

Plan to occupy Saudi Arabia is an old one

A column by former U.S. Ambassador to Saudi Arabia James E. Akins in the Sept. 12 *Los Angeles Times* reveals that a U.S. plan to occupy the Saudi oil fields was planned as far back as 1975. Iraq has maintained that seizing control of the Persian Gulf oilfields was one of the primary motivations for Bush's decision to send U.S. troops into the region.

According to Akins, "In January 1975, the neo-conservative publication *Commentary* carried an article proposing invasion of Saudi Arabia as a solution to the eternal Arab problem and to our own economic problems. A flurry of similar articles followed that proposed occupying oilfields on the peninsula from Kuwait to Dubai, pumping them dry, and in 50 years or so returning the properties to their original owners.

"I was Ambassador to Jeddah at the time, and I was appalled by the cynicism and the immorality of the suggestion. . . .

"I suggested that anyone who would take this proposition seriously was a madman, a criminal, or a Soviet agent. Henry Kissinger, the secretary of state, had another view, and my career in the Foreign Service did not extend much beyond that point. . . .

"Nevertheless, there are those in the Bush administration who will point out that conditions are more propitious now than in 1975 for at least a de facto military occupation of the Saudi oilfields. . . .

"Those in and out of the U.S. government—including Kissinger—who were serious about taking over the oilfields in 1975 surely will argue that we should not let these extraordinary resources go, now that they are in our control."

might create something like NATO in the region, perhaps a permanent base in Kuwait once seized from Iraq, a permanent base in Saudi Arabia, apparently something like CENTO of the previous period. There is a certain concern in Europe and Japan that this arrangement would be linked to NATO out-of-area deployments into the region. What is Iraq's view of this proposal?

al-Mashat: We would not accept that at all, because this is a new form of a new imperialism. Security could be established in two ways. First—which is what we prefer—is between and among the Arabs, and supported by the Security

Council, by the U.N. This is the security that would be fair to everybody. The security arrangement spoken about by Baker is a camouflage for the occupation of the Holy Land and the Arab land, to control the oil. It is a false control, because as I said before, we could make arrangements to have fair oil prices that would benefit everybody. We are against jacking prices too high, because we want to sell the oil, and make it cheaper than other sources. This is our official policy. We don't want you to develop alternative sources of energy.

So all of this is false pretexts for this planned military action in the area. It will not work; believe me, it will not work. The previous arrangements, like CENTO, the Baghdad Pact, did not work and it collapsed. Nowadays, the possibility of collapse is much more than before, because the Arabs have awakened. And if you think you have security with some puppet government, this is an illusion, a mirage. It is unfortunate, it will not work; with all the power you bring to bear, it will not work.

the arbiter. It never was before, even at the time when the Arab was not as awakened as today.

EIR: Iraq has played a crucial role in attempting to maintain the territorial integrity of Lebanon. And for this there have been many attacks and the blaming of Iraq for much of what has happened there.

al-Mashat: Those who claim this are making a false statement. We supported the legitimate government of Michel Aoun in Lebanon when it was appointed by Amin Gemayel, because it was appointed according to their Constitution. When one legitimate Arab government asked for help, we gave it to them. But then, when the tripartite Arab committee, which had been delegated by the Arab summit to solve the Lebanese question, asked us to stop helping them, we stopped; whereas the Syrians and Israelis have been destroying Lebanon for the last 15 years, and are still occupying their country.

EIR: It appears that Syria and Israel continue to do that.

al-Mashat: That's right.

But, to conclude, the problem is that we as Arabs do not feel that there is U.S. policy in the Middle East, but that there is an Israeli expansionist policy implemented by the U.S. with the American taxpayers' money. Through the Israeli lobby there is control of U.S. policy in the area to the detriment of the American taxpayer. It is high time for the Americans to wake up.

EIR: And the British role?

al-Mashat: This is the last breath of the British empire. They wanted to reestablish control by enhancing and supporting and pushing America to take this action. It is tripartite: Israeli, British, and American, together with the conspiracy of the al-Sabah family.