century (PNAC), and quotes from the section of the report dealing with Iraq: “The United States has for decades sought to play a more permanent role in Gulf regional security. While the unresolved conflict with Iraq provides the immediate justification, the need for a substantial American force presence in the Gulf transcends the issue of the regime of Saddam Hussein.”

The PNAC study precisely repeated the language of the 1990 and 1992 Cheney Defense Department studies, says Mackay, promoting a “blueprint for maintaining global U.S. pre-eminence, precluding the rise of a great power rival, and shaping the international security order in line with American principles and interests.” It is not surprising that the study so closely followed the Pentagon studies of a decade earlier. Two of the principal participants in the task force that produced the document were Paul Wolfowitz and Lewis Libby. Other project participants included: Robert Kagan, William Kristol, and Dov Zakheim (currently the Comptroller of the Pentagon).

French President Jacques Chirac, Sept. 23, in Copenhagen for the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) summit conference:

“Let us give peace a chance; war is always the worst solution. As far as Iraq is concerned, war is not unavoidable.” Chirac said he would resist the new American preemptive war doctrine “with all means,” because that doctrine, once implemented, would “lead to the worst excesses.” He voiced disagreement with British Prime Minister Tony Blair’s dossier on Iraq, and, according to wire service reports, clashed with Italy’s Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, because the latter supported the Bush view “more than is good for Europe and for the world,” as Chirac is said to have characterized the discussion.

Peter Kilfoyle, “Defending Ourselves,” *The Guardian*, London, Sept. 23:

Kilfoyle, a senior British Labour Party parliamentarian, was Minister of Defense in the Blair government (1999-2000), and is now a critic of Blair. He writes that Europe should unite, to “counterbalance an increasingly paranoid and hawkish America.”

“In ancient Rome, the statesman Cato the Elder was renowned for declaiming at the end of every speech, that ‘Carthage must be destroyed,’ referring to Rome’s long-standing enemy. It is perhaps appropriate, therefore, that one of the right-wing think-tanks in the U.S. should be called the Cato Institute—except that the ultra-right of American politics sees enemies everywhere. The thinking of these ideologues is alien to most of us.”

Kilfoyle calls Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz

“so extreme, that the description ‘hawk’ does not do him justice.” After mentioning the National Institute for Public Policy and the Heritage Foundation, Kilfoyle writes that “perhaps the strangest pair of these factories of paranoia are the Center for Security Policy, and the Project for the New American Century (PNAC). The former is run by the ultra-hawk Frank J. Gaffney. He calls UN inspections in Iraq ‘hare-brained,’ and is very well-connected in Washington.

“Back in 1997, Gaffney was co-signatory of the principles of PNAC, along with Donald Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney, Paul Wolfowitz, and Lewis Libby (all senior officials to President Bush), together with Jeb Bush, brother of the President.”

Russia

“Preemptive Attack on the World,” *Krasnaya Zvezda*, official newspaper of the Russian Defense Ministry, Sept. 24:

“Official Washington is preparing to shift from the doctrine of deterrence, which the U.S. has held to throughout the Cold War until recently today, to a strategy of carrying out preemptive attacks on those countries judged to be sources of threats to U.S. interests. This means that the object of American military operations can become any country which refuses to agree to any demand from Washington.”

Krasnaya Zvezda notes that “the idea of preemptive strikes has been circulating in military political circles in the U.S. for a long time; moreover, preemptive attacks had been included in many documents in the Pentagon, including at the highest-level leadership. But only now has it become official. . . . The process began long before Sept. 11, and the terrorist attack simply strengthened and accelerated it.”

The paper remarks that “nuclear weapons play a special role in the doctrine of preemptive attacks,” pointing to indications of development of new types of nuclear weapons in the United States, including mini-nukes.

Chris Floyd, *Moscow Times*, English-language Russian daily, Sept. 24:

“Not since *Mein Kampf* has a geopolitical punch been so blatantly telegraphed, years ahead of the blow. . . . Adolf Hitler clearly spelled out his plans to destroy the Jews and launch wars of conquest . . . in his 1925 book, long before he ever assumed power. . . . Similarly—in method, if not entirely in substance—the Bush regime’s foreign policy is also being carried out according to a strict blueprint written years ago, then renewed a few months before the Regime was installed in power by the judicial coup of December 2000.

“The first version . . . was drafted by a team operating under then-Defense Secretary Dick Cheney in 1992. . . . When the Dominators were temporarily ousted from government after 1992, they continued their strategic planning with funding from the military-energy-security apparatus and right-wing foundations. This culminated in a new group, the aptly named Project for a New American Century (PNAC). Members included hard-right players like Cheney, Donald

Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, Zalmay Khalilzad (now ‘special envoy’ to the satrapy of Afghanistan) and other empire aspirants currently perched in the upper reaches of government power. In September 2000, PNAC updated the original Cheney plan in a published report, ‘Strengthening America’s Defenses.’ . . . Anyone still ‘puzzled’ over the Bush Regime’s behavior need only look to these documents for enlightenment. They have long been available to the media. . . . The Dominators dream of empire. . . . One of their chief gurus, Reaganite firebreather Michael Ledeen, says that if the Dominators reject ‘clever diplomacy’ and ‘just wage total war’ to subjugate the Middle East, ‘our children will sing great songs about us years from now.’ This madness, this bin Laden-like megalomania, is now driving the hijacked American republic—and the world—to murderous upheaval.”

United States

John Ikenberry, “America’s Imperial Ambition,”
Foreign Affairs, October 2002:

Ikenberry, a Georgetown University professor of “Geopolitics and Global Justice,” criticizes “America’s imperial ambition” and traces the new Bush doctrine to Paul Wolfowitz’s 1990 draft. He argues that a unilateralist and pre-emptive U.S. strategy will be self-defeating, in that it will weaken and destroy the alliances, such as NATO, and international campaigns, such as that against proliferation, which are needed against terrorism.

“History shows,” he writes, “that powerful states tend to trigger self-encirclement by their own overestimation of their power. Charles V, Louis XIV, Napoleon, and the leaders of post-Bismarck Germany sought to expand their imperial domains and impose a coercive order on others. Their imperial orders were all brought down when other countries decided they were not prepared to live in a world dominated by an overweening coercive state. America’s imperial goals and *modus operandi* are much more limited and benign than those of age-old emperors. But a hard-line imperial strategy runs the risk that history will repeat itself.”

Ikenberry discusses the doctrine that America’s military strength must be kept beyond the ability of any nation or coalition to try to challenge it. He writes, “This goal made an unsettling appearance at the end of the first Bush Administration, in a leaked Pentagon memorandum written by then Assistant Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz.”

Ibero-America

Editorial, “The Apotheosis of American Supremacy,”
O Estado de São Paulo, Brazil, Sept. 24:

This Brazilian establishment daily excoriates the arrogance and “Orwellian doublethink” of the newly released U.S. National Security Doctrine document.

“The text was not surprising. Since at least the President’s speech at West Point Military Academy, last June 1, it was known that the new thinking dominant in Washington was



British Prime Minister Tony Blair is alone with U.S. warhawks—here, with Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld: Blair is virtually the only world leader supporting the new Bush pre-emptive war doctrine and its application to Iraq.

retiring the philosophy of deterrence and containment that had guided the United States to final victory during nearly a half-century of Cold War with the Soviet Union. . . . But, if it was not surprising to anyone who had closely followed Bush’s foreign policy for the almost 20 months between his inauguration and the Sept. 11 massacre, the document is stunning for the absolute matter-of-factness with which the U.S. government makes clear that it will respect such [international] norms and institutions only to the precise degree that they represent no obstacle to Washington’s decisions. . . .

“In a demonstration not that far from that which the late English writer George Orwell called ‘doublethink’ to characterize the lexicon of totalitarian regimes, the Bush government called the principle guiding what is without doubt the most aggressive security policy adopted by the U.S.A. since President Reagan, ‘authentic American internationalism,’ in opposition to what would be a search for ‘unilateral advantage.’ Reminiscent of the ‘Big Stick’ era of Theodore Roosevelt. . . .

“In other words, no nation will have the liberty to develop

a defense system which the United States considers potentially competitive with its own. But all of them, on the other hand, must accept their 'sovereign responsibilities' in the battle against terrorism."

Helio Jaguaribe, "Superpower and Legitimacy," *O Globo*, Brazil, Sept. 23:

Jagueribe, a sociologist who is close to President Fernando Henrique Cardoso, writes that the Bush Administration's new security doctrine is changing the most important characteristic historically of the United States: that it adhered to principles of democracy and legality, in matters both domestic and international. Such was the case from Presidents Washington and Jefferson, through Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt, to Kennedy and Clinton. This consistent democratic orientation is what permitted the United States to become a world power in World War I, and a superpower in World War II, with the agreement of the civilized and democratic world.

Bush, after a contested election in which a majority of the citizens voted against him, instead of adopting a moderate position, "formed, with the notable exception of Secretary Powell, a Cabinet of ultras, representative of the most reactionary currents of the country, and intends now, in the name of the battle against international terrorism and the pretext of keeping Saddam Hussein from accumulating dangerous stocks of weapons of mass destruction, to militarily invade Iraq, to overthrow its President and replace him with an American puppet.

"The world now faces . . . the unilateral assertion by the only superpower, that it will superimpose its will upon international law. The long historical tradition of the United States, as an open and democratic society, respectful of law, is threatened by a frontal attack from the man who happens to be President. . . . Suddenly, President Bush declares himself willing to use, arbitrarily and unilaterally, his military superpower, including, if judged convenient, nuclear weapons. This challenge places the United Nations and the democratic and civilized world in an unescapable dilemma. Should American unilateralism be tolerated, even implicitly, the world will cease to be free, democracy cease to be universal, and the power of the strongest will prevail."

Mideast

***Al-Watan*, Saudi Arabian daily, publishes an article by EIR's Jeffrey Steinberg, "Pollard's Spies in the White House" Sept. 20:**

Steinberg reports the latest revelations made by Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche on the role of Israeli agents, including people in the office of Vice President Cheney, such as Lewis Libby.

Zainil-Abdin al-Rikabi, *Asharq al-Awsat*, Saudi Arabian daily, Sept. 14:

Zainil-Abdin Al-Rikabi, a well-known Saudi religious author, comments on President Bush's decision to take the Iraq case to the United Nations. "Bush's backing down from a direct war could be due to the growing opposition, or an attempt to contain the wide opposition to the war both domestically and internationally. Meanwhile, we should not downplay the other options, because the plans to attack Iraq are mixed and interconnected with parallel strategies aiming at redrawing the maps of the region. There are people in Washington who are pushing into this direction to serve the Zionist strategy, as American political leader Lyndon LaRouche has said. And, this is what he said literally: 'There is now firm evidence that the ongoing drive to induce President George W. Bush to launch a war against Iraq, is a 1996 Israeli policy that is being foisted on the President by a nest of Israeli agents inside the Israeli government.' "

Patrick Seale, "Have the Washington Hawks Been Defeated?" *Al-Hayat*, London-based Saudi-Lebanese daily, Sept. 20:

"The hawks in Washington and Tel Aviv are furious. They were preparing to smash Iraq, unseat Saddam Hussein, install a puppet government in Baghdad, and redraw the political map of the entire region, shifting the balance of power decisively in favor of the United States and Israel," writes Seale, a British Mideast expert, pointing to the Iraqi decision to allow UN weapons inspectors back.

"As they voice angry skepticism about the sincerity of Iraq's intentions, the hawks' disappointment is palpable. They want to kill Saddam Hussein, not merely to disarm him." Under the subtitle "Likudniks in the Bush Administration," Seale writes: "The hawks in Washington and Tel Aviv do not want Saddam to be serious about weapons inspections. They want him to cheat and provide a pretext for war. For them, Iraq's alleged possession of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) has always been something of a side issue, while Iraq itself was only a means to an end. They dream of 'regime change' in Iraq as a stepping stone to bigger things—control of Iraq's oil, thereby reducing Western dependence on Saudi oil; pressure on Iran, seen as the major long-term threat to Israel; possible 'regime change' in both Iran and Syria; a free hand for Israel to break the Palestinians and draw new expanded frontiers; 'democratic' reform, U.S.-style, in both Egypt and Saudi Arabia; a new imperial order in the Middle East under joint U.S.-Israeli control. . . . Such are the geopolitical fantasies devised by a group of fervent American Likudniks—Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, Assistant Secretary for Defense Policy Douglas Feith, Chairman of the Defense Policy Board Richard Perle—and which have been adopted, uncritically, by the two most powerful men in President Bush's Administration, Defense Secretary Rumsfeld and Vice President Cheney, and apparently by the President himself." He warns that "some of these men are aware that, if Iraq manages to escape from war, their own ideological

vision and political fortunes could be sacrificed. They need to move fast because the timetable is extremely tight.”

From Our Archives

Suspected Soviet Cell Wrote Reagan's Long-Term Strategy

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Reprinted and excerpted from EIR, June 3, 1988.

On Feb. 19, 1988, *Washington Post* associate editor Bob Woodward published a front-page story detailing the Pentagon and CIA's futile search for “Mr. X,” the designation for a high-level intelligence community mole who was believed to be providing Pollard with top-secret code numbers of classified military documents that Pollard, a counterterrorist analyst at a Naval Investigative Service facility in Suitland, Maryland, would then pilfer and pass on to Israeli and Soviet intelligence. Shabtai Kalmanowitch, a Russian-born Israeli multi-millionaire, soon to be tried in Israel as a KGB spy, is widely believed to have been one of the Israel-Soviet “back channels” through which the “Mr. X” loot was shared with Moscow.

According to one Pentagon source, the elusive “Mr. X” is actually known to be an entire cell of shared Soviet-Israeli agents, rather than just one well-placed individual. While Woodward's headline-grabbing revelations about “Mr. X” were aimed at blocking the Department of Justice from shutting down its Pollard investigation altogether, under reported strong pressure from State Department chief counsel Abraham Sofaer and Secretary of State George Shultz himself, Pentagon and CIA officials have been reportedly aware that they are dealing with an “X Committee,” buried deep inside the American national security establishment.

One version of the “X Committee” list, reportedly passed from the office of the general counsel to the Secretary of Defense and on to the FBI early this year, contained such prominent Reagan Administration figures as: Iklé, Richard Perle, Steven Bryen, Doug Feith, Andy Marshall, Henry Rowen, and Frank Gaffney, Jr. All were, up until very recently, senior officials at the Pentagon, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the CIA's National Intelligence Estimates Board.

For the past month, a team of *EIR* investigators has con-

ducted an extensive background cross-check of these named individuals and others closely associated with them, such as Michael Ledeen, Roy Godson, and Neil Livingstone. This preliminary special report summarizes the findings to date.

Albert Wohlstetter Recruits a Net

Decades before there was Pollard and Kalmanowitch, Dr. Albert Wohlstetter had already established himself as one of America's preeminent “nuclear strategists”—certainly one of the figures upon whom the early 1960s character “Dr. Strangelove” was based. First at the RAND Corporation and the University of Chicago, and later at his own consulting firm, Pan-Heuristics, Wohlstetter groomed literally scores of protégés for future sensitive government posts.

Using the Senate offices of the late Henry Jackson (D-Wash.) and Clifford Case (R-N.J.) as stepping stones for placing his epigones into the Washington, D.C. policymaking circuit, Wohlstetter had succeeded, by the time the Reagan Administration entered office, in placing his assets in sensitive and powerful positions at the Pentagon. Dr. Fred Iklé, a Wohlstetter protégé from their days together at RAND, became the Deputy Secretary of Defense. Richard Perle, who had come under Wohlstetter's wing while still a student at Hollywood High School, and who survived a 1970 near-arrest, reportedly for passing secrets to the Mossad while on Scoop Jackson's staff, became President Reagan's most trusted arms control adviser up until his departure from the Pentagon late last year. Perle was the actual author of the disastrous INF treaty proposal jumped on by Soviet boss Gorbachov at Reykjavik. . . .

Wohlstetter apparently went to great lengths to distance himself from his years of activity as a figure in the American communist movement in the 1930s and 1940s.

By 1983, Wohlstetter and his network had so penetrated the national security apparatus of the Reagan Administration that the “father of America's MAD strategy,” as Wohlstetter was known, was formally appointed—at the same time as Henry Kissinger—to the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, a post he retains today. While not exactly an operational assignment, membership on PFIAB entitles Wohlstetter to access some of America's most important and operational intelligence secrets.

When the Reagan Administration set out to define a long-term strategy for confronting the Soviet threat going into the early decades of the 21st Century, a “private” blue ribbon commission was empaneled by Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger. The co-chairmen of the panel were Wohlstetter and Iklé.

The final product of the Wohlstetter-Iklé Commission, once one grasps the implications of the “X Committee” authorship, was predictable. Released at a Pentagon press conference on Jan. 12 of this year, *Discriminate Deterrence, a Report from the Commission on Integrated Long-Term Strategy*, made two particular policy pronouncements that were

tantamount to treason.

First, the report stated categorically that the United States should formally remove its nuclear umbrella from its European NATO allies, thus virtually assuring the Soviets of an unchallenged conventional military takeover of Western Europe at any moment they might choose.

Second, the report called for the abandonment of the President's Strategic Defense Initiative by refocussing on the more narrow objective of a point defense of America's land-based nuclear arsenal. By abandoning the overall doctrinal shift to Mutually Assured Survival based on a broad defense against all Soviet nuclear weapons, the report called for killing the whole program while at the same time abandoning the post-war doctrine of deterrence by massive retaliation.

As if to remove any doubt as to the intention of the report, co-author Wohlstetter told an *EIR* journalist at the Pentagon press briefing, "The SDI will eventually die of embarrassment [because] the notion that the Soviet Union would launch a nuclear attack against the population of the United States is absurd."

The Search for 'Mr. X'

by Joseph Brewda

Reprinted and excerpted from EIR, June 3, 1988, this profile of leading candidates for the "X Committee" controlling the espionage of Jonathan Pollard, exposes much of the warhawk leadership of the Pentagon today.

U.S. government investigators are hot on the trail of "Mr. X," the senior U.S. government official deemed responsible for having placed convicted Soviet-Israeli spy Jonathan Pollard in a sensitive post at U.S. Naval Intelligence. Without such an official, or officials, Pollard could never have reached his position. *EIR* has received a list of suspects currently being investigated by the U.S. government for having played that treacherous role. It is *EIR*'s judgment, moreover, that the individuals on the list, far from being a random collection of suspects, constitute a tightly organized conspiracy, which was responsible, *as a whole*, for patronizing and protecting Pollard. Perhaps the best description of them is "Albert Wohlstetter's children." . . . Wohlstetter was one of the founders of the RAND corporation, a center of crackpot strategies, together with Andrew Marshall, Henry Rowen, and Herman Kahn.

Altogether, the list includes:

Henry S. Rowen. Currently a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, Rowen joined Wohlstetter and Kahn at the newly formed RAND corporation in 1951, following graduation from Massachusetts Institute of Technology. His most recent government post was chairman of the National Intelligence

Estimates Board at CIA, 1980 to 1983.

In 1951, Rowen and Wohlstetter succeeded in expanding their penetration of U.S. defense circles through a RAND study on the vulnerability of Strategic Air Command bases to Soviet surprise attack. Rowen and Wohlstetter designed the insane doctrine of "flexible response" and "controlled escalation" at RAND, and later sold it to Defense Secretary Robert McNamara.

In 1959, Rowen, Wohlstetter, and Andy Marshall became key figures in the John F. Kennedy campaign. Following Kennedy's election, Rowen was appointed Deputy Assistant Defense Secretary under McNamara, where he advocated the "Mutually Assured Destruction" deterrence thesis, in opposition to the traditional military doctrine of "war-winning." Rowen served as President Johnson's assistant director at the Bureau of the Budget, and then returned to RAND. Rowen reemerged as the leader, with Wohlstetter and Kahn, of the team which wrote Jimmy Carter's notorious PD-59, a policy which removed the strategic nuclear umbrella from Western Europe.

Andrew Marshall. Currently the director of the Defense Department's Office of Net Assessments, a post he has held since 1973, Marshall oversees all Pentagon studies comparing the relative strengths of the U.S. and Soviet military. The office's assessments have been notoriously incompetent. A founder of RAND, Marshall assisted Albert Wohlstetter and his wife, Roberta, in their influential study on the vulnerability of the Strategic Air Command. While at RAND, Marshall also trained future Defense Secretary James Schlesinger.

In 1957, Marshall joined H. Rowan Gaither in directing the Council of Foreign Relations-linked Gaither Committee, which concluded that the United States would not be able to follow the doctrine of "massive retaliation," and had to, they insisted, accept the idea of U.S.-Soviet strategic parity. The committee's ideas were later picked up by Henry Kissinger. In 1973, Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger hired his mentor Marshall to become director of the Office of Strategic Assessment. Under Marshall, it became the key Pentagon office overseeing the subcontracting of strategic assessments to private firms, such as RAND. Marshall has also served as the key liaison with the Israeli Defense Ministry. In 1982, Marshall, Fred Iklé, and Richard Perle co-authored the Reagan Administration's guidelines on defense guidance.

Fred Charles Iklé. Product of an elite family associated with the National Bank of Switzerland, Iklé was trained at the RAND Social Sciences department under Wohlstetter and Marshall. From 1981 through February 1988, Iklé was Undersecretary of Defense for Policy. He is the co-author with Wohlstetter, of the recent Pentagon study, *Discriminate Deterrence*.

In addition to serving in his family's Zurich-American Insurance Company and teaching at MIT, Iklé directed the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency under President Ford. He has served as the main patron of the "X Commit-

tee's" Richard N. Perle and Stephen D. Bryen within the Defense Department.

Richard N. Perle. From 1981 through April 1987, Perle was Assistant Secretary of Defense for International, Economic, Trade, and Security Policy, serving under Undersecretary Iklé. Perle is now based at the American Enterprise Institute. Perle formulated the treasonous "zero option," and sold the policy to Ronald Reagan for the 1986 Reykjavik summit. He is married to Leslie Joan Barr, formerly a top officer at the Commerce Department and currently in the sensitive post of director of the Customs Service's International Program Management Division.

Perle got his start by dating Wohlstetter's daughter in high school. He was later a London School of Economics college roommate of another Wohlstetter protégé, nuclear strategist Edward Luttwak. Perle was sent into the Congress in 1970, as a top aide to the late Sen. Henry "Scoop" Jackson, with access to high-level classified information. In 1970, U.S. wiretaps of the Israeli embassy showed that Perle was feeding some of this classified information to the Israeli government, probably in association with Kissinger associate Helmut Sonnenfeldt.

In 1976, Perle left government to form the Abingdon Corporation, an arms trading company, with future Navy Secretary John Lehman. Perle maintained Abingdon's lucrative account with Soltam Corporation, Israel's largest mortar manufacturer, which was later implicated in the Iran-Contra arms sales. Perle was later caught receiving over \$100,000 from Soltam, after he joined the Reagan Administration in 1980, allegedly for past services due. Simultaneous with forming Abingdon, Perle founded the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA) with Stephen Bryen; Michael Ledeen, a suspected Mossad or Soviet spy later central to the Iran-Contra affair; and Yossef Bodansky, reportedly the Israeli intelligence handler of Jonathan Pollard.

Stephen D. Bryen. Currently employed at the new post of Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Trade Security Policy, Bryen had been a deputy of Perle at Defense since 1980. Bryen got his start as an aide to Sen. Clifford Case in 1971, quickly becoming Perle's closest associate in the Senate. Bryen co-founded JINSA with Perle, and his wife, Shoshana Bryen, has served as JINSA's executive director since its inception.

In 1978, Bryen was caught red-handed with the Mossad's Washington station chief, Zvi Rafiah, discussing giving the Israeli government classified information. Bryen was then staff director of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. Like Perle, Bryen escaped prosecution.

While serving as Perle's assistant at the Defense Department, Bryen formed the Technology Transfer Center, with oversight over the smuggling of strategic technology. Bryen hired Pollard's reported handler, Yossef Bodansky, to serve at the center, as well as Michael Ledeen's wife, Barbara Ledeen.

Frank Gaffney, Jr. Now based at Herman Kahn's Hudson Institute, Gaffney was Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear Forces under Perle, and was slated to be his replacement until his resignation from government last November. Like Perle, Gaffney got his start working for Sen. Scoop Jackson, and has often been described as a Perle protégé. Since his resignation, Gaffney has loudly criticized the INF treaty, whose worst features Perle masterminded. He has not broken with Perle, however, and co-authored a loyal "critique" of the treaty with Perle in February.

Douglas J. Feith. At his own Washington law firm since 1986, Feith served as Perle's deputy in varying capacities at Defense since 1982, most recently as deputy assistant secretary for negotiations policy. He had previously served on the Reagan National Security Council.

John F. Lehman, Jr. Secretary of the Navy from 1981 through 1987, Lehman is currently touted as a National Security Adviser or Defense Secretary in a Bush Administration. A relative of the late Princess Grace of Monaco, Lehman got his start as the Oxford University roommate of David Walker, a future leader of Britain's elite Strategic Air Services (SAS), and founder of KMS, Ltd., a firm which Lehman ensured handled much of the Iran-Contra arms trafficking.

Lehman was a senior staff aide and counsel to Henry Kissinger, both at the NSC and the State Department. Beginning in 1975, Lehman served as Iklé's deputy director at the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. During the Carter years, Lehman formed the Abingdon Corporation with Richard Perle.

Paul Dundes Wolfowitz. Currently ambassador to Indonesia, Wolfowitz had been Wohlstetter's student at the University of Chicago, together with Donald Fortier, the recently deceased deputy director of the National Security Council. Wolfowitz's first government post was as special assistant to Fred Iklé, 1974-77, then directing the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. After a three-year stint at the Defense Department Regional Programs Office, Wolfowitz became director of the Policy Planning Staff at the State Department, in 1981-82, and then Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs through 1985. At that post, Wolfowitz played a key role in the overthrow of Philippines President Ferdinand Marcos.

WEEKLY INTERNET
AUDIO TALK SHOW

The LaRouche Show

EVERY SATURDAY

3:00-4:00 p.m. Eastern Time

<http://www.larouchepub.com/radio>

George Pratt Shultz: The Vulcans' Godfather

by Scott Thompson

According to news accounts of Summer, 1998, a Bush family war council took place at their Kennebunkport, Maine vacation compound, where it was decided to make George Pratt Shultz (a high-ranking official in every Republican Cabinet since President Nixon's), head of then-Gov. George Bush "43's" Presidential Exploratory Committee. Shultz's deputy on the Committee, launched shortly thereafter, was former President Bush "41's" Secretary of Defense, Dick Cheney, who has since emerged as one of the most powerful Vice Presidents in history. Like Shultz, Cheney brought with him baggage, such as his 1990 Defense Secretary's brief advocating a Roman-style *Pax Americana*. Clearly, Shultz did not disagree, because almost every member of Bush 41's foreign policy team shared the post-Cold War mirage of building an "American empire." It was these two Anglo-American Establishment members of the Republican "Old Guard" who paved the way for Bush 43's successful Presidential campaign.

One of the first selections made by Shultz—who was himself then a Distinguished Fellow at the Hoover Institution among other positions—was of Condoleezza Rice, also a Hoover Fellow, who had just finished a term as Provost at Stanford. It was she who dubbed Bush 43's strategic policy team "The Vulcans," after a statue of the Roman god of metal-forging in the steel center of Birmingham, Alabama, her home town. (Some wags have suggested since, that she ought better to have dubbed the team "Martians," after the Roman god of war.)

Shortly after the Kennebunkport summit, Bush 43 visited Shultz's home in Palo Alto, California and approved the woman who was to be part "nanny," part "school marm," and today Presidential Assistant for National Security Affairs. With Condi Rice as the self-described "quarterback of the Vulcans," one of the first drafts by Shultz and Cheney was Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy Secretary of Defense. Wolfowitz, as a member of the Cheney Defense Department under Bush 41, had argued loudly that the time was ripe for a *Pax Americana* empire. Wolfowitz in turn is believed to have brought in Richard Perle, today chairman of the Defense Policy Board, having served as the highly suspect Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs from 1981-87 in President Reagan's Administration.

Thus came together the followers of H.G. Wells who

would be the trainers and advisers of the current President, whom Lyndon LaRouche has called "a dupe from birth."

Shultz and the Pollard Affair

His role with "The Vulcans" makes it hardly surprising that as Reagan Administration Secretary of State, Shultz did everything within his power to halt the investigation of convicted "spy for Israel," Jonathan J. Pollard. As *EIR* reported, from well-informed U.S. intelligence sources, the reason Pollard has never been released from prison to Israel, lies in the sealed affidavit of Reagan's Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger. Weinberger attested that far from Pollard's main focus being Arab "enemies of Israel," he gathered the most highly classified material on the U.S. war-fighting strategy against the Soviet Union, which Israel then used for trading with the U.S.S.R.—e.g., for the release of Jews to Israel.

EIR learned from Pentagon and other U.S. intelligence sources, and published, that an investigation was ongoing, not simply to find the "Mr. X" director of Pollard's spying activities, but to identify an "X Committee" acting as a Soviet-Israeli "molehill" in Washington, telling Pollard what documents were available to be turned over to the Israelis.

Ironically, one of the foremost suspects in the "X Committee" was Richard Perle (a.k.a. "The Prince of Darkness). Perle, whose appointment as chairman of the Defense Policy Board did not require Senate approval, and who reports directly to Paul Wolfowitz, has been foremost among those arguing for war on Iraq, for U.S. occupation and takeover of Saudi Arabia's eastern oil fields, for a total break with the House of Saud, and for a purge of those American military chiefs who don't agree with him. Still, Shultz drafted Richard Perle as one of the first members of "The Vulcans," who held daily conference calls "to bring Governor Bush up to speed."

It was this investigation into the "X Committee" that Shultz, when Secretary of State under Reagan, had tried to nip in the bud. For this purpose, Shultz deployed the Legal Adviser of the U.S. State Department, Abraham Sofaer, who was a former Federal Judge nominated by President Jimmy Carter, and an alleged Mossad agent. Judge Sofaer had presided over the lawsuit brought by then-Gen. Ariel Sharon against *Time* for its straightforward coverage of the slaughter in Lebanon by Falange militia under General Sharon's oversight.

No sooner did Shultz tip Sofaer to try to bury the Pollard case, than Sofaer led a delegation in late 1985 to Israel to interrogate Rafael Eitan. Eitan had been the head of Lekem—the "off-the-reservation" technological intelligence unit that was believed to have been the Israeli counterpart of the "X Committee." Not only did nothing come out of this interview with Eitan, but, while in Israel, Sofaer—according to columnists Evans and Novak—gave an interview to the Israeli daily *Ha'aretz*, where he praised Sharon's invasion of Lebanon, Israel's bombing the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in Tunisia, and its interception of an Egyptian airliner.



George Shultz (left) with Caspar Weinberger, in 1987. Shultz was instrumental in protecting Jonathan J. Pollard, who was convicted of espionage for Israel.

So, Shultz used an avowed advocate of Israel's fascist "Terror Against Terror"-style tactics, to cover-up the extent of the Jonathan Pollard espionage network. And, he rewarded Judge Sofaer by seeing that he is now a Fellow at the Hoover Institution, along with Shultz.

Other Treachery Against U.S. Interests

Shultz's personal disdain for the general welfare of U.S. citizens may originate with his background before entering high office. He was one of the first Secretaries of State, whose training had been largely that of a nerdy, cybernetics "time study" man. Shultz earned a Ph.D. in industrial economics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he also taught from 1948-57. He became Dean of the Graduate School of Business at the University of Chicago (1962-68). There Shultz was a "sherpa" for the likes of such "Chicago School" types as the Milton Friedman who followed in the footsteps of Nazi Finance Minister Hjalmar Schacht. A 1960 Shultz book that helped him obtain this job was *Management Organization and the Computer*, which peddled the fraud of artificial intelligence, and what became known as the late, great "Information Age."

Shultz served as Secretary of Labor in the Nixon Administration from 1969-70, and was then appointed Director of the Office of Management and the Budget (OMB). It was in the latter position, according to well-informed sources, that Shultz was one of the persons who strong-armed Treasury Secretary John Connolly to accept the 1971 decision to destroy the Bretton Woods monetary system. This process, especially, included dumping gold-reserve-pegged parities among currencies, to create the floating exchange-rate system. Of all the disastrous policies in the post-World War II era, this decision to destroy Bretton Woods did perhaps more than any other, to extinguish President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's success in reversing the Great Depression. In physi-

cal-economic terms, it has meant negative growth for the United States since 1971. It was critical in creating the current, accelerating, global systemic economic collapse. As a reward, the tragic Nixon appointed Shultz Secretary of the Treasury—replacing Connolly—where Shultz implemented austerity measures upon American citizens from May 1972 until May 1974.

In 1981 Shultz was made chairman of the incoming President Reagan's Economic Policy Advisory Board. In that position, he did nothing to reverse the ravages upon the physical economy—industry, agriculture, infrastructure—wrought during the previous Carter Administration by Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker's usurious interest rates. Rather, Shultz embraced the New York Council on Foreign Relations' "1980s Project" work of 1976, which had called for "controlled disintegration."

In 1982, Shultz was promoted to become the 60th Secretary of State, and served until Jan. 20, 1989. Toward the end, following then-Prime Minister Lady Margaret Thatcher's advice that Mikhail Gorbachov was a "man with whom you can do business," Shultz proposed what was then known as a "global condominium" or "New Yalta" arrangement with Gorbachov. Ironically, by 1989, Soviet hardliners, fearing an impending economic collapse, were preparing for a potential "global showdown," and Gorbachov was Secretary General in name only.

Exemplary of the "New Yalta," is the case of the Middle East, where Shultz rudely rejected Israeli and other suggestions that an economic development program for the region ought to be the key component of negotiating political solutions. Taking a page from Zbigniew Brzezinski's "Arc of Crisis," Shultz carried out secret diplomacy, offering Israel the West Bank (which had been part of Jordan), plus a part of southern Lebanon, if Israel would grant Syria, which was then a Soviet satrap, the remainder of northern Lebanon. Thus, the map of the Mideast would be redrawn into a "Greater Syria" and a "Greater Israel"—an arrangement which left the Palestinians, with whom Shultz refused to deal, with nothing.

Since leaving office, Shultz has not changed his disregard for the general welfare. He teamed up with "British Golem" and mega-speculator George Soros to promote a series of referenda to legalize narcotics, making him truly the "Godfather of The Vulcans." Thus, in an Oct. 7, 1989, speech to the Stanford Business School, Shultz said that the time had come "to make it possible for addicts to buy drugs at some regulated place at a price that approximates cost. . . . We need at least to consider and examine forms of controlled legalization of drugs." Shultz's argument, in historical effect, has been for skyrocketing addiction wherever it has succeeded.

In semi-retirement in the Hoover Institution's ivory towers, Shultz has done very well indeed, giving economic advice to many companies gullible enough to accept it from the man who helped bring about their impending demise.

He is a member of the board of directors of Bechtel Group, Fremont Group, Gilead Sciences, Unext.com, and Charles Schwab & Co. He is also chairman of the International Council of J.P. Morgan Chase, which *EIR* analysts believe may have been taken under protection of the Federal Reserve after it nearly went under this year. For now, Shultz is being well rewarded for his years of servitude to the Anglo-American Establishment.

The 'Neo-Conservative' Problem

by Dr. Clifford A. Kiracofe, Jr.

In the last several weeks, EIR has reprinted, with permission, notable commentaries questioning war against Iraq, including articles by former U.S. National Security Adviser Gen. Brent Scowcroft, former Republican U.S. Rep. Pete McCloskey of California, and speakers at a conference of the National Council on U.S.-Arab Relations in Washington. The following comments by Dr. Clifford Kiracofe were made on Sept. 9 to that conference. Kiracofe, an historian who was a senior staff member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, anticipated the contents of President George W. Bush's "neo-imperial" doctrine by several weeks. Further speeches from the U.S.-Arab conference will be covered in next week's EIR.

In June, I had the opportunity to visit Saudi Arabia and Egypt. It was instructive to be in the region again. The situation is dangerous and the gulf is widening between the United States and our friends in the region. I was pleased to meet and hear from such personalities as H.R.H. Crown Prince Abdullah, the Egyptian Foreign Minister, and the head of the Arab League. . . . Turning now to this town, I shall now comment on neo-conservatives, Christian Zionists, and the print news media.

Congressmen and Senators, while home during recess, evidently encountered a deeply skeptical electorate with respect to war against Iraq. Scurrying back to this town, somewhat chastened politicians seem nervous about the elections just ahead and the international situation.

Where the United States had the whole world behind it last 9/11, the whole world today—one can say, with good reason—is against the United States, because of the Administration's neo-conservative Middle East policy, to attack Iraq and to do nothing to solve the Palestine question.

While many in this room are familiar with the "hawks versus doves" or "unilateralists versus multilateralists" analysis of the foreign policy debate, may I offer the perspective

of "Traditionalists versus Neo-Conservatives"? In my view, the current policy debate is a confrontation between those who advocate the core values of the traditional United States approach to foreign relations, as established by the Founding Fathers, and those who are the alien-minded advocates of a radical break with American tradition.

The alien-minded neo-conservative policy network advocates the revival of a 19th-Century European imperialism—if not a ruthless and cynical 20th-Century German *machtpolitik*—as the basis for a new permanent direction in U.S. foreign policy. In fact, the neo-conservative policy network demands that the United States adopt a policy of global imperialism. That this is a constant theme in their propaganda is well known, and observable on a daily basis.

The policy of permanent global imperialism is the core of the dark, hysterical, and alien mind-set of the neo-conservatives. American foreign policy traditionalists, of course, reject permanent global imperialism and pre-emptive war. Traditionalists say international law must be respected, and that our policy should be to "observe good faith and justice toward all nations."

Because of the penetration of the Republican Party by the neo-conservative policy network during the past 20 years, the Republican Party now faces a severe internal crisis. This is reflected in the situation in Congress today by the sharp split between pro-Zionist Republicans and non-Zionist Republicans. A few sensible and respected Republican leaders of an older generation, such as James Baker and Brent Scowcroft, stepped forward to caution fellow citizens about the dangers of neo-conservative foreign policy. But the neo-conservative network of a younger generation of ideological zealots operating inside the Bush Administration, and supported by most Republicans in Congress—at least for the time being—goes about its work unimpeded, and is in fact protected at the highest levels of the Administration. . . .

1. Who Are the Neo-Conservatives?

When I refer to "neo-conservatives," I mean a particular network of Jewish-American intellectuals, operative since the 1950s. Gentile allies of the self-styled neo-conservatives, such as Gary Bauer, began to refer to themselves in the 1980s as "Social Conservatives." The followers of William Buckley, who have been allies of the neo-conservatives since the 1950s, tend to call themselves "Conservatives."

With respect to Buckley, I recall his *National Review* magazine lambasted President Eisenhower for his Middle East policy during the Suez Crisis in 1956. President Eisenhower, of course, opposed the neo-imperialism of Britain, France, and Israel. The "neo-conservative" movement emerged in the 1950s from the work of two key intellectuals, Norman Podhoretz and Irving Kristol. They had, according to some intellectual historians, drifted from pre-World War II Trotskyism to post-World War II Cold War Zionism. They



*Dr. Clifford Kiracofe:
"American traditionalists oppose a policy of permanent global imperialism and pre-emptive war."*

became Truman Democrats.

The intellectual roots of neo-conservative thinking on foreign policy matters can be traced, in large measure, to Prof. Leo Strauss and Prof. Hans Morgenthau—both emigrés from Nazi Germany teaching at the University of Chicago. Morgenthau advocated *realpolitik* foreign policy in what came to be called the "Realist School." The philosophical underpinnings of these "Realists" and neo-conservatives are, demonstrably, Friedrich Nietzsche with his advocacy of amoral power, and Spinoza with his advocacy of a certain esoteric intellectual elitism. This is certainly a very far cry from the traditions of the United States, our Founding Fathers, and our Constitution.

In the early 1970s, the neo-conservatives clustered around U.S. Sen. "Scoop" Jackson. They then, opportunistically, bolted the Democratic Party led by President Jimmy Carter, in disagreement with his approach to the Middle East. And what did they do next? They simply penetrated the Republican Party and the incoming Reagan Administration in 1981.

2. What Do the Neo-Conservatives Advocate?

The neo-conservative policy network advocates a destabilization and balkanization of the Middle East. Out of the chaos, they say, will come a new order through "regime change," the redrawing of borders, and the reallocation of the control of the hydrocarbon resources of the region. Neo-conservatives see the destabilization of the Arab and Muslim Middle East as good for Israel. I myself, to the contrary, think this policy is harmful—even dangerous—to the long-range security of Israel, not to mention to the region as a whole.

One element of neo-conservative foreign policy seems drawn from Lord Palmerston, ca. 1840. Palmerston devised a Middle East policy for the British Empire that promoted a Jewish entity in historic Palestine, linked to the Turkish Empire as a counterweight to Egypt. This policy was later modified when the British Empire seized Egypt outright in the latter 19th Century.

The neo-conservative, neo-imperial policy for the Middle East is based on an alliance between Israel, the United States,

Turkey, Jordan, and a "Hashemite Iraq." One can imagine that the next step will be to restore the Holy Places to Hashemite control after dismembering Saudi Arabia, by carving out the Eastern Province as a separate state. . . .

Neo-conservatives go further than mere routine imperialism. They advocate active "pre-emptive" warfare, and the erection of a "new order" in the Middle East. Their policy position is akin to the cynical German *macht*-politicians and diplomats who sought a "New Order" in Europe, and launched the "pre-emptive" attack on Poland that triggered World War II.

3. Neo-Conservatives and Christian Zionists in Congress

Why has Congress become an engine for the destruction of U.S. relations with the Arab and Muslim worlds? Beginning about 1980, the parasitic neo-conservative element in the Republican Party aligned with the fundamentalist Christian Right. Christian Zionists, such as Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson, follow the bizarre cultic theology spread in parts of the United States during the mid-19th Century by the defrocked Anglican priest from England, John Nelson Darby. This bizarre cult has no relationship, at all, to the traditional Christian churches established in the United States during the 17th and 18th Centuries. Darby spread the cult between 1859 and 1872 during visits to the United States. Because the apocalyptic Darbyite cult underlies the Christian Zionist influence in Congress, and in the Administration, it must be understood for what it is.

You can explain the behavior of a Dick Armey and a Tom DeLay and dozens of members of Congress, as well as some Senators, when it is understood that they themselves are Darbyite Christian Zionists. A simple Internet search of the name "John Nelson Darby" will flood your desktops with ample data, I can assure you.

Jerry Falwell's trip to Israel in 1979 was key to the alliance between the Darbyite Christian Zionists in the United States and the Likud party in Israel. In fact, the American Christian Zionists developed complex and close relations with a range of extreme Messianic Jewish circles in Israel, including the Gush Emunim, the "settlers' " movement, and the old-line Jabotinsky right-wing nationalists of Begin's Herut party.

Prior to the 1980 elections in the U.S., the Israeli New Right made preparations to form political relationships with the Christian fundamentalist groups in the United States that adhered to the Darbyite apocalyptic cultic theology. These Christian Zionists, in turn, would pressure Congress and the White House to support Likud's "Eretz Israel" ("Greater Israel") policy.

The Israeli operational guide for targeting and manipulating Christian Zionists in the United States was published in 1978. It is entitled, *American Fundamentalism and Israel: The Relation of Fundamentalist Churches to Zionism and*

the State of Israel. Written by the late Israeli scholar Yonah Malachy, the book was published by the Institute of Contemporary Jewry at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

The Christian Zionist lobby came out of the closet with its first “National Prayer Breakfast for Israel” held in Washington on Feb. 6, 1985. The event attracted many key political personalities. Benjamin Netanyahu, then Israeli Ambassador at the United Nations, gave the keynote address and praised the work of Christian Zionists who, he said, “influenced the thinking of Lloyd George, Arthur Balfour, and Woodrow Wilson.”

Fast forward to 1998-1999. The neo-conservatives, under the protection of “pro-Israel” George Shultz, were able to form the so-called “Vulcan Group” of policy experts—led by Paul Wolfowitz and Richard Perle, and coordinated by Condi Rice—that advised Presidential candidate George W. Bush. Their advice to candidate Bush on Middle East policy was to put Iraq on the front burner, and to put the Palestine question on the back burner, if not in the freezer. Following Bush’s election, the neo-conservative policy network was rewarded with a variety of top positions in the new Administration. Their advice is unchanged: Iraq on the front burner, and the Palestine question in the freezer, if not in the trash. And this policy line is supported by the Christian Zionist phalanx of Republicans in Congress led by Armey and DeLay on the House side.

The Print News Media and Public Opinion

Significant editorial opinion in newspapers in the United States reflects caution and restraint with respect to pre-emptive war against Iraq. Furthermore, significant editorial opinion in newspapers in the United States urges a just solution to the Palestine question.

While Washington might be a three newspaper town—the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and the *Washington Times*—there is the rest of the country, after all. And we should not forget this. We all know the handful of big-name columnists who serve as the vector for Israeli propaganda, neo-conservative foreign policy, and the Christian Zionists. But they are just a handful. There are dozens, if not hundreds, of working journalists across the United States who reject the neo-conservative line.

Reviewing U.S. newspaper editorial opinion for the last couple of months, I have found editorial after editorial, from across the United States, that call for caution and restraint with respect to the Iraq question. Similarly, I have found editorial after editorial that advocate a just solution of the Palestine question.

Please examine, for example, the editorial pages of such papers as: the *San Diego Union*, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, the *Sacramento Bee*, the *Rocky Mountain News*, the *Kansas City Star*, the *Chicago Tribune*, the *Minneapolis Star-Tribune*, the *Detroit Free Press*, the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, and the *Hartford Courant*, to name just a few.

The White House can’t fail to notice American editorial opinion. And my guess is that this explains why the White House appears somewhat unnerved just at the moment. The “pro-Israel” lobby does not fail to notice American editorial opinion. In fact, it seeks to manipulate or intimidate it.

That is why the “pro-Israel” lobby moved to establish three key operations to attack the American media, in order to intimidate and silence working journalists who advocate peace and justice in the Middle East, rather than slavishly push the extremist line of the Likud, the Sharonists, and the neo-conservatives.

I would cite MEMRI, CAMERA, and HONESTREPORTING.COM. They all have websites, and they are linked to the U.S. “pro-Israel” lobby, as well as to certain Israeli government, military, and intelligence circles. There is no question that CAMERA and HONESTREPORTING.COM exist to intimidate American journalists in order to stifle freedom of the press in our land. A simple review of their websites will demonstrate this fact to you. . . .

American traditionalists oppose a policy of permanent global imperialism and pre-emptive war.

After listing 13 key “fundamentals” of American foreign policy, Prof. Samuel Flagg Bemis of Yale University once said, of our greatest President from a foreign policy perspective: “Implicit in all these fundamentals, which all together we may connect with the name John Quincy Adams more than with any other one man, was a feeling, strongly sensed and practiced, of anti-imperialism.”

What Is To Be Done?

We must return to traditional principles of foreign policy such as respect for the rule of law—not to mention respect for our own Constitution.

We must reject the neo-conservative agenda of permanent global imperialism and pre-emptive war.

Allow me to quote President “George W.” when he said: “Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct.”

Oh, by the way, I am quoting the real “George W.”—President George Washington, that is—in his Farewell Address. To continue with President George Washington’s words: “Nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded. . . . A passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of common interest where no real common interest exists, and infusing one with the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter without adequate inducement or justification.”

The passionate attachment of the neo-conservatives for Israel may well be the Achilles’ heel of the Bush Administration, if not this republic.