

that can help move the stalled peace process forward. So, too, will the appointment of the moderate Mahmoud Abbas as Palestinian Prime Minister.” Baker III drew the parallel to the 1991 Persian Gulf War, which led to the Madrid talks, and, soon afterwards, to the groundbreaking Oslo Accords. Baker III bluntly stated that “Land for peace under United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 . . . is the only basis upon which the dispute can be settled.” He directly warned Ariel Sharon: “Any decision to reopen the ‘road map’ to substantive amendment . . . is an open invitation to interminable delay. And there should be no conditions whatever to Israel’s obligation to stop all settlement activity. The United States must press Israel—as a friend, but firmly—to negotiate a secure peace based on the principle of trading land for peace. . . . But the bottom line is this: the time for talking about a road map is over. We have one. And, when the war is over, we need to begin using it.”

Focus on Mideast, Korean Peninsula

On April 15, Bush “41’s” Ambassador to the Soviet Union and Russia, former Democratic National Committee Chairman Robert S. Strauss, wrote an oped published in the *Washington Post*, seconding Baker III’s call for aggressive Bush Administration pressure on Israel to accept the road map for Middle East peace. “The time to implement the road map is now,” he wrote. “There is no perfect plan, but there are reliable friends. The United States has repeatedly demonstrated its friendship with Israel. Now comes a win-win opening; a plan from which all parties can benefit that can break the logjam at a critical moment. . . . The United States can no longer afford to sit on the sidelines, nor can Israel or the Palestinians afford the luxury of turning their backs on this potential breakthrough. It’s time for positive thinking and progress, not retrogression.”

In the midst of this surfacing of strong substantive opposition to the Bush Administration war party faction’s agenda, former President Bush, himself, made a trip to Seoul, South Korea, during which he promoted the idea of multilateral talks to resolve the North Korea crisis without war. Donald Gregg, his former Vice Presidential national security aide, and later his Ambassador to South Korea, made similar statements, promoting a peaceful settlement of the conflict.

This chorus of statements from leading associates of former President George H.W. Bush reflects the same intensity of behind-the-scenes policy warfare inside the GOP, where the dominant Cheney-Rumsfeld grouping within the Administration, is committed to a permanent war of destructionism, pointed at the heart of Eurasia. The fact that leading figures in both the Democratic and Republican parties are now publicly revolting against the dominant war party factions, is of great strategic import. It reflects potential for action along the lines of Lyndon LaRouche’s persistent call, in recent weeks, for a “counter-coup” against the neo-conservatives who are driving a pathetically ill-equipped President George W. Bush into the abyss of world war and a new dark age.

Syria War: Neo-Cons’ ‘Clean Break’ Again

by Michele Steinberg

“If George Bush attacks Syria, all Hell will break loose in the Arab world against us,” stated a retired U.S. general, who served under World War II Gen. “Vinegar Joe” Stilwell. He believes the policies of neo-con Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz are insane. On April 14, British press reported that Lawrence Eagleburger, former Secretary of State under President George H.W. Bush, “41,” told BBC that President George W. Bush should and would be impeached if he “turned troops on Syria now and then Iran.”

But criticism from military heroes and veteran diplomats, even paired with the fact that the military is exhausted and weapons depleted after two *unfinished* wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, is not enough to stop the war against Syria. Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche warned, “Don’t make any assumptions that the war is off. The neo-cons are crazy.” Only a counter-coup that ousts them can secure peace.

Like the Iraq war, the attack on Syria has nothing to do with a current threat—it was planned by the neo-conservative chicken-hawks as early as 1996.

On April 10, the *Oakland Tribune* reported that Donald Rumsfeld had commissioned two of the Pentagon’s neo-cons, Douglas Feith and Dr. William Luti, to draw up plans for attacks on Syria. It was a “perfect fit”—Feith had already written the “talking points” for war against Syria in the policy paper prepared for the Israeli right-wing government in 1996, titled “Clean Break: A New Strategy for Security the Realm.” A co-author was scandal-ridden Rumsfeld advisor Richard Perle, who delivered it to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. The paper has two pillars of “regime change”: toppling Saddam Hussein in Iraq; and destroying the Ba’ath regime in Syria. It’s a game plan, in its own words, for “redrawing the map of the Middle East.”

Syria is a “regime murderous of its own people, openly aggressive toward its neighbors . . . and supportive of the most deadly terrorist organizations,” wrote Feith and Perle in 1996. “It is both natural and moral that Israel . . . move to *contain* Syria, drawing attention to its weapons of mass destruction program.”

In May 2000, Feith, Perle, David Wursmer (all “Clean Break” authors) signed onto an updated attack plan against Syria, prepared for the Middle East Forum by Islam-hater Daniel Pipes and Ziad Abdelnour, called “Ending Syria’s Occupation of Lebanon: The U.S. Role.” Something of a follow-up to “Clean Break,” the report demanded that “use of force

needs to be considered” against Syria, utilizing America’s “new era of undisputed military supremacy.” This must be done sooner rather than later, it said, because Syria is developing weapons of mass destruction. Signers also include Elliott Abrams, the Iran-Contra perjurer who now heads the National Security Council’s Middle East desk.

Neo-Con Aim: Greater Israel

But the neo-cons have an Achilles’ heel—the third emphasis of “Clean Break”—which is to prevent a Palestinian state from coming into being. This puts them at odds with Bush’s policy for a Palestinian state—something the President considers *his own policy*, report sources close to the “road map” discussions. So, instead of confronting Bush, the neo-cons and their Israeli counterparts are driving for war on Syria—to keep the region in “permanent war” where talk of a “peace process” is a sick joke. The Israeli newspaper, *Ha’aretz* calls this “oratorical Shock and Awe.”

Rumsfeld began with accusing Syria of hiding people and weapons for Iraq. Then, on April 6, Bush said, “Syria just needs to cooperate . . . not harbor any Ba’athists, any military officials, any people who need to be held to account.” He added, “We believe there are chemical weapons in Syria,” but “I expect they will cooperate.”

Rumsfeld had already ordered the Syria war plans to be drawn up. By April 14, he escalated again: “We have seen the chemical weapons tests in Syria over the past 12, 15 months.” He charged that Syrian terrorists were going into Iraq to kill Americans.

By April 15, Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon’s cabinet started a drumbeat for a U.S. attack on Syria. Foreign Minister Silvan Shalom announced, “Syria is letting terrorist organizations operate in the country.” Cabinet Minister Uzi Landau railed about the Syrian danger, and Defense Minister Shaul Mofaz, in a radio interview, praised the Americans for threatening Syria. Mofaz then told the daily *Ma’ariv* that Israel has “a long list of issues that we are thinking of demanding of the Syrians” and they are going to get the “Americans” to deliver it.

But this time, there is a counter-offensive against the neo-cons’ “permanent war,” in large part triggered by the “LaRouche in 2004” campaign release of 400,000 copies of a pamphlet exposing the war party’s “Children of Satan.” By April 17, with the backing of the Arab Group of 22 countries in the UN, Syria—a member of the Security Council—introduced a resolution for a Middle East “WMD Free Zone,” specifically targetting Israel, the only nuclear-armed country in the region. U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell announced that he may be visiting Syria in the immediate future to seek a diplomatic solution to the growing tension. The London *Guardian* reported that Bush had “vetoed” the Rumsfeld war plan against Syria, and U.S. syndicated columnist Robert Novak blew the lid off the right-wing Israeli interest in the Syria war, citing Mofaz’s plan to use the United States to “deliver” a message.

Iraq War Fuels Military Transformation Debate

by Carl Osgood

The sudden fall of Baghdad after a messy three-week campaign will, no doubt, add further fuel to the debate that has long been raging in military circles regarding military transformation. Were the transformational concepts, long advocated by Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, instrumental to the military outcome, or were the troops on the ground forced to resort to much maligned but more traditional “kinetic methods” to defeat Iraqi forces? Rumsfeld has long reflected the utopian notion that, to fight the wars of the 21st Century, the military has to transform itself, placing much greater emphasis on special operations forces, airpower, precision-guided weapons, and information technology. With military operations in Iraq transitioning into an occupation, has the war proved out the theories that Rumsfeld has been promoting?

The drive for military transformation rests on a number of concepts, which have become buzz-phrases at Joint Forces Command and elsewhere. These phrases include “operational net assessment,” “effects-based operations” (EBO), and “rapid decisive operations” (RDO). These concepts have been attacked by Marine Lt. Gen. Paul Van Riper (ret.), who has derided them as little more than “bumper stickers and slogans.” Van Riper is a Vietnam War veteran whose last position before he retired in 1997 was as commander of the Marine Corps Combat Development Command (see *EIR*, Dec. 13, 2002).

One indication of the depth of the pre-war debate on military transformation is a volume published last September by the U.S. Army War College, entitled *Transformation Concepts for National Security in the 21st Century*. The book is a collection of 12 papers written by students of the War College, and the views expressed range from Van Riper’s to the “we’ve already been doing them since time immemorial, but now we have the technology to do things with them that weren’t possible before” view. The most interesting among the papers are those critical of the notions of effects-based operations and rapid decisive operations, because they appear to have the most bearing on events that are now transpiring in Iraq.

Chess Game or a Boxing Match?

In an essay entitled “Effects-Based Operations: The End of Dominant Maneuver?” Col. Gary Cheek identifies Air Force Maj. Gen. David Deptula as one of the key theorists for EBO. Deptula was part of “the black hole,” the planning cell that laid out the air campaign in the 1991 Gulf War, who