

for their own ideological reasons. This war has more to do with domestic U.S. policy than anything else, he charged, adding, that there are people who want to hijack our foreign policy to promote their own ideology and ambitions.

Ritter debunked the idea that Iraq would proliferate WMD through Islamic terrorist networks, even if they had them, by describing an operation Iraq has in its North to eliminate Islamic fundamentalist infiltration of the Kurds there. Soldiers are being trained for this mission at a camp south of Baghdad, which had been formerly used for training hostage-release missions. The U.S. government has been giving a false picture of the purposes of this camp, Ritter said.

He confirmed that contrary to the pro-war propaganda, the UN inspectors were not thrown out by Iraq, but pulled out six days before the U.S. bombing campaign in 1998, after Iraq had been manipulated into creating a provocation, which then became a pretext for the bombing. After seven years of inspections and destruction of weapons of mass destruction capability, Ritter said he was confident that Iraq was disarmed, and incapable of projecting military power beyond its borders. Iraq, he said, is no threat to the region.

Alternatives to War

Phyllis Bennis of IPS argued that the United States would be violating international law, if Iraq were attacked, because Article 51 of the UN Charter allows a country to wage war to defend itself only if there has been an armed attack. She said that any pre-emptive strike is a violation of international law.

Dr. Cortwright advocated a series of alternatives to “contain Iraq,” rather than going to war. He called the consequences of a pre-emptive attack so dangerous that no one who was truly concerned with future terrorism, would contemplate such an action. “If we go to war, it will make the terrorist threat worse. It would recruit people to taking extreme actions against us. It would undermine international cooperation.”

Neither Ritter nor Cortwright believes the Bush Administration wants inspectors to return to Iraq. It would be contrary to existing law passed by Congress in support of a regime change, when it authorized support for the opposition Iraqi National Congress. Ritter also does not believe Iraq will allow inspectors in, as long as the U.S. policy is for a regime change. Cortwright said the new inspectors might be more acceptable to the Iraqis, because they would be less likely to be manipulated and used for spying as the previous UN Special Commission (UNSCOM) inspectors were, because they will not be the agents of any state, but civil servants working for the UN.

Kucinich said he expects many other opponents to the war to surface after Congress reconvenes. He is not opposed to responding to the Iraqi offer to U.S. Congressmen to visit, but said it would have to occur in tandem with the return of inspectors. He hoped Russia could be drawn into the process of finding a resolution, and referred to the U.S. Congressional delegation which worked with Russia to negotiate a solution to the war with Serbia in 1999.

Rumsfeld's 'Feith and Bum' Corps: What Is Defense Policy Board?

by Michele Steinberg

To say that Richard Perle's Defense Policy Board “advises” Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld is an legend that has popped up increasingly in recent weeks, especially following the exposure of the notorious July 10 anti-Saudi briefing, where Laurent “of Arabia” Murawiec delivered a Power Point presentation identifying the Saudis as enemies of the United States. Rumsfeld, who claimed to know nothing about the scheduling of the briefing, later called Murawiec “a resident alien,” who had nothing to do with policy. A few days after Murawiec's briefing was exposed, Frank Gaffney, head of the right-wing extremist Center for Security Policy, was praising Murawiec as “Laurent of Arabia.”

The fact that Murawiec's employer, the RAND Corporation, disavowed any connection to the anti-Saudi briefing, and critics described the quality of the presentation as “sub-undergraduate” grade, should be a warning that the Defense Policy Board's agenda is not “policy,” but propaganda. And that propaganda is in the hands of a notorious troika of Likudnik agents and followers of the pro-fascist Vladimir Jabotinsky within the Defense Department: Under Secretary of Defense for Policy Douglas J. Feith, Defense Policy Board Chairman Richard Perle, and Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz.

Run Rings Around Rumsfeld

It is absolutely true—to the dismay of traditional Republican Party strategists—that Rumsfeld, who is showing the signs of age, as well as the stress of the Afghanistan war disaster, has fallen increasingly under the sway of Defense Policy Board, which has also been called “the Wolfowitz cabal.” The troika of Likudniks has worked together for over 20 years in a network of neo-conservative think tanks, during which time Rumsfeld was in semi-retirement after serving as the Secretary of Defense for President Gerald Ford.

Defense Department sources have told *EIR* that the troika runs rings around Rumsfeld, as they fight to make U.S. policy identical to the aims of Israeli war criminal Ariel Sharon: ethnic cleansing of the Palestinians, preemptive war against Iran and Iraq; and the breakup of Saudi Arabia and seizure of its oil fields.

The Defense Policy Board is an extension of the neo-conservative gaggle of Israeli moles that surrounded then-

Gov. George W. Bush during the 2000 campaign, and called themselves “The Vulcans.” The two main figures were Wolfowitz and Perle, tasked with pounding Bush into shape on foreign policy—recall that Bush could not even name the heads of five countries in a nasty “pop quiz.” Joining them in the effort was Condoleezza Rice, now the National Security Adviser. Rumsfeld was a johnny-come-lately to the Bush team.

When Rice and Wolfowitz received their high-level appointments, (though Wolfowitz wanted the Defense Secretary job directly), observers wondered why Perle did not have an administration post. Some explained that he did not wish to submit to Senate approval—which was avoided in the Defense Policy Board role. Others explained that Perle could use the DPB platform to access classified information, and plant policy proposals, while he continued to keep his other jobs: head of the Digital division of the Hollinger Corporation, owner of the *Jerusalem Post* and the London *Daily Telegraph*; member of American Enterprise Institute and the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA), where he continues to serve along with espionage-investigation target Steven Bryen (see accompanying article).

Reporting on the anti-Saudi DPB meeting, *Time* reporter Mark Thompson noted that being on the Board affords its members something “every Washington player wants—unrivaled access without accountability.” Citing “the Saudi episode,” Thompson accused the DPB of concocting “a false impression” of U.S. policy—such as a planned attack against Saudi Arabia, and the Iraq war.

Chain of Command

According to its charter, the Defense Policy Board (full name—Defense Policy Board Advisory Committee) “will serve the public interest by providing the Secretary of Defense (Rumsfeld), Deputy Secretary (Wolfowitz), and Under Secretary for Policy (Feith) with independent, informed advice and opinion concerning major matters of defense policy.” The sole function is “advisory” and its members, limited to “approximately 30” serve without compensation. But in this organizational chart, “location” is everything, and Doug Feith is the strategically located linchpin.

According to the charter, Feith selects the members of the DPB, including Chairman Perle, with Rumsfeld’s approval. Feith is the “Official to Whom the Committee Reports.” Feith is also the head of the “Agency Responsible for Providing the Necessary Support” for the DPB. Feith also calls the shots on when the Board should meet—“quarterly or as required by the Under Secretary for Policy.” Feith also controls the budget, selects the “2.2 man-years” of permanent staff, and pays expenses.

Feith briefs the Deputy Secretary of Defense (Wolfowitz), the second highest position in the Pentagon, on the scenarios. Importantly none of the members of DPB are paid, so they are deliberately deployed by the Perle/Feith/Wolfowitz troika around the world, planting op-eds, holding conferences, such

as the Hudson Institute conference on June 18 in Washington, D.C. where the policy of breaking up Saudi Arabia was first fully laid out.

Crucial to this propaganda side of the operation are the links of Feith and Perle *outside* the government, as documented in *EIR*’s Aug. 2 Special Offprint article, “The ‘Mole-hill’ Inside the Bush Administration.” Until he joined the Bush Administration, Feith was a director of the extremist Center for Security Policy (CSP), headed by Frank Gaffney, a fanatical supporter of the Netanyahu-Sharon apparatus in Israel, and linked to the right-wing Christian Zionists. In addition, during the Clinton Administration, Feith worked closely with Perle, Wolfowitz, JINSA, AEI, and the neo-conservative *Weekly Standard*, churning out scenarios for war against Iraq, and occasionally China, at every opportunity.

Most importantly, Feith, who made private business deals for Israeli defense companies (as did Perle,) is a “second generation” Jabotinskyite. His father, Dalck Feith, was honored by the Zionists of America group—which opposes any peace in Palestine and Israel—as an early member of Betar, the youth movement founded by Jabotinsky, who had been denounced by Israel’s first Prime Minister, David Ben-Gurion, as “Vladimir Hitler.”

Among the DPB members, “war party” operatives—those who advocate a U.S. unilateral “war against terrorism” that can go anywhere, anytime, with no explanation—and Likud supporters have the strongest voice. This group includes former Congressman Newt Gingrich, the fallen angel of the 1994 “Conservative Revolution”; Fred Iklé, Adm. David Jeremiah, and former CIA Director James Woolsey, all JINSA members; and Eliot Cohen, a writer for the *Weekly Standard* and co-founder of the Project for a New American Century.

The other members of the DPB are: Kenneth Adelman, Richard Allen, Martin Anderson, Gary Becker, Barry Blechman, Harold Brown, Lt. Gen. Marc Cisneros (ret.), Devon Cross, Gen. Ronald Fogleman (ret.), Thomas Foley, Tillie Fowler, Gerald Hillman, Kim Holmes, Gen. Chuck Horner (ret.), Henry A. Kissinger, Philip Merrill, Adm. Bill Owens (ret.), Dan Quayle, Henry Rowen, James Schlesinger, Gen. Jack Sheehan (ret.), Kiron Skinner, Helmut Sonnenfeldt, Chris Williams, and Pete Wilson.

By charter, the Defense Policy Board must announce its meetings 15 days in advance in the Federal register, and “all procedures for closed meetings will be followed scrupulously.” After the July 10-11 debacle, officials in the Pentagon and the State Dept. will be watching more carefully what the Perle gang is up to.

**To reach us on the Web:
www.larouchepub.com**