

## Soviet move to Iran no penalty for Western alliance

by Criton Zoakos

On July 17, the French government broke diplomatic relations with Khomeini's Iran and placed the Iranian embassy in Paris on quarantine. The Ayatollah's government, realizing that it cannot bomb French commercial vessels with impunity, is threatening to unleash the fury of its terrorist organizations on France. We are very close to war between France and Iran.

At the same time, the U.S.A. is preparing to provide military escorts to protect Kuwaiti ships from Iranian attacks in the Gulf. Iran, especially its "moderate" Speaker of Parliament Ayatollah Rafsanjani, have announced that if U.S. forces attempt to uphold freedom of navigation, they will find themselves under attack. Also on July 17, Iran and the Soviet Union issued a joint statement in which they "expressed the common opinion that the aggravation of the situation in the Gulf is a result of a buildup by Washington of its military presence off the shores of Iran, Iraq, and other Arab states."

The State Department, with assistance from other parts of the Reagan administration, is mobilized in an effort to pull the United States back from its stated commitment to protect navigation in the Gulf from Iranian blackmail. In fact, secret negotiations between the department's Richard Murphy and Soviet official Evgeni Primakov, in Geneva, suggest that State is making a systematic effort to transfer overall responsibility for the affairs of the Gulf, from the United States, where it has been since the end of the Second World War, to the Kremlin. The department's efforts are widely supported by others.

In fact, the dominant policy-making circles in Washington and European capitals are not thinking clearly about the

current Persian Gulf crisis. Some argue, that if the United States and France respond militarily to attacks by the Khomeinians, that this will either force Teheran into the Soviet camp, or that the Soviets might just move into Iran militarily.

These circles stubbornly refuse to face the fact, that when President Carter and Zbigniew Brzezinski overthrew the Shah, and backed bringing Khomeini's lunatics to power, the United States had already turned Iran over to Moscow at any time Geidar Aliyev's Moscow chose to pick up the option.

Since the time that certain U.S. fellows helped Khomeini by exposing the anti-Khomeini coup-plot of summer 1979, and since the time other fellows around Washington also blew the U.S. hostage-rescue mission, Iran was lost irreparably to the West until such time as the supporters of the young Shah might be able to take the country back.

Remember how the Reagan administration bragged, defending its Israeli-U.S. weapons-smuggling to Khomeini's terrorists, by saying that so-called "moderate" lunatic Rafsanjani was a potential U.S. asset. This "asset" is now leading the charge, in demanding military attack on U.S. vessels in the Gulf. In point of fact, the White House legal defense strategy continues to be that the President was not engaged in "arms for hostages" swaps, but, rather, in a geopolitical gambit of promoting "moderate" Rafsanjani to a position of greater factional influence inside Iran.

The facts are that Carter and Brzezinski, helped by Ramsey Clark, gave Iran to that terrorist lunatic, our devout enemy Khomeini, and that the silly Reagan administration has simply continued Carter's Iranian policy, up to the point that the present Gulf crisis erupted.

One of the reasons that *EIR* has been persecuted and victimized by both the Carter and Reagan administrations has been our insistence on exposing the fact that the Reagan administration simply continued Carter's policy of betraying U.S. interests in the Gulf.

The Soviets could not take Iran, for the simple reason that the United States has already given Iran to Moscow, any time Moscow chooses to take it.

If Carter and Brzezinski gave it to Moscow, Reagan is now fully exposed as collaborating with Israel, to continue Carter's and Brzezinski's policy.

The vital, overriding issue at the moment, is to restore U.S. credibility in the Middle East region. If we back down, State Department-style, we lose our credibility throughout the region, and lose everything in that region as a result of our lost credibility. If we do not back down, we may have a fight in our hands, but a fight we can win.

If Moscow were to move into Iran now, it could spark a fierce and growing resistance to its forces there. This could become a serious strategic blunder for Moscow, diluting its position in an Afghanistan it has otherwise nearly under control, and weakening Soviet destabilization operations in Pakistan, India, and elsewhere.

The United States, of course, must avoid invading any portion of Iran. The policy must be, the security of the Gulf waters for merchant shipping, and U.S. military rules of engagement, free of all State Department interference, to the effect that, in case of attack, U.S. forces respond with a hot pursuit against the source of the attack to the purpose of inflicting maximum damage on the base areas of the forces deployed for the attack.

The worst response, would be for the military to fend off an attack, and then bring in the State Department, to negotiate with Shultz and company what post-action military reprisals might be taken, in measured amounts, with what penalty, against which Iranian targets. All action should be limited to responses under rules of engagement during the heat of the moment of attack, and the hot pursuit damage inflicted upon bases of the attacking forces should be devastating. Once the enemy begins the "incident," the response must be immediate, and brought to a conclusion even before the relevant dispatches reach the State Department desks. By the time the debate begins, the incident should be past history—unless the silly Khomeiniacs decide to escalate, for which contingency we must be prepared to assure that they are no match for our capabilities deployed into that region.

The Soviets will not attack United States military forces at this time. They are not ready for a war with the United States, and any limited attack upon U.S. forces by Soviet forces, would spark a "Pearl Harbor" effect within the populations of the United States and Western Europe. United States military response means walking close to the edge, of course; however, that is unavoidable, since the effect of not doing so would be disastrous. The danger is, the lack of clear thinking and nerve in most parts of Washington.

## Four delusions

This lack of clear thinking is the result of numerous false presumptions which policy makers adopt as premises for their policy making. With respect to the present strategic crisis in the adjacent Gulf-Middle East-Balkan regions, U.S. policy is drifting along as a result of the pre-eminence, of the following false presumptions, in addition to the delusion that Iran is not already in Moscow's claws: that Syria, a wholly owned asset of the Soviet Armed Forces, can play an independent and positive role; that Papandreou's Greece is not, de facto, an informal member of the Warsaw Pact; that "Israel is our closest ally."

These four illusory premises, respecting the nature of the governments in Iran, Syria, Israel, and Greece, though they pervade all, otherwise conflicting factions in Washington, have originated principally with the State Department, the State Department's Policy Planning bureaucracy, and their factional allies in the various agencies of the intelligence community. Others may disagree with the State Department's mythologies respecting these matters, but, daring not to challenge the Department's practical policies, they end up accepting its mythological assertions respecting "moderate mullahs," "anti-terrorist Syrians," "NATO-member Greece," and "closest ally Israel."

There is, at this time, a major internal power struggle inside Israel which, most likely, will determine whether Israel becomes "our closest ally," or not. This power struggle is not unrelated to the ongoing power struggle in Washington, around the Iran and Contra hearings. In effect, the Israeli power struggle is pitting the country's professional military establishment and leading elements of the Labor Party, against the old Meyer Lansky drug-running interests associated with Ariel Sharon and the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC)/Israel lobby forces in Washington.

The Sharon-AIPAC grouping has played a major role, together with elements of the State Department, and various institutional arrangements of the secret government, in bringing to power, not only Khomeini and the Khomeiniacs in Iran, but Soviet agent-of-influence Papandreou in Greece, while saving the bloody Assad regime of Syria from numerous near successful attempts to overthrow it.

Those who oppose the Sharon-AIPAC-"Meyer Lansky" mafia in Israel, including persons close to Foreign Minister Shimon Peres, are pointing out that Secretary of State George Shultz is the greatest problem the U.S.A. has in the region. A senior Israel official close to Peres, accused Shultz of having deliberately sabotaged the prospect of an Israeli-Jordanian agreement, so as to open the floodgates of Soviet influence in the area. "Some say that an international conference would only bring the Soviet Union back in the region. Well, I've got news for them. The Soviets are not waiting to be let into the region. They've kicked the door wide open and they're running all over the place. The question now is, will we bring the United States back into the region? Will there be a role for the United States?"