EIR Feature

Spread of Gulf war will bring back global showdown

In the articles below, members of *EIR*'s intelligence team have taken a look at the global implications of the Persian Gulf war. We contend that it is already spreading out of the confines of the showdown between Iraq and the United States, and renewing the nightmare of which this publication warned more than half a decade ago: a "Global Showdown," in which a United States in decline politically, economically, and morally, would be pitted against a desperate and heavily armed Soviet military regime.

In this package, we look at the world map beyond the Middle Eastern theater, and in particular at Eastern Europe and the Balkans; the continent of Africa; and Asia.

In 1985 and again in 1988, *EIR* released book-length studies of the danger of a *Global Showdown,* highlighted by the warnings of Lyndon LaRouche that the United States would have to pursue a very different policy toward the Soviet sector and toward the world in general, in order to avert the probable outbreak of a new world war—or the equally catastrophic conquest of Western Europe by the Soviets by means other than war. The anti-Bolshevik resistance movement that swept through Eastern Europe between 1988 and 1990 appeared to have lessened that threat. Now we confront it again, because the root causes of the crisis remained untouched.

On Jan. 19, 1991, three days after the United States began bombarding Iraq, Lyndon LaRouche reported that he had received an assessment "from a dear and eminently qualified military expert," that Bush's military problem in the Gulf is that he must, or his generals or soldiers must, destroy Iraq *before* the inevitable spread of the conflict prevents any containment of the war to the Iraqi area from being broken.

"That is a valid military concept offered by our friend, and has to be taken seriously," LaRouche responded. "His point was, that the dynamic of the U.S. attack is such, with the technology and all that sort of thing, that we'll overwhelm Iraq before this factor of decontainment would become the dominant feature of

Soviet M-80 tank in Europe: a blackmail capability that remains in place, in the most important global theater of war. Western combat capabilities have been crippled just as Gorbachov turns toward a brutal crackdown on democratic movements in the U.S.S.R. and East bloc.

the military situation as such." But, LaRouche went on, "at the present rate, our friend's estimate that the U.S. would overwhelm Iraq is called seriously into question, for the following reasons."

A global conflict

"We have several dimensions of a global conflict in progress. One, we have the aspects of the conflict which are centered around the U.S. war against Iraq. This involves Turkey, of course; it involves the Muslim populations of much of the world, increasingly, and involves the nations of the region, with a particular emphasis on the escalation, to include openly, rather than merely implicitly, of the war between the Arabs and Israel. The Israeli-Arab war is now escalating rapidly," he said.

He mentioned as part of this, the protests in various parts of the Arab world, and the likelihood of overthrow or serious destabilization of regimes such as that in Turkey, which have so far supported Mr. Bush.

"More serious, of course, is what will be the reaction in Iran. A change of a type which is, off and on, threatened from Iran on this matter is to be seriously considered, and that spread of the U.S.-Iraq war would be qualitative, as opposed to quantitative," as in the case of the Arab reaction. "The inclusion of other major Islamic forces, possibly signaled by an action of Iran of the type threatened, would be a qualitative shift, as would a shift in Turkey."

He added, "We have the conflict in India which may blow up; the India-Pakistan conflict may take a new form, and these countries are obviously among the next targets of the Bush New World Order policy, as is, of course, Brazil in South America, and so forth, and so on."

The Balkans and the Soviet southern flank

LaRouche then pointed to the Jan. 19 "ultimatum from the Serbian government—the little brother of Moscow's military—against Slovenia and implicitly also Croatia. That means Balkan war. We have the move against the Baltic states, which may have slowed down a bit, but it has not necessarily slowed down very much. We have other crackdowns in the Soviet Union."

Polish President Lech Walesa and Czechoslovak President Vaclav Havel and others are signaling "that the Eastern European states which recently have won a fragile freedom, fear that they are about to lose it in a bloody manner at Soviet hands."

LaRouche concluded, "So, what we have is not a war between the United States and Iraq. We have a war which is spreading in the Islamic world around the Iraq-U.S. war, which appears to be merely an added feature, a flanking feature of an emerging new conflict centered around Moscow and its Balkan assets." The Serbian military, he stressed, is an asset of the tripartite (military-Russian Orthodox Church-KGB) forces coming into a dictatorial position in Moscow now, around the "conservative" lobby that calls itself Soyuz.

He summed up, "The United States is now tied down on a flank of the Soviet Union, in the Islamic world. Bush has

put the United States military, and other related capabilities, into the mud in the Islamic world—just as Napoleon's forces were stuck in the mud in Spain, which ultimately brought Napoleon down, militarily, in terms of weakening his position—while the main issue, the Soviet conflict, which Bush thought he had solved, i.e., the East-West conflict, has now erupted to full magnitude, and the North-South aspects of Bush's conflict policy, or the Thatcher conflict policy, have become a mere appendage to a resurrection of the main lines of conflict which are becoming East-West.

"If the present policy of Bush in the Gulf continues, the erosion of the power of the Anglo-Americans being stuck in the mud of the Islamic world and related places, will mean a rapid Soviet military domination, to overshadowing of continental Europe as a whole, and Japan. And then, ladies and gentlemen, where do we stand? We're back to Global Showdown," the scenario against which LaRouche warned in 1985.

The name for peace is development

LaRouche then reflected on the deeper causes of the present spiraling catastrophe. "The fact of the matter is, that the United States and others did have a chance to support continental Europe in a fundamental change in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. That failed, for essentially one reason: the Thatcher-Bush success, along with others, in imposing the Jeffrey Sachs model of IMF conditionalities, first on Poland, then upon Eastern Europe in general, and threatening to impose it upon the Soviet Union, as the characteristic feature of economic reform.

"That push ensured the Third Rome upsurge which is now taking over the Soviet Union," LaRouche continued, referring to the renewed ideology of Moscow as the capital of a "third and final Roman empire," the old Russian imperial fantasy. "Pope Paul VI said, 'The name for peace is development.' We might also say that the name for avoidance of war is development. Had the development policies which we in particular had proposed, been the leading thrust of German action in the Eastern part of Germany, of Western Europe or continental Europe at least in Eastern Europe, i.e., in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and proposed toward the Soviet Union, we would not be in the strategic mess we're in today.

"The same thing is true, in respect to the Middle East."

LaRouche drew attention to the case of Democratic Sen. Albert Gore (Tenn.), who bolted from the Democratic majority to vote on the side of President Bush in favor of the use of force in the Gulf. "It is relevant that Albert Gore, like his father, was an asset of the late Armand Hammer. What did Gore say, after supporting war in the Middle East? Typical of the Hammer boy. He said that this experience demonstrates the propriety of denying technology to Third World peoples. Now he's drawn up a genocide list. . . .

"These are the same people who have insisted, since particularly late 1967, with the Millionaires' Club meeting in Israel, that there must be no economic development policy for the Middle East. *This has ensured war.*

"The reason why the United States and Britain refuse to allow members of the United Nations to confer on the subject of a global settlement of the issues of the Middle East? This is the issue: Iraq is for development. The Saudis, while they may have some development of a Spartan type, are *opposed* to development of the Middle East. Do not believe anybody who says the contrary. That's a fact. These are oligarchical regimes, which demonstrate that they lack the essential qualities of humanity, and they're about to be overthrown, and doomed, anyway. There's nothing that can save these oligarchical regimes, such as the Saudis at this time. They've just gone too far, they've put the sign of doom upon their own foreheads.

"The Saudis are against development. We've seen it again and again. In Sudan, they were against development. In Egypt, they were against development. Oh, they're for token development. They're for profitable investments. That is, extracting profit from one section of the national economy to invest, by looting the other parts, bringing the other parts to greater poverty than they are already in at present. That's Saudi policy. Let's have no illusions about the Saudis' support for development. They have never been in support of development of the Arab world—not in any real sense. Rather, they have been among the foremost opponents of development, in the Arab world. They're like Spartans. They'd like a little development for themselves, their oligarchy, but not for their people.

"If there had been an economic development negotiation, as we have proposed repeatedly, most emphatically, beginning 1975, when it became public on this in a prominent way, there would be no war in the Middle East today. Had this been *proposed* as the basis for a solution, even during the recent years in a serious way by the U.S. government, as we proposed in our discussions with the Shimon Peres government of Israel, for example, and others; there would be no war in the Middle East today.

"There's war in the Middle East today, because the forces behind Ariel Sharon and others, and the Saudis, *suppressed* these development programs, these development alternatives, and demanded political solutions without economic development. They sought to crush the forces which were, in Israel and elsewhere, which were for development, and have sought an oligarchical solution of the type that Sen. Albert Gore's recent statement demanded.

"The imposition of International Monetary Fund conditionalities, which is the essence of Mr. Bush's and Mrs. Thatcher's New World Order, this form of *global fascism,* and genocide, is the cause for the spreading conflict, not only on the southern flank of the Soviet resurgence in the Islamic world," LaRouche said, but for the resurgence of the Soviet threat in Europe itself. This foreshadows "the early domination of Western Europe and Japan, by overwhelmingly superior armament as the United States destroys its strategic capability in the quagmires of its victims' blood in the Third World."