

## Qaddafi's toppling will stop appeasers' 'New Yalta'

by Criton Zoakos

One of the principal objectives of President Reagan's decision to order the successful April 14 air raid against Muammar Qaddafi's terror headquarters in Libya, was to stop a Moscow-ordered terror campaign designed to lead to a withdrawal of the 330,000 American troops in Europe. This projected withdrawal of U.S. troops has many overt and covert adherents both in the U.S. State Department and in Western Europe's foreign ministries—it is viewed as one of the most essential ingredients of the "New Yalta Deal," to reduce American power projection worldwide to "approximately 25% of its postwar extent," as Henry Kissinger had argued back in August 1982.

Decisions had been taken at the February 1986 Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, to launch, through Libyan and other surrogates, a sustained terror campaign throughout Europe against American and American-related targets. Even prior to the West Berlin La Belle discothèque bombing of April 5, many Western European and especially German newspapers had expressed serious concern that the combined pressure of terrorist attacks and artificially fanned anti-American propaganda, might soon force a withdrawal of American troops from Europe.

When British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher defended her policy of providing crucial aid to the American raid against Qaddafi, she pointed out, quite forcefully, that it is the obligation of European governments to provide all the support needed for the protection of "330,000 United States troops who are on guard defending the liberties of Europe." West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, in a series of public statements following the raid, repeated Thatcher's theme of

European governments' obligation to come to the support of the American presence in Europe, now threatened by the Moscow-orchestrated terror wave.

President Reagan himself, in his internationally televised address two hours after the air raid, on April 14, issued a strong warning against the "appeaser" tendencies within the West, to the effect that the war against terrorism which had just begun, is going to continue until the end.

The combined result of the successful military raid and the firm diplomatic and political offensive from the White House which accompanied the raid, has had a shocking effect, not only on the "mad dog of the Middle East," Colonel Qaddafi, but also on the entire coterie of "mad dog-lovers" among the appeasers' faction in Western diplomatic services.

### 'Mad dog' Qaddafi-lovers in the West

You will recall the pathetic Jimmy Carter, the brother of Libyan businessman Billy Carter. He was one of a large group, associated with David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission, committed to a policy of bolstering up the Qaddafi regime. Qaddafi himself was elevated to power in 1969 by Kissinger, in a saga that would better be told some other time. The support and promotion of Qaddafi from a demented lieutenant of the Signal Corps, to chief troublemaker of the People's Jamahiriya of Libya, involved a significant portion of the U.S. intelligence community since the time that William Colby was director of the CIA. It will also be recalled that, during that time, most American businessmen: the e-quarters of Libya's oil was pumped by Occidental Petroleum, Conoco, Marathon Oil,

and Amerada Hess. The names behind the companies were: Armand Hammer, Edgar Bronfman, and Max Fisher.

In Europe, the most prominent Qaddafi promoters are public figures with political signatures similar to those of Libyan businessman Billy Carter's brother Jimmy. These are to be found in the Italian foreign ministry of Giulio Andreotti, the West German foreign ministry of Hans-Dietrich Genscher, France's presidential palace, around the persons of adviser Regis Debray and Mrs. Danielle Mitterrand, the top ranks of the European Socialist International, and the entire Greek government of "Boston Brahmin" Prime Minister Andreas Papandreu, the Socialist darling of CIA Deputy Director for Clandestine Services Clair George.

Though it may not have been the initial precalculated intention of President Reagan, the most important victims of his impeccably executed strike against Qaddafi's terror headquarters, were the coterie of senior international diplomats both in the State Department and in other Western nations' foreign services—such as Andreotti and Genscher.

These Western backers of the Qaddafi regime had viewed their peculiar protégé as both a symbol and an important instrument of their policy of collaboration with, and appeasement of, Soviet expansionist policies. The imminent collapse of Qaddafi puts in jeopardy the entire program of Western appeasers which goes under the rubric of "New Yalta." It will be recalled that Muammar Qaddafi was put in power in September 1969, on the basis of a policy perspective of Henry Kissinger's, then National Security Adviser, who wished to transform Libya from a pro-Western country to one ruled by a "power-sharing" arrangement together with the Soviets. On the basis of Kissinger's delivery of Libya to Moscow, the broader policy of "détente," "arms control," and SALT agreements between East and West followed.

A dissection of the various international cliques controlling the Qaddafi regime has brought to light a very unique group of power-brokers spanning both East and West, which, among intelligence specialists, is nicknamed "The Trust." This "Trust" is now in jeopardy, as a result of the April 14 raid. Armand Hammer, Libya's premier businessman, best exemplifies the type of the high-powered multinational power-brokers; Italy's Venetian banking and insurance cartel was another of Qaddafi's principal supports; the French Socialist Party's bosses a third; and then, of course, the Russians and East Germans.

When Kissinger, in September 1969, altered the character of the Libyan state by introducing the Qaddafi regime, he was in fact fulfilling a Soviet request which dates back to the Potsdam Conference among Stalin, Churchill, and Truman. The matter is not unimportant, in light of the decisions that will have to be made in numerous capitals respecting the future of a post-Qaddafi Libya in the weeks ahead: The Russians in Potsdam proposed that Libya, then still an Italian colony, be divided into four allied zones—Russian, American, British, and French—and administered in more or less

the same way as Berlin. All Western allies objected, and the matter of Libya's status remained unresolved until 1951. From 1943 to 1951, the country was ruled by a British Provisional Military Administration in Cyrenaica and Tripolitania, and a French one in Fezzan. During 1948, there was a "Bevin-Sforza Plan," to divide Libya three ways: Cyrenaica to Britain, Tripolitania to Italy, Fezzan to France. Eventually, the United Nations General Assembly voted to create a Libyan state in its present form. The 1951-69 regime of King Idris al Sanussi followed a pro-Western policy.

When the King was overthrown by Qaddafi in 1969, the power-and-influence balance inside Libya eventually settled along the lines originally suggested by Stalin at Potsdam. It is this arrangement which is about to disintegrate, after the April 14 American action.

### **Toward the Tokyo summit**

If in the weeks ahead, the Qaddafi regime disintegrates, the dirty linen of the appeasers' factions in the major Western nations will be aired and washed in public. As the more astute among these latter-day Chamberlains have observed, their days are numbered. It is likely that this entire "parallel power structure," from Papandreu to Genscher, Andreotti, Debray, et al, which was brought into prominence and influence, and in some instances to full power, as a result of Kissinger's 1970s strategies, may soon be eclipsed in the aftermath of the Qaddafi regime's collapse.

Should this occur, the entire strategy of European "decoupling" from the United States, the "New Yalta" deal, is bound to begin coming apart. With this, the underpinnings of a disastrous United States long-term foreign policy which were established during the 1969-75 period will collapse, clearing the decks for a new, rational foreign policy. President Reagan has made it clear that, during the upcoming May 4-6 annual Economic Summit, the subject of a joint Western anti-terrorist plan will occupy the top of the agenda and will overshadow all other issues. If Reagan succeeds in rallying the leading Western countries behind an effective anti-terror strategy, he will have established a hegemonic anti-appeasement consensus in the West.

For those who profess to be "concerned," and "worried," that a strong U.S. stand against Qaddafi will "alienate" the European allies: If the rotten Qaddafi regime were to be put out of its misery before the Tokyo summit, Europe's response would be not only enthusiasm and relief, but also an awakened interest in kicking the appeasers out of office. When Margaret Thatcher took her courageous stand, she received a whopping 325-206 vote of approval from Parliament, despite the impotent howls of Neil Kinnock and his likes—the largest margin of vote for Thatcher since Lord Carrington's Foreign Office mafia tried to "watergate" her out of office two months ago. If Reagan topples Qaddafi, the foreign ministry appeasers will be talking themselves out of employment.