

How To End 'The Wrong War at the Wrong Time'

by Michele Steinberg

"The Iraq adventure was the wrong war, at the wrong time, waged with extraordinary incompetence by the civilian leadership. . . . Success as defined by our civilian leadership three years ago is out of reach," stated Gen. Joseph P. Hoar (USMC, ret.), the former head of the U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM), at an "informal," *bipartisan* Congressional hearing called on Sept. 15 by Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey (D-Calif.), on defining an exit strategy from Iraq.

"[T]here is still the possibility that a stable pro-Western Iraq can take its place in the community of nations," Hoar added, but, this could *only* happen in the context of a "paradigm-shift [in Washington] that places a major political figure in charge, one who can guide U.S. policy through ratification of the Constitution," and other major developments in Iraq.

The Woolsey hearing was informal, not by choice, but because her repeated requests to the House Armed Services Committee and to the House International Relations Committee had been turned down, and blocked by the Republicans. But, as the death toll rises for American troops to nearly 2,000 young men and women soldiers, and to uncounted tens of thousands for Iraqis, Woolsey, who was the first in Congress to call on President Bush to withdraw American troops from Iraq, put together a panel of experts to open the discussion of an exit strategy.

It was a panel that is fully qualified to help shape a way out of the Bush/Cheney "perpetual war." Included were former Sen. Max Cleland (D-Ga.), a Vietnam War hero; General Hoar; Ambassador David Mack, vice president of the Middle East Institute and former Ambassador to the United Arab Republic and Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs; Anas Shallal, an Iraqi American and Sunni Muslim, founder of Iraqi Americans for Peaceful Alternatives; Dr. Ken Katzman, senior Middle East analyst for the Congressional Research Service, who is also a former CIA officer, with expertise on Iraq and Iran; and Prof. Antonia Chaves, a visiting professor of International Politics and Law at Tufts University's Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy.

And while Cheney can use threats to control the schedule of House and Senate committees, these cannot silence some Republicans.

One such courageous Republican is Rep. Walter Jones, of North Carolina, the "very conservative" (by his own de-



Former Sen. Max Cleland (D-Ga.), a Vietnam War veteran, told the congressional hearing that "the war in Iraq is beginning to look a lot like Vietnam. . . . I can't stand by silently while thousands of American soldiers risk their lives—again—for a no-win, no-end war."

scription) Congressman, who sponsored a bipartisan bill in the House for withdrawing troops from Iraq. Jones attended the Woolsey hearing, where he was applauded by the other House members for his courage.

Some days earlier, on Sept. 12, at the annual policy-makers' conference of the National Council on U.S.-Arab Relations, former U.S. Ambassador to Saudi Arabia Chas Freeman, who had served under Republican Presidents Richard Nixon and George H.W. Bush, decried the lack of discussion in Washington, and told the opposition to "speak out," in order to restore democracy—in Washington (see *Documentation*).

Break the Silence on Capitol Hill

The Woolsey hearing indicates that more and more policymakers now see that the Iraq war was intended to be a "no win" war—by design.

It is a point that Lyndon LaRouche, founder of *EIR* and 2004 Democratic Presidential primary candidate, had made back in 2002, when Dick Cheney authored the imperial "pre-emptive war" doctrine, known as the National Defense Strategy document. Already, in 2002, LaRouche had called for Cheney to be impeached for violating the Constitutional powers of Congress, around the Iraq War buildup. Then, again, in late July 2005, LaRouche warned again about the perpetual war danger, spotlighting the fact that Cheney has given the order for a war plan against Iran, using nuclear weapons.

In his opening statement, Cleland said, "I agree with my distinguished former colleague and Vietnam veteran, U.S. Senator Chuck Hagel, that the war in Iraq is beginning to look a lot like Vietnam. . . . Now, I am seeing this movie all over again. I can't stand by silently while thousands of American soldiers risk their lives—again—for a no-win, no-end war."

And, General Hoar, while praising the U.S. Armed Forces, who “continue to serve with courage and determination at great personal sacrifice,” painted a grim picture of what the United States has done in Iraq, under the “planning” of the Pentagon civilians. Hoar says that Iraq is now a “budding civil war” which the U.S. cannot win “by killing Iraqis. Were this possible, the over 25,000 Iraqis killed already might have been enough.”

Moreover, Hoar added, “The invasion of Iraq has created a force of thousands of Jihadists in Iraq where none existed over two years ago.” There is a slim chance, that if the Bush Administration completely overthrows the policy it has had since the invasion, that Iraq can be saved—but only by returning to the American System. Hoar proposed: “Developmental projects should put everyone to work who wishes to be employed. Our country has apparently forgotten the CCC [Civilian Conservation Corps] of the 1930s, in which tens of thousands of unemployed Americans were put to work on public works projects. Construction of sewers, roads, bridges, and buildings are all possible with skilled and semi-skilled Iraqi workers.”

But the time has come for more than just “opposing,” said Representative Woolsey in her opening remarks: With less than 40% of Americans supporting Bush’s handling of the Iraq War, and about 50% favoring a withdrawal of troops, the obligation of those elected officials opposing the war, is to “break the silence on Capitol Hill,” and to put forward policy proposals that will bring peace.

But, under the Bush/Cheney regime, that is almost impossible, noted Rep. Marcy Kaptur (D-Ohio), who reported that she had met, just a day earlier, with Syrian Ambassador to the United States Dr. Imad Moustafa, and found out that the Administration is not meeting with our Arab ambassadors. “There is a communications blackout,” she exclaimed. This is all the more dangerous since Syria knows it is targeted by the Bush Administration.

One hopeful sign is that Representative Kaptur announced that after nine months of work, she has succeeded in a plan to bring in four Arab ambassadors—from Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon—who will brief the Democratic Congressmen on their views of what is happening in that region.

The LaRouche Doctrine

But for all its outstanding content, the Woolsey hearing comes up short on a solution—which has, in fact, been there all along, since LaRouche issued, in Spring 2004, his peace plan, “The LaRouche Doctrine.”

In that, LaRouche laid out how *only* if the United States engaged in a full dialogue over *development* of the region, especially through water projects, with Iraq, and all of its surrounding neighbors, could there be a solution. The only way out, LaRouche emphasizes, is the application of the principles of the Treaty of Westphalia, that ended the Thirty Years’ War, in 1648. Based on the Westphalia concept of

seeking to further “the advantage of the other,” a new peace can be born. Again, on Sept. 16, one day after the Woolsey hearings, LaRouche offered his services to meet with the leaders of the nations of Southwest Asia to apply those principles. It is a solution that can work—and it’s the only one on the table.