

Cheney Invented Today's 'Bush Doctrine' in 1990

by Edward Spannaus and Jeff Steinberg

On Sept. 22, 2002, Lyndon LaRouche issued his first call for Vice President Dick Cheney to resign (see below). What triggered LaRouche's dramatic call for Cheney to step down, was the accumulated evidence that Cheney and a small group of his long-time collaborators, centered around Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, and Cheney's Chief of Staff Lewis Libby, have willfully lied to the American public, to Congress, and to the President himself, about the circumstances under which they have promoted the so-called "war on terrorism," the drive for a new war against Iraq, and the fraudulent and dangerous new National Security Strategy.

The 1990 Cheney Task Force

Both the proposed Congressional use-of-force resolution on Iraq, issued by the White House on Sept. 19, 2002; and "The National Security Strategy of the United States of America," issued under the signature of President George W. Bush the next day, were presented as a "new" national security doctrine, made necessary by the events of Sept. 11, 2001. The common feature of the draft war powers resolution, and the new National Security Strategy, is that they promote a doctrine of unilateral pre-emptive military action by the United States.

This is what Lyndon LaRouche said, in his Sept. 22, 2002 statement: "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," LaRouche continued, "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 Chicken-hawk accomplices over the course of no less than the past dozen years."

The origins of the Cheney task force were described as follows, in an April 1, 2002 *New Yorker* magazine article by

Nicholas Lemann, entitled "The Next World Order": "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. . . . 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."

The plan was for each team to brief Cheney for an hour on May 21, 1990, after which Cheney would brief President George H.W. Bush ("41"), and then Bush would make a foreign-policy address unveiling the new grand strategy.

But, according to Lemann, when Wolfowitz and Powell arrived at Cheney's office for the May 21 briefing, Wolfowitz went first, and went far beyond the allotted hour—which Cheney permitted him to do, while Powell was left twiddling his thumbs. Powell wasn't even allowed to present his view until a couple of weeks later. Cheney's briefing to the President was based largely on Wolfowitz's material. Bush then prepared his foreign-policy address, but it was given on Aug. 2, 1990—the day that Iraq invaded Kuwait—without much attention paid to it.

1992 Defense Planning Guidance

The Cheney task force kept at it, and their next effort was the draft Defense Planning Guidance (DPG) for 1994-99, which was leaked to the press in February 1992. The current Bush Administration's National Security Strategy bears a remarkable resemblance to this draft.

Following are key sections of the leaked draft, as published in the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* at the time (1992):

This Defense Planning guidance addresses the fundamentally new situation which has been created by the collapse of the Soviet Union, the disintegration of the internal as well as the external empire, and the discrediting of communism as an ideology with global pretensions and influence. The new international environment has also been shaped by the victory of the United States and its coalition allies over Iraqi aggression—the first post-Cold War conflict and a defining event in U.S. global leadership. In addition to these two victories, there has been a less visible one, the integration of Germany and Japan into a U.S.-led system of collective security and the creation of a democratic "zone of peace."

Our first objective is to prevent the re-emergence of a new rival, either on the territory of the former Soviet Union or elsewhere, that poses a threat on the order

of that posed formerly by the Soviet Union. This is a dominant consideration underlying the new regional defense strategy and requires that we endeavor to prevent any hostile power from dominating a region whose resources would, under consolidated control, be sufficient to generate global power. These regions include Western Europe, East Asia, the territory of the former Soviet Union, and Southwest Asia.

There are three additional aspects to this objective: First, the U.S. must show the leadership necessary to establish and protect a new order that holds the promise of convincing potential competitors that they need not aspire to a greater role or pursue a more aggressive posture to protect their legitimate interests. Second, in the non-defense areas, we must account sufficiently for the interests of the advanced industrial nations to discourage them from challenging our leadership or seeking to overturn the established political and economic order. Finally, we must maintain the mechanisms for deterring potential competitors from even aspiring to a larger regional or global role. . . .

While the U.S. cannot become the world's "policeman" by assuming responsibility for righting every wrong, we will retain the pre-eminent responsibility for addressing selectively those wrongs which threaten not only our interests, but those of our allies or friends, or which could seriously unsettle international relations. Various types of U.S. interests may be involved in such instances: access to vital raw materials, primarily Persian Gulf oil.

'Preclude Any Future Global Competitor'

The scenario blithely assumes that no matter what type of government evolves in post-Soviet Russia, even a resurgent imperial faction could not pose an immediate threat to Europe without the Warsaw Pact. The threat to the Bush Administration is perceived as coming from other quarters: "There are other potential nations or coalitions that could, in the further future, develop strategic aims and defense posture of region-wide or global domination. Our strategy must now refocus on precluding the emergence of any potential future global competitor."

Pentagon spokesman Pete Williams at the time insisted to reporters that this referred only to a "hostile power," an assertion which may provide small comfort to allies who are wondering exactly what that means. The Pentagon insists, for example, that the United States "must seek to prevent the emergence of European-only security arrangements which would undermine NATO." This posture produced a direct clash between Secretary of State James Baker and French officials at the 1992 Brussels meeting of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council.

The Italian newspaper *Corriere della Sera* editorialized at that time, on its front page, that the Pentagon document "is

shocking in many respects, starting from the frankness, to the brutality with which it theorizes the permanent subordination of allies-competitors and explains how to use military power and nuclear force to reiterate this subordination." U.S. correspondent Rudolfo Brancoli went on to call it a "foolish ambition" that pushes somebody "to design such ambitious plans while belonging to an administration which is every day forced to realize that it has no money to help the new democracies in the East, no means to help paying the costs of the UN peacekeeping missions, and is not even able to pay its own quota to the international financial organizations."

Looking Back

The 1992 draft sparked a major controversy within the Bush "41" Administration, said author Jim Lobe in the Sept. 10, 2002 *Asia Times*, and several other online publications. Lobe wrote: "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, as reported by Lobe: "Deterring potential competitors from even aspiring to a larger regional or global role," and taking pre-emptive 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 the Sept. 11, 2002 web-cast (see *EIR*, Sept. 20) which preceded his call for Cheney's resignation: "Through the '90s 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 advisor, 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."

Iraq Is a Fuse, but Cheney Built the Bomb

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

This statement by LaRouche demanding Cheney's resignation was issued on Sept. 20, 2002 (EIR, Oct. 4, 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.

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.