Editorial

Cheney in the Bunker

The scene is legendary: It's 1945, and there is Hitler, ensconced in his bunker and standing in front of a huge map of the battlefront, barking orders for non-existent armies to redeploy to confront the enemy on the Eastern front. He was totally out of touch with reality—and even top military figures who had kowtowed to his calamitous orders before, shook their heads and refused to pass the orders on. The end was only weeks away.

Fast-forward to today, and you see the Cheney-Bush duo virtually reading from the same script. "Full-speed ahead," raves the deluded Dick Cheney to ABC's George Stephanopolous on Nov. 3, even as the U.S. military forces find themselves enmired in an ever-more-disastrous bloodbath of a civil war in Iraq, and Afghanistan. It doesn't matter what happens in the elections, Cheney said—we're going to keep pursuing this war.

We would do well to take him very seriously. Cheney, and his mouthpiece Bush, are literally insane, and their impeachment must be at the very top of the agenda of the incoming Congress, before they fulfill their real threats of launching new, likely-nuclear wars.

Unlike in the Hitler case, the U.S. military is going public with its opposition to this insanity. There is no foreign army coming to liberate our nation—it's up to patriotic citizens themselves. In this case, the military, buttressed by significant other sections of the institution of the Presidency, most definitely including Lyndon LaRouche, are taking the lead.

The drumbeat of calls from retired military officers, and now numbers of active-duty military as well, for the President to fire Donald Rumsfeld for his botched war strategy and conduct, is escalating dramatically. On the eve of the midterm elections, Nov. 6, all four of the military newspapers—the *Army Times*, the *Navy Times*, the *Airforce Times*, and the *Marine Times*—will publish an editorial entitled "Time for Rumsfeld To Go." The argument they make is as follows: The Administration line has been that the key to "victory" is standing up the Iraqi Army. In reality, this policy has totally failed, bringing Iraq deeper and deeper into chaos. Yet, President Bush has declared that he will

keep Rumsfeld, who says things are going well, in position for the next two years.

"This is a mistake.

"It is one thing for the majority of Americans to think Rumsfeld has failed. But when the nation's current military leaders start to break publicly with their defense secretary, then it is clear that he is losing control of the institution he ostensibly leads." In conclusion, Rumsfeld has to go.

Other sections of the military have gone much further, addressing the issue of strategy, not just personnel. Take the op-ed by Lt. Gen. William Odom (ret.) and former head of the National Security Agency, published in the *Los Angeles Times* on Oct. 31. Odom entitled his article "How To Cut and Run," and he called for not only recognizing the failure of the Administration's policy, but for launching crucial initiatives to get out of the mess.

Odom writes: "Only a complete withdrawal of all U.S. troops within six months and with no preconditions can break the paralysis that now enfeebles our diplomacy. And the greatest obstacles to cutting and running are the psychological inhibitions of our leaders and the public." He then offers four initiatives on how to leave Iraq: 1) "concede" that the U.S. "has botched things," and "let others have a say in what's next" as troops are withdrawn; 2) have an open forum with Iraq's neighbors, including Iran; 3) cooperate informally with Iran, including on nuclear technology and even "dropping U.S. resistance to an Iran weapons program"; and 4) make real progress on the Palestianian issue

It is clear as a bell that the Cheney-Bush team is not going to follow these recommendations; they are hell-bent on destroying the United States by *expanding* the war. Nor is the military in a position to impose such a new policy. In our republic, it is the citizenry which has the responsibility to elect and support a leadership which will bring peace and prosperity to our nation today, and in the future. Can we save this republic from the likes of Cheney-Bush? That is the question on the agenda of us all.

72 Editorial EIR November 10, 2006