

George Shultz Pushes Next 'Preventive War'

by Michele Steinberg and Roger Moore

The Committee on the Present Danger (CPD), in a new Iran Policy Paper released today, calls for regime change in Iran to be U.S. policy. . . .

—R. James Woolsey and George P. Shultz,
co-chairmen, CPD, Jan. 23, 2006

Our adversary has been clearly identified: a radical brand of Islam. . . . And our mindset has changed . . . to the emergence of a war mentality with an offense and a defense and a willingness to use force to prevent attacks on us and our allies. . . . [B]ut the juices of reaction to 9/11 have subsided.

—George P. Shultz, *Preventive Force Conference, Princeton University, March 15-16, 2006*

Preventive force symbolizes the upheaval in the international system. The Westphalian system sought security based on the sanctity of international borders. In our time . . . this definition is too narrow.

—Henry A. Kissinger, *Preventive Force Conference, Princeton University, March 15-16, 2006*

Few Americans, and even fewer members of the international community, are aware that the policy of “preventive war,” which has become the hated official policy of the United States, is rightfully called “the Shultz Doctrine.” And if Shultz has his way, the next preemptive war will be against Iran.

George Pratt Shultz, who created the mentally defective entity known as President George W. Bush, assesses that the team of Bush and Dick Cheney, which he put in the White House, is incapable of the kind of manipulative ruthlessness needed to “sustain” the support for “preventive wars” under the Shultz Doctrine.

According to Shultz, he has been planning this strategy of “preventive attacks” since 1973, when Palestinian terrorists carried out an attack on the Olympic games in Munich, Germany, and he regrets that he failed to implement the doctrine, when he was Secretary of State under President Ronald Reagan. Today, five years after 9/11, Shultz claims the “juices of reaction to 9/11” are waning, and it is therefore imperative to revitalize these sentiments. But, as the approval ratings of Bush and Cheney go down the sewer, action must

be taken to reverse this, he says. That’s where Shultz’s groups, the Committee on the Present Danger, the Hoover Institution, and the Princeton Project on National Security, come in.

An Economic Hit Man

Shultz is good at furtive planning—it was he who assembled the team of Cheney-Condoleezza Rice-Paul Wolfowitz-Richard Perle-Doug Feith, known as the Vulcans, who turned failed-businessman, dry-drunk, George W. Bush, into the Presidential nominee of the Republican Party.

But his power is not that of a mere retired top Cabinet official. Shultz is one of the Synarchist international bankers’ top operatives. As a former high-level Treasury Department official under Richard Nixon, he was one of the key architects of Nixon’s 1971 order to bring down the Bretton Woods system of fixed-exchange currency rates that had been set up by Franklin D. Roosevelt. Shultz left the Nixon White House as it was crumbling under the Watergate scandal, to become the head of the Bechtel corporation, one of the world’s largest construction companies.

As head of Bechtel, Shultz was the most powerful, and feared of the “Economic Hit Men” (EHM), who could make or break nations, according to John Perkins, in his 2004 book, *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man* (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc., 2004; see also “George Pratt Shultz: Profile of a Hit Man,” *EIR*, Dec. 10, 2004). EHM would use international financial institutions, like the World Bank and the IMF to utterly control nations.

Perkins identifies Shultz’s role in Panama, where, in 1972, then-Panamanian head of state, Gen. Omar Torrijos, told Perkins about his plan to build a second Panama canal, at sea level, financed by the Japanese. The new canal would be larger, faster, and more efficient, and Torrijos laid out his plans for using the proceeds to improve living standards in Panama. Torrijos already knew that he was provoking the wrath of Bechtel head Shultz, by dealing with Japan, and hoped to win over some support in international banking circles for his project. The second Panama canal was never built, and Torrijos died in a fiery airplane crash on July 31, 1981. Whether it was an assassination remains an unanswered question to this day.

Privatization of Policy

The series of conferences which Shultz organized from his perch as chairman of the Princeton Project on National Security, since October 2004, provides an alarming picture of a quasi-covert policy-planning operation that has usurped the proper role of a dialogue of “advice and consent” between the Congress and the White House. Members of Congress who bemoan the current rift between the Executive and Congress, should take a close look at two conferences run by Shultz on the issue of “Preventive Force.” These conferences are an eye-opener for anyone who thought that the imperial

doctrine of the Iraq War, and the next war, was abandoned when the neo-con whackos, Richard Perle, Paul Wolfowitz, and Douglas Feith, left the Pentagon.

The first of the Preventive Force conferences—attended by Condoleezza Rice—was the May 25-27, 2005 conference on Preventive Force held by the Hoover Institution and Stanford Institute for International Studies, in Palo Alto, California. The second, held on March 15-16, 2006 at Princeton University, did not include any current Administration officials, but featured Shultz and his co-conspirator and rival, Henry Kissinger. Jointly, the two buried the concept of national borders, national sovereignty, and the international agreements of the post-war system.

The purpose of Shultz's extra-judicial conferences—which include other institutes, such as the (Felix) Rohatyn Center for International Affairs at Middlebury College in Vermont (see "Rohatyn, Shultz, Cheney Privatization Scheme to Wreck U.S. National Security," *EIR*, March 31, 2006), the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, and the Hoover Institution at Stanford University—is nothing less than to organize "perpetual war," as the policy of the United States, and to eliminate the nation-state and the sovereignty of nations as established by the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia. These are extra-judicial policy sessions, outside the official government, which aim to shape an imperial doctrine for the United States—without the knowledge of Congress or the American people.

In his March 15, 2006 paper at Princeton, Shultz virtually claimed to be the father of the Bush-Cheney Administration's 2002 National Strategy doctrine of "preventive force." The 2002 National Strategy went way "beyond [the] established principles" of "using preemptive force when an attack is imminent."

Instead, Shultz urged that the United States should not "become the Hamlet of nations, worrying endlessly over whether and how to respond," as it had in Lebanon in 1983-84, when terrorists blew up the U.S. Embassy, the U.S. Marines barracks, and assassinated U.S. diplomats, military personnel, covert agents, and university professors. Shultz boasted that he has been advocating preventive attacks since 1984, when he gave a speech, while serving as Reagan's Secretary of State.

Shultz told the 2006 audience in Princeton, that 22 years ago, in 1984, he had been wise enough to envision the fight against the Islamist radicals, and had said that America's "responses should go beyond passive defense to consider means of active prevention, preemption, and retaliation." His second point was that "intelligence" (i.e., propaganda) must be used to rally "firm public understanding and support for the actions."

To grasp the details of Shultz's plan, it is necessary to look at a little-known organization called "The Stanford Group on Preventive Force" which, prior to the March 2006 meeting, claims to have met periodically "to consider the need for, and

implications of, a greater reliance on preventive force" in defending the United States and its allies. The meetings were held under the chairmanship of Shultz.

A summary of the Stanford Group discussions, written by Abraham Sofaer, explains that "preventive forces does not require that the outcome to be prevented is under way or soon to cause harm." Therefore, the United States and Israel, which do engage in "preventive force," do so, based on the fact that a suspect has carried out an attack in the past, and still has the capability to do so.

As far as the scope of the attack, Sofaer writes, "At one end of the spectrum would be a nuclear attack," designed to destroy the capacity of a state. He also describes a full range of seven types of prevention: searches, detentions, and interrogations; hostage rescue; abductions, including the illegal conduct of these inside the borders of a state other than your own, without permission; targeted killings which are "justifiable" as "necessary, reasonable, and proportionate . . . despite the absence of proof that the individuals targeted are in the process of preparing additional imminent attacks"; attacks on terrorists and their support infrastructure, such as training camps; prevention of WMD development, such as the 1981 Israeli attack on the Osirak nuclear reactor in Iraq; and humanitarian interventions, such as the attacks by the United States, Britain, et al. on Kosovo, without UN Security Council approval.

First and foremost, the Shultz/Stanford Group agrees that the concept of going to the United Nations Security Council for "approval" of military action is a joke, and all that is required is a fig leaf of approaching the UN at least "once," to notify the body of a grievance or a threat.

Furthermore, Sofaer writes that, given the fact that there are now "failed states," which cannot enforce internationally recognized norms of behavior, and "rogue states," which do not accept them, the doctrine of absolute sovereignty within the national boundaries of a state is no longer a viable concept.

Without question, Shultz's focus is the next war—against Iran. From the January 2006 statement of the Committee on the Present Danger, of which he is the co-chairman, to the March 2006 Princeton conference, Shultz has insisted that "ultimately, force" is the only way to stop Iran, which is one enemy in what Shultz calls "a war waged by terror-using Islamists."

While Shultz likes to concentrate on the "use of force" images, it was Kissinger who closed the proceedings of the March 15-16 Princeton conference, making the point that this "long war" against terrorism, and the preventive force doctrine, spells the end of the Westphalia system of sovereign nation-states—one of his favorite themes.

But, what Kissinger and Shultz don't tell you, is that before Westphalia, Europe was ravaged by feudalism and perpetual war—exactly what the Synarchist International has in store today.