

greater ferment within Republican ranks, one source said. One source said that top circles in both the Republican and Democratic Parties are stunned at what he called “the impeccable timing” of Lyndon LaRouche’s launching of his campaign to expose and discredit McCain and Lieberman; LaRouche’s efforts have had an enormous impact in creating the climate in which others have been able to speak out against the warhawks.

Lyndon LaRouche himself forecast, when he launched his campaign to destroy the influence of Lieberman and McCain, that ripple effects would be felt in the Republican as well as the Democratic Party.

In his 5-million-circulation “The Electable LaRouche” leaflet, LaRouche wrote that two urgent steps must immediately be taken: to shut down the political blackmail being exerted by the McCain-Lieberman cabal, and, secondly, to build a new bipartisan political infrastructure around the Presidency, which gives the President new policy-options.

This is what is now in the process of taking place.

Don’t Attack Saddam

by Brent Scowcroft

The following article is reprinted here with the permission of the author. The op-ed, circulated by the Forum for International Policy beginning Aug. 18, has become a focus for a long-overdue national and international policy discussion about the war on Iraq. Mr. Scowcroft, National Security Adviser under Presidents Gerald Ford and George H.W. Bush, is founder and president of the Forum for International Policy.

Our nation is presently engaged in a debate about whether to launch a war against Iraq. Leaks of various strategies for an attack on Iraq appear with regularity. The Bush administration vows regime change, but states that no decision has been made whether, much less when, to launch an invasion.

It is beyond dispute that Saddam Hussein is a menace. He terrorizes and brutalizes his own people. He has launched war on two of his neighbors. He devotes enormous effort to rebuilding his military forces and equipping them with weapons of mass destruction. We will all be better off when he is gone.

Think Carefully

That said, we need to think through this issue very carefully. We need to analyze the relationship between Iraq and our other pressing priorities—notably the war on terrorism—as well as the best strategy and tactics available were we to move to change the regime in Baghdad.

Saddam’s strategic objective appears to be to dominate the Persian Gulf, to control oil from the region, or both.

That clearly poses a real threat to key U.S. interests. But there is scant evidence to tie Saddam to terrorist organizations, and even less to the Sept. 11 attacks. Indeed, Saddam’s goals have little in common with the terrorists who threaten us, and there is little incentive for him to make common cause with them.

He is unlikely to risk his investment in weapons of mass destruction, much less his country, by handing such weapons to terrorists who would use them for their own purposes and leave Baghdad as the return address. Threatening to use these weapons for blackmail—much less their actual use—would open him and his entire regime to a devastating response by the United States. While Saddam is thoroughly evil, he is above all a power-hungry survivor.

Saddam is a familiar dictatorial aggressor, with traditional goals for his aggression. There is little evidence to indicate that the United States itself is an object of his aggression. Rather, Saddam’s problem with the United States appears to be that we stand in the way of his ambitions. He seeks weapons of mass destruction not to arm terrorists, but to deter us from intervening to block his aggressive designs.

Given Saddam’s aggressive regional ambitions, as well as his ruthlessness and unpredictability, it may at some point be wise to remove him from power. Whether and when that point should come ought to depend on overall U.S. national security priorities. Our pre-eminent security priority—underscored repeatedly by the president—is the war on terrorism. An attack on Iraq at this time would seriously jeopardize, if not destroy, the global counterterrorist campaign we have undertaken.

The United States could certainly defeat the Iraqi military and destroy Saddam’s regime. But it would not be a cakewalk. On the contrary, it undoubtedly would be very expensive—with serious consequences for the U.S. and global economy—and could as well be bloody. In fact, Saddam would be likely to conclude he had nothing left to lose, leading him to unleash whatever weapons of mass destruction he possesses.

Israel would have to expect to be the first casualty, as in 1991, when Saddam sought to bring Israel into the Gulf conflict. This time, using weapons of mass destruction, he might succeed, provoking Israel to respond, perhaps with nuclear weapons, unleashing an Armageddon in the Middle East.

Finally, if we are to achieve our strategic objectives in Iraq, a military campaign very likely would have to be followed by a large-scale, long-term military occupation.

But the central point is that any campaign against Iraq, whatever the strategy, cost and risks, is certain to divert us for some indefinite period from our war on terrorism. Worse, there is a virtual consensus in the world against an attack on Iraq at this time. So long as that sentiment persists, it would

require the United States to pursue a virtual go-it-alone strategy against Iraq, making any military operations correspondingly more difficult and expensive. The most serious cost, however, would be to the war on terrorism. Ignoring that clear sentiment would result in a serious degradation in international cooperation with us against terrorism. And make no mistake, we simply cannot win that war without enthusiastic international cooperation, especially on intelligence.

Possibly the most dire consequences would be the effect in the region. The shared view in the region is that Iraq is principally an obsession of the United States. The obsession of the region, however, is the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. If we were seen to be turning our backs on that bitter conflict—which the region, rightly or wrongly, perceives to be clearly within our power to resolve—in order to go after Iraq, there would be an explosion of outrage against us. We would be seen as ignoring a key interest of the Muslim world in order to satisfy what is seen to be a narrow American interest.

Even without Israeli involvement, the results could well destabilize Arab regimes in the region, ironically facilitating one of Saddam's strategic objectives. At a minimum, it would stifle any cooperation on terrorism, and could even swell the ranks of the terrorists. Conversely, the more progress we make in the war on terrorism, and the more we are seen to be committed to resolving the Israel-Palestinian issue, the greater will be the international support for going after Saddam.

If we are truly serious about the war on terrorism, it must remain our top priority. However, should Saddam Hussein be found to be clearly implicated in the events of Sept. 11, that could make him a key counterterrorist target, rather than a competing priority, and significantly shift world opinion toward support for regime change.

No-Notice Inspections

In any event, we should be pressing the United Nations Security Council to insist on an effective no-notice inspection regime for Iraq—any time, anywhere, no permission required. On this point, senior administration officials have opined that Saddam Hussein would never agree to such an inspection regime. But if he did, inspections would serve to keep him off balance and under close observation, even if all his weapons of mass destruction capabilities were not uncovered. And if he refused, his rejection could provide the persuasive *casus belli* which many claim we do not now have. Compelling evidence that Saddam had acquired nuclear-weapons capability could have a similar effect.

In sum, if we will act in full awareness of the intimate interrelationship of the key issues in the region, keeping counterterrorism as our foremost priority, there is much potential for success across the entire range of our security interests—including Iraq. If we reject a comprehensive perspective, however, we put at risk our campaign against terrorism as well as stability and security in a vital region of the world.

Kucinich Forum Hears Opposition to Iraq War

by Suzanne Rose

Representative Dennis Kucinich (D-Ohio) has launched a campaign to open up the U.S. Congress to a discussion of why we should not go to war in Iraq, with a series of forums beginning on Aug. 20 on Capitol Hill. Himself opposed, he said that he wants to create an opportunity for bipartisan, diverse voices to be heard. The three speakers at his opening forum were Dr. Donald Cortwright, president of the Fourth Freedom Forum; Phyllis Bennis of the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS); and former UN chief weapons inspector in Iraq, Scott Ritter. By far the most relevant and effective presentation was Ritter's, in countering the propaganda campaign which is accompanying the drive to war. No one, however, challenged the underlying motive for war, which, as has been pointed out by Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche, has nothing to do with Iraqi President Saddam Hussein. U.S. Iraq policy is a foil in the strategic policy backed by Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and allied financial elites to impose perpetual war on the world, in the midst of a global financial breakdown crisis.

Where's the Threat?

Ritter opened by criticizing the lack of democracy reflected in the want of debate on this issue, specifically in the one-sided Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings chaired by Sen. Joseph Biden (D-Del.) prior to the Congressional recess. Ritter said you can't make a case for going to war unless you discern a threat, and in his view, there is no evidence that a threat exists.

He specified, that before the inspections were ended in Iraq in 1998, Iraq had been disarmed. If Baghdad has tried to produce weapons of mass destruction (WMD) since 1998, which is the central argument for going to war, the Iraqi government would need an infrastructure, and that would be detectable from the outside. Ritter asserted, that every nuclear facility was destroyed and then blanketed with gamma detection sensors. The technology to detect poison gas production also exists, he said, though he was not sure it is being used. In response to Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's recent assertions that Iraq is producing weapons of mass destruction in underground factories and on mobile trucks, Ritter said this is speculative: Iraq's geography is not conducive to building things underground, and the inspectors never detected any factories on trucks during their exhaustive and often surprise inspections. He also attacked those who want war against Iraq