

Clinton-Bayh Split Highlights Policy Battle in Both Parties

by Jeffrey Steinberg

The stark contrast between statements delivered during the week of April 14-21, by former President Bill Clinton and Democratic Leadership Council (DLC) chairman Sen. Evan Bayh (D-Ind.), underscores that the Democratic Party is split wide open on the most pressing issues of the day: the issues of war and peace; and whether the United States will remain a Constitutional republic or seek to become a sick-joke version of the Roman and Napoleonic empires.

The Clinton-Bayh conflict surfaced at the very moment that Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche issued a call for a political “counter-coup” against the neo-conservative power-grab in the Bush Administration, which led to the illegal “preventive” war on Iraq, and to an ongoing drive for an extension of that war to Syria, Iran, and even Saudi Arabia.

Because former President Clinton’s remarks were largely blacked out of the corrupt U.S. media, while Bayh’s threats received wide publicity, it is critical that the basic facts be presented through the independent press of Lyndon LaRouche, so that leading political circles around the globe have an accurate assessment of the level of political warfare occurring in the United States, as the result of the disastrous policy course adopted by the Bush Administration. A parallel policy battle has erupted inside the Republican Party, involving the circles of former President George H.W. Bush.

‘Go to Hell’

President Clinton’s remarks were delivered at an April 15 New York City policy forum, sponsored by the Conference Board, a prestigious business forum, before an audience of 300 people. The former President sharply criticized the Bush Administration’s “paradigm shift” since the attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, warning that the United States cannot “jail, kill and occupy all your adversaries.” The former President accused the Bush Administration of telling the rest of the world

“to go to Hell.” He said that the Bush Administration was practicing poor decision-making, noting that, “when people are under stress, they hate to think . . . when they most need to think.” Clinton said that chief UN weapons inspector Hans Blix had requested more time to continue the work of his inspectors, and that in time, Clinton believed, Iraq would have been fully disarmed—without the use of military force. The Bush Administration would not bend, and instead, decided, “We are going to do it now, and if you don’t like it, we’ll get even with you when it’s over”—as Clinton characterized their policy.

The next day, the *New York Times*, while not mentioning a word about former President Clinton’s speech, published interviews with several Democratic Party candidates and elected officials, commenting on the Iraq war. Sen. Evan Bayh delivered a blunt warning to fellow Democrats that there would be no toleration for any attacks on President Bush over his Iraq war. “There is no question that the President has been strengthened at least in the short run,” Bayh told the *Times*. “If people can’t envision a candidate as their commander in chief in a dangerous world, they’re not going to listen to you. The threshold has now been raised, and we need to nominate someone on those grounds. . . . Equivocating about whether Saddam’s departure is a good thing or not,” he added, “doesn’t help the Democratic Party.” Bayh speaks for the organized crime-contaminated DLC, of Sen. Joseph Lieberman (D-Conn.), which supported and even pushed the Bush Administration’s war of aggression against Iraq.

In a further indication of the deep rift in the Democratic Party over the Bush doctrine of imperial preventive war, the *Times* quoted an unnamed senior Democratic Senator, who clearly shared former President Clinton’s concerns: “The big difference is that the first gulf war ended. This Administration will never end the war. And because they never end the war, they will have an ongoing advantage. An open-ended war on

terrorism that will never end and that keeps people constantly on edge. A never-ending military commitment in Iraq that might lead to other commitments beyond Iraq also keeps people focused on national security.”

Specter of Impeachment Raised

Leading Republicans, closely allied with former President Bush, have recently surfaced with powerful objections to the policies of the current “chicken-hawk”-dominated Bush Administration, which threaten World War III. On April 13, former Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger gave an interview to BBC. The Bush “41” Administration official was asked about the argument, coming out of Washington, from circles close to the President, that the overthrow of Saddam Hussein justifies regime-change elsewhere in the region, “even if that includes extending military action to Syria, Iran—I’ve even heard Saudi Arabia mentioned.” Eagleburger replied, “I just don’t think anybody who says that truly understands the American people. You saw the furor that went on in this country before the President got sufficient support to do this [attack on Iraq]. We’re just not built like that. This is still, whether anybody is prepared to admit it or not, this is still a democracy. And public opinion and the public, still, on these issues, rules.” Eagleburger warned, “And if George Bush decided he was going to turn the troops loose on Syria now, and Iran after that, he would last in office for about 15 minutes! . . . In fact, if George Bush were to try it now, even I would feel that he ought to be impeached. You can’t get away with that sort of thing with this democracy. It’s ridiculous!”

Five days before Eagleburger’s warning of impeachment

if the President follows the agenda of Vice President Cheney, Defense Secretary Rumsfeld, Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, et al. and wages war against Damascus, Gen. Brent Scowcroft, the National Security Advisor and one of the closest confidants of President Bush “41,” delivered a speech in Oslo before the Norwegian Nobel Institute. In that April 8 address, as in other recent public appearances, General Scowcroft repeated his opposition to the Iraq war. He had warned strongly, prior to the unprovoked American attack, that a preventive war on Iraq would be a dangerous distraction from the war on terrorism, and would undermine the entire international system. He told the Oslo audience that were the United States and Britain to occupy and control the interim administration in Iraq, this could provoke the “wrath and enmity” of the entire Muslim world. He added, “We’re moving uncertainly down paths nobody has gone down before. The structures we’ve built to handle our security are under significant stress and may not survive to serve us in the future.” Warning about the propagandistic use of the term “democracy” by Bush Administration officials, Gen. Scowcroft asked, “What’s going to happen the first time we hold an election in Iraq and it turns out the radicals win? We’re surely not going to let them take over.”

On April 2, speaking in Toronto at the Empire Club, Bush “41” Secretary of State James Baker III made a strong push for the current Bush Administration to turn from war in Iraq to peace between the Israelis and Palestinians, emphasizing that the “road map” document, prepared by the Quartet (the United States, the European Union, Russia, and the Secretary General of the United Nations), represented a “vehicle . . .

Clinton Breaks With War Policy

Virtually blacked out by the “war media” was former President Bill Clinton’s “Conference Board” interview with Marvin Kalb, April 15, excerpted here.

Kalb: Mr. President . . . I have to conclude that you are *profoundly* in disagreement, with those people in the administration right now, who feel very negatively toward the UN?

President Clinton: Yeah, I am! I’m totally in disagreement! And, I’ll tell you why: Keep in mind, I supported the resolution in the Congress, to give the President the authority to use force if the UN inspection process broke down; and I did it as soon as he said he would go to the UN first.

But, I think, again, we all—Sometimes, when people are under stress, they hate to think. And, it’s the time when they most need to think. If you think about some personal

period in your life—forget about politics: Think about something in your life that happened to you—maybe you were a kid; maybe it happened last week—when you had *great stress* and fear. That’s the time when you most needed to think, but it’s the time when it’s most difficult to think. That’s what we should be doing now.

So, look at the UN. We liked the UN a lot, after Sept. 11! When the whole world said, “We’ll go to Afghanistan, and help you get Osama bin Laden.” There are German and French soldiers in Afghanistan today. Does the President want ’em to come home? Secretary Rumsfeld want ’em to leave? We don’t want ’em to help us find bin Laden any more, since they didn’t agree with our timetable in Iraq? It’s a complicated world out there—they don’t work for us.

You know, Hans Blix was begging for more time, and they said, “We think he ought to have it.” And our United States says, “No, we’re going to liberate Iraq, and we’ve got a resolution which gives us the authority to do it, and so, we’ve determined that we’re going to do it now. And, if you don’t like it, we’ll get even with you, when it’s over.”

that can help move the stalled peace process forward. So, too, will the appointment of the moderate Mahmoud Abbas as Palestinian Prime Minister.” Baker III drew the parallel to the 1991 Persian Gulf War, which led to the Madrid talks, and, soon afterwards, to the groundbreaking Oslo Accords. Baker III bluntly stated that “Land for peace under United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 . . . is the only basis upon which the dispute can be settled.” He directly warned Ariel Sharon: “Any decision to reopen the ‘road map’ to substantive amendment . . . is an open invitation to interminable delay. And there should be no conditions whatever to Israel’s obligation to stop all settlement activity. The United States must press Israel—as a friend, but firmly—to negotiate a secure peace based on the principle of trading land for peace. . . . But the bottom line is this: the time for talking about a road map is over. We have one. And, when the war is over, we need to begin using it.”

Focus on Mideast, Korean Peninsula

On April 15, Bush “41’s” Ambassador to the Soviet Union and Russia, former Democratic National Committee Chairman Robert S. Strauss, wrote an oped published in the *Washington Post*, seconding Baker III’s call for aggressive Bush Administration pressure on Israel to accept the road map for Middle East peace. “The time to implement the road map is now,” he wrote. “There is no perfect plan, but there are reliable friends. The United States has repeatedly demonstrated its friendship with Israel. Now comes a win-win opening; a plan from which all parties can benefit that can break the logjam at a critical moment. . . . The United States can no longer afford to sit on the sidelines, nor can Israel or the Palestinians afford the luxury of turning their backs on this potential breakthrough. It’s time for positive thinking and progress, not retrogression.”

In the midst of this surfacing of strong substantive opposition to the Bush Administration war party faction’s agenda, former President Bush, himself, made a trip to Seoul, South Korea, during which he promoted the idea of multilateral talks to resolve the North Korea crisis without war. Donald Gregg, his former Vice Presidential national security aide, and later his Ambassador to South Korea, made similar statements, promoting a peaceful settlement of the conflict.

This chorus of statements from leading associates of former President George H.W. Bush reflects the same intensity of behind-the-scenes policy warfare inside the GOP, where the dominant Cheney-Rumsfeld grouping within the Administration, is committed to a permanent war of destructionism, pointed at the heart of Eurasia. The fact that leading figures in both the Democratic and Republican parties are now publicly revolting against the dominant war party factions, is of great strategic import. It reflects potential for action along the lines of Lyndon LaRouche’s persistent call, in recent weeks, for a “counter-coup” against the neo-conservatives who are driving a pathetically ill-equipped President George W. Bush into the abyss of world war and a new dark age.

Syria War: Neo-Cons’ ‘Clean Break’ Again

by Michele Steinberg

“If George Bush attacks Syria, all Hell will break loose in the Arab world against us,” stated a retired U.S. general, who served under World War II Gen. “Vinegar Joe” Stilwell. He believes the policies of neo-con Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz are insane. On April 14, British press reported that Lawrence Eagleburger, former Secretary of State under President George H.W. Bush, “41,” told BBC that President George W. Bush should and would be impeached if he “turned troops on Syria now and then Iran.”

But criticism from military heroes and veteran diplomats, even paired with the fact that the military is exhausted and weapons depleted after two *unfinished* wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, is not enough to stop the war against Syria. Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche warned, “Don’t make any assumptions that the war is off. The neo-cons are crazy.” Only a counter-coup that ousts them can secure peace.

Like the Iraq war, the attack on Syria has nothing to do with a current threat—it was planned by the neo-conservative chicken-hawks as early as 1996.

On April 10, the *Oakland Tribune* reported that Donald Rumsfeld had commissioned two of the Pentagon’s neo-cons, Douglas Feith and Dr. William Luti, to draw up plans for attacks on Syria. It was a “perfect fit”—Feith had already written the “talking points” for war against Syria in the policy paper prepared for the Israeli right-wing government in 1996, titled “Clean Break: A New Strategy for Security the Realm.” A co-author was scandal-ridden Rumsfeld advisor Richard Perle, who delivered it to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. The paper has two pillars of “regime change”: toppling Saddam Hussein in Iraq; and destroying the Ba’ath regime in Syria. It’s a game plan, in its own words, for “re-drawing the map of the Middle East.”

Syria is a “regime murderous of its own people, openly aggressive toward its neighbors . . . and supportive of the most deadly terrorist organizations,” wrote Feith and Perle in 1996. “It is both natural and moral that Israel . . . move to *contain* Syria, drawing attention to its weapons of mass destruction program.”

In May 2000, Feith, Perle, David Wursmer (all “Clean Break” authors) signed onto an updated attack plan against Syria, prepared for the Middle East Forum by Islam-hater Daniel Pipes and Ziad Abdelnour, called “Ending Syria’s Occupation of Lebanon: The U.S. Role.” Something of a follow-up to “Clean Break,” the report demanded that “use of force