

# 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