
Documentation

EIR Testimony Tells Senate: Pass Rail Act

Excerpts from EIR's testimony to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation on March 14.

Standing in the way of needed anti-depression policies, are the continued pronouncements and delusions about “recovery” just ahead. In a forthcoming special report by the LaRouche in 2004 Presidential campaign committee, Lyndon LaRouche “lists a number of typical actions to be taken to halt the depression and launch a self-sustaining recovery:

“1. We must a.) put the international monetary-financial system into immediate, governments-dictated reorganization; b.) restore a fixed-exchange-rate system; c.) establish exchange, capital, financial controls, trade controls, and fair-trade forms of protectionist measures internally and externally; d.) increase drastically rates of taxation on financial capital gains, and substitute production- and technology-oriented medium- to long-term investment tax credits to entrepreneurs; e.) generate large masses of government-created credit at rates between 1-2% for, chiefly, a combination of entrepreneurial investment production and infrastructure investment; and f.) implement a general bank-reorganization program, which keeps needed banks performing essential functions for the community while under even drastic financial reorganization.

“2. We replace ‘free trade’ with the promotion of protected hard-commodity international trade, as part of the promotion of a global, long-term economic-recovery effort.

“3. We must introduce the economic equivalent of a high-technology-oriented ‘arsenal of democracy’ recovery program, both in the domestic economy and in world trade, to provide the qualitative dimension needed to reverse the monstrous loss of technologically progressive, physical-productive capacity and potential—a loss which has accumulated in the world as a whole during the recent thirty years, especially the recent quarter-century.

“We had better take such measures, to stop that process of collapse before it hits with irresistible, crushing force.”

The steel tonnage requirements implied in the S. 1991 bill, show the right kind of follow-on action to the new steel import tariffs decision. The U.S. domestic steel industry needs to be rapidly rebuilt to supply the millions of tons of steel for expanding rail and other needed categories of capital consumption, in an overall infrastructure-building program. . . .

U.S. Nuclear Doctrine Is Madder Than MAD

by Jeffrey Steinberg

On Jan. 14, *EIR Executive Alert Service* published an exclusive English-language account of Russian Col. Gen. Leonid Ivashov's harsh criticism of the United States' new nuclear war-fighting policy. General Ivashov, who served until the Summer of 2001 as Chief of the Department for International Military Cooperation of the Russian Defense Ministry, gave an interview to the Russian internet publication Strana.ru, in which he warned of the Malthusian character of the new doctrine:

“The Americans are trying to accustom the world to the necessity or possibility of a U.S. battlefield use of nuclear weapons. . . . If we read the documents on U.S. national security strategy for the coming century, we find that the Americans see the exhaustion of natural resources and the rapid growth of world population, as one of the main, priority problems. They project that already by 2015, world population will increase by 1.1 billion people. And this growth will occur in the East and the South, not the West. Therefore, what the United States is doing in various regions of the world, is being done, obviously, in order to force the nations of those regions into a mode of regressive development. As a means to ensure this, they, perhaps, are considering the possibility to solve at a single blow, the problem of reducing consumption and population. If my conclusion is correct—and I am sure of its correctness—then in that case nuclear weapons will really become a battlefield weapon. They are preparing us for it.”

General Ivashov's comments to Strana.ru were directed at the Bush Administration's *Nuclear Posture Review (NPR)*, a classified report which was submitted to relevant committees of the U.S. Congress on Jan. 8. It is not known whether the Russians were also provided a copy of the document by the Bush Administration, or whether General Ivashov's comments were based on background briefings provided by American officials, or merely on leaks that appeared in the U.S. media around the time of the *NPR* release.

The charge that the United States was abandoning a long-standing, albeit informal policy of non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states, was then confirmed on Feb. 22. John Bolton, Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, and a card-carrying member of the “Wolfowitz Cabal” inside the Bush Administration, gave an interview to the *Washington Times*, in which he said that the United States “would do whatever is necessary to defend America's innocent civilian population. . . .

We are not into theoretical assertions that other administrations have made.”

The very same day that the Bolton interview appeared, State Department spokesman Richard Boucher tried to put the genie back into the bottle, by denying that there was any change in U.S. nuclear weapons-use posture. “The United States reaffirms that it will not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapons-state parties to the Treaty on the Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), except in the case of an invasion or any other attack on the United States, its territories, its Armed Forces or other troops, its allies, or on a state toward which it has a security commitment, carried out or sustained by such a non-nuclear-weapons state in association or alliance with a nuclear-weapons state.” Boucher, while attempting to say there was no policy change, did, however, add that the United States might use nuclear weapons, in the event of an attack involving the threat of *other* weapons of mass destruction.

A Leak and a Confirmation

This was where the matter stood until March 10, when the *Los Angeles Times* published a story by nuclear weapons expert William M. Arkin, featuring leaked portions of the secret *Nuclear Posture Review*. Under the banner headlines “Secret Plan Outlines the Unthinkable,” Arkin revealed that “the Bush Administration, in a secret policy review completed early this year, has ordered the Pentagon to draft contingency plans for the use of nuclear weapons against at least seven countries, naming not only Russia and the ‘axis of evil’—Iraq, Iran, and North Korea—but also China, Libya, and Syria.”

Arkin continued: “In addition, the U.S. Defense Department has been told to prepare for the possibility that nuclear weapons may be required in some future Arab-Israeli crisis. And, it is to develop plans for using nuclear weapons to retaliate against chemical or biological attacks, as well as ‘surprising military developments’ of an unspecified nature. These and a host of other directives, including calls for developing bunker-busting mini-nukes and other nuclear weapons that reduce collateral damage, are contained in a still-classified document called the *Nuclear Posture Review*, which was delivered to Congress on Jan. 8.”

Arkin charged that “the Bush Administration plan reverses an almost two-decade-long trend of relegating nuclear weapons to the category of weapons of last resort. . . . Now, nuclear strategy seems to be viewed through the prism of Sept. 11.”

On March 11, *USA Today*, in a lead story promoting a U.S. military attack on Iraq, observed that the *Los Angeles Times* article had just made Vice President Dick Cheney’s tour of the Middle East that much more difficult—given that four of the countries named as prospective targets of U.S. nuclear attack—Iraq, Syria, and Libya—were Muslim countries. Cheney’s tour has been widely promoted as a diplo-

matic mission to arm-twist Arab states into giving support to the planned invasion of Iraq, scheduled to begin as early as the Autumn of this year.

Yet, the Vice President, during a joint press conference in London with British Prime Minister Tony Blair, on March 11, confirmed that the *NPR* does indeed name Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Libya as possible targets for future use of tactical nuclear weapons. And his comments came just moments after Blair had blathered about British “proof” that Saddam Hussein already has an arsenal of weapons of mass destruction.

Dr. Strangelove, I Presume

It is not irrelevant that Arkin is a senior fellow at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, a graduate program where Paul Wolfowitz served as Dean prior to joining the Bush Administration. While many people presumed that the *Los Angeles Times* leak was aimed at exposing and stopping the change of nuclear warfighting doctrine, Lyndon LaRouche presented an opposite view, in discussions about the *NPR* on March 11.

LaRouche charged that the contents of the new doctrine had been leaked *by* the proponents of the mad “Clash of Civilizations” doctrine, associated with Samuel Huntington, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Bernard Lewis, and Henry Kissinger. These lunatics, LaRouche said, are playing a “nuclear chicken-game” with the rest of the world, attempting to scare nations, including America’s European NATO allies, into capitulating to the drive to provoke a new world war, beginning in the Middle East. Like all utopian warfighting schemes, LaRouche charged that the talk of new mini-nukes and nuclear “bunker busters” has as much scientific credibility as do the U.S. government claims that we are close to deploying a viable National Missile Defense System. After years of disinvestment in real science, and decades of take-down of the industrial infrastructure of the United States, these wet-dream schemes of “super-weapons” are more utopian psy-war than reality.

The real danger is that the Huntington-Brzezinski-Wolfowitz-Pearl madmen are steering the United States toward precisely the kind of Clash of Civilizations war that was the strategic-policy objective behind the attacks of Sept. 11. Anytime such wanna-be Dr. Strangeloves insinuate themselves into positions of power in Washington—particularly in the area of military and national security policy—the danger of war skyrockets. However, that danger does not really center on a future generation of field-operational tactical nuclear devices. The war danger is far more immediate, and the agenda of the Kissingers and Brzezinskis is, as General Ivashov correctly warned, a Malthusian nightmare of a war, of each against all, aimed at mass population reduction, raw material piracy, and global imperial power. The countdown for that war is already on, as the insane talk of an Autumn invasion of Baghdad, and the Nazi-modeled Israeli Defense Forces’ assault on the Palestinian civilian population of the West Bank and Gaza Strip, demonstrate.