

Ominous Turn in Bush Administration Policy

by Jonathan Tennenbaum

A “doomsday” mood, like that which dictated Warsaw Pact “blitzkrieg” planning in the 1980s,¹ has evidently seized a “hard core” among the Anglo-American financial interests, the backers of Samuel Huntington, Paul Wolfowitz, Henry Kissinger, and Zbigniew Brzezinski. Faced with the accelerating disintegration of their entire system—as symptomized by the latest, unprecedented wave of mega-bankruptcies, defaults, and corporate scandals in Wall Street and elsewhere—they are preparing to plunge the planet into what could become decades of generalized clash of civilizations warfare and chaos.

This is the background to President George Bush’s Jan. 29 message to Congress, to the declared intention to launch a massive U.S. military buildup; the declared targetting of Iraq, Iran, and North Korea; and the disastrous foreign-policy shifts by the Administration in recent weeks. Meanwhile, Huntington and other spokesmen for what Lyndon LaRouche has called the policies behind the Sept. 11 military coup attempt, have stepped forward in unprecedented fashion, to proclaim the establishment of a new, Anglo-American “world empire” as the goal of the “war against terrorism.”

Viewed by the rest of the world, the tone of triumphalism brings up memories of the late Erich Honecker, reviewing the pompous East German military parade on the 40th anniversary of the G.D.R.—just weeks before the collapse of his communist SED regime and the fall of the Berlin Wall! Hence, LaRouche’s recent, thought-provoking question: “Is George Bush the Erich Honecker of 2002?” While apparently rising toward the pinnacle of undisputed world power, Huntington’s Anglo-American empire is in reality hopelessly overextended.

It is fantasy to imagine that the collapsing U.S. economy could be revived by even a gigantic increase in military spend-

1. In 1992 the German Defense Ministry completed a detailed study of 52,000 internal documents recovered from former East Germany, related to Warsaw Pact military planning and preparedness. A summary of the results was published. The documents revealed an exclusively *offensive* orientation of pre-collapse Warsaw Pact military planning. The core of the planning was projection of a massive military thrust into Western Europe, the capture of Denmark and the Northern German state of Schleswig-Holstein within the first three days, and rapid penetration toward France. The use of low-yield nuclear weapons was an essential feature.

The documents showed that those, such as Lyndon LaRouche and EIR, who insisted that the Warsaw Pact offensive threat was increasing as the Comecon economies approached disintegration, had been correct.

ing. Apart from the ongoing financial collapse, the productive base of today’s U.S. economy is emphatically not what it was at the beginning of World War II, nor even in the 1960s at the time of the Vietnam War. The present, deindustrialized and downsized U.S. economy has no significant reserves of productive capacities that could be mobilized. Furthermore, the effects of decades of “dumbing-down” of the population through mass-media “entertainment” and other means, has left the nation with a depleted labor force, of which the major portion would be unable to operate modern industrial technology, without extensive education and a virtual cultural renaissance. Thus, the United States—especially under its present leadership—could never sustain the kind of economic and social strain which the intended military mobilization would place it under.

Ominous Signs

The analogy with the 1980s’ collapsing Soviet Union and its “doomsday” military doctrine, is thus by no means far-fetched. The economic weakness of the United States constitutes a major factor driving the dangerous, “flight-forward” mood of the cabal behind Huntington, Brzezinski, et al., and their desire to rely on a dangerous combination of threats, bluff, destabilization, and actual military force.

Among the most important features of the recent weeks’ shift of the Bush Administration:

- The largest increase in the Defense budget in two decades, with the evident intention to carry out a substantial military buildup. U.S. military doctrine is evidently being revamped toward the potential use of new, “precision” nuclear warheads in tactical battlefield and anti-missile defense applications, as part of a “New Triad” consisting of: a) offensive nuclear weapons; b) so-called “active defense,” or preemptive strikes worldwide; and c) expanded military infrastructure around the world and in space. At the same time, a major effort to militarize the United States itself, as symptomized by the doubling of financing for the paramilitary “Homeland Defense” and the unprecedented plan to set up a special military command for U.S. domestic territory.

- The virtual declaration of war, in Bush’s Jan. 29 address, against Iraq, Iran, and North Korea, with additional threats directed toward the Philippines and other sovereign nations. This is intended—whether Bush understood this himself or not—to provoke the maximum possible counterreactions from those countries, destabilizing the corresponding regions. This includes, not least of all, a potentially disastrous blow to South Korea and to the stability of the entire East Asia region, including China.

- The abrupt abandonment of any pretense to seeking a just settlement in the Middle East, while instead giving the green light to the push by Sharon and the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF), to go ahead with their plans for a “final solution” against Yasser Arafat and the Palestinians. This, even as proof has surfaced in the Israeli press itself, that leading Israeli military officers are explicitly conscious of the similarity be-

tween their *modus operandi* in the Palestinian areas, and the German Nazis' destruction of the Warsaw Ghetto.

- The evident intention to drop the “strategic partnership” with Russia, of the sort that Putin and Bush began to develop in the wake of Sept. 11. The deliberate undermining of that partnership is *prima facie* evidence for a deadly influence of the coup-plotters within current administration policy. The new crisis in U.S.-Russian relations involves an array of elements. These have been emphasized, in discussions with *EIR*, by a number of well-informed Russian observers.

Betraying the U.S.-Russia Partnership?

The new U.S. “hard line” in strategic arms negotiations is linked to U.S. intentions to drastically upgrade the effectiveness of the projected antiballistic-missile (ABM) defense system. This would be involve equipping ABM interceptor missiles with low-yield nuclear devices. If this were done together with the planned, drastic reduction of nuclear offensive arsenals on both sides, the United States could theoretically launch a first strike, destroying 80% of Russian offensive missiles on the ground, and then destroying the small Russian retaliatory strike by nuclear-tipped interceptors and other means.

Add to this, the sudden American insistence on not eliminating, but merely storing, the U.S. nuclear warheads proposed to be taken out of service. The Russian reaction, is to ask why—if the United States and Russia are supposed to be friends, and the probability of a U.S.-Russian nuclear confrontation practically zero—is the United States moving toward a first-strike capability?

Secondly, recent meetings of Chechen separatist emissaries with U.S. State Department officials, organized and publicly flaunted by Brzezinski personally, are seen from the Russian side as contrary to explicit or implicit understandings between Putin and Bush. At the same time, Russian observers point to the evident protection given to Russian “oligarch” Boris Berezovsky—recently accused by the head of the Russian FSB of having directly financed the Chechen rebels—by U.S. and British intelligence. Berezovsky, from his London base, has repeatedly and openly threatened Putin.

There is evidence of preparation for a long-term basing of American military forces in Central Asia, despite official U.S. denials. And Russian sources cite indications in recent World Bank documents, of a drive to push down world oil prices to as low as \$12 a barrel. This would create a disaster for Russia's financial situation.

All of this together means not only a crisis in U.S.-Russian relations, but also a great weakening of Russian President Putin himself, who took a major strategic risk in attempting to forge the partnership with Bush in the first place. As a result, there is a growing view in Russia, that Putin, in attempting to maintain the partnership with the United States, “is selling Russia down the river, just as Gorbachov did.” A destabilization of Putin's Presidency is itself an included goal of Brzezinski and his backers.

LaRouche's Advice to Black Elected Officials

During his Jan. 24 webcast, U.S. Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche answered a question by a member of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, what would you say, is the appropriate course of action for African-American elected officials, in speaking out against the clash of civilizations, as well as the increasing abandonment of any commitment to the principle of the General Welfare, without appearing to be soft on the question of terrorism?

LaRouche: Well, see, this is a typical problem. We just have celebrated, presumably—those of us who are in a position to do so—just celebrated the anniversary of Rev. Martin Luther King.

Now, what happened, is that, when Martin died, the Civil Rights movement almost died. The veterans existed; but the Civil Rights movement existed as an organization of *veterans* of the Civil Rights struggle. Other issues took over. Why? Because the leaders around King, were not like King: King was really a Christian! You have a lot of preachers in this country, but not so many real Christians. King believed in mankind. He believed, as he said in the speech on the mountain top—the question of the mountain top. He believed, that he had to put his life on the line, for the sake of a *purpose for humanity*, and that the African-American leader must struggle *for humanity*, not so-called “black interests” first. Because, when you struggle for humanity, you become a representative of humanity, and you have *the power* of being a spokesman for humanity. Not of special interests. And, when you come from an oppressed group, *and you represent all humanity*, you are more powerful than otherwise. Because you are capable of rising above the *littleness*, the piggishness, which most people have about the idea of self-interest.

King had that! King united and inspired people, with love, in his policy, his works. Those who tried to succeed him *could not do that: They were too selfish*; they were too small, in their minds. They were too concerned about things that were small—that King kept them from spoiling the job, while he was still there. He would bring them to a higher level. And, there were a few people around King, who represented that—as my friend, Amelia Boynton Robinson, says: The key to the Civil Rights movement, in its hardest struggles in the South, were some of the have-nots. The people who thought they had something, thought their interest was in *what they had*. The *have-nots* thought their interest was in *what nobody had*: real freedom. A decent society. And, they fought. And the