

terrorism that will never end and that keeps people constantly on edge. A never-ending military commitment in Iraq that might lead to other commitments beyond Iraq also keeps people focused on national security.”

Specter of Impeachment Raised

Leading Republicans, closely allied with former President Bush, have recently surfaced with powerful objections to the policies of the current “chicken-hawk”-dominated Bush Administration, which threaten World War III. On April 13, former Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger gave an interview to BBC. The Bush “41” Administration official was asked about the argument, coming out of Washington, from circles close to the President, that the overthrow of Saddam Hussein justifies regime-change elsewhere in the region, “even if that includes extending military action to Syria, Iran—I’ve even heard Saudi Arabia mentioned.” Eagleburger replied, “I just don’t think anybody who says that truly understands the American people. You saw the furor that went on in this country before the President got sufficient support to do this [attack on Iraq]. We’re just not built like that. This is still, whether anybody is prepared to admit it or not, this is still a democracy. And public opinion and the public, still, on these issues, rules.” Eagleburger warned, “And if George Bush decided he was going to turn the troops loose on Syria now, and Iran after that, he would last in office for about 15 minutes! . . . In fact, if George Bush were to try it now, even I would feel that he ought to be impeached. You can’t get away with that sort of thing with this democracy. It’s ridiculous!”

Five days before Eagleburger’s warning of impeachment

if the President follows the agenda of Vice President Cheney, Defense Secretary Rumsfeld, Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, et al. and wages war against Damascus, Gen. Brent Scowcroft, the National Security Advisor and one of the closest confidants of President Bush “41,” delivered a speech in Oslo before the Norwegian Nobel Institute. In that April 8 address, as in other recent public appearances, General Scowcroft repeated his opposition to the Iraq war. He had warned strongly, prior to the unprovoked American attack, that a preventive war on Iraq would be a dangerous distraction from the war on terrorism, and would undermine the entire international system. He told the Oslo audience that were the United States and Britain to occupy and control the interim administration in Iraq, this could provoke the “wrath and enmity” of the entire Muslim world. He added, “We’re moving uncertainly down paths nobody has gone down before. The structures we’ve built to handle our security are under significant stress and may not survive to serve us in the future.” Warning about the propagandistic use of the term “democracy” by Bush Administration officials, Gen. Scowcroft asked, “What’s going to happen the first time we hold an election in Iraq and it turns out the radicals win? We’re surely not going to let them take over.”

On April 2, speaking in Toronto at the Empire Club, Bush “41” Secretary of State James Baker III made a strong push for the current Bush Administration to turn from war in Iraq to peace between the Israelis and Palestinians, emphasizing that the “road map” document, prepared by the Quartet (the United States, the European Union, Russia, and the Secretary General of the United Nations), represented a “vehicle . . .

Clinton Breaks With War Policy

Virtually blacked out by the “war media” was former President Bill Clinton’s “Conference Board” interview with Marvin Kalb, April 15, excerpted here.

Kalb: Mr. President . . . I have to conclude that you are *profoundly* in disagreement, with those people in the administration right now, who feel very negatively toward the UN?

President Clinton: Yeah, I am! I’m totally in disagreement! And, I’ll tell you why: Keep in mind, I supported the resolution in the Congress, to give the President the authority to use force if the UN inspection process broke down; and I did it as soon as he said he would go to the UN first.

But, I think, again, we all—Sometimes, when people are under stress, they hate to think. And, it’s the time when they most need to think. If you think about some personal

period in your life—forget about politics: Think about something in your life that happened to you—maybe you were a kid; maybe it happened last week—when you had *great stress* and fear. That’s the time when you most needed to think, but it’s the time when it’s most difficult to think. That’s what we should be doing now.

So, look at the UN. We liked the UN a lot, after Sept. 11! When the whole world said, “We’ll go to Afghanistan, and help you get Osama bin Laden.” There are German and French soldiers in Afghanistan today. Does the President want ’em to come home? Secretary Rumsfeld want ’em to leave? We don’t want ’em to help us find bin Laden any more, since they didn’t agree with our timetable in Iraq? It’s a complicated world out there—they don’t work for us.

You know, Hans Blix was begging for more time, and they said, “We think he ought to have it.” And our United States says, “No, we’re going to liberate Iraq, and we’ve got a resolution which gives us the authority to do it, and so, we’ve determined that we’re going to do it now. And, if you don’t like it, we’ll get even with you, when it’s over.”