

He is a member of the board of directors of Bechtel Group, Fremont Group, Gilead Sciences, Unnext.com, and Charles Schwab & Co. He is also chairman of the International Council of J.P. Morgan Chase, which *EIR* analysts believe may have been taken under protection of the Federal Reserve after it nearly went under this year. For now, Shultz is being well rewarded for his years of servitude to the Anglo-American Establishment.

## The 'Neo-Conservative' Problem

by Dr. Clifford A. Kiracofe, Jr.

*In the last several weeks, EIR has reprinted, with permission, notable commentaries questioning war against Iraq, including articles by former U.S. National Security Adviser Gen. Brent Scowcroft, former Republican U.S. Rep. Pete McCloskey of California, and speakers at a conference of the National Council on U.S.-Arab Relations in Washington. The following comments by Dr. Clifford Kiracofe were made on Sept. 9 to that conference. Kiracofe, an historian who was a senior staff member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, anticipated the contents of President George W. Bush's "neo-imperial" doctrine by several weeks. Further speeches from the U.S.-Arab conference will be covered in next week's EIR.*

In June, I had the opportunity to visit Saudi Arabia and Egypt. It was instructive to be in the region again. The situation is dangerous and the gulf is widening between the United States and our friends in the region. I was pleased to meet and hear from such personalities as H.R.H. Crown Prince Abdullah, the Egyptian Foreign Minister, and the head of the Arab League. . . . Turning now to this town, I shall now comment on neo-conservatives, Christian Zionists, and the print news media.

Congressmen and Senators, while home during recess, evidently encountered a deeply skeptical electorate with respect to war against Iraq. Scurrying back to this town, somewhat chastened politicians seem nervous about the elections just ahead and the international situation.

Where the United States had the whole world behind it last 9/11, the whole world today—one can say, with good reason—is against the United States, because of the Administration's neo-conservative Middle East policy, to attack Iraq and to do nothing to solve the Palestine question.

While many in this room are familiar with the "hawks versus doves" or "unilateralists versus multilateralists" analysis of the foreign policy debate, may I offer the perspective

of "Traditionalists versus Neo-Conservatives"? In my view, the current policy debate is a confrontation between those who advocate the core values of the traditional United States approach to foreign relations, as established by the Founding Fathers, and those who are the alien-minded advocates of a radical break with American tradition.

The alien-minded neo-conservative policy network advocates the revival of a 19th-Century European imperialism—if not a ruthless and cynical 20th-Century German *machtpolitik*—as the basis for a new permanent direction in U.S. foreign policy. In fact, the neo-conservative policy network demands that the United States adopt a policy of global imperialism. That this is a constant theme in their propaganda is well known, and observable on a daily basis.

The policy of permanent global imperialism is the core of the dark, hysterical, and alien mind-set of the neo-conservatives. American foreign policy traditionalists, of course, reject permanent global imperialism and pre-emptive war. Traditionalists say international law must be respected, and that our policy should be to "observe good faith and justice toward all nations."

Because of the penetration of the Republican Party by the neo-conservative policy network during the past 20 years, the Republican Party now faces a severe internal crisis. This is reflected in the situation in Congress today by the sharp split between pro-Zionist Republicans and non-Zionist Republicans. A few sensible and respected Republican leaders of an older generation, such as James Baker and Brent Scowcroft, stepped forward to caution fellow citizens about the dangers of neo-conservative foreign policy. But the neo-conservative network of a younger generation of ideological zealots operating inside the Bush Administration, and supported by most Republicans in Congress—at least for the time being—goes about its work unimpeded, and is in fact protected at the highest levels of the Administration. . . .

### 1. Who Are the Neo-Conservatives?

When I refer to "neo-conservatives," I mean a particular network of Jewish-American intellectuals, operative since the 1950s. Gentile allies of the self-styled neo-conservatives, such as Gary Bauer, began to refer to themselves in the 1980s as "Social Conservatives." The followers of William Buckley, who have been allies of the neo-conservatives since the 1950s, tend to call themselves "Conservatives."

With respect to Buckley, I recall his *National Review* magazine lambasted President Eisenhower for his Middle East policy during the Suez Crisis in 1956. President Eisenhower, of course, opposed the neo-imperialism of Britain, France, and Israel. The "neo-conservative" movement emerged in the 1950s from the work of two key intellectuals, Norman Podhoretz and Irving Kristol. They had, according to some intellectual historians, drifted from pre-World War II Trotskyism to post-World War II Cold War Zionism. They



Dr. Clifford Kiracofe:  
"American traditionalists oppose a policy of permanent global imperialism and pre-emptive war."

became Truman Democrats.

The intellectual roots of neo-conservative thinking on foreign policy matters can be traced, in large measure, to Prof. Leo Strauss and Prof. Hans Morganthau—both emigrés from Nazi Germany teaching at the University of Chicago. Morganthau advocated *realpolitik* foreign policy in what came to be called the "Realist School." The philosophical underpinnings of these "Realists" and neo-conservatives are, demonstrably, Friedrich Nietzsche with his advocacy of amoral power, and Spinoza with his advocacy of a certain esoteric intellectual elitism. This is certainly a very far cry from the traditions of the United States, our Founding Fathers, and our Constitution.

In the early 1970s, the neo-conservatives clustered around U.S. Sen. "Scoop" Jackson. They then, opportunistically, bolted the Democratic Party led by President Jimmy Carter, in disagreement with his approach to the Middle East. And what did they do next? They simply penetrated the Republican Party and the incoming Reagan Administration in 1981.

## 2. What Do the Neo-Conservatives Advocate?

The neo-conservative policy network advocates a destabilization and balkanization of the Middle East. Out of the chaos, they say, will come a new order through "regime change," the redrawing of borders, and the reallocation of the control of the hydrocarbon resources of the region. Neo-conservatives see the destabilization of the Arab and Muslim Middle East as good for Israel. I myself, to the contrary, think this policy is harmful—even dangerous—to the long-range security of Israel, not to mention to the region as a whole.

One element of neo-conservative foreign policy seems drawn from Lord Palmerston, ca. 1840. Palmerston devised a Middle East policy for the British Empire that promoted a Jewish entity in historic Palestine, linked to the Turkish Empire as a counterweight to Egypt. This policy was later modified when the British Empire seized Egypt outright in the latter 19th Century.

The neo-conservative, neo-imperial policy for the Middle East is based on an alliance between Israel, the United States,

Turkey, Jordan, and a "Hashemite Iraq." One can imagine that the next step will be to restore the Holy Places to Hashemite control after dismembering Saudi Arabia, by carving out the Eastern Province as a separate state. . . .

Neo-conservatives go further than mere routine imperialism. They advocate active "pre-emptive" warfare, and the erection of a "new order" in the Middle East. Their policy position is akin to the cynical German *macht*-politicians and diplomats who sought a "New Order" in Europe, and launched the "pre-emptive" attack on Poland that triggered World War II.

## 3. Neo-Conservatives and Christian Zionists in Congress

Why has Congress become an engine for the destruction of U.S. relations with the Arab and Muslim worlds? Beginning about 1980, the parasitic neo-conservative element in the Republican Party aligned with the fundamentalist Christian Right. Christian Zionists, such as Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson, follow the bizarre cultic theology spread in parts of the United States during the mid-19th Century by the defrocked Anglican priest from England, John Nelson Darby. This bizarre cult has no relationship, at all, to the traditional Christian churches established in the United States during the 17th and 18th Centuries. Darby spread the cult between 1859 and 1872 during visits to the United States. Because the apocalyptic Darbyite cult underlies the Christian Zionist influence in Congress, and in the Administration, it must be understood for what it is.

You can explain the behavior of a Dick Armey and a Tom DeLay and dozens of members of Congress, as well as some Senators, when it is understood that they themselves are Darbyite Christian Zionists. A simple Internet search of the name "John Nelson Darby" will flood your desktops with ample data, I can assure you.

Jerry Falwell's trip to Israel in 1979 was key to the alliance between the Darbyite Christian Zionists in the United States and the Likud party in Israel. In fact, the American Christian Zionists developed complex and close relations with a range of extreme Messianic Jewish circles in Israel, including the Gush Emunim, the "settlers' " movement, and the old-line Jabotinsky right-wing nationalists of Begin's Herut party.

Prior to the 1980 elections in the U.S., the Israeli New Right made preparations to form political relationships with the Christian fundamentalist groups in the United States that adhered to the Darbyite apocalyptic cultic theology. These Christian Zionists, in turn, would pressure Congress and the White House to support Likud's "Eretz Israel" ("Greater Israel") policy.

The Israeli operational guide for targeting and manipulating Christian Zionists in the United States was published in 1978. It is entitled, *American Fundamentalism and Israel: The Relation of Fundamentalist Churches to Zionism and*

*the State of Israel*. Written by the late Israeli scholar Yonah Malachy, the book was published by the Institute of Contemporary Jewry at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

The Christian Zionist lobby came out of the closet with its first “National Prayer Breakfast for Israel” held in Washington on Feb. 6, 1985. The event attracted many key political personalities. Benjamin Netanyahu, then Israeli Ambassador at the United Nations, gave the keynote address and praised the work of Christian Zionists who, he said, “influenced the thinking of Lloyd George, Arthur Balfour, and Woodrow Wilson.”

Fast forward to 1998-1999. The neo-conservatives, under the protection of “pro-Israel” George Shultz, were able to form the so-called “Vulcan Group” of policy experts—led by Paul Wolfowitz and Richard Perle, and coordinated by Condi Rice—that advised Presidential candidate George W. Bush. Their advice to candidate Bush on Middle East policy was to put Iraq on the front burner, and to put the Palestine question on the back burner, if not in the freezer. Following Bush’s election, the neo-conservative policy network was rewarded with a variety of top positions in the new Administration. Their advice is unchanged: Iraq on the front burner, and the Palestine question in the freezer, if not in the trash. And this policy line is supported by the Christian Zionist phalanx of Republicans in Congress led by Armev and DeLay on the House side.

## **The Print News Media and Public Opinion**

Significant editorial opinion in newspapers in the United States reflects caution and restraint with respect to pre-emptive war against Iraq. Furthermore, significant editorial opinion in newspapers in the United States urges a just solution to the Palestine question.

While Washington might be a three newspaper town—the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and the *Washington Times*—there is the rest of the country, after all. And we should not forget this. We all know the handful of big-name columnists who serve as the vector for Israeli propaganda, neo-conservative foreign policy, and the Christian Zionists. But they are just a handful. There are dozens, if not hundreds, of working journalists across the United States who reject the neo-conservative line.

Reviewing U.S. newspaper editorial opinion for the last couple of months, I have found editorial after editorial, from across the United States, that call for caution and restraint with respect to the Iraq question. Similarly, I have found editorial after editorial that advocate a just solution of the Palestine question.

Please examine, for example, the editorial pages of such papers as: the *San Diego Union*, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, the *Sacramento Bee*, the *Rocky Mountain News*, the *Kansas City Star*, the *Chicago Tribune*, the *Minneapolis Star-Tribune*, the *Detroit Free Press*, the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, and the *Hartford Courant*, to name just a few.

The White House can’t fail to notice American editorial opinion. And my guess is that this explains why the White House appears somewhat unnerved just at the moment. The “pro-Israel” lobby does not fail to notice American editorial opinion. In fact, it seeks to manipulate or intimidate it.

That is why the “pro-Israel” lobby moved to establish three key operations to attack the American media, in order to intimidate and silence working journalists who advocate peace and justice in the Middle East, rather than slavishly push the extremist line of the Likud, the Sharonists, and the neo-conservatives.

I would cite MEMRI, CAMERA, and HONESTREPORTING.COM. They all have websites, and they are linked to the U.S. “pro-Israel” lobby, as well as to certain Israeli government, military, and intelligence circles. There is no question that CAMERA and HONESTREPORTING.COM exist to intimidate American journalists in order to stifle freedom of the press in our land. A simple review of their websites will demonstrate this fact to you. . . .

American traditionalists oppose a policy of permanent global imperialism and pre-emptive war.

After listing 13 key “fundamentals” of American foreign policy, Prof. Samuel Flagg Bemis of Yale University once said, of our greatest President from a foreign policy perspective: “Implicit in all these fundamentals, which all together we may connect with the name John Quincy Adams more than with any other one man, was a feeling, strongly sensed and practiced, of anti-imperialism.”

## **What Is To Be Done?**

We must return to traditional principles of foreign policy such as respect for the rule of law—not to mention respect for our own Constitution.

We must reject the neo-conservative agenda of permanent global imperialism and pre-emptive war.

Allow me to quote President “George W.” when he said: “Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct.”

Oh, by the way, I am quoting the real “George W.”—President George Washington, that is—in his Farewell Address. To continue with President George Washington’s words: “Nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded. . . . A passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of common interest where no real common interest exists, and infusing one with the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter without adequate inducement or justification.”

The passionate attachment of the neo-conservatives for Israel may well be the Achilles’ heel of the Bush Administration, if not this republic.