

McCain and Lieberman: 'Bull Moose' Mate Again

by Scott Thompson

Senators and potential Presidential candidates John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Joseph Lieberman (D-Conn.) are seeking again to put Congressional pressure on President George W. Bush to go to war immediately—as at the Feb. 8-9 “Wehrkunde” meeting in Munich, where the pair proclaimed that the Iraq war is “their policy.” They continue to blackmail President Bush to go through with this reckless Clash of Civilizations war, including through McCain’s ongoing threat to follow his hero, President Teddy Roosevelt’s 1912 “Bull Moose” campaign, in the 2004 Presidential election. This McCain option, concocted at the Hudson Institute by his chief spokesman, Marshall Wittman, threatens the President with a third-party vote drain like that by which Teddy Roosevelt knocked off Republican Presidential candidate Howard Taft and elected the “Ku Klux Klan Democrat,” Woodrow Wilson. It makes McCain and Lieberman virtual “running mates” for 2004, promoting the same set of dangerous utopian war policies.

At the same time, despite their *vox populi* rhetoric about “reform of government” and helping “the middle class,” McCain and Lieberman have both been seeking to dismantle what remains of U.S. infrastructure—including transportation, water, and energy—in the name of cutting “larded pork.”

Moreover, as *EIR* has reported, both Lieberman and McCain are being promoted by the so-called “New Democrats” of the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC), set up by the financial support of Michael A. Steinhardt, the son and beneficiary of the Meyer Lansky Syndicate’s number-one jewel fence, “Red” Steinhardt. The DLC is dedicated to destroy the last vestiges of President Franklin Roosevelt’s commitment to the “forgotten man” under the General Welfare clause of the Preamble to the Constitution. The DLC, of which Lieberman was the longest serving head from 1993-2000 under Steinhardt’s patronage, has twice published pieces by Wittmann praising the McCain “Bull Moose Party” option.

‘Bush Enforcing McCain-Lieberman Policy’

Demonstrating the overweening lunacy of Lieberman and McCain was the former’s Feb. 8 Munich Wehrkunde speech, entitled “NATO’s Future Role.” Lieberman boasted, “In fact, five years ago, after Saddam ejected the UN inspectors, John McCain and I gave up on containment and introduced the Iraqi Liberation Act, which, when it became law, made a change of regime in Baghdad official U.S. policy. You might therefore say that, when it comes to Iraq, President Bush is just enforcing the McCain-Lieberman policy.”

In the same speech, Lieberman stressed that “in a world facing new and evolving threats—terrorists, rogue regimes, and weapons of mass destruction—NATO is split.” Back in the United States, Lieberman and McCain called in the press on Feb. 11 and proposed a Congressional move to further this split by isolating France and Germany, whose leaders continue to oppose the “McCain-Lieberman policy.” McCain’s Feb. 11 press release quoted Lieberman: “France and Germany . . . are important allies of America—but in this case, the tone and volume of their dissent is in danger of drowning out the voice of a nearly united Europe. We must not let that happen.” Joined by Sens. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) and Evan Bayh (D-Ind.), they said they will “introduce a Sense of the Congress resolution praising 18 European allies for their support for enforcing UN Security Council Resolution 1441 which demands Iraqi disarmament.”

According to a Feb. 11 transcript of the four Senators’ press conference by Federal News Service, they gave a backhanded slap at France and Germany, praising the European nations that have offered to support a U.S. war—i.e., “the Vilnius 10” and “the Gang of Eight.” The event quickly turned into a French- and German-bashing session, with special venom directed at France. The public relations stunt was highlighted by Graham’s sycophantism towards Lieberman. “I want to say,” Graham began, “that Senator Lieberman’s presentation in Munich was outstanding. It made me proud to be an American, it made me proud to be a member of the Senate. Senator McCain has been a voice in foreign policy for a long time, and I’m a Republican and he’s a Republican. But the fact that Senator Lieberman would stand up with Rumsfeld and McCain and have a united front about what our nation needs at this time was heartening.”

Even before his “Manchurian candidate” moment at Wehrkunde, where McCain blasted those who would not support pre-emptive war against Iraq, he had tried to dominate the Senate and abridge the Constitution by arguing that there was no need for a Congressional Declaration of War against Iraq, as President FDR had sought even after Pearl Harbor. In a Jan. 29 press release, McCain called for defeat of a resolution to this effect by Sens. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) and Robert Byrd (D-W.V.). McCain argued: “Mr. President, over three months ago, I worked with Senators Lieberman, Warner, and Bayh to manage the resolution authorizing the use of military force against Iraq. . . . Seventy-seven Senators then voted to authorize the President to use our armed forces. . . . That debate is over. . . . The Senator from Massachusetts apparently believes we should revoke the President’s authority as Commander in Chief . . . unless there is clear evidence of an imminent Iraqi threat to the United States. But in the world we live in, there is no such thing as knowledge of imminence of attack. . . . I believe the case to disarm Saddam Hussein has become more compelling.” A spokesman for Senator Byrd told *EIR*, that his resolution was then bottled up in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Committee Chairman John Lugar (R-Ind.).

Gutting U.S. Infrastructure

U.S. citizens may have been puzzled by the sight of National Guardsmen who had been called up for “the McCain-Lieberman policy” of war with Iraq, having to use their “frequent flyer miles” to get to the war zone on civilian aircraft. But, this is apparently fine for McCain and the DLCers, who would gladly shut down what little remains of America’s national economic infrastructure.

In contrast to Democratic Party Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche’s “Super-TVA” policy proposal for infrastructure and recovery measures in the spirit of those of FDR in the last Depression, McCain opposes any appropriation for basic infrastructure as just so much “pork.” In a Dec. 4, 2001 26-page press release, “McCain Objects to \$4 Billion in Porkbarrel Projects in FY’02 Transportation Appropriations Bill,” McCain pushed a House-Senate conferees report to cut both the Boston Central Artery Tunnel Project (“The Big Dig”), and the national rail carrier Amtrak, in accordance with

the “privatization” schemes of the neo-conservatives’ Amtrak Reform Council. It is notable that the minimum to keep Amtrak running, carrying more passengers than the airlines in the Northeast corridor, is \$1.2 billion annually, as compared to an estimated \$3 billion a day for war against Iraq.

McCain now claims that \$1.1 billion in specific rail enhancement and connection projects of the Federal Transit Administration should be cut. He argues against any spending on “transportation planning, research, and development.” He would eliminate dozens of “instrument landing systems” which would make airports more secure, to save \$27 million; and he calls for \$131 million in cuts against improvements of “Terminal Air Traffic Control Facilities,” when everyone knows the existing system is overloaded. Further, he calls for \$433 million in cuts in the Federal Aviation Administration’s suggested improvements at nearly 100 airports. Thus, McCain represents a form of universal fascism where even “the trains do not run on time.”

Egyptians Warn U.S. Of High Cost of War

As the Washington media were preoccupied with hyping a war against Iraq, little attention was paid to an Egyptian delegation that had spent over a week early in February, talking to U.S. officials. The delegation included President Hosni Mubarak’s son Gamal Mubarak, who heads the policy planning committee of the ruling National Democratic Party, President Mubarak’s chief political advisor Dr. Osama El Baz, and Minister of Foreign Trade Youssef Boutros-Ghali. The delegation sought to negotiate some recompense for the economic disaster which would befall their nation, should the United States launch an attack on Iraq. They were anxious to stave off U.S. military action, as well as to prevent any spillover in this “clash of civilizations” offensive into U.S.-Egyptian relations.

To defray its costs of a U.S. war on Iraq, Egypt is asking for an additional U.S. aid package and has renewed its appeals for a bilateral free-trade agreement. The Bush Administration is still considering a request for \$2 billion in new military assistance along with \$10 billion in loan guarantees.

The delegation was also intent on getting the Bush Administration to revive peace efforts between Israel and the Palestinian Authority. At a forum in Washington on Feb. 6, on “Egypt and the United States, Further Prospects for a Strategic Partnership,” Osama El Baz said: “We have wasted valuable time in the Arab-Israeli conflict. We have

to jump-start the process. We can’t allow the situation to deteriorate further.” President Mubarak had just that week phoned Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, to discuss ways to move the peace process forward. In a dig at those U.S. officials, such as former National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, who had helped create the mujahideen during the 1980s, El Baz remarked, “Some of these terrorist gangs were viewed by some political circles here as former allies at the same time that they were contaminating the minds of the younger generation.”

Another speaker at the forum, Lawrence Eagleburger, who was George H.W. Bush’s last Secretary of State, stressed, “There is only one nation that can get Israel moving in the right direction, and that is the United States.”

EIR asked panelist Gen. Anthony Zinni (USMC-ret.), a prominent opponent of another war against Iraq, what effect an American Empire paradigm-shift would have on the U.S. military. Eagleburger intervened: “There would be a revolution in the ranks if anybody tried to do that,” he said. Zinni concurred: “The military takes on the burden of a new deployment only when it has to. The biggest squeals come from the Pentagon whenever a new foreign deployment is added. You would not find anyone in the military that would support such a policy, or even the idea that the U.S. must become some kind of colonial power.”

Eagleburger again interjected, “You have to remember how difficult it was to get the American people to support even the limited operations we had in Bosnia and in Kosovo. Anybody who even thought of turning the U.S. into a colonial power would see radical shift in the public opinion polls. The U.S. will not become a colonial power.”

—William Jones