

State Department works for Moscow in Gulf crisis

by Criton Zoakos

As of 12:15 p.m. Sept. 3, 1987, the State Department has been committing treason against the United States, by explicitly aiding and abetting Iran, a state which has formally declared war on the United States. State Department officials publicly associated with "aiding and abetting" Iran are: Charles Redman, Michael Armacost, Abraham Sofaer, Phyllis Oakley, and Ed Djerejian. Will Secretary Shultz be able to plausibly deny that he knows what his underlings are doing?

Here are some of the facts:

As of Sept. 3, after five full days of Iranian terrorist rampages, which damaged or destroyed over 20 peaceful commercial ships belonging to most of the world's seafaring nations, the U.S. State Department is refusing to admit that Iran is completely outside international law, thus attempting to run cover for Ayatollah Khomeini's terrorism. So far, all of the rabid Pasdarans' (Revolutionary Guards') attacks occurred against ships of Italian, Japanese, Spanish, Greek, Cypriot, Yugoslav, Bahraini and Saudi nationality, all of them non-belligerents, and all of them sailing either in international waters, or inside the territorial waters of non-belligerent nations.

Authoritative legal opinion all over the world, has identified the Iranian naval actions as falling strictly within the legal characterization of piracy. By contrast, all the Iraqi attacks so far have been against Iranian targets, and all inside Iranian territorial waters designated and recognized as war zones.

Despite all this, the State Department, by midday Sept. 3, at the insistence of Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovsky, dropped the earlier U.S. demand that Iran respond to the U.N. cease-fire resolution by Sept. 4. As of 12:15 p.m. on Sept. 3, according to an announcement by Department spokesman Charles Redman, the U.S.A. dropped

any deadline for when the Iranian response should be given to the United Nations' binding resolution 598 calling for a ceasefire in the Gulf War. Now the State Department has fully adopted the Soviet suggestion that U.N. General Secretary Javier Pérez de Cuéllar first visit Teheran some time in Sept. 14-17, or thereabouts, and no discussion of sanctions be allowed until perhaps after his eventual return from Teheran.

The astounding scandal is that the U.S. State Department, without any explanation whatsoever, completely abandoned its own policy and, as of Sept. 4, adopted the policy of the Soviet Foreign Ministry.

Accustomed as we are to State Department treason, we still are obliged to classify this latest act of perfidy, which was performed by Charles Redman, at the instigation of State Department Counsel Judge Abraham Sofaer, and with the toleration of Secretary Shultz, as unprecedented *treason in time of war*, in the sense of aiding and abetting an enemy of the United States in time of war—as both Ayatollah Khomeini, and Iranian President Khamenei have formally declared war on the United States.

This act of treason was further compounded with a further decision of the State Department, announced the following day, Sept. 4: "As part of the continuing U.S.-Soviet dialogue on regional issues, Senior Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs Ed Djerejian, will meet in Geneva, Sept. 10 and 11, with Soviet MFA [Ministry of Foreign Affairs], Middle East Department Chief Yuri Alexeyev, to discuss Afghanistan and the situation in the Gulf War."

This entire pattern of State Department moves was capped when U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Vernon Walters announced that he is confident that if Iran agrees to a temporary ceasefire during the scheduled visit of General

Secretary Pérez de Cuéllar, then the possibility might arise for the U.S. naval task force in the Gulf to be removed. Vernon Walter's suggestion, incredibly, conforms with the Soviet leadership's demand that "all alien naval forces" withdraw from the Gulf before any settlement of the war can be negotiated in the Gulf.

The strategic stakes

Such a withdrawal of the U.S. naval force would leave the Soviet Union, the major land military power in that region, as the sole arbiter of the Iran-Iraq war, cause a sudden precipitous collapse of all pro-U.S. and pro-Western forces and factions throughout the entire Arab world—an imminent overthrow of the Saudi regime, a collapse of the Egyptian government—in short, the complete and permanent destruction of all Western influence in the Middle East and Near East. This conclusion is not speculative: It is a generally recognized fact that a sudden collapse of the American military commitment in the Gulf, under whatever pretext, will have a more devastating effect on the U.S. position in that region and the world, than the fall of Saigon had in May of 1975. And yet, incredibly, this appears to be exactly what the Department of State is aiming for.

State Department treason in this matter does not merely consist in simply and without explanation dropping, overnight, the earlier positions of the United States government, in simply abandoning the application of routine legal criteria on Iranian piracy, and as simply and suddenly adopting and enthusiastically pursuing the opposite Soviet policy with respect to the Gulf. This sort of activity is, of course, treasonous in a broad sense. However, in aiding and abetting Iran, those State Department officials who are pursuing a policy of extending time to Iran are committing treason in the technical sense of the law, given that Iran has formally declared war on the United States.

As we have repeatedly pointed out, Iranian leaders, including Ayatollah Khomeini, President Khamenei, and Prime Minister Moussavi, have all declared that they have placed their nation at war with the United States. For over 30 days since these formal declarations of war, the United States has reserved its right to respond whenever it deemed appropriate. Up until the early afternoon of Thursday, Sept. 3, the U.S. State Department was piously admonishing the Iranian mullahs to please abide by United Nations Resolution 598, which calls for an immediate ceasefire in the Gulf War, or else, the State Department, in the name of peace, law, freedom of navigation and all that is decent and so forth, would be obliged, come Friday, Sept. 4, to press forward in the United Nations Security Council for sanctions against Iran, perhaps even including an arms embargo.

Suddenly, after four days of berserk Iranian attacks, the State Department announced that it would wait indefinitely for the Iranians to respond to the United Nations, in fact acting on behalf of Soviet interests, directly, explicitly, and

unabashedly. For George Shultz, Abraham Sofaer, Richard Murphy, and Charles Redman to deny this straightforward charge, they must reverse their present policy course.

The State Department is operating on behalf of an effort to impose a "crisis management" solution to the Gulf situation, in the context of a superpower summit. The effort is based on a gross misestimation of what the Russians are up to. It is known that political circles associated with Armand Hammer, his designated successor Dwayne Andreas, their political and business partners in the Hamburg Orient Institute circles who control West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher's Iranian and East-West policy (Count Baudissen, for instance), fully accept that the present crisis in the Gulf will continue worsening, but not in the direction of a superpower confrontation or breakdown of relations, but rather in the direction of a joint superpower "crisis management" intervention in the Gulf.

Such a settlement would be worked out in the context of the "regional issues" agenda already cluttering the preparations for another Reagan-Gorbachov summit. That summit is supposed to not only produce an agreement eliminating all American medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, thus making Western Europe indefensible, but also a series of "regional agreements," which, in essence, would codify a withdrawal of the United States from all parts of the world except the American continent—more or less in accordance with a proposal made in April 1983 by then Soviet President Yuri Andropov.

It is not accidental that the Sept. 10-11 U.S.-Soviet discussions on the "regional matters" of Afghanistan and the Gulf War between Djerejian and Alexeyev, will be held in Geneva, the residence of the watchful Soviet Arms control negotiator Deputy Foreign Minister Yuli Vorontsov. Vorontsov—in fact Count Vorontsov-Dashkov, according to the older designation of the Russian *nomenklatura*—is the man who not only presides over the U.S.-Soviet arms control talks, but also handles the Soviet policy toward Iran and Soviet policy in Afghanistan, two places which he frequently takes time off from his Geneva duties to visit.

Vorontsov, therefore, will be supervising the work of Djerejian and Alexeyev, and properly so. The entire package of INF (Intermediate Nuclear Forces) negotiations and "regional matters," from the standpoint of the Russian masterplan, aims at the same objective: the summary removal of the United States from Europe, the Middle East, Near East, and Far East. If an INF agreement is eventually signed together with a "resolution" of the Gulf crisis along the lines suggested by Vernon Walters on Sept. 4, then, by the time of the projected summit, the Russians will not only have a defenseless Europe under their military threat, they will also control Europe's energy lifeline in the Middle East. If not reversed, the State Department's present policy will hand over to Moscow the industrial and raw materials resources it need for a final war mobilization against the United States.