

trafficking of drugs from the Far East to Europe.”

Dick Cheney was the ranking Republican member of the House of Representatives committee to investigate the Iran/Contra affair (House Select Committee to Investigate Covert Arms Transactions with Iran). Cheney helped steer both the House and Senate committees away from any significant probes. Their reports, filed Nov. 13, 1987, exonerated Vice President Bush, hardly even mentioning him.

This was consistent with Cheney’s avid support for the entire Contra adventure. After questioning Lt. Col. Oliver North in the Iran-Contra hearings, Cheney said: “Colonel North has been, I think, the most effective and impressive witness certainly this committee has heard, and I know I speak for a great many Americans when I thank him for his years of devoted service to the nation, both in the United States Marine Corps and as a member of the NSC [National Security Council] staff.”

Congressman Cheney was present at a meeting with North in the White House Situation Room on Aug. 6, 1986, when North told Cheney and others, that his “principal mission” was simply to coordinate contacts between U.S. officials and the Contras; and North said that he gave the Contras advice on human rights and the need for an improved civic image. But North actually coordinated the shipment of military supplies to the Contras at the time, knowingly using drug-traffickers to handle the shipments.

‘Cross Bush and You Pay’

As President Bush’s Defense Secretary, Cheney dove in to implement Operation Blue Spoon, the plan to invade Panama and kidnap Panamanian Defense Forces leader, Gen. Manuel Noriega. The U.S. Commander in Panama, Gen. Frederick F. Woerner, declined to accept a 3,000-man increase in the 12,000 troops stationed in Panama, when Bush wanted the reinforcement in order to intimidate Noriega. Cheney reportedly threatened General Woerner and other officials, by way of an intermediary, telling Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Adm. William Crowe, “You know, the President has got a long history of vindictive political actions. Cross Bush and you pay. Bush remembers, and you have to be careful.” (Quoted in Bob Woodward, *The Commanders* [New York: Simon and Schuster, 1991, p. 89].) The generals acceded, and Woerner was soon replaced.

The December 1989 bombing of Panama and kidnapping of Noriega were a warm-up for the Gulf War, and the Scowcroft-Bush declaration of the New World Order.

Cheney spearheaded the creation of a war psychosis, then carried out a genocidal attack on Iraq, from the bombing of power, water, health, and other vital civilian infrastructure, to the imposition of permanent sanctions that have killed hundreds of thousands of Iraqi children. In Saudi Arabia, in Europe and elsewhere, from his four years as Secretary of Defense, Cheney is remembered as an arrogant hatchetman.

Paul Wolfowitz

A Bully To Enforce the ‘New World Order’

by Michele Steinberg

On Jan. 15, 1991, President George Herbert Walker Bush announced the war against Iraq on national television with his infamous call for a “New World Order.” With those words, Bush set the United States on a course of destroying its own heritage as a republic. Countless commentaries — by U.S. patriots such as former Rep. Henry Gonzalez (D-Tex.) and former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who called for Bush’s impeachment, to prominent international observers around the world — immediately noted that Operation Desert Storm was not about territory in Kuwait, nor about international human rights, nor about oil, but about the New World Order. It was because of his service in implementing this concept, that former President Bush was knighted “Sir” by Queen Elizabeth II.

In his pronouncement of the New World Order, Bush echoed the thinking of Adolf Hitler, who used nearly identical terms in justifying his drive for world domination. In 1941, Hitler declared, “I am convinced that 1941 will be a crucial year of a great new order in Europe. The world shall open up for everyone. . . . This year will help provide the foundation of a real understanding among peoples, and with it the certainty of conciliation among nations.”

And if you liked the New World Order, you’ll love the campaign of Texas Gov. George W. Bush, because the inventors of the term, and the policy, are the puppet-masters pulling the strings of the “clown prince,” George W. On Feb. 18, 1991, the *Los Angeles Times* reported that President Bush’s New World Order slogan had been coined in August 1990 by Brent Scowcroft, his National Security Adviser, to connote Bush’s “assertive new policy” against Iraq, in the aftermath of the disintegration of the Soviet military control over eastern Europe.

Today, Scowcroft is the grey eminence to the “Vulcans,” as the Bush inner circle of “mind-benders” is known. Right next to Scowcroft is one of the leading “technicians” of the



New World Order, Paul Wolfowitz, protégé of the notorious Albert Wohlstetter, a former Trotskyite Communist turned think-tanker.

Wolfowitz claims to be an avid Republican and an indisputable loyalist of Ronald Reagan, but he is actually a Trilateral one-worldist, who began his government career as an official in Democrat Jimmy Carter's 1977 State Department, and later served in the Bush Administration as Undersecretary of Defense for Policy. In 1992, he authored the Defense Policy Guidance, which is one of the sources for crazy U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright's "sole superpower" fantasies. Albright's embrace of the Wolfowitz argument is behind the Kosovo debacle, and the unending war against Iraq that has killed more than 500,000 innocent children.

Since the 1992 election of Bill Clinton as President, Wolfowitz has functioned as a key operative to keep the policies of the New World Order alive. A small sampling of these policies include:

Iraq: Wolfowitz is behind the repeated attempts to assassinate Iraq's Saddam Hussein, and to organize a ground invasion of Iraq. In 1991, Wolfowitz and Richard Cheney backed such a plan, called "Operation Scorpion," but it was reportedly turned down by Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Colin Powell; in 1992, operating from Turkey, Wolfowitz attempted to engineer an invasion of northern Iraq, under the code-name "Operation Poised Hammer." When the United Nations passed resolutions allowing the sale of Iraqi oil, Wolfowitz intensified his efforts to smash Iraq. Among the most well known of these was a 1997 scenario, drafted by Wolfowitz and Gen. Wayne Downing (U.S. Army, ret.), to overthrow Saddam and use the London-based Iraqi opposition to invade the country. The plan to give American backing for the murder of a foreign leader was rightly ridiculed as another "Bay of Pigs" or "Iran-Contra" fiasco, but it is still on the books, especially since the 1998 passage of the Iraq Liberation Act. If Bush were President, it would become policy—in the way the Oliver North secret government functioned under Vice President Bush.

Malaysia: In October 1998, Wolfowitz and former Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) co-authored a commentary for the *New York Times*, in which they attacked Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir bin Mohamad for "betraying Malaysia's future" by allowing the trial of Deputy Prime Minister Anwar Ibrahim. About a month later, Vice President Al Gore mouthed this same Project Democracy line in Kuala Lumpur, virtually calling for the overthrow of Mahathir by the "*reformasi*." These attacks on Mahathir were actually triggered by Dr. Mahathir's assertion of national sovereignty for Malaysia, by imposing currency controls, and penalizing speculation against his nation's currency.

Enlarging NATO to Russia's borders: Wolfowitz is one of the founders of the New Atlantic Initiative (NAI), the British/Anglo-American project that was the operating base

for Lady Margaret Thatcher.

Thatcher's 1996 statement to the NAI reaffirmed the "New World Order," with the U.S.A. as the sole superpower (covertly controlled, of course, by the British Empire). Her opening statement came right out of the 1992 Defense Guidance Policy that Wolfowitz wrote for Cheney and Bush. Thatcher said, "Our energies must be directed toward strengthening NATO, which is as important in the post-Cold War world as in the circumstances of its creation. NATO's role should be expanded. It must be prepared to go out-of-area, where so many of today's threats lie. . . . NATO can also coordinate support for the construction of that system of global missile defence which is now an imperative requirement" (see *EIR*, April 23, 1999).

North Korea: In February 1999, from his platform at the privately funded "House Policy Advisory Board," Wolfowitz, with fellow George W. adviser Richard Armitage, attempted to throw a hand grenade into U.S. talks with North Korea, and the two-Korea negotiations, with a plan for war. Wolfowitz says that "should talks fail," the United States should carry out a major military buildup in South Korea; a "blockade," conducted from Japan, in which the United States will "board North Korean ships suspected of carrying missile exports; and prepare a preemptive strike on suspected nuclear facilities" in North Korea.

Richard Perle: the 'Prince of Darkness'

Wolfowitz is not a man, but a network. His sidekick is Richard "Prince of Darkness" Perle, who is also a leading member of the "Vulcans." Both are close allies of the Likud-nik killers of former Israeli Foreign Minister Ariel Sharon, godfather of the network of Jewish fanatics who assassinated Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin because of his commitment to Middle East peace. Both Wolfowitz and Perle were under investigation in the mid-1980s as spies for the Israeli mafia, and were part of the "X Committee," the entire "mole-hill" of penetration agents who facilitated the work of Jonathon Jay Pollard, convicted of spying for Israel.

Since the Clinton election, when Wolfowitz and Perle lost their official positions in the defense and intelligence establishment, they have operated through a powerful, closely knit group of Anglo-American-Israeli private institutions that have pushed policies of war and the New World Order. Wolfowitz is a board member and/or adviser of the following such institutes: the International Republican Institute (IRI) of the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), where he





Iraqi victims of President George Bush's 1991 Gulf War. Nearly a decade later, the murderous sanctions against Iraq continue, while Paul Wolfowitz leads the campaign to assassinate Saddam Hussein and organize a ground invasion of Iraq.

interfaces with the “human rights” mafia of Jimmy Carter and Albright; the Center for Security Policy, run by anti-China maniac Frank Gaffney, one of Wolfowitz’ protégés from the Bush Administration; the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA); the Washington Institute for Near East Policy (WINEP), where, in July, another Bush “Vulcan” called for total war against Saddam Hussein; the American Enterprise Institute (AEI); and the New Atlantic Initiative, which was initially called Thatcher’s “private Bilderberg Society,” and which has been the leading institute pushing the drive for NATO expansion and unilateral military action by the United States and Britain, without the authority of United Nations or any other international law.

America, the Bully

Where Wolfowitz goes, wars and destabilizations follow. Under the Bush/Cheney/Wolfowitz model, the Augustinian concept of a just war is scuttled. The republican notion of “winning the peace,” by concluding the war by treaty among sovereign nation-states, is eliminated. Defense and military preparedness are replaced by “bully” tactics and “small wars.” Like the British Empire, the New World Order doctrine holds that the United States “has no permanent allies, only interests,” and these interests are to prevent the development of other strong nations, as in Nineteenth Century British geopolitics.

The roots of these insane policies are to be found in the 1992 Defense Planning Guidance authored by Wolfowitz, who was then Richard Cheney’s Undersecretary of Defense:

“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.* . . .

“Our first objective is to prevent the reemergence 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 of this objective: First, the United States “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. . . .”

The leaking of the paper was accompanied by testimony by top-level Bush Administration officials William Webster and Army Chief of Staff Gen. Gordon R. Sullivan, that Japan and Germany were in fact examples of such “rivals” that would become a threat to U.S. national security.

In 1992, the Italian newspaper *Corriere della Sera* responded to the Wolfowitz paper with a front-page editorial that called it “Bush’s Dream of Glory.” It “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,” the daily said.

Russian commentators also called the paper for what it was — a naked warning to the world that there was now only “one superpower.”

Today, the Vulcans repeat over and over the phrase that the United States “cannot be the policeman to the world,”

pretending that they oppose the policies of the crazy Albright and the follies that Clinton continued from the Bush Administration. But, “Dubya’s” team will not only be the “policemen of the world,” but those world cops will also look a lot like the New York City killers of unarmed African immigrant Amidou Diallo.

Condoleezza Rice

The ‘Quarterback’ for Bush’s Vulcans

by Scott Thompson

Condoleezza “Condi” Rice, who served as the chief Sovietologist in President George Bush’s National Security Council (NSC), is today the self-described “quarterback” of the George “Dubya” Bush national security team. Since she took a one-year leave of absence from the post of Provost of Stanford University in July 1999, sources report that she and the other members of the “Vulcans” group, which she heads, have held tutorials with Dubya at least once a week. Of all the Vulcans, Rice is said by reliable sources to be the most successful at explaining her version of foreign policy to “Dubya.”

Rice, who is seen as the most likely candidate to become National Security Adviser in a Bush administration is getting rave reviews from the London press, such as a Sept. 26, 1999 article in the *Guardian*, entitled “The Iron Lady Behind Bush’s New Cold War,” which described her as “black, sleek and having the same kind of sex appeal Diana Ross had.” London’s enthusiasm is no surprise, given her geopolitical doctrines and pro-British sympathies. In an interview with the London *Daily Telegraph* published on July 29, she said that the British would be welcomed into the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). “Britain is probably our closest ally in the world,” she gushed, “and would be welcome from my point of view into any association in which the United States finds itself.”

We examine here her positions on key foreign policy issues, as presented in interviews with a Washington, D.C. re-



porter on May 2 and June 21, 2000, among other sources.

- Although she opposes President Ronald Reagan’s Strategic Defense Initiative as it was announced on March 23, 1983, she favors building a Ballistic Missile Defense system that would guard against what she calls “rogue” or “failed” states, such as Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. Instead of President Reagan’s vision, which was first proposed by statesman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., of sharing this technology with Russia, Rice insists that no such sharing can take place with other nuclear powers, such as Russia and China, so long as these countries remain “nuclear proliferators.” And, instead of the LaRouche-Reagan plan to build a system based upon “new physical principles”—e.g., x-ray lasers, lasers, and particle beams—which would act as a science driver for the world’s economy, Rice’s version of National Missile Defense and Theater Missile Defense would be based upon off-the-shelf kinetic kill interceptors that date back to 1960s technology. In short, she plans to build an unworkable junkheap, which would cost billions of dollars, and would serve only to provoke strategic tensions and conflicts.

- Rice, who as the chief NSC Sovietologist wrote the seminal document consigning Russia to International Monetary Fund (IMF) “shock therapy,” from which it has never recovered (see below), is not the least bit concerned to consider the further disintegration of this major nuclear power. In an interview with the *Stanford Journal of International Relations* in Spring 1999, as she was hopping aboard the Bush express, Rice said of Russia: “It’s very chaotic now, . . . but I think that in the short term you’re likely to see the continued disintegration of Russia. You’re going to continue to see Moscow not capable of managing the relations with the periphery . . . and becoming increasingly irrelevant in its own people’s lives, because they play these political games at the center that don’t connect in any way with what those lives are really about. . . . There’s a feeling right now that they’re living in a ‘grave-yard’ a little bit.” Of course, neither Rice nor the Republican Party Platform are prepared to counter this great threat to world peace, by freeing Russia from the shackles of the International Monetary Fund’s (IMF’s) austerity conditionalities.

- Rice told a Washington-based reporter that she is a firm believer in “balance-of-power politics,” of which she considers the British to have been “very artful practitioners.” Confirming that she has a “geostrategic” view, she believes that the United States must pursue policies that would prevent “any single power to rise, much less to dominate” the “Eurasian Heartland.”

- Despite the end of the Cold War and Russian belligerency, Rice says that she would pursue a policy of “continued enlargement of NATO,” and that even the Baltic states “cannot be excluded from possible membership.”

- She dismisses the recent breakthrough summitry of North and South Korea, stating that it is purely “desperation” on the part of North Korean President Kim Jong-il, “because