

George Shultz pursues NATO's plan to militarize the Middle East

by Judith Wyer

The escalation this month of the Iran-Iraq war, combined with Washington's so-called new Mideast peace initiative, is the basis upon which NATO expects to extend its forces into the developing sector, beginning with the Persian Gulf.

As the NATO foreign ministers convened at a secluded retreat in Quebec on Oct. 3, Iran began its boldest offensive to date against Iraq, opening up a new front in order to attack Baghdad, heavily bombarding the port town of Basra, and massing forces at the mouth of the Persian Gulf in order to be in a position to blockade oil flows.

Over the past six weeks, there was been an unpublicized U.S. naval deployment into the Indian Ocean area for a demonstration of U.S. "resolve" to aid Arab Gulf states against Khomeini in the Gulf, and the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force is currently near the mouth of the Gulf on the Oman-controlled Masira Island in preparation for upgraded "Bright Star" maneuvers. The Gulf crisis provides the pretext for the next stage of preparing NATO out-of-area deployments, reportedly a priority item at the Quebec meeting. The out-of-area doctrine, which was first officially adopted by NATO member states in April during the Malvinas crisis, is not a military policy per se, but a financial policy of using NATO to enforce debt repayment by the developing sector if necessary, and of looting raw materials.

The recent Mideast initiative delivered by President Reagan was cooked up by self-professed British agent Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State George Shultz, and Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger in order to entice the Saudis and other Arabs to make the following kind of deal: a diplomatic drive to solve the Palestinian problem, in exchange for Saudi and Egyptian acquiescence to a military buildup in the Mideast. Among the secret clauses in the Camp David accords to which the White House Mideast policy conforms is the establishment of a military bloc in the region, as an extension of NATO.

The Gulf crisis puts pressure on the anti-Khomeini Arabs to accept the NATO scheme, while the Reagan peace plan is dangled as a token of resolving the crucial Palestinian question. The Egyptians, Jordanians, and others are naturally fearful of the expansion of Khomeini's barbaric Islamic Rev-

olution, and along with Sudan, are trying to bolster Iraq; the State Department and National Security Council are not hiding the fact that they approve of this effort.

This U.S. support against Iran does not mean the U.S. foreign-policy establishment is anti-Khomeini—on the contrary, they continue to seek to impose enforced backwardness and Dark Age rulers on the region. The goal is to leverage the Gulf war into "crisis management" control of Arab governments' policies and to militarize the region. The decline of Soviet clout in the Mideast, and the aura of recovered prestige following the Reagan initiative, have made this effort more plausible.

As for the Palestinian element of the incipient deal, the Reagan proposal to federate the West Bank with Jordan is not in principle an unviable one, but Shultz and Kissinger have no intention of allowing negotiations to proceed to that point. For Shultz, what is important is not meeting Arab hopes or the objective requirements of the problem, but simply adopting the appearance of rapprochement with the Arabs.

The overriding question is in what global economic situation such a Palestinian entity would be created. Shultz and his associates in London are intent on salvaging the bankrupt IMF monetary system by imposing unprecedented levels of austerity on both the advanced and underdeveloped sectors. In such a climate, no "Palestinian entity" could succeed. But Shultz, "the friend of the Saudis," has dangled his package to draw the Saudis into using their wealth and influence to bail out the IMF's global order. Saudi Arabia is rumored to have already offered a multibillion-dollar loan to Mexico in early October, a move thought to have been inspired by Washington to pre-empt growing fears that Mexico will enact a debt moratorium and bring down the monetary system rather than accept the IMF's brutal conditionalities for debt rescheduling.

Blackmailing Riyadh

The doctrine of the Rapid Deployment Force was drafted in London in the late 1940s as the global enforcer of a post-war neo-colonial order. According to this doctrine, the U.S. force is the transition to a broader multinational strike force

to include other NATO members, notably Britain and France, in what the Aspen Institute calls a "consortia of the concerned."

The same anglophile traitors in the U.S. that ran the genocidal Vietnam war, including Henry Kissinger, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Robert MacNamara, and Bob Komer, are the architects of the RDF.

While they upgrade relations with Iraq (the Thatcher government has even offered to provide troops against Iran), the British view with complacency the prospect that Khomeini could make good on his pledge to block the Straits of Hormuz, although the Third Oil Hoax which would ensue would ravage continental Europe and Japan, over 50 percent dependent on Persian Gulf oil. Britain is self-sufficient in energy, and the United States' dependency on Gulf oil has greatly declined. The esteemed allies of the Anglo-Americans, after this blow, would presumably have no other recourse than to join the NATO buildup against the developing sector, and play a greater military role, freeing the RDF and the British to expand out-of-area initiatives.

As *EIR* has reported, Britain is providing logistical support for Khomeini's stated objective of halting Gulf oil flows. The recently negotiated contracts between Iran and British Petroleum and Royal Dutch Shell are only one facet of Anglo-Iranian ties. Those companies are reported to be secretly stockpiling recently purchased Iranian crude in anticipation of a new oil cutoff. Reports have begun to surface of a large upturn in Iranian spot sales of crude, indicating that the Islamic regime may be attempting to earn quick cash before a shutdown of oil from the Gulf.

U.S. buildup signaled

Step by step, the U.S. Congress has rubberstamped Britain's out-of-area NATO scheme. On Sept. 30, a conference committee of both houses of Congress declared that "NATO and Japanese allies will be taking an active role in the Persian Gulf program." According to a congressional source, initially this means that U.S. allies will help fund the exorbitant costs of building military infrastructure in the Indian Ocean-Mideast region.

On Sept. 28, the Senate had passed a resolution calling upon Japan to increase its military spending to engage in a military build-up capable of "filling the gap" left as a result of American forces redeploying to the Gulf region.

A week earlier, the Senate Defense Committee approved a bill sponsored by Sen. Ted Stevens (D-Alaska) 12 to 1 that U.S. troop levels in Europe be frozen at 1980 levels. Freezing troops at the 1980 level will require that 23,000 troops be pulled out of Europe. U.S. forces in Weisbaden have been targeted for withdrawal. The Senate Appropriations Committee has released the Stevens bill, and it is now a high-priority item to go to the floor of the Senate in November.

A Defense Committee aide told *EIR*, "Never before has there been such a strong sentiment in the Congress that Europe and Japan must take greater responsibility for strengthening their domestic defense so that the United States can

take a leading role in protecting the sea lanes in the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf." According to a congressional aide, the White House found a loophole in the War Powers Act which requires congressional approval before the executive branch can send U.S. troops to a war zone when it sent the Marines to Lebanon. As a result there is no time limit on the duration of the stay of the Marines in Lebanon. The White House has announced that the Marines would likely have a minimum tour in Lebanon of four to six months.

A former U.S. ambassador to the Mideast commented that with the increasing military role of the United States in the Mideast, "The American people are going to have to get used to seeing our boys be killed abroad." The death of a U.S. marine less than a week after the U.S. contingent arrived in Lebanon is "only the beginning" of a new U.S. military presence in the area. Leslie Gelb, a former Carter State Department official, wrote in a *New York Times* op-ed Oct. 3 that not only is the United States a peacemaker in the Mideast but also a "policeman." Shultz and Weinberger are working on a plan to insert the same kind of RDF-led multinational force that polices the Sinai into southern Lebanon.

According to the *Washington Post* of Oct. 5, the Saudis

Kissinger and Shultz are offering the Arabs a Palestinian solution, which they do not intend to deliver, in exchange for Saudi funding of the bankrupt monetary system, and acceptance of the militarization of the region. At the same time, Britain is manipulating both the Iraqis and the Iranians, whose Gulf war is NATO's delight.

may soon finance a new arms industry for Egypt to the tune of \$2 billion. U.S. fighter jets would be assembled in Egypt, since the cost of Egyptian labor is significantly cheaper than in the United States, with Raytheon and General Dynamics as the leading bidders in providing the components for the assembly. Meanwhile, in the past six weeks, British Foreign Office official Douglas Hurd and British Defense Minister Nott have toured the Mideast firming up contracts with the Saudi Air Force and National Guard.