

## A LaRouche-Led Revolt Against The Perpetual-War Party

by Jeffrey Steinberg

While the ultimate decision on war or peace in Iraq is yet to be made by President Bush, there are growing indications that the American public, as well as key U.S. institutions, are joining the fight launched early last year by Lyndon LaRouche, to defeat the neo-conservative cabal which is increasingly desperate to steer the Bush Administration to war and "Empire."

Dramatic evidence of growing opposition to the "chickenhawk" agenda was a full-page ad in the Jan. 13 *Wall Street Journal*, called "A Republican Dissent on Iraq." The ad was taken out by a group of 500 corporate executives, all "card-carrying" Republican Party activists, in the name of Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities. The group boasts a military advisory committee stacked with retired flag grade officers, including Vice Adm. John J. Shanahan, former CIA Director Adm. Stansfield Turner, former Reagan Administration Assistant Secretary of Defense Lawrence Korb, Rear Adm. Eugene Carroll, and Col. David Hackworth (USA-ret.), America's most decorated living combat veteran.

The ad began, "Let's be clear: We supported the Gulf War. We supported our intervention in Afghanistan. We accept the logic of a just war. But Mr. President, your war on Iraq does not pass the test. It is not a just war. The candidate we supported in 2000 promised a more humble nation in our dealings with the world. We gave him our votes and our campaign contributions. That candidate was you. *We feel betrayed. We want our money back. We want our country back*" (emphasis in the original). The ad not only opposed American casualties and Iraqi suffering after two decades of sanctions and bombing. It directly challenged the logic of Samuel Huntington's Clash of Civilizations, warning, "Among the 1 billion Muslims in the world there is now a steady trickle of recruits going to Al-Qaeda. You will turn the trickle into a torrent. A billion

bitter enemies will rise out of this war." And on the issue of empire: "Our jaws drop when we read that you may decide we have to occupy Iraq for years, that the next ruler of Iraq may be . . . an American general! Is there anyone in this country who thinks that will work? Your odds of success are infinitesimal!" The Republicans concluded, "You are waltzing blindfolded into what may well be a catastrophe. Pride goeth before a fall. Show the humility and compassion that led us to elect you. War with Iraq is not inevitable. Now is the time to stop it."

### American Angst

The sense of astonishment at the perversity of the war party in the Bush Administration is also beginning to sink into the psyche of the population at large. After more than 10 million leaflets and "crisis pamphlets" have been circulated in the United States since the Spring of 2002 by the LaRouche in 2004 campaign, it is not surprising that there is a growing anti-war mood in the country, shaped by the impact of the economic collapse, and the "credibility" gap rapidly arising over the Bush Administration's disastrous economic stewardship.

On Jan. 15, the *Washington Post* published a front-page story highlighting the growing American angst, beginning, "A solid majority of Americans consistently tell pollsters that they favor attacking Iraq to topple President Saddam Hussein. But beneath that bedrock of support lies a deep sense of anxiety." The *Post* article, based in part on a recent *Washington Post*/ABC News nationwide poll, shows that while 60% of those surveyed support an Iraq war, the support falls sharply to 42% when the war involves American ground troops, and crashes to a mere 30% when the issue of possible American casualties is introduced. Americans may go along with a

Nintendo game of “catch Saddam,” but they shrink at the thought of real combat, with boots on the ground and daily body bags being flown home.

Above all else, the *Post* survey revealed a deep fear, among Americans in every part of the country, and at every socio-economic scale, about the collapsing economy. “To many Americans,” the *Post* reported, “one crisis at a time seems manageable. But pile on the worries, and the mind starts to race. The video image of a hospital ship sailing from Baltimore’s harbor starts a conversation about global unrest and nuclear threats in Iraq and North Korea, which leads to a gripe session about the cost of sending troops to Iraq, which circles back to the ailing U.S. stock market. And always in the background are worries about the possibility of another massive terrorist attack.” One Decatur, Georgia man summarized the national sentiment, telling the *Post* interviewer, “The economy is in terrible shape, and it’s definitely going to get worse if we go to war. There will be a ripple effect—gas and oil prices will go higher, so homeowners will have to pay more, and landlords will have to charge more rent to cover heating costs.” A second man, a World War II and Korean War veteran, said, “With the state of the country’s finances and economy, we do not need that expense [of an Iraq war]. I think we are destined for a very stark future.”

*New York Times* columnist Maureen Dowd took up the same theme the same day, insightfully writing that “George W. Bush designed his entire political career and Presidency to make sure he would never face this moment. . . . For the first time since 9/11, Mr. Bush’s ratings have slipped below 60 percent in a new USA Today/CNN Gallup poll that reflects growing unease with his approach on the economy and taxes, domestic policy and international threats.” Dowd noted that both G.W. and White House political svengali Karl Rove are now facing the nightmare prospect of a repeat of “Poppy’s” 1992 defeat by “voters who thought he was aloof from their economic suffering, overly consumed with foreign affairs and insulated by an inner circle of rich white patricians.”

### Neo-Con/Fundi Alliance Under Attack

The clearest evidence of LaRouche’s impact within segments of the Democratic Party surfaced on Jan. 14, at a Washington event co-sponsored by the New America Foundation and *Atlantic Monthly*. The meeting unveiled a special January/February 2003 edition of the magazine, focused on “The Real State of the Union,” and a book by New America Foundation senior fellow Michael Lind, *Made in Texas—George W. Bush and the Southern Takeover of American Politics*, published by Basic Books.

The Lind book offers a devastating exposé of the 25-year alliance between the neo-conservative Zionist liberal imperialists, and a Southern-based right-wing Christian fundamentalist movement, which has become the dominant political and financial base of support for Israel’s Likud party, inside the United States. In one particularly powerful chapter, titled

“Armageddon,” Lind picks up on every major theme detailed in the series of *EIR* offprints, which circulated throughout the Summer and Autumn of 2002 in tens of thousands of copies inside the Washington Beltway.

Lind, borrowing a leaf from the earlier *EIR* studies, tore apart the “chicken-hawks” inside the Bush Administration by name—Paul Wolfowitz, Doug Feith, David Wurmser, Richard Perle—and documented their ties to the Israeli government and their early 1990s promotion of the doctrines of American hegemonism and pre-emptive warfare, that have become the buzzwords of the present Administration.

At the Jan. 14 forum, both Lind and *Atlantic Monthly* senior editor James Fallows conceded, to questioning from an *EIR* correspondent, that of all the candidates for the Democratic Presidential nomination, only Lyndon LaRouche is promoting the American System ideas of Alexander Hamilton, Friedrich List, and Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal. The “Real State of the Union” survey which they promoted from the podium, certainly presented a fairly accurate snapshot of an America facing the biggest wealth-gap since the start of FDR’s New Deal, the most imbalanced health care delivery system in the advanced sector, the highest rate of incarceration of almost any nation on the earth, the biggest consumer bubble and the lowest household savings rate of any nation in history, growing economic racism, a collapsed manufacturing sector, and a breakdown of the basic family structure, due to the fact that few households can survive on one paycheck.

### The LaRouche Factor

The very idea of a “Real State of the Union” echoes LaRouche’s announcement, late last year, that he would deliver his own State of the Union address on the afternoon of Jan. 28, 2003. In his Jan. 1 message, previewing his international webcast assessment of the Bush Administration at mid-term, LaRouche identified the month of January 2003 as crunch-time, with vital decisions due to be made by the end of the month on war or peace in the Persian Gulf, the future survival of Israel, and—above all else—the fate of the U.S. and world economy.

While the word circulating around the Democratic Party headquarters is that Bush should be allowed to drown in his own insane economic and monetary policies, statesman LaRouche has vowed to pave the way to his own inauguration in January 2005, by helping President Bush to set the country and the world back on a course of sane economic policy, modeled on Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal and Bretton Woods System.

At 1:00 p.m. Washington time on Jan. 28, all eyes and ears will be on LaRouche’s webcast. That includes those of President Bush, who will be delivering his own State of the Union address seven hours later, knowing that his words will be held up to the standard set by his Democratic challenger and potential greatest asset.