

## U.S. uses Gulf crisis to wage war on Germany, Japan

by Kathleen Klenetsky

The crisis in the Persian Gulf has provided the Bush administration with a perfect opportunity to pursue one of the principal goals of the Anglo-American policy combination: the destruction of the few pockets of high-technology, production-oriented, economic activity in the world, namely, Japan and several Western European countries, and above all the soon-to-be reunified Germany.

Anyone who has looked at recent issues of the *Congressional Record*, or has read between the lines of the Bush administration's pronouncements on the crisis, would quickly come to the conclusion that the real target of "Operation Desert Shield," is not so much Iraq, as it is those industrialized countries that Washington and London see as a threat and a challenge to their own, failed policies of "free trade" and deindustrialization.

As Secretary of State James Baker and Treasury Secretary Nicholas Brady, wended their way through Europe and Asia—begging bowls in one hand and threats in the other—to demand financial, military, and other forms of aid for the Gulf intervention, Congress backed them up by letting loose a torrent of abuse against America's allies.

Congress's main complaint was that neither Europe nor Japan have shouldered their share of the burden for the American military deployment. In other words, Congress is upset that the Europeans and Japanese have been reluctant to become enmeshed in Bush's imperialist adventure in the Middle East, and less than enthusiastic about the oil embargo, and consequent skyrocketing in world oil prices, that Bush—not Iraq, mind you—has imposed.

The rhetoric employed on the floor of Congress against America's allies has been astoundingly antagonistic. Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) accused Germany of "contemptible tokenism" for not pledging more money to the U.S. interven-

tion, and warned that Germany's attitude could "dramatically erode the very strong relationship" between Washington and Bonn. Rep. Carroll Hubbard (D-Ky.) asserted that the "Japanese have been acting the way they usually do: If there's no profit in it for Japan, forget it." But Rep. Les Aspin (D-Wisc.), chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, contended that "if you're picking on one country, it should be Germany, which is doing even less than Japan."

Congress's ally-bashing orgy has gone way beyond rhetoric. Of many measures put forth to punish Germany and Japan for their recalcitrance, some have already been adopted. On Sept. 10, the Senate passed an amendment, submitted by Sen. Dennis DeConcini (D-N.M.), calling on the President to take "the diplomatic initiative to encourage other nations to share the international financial burden of the defense of Saudi Arabia," and to ensure that those allies who are not involved militarily in the Gulf action assume "an appropriate financial share of the collective defense."

Although the measure did not specify sanctions to back up the "diplomatic initiative" it mandates, there has been no lack of these. For example, the House voted Sept. 11 to slap a 20% increase in import duties on any ally that does not pay its "fair share" in the crisis.

In the most headline-getting move, the House also approved, by a lopsided 370-53 vote, an amendment to the defense authorization bill that would force Japan to foot the full cost of stationing U.S. troops in that country. Sponsored by Rep. David Bonior (D-Mich.), the measure was directly linked to Japan's participation in the Gulf intervention. If enacted, it will require Japan to pay \$7.4 billion per year—the total cost of supporting U.S. forces in Japan—or face the phased withdrawal of all American troops over the next ten years. Invoking President Bush's phrases from his national

television broadcast Sept. 11, Bonior called the measure a “wake-up call for a new world order” in which Japan and other allies “must bear their fair share of the burden.”

Bonior and his colleagues may have gotten a macho kick out of their accomplishment, but the real interests which are being hurt are those of the U.S. As one Japanese official put it: “To withdraw 5,000 troops a year from Japan is sheer nonsense. It would destroy not only the national interests of Japan, but of the United States as well.” American troops are in Japan “not for the narrow purpose of defending Japan alone,” but to protect “American interests in the Pacific and Indian Oceans.”

The entire purpose of “Operation Desert Shield” is to undermine allied interests. Already, the U.S. deployment has sent oil prices skyward, with predictions of even greater increases to come. Now, hints are appearing that the U.S.’s true purpose is to permanently occupy the Saudi oilfields, taking de facto control of the production and sale of the bulk of the Mideast oil supply—on which Europe and Japan so crucially depend. James Akin, the former ambassador to Saudi Arabia, points to this possibility in a commentary published in the *Los Angeles Times* and the *Virginia-Pilot*. He recalls that back in 1975, then-Secretary of State Henry Kissinger supported a proposal for seizing the Saudi oilfields—even to the point of exterminating the Arabs living there. This same scenario is in the works again with the U.S. Gulf deployment, he writes.

This is hardly far-fetched. Administration spokesmen are already talking about keeping U.S. troops in place far longer than initially disclosed. *National Review*’s William Buckley suggested that Japan be forced to pay for oil at a rate that would eliminate its trade deficit with the U.S.

### **Target: German reunification**

German reunification—which threatens to pull the props out from under the anti-development policies promoted by the Anglo-American elite—is clearly one of the main targets of the Anglo-American powers orchestrating the whole Gulf scenario.

George Bush and Maggie Thatcher have already announced that they will not be able to attend the Oct. 3 ceremonies signifying the formal reunification of the divided nation—an action correctly read in Bonn as a show of antagonism to one of the most important developments of the postwar era. In addition, the Bush administration has decided to send to the Senate for ratification, the recently signed treaty restoring German sovereignty, and formally opening the way for reunification—which will give the Senate yet another forum for venting its spleen against a country that is doing something right.

On Sept. 13, the U.S. Senate, taking advantage of the war hysteria, passed two amendments to the Export Administration Act that are intended as economic warfare against Germany. Sponsored by Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), they

call for 1) preventing “the shipment to Iraq, Iran, Syria, or Libya of materials or technology which would assist the ability of such countries to develop, produce, or stockpile, chemical, biological or nuclear weapons or ballistic missiles”; and 2) providing for the “imposition of sanctions on countries which use chemical or biological weapons and on corporations which assist Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya or certain other countries to obtain, develop or stockpile chemical, biological or nuclear weapons, and for other purposes.”

While seemingly aimed at curbing the spread of lethal weapons, the real objective of the amendments—like most of the so-called “anti-proliferation” policies in place, or being proposed—is to prevent Germany, Japan and others from transferring to developing countries those advanced technologies that would enable them to industrialize, and free themselves from being exploited raw materials exporters.

Networks associated with Project Democracy, the “secret government” which orchestrated Iran-Contra, is smack in the middle of this operation. The Center for Security Policy, a Washington-based think tank whose board includes such key Project Democracy functionaries as Richard Perle to Elliott Abrams, played a pivotal role in developing the Helms amendments. As a result, an informed source reports, Helms “definitely had Germany in mind” when he proposed them.

Helms was purportedly motivated by the case of Imhausen, the German firm which helped build the Libyan chemicals plant at Rabta. The center has just put out a report, “Rabtagate: The Inside Story of German Collusion in the Libyan Chemical Warfare Program,” which concludes that Germany’s transfer of “dangerous technology” to Libya and Iraq is “the product of an as yet unchanging, fatal willingness at the highest levels of German industry and officialdom to subordinate common Western security interests to narrow parochialism and greed.”

Subsequently, White confided to a journalist that a reunified Germany is the center’s major “concern.” “Once Oct. 3 comes around, there will be an absolute hemorrhage of sensitive West German technology to the Soviet Union. . . . The Germans have indirectly said to us, through their multi-billion-dollar aid package to Moscow, that they’re far more interested in good relationships with the Soviets, than they are with us. I think that there is a high possibility that the Germans could say, ‘To hell with CoCom [export controls]; we need relations with the Soviets more than with Washington, so we will sell Moscow what we want to.’ ”

On Sept. 4, center director Frank Gaffney, in a commentary for the *Washington Times*, called on Bush to “impose import sanctions against German companies judged to have violated regulations controlling exports.” In addition, he said, Congress should immediately hold hearings into German export practices. “The model for those hearings could be the congressional inquiries of half a century ago when those who sold Japan scrap metal subsequently used to attack U.S. forces were held to account.”