

America's interest in retaining access to Pakistani territory and operational support from its armed forces, in its war against the Taliban and al-Qaeda, has certainly dampened U.S. condemnation of Pakistani support for cross-border terrorism. But Washington is now under pressure to face up to the facts being placed on the table.

Following the emergence of the present crisis, the first to arrive on the scene was U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for South Asia Christina Rocca. After New Delhi gave her short shrift, British Defense chief Adm. Michael Boyce landed in Delhi, for meetings with the service chiefs and Defense Minister George Fernandes. Meanwhile, India's External Affairs Minister Jaswant Singh, who is very friendly to the Americans, has told the European Commission's High Representative Javier Solana not to come to India. European Union diplomat for foreign affairs Chris Patten was scheduled to arrive in New Delhi on May 23-24, but he found no one willing to meet with him. Both Solana and Patten are in Islamabad cooling their heels. The reason that Solana has been told to stay out is because New Delhi is furious about the EC's criticism of India over the Gujarat riots.

U.S. State Department spokesman Richard Boucher told reporters recently that U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage will travel to Islamabad and New Delhi in the first week of June. His visit will be an attempt to ease tensions between the "nuclear rivals."

British Foreign Secretary Jack Straw is expected to visit both countries before Armitage makes his appearance. Straw is reportedly in touch with U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell on the crisis. Meanwhile, British Prime Minister Tony Blair, describing the India-Pakistan crisis as "grave," has called for restraint. A similar statement has also been issued by U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld.

Already in the area is Iranian Foreign Minister Kamal Kharrazi. He held talks with Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee for 45 minutes on general security in the region and on the reconstruction of Afghanistan. Tehran also reported that Minister Kharrazi made an unscheduled stopover in Islamabad on his way back home, because of the deteriorating relations between India and Pakistan.

Although neither Beijing nor Moscow have sent emissaries to either country, leaders from both nations have urged India and Pakistan to exercise maximum restraint.

To reach us on the Web:

www.larouchepub.com

Utopians in Washington Press War, Though Iraqi Opposition Is a Farce

by Michele Steinberg

The Iraqi dissidents who are trying to make a "perpetual war" in Iraq their meal ticket, stand exposed as a farce, in a series of mishaps surrounding both an alleged conference of military officers opposed to Saddam Hussein, and the finances of the London-based Iraqi National Congress (INC), run by accused con-man Ahmed Chalabi. But the lack of an opposition, and the warnings of experienced U.S. military officers to Congress and the White House, that the United States does not have the *means* or the *readiness* to fight a war to conquer Iraq and run a new government, has not deterred a network of war-mongers inside the Bush Administration known as the utopians.

The policy of "regime change" through near-term invasion and war is pushed by a gang led by four operatives—Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz White House adviser on Counter-Terrorism Gen. Wayne Downing; Defense Policy Board Chairman Richard Perle; and Defense Policy Board Adviser James Woolsey. Such a policy of perpetual imperial war violates the true republican tradition of the United States (see "Wolfowitz Cabal is an 'Enemy Within,'" *EIR*, Oct. 26, 2001).

Speaking on May 1 to an international webcast audience on the "Middle East Blow-Back Effect," Lyndon LaRouche, candidate for the 2004 Democratic Presidential nomination, likened the Iraq war policy to the "determination to have a *perpetual war in Asia*, called Korea," 50 years ago. LaRouche noted that the Korean War—which never ended—was the first victory after World War II of the utopian military against the traditional republicans such as Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who had a nation-state commitment to "win the peace," as the only true end of war.

LaRouche warned that today, the Iraq war is both the actual war plan and the symbol of the determination of the Clash of Civilizations war-mongers to extend this "perpetual war insanity," as they have with Bush's folly in Afghanistan. "What they've done in Iraq is a perpetual war," LaRouche said. "They went in and conducted a war against Iraq: The war has never ceased. Peace has never been declared. The war goes on. . . . We're about to reactivate the perpetual war in Iraq, against Iraq, throughout the Middle East."

LaRouche named Wolfowitz and Perle as key organizers of the policy, and added that "the policy has been one of: Pick enemies, the way the Romans did, the way the Nazis did, and

declare perpetual war. How do you fight perpetual war? By conventional warfare means? No. You fight wars of annihilation and intimidation. You force nations to submit to your will, the way the Romans did. These are the utopians. What they hated above all, is, they hated the United States.”

It is not accidental, that these utopians point to the supposedly quick “Afghanistan victory,” as their model for a quick “repeat” in Iraq. Any sane government leader or analyst would know that Afghanistan is a mountainous quagmire, where the United States—refusing to learn from the lessons of the Soviet campaign there—is *stuck*.

‘Red INC’

The Iraq war is a civil war inside the Bush Administration, and nothing points to both conflict and farce more clearly than the case of the Iraqi National Congress, (INC) and its leading figure, ex-banker Ahmed Chalabi, who is wanted on criminal charges for defrauding his own bank in Jordan. In the eyes of Perle, Woolsey, and Downing, among others, the INC is the parallel to the Northern Alliance in Afghanistan. But the INC has no credibility, is accused of keeping fraudulent financial books, and has been caught exaggerating its support in Washington. Furthermore, it turns out that the INC’s leading advocates inside the administration—Woolsey and Downing—are on its payroll. Woolsey, not wanting to be viewed as trying to overthrow Saddam Hussein for the money, claims that the INC only pays his law firm, Shea and Gardner. The scramble for funds might be called, “How To Make Millions From Perpetual War.”

But as of May 1, the INC is apparently swimming in red ink, according to a press release on the London-based organizations’s website, which says: “Liberty TV, the satellite channel owned and operated by the Iraqi National Congress, ceased broadcasting today due to a lack of funding from the U.S. State Department. ‘Although the U.S. Congress has appropriated funds for broadcasting to the Iraqi people, the State Department has not released any funds to Liberty TV since February, and therefore we are unable to pay service providers. . . . Despite continued assurances from the Bush Administration of their full confidence in the role of the INC and in particular Liberty TV, the State Department has failed to allocate adequate funding to Liberty TV at a time when our audience is growing. . . . The Iraqi people are yearning for free and unbiased news and information. Liberty TV was an important element in the democratic Iraq opposition’s strategy.’ ” Thus spake Sharif Ali Bin Al-Hussein, a member of the INC Leadership Council.

Well-placed Washington sources told *EIR* that the INC funding has been bitterly fought over, since last December, when a decision was made to withhold funds because of faulty record-keeping on the \$800,000 to \$1.1 million being given to INC in London every month. When the INC did not provide quarterly financial records, the funds were frozen, and then, reportedly, reinstated. However, new problems emerged after

Sharif Ali announced on Feb. 27, that “the largest conference of military officers in opposition to Saddam’s dictatorship ever held,” would take place in Washington to “develop a plan of action to confront Saddam’s regime.” Sharif Ali further bragged that Undersecretary of State Marc Grossman “expressed the U.S. government’s support for this event,” and that the INC was working closely with the State Department and Defense Department on “the logistics for the conference.”

The problem was that there was no conference, and when State Department spokesman Richard Boucher blurted out at a briefing, that the Pentagon was running the conference, the Defense Department scurried to tell Boucher to retract the false information.

Decade-Long Faction Fight

This factional battle isn’t new—it actually goes back to 1991, when a hopelessly inept “march on Baghdad” authored by Wolfowitz under the name “Operation Scorpion,” was rightly overruled by Gen. Colin Powell, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff under President George H.W. Bush. “Scorpion” was the brainchild of Wolfowitz, then serving in the elder Bush’s State Department, and had won the admiration of Dick Cheney, who was then Secretary of Defense. Now, 11 years later, Wolfowitz, the leading war-monger in the Department of Defense, is still trying to ram through his “Scorpion.”

Describing this faction fight on May 10, the usually humorless *New York Times* carried the tale of a farcical war between the State Department/CIA and the Wolfowitz/Perle gang in the Pentagon, using factions of anti-Saddam Hussein Iraqis as their proxies. As in the case of the disasters of the 1961 Cuban Bay of Pigs, and the 1980s Nicaraguan Contras, the U.S. warriors are looking like the “Gang that Couldn’t Shoot Straight.” After holding back portions of the Congressionally approved \$97 million for Chalabi’s INC for months, because Chalabi could never account for what he spent, the State Department offered a short-term \$1.1 million per month, with the condition that a State Department official oversee the disbursement of the funds. On advice of Wolfowitz, Perle, et al., the INC said, “No way—you can keep your money.”

Meanwhile, wrote the *Times*, the Wolfowitz cabal moved to scotch a State Department-planned meeting of Iraqi opposition leaders slated to be held in Germany this Summer, to try to pull together an alternative to INC. Chalabi’s sponsors boiled over when the INC was told it could have only one representative at a planning session. State had contracted Washington’s Middle East Institute, headed by Ambassador Edward Walker, a former Assistant Secretary of State for Near East Affairs, and the conference’s Pentagon opponents discovered that Walker had expressed doubts about the “axis of evil.” Rather than allow such sanity to be part of a conference on Iraq, the neo-conservative thugs around Perle, Woolsey, et al., allied with the Christian Zionists on Capitol Hill, pulled the \$5 million funding, cancelling the conference.

On May 11, the *Washington Post* attempted to sugar-coat the general disdain for the INC with an upbeat article that claimed that the United States is simply looking for a “wider role, for more groups to help oust Saddam Hussein.” In the course of writing about the involvement of Kurdish opponents in Iraq, the *Post* also revealed that White House counter-terror chief General Downing, formerly head of Special Forces, had been a highly paid consultant for INC.

The stench of financial/political corruption seems to go further than Chalabi and the INC, and involves former CIA chief Woolsey as well. Woolsey is a partner with the law firm of Shea and Gardner in Washington, which represents the INC in their attempt to cash in on the \$97 million allocated under the 1998 Iraqi Liberation Act, pushed through by Sens. Sam Brownback (R-Kan.) and Joseph Lieberman (D-Conn.), both Clash of Civilizations fanatics. Woolsey gets his political orders from the Jewish Institute on National Security Affairs (JINSA), a notorious Israeli Jabotinskyite penetration operation into the Pentagon and U.S. intelligence services. From his JINSA perch, Woolsey was chosen by Perle to be a member of the Defense Policy Board, which ardently pushed for an invasion of Iraq—instead of Afghanistan—in the days following Sept. 11. When Bush rejected the invasion of Iraq plan in September, the utopians went into high gear, pushing the Iraq war as “Phase II” of the “war on terrorism.”

However, no evidence has ever emerged tying Iraq or

Saddam Hussein to the Sept. 11 events. Hoked-up information involving alleged Sept. 11 hijacker Mohammed Atta, evaporated. In his May 13 syndicated column, Robert Novak lampooned the “attack-Iraq advocates outside the government”—William Safire, Kenneth Adelman, James Woolsey—for clinging to the Atta-met-Iraqi-agent-in-Prague story. As for Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, Novak says that when he asked him directly, Rumsfeld couldn’t confirm the story, but fell back on the argument that Iraq and other “terrorist” nations are developing weapons of mass destruction, which could kill “hundreds of thousands of people.” But, Novak notes, no one in Washington takes seriously former Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s recent statement about Iraqi suitcase nukes, and Novak also cites former UN weapons inspector Scott Ritter as saying that Iraq does not currently have a biowarfare capability.

‘World War IV’

Putting even more pressure against the utopians’ mad drive for Iraq war, was the unanimous adoption of Resolution 1409 by the United Nations Security Council on May 14. Resolution 1409 alters the sanctions against Iraq, and the utopian war-mongers in the Bush Administration fear that Iraq would actually agree to new arms inspections, thereby ending the “axis of evil” *cum* “weapons of mass destruction” scare stories that Woolsey, Perle, et al. spread. With the UN vote opening the possibility of Iraqi cooperation, Perle and Woolsey rushed into high gear in Germany, demanding war on Iraq now.

In advance of the first trip to Germany by President George Bush, which began on May 22, Woolsey got there first, and held several days of briefings with European journalists, widely reported in the German news dailies *Tagesspiegel* and the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Woolsey ranted that war against Iraq should be launched “sooner rather than later,” and that the “war on terrorism” would not be over with an Iraq war—but will constitute a perpetual “Fourth World War.” Woolsey, who has called the war on terrorism, a war “of a hundred years,” is considered a madman by many Europeans.

Woolsey was backed up by the “Prince of Darkness,” Richard Perle, who gave an interview to Germany’s widely read magazine *Der Spiegel*, insisting that weapons inspections in Iraq would never solve the problem. Perle denounced any idea that President Bush should promote a new weapons-inspection effort in Iraq. War, and only war, was Perle’s line, and, being a true utopian to the end, Perle said that while the United States has enough conventional weapons to be able to avoid using nuclear ones in dealing with Iraq, “naturally, no reasonable strategist can rule out their use, in principle.”

With Woolsey and Perle, both Bush Administration officials, pushing a “Fourth World War,” which might have to “go nuclear,” it is no wonder that President Bush is meeting skepticism and unprecedented hostility about the true aims of the war against terrorism, from the Atlantic Alliance, including leading British officials.

Electronic Intelligence Weekly

EIW

An online almanac from the publishers of **EIR**

Electronic Intelligence Weekly

gives subscribers online the same economic analysis that has made *EIR* one of the most valued publications for policymakers, and established LaRouche as the most authoritative economic forecaster in the world.



EIR Contributing Editor, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Issued every Monday, *EIW* includes:

- Lyndon LaRouche’s economic and strategic analyses;
- Charting of the world economic crisis;
- Critical developments ignored by “mainstream” media.

\$360 per year Two-month trial, **\$60**

For more information:

Call **1-888-347-3258** (toll-free)

VISIT ONLINE:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw