

# The outrageous State Department and the Gulf war

by Criton Zoakos

On the fine morning of March 4 in Washington, a State Department official who "preferred to remain anonymous" issued a scathing attack against Iraq for using "internationally outlawed lethal chemical weapons" against Iranian troops in the three-and-a-half-year war against Khomeini's Islamic Republic.

"The United States strongly condemns the prohibited use of chemical weapons wherever it occurs. There can be no justification for their use by any country," the official who "preferred to remain anonymous" said. Still preferring to remain anonymous, he pontificated that this is "inconsistent with the accepted norms of behavior among nations."

Just hold on there a minute, Mister! Khomeini's Islamic Republic is documented to have reduced its population by over 2 million since it took power. The nameless and faceless stuffed striped pants at the State Department preferred to remain speechless on that subject. Over 50,000 Iranians were executed without trial by Khomeini's Islamic Republic. The State Department said nothing. Hundreds of thousands were thrown in the private jails of various mullah warlords to be tortured with sophisticated technologies. The State Department said nothing. Scores of thousands of children between 12 and 18 years of age were taken from their homes and unarmed and untrained were sent to the war front to clear minefields with their bare bodies. The State Department said nothing. Hundreds of Khomeini's political opponents were tracked down like animals and killed by Khomeini's death squads in Europe and the United States itself. The State Department said nothing. Khomeini's mullahs flooded the cities of the Western world with drugs and brought back billions. The State Department said nothing. It did not consider those deeds "inconsistent with the accepted norms of behavior among nations."

Khomeini has made it clear that he will continue to employ "human wave" tactics in his war against Iraq by sending incessant swarms of unarmed, untrained, and drugged con-

scripts against Iraqi machine-gun nests and artillery positions until the Iraqis run out of ammunition. The State Department viewed this as "consistent with accepted norms of behavior."

Khomeini announced the following: "We need the war because it purifies our society. Even when our war with Iraq is over, we will launch another war somewhere else. . . . The generation of men and women more than 30 years of age is almost a corrupt generation. The country should be cleaned of such generation. They should be sent to the front. . . . The second generation, which includes youth between 19 and 30 who had been provided under the Shah with a Western style of living and Western corruption, should be purified by being sent to the front. . . ."

The State Department said nothing.

The prisons in Khomeini's Islamic Republic widely practice the removal of vital organs from prisoners which the jailers then sell for medical transplants. Prisoners are systematically bled to death via forced blood "donations." Some of the blood is sold in Europe. Many prisoners are skinned and their skin sold.

The God-damned State Department said nothing.

## The murderous touch of Henry A. Kissinger

The State Department and its hordes of striped pants have had their reasons to remain anonymous over Khomeini's Hitlerian atrocities and to cynically condemn Iraq's alleged use of "chemical weapons." These reasons go back to Henry A. Kissinger's tenure as Secretary of State and Kissinger's Policy Planning Council under Winston Lord, the team which originally authored the atrocity which is Khomeini's Iran.

When Cyrus Vance replaced Kissinger as the chief of the State Department's anonymous striped pants, the Policy Planning Council's scheme was put into effect: the Shah of Iran was replaced by the infernal Khomeini regime. The appropriate arrangements between Moscow and Foggy Bottom were made to ensure that the emerging carnage would

not interfere unduly with superpower relations. Those arrangements were based on a common agreement between the State Department and Moscow to launch an era of medieval horror throughout the Middle East and beyond, covering the Muslim world. Khomeini's Islamic Republic was to be the principal instrument. British intelligence, through the H. A. R. "Kim" Philby connection, facilitated the understanding between Moscow and the State Department. Israeli intelligence assisted, with Henry Kissinger personally, in the "blinding" of the Shah.

General Alexander Haig, then Supreme Commander of NATO, sent his aide Gen. Robert Huyser to Teheran in the last days of the Shah's drama to decapitate the country's military command and "break" the Shah. Within two weeks of Huyser's arrival in Teheran, Khomeini was in power. On the day of Khomeini's elevation to power, the London *Economist* jubilantly greeted Khomeini's emergence as the "Return of Evil" in the world political arena. The *Economist* of that day predicted that human life is about to become cheap, cheaper than usual, in today's world of diplomacy. That prediction was based on intimate knowledge of what the State Department's Policy Planning Council has cooked up together with Moscow.

### **How Haig continued the Carter policy**

Then Alexander Haig replaced Cyrus Vance (and the brief-tenured Edmund Muskie) as the chief of the State Department's anonymous striped pants. Fresh from his success in installing Khomeini to power via Huyser, Haig next engaged in a series of maneuvers to ignite a war between Iran and Iraq. *EIR* reported at the time the details of this sordid affair. However, Haig succeeded. When the Gulf War began, the State Department stood back with smug satisfaction and announced that the United States would preserve a "strict neutrality" between Iran and Iraq. Moscow, on cue, also made it clear that they will preserve "strict neutrality."

The "strict neutrality" over the last three and a half years has taken the form of shipping weapons to both belligerents in precisely measured quantities, designed to perpetuate the human carnage indefinitely. American weapons and spare parts have been pouring into Iran during both the Carter and Reagan administrations—Soviet weapons too. When Iraq appeared weakened, then American and Soviet weapons started pouring into Iraq—in limited quantities and under strict preconditions for use. As the months went by, more arms exporters became involved. Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Portugal, even Papandreu's Greece with its nascent munitions industry, and so forth.

And always, the weapons are measured out in quantities designed to continue the carnage. There is a Moscow-Washington consensus to do this. The British Establishment is the guardian and manager of the consensus. Swiss financial institutions are the financial overseer. The old Nazi-Communist

political networks in the Middle East are the on-the-ground enforcer. The documentation is voluminous and has been published by *EIR*. This review has even taken the case to federal courts, which have refused to litigate, invoking "national security" grounds. We need not cover the evidence again in this space.

### **State Department's target is the U.S.**

The broader objective of the State Department's policy toward the Gulf and the Middle East in general is to systematically brutalize the region's populations into a well-designed and hardened state of savagery for many years to come. Khomeini's form of insanity was the first instrument selected for such brutalization. The subsequent Gulf War was the second. Both are preplanned to merge with the effects of the carving up of Lebanon, the spreading of civil war in Syria at some point, and the scheduled internal disintegration of

---

---

*Moscow's agreement with Kissinger's sponsors to handle Iran and the war in the Gulf the way they have been handled derives from Moscow's commitment to destroy the science-and-technology outlook of the Western world. Has not the U.S. State Department scrupulously pursued that goal?*

---

---

Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt. The overall scheme was once known as the "Bernard Lewis Plan" (see *EIR*, March 13).

Citizens and political analysts who are trying to understand the State Department's Middle East policies by seeking to discern presumed and imputed "geopolitical" objectives such as preservation of U.S. influence in various countries, or protection of U.S. military and economic interests in the area, will abandon such efforts more bewildered and ignorant than they were to begin with: *The State Department is pursuing a policy of protracted cultural devastation.*

It is doing so for what it considers strategic reasons of the highest order: in the name of ultimately scrapping the dominance of technological culture in world affairs.

A retrospective telescoping of our foreign policy's salient features from the beginning of the Kissinger era to date (1969-83) illuminates what to many would appear an incomprehensible State Department policy in the Middle East: Kissinger's

and his sponsors' military-strategic orientation toward nuclear weapons was originally spelled out by Lord Bertrand Russell's Pugwash Conferences in the 1950s. The Russell-Kissinger-Pugwash outlook is based on the assumption that *science and technology* must be suppressed as dominant features of modern culture. *Such suppression of science-and-technology-based culture will become the only reliable foundation upon which a meaningful and lasting arms control regime can be constructed in world affairs.* The Kissinger-dominated era of SALT and détente was launched simultaneously with the lavishly financed environmentalist-irrationalist youth movement in Western Europe and the United States.

Moscow's agreement with the State Department to handle Iran and the Gulf War in the way they have been handled so far has derived from the fact that Moscow's fundamental policy orientation since the 1968-69 beginning of the Kissinger era has been to encourage and cultivate, as a priority commitment of Russia's *raison d'état*, everything which shall undermine and destroy the primacy of the science-and-technology outlook in the cultural orientation of the Western world.

Thus, the Iran-Iraq war is, primarily, the crucible in which the 20th century's most decisive cultural war is being fought. The fight is only secondarily one between secular-republican Iraq and irrationalist and sacerdotal Iran. The more this war continues, the more the local populations are brutalized into hysteria and irrationality. Unless Khomeini's Islamic Republic is crushed, the Russell-Kissinger-Pugwash program of barbarization wins—even if Khomeini does not win. Whether or not the Soviet armies will eventually roll all over Iran, take over the Gulf, and establish dominion over the rest of the region's Arab populations is in fact a secondary consideration.

### How Moscow sees it

Routine monitoring of developments leaves no doubt that the Soviets have continuously built capabilities which would enable them to militarily dominate the area "tomorrow morning" if they so decide. However, there is no evidence that the Soviets will proceed along this simple military path. Their policy is primarily designed to assist the Russell-Kissinger-Pugwash program in causing a fundamental cultural shift in the Western world toward a permanent abandonment of our cultural "bias" in favor of science and technology. They are thus decidedly more interested in promoting the spread of New Dark Ages irrationalism in the Middle East and by extension in Europe and the United States, than they are in consolidating their military advantage.

After the State Department's program of cultural decoration has succeeded completely, there will be nothing to prevent the Russians from taking a leisurely stroll down the sandy shores of the Persian Gulf. This is what the State Department's "strict neutrality" in the Iran-Iraq war would produce.

No wonder they "prefer to remain anonymous."

# The Reagan Plan

by Allen Douglas

After a lapse of almost a year, the chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Yasser Arafat, and Jordan's King Hussein resumed on Feb. 26 discussions aimed at establishing a Palestinian state on the West Bank of the Jordan River. Though the talks are very important, the crucial protagonist in this situation is neither Hussein nor Arafat, but Washington, D.C. Without vigorous U.S. efforts, including, as stressed by Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak, direct U.S. dealings with the PLO, the talks will almost surely fail.

The Mubarak-Hussein-Reagan meetings in Washington came just as the United States announced that it was packing its bags and leaving Lebanon, amid cheering headlines in the British press, "The Soviets and Syria Have Won!" The process of rewriting the map of the Middle East has begun. Maintenance of even a shaky status quo is now impossible in the wake of the Soviet-Syrian victory in Lebanon and with a Soviet-abetted intensification of Islamic fundamentalism threatening all regimes in the area. The only question, therefore, is whether the United States rewrites the map around the core of a just solution for the Palestinians, or whether the Soviets destroy the fragile nation-states of the area, ultimately including Israel, as part of their plan to drive the United States out entirely.

### Sabotaging the Reagan Plan

With this in mind, Mubarak conveyed to Reagan the urgency to move ahead on the latter's September 1982 peace plan, and in so doing to push aside Henry Kissinger's 1975 pledge that the United States would never recognize the PLO unless the PLO first recognized Israel. The Mubarak-Hussein-Reagan meetings were barely over when Kissinger's henchmen in the State Department leaked to the *New York Times* the existence of intensive Reagan administration-PLO contacts going back to Alexander Haig's tenure as secretary of state. Exploding in a nationwide barrage of publicity led by the *Times's* front page article of Sunday, Feb. 19, the leaks had the intended effect of forcing the hand of the Reagan administration in precisely the opposite direction Mubarak had specified. The next day Kissinger co-thinker, Secretary of State George Shultz, reiterated the original Kissinger pledge, backed up by similar remarks from the President