

LaRouche's Iraq Exit Strategy Under Scrutiny in Arab World

by EIR Staff

Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche's Nov. 28 statement of a strategy for rapid U.S. exit from its occupation ("Restore Iraq's Constitution," *EIR*, Dec. 12) has been widely reported and explained in the Mideast press during the first two weeks of December, indicating its discussion throughout the Arab world—including within Iraq. Some examples:

- LaRouche's "Restore Iraq's Constitution" was published in full on Dec. 12 in the daily *Al-Arab International*, with additional notes on Iraq's 1958 Interim Constitution as the reference point, and a clarification on the ecumenical nature of LaRouche's call for the release of former Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz.

- The Iraqi daily *Al-Sa'a*, in Baghdad, published "Restore Iraq's Constitution" in Arabic on Dec. 16. The daily, distributed in the capital and in other cities and towns throughout Iraq, belongs to the newly established United Nationalist Movement, a group which demands national unity and resistance against the U.S.-British occupation through peaceful means.

- The Cairo-based newspaper *Al-Shaab* published the Arabic text of the LaRouche statement on Dec. 15. *Al-Shaab* is the publication of the opposition Islamic Al-'Amal (Labor) Party.

- The Dubai-based leading daily *Al-Bayan* published an interview with Lyndon LaRouche, and *EIR*'s "Cheney-Gate" article in Arabic (see below for excerpts), in a special political weekly supplement for the end of the year. This special supplement, "Al-Malaf Al-Isbou'i," is dedicated to U.S. foreign policy in 2003 and the near future. The interview is titled: "The 'Unnamed' Democratic Presidential Candidate Lyndon LaRouche: Current U.S. Foreign Policy Intends To Loot the world," and was posted on *Al-Bayan*'s website with the article.

The effect of the Dec. 13 arrest of Saddam Hussein by the U.S. Armed Forces in Iraq, has been to increase pressure from the Mideast countries, and forces in Iraq, for the early end of the U.S.-British occupation of the country—the point of LaRouche's Nov. 28 statement. Members of the Iraqi Governing Council (IGC), such as Adnan Pachachi, are saying that now the time has come to discuss a fast time-table for U.S. withdrawal and ending the occupation. It is widely forecast, that the latest developments will fuel a general Iraqi move against the occupation, whether in the form of stepped-up military resistance, or in the form of political demands, even by the U.S.-appointed IGC members.

The American position, however, seems to be quite different so far. The Egyptian de facto government daily *Al-Ahram* on Dec. 14 reported remarks by U.S. commander General Sanchez, who was asked about the future of the coalition forces in Iraq, after the formation of a government. He stated, "We expect an invitation from the government to retain the coalition forces, as per agreement, to establish stability and security." He said this would be a permanent arrangement; and, asked about the number of forces, he said it would be the current troop strength; i.e., 130,000 soldiers.

Dubai's Al-Bayan Interviews LaRouche, Dec. 14

Al-Bayan: Where is U.S. foreign policy heading at this moment? What is the impact of special right-wing political and financial lobbies in determining U.S. policy?

LaRouche: In effect, the current foreign policy of the U.S. today is that which then-Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney had proposed, then unsuccessfully, during 1991-92. The pol-

icy is one which aims at U.S. imperial world domination, and looting of victim-nations, through a world government brought into being through what Cheney et al. defined as “preventive nuclear war.” China is on the list of intended targets.

This was a qualified revival of the original “preventive nuclear warfare” doctrine formulated by Bertrand Russell during the 1940s, which was set into motion during the period from August 1945 until the beginning of the 1950s. The Soviet development of the world’s first deployable form of thermonuclear weapon, caused the dumping of preventive nuclear warrior President Truman and his policies, with the installation of anti-utopian President Dwight Eisenhower for two terms. The collapse of the Soviet Union was seen by so-called “neo-conservatives” as the foreseeable end of “thermonuclear detente”; consequently, Russell’s nuclear warfare policies of the 1940s were revived by these neo-conservatives.

Thus, this policy was revived by Cheney as a proposed way of exploiting the opportunity created by the 1989-2001 collapse of Soviet power. The administration of President George H.W. Bush rejected Cheney’s proposal at that time. The present revival of that policy, which had been Cheney’s continuing commitment during the course of the 1990s, was successfully foisted upon the current Bush Presidency, by Cheney, following the events of Sept. 11, 2001. It has been overtly U.S. policy since President George W. Bush’s January 2002 State of the Union address to the U.S. Congress.

At first glance, from a military standpoint, what Cheney proposes is not merely incompetent, but insanely so. The fact that it is insane does not mean it could not, or would not be carried out by the U.S.A., if Cheney were not to be removed from office soon. Hitler’s policies were also insane, especially at the point, in June 1940, that Winston Churchill decided to prevent Britain and its navy from joining forces with a Hitler who seemed victorious over western Europe at that time. The continuing war remained inevitable, but, virtually, so was the U.S.-led defeat of Germany and Japan. . . .

Al-Bayan: Has the “war on terrorism” produced any results? What is the alternative to this policy?

LaRouche: It has promoted the growth and spread of terrorism beyond anything which would have been possible prior to the combination of U.S. successive attacks on both Afghanistan and Iraq, and Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon’s brutal and deliberately provocative exploitation of his influence over U.S. policy.

Worse, this spread of terrorism brought about by current U.S. policy, has pushed the perspective for the world of the immediately coming years in the direction of a form of globally spreading asymmetric, nuclear-armed warfare, beyond anything seriously considered probable in the entire period since 1945. The security policies of nations today must now put that growing danger foremost in diplomacy and related matters of policy-shaping.

Al-Bayan: How was the “Iraq war” intelligence produced? How could this be corrected to avoid further wars?

LaRouche: The fraudulent intelligence crafted to dupe the U.S. Congress and others into violating the U.S. Constitution with the present warfare, was coordinated through the influence of Vice-President Dick Cheney and his I. Lewis Libby—all done in concert with both Ariel Sharon and British Prime Minister Tony Blair. The evidence is, that it was all essentially fraudulent.

Al-Bayan: What is Lyndon LaRouche’s position on the Geneva Initiative for Palestinian-Israeli peace; his view of the religious fanatics both Christian and Jewish; and, how this religious factor could be dealt with, in regards to the Palestinian and Middle East situations?

LaRouche: Israel is a nuclear hand-grenade poised to be thrown at the Islamic world. Hand grenades are not known to survive their own detonation. This latter fact is well known to the Israeli professional military and other relevant parties. Therefore, since the middle of the 1970s, there has been an ebb and flow in the strength of the Israeli alliance for a peaceful relationship between Israeli and Palestinian.

There are two principal components to that peace factor among pro-Zionist Israelis. One is in the tradition of Nahum Goldman; the other, chiefly, those circles of Labor Zionism associated with David Ben-Gurion which came to recognize the limits of Israeli aggression against the Arab world. Today, there are even some members of the Likud who share the practical view of the need for peace.

My own approach to this is premised chiefly on the precedent of the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia: the principle of “the advantage of the other,” which I see as the only approach which could be workable under the present, historically determined circumstances. Whether as two states, or one, there must be agreement for peace based on that principle. Everything different has failed. If I am President, I shall use the full influence of the U.S. to bring such an approach to bear.

Naturally, I am in support of the Geneva Accord, and of former U.S. President Jimmy Carter’s address on that subject. It is not yet a perfect solution, but it is an indispensable and good step in a useful direction.

Al-Bayan: Can you comment on the issue of double standards in the West regarding the question of economic and political reform in the Middle East?

LaRouche: “Double standard” is too mild a condemnation. It is the same kind of sophist’s duplicity—then, by the rulers of ancient Athens—which caused the Peloponnesian War. The perpetrators of such duplicitous diplomacy are governed . . . by a Hobbesian outlook in world affairs. This means rule by the diplomacy of threat, in which the hypocritical interest of the would-be powerful is the submission of those intended to be subjugated.