

a broadcast in which McCain admitted to bombing civilian targets in North Vietnam, and praised the medical treatment he received while a prisoner. The broadcast was beamed to U.S. troops in South Vietnam, to counter charges that American POWs were being mistreated in the North.

McCain was kept in isolation from other American POWs for a period of 22 months, during which he was subject to intense indoctrination. Even though it has been documented that Soviet officials interrogated U.S. POWs in Vietnam as well as in Korea, McCain has always hysterically denied this.

McCain has been brutally hostile to POW-MIA organizations and activists, calling them “hoaxsters,” “charlatans,” and “conspiracy theorists.” He harassed and scoffed at witnesses—including family members of missing servicemen—at Senate hearings on the POW-MIA issue in 1992, questioning their patriotism and mocking their concerns.

McCain was the most determined of any Senator involved, to discount and dismiss the formidable body of evidence indicating that hundreds of POWs and MIAs had been left behind when the United States pulled out of Vietnam in 1975. He even asked the Justice Department to investigate POW-MIA activists for fraud—the fraud being the claim that the U.S. government knowingly left U.S. POWs behind in Vietnam. The Justice Department found no grounds for any action against the activists.

Further, McCain has infuriated POW-MIA organizations and families by consistently opposing disclosure of documents and information about POWs and MIAs. Not a few of those involved in seeking disclosure of these records, wonder at McCain’s determination to keep all such records secret, and ask whether McCain himself has something to hide—something that he fears being made public.

Whatever personal concerns McCain has about these records, another important element of his strange behavior in this regard, is his, and his father’s, close association with Henry Kissinger, the architect of the U.S. withdrawal. Kissinger, more than anyone else, bears the personal responsibility for abandoning hundreds of U.S. military personnel in his haste to arrive at a “peace” agreement.

Kissinger still remains one of McCain’s closest advisers; others among McCain’s foreign policy and national security advisers during his 2000 Presidential campaign were Carter’s National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski, George Bush (father)’s Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger, and former CIA director James Woolsey.

Profile: Sen. Joseph Lieberman

The Senator from ‘Mega’

by Scott Thompson

At the Feb. 1-3, 2002 Wehrkunde (International Conference on Security Policy) meeting in Munich, Germany, the U.S. delegation, led by Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz—whose entourage included the Chairman of the Defense Science and Policy Board Richard Perle, and Senators Joseph Lieberman (D-Conn.) and John McCain (R-Ariz.)—shocked Europe with the vehemence of their call for what amounts to a Thirty Years War scenario in the Middle East, starting with a “Phase II” war against Saddam Hussein’s Iraq.

For many years, Senator Lieberman—one of only ten Democrats who voted for President George H.W. Bush’s 1991 Persian Gulf War—has been sounding the trumpet for yet another charge against Iraq. Long before President George W. Bush proclaimed a “war against terrorism” following the Sept. 11 coup d’état, Lieberman had expanded his target list of nations, calling for a “global showdown” with Islam, on the model of Samuel Huntington’s “Clash of Civilizations” thesis.

Thus, in a Jan. 14, 2002 “major policy speech” at Georgetown University, Lieberman paraphrased his hero, former British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, stating that the fanatical forces of an Islamic jihad were about to drop a “theological iron curtain” across the world. The Senator unabashedly called for a new “imperialist” U.S. foreign policy in response. Lieberman said that this “iron curtain would extend from the terrorist camps in the hills and villages of Central Asia, to the sands of Somalia, Sudan, and Saudi Arabia, to cells in Singapore, Indonesia, the Phillipines, and many other places, including Europe and America.” In other words, a string of endless wars, that would keep President Bush from focussing on a solution to the present global systemic economic collapse, such as that proposed by Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche.

One of Lieberman’s closest collaborators in promoting this “Clash of Civilizations” with Islam, has been Sen. John McCain (see accompanying article), who has worked with Lieberman to blackmail two Presidents on this question—first, Bill Clinton, and now George Bush. At present, Senator McCain is holding a gun to Bush’s head by encouraging supporters to mount a draft third-party “Bull Moose” candidacy on McCain’s behalf, that would throw the 2004 Presidential election to Lieberman, should he win the Democratic Party Presidential nomination.

★ LAROUCHE IN 2004 ★

www.larouchein2004.com

Paid for by LaRouche in 2004.

The ‘Mega’ Candidate

This essence of the policy coup d’état against President George W. Bush is discussed at length in a February 2002 Special Report, issued by Democratic Party Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., entitled *Zbigniew Brzezinski and September 11th*, that reveals how a major component of the coup attempt was facilitated by an organization known as “Mega.” Usually well-informed U.S. intelligence sources have told *EIR*, that Sen. Joseph Lieberman is the favored candidate, for the 2004 elections, of the Mega Group. Mega was founded in 1991 by Leslie Wexler and Charles Bronfman, to boost the power and financial clout of the pro-Israel lobby, replacing the old “Billionaires’ Club”; its “Megabucks” are now supporting the fascist policies of Ariel Sharon’s Israel.

As part of its own ongoing investigation, *EIR* has uncovered particularly close ties between Lieberman, and Mega spokesman and former hedge-fund operator Michael Steinhardt. According to the Nov. 6, 2000 issue of *LINK Magazine*, in an article by Michael Massing, entitled “Should Jews Be Parochial?,” Lieberman shares with Steinhardt the dubious distinction of having been a past chairman of the “New Democrat” flagship institution, the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC). Steinhardt was a founding member of the DLC, which was created by former Carter Administration adviser Al From. Steinhardt gave large sums to kickstart the DLC before becoming its chairman in 1985. He also helped found the DLC’s think tank, the Progressive Policy Institute, that recently featured Sen. John McCain, as its keynote speaker. Steinhardt was succeeded as chairman of the DLC by former President Bill Clinton; however, Steinhardt resigned from the DLC altogether, when Clinton appointed Lani Guinier to a top Justice Department post; and Steinhardt refused to support Clinton’s reelection in 1996. Meanwhile, Lieberman became DLC chairman in 1995, remaining in that post until he was tapped as Vice President Al Gore, Jr.’s running mate in the 2000 Presidential elections.

But, mutual chairmanship of the DLC is not the only point of contact between Lieberman and Steinhardt.

In 1990, Steinhardt reportedly became alarmed when the National Jewish Population Survey revealed that 52% of American Jews were intermarrying. Steinhardt sought advice from Rabbi Irving “Yitz” Greenberg, who was then counseling Jewish adults. Among his students was Judy Steinhardt, Michael’s wife; through her, Steinhardt became a protégé of Rabbi Greenberg. As it turns out, Rabbi Greenberg is Joseph Lieberman’s religious adviser; he gave the benediction at the Democratic Convention on the day of Lieberman’s acceptance speech as Vice Presidential candidate.

Together with Rabbi Greenberg, Michael Steinhardt spent a small part of his fortune on reversing Jewish demographics, and in propagandizing for Prime Minister Ariel “The Butcher of Lebanon” Sharon. One such group, founded



Connecticut Sen. Joseph Lieberman was one of only ten Democrats who voted for President George H.W. Bush’s Persian Gulf War, and is now leading the pack of those calling for a new war against Iraq.

with seed money from Steinhardt and other members of Mega, was Emet (Hebrew for “truth”). Sharon had called for its creation following the Al-Aqsa Intifada, in an attempt to improve Israel’s public-relations image. Apparently, it is Emet’s role to bury, or put a positive spin on, stories unfavorable to Israel. Yet, Emet masquerades as a “think-tank.”

The close ties between Senator Lieberman and Michael Steinhardt are even more scandalous, given that Steinhardt had founded his hedge fund, Steinhardt Partners, in 1967, partly with the money he had inherited from his father, “Red” Steinhardt, a Prohibition-era member of Meyer Lansky’s “National Crime Syndicate.” “Red” was sent to Sing Sing to serve a five-to-ten year prison sentence, while Michael joined the “Our Crowd” firm, Loeb Rhodes, before striking out on his own. Nevertheless, the old adage, “like father, like son” proved out: Steinhardt Partners came under SEC and Justice Department scrutiny in the early-1990s, along with Solomon Brothers, for cornering the market in short-term U.S. Treasury bond sales. To avoid jail, Steinhardt settled the case out of court, by paying a \$50 million fine; he later closed his hedge fund after recouping his losses.

‘The Conscience of the Senate’

It is ironic, that Senator Lieberman has oft been referred to as “the conscience of the Senate,” because he likes to grandstand on moral issues. Truth is, his “conscience” can be

bought. Notably, next to former Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-N.Y.), Lieberman was one of the foremost Democratic traitors pushing the resignation of President Bill Clinton over the Monica Lewinsky affair. In a crafty speech on Sept. 3, 1998, Lieberman performed the role of Brutus, by stabbing his “close friend,” President Bill Clinton, in the back, when he insisted that a final verdict on the affair awaited the report of the “Independent Counsel,” Mellon Scaife operative Kenneth Starr:

“I have chosen to speak particularly at this time, before the Independent Counsel files his report, because while we do not know enough to answer the question of whether there are legal consequences from the President’s conduct, we do know enough to answer a separate and distinct set of questions about the moral consequences for our country. . . . Because the conduct the President has admitted to was so serious, and his assumption of responsibility on August 17th was so inadequate, the three weeks have been dominated by a cacophony of media and political voices calling for impeachment, or resignation, or censure, while a lesser chorus implores us to ‘move on’ and get this matter behind us. . . . As I have said at length today, it is wrong and unacceptable and should be followed by some measure of public rebuke and accountability. . . . In the same way, it seems to me, talk of impeachment and resignation at this time is unjust and unwise. It is unjust because we do not know enough in fact and will not until the Independent Counsel reports and the White House responds. . . .”

At precisely the moment that Lieberman was helping to push Clinton over the cliff, the President and Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin were discussing a “new global financial architecture,” of the type that had been proposed by Democratic Party Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. Moreover, several reliable sources have reported that, even though Lieberman eventually voted against impeachment, he was one of the key operatives promoting the President’s downfall. Lieberman knew that Gore’s only chance to win the 2000 Presidential election were, if he were already President. Ironically, Gore chose Lieberman as his running mate largely to put distance between himself and President Clinton, even though it was precisely the President’s support that allowed Gore to nearly win the election.

Likewise, when Lieberman had just resigned as chairman of the DLC, he wrote an article for the September 21, 2001 *Blueprint* magazine called, “Crude, Rude, and Lewd—How to stop the glut of sex and violence on primetime TV: Don’t watch. Turn it off. Set rules. Then call the FCC.” Sex and violence in mass entertainment—from TV to movies to records—has been a major feature for this “conscience of the Senate,” who on Sept. 19, 2001 told a TV audience that “the culture of carnage surrounding our children” was “a toxic mix turning some of them into killers.” For some time, Lieberman was allied with former Education Secretary William Bennett.

But when the Gore/Lieberman ticket began to pull in millions of dollars in campaign contributions from Hollywood, Lieberman explicitly rejected media censorship. Bennett said: “I am deeply disappointed by Senator Lieberman’s recent comments to members of the entertainment industry. . . . I did not realize that when Joe Lieberman and I were denouncing the filth, sewage, and mindless bloodletting of the popular entertainment industry, calling it what it is—degrading and dehumanizing—we were just being ‘nudges.’ ”

A review of Lieberman’s campaign finance records shows that, despite the rhetoric, he is one of the biggest Senate recipients of contributions from top executives of the leading manufacturers of the most violent “point-and-shoot” video-games. Among the Senator’s campaign donors are top executives from Nintendo of America, Inc., Midway Games, and Viacom. And, he is also high on the list of favorite pols at Mega member Steven Spielberg’s Dreamworks Studios, producers of some of the more vile movies coming out of Hollywood.

Also under investigation by *EIR* staff at the moment: Given Lieberman’s grandstanding on Enron and its ties to the Bush Administration, why has he continued to retain his Chief-of-Staff, Bill Andriessen, formerly a top Enron lobbyist? Also being probed is why, from 1993 to 2000, Sen. Lieberman has accepted large contributions from the discredited HMO industry, which has been charged with significantly degrading health care in this country: Lieberman had the highest campaign contributions from HMOs of any Senator (some \$77,000).

Blackmail and an Iraq War

It is not surprising that Lieberman, and his Senate colleague John McCain, should try to push President George W. Bush deeper into the post-Sept. 11 policy disaster by starting a second war against Iraq. On the Dec. 16, 1998 “Online NewsHour” with Jim Lehrer, Lieberman boasted that he had been, as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, one of the leading backers of financial support for the Iraqi National Congress (INC), even before the Iraqi Liberation Act of 1998, which appropriated over \$100 million in aid for an “Iraqi regime change.” On Sept. 24, 1998, Senators Lieberman and McCain were among four Congressmen who wrote to President Clinton, basing themselves upon the report of United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) Executive Chairman Richard Butler (a deep-dyed Anglo-American intelligence agent), and demanding the President “take necessary action (including, if appropriate, air and missile strikes on suspect Iraqi sites) to respond effectively to the threat posed by Iraq’s refusal to end its weapons of mass destruction programs.”

Senator Lieberman’s attempts to provoke President Bush into a war against Iraq, should be seen against backdrop of his 1998 role in the impeachment of President Clinton: Again, they bear the mark of treason against a sitting President.