

## 'Balance of power' spells Gulf humiliation

by Linda de Hoyos

Speaking from Geneva May 25, Saudi Arabia Oil Minister Zaki Yamani delivered a warning to the Western powers to cease their balance-of-power posture toward the escalating Iran-Iraq war. "We think those nations who played with this fire at the beginning and let the war escalate and helped the Iranians with a lot of weapons are really hurting the interests of the West."

It is not known to what degree Yamani's message got through to the White House. On May 25, the Reagan administration announced that it was sending two more naval vessels to the Gulf—joining two other ships in the Gulf and the aircraft carrier Kitty Hawk which has been stationed in the north Arabian Sea—and that the President intended to use his executive powers to immediately deliver 200 out of a requested 1,200 land-to-air Stinger missiles to Saudi Arabia, overriding Israeli objections.

But the United States is walking into another pratfall, a repeat of the February debacle in Lebanon, where the failure to act decisively placed U.S. forces in an untenable military position and destroyed American credibility worldwide. The catch phrase for the choice of half-measures on behalf of maintaining "balance" this time around is the commitment reaffirmed by National Security Adviser Robert McFarlane, State Secretary George Shultz, and the President himself "to keep the Persian Gulf open." This policy formulation begs the real question raised by the Saudi oil minister: Why does the United States continue to bolster the Khomeini regime when the results of that policy are exposing all the Gulf oil-producing countries to engulfment by Iran's "Islamic Revolution" and prolonging a war that could at any moment break into a full-scale superpower showdown?

As presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche has pointed out, Iran has declared itself in a state of war with the United States. Last week, Iranian President Ali Khamenei pro-

claimed that if the United States intervenes in the war, it will "receive a slap far harder than the one it received in Lebanon"; Foreign Minister Velayati threatened to "set the whole region on fire"; and State Department favorite, Speaker of the House Hashemi Rafsanjani threatened a "war against the world." U.S. law enforcement authorities are now on a red alert for an expected outbreak of Iranian-sponsored terrorism in the United States directed at government officials, including the President. Why then, as Yamani asserts, does the United States maintain an even-handed approach to the Gulf war, spurning its Arab allies' demands for aid against Ayatollah Khomeini, and slowly but surely allow itself to be sucked into another military deployment with no clear objective?

### 'Not a conspiracy'

The answer to those questions is not to be found in the Oval Office—but among the "VIPs" who attended the conference of the prestigious Bilderberg Group May 14 in Stockholm, Sweden. The Bilderberg Group features prominent representatives of the European oligarchy, including the Netherlands royal family and Royal Dutch Shell oil interests—the same grouping that has cut a "New Yalta" deal with the Soviet Union in which the Russian Empire will exert hegemony over the Middle East and northern Africa, and a destroyed United States is to be limited to its quarters in the Western Hemisphere. Attendees at this conference included Soviet agent-of-influence Henry Kissinger, David Rockefeller, and recording secretary Flora Lewis.

Top item on the agenda: the Persian Gulf crisis. The consensus to emerge, according to Lewis's May 16 account, was that the war represented a "serious danger for everybody" and is likely to provoke an "Islamic upheaval" throughout the Mideast. The agreement extended further: that although

the "ideal solution" would be the "simultaneous downfall" of both regimes, the Bilderberg elite would probably be limited to the next best option—to "to keep the war going by supplying both sides with arms and money." This is not, however, Lewis reassures her readers, "any classical conspiracy or Communist or capitalist plot."

On the same weekend, across the Atlantic, Yuri Primakov, the head of the Soviet Oriental Institute, was in Cambridge, Mass., meeting with the Harvard Crisis Management group, where the Mideast was again at the top of the agenda. Reportedly, Primakov warned that an inadvertent action or uncontrollable element in the war could cause a major crisis—as if Syria had decided to attack the U.S.S. Jersey during the Lebanon crisis. Aside from this, since the Reagan administration is likely to be dragged into the conflict by Saudi Arabia, Iran would be likely to cut a deal with the Soviet Union.

The administration is reportedly operating on the basis of just such a fear, or worse, fear of a Soviet military move into Iran should the Khomeini regime become too weakened by the war and growing internal unrest. It is a fear the Soviets, who, as *EIR* has conclusively proved, already have extensive control over Iran operating through Politburo member Geidar Aliyev, are deliberately promoting.

The signal that the United States would remain locked in a policy framework provided by Kissinger, was the statement made by a U.S. diplomat in Islamabad, Pakistan on May 14. Speaking just before Vice-President George Bush was due to arrive for discussions with President Zia ul-Haq, the diplomat told reporters that the United States would ask Zia to help mediate the Iran-Iraq war, since Pakistan has good relations with Iran "and that is important to us." The diplomat then proceeded to say he believed relations between the United States and Iran would be re-established, "perhaps not right away, but in a year, 5 years, or 20 years." Early this week, Secretary of State George Shultz consulted with Pakistani Foreign Minister Yaqub Khan in Washington to discuss the progress of the U.S. bid to cajole Iran.

It is now expected that the United States will go on the record with this policy and veto a resolution "strongly" condemning the Iranian bombing of shipping in the Gulf put forward in the United Nations Security Council by the countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council—American allies Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar, Oman, the United Arab Emirates, and Bahrain. The U.S. complaint is that the resolution does not equally attack Iraq.

The Gulf states have made clear that they are not interested in half-way measures from the United States that will only make matters worse and open the door for a superpower confrontation in the region. While attacking the United States for "indifference" to the Khomeini danger, Kuwaiti Foreign Minister Al Sabah stated May 17 that "Iranian attacks against oil tankers in the Gulf will give the superpowers the pretext they need to intervene in the region. We are trying to push back these superpowers. . . . I hope we will not reach a stage

where we will find these superpowers in our territorial waters and soil."

## Preparations for a blowout

The Soviets are taking the same tack as the United States. According to wire releases of May 26, U.S. and Soviet representatives, meeting informally in Washington, agreed that both superpowers will veto the Gulf Cooperation Council resolution and both will militarily stay out of the Gulf.

In addition, the Soviets, with U.S. assent to be sure, have reportedly told the Iraqis to stop bombing Iranian shipping because it will only provoke the Khomeini regime into a massive counterattack. This ignores the fact that the Iraqis launched their attack on Iranian shipping in the Gulf in order to preempt an Iranian human wave assault that was known to be in preparation.

Given these facts, the agreement by Soviet and American diplomats is clear: the Bilderberg conference and Primakov's discussions with the Harvard Crisis-Management group have produced a superpower agreement, now in effect on both sides, to maintain Khomeini in power.

The stage is now set up for a total blow-up in the Gulf. After Lloyds of London more than doubled insurance rates after the Iraqis had sunk eight Iranian vessels on May 25, all commercial shipping in the Gulf, including that of Japan which receives 60% of its oil from Gulf ports, has been pulled out of the area.

With the superpowers behind him, Khomeini has effectively been given a carte blanche to wreak havoc upon the area. Intelligence sources in Washington report that the Iranians may be planning to destroy Saudi oil fields, and launch a new human wave assault into Iraq on June 1, the first day of Ramadan, the Islamic month of fasting.

The Soviets are now preparing for total chaos to break out in the region, reinforcing security in the Gulf and Lebanese embassies and strengthening Soviet troop deployments on the Iran-Aghan border. As for the United States, intelligence sources believe that if Khomeini strikes at Gulf oil fields, Washington would be forced to intervene militarily. The deal struck with the Soviets has done nothing for the American position, nor for the avoidance of superpower confrontation. What it has done is to buy the Soviets and their imams time to establish the most advantageous conditions for a blow-up.

With the Syrian-sponsored government in Lebanon now ordering the United States to mediate the withdrawal of Israeli troops in the south; with the consensus growing that the Soviet Union must be involved in any peace negotiations on the Arab-Israeli conflict; and with the Israelis now talking openly of Moscow's desire to re-open friendly relations with Jerusalem, the stage has been set in the Gulf to put a permanent end to U.S. presence in the Middle East.

The only way out is for the Reagan administration to blow up the game itself, and take decisive action against the dark ages regime of Iran.