

U.S. Soviet 'experts' seek to push Moscow to the wall

by Herbert Quinde

The Soviet military-industrial-KGB complex continues to publicly express its rejection of the Bush administration's new world order. But the arrogance of power demonstrable in President Bush's policy to "install a MacArthur in Baghdad," as one senior diplomatic source characterized it, seems eventually headed for a direct East-West conflict. The heady euphoria accompanying the military defeat of Iraq has exacerbated the strategic misperceptions of the Anglo-American establishment, leading to a severe miscalculation of how much bullying the Soviets will put up with.

What is being put forward by the Americans, in close collaboration with the British, is a new Roman Empire, which includes a flight forward against the other military superpower. (see accompanying article for Soviet view.)

Neo-conservative ideologue Charles Krauthammer, writing in the recent issue of *Foreign Affairs*, most clearly reflects the infectious Roman imperial delusions that are spreading throughout Washington, D.C. as the media intoxicates the public with a sense of American invincibility. "Our best hope for safety," writes Krauthammer, "is in American strength and will . . . to lead a *unipolar world*, unashamedly laying down the rules of world order and being prepared to enforce them."

Gulf war fortuitous, says Kissinger

The mechanics of a U.S.-dominated unipolar world were explicated by Mr. Geopolitics himself, Dr. Henry Kissinger, in a Feb. 24 commentary in the *Los Angeles Times*. Self-admitted British agent Kissinger notes that the Gulf adventure of the Bush administration will be viewed as a fortuitous event that occurred just as the U.S. began a major military mobilization.

"There is no escaping the irony," writes Kissinger, "that

our triumph in the Cold War has projected us into a world where we must operate by maxims that historically have made Americans uncomfortable. To many Americans, the most objectionable feature of the balance of power is its apparent moral neutrality, for the balance of power is concerned, above all, with preventing one power or group of powers from achieving hegemony. Winston Churchill described it: 'The policy of England takes no account of which nation it is that seeks the overlordship of Europe. It is concerned solely with whoever is the strongest or the potentially dominating tyrant. It is a law of public policy which we are following, and not a mere expedient dictated by accidental circumstances or likes or dislikes.'

"A policy based on such concepts knows few permanent enemies and few permanent friends," Kissinger continues. "In the Gulf crisis, it would seek to balance rivalries as old as history by striving for an equilibrium between Iraq, Iran, Syria, and other regional powers. In Northeast Asia, it would seek to maintain equilibrium between China, Japan, and the Soviet Union. In Europe, where the old balance has collapsed, the shape of its successor will depend on the outcome of the Soviet Union's internal struggles, especially on the Soviet capacity to continue its historic role in Europe.

"These balances need a balancer. . . . Paradoxically, no nation is better able to contribute to a new world order than the United States: It is domestically cohesive, its economy is less vulnerable to outside forces, its military capacity for the foreseeable future is still the world's largest and most effective. Our challenge is the price of success," he concludes.

New line: the Soviets are no superpower

Once Iraq is defeated, the U.S. should make it clear to the Soviet leadership that they no longer will be treated as

a superpower, such experts say. Such "New Think" was expressed in a Feb. 25 *Washington Times* commentary by conservative columnist Georgie Ann Geyer entitled "Hallet's Falling Off." What has become evident "these last few weeks," Geyer opines, "is the extent to which Mr. Gorbachov and Saddam are conspiring over their own profoundly failed plans and societies. They send envoys scurrying across the desert in the dark of night to avoid the power and brilliance of American weaponry. Each man waits isolated in an increasingly empty center, while others move into place around them. . . ."

"Mr. Gorbachov is reduced to watching a historic moment: The weaponry for which his Soviet Union bankrupted itself stands up to American technology the way spears face machine guns.

"And the final indignity for both leaders is that they are trying to outfox the only country—the United States and the Western capitalist world—that could help them. But then these two men are only in the short-meter dash."

The provocative policy planned by the Anglo-Americans was anticipated in the London *Sunday Telegraph*, where U.S. columnist Xan Smiley on Feb. 24 said that the U.S. intends to carry out the following measures:

- A White House invitation for opposition leader Yeltsin;
- Cutoff of food and other financial aid until major "free market reforms" are made;
- Direct U.S. recognition of the Baltic states;
- Deny the Soviets any role in postwar Middle East diplomacy.

Smiley says he is quoting from a "source very close to Dick Cheney," and that there is under way "a drastic reexamination of relations that has been delayed by the war and [U.S.] sense that we had to have [Gorbachov] on board for the U.N. resolution and so on." The reevaluation apparently overlooks or dismisses the increasing evidence of Soviet military concern and capability to act.

Charging ahead

Recently beknighted Sir Caspar Weinberger, secretary of defense in the Reagan administration, has been the most vocal of an increasing number of conservatives who are calling for Bush to affirm American "unilateralism" by dumping the condominium policy with Gorbachov. Weinberger has repeatedly accused the Soviets of providing direct military assistance to Iraq in the Kuwaiti theater, including having Soviet military advisers manning Iraqi Scud missile launchers.

Weinberger is among a grouping of former Gorbachov cheerleaders and "skeptics" of glasnost and perestroika, including the CIA's Robert Gates, who have banded together calling for the U.S. to take advantage of apparent Soviet weakness. The American Defense Lobby recently articulated the new line in a white paper entitled "The Soviet-Iraq Con-

nection: Soviet Duplicity in the Gulf." It proposes "recalibrating the correlation of forces," concluding that "the dissolution of the Soviet empire under the control of the Communist Party" is "accelerating." Therefore, "the United States, while facing some domestic economic problems during the summer of 1990," is "widely acknowledged as the only viable global 'superpower,' " and has successfully proceeded "to fill the vacuum on the world stage."

Sol Sanders, a strategic analyst and author of a recent book, *Living Off the West: Gorbachov's Secret Agenda and Why It Will Fail*, is unapologetic in espousing the new Pax Americana. There is no strategic downside to the U.S. war against Iraq, he writes. The Soviets will stand down; there will be no Muslim backlash that has any consequence. "Give me ten cents and I can start a riot in Karachi tomorrow and kill 50,000 people, that is just Third World politics . . . after Saddam is dragged through the street by his heels . . . no one will ever challenge the U.S. again," Sanders stated cynically.

Similar analyses add that the real intentions behind Soviet diplomacy in the Persian Gulf was a desperate desire to stop the crushing defeat of Soviet-made military hardware. What Third World country will want to buy inferior military equipment from the Soviets after its dismal performance on the Gulf battlefield?

Desert Stormtroopers

Supporting Bush's new world order is the recently created Coalition for Desert Storm, organized by the National Security Caucus in the U.S. Congress and administered by the American Security Council, which published a political ad in the Feb. 27 *Washington Post*. The coalition is co-chaired by former Presidents Reagan, Ford, and Nixon, and made up of Kissingerians, conservatives, Iran-Contra neo-conservatives, Anti-Defamation League (ADL) types, and "pro-defense" Democrats. Prescott Bush, the President's brother, is listed in the ad along with a bevy of Trilateralists and members of the Council on Foreign Relations.

There is also a wave of propaganda about how the Soviets were involved in Iraq. Public source reports have confirmed widespread rumors that Soviet military advisers have provided tactical intelligence in the field, satellite intelligence, SS-12 Scaleboard missiles, as well as resupplying military hardware via truck convoys originating in the U.S.S.R. which have traveled through Iran to Iraq. The Jan. 14 *Navy News & Underseas Technology* reported that the both U.S. and British intelligence confirmed that "12 flights of fully loaded AN-124 and/or AN-22 [Soviet] transport aircraft are landing every day" at "a military airport near Baghdad."

But, far from providing the assistance out of concern for Saddam Hussein, the Soviet military command has looked upon the Iraqi Army as a testing ground which has allowed Red Army specialists to get a closeup look at top-of-the-line U.S. military hardware and evaluate the U.S. "Airland Battle" military doctrine.