

LaRouche Hits Likud Warmongers: The Pollard Affair Never Ended!

We reproduce here the text of a 500,000-run leaflet circulated nationwide by the LaRouche in 2004 Presidential campaign, aimed at “cleaning house” of the war party in Washington.

Lyndon LaRouche reports that 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 government policy that is being foisted on the President by a nest of Israeli agents inside the U.S. government. This Israeli spy network inside the United States was unable to achieve their objective until President Bush was entrapped by the events of Sept. 11, 2001 and the falsified accounts of those events provided by this foreign intelligence apparatus, and lured over to their policies. Lyndon LaRouche demands to know: Is this not the motive that explains the who and why of the attacks of Sept. 11, 2001? LaRouche demands an immediate Congressional investigation, to help purge the U.S. government of this foreign intelligence apparatus, which attempted, with the 9/11 events, to seize control over U.S. foreign policy. The network of Pollard “stay-behinds” inside the Bush Administration is engaged in a witting hoax, to induce the President and the U.S. Congress to go to war.

When you read the summary evidence below, you will certainly share Lyndon LaRouche’s conclusion that all of these people must be immediately fired from their Administration posts, and that the U.S. Congress must launch public hearings to get to the bottom of this criminal scheme.

The summary facts are as follows:

On July 8, 1996, Richard Perle, now the Chairman of the Defense Policy Board, an advisory group that reports to Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, presented a written document to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, spelling out a new Israeli foreign policy, calling for a repudiation of the Oslo Accords and the underlying concept of “land for peace”; for the permanent annexation of the entire West Bank and Gaza Strip; and for the elimination of the Saddam Hussein regime in Baghdad, as a first step toward overthrowing or destabilizing the governments of Syria, Lebanon, Saudi

Arabia, and Iran. The document was prepared for the Jerusalem and Washington, D.C.-based Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies (IASPS), a think-tank financed by Richard Mellon Scaife. The report, “A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm,” was co-authored by Perle; Douglas Feith, currently the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Policy; David Wurmser, currently special assistant to State Department chief arms control negotiator John Bolton; and Meyrav Wurmser, now director of Mideast Policy at the Hudson Institute.

Two days after he received the foreign policy blueprint from Perle, Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu delivered a speech before a joint session of the U.S. Congress, which strongly echoed the IASPS outline. The same day, the *Wall Street Journal* published excerpts from the IASPS document, and the next day, July 11, 1996, the *Journal* editorially endorsed the Perle document.

Beginning in February 1998, the British government of Prime Minister Tony Blair launched a concerted effort, in league with the Netanyahu government in Israel, and the Perle Israeli agent-of-influence networks inside the United States, to induce President William Clinton to launch a war against Iraq, under precisely the terms spelled out for Netanyahu in the “Clean Break” paper. The war was to be launched, ostensibly, over Iraq’s possession of “weapons of mass destruction” (WMD). United Nations weapons inspectors were, at this time, still on the ground inside Iraq.

To buttress the war drive, British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook issued an official lying “white paper” on the Iraqi drive to obtain WMD. On Feb. 19, 1998, Richard Perle and former Congressman Stephen Solarz released an “Open Letter to the President,” demanding a full-scale U.S.-led drive for “regime change” in Baghdad. The dangerously incompetent military scheme for the overthrow of Saddam that was published in the Open Letter, has been recently revived by the Perle-led network of “chicken hawks” in the office of the Secretary of Defense—but has been summarily rejected by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Among the signators on the original Perle-



The Pentagon ranks pushing Iraq war and Mideast war are full of active advisers and lobbyists of Sharon's and Netanyahu's Likud party in Israel; explicit and implicit supporters of convicted Israeli spy Jonathan Pollard (left). In 1996 they gave the same war plan to the incoming Netanyahu government, which the Sept. 11 events now allow them to carry out. Typical of the problem is Defense official Douglas Feith (right).

Solarz letter were the following current Bush Administration officials: Elliott Abrams (National Security Council), Richard Armitage (State Department), John Bolton (State Department), Doug Feith (Defense Department), Fred Iklé (Defense Policy Board), Zalmay Khalilzad (White House), Peter Rodman (Defense Department), Donald Rumsfeld (Secretary of Defense), Paul Wolfowitz (Defense Department), David Wurmser (State Department), and Dov Zakheim (Defense Department).

President Clinton rejected the February 1998 demand for war, sending both Netanyahu and Blair into fits of rage.

On Aug. 6, 1998, Angelo Codevilla, the Washington, D.C. co-director of IASPS (along with David Wurmser), penned an op-ed in the *Wall Street Journal*, demanding the freeing of convicted Israeli spy Jonathan Pollard. Codevilla argued that Pollard had been right to pass U.S. classified material to Israel, because of the threat posed by Saddam Hussein. Days later, two members of the Netanyahu cabinet contacted Vice President Al Gore, demanding Pollard's release.

After again rejecting the Netanyahu and Blair demands for war on Iraq in November 1998, President Clinton—under the impeachment onslaught, led by the Mellon Scaife-funded apparatus—finally caved in and authorized Operation Desert Fox in December 1998, as he was returning on Air Force One from a visit to Israel. But the 70 hours of bombardment did not eliminate the Saddam Hussein regime, and the issue remained dormant for the next three years . . . until Sept. 11, 2001.

Within moments of the 9/11 attack on Washington and New York, the same Pollard-linked American networks who had designed the Netanyahu foreign policy were on the war-path, demanding that President Bush go to war against Iraq, despite the fact that, to this day, there is no plausible evidence linking Iraq to the September 2001 irregular warfare attacks. The Sharon government in Israel instantly declared that the attack had been ordered by Saddam Hussein, and called for

massive retaliation against Baghdad.

On Sept. 22, 2001, Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz made a feverish pitch for war on Iraq at a Camp David meeting with President Bush and most of the Cabinet. Wolfowitz had been brought into the inner circle of George W. Bush a year before the 2000 Presidential elections, at the initiative of former Secretary of State George Shultz. By 1999, Wolfowitz and Condi Rice had become co-responsible for pulling together the Bush campaign foreign policy and national security team, which Ms. Rice dubbed "The Vulcans." Wolfowitz immediately brought "X Committee" Israeli agent-of-influence Richard Perle into the inner sanctum, from where he has been peddling the Netanyahu-Israeli foreign policy agenda from day one. Perle most recently staged the July 10, 2002 Defense Policy Board session, which demanded the purging of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of all opponents of the Iraq war, and called for a U.S. military occupation and takeover of the Saudi oil fields and a total break with the House of Saud—just as his July 1996 IASPS "Clean Break" study had proposed.

This is but the briefest of summaries of the massive evidence in hand. The current campaign to induce President Bush and the U.S. Congress into a war with Iraq, one that would surely unleash the "Clash of Civilizations," is a direct continuation of the Pollard affair. President Bush is being pressured—from inside his own national security apparatus—to adopt an Israeli Likud foreign policy! What nation is dictating policy to the United States? This is a scandalous hoax, far worse than the Gulf of Tonkin affair of the late 1960s.

From the point that Perle, Feith, the Wurmser, et al. first delivered the "Clean Break" policy to Netanyahu, this crowd has been obsessed with inducing the United States government to adopt and implement it. All prior efforts failed, until Sept. 11, 2001 created a new context for reviving and pushing it—under the guise of the "war on terrorism." Does this raise

questions about the true, mysterious authors of the 9/11 attack? What are the links between the events of Sept. 11 and the subsequent unabated drive for war against Iraq?

From Perle and Feith, to others pressing the Netanyahu scheme from outside the Administration—including Frank Gaffney, Steven Bryen, and Michael Ledeen—the entire crew were among the leading suspected Israeli spies, tasking Jonathan Pollard to steal the most precious national security secrets of the U.S.A., from inside the Reagan-Bush national security apparatus. They avoided prosecution, and later emerged as “The Vulcans,” assigned to “teach” President Bush the ins and outs of foreign and national security policy. Isn’t it time that these co-conspirators joined Jonathan Pollard behind bars? Isn’t it time for President Bush to give these clowns a “September Surprise”?

Documentation

‘Pollard II’ Network’s 1996 Policy for Israel

Excerpts from “A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm,” the 1996 strategy for Likud party leader Benjamin Netanyahu’s new Israeli government, by a team led by Richard Perle, and including other current Bush Administration officials Douglas Feith and David Wurmser, and Hudson Institute official Meyrav Wurmser. The auspices were the Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies in Jerusalem.

Benjamin Netanyahu’s government comes in with a new set of ideas. While there are those who will counsel continuity, Israel has the opportunity to make a *clean break*; it can force a peace process and strategy based on an entirely *new intellectual foundation*, one that restores strategic initiative and provides the nation the room to engage every possible energy on rebuilding Zionism, the starting point of which must be economic reform. To secure the nation’s streets and borders in the immediate future, Israel can:

- Work closely with Turkey and Jordan to contain, destabilize, and roll back some of its [Israel’s] most dangerous threats. This implies a clean break from the slogan “comprehensive peace” to a traditional concept of strategy based on balance of power.
- Change the nature of its relations with the Palestinians, including upholding the *right of hot pursuit* for self-defense into all Palestinian areas and nurturing alternatives to Arafat’s exclusive grip on Palestinian society.
- Forge a new basis for relations with the United States—stressing self-reliance, maturity, strategic cooperation on

areas of mutual concern, and furthering values inherent to the West. This can only be done if Israel takes serious steps to terminate aid which prevents economic reform. . . .

Securing the Northern Border

Syria challenges Israel on Lebanese soil. An effective approach, and one with which America can sympathize, would be if Israel seized the strategic initiative along its northern borders by engaging Hezbollah, Syria, and Iran, as the principal agents of aggression in Lebanon, including by:

- Striking Syria’s drug-money and counterfeiting infrastructure in Lebanon, all of which focuses on Razi Qanan.
- Paralleling Syria’s behavior by establishing the precedent that Syrian territory is not immune to attacks emanating from Lebanon by Israeli proxy forces.
- Striking Syrian military targets in Lebanon, and should that prove insufficient, *striking at select targets in Syria proper*.

Given the nature of the regime in Damascus, it is both natural and moral that Israel abandon the slogan “comprehensive peace” and move to *contain* Syria, drawing attention to its weapons of mass destruction program, and rejecting “land for peace” deals on the Golan Heights.

Moving to a Traditional Balance of Power Strategy

Israel can shape its strategic environment, in cooperation with Turkey and Jordan, by weakening, containing, and even rolling back Syria. This effort can focus on removing Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq—an important strategic objective in its own right—as a means of foiling Syria’s regional ambitions. Jordan has challenged Syria’s regional ambitions recently by suggesting the restoration of the Hashemites in Iraq. . . . Syria recently signaled that it and Iran might prefer a weak, but barely surviving Saddam, if only to undermine and humiliate Jordan in its efforts to remove Saddam.

Most importantly, it is understandable that Israel has an interest in supporting diplomatically, militarily, and operationally Turkey’s and Jordan’s actions against Syria. . . .

Changing the Nature of Relations With the Palestinians

Israel has a chance to forge a new relationship between itself and the Palestinians. First and foremost, Israel’s efforts to secure its streets may require hot pursuit into Palestinian-controlled areas, a justifiable practice with which Americans can sympathize. . . .

We believe that the Palestinian Authority must be held to the same minimal standards of accountability as other recipients of U.S. foreign aid. A firm peace cannot tolerate repression and injustice. A regime that cannot fulfill the most rudimentary obligations to its own people cannot be counted upon to fulfill its obligations to its neighbors.

Israel has no obligations under the Oslo agreements if the PLO [Palestine Liberation Organization] does not fulfill its

obligations. If the PLO cannot comply with these minimal standards, then it can be neither a hope for the future nor a proper interlocutor for the present. To prepare for this, Israel may want to cultivate alternatives to Arafat's base of power.

Open Letter to President Clinton

This letter demanding war on Iraq was sent to President Bill Clinton and the press on Feb. 19, 1998. In the list of signers below, those now holding positions in the Bush Administration appear in bold-face.

Dear Mr. President,

Many of us were involved in organizing the Committee for Peace and Security in the Gulf in 1990 to support President Bush's policy of expelling Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. Seven years later, Saddam Hussein is still in power in Baghdad. And despite his defeat in the Gulf War, continuing sanctions, and the determined effort of UN inspectors to ferret out and destroy his weapons of mass destruction, Saddam Hussein has been able to develop biological and chemical munitions. . . .

Iraq's position is unacceptable. While Iraq is not unique in possessing these weapons, it is the only country which has used them—not just against its enemies, but its own people as well. We must assume that Saddam is prepared to use them again. This poses a danger to our friends, our allies, and to our nation.

It is clear that this danger cannot be eliminated as long as our objective is simply "containment," and the means of achieving it are limited to sanctions and exhortations. . . . Only a determined program to change the regime in Baghdad will bring the Iraqi crisis to a satisfactory conclusion. . . . Saddam must be overpowered; he will not be brought down by a coup d'état. But Saddam has an Achilles' heel: Lacking popular support, he rules by terror. The same brutality which makes it unlikely that any coups or conspiracies can succeed, makes him hated by his own people and the rank and file of his military. Iraq today is ripe for a broad-based insurrection. We must exploit this opportunity.

Saddam's long record of treaty violations, deception, and violence shows that diplomacy and arms control will not constrain him. In the absence of a broader strategy, even extensive air strikes would be ineffective in dealing with Saddam and eliminating the threat his regime poses. . . . What is needed now is a comprehensive political and military strategy for bringing down Saddam and his regime.

Once you make it unambiguously clear that we are serious about eliminating the threat posed by Saddam, and are not just engaged in tactical bombing attacks unrelated to a larger strategy designed to topple the regime, we believe that such countries as Kuwait, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia, whose coop-

Story of Perle Gang's Dual Role Spreads

According to a wire of Agence France Presse from the Arab League Foreign Ministers' meeting in Cairo on Sept. 4-5, the fact that most of the Bush Administration's Iraq war-planners had also been war-planners for the Israeli Likud party government of Benjamin Netanyahu was a point of discussion at that meeting.

The wire says the Arab world appears, for once, to be unanimous in its opposition to the U.S. plan to overthrow the Iraqi regime, which Arabs see as a project designed to seal Israeli domination of the Middle East. President George Bush's argument, that Saddam Hussein must be toppled because of the alleged threat from his weapons of mass destruction program, "has fueled suspicious of a hidden agenda to remodel the region to Israel's advantage," writes AFP's Maher Chmaytelli.

His story concludes: "While the Arab street is fond of conspiracy theories, some have found what they believe is evidence of a plot in the U.S. and Israel itself.

"Israel's Institute for Advanced and Political Studies published a study in 1996 called 'A Clean Break, a New Strategy for Securing the Realm,' which lays out ideas for remodelling the region starting with Iraq.

" 'Israel can shape its strategic environment, in cooperation with Turkey and Jordan, by weakening, containing, and even rolling back Syria.

" 'This effort can focus on removing Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq, an important Israeli strategic objective in its own right, as a means of foiling Syria's regional ambitions,' said the report."

eration would be important for the implementation of this strategy, will give us the political and logistical support to succeed.

Signed:

Rep. Stephen Solarz; **Richard Perle; Elliott Abrams;** Richard V. Allen; **Richard Armitage;** Jeffrey T. Bergner; **John Bolton; Steven Bryen;** Richard Burt; Frank Carlucci; Judge William Clark; Paula J. Dobriansky; **Douglas Feith;** Frank Gaffney; Jeffrey Gedmin; **Fred C. Iklé;** Robert Kagan; **Zalmay M. Khalilzad;** Sven F. Kraemer; William Kristol; Michael Ledeen; Bernard Lewis; R. Adm. Frederick L. Lewis; Maj. Gen. Jarvis Lynch; Robert C. McFarlane; Joshua Muravchik; Robert A. Pastor; Martin Peretz; Roger Robinson; Peter Rodman; Peter Rosenblatt; **Donald Rumsfeld;** Gary Schmitt; Max Singer; Helmut Sonnenfeldt; Caspar Weinberger; Leon Wienseltier; **Paul Wolfowitz; David Wurmser; Dov. S. Zakheim.**