

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