

LaRouche Mobilization Leads to Global Action Against Iraq War

by Jeffrey Steinberg

With his keynote address on Aug. 31 at the annual Labor Day Weekend conference of the Schiller Institute in Reston, Virginia, Lyndon LaRouche accelerated the international effort to stop President George W. Bush from committing political suicide by launching an insane war against Iraq. Such a war would send the entire Mideast region into convulsions, and would trigger precisely the global Clash of Civilizations sought by the actual authors of the Sept. 11, 2001 irregular warfare attacks on New York City and Washington.

Ever since LaRouche called upon his political supporters to distribute more than 5 million campaign leaflets in the United States in the five-week period leading into the Labor Day conference, the political climate in the United States has tilted, enabling other sane, but less courageous political and military leaders to step forward in opposition to the war party run amok in and around the Bush Administration.

In an internet radio broadcast on Saturday afternoon, Aug. 24, LaRouche announced the distribution of a series of updated LaRouche in 2004 campaign leaflets over the two months leading to the November midterm elections, with tens of millions of copies to be in circulation by Election Day. The Labor Day Weekend conference in Virginia was attended by hundreds of young people, between the ages of 18 to 25, who make up the core of a rapidly expanding LaRouche youth movement, which has now taken the LaRouche warning about a Clash of Civilizations war onto university campuses.

It is only in the context of this LaRouche-led mobilization in the United States, Western Europe, and Ibero-America, that other anti-war moves can be appraised.

Congress' Constituents Say No

In fact, the returning members of the U.S. House and Senate made it abundantly clear, in media comments, and in sessions that have taken place with President Bush, Vice President Richard Cheney, CIA Director George Tenet and

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, that their constituents are *not* in favor of the war, being peddled by the "chicken hawks" of the Richard Perle-Paul Wolfowitz cabal.

At a Sept. 4 forum on Capitol Hill, sponsored by Rep. Dennis Kucinich (D-Oh.), Rep. Jan Schakowsky (D-Ill.) reported that she had held town hall meetings throughout her Congressional District, and only three people had stepped forward to support a war on Iraq. The night before her return to Washington, she had addressed a standing-room-only crowd, in which not a single person had supported a war.

Following a meeting with President Bush and a classified briefing by Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld on Sept. 3, a number of Congressional leaders declared publicly that they were "not convinced" that there was any basis for going to war to overthrow Saddam Hussein. Democratic Senate leaders Carl Levin (Mich.) and Tom Daschle (S.D.) stated that, if there were a vote on going to war with Iraq that day, they would vote against it. Even Senate Minority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.), one of the leading Capitol Hill war hawks, told reporters, following the White House meeting, that he did not believe that Congress could debate the Iraq issue and vote up a resolution of support for military action, before the Congress recesses for the final campaign period before the Nov. 5 election.

World Leaders Add Their Voices

On Sept. 5, two leading political figures added their voices to the growing chorus of opponents of an American war on Iraq. German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder, in a lengthy interview that was published on the front page of the *New York Times*, delivered a dire warning to President Bush of the consequences of a unilateral American assault on Baghdad. The *Times* headlined the interview "German Leader's Warning: War Plan Is a Huge Mistake," and led off by reporting, "Gerhard Schröder, the German chancellor, believes that the Bush



President Bush's attempts to gain support for war on Iraq (here, in Louisville, Kentucky, Sept. 5) are not convincing Congressmen, who found out, during the recess, that their constituents do not want war and economic crisis at once.

Administration is making a terrible mistake in planning a war against Iraq, and he is not afraid to say so. A new war in the Middle East, he says bluntly, would put at risk all that has been gained so far in the unfinished battle against al-Qaeda. The arguments against a war with Iraq are so strong, he said, that he would oppose one even if the Security Council approved."

Schröder explained to *Times* reporter Steven Erlanger, "Let me begin by saying that without a UN Security Council mandate, our Constitution would not permit any form of participation. That is quite clear. But the other arguments that I have cited against an intervention are so important that I would also be against such an intervention if—for whatever reasons and whatever form—the Security Council of the United Nations were to say 'yes,' which I cannot imagine happening in the present situation."

Schröder warned that no viable war could be launched without a coherent plan for postwar regional development and stability. "I have attempted to make clear that we must prove before the eyes of the world, in Afghanistan and elsewhere, that participation in the struggle against terror will also bring a peace dividend; and I know of no one who has a real concept for a new order in the Middle East which could shape the region afterwards. These are weighty arguments that lead me to say . . . Hands off. Especially, because, as I said before, the evidence appears to be highly dubious."

According to one well-placed Washington source, Schröder was speaking for more than the German political establishment in his *Times* interview (the opposition Christian Democratic Union has joined the Social Democrats in opposing the Bush war on Iraq). Of the three "leading" Western European nations, Great Britain and France are permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, and may be called upon shortly, to vote on a new resolution on Iraq.

Schröder, the source emphasized, is speaking for leading circles in both Britain and France, exploiting the fact that he is not coming under the same Washington pressure as the Security Council permanent members.

The same day that Chancellor Schröder was letting his view air in the *Times*, two leading American figures—former President Jimmy Carter and Bush Sr. National Security Advisor Gen. Brent Scowcroft—both came out strongly against a war on Saddam. Scowcroft reiterated the position he had taken in an op-ed in the *Wall Street Journal* several weeks ago—an op-ed that launched the drive by mainstream Republicans to convince President Bush to back down from the war perch. Scowcroft's remarks were delivered during his keynote presentation at a day-long conference of the U.S. Institute of Peace in Washington, on "America's Challenges in a Changing World."

Former President Carter penned a strongly worded opinion piece in the *Washington Post*, warning that the United States is abandoning fundamental principles, and is becoming the target of worldwide scorn, as a leading violator of human rights and international law. He quickly got to the issue of Iraq: "While the President has reserved judgment, the American people are inundated almost daily with claims from the Vice President and other top officials that we face a devastating threat from Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, and with pledges to remove Saddam Hussein from office, with or without support from any allies. As has been emphasized vigorously by foreign allies and by responsible leaders of former administrations and incumbent officeholders, there is no current danger to the United States from Baghdad." Carter detailed that any belligerent moves by Iraq would be suicidal.

Carter joined former Secretary of State James Baker III in calling for the return of weapons inspectors—with an unfettered mandate. However, he warned that the President's vow

of “regime change” is making any effective UN involvement far more difficult. He then turned to the Israel-Palestine debacle: “Tragically, our government is abandoning any sponsorship of substantive negotiations between Palestinians and Israelis. Our apparent policy is to support almost every Israeli action in the occupied territories and to condemn and isolate the Palestinians as blanket targets of our war on terrorism, while Israeli settlements expand and Palestinian enclaves shrink.”

The ‘Godfather’ Steps In

Ironically, right next to President Carter’s op-ed in the Sept. 5 *Post*, appeared another opinion piece, by Eliot A. Cohen, a Wolfowitz protégé and author of an updated version of Samuel Huntington’s imperious 1956 book *The Soldier and the State*. Cohen’s new diatribe, in favor of a Roman Imperial “do or die” military, *Supreme Commander: Soldiers, Statesmen, and Leadership in Wartime*, was the only known book on President Bush’s Summer reading list, according to recent news accounts.

Cohen’s op-ed, “Hunting ‘Chicken Hawks,’ ” was a pathetic defense of the gaggle of draft dodgers-turned grand strategists, who are proclaiming that a military action to unseat Saddam Hussein will be a “cake-walk.” As reported last week in *EIR*, a number of newspapers and websites have catalogued that the vast majority of Iraq war-hawks in the Bush Administration—starting with Perle and Wolfowitz—never served in the military. These “chicken hawks” were the subject of a public tongue-lashing by Gen. Anthony Zinni, who noted that “all of the generals” agree that the Iraq war is a bad idea, while the war party is full of people without a clue as to how to fight a war and what the human dimensions of combat are all about.

With the legions of neo-cons and Christian Zionists all exposed as draft dodgers and wanna-be warriors, the war party decided that they had no choice but to call upon one of their own elder statesmen to “give war a chance.” On Sept. 6, George Shultz, the former Reagan Administration Secretary of State, penned a wild op-ed in the *Washington Post*, mirroring the warlike babble in Vice President Cheney’s pair of war speeches the previous week.

Lyndon LaRouche, upon reading the Shultz diatribe, denounced him for failing to confess to one very significant fact: It was Shultz, personally, who saddled George W. Bush with the Wolfowitz-Perle cabal, which is now brainwashing the President into war. As reported in *EIR* in Sept. 2000, the first time that G.W. was introduced to Condi Rice was at Shultz’s Palo Alto, California home. A week later, Shultz introduced the Texas Governor to Paul Wolfowitz. Shultz was the chairman of Bush’s Exploratory Committee policy advisory team, and he oversaw the parade of neo-conservatives, including Richard Perle, who were brought to Austin, Texas to “teach” the future President “how to think” about foreign policy.