

# Pentagon plans for more regional wars

by Leo F. Scanlon

The annual debate over Department of Defense spending plans has been given an unusual spin by the release of classified "war game" scenarios which are used to build the budgetary plans of the Pentagon. The seven scenarios, and the budget they support, have been widely criticized as a Pentagon attempt to continue Cold War funding levels in the "post-communist" era; in fact the scenarios are linear projections of George Bush's "new world order" fantasies, and are as clear an indictment of those policies as one may find.

The scenarios, developed under the direction of Undersecretary of Defense for Policy Paul Wolfowitz, address potential conflicts in different regions. They are being used to shape the inter-service debate over alternative weapons systems, and are draft documents, normally attached to the Defense Planning Guidance.

These scenarios are the expression of a policy shift articulated by George Bush and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher at Aspen, Colorado in June 1990. As the following summary shows, this military policy leads only to chaos and wars that the United States will not win.

First is a **European** crisis, which involves a U.S./NATO military response to a Russian threat to Lithuania. The "out of area" NATO deployment proposes the use of the rapid reaction corps of 24 divisions, 70 fighter squadrons, and 6 carrier battle groups to confront 18 Russian and 6 Belorussian divisions which have seized portions of Poland and Lithuania. The scenario asserts that Russian forces will not use nuclear weapons, an assumption contradicted by recently released planning documents of the Red Army discovered in Germany. The crisis is precipitated by the collapse of current reform efforts and the consolidation of an authoritarian regime in Russia—precisely the likely outcome, if current Bush administration policies continue.

A scenario for the **Middle East** begins with the assumption that U.N. sanctions are still in place against Iraq in 1995, but have slackened enough to allow military rearmament with surplus Russian weapons. The explosive mix erupts in a conflict which involves a replay of the recent slaughter. It is noteworthy that this scenario presents the genocidal sanctions as a long-range policy, which does not affect the ability of Iraq to arm itself. This is quite in line with Bush

administration actions, which make a lot of noise about stopping "weapons of mass destruction," even while they fuel a conventional arms race in the region. That such a scenario is even remotely plausible, serves to indict the Bush administration's use of starvation and disease to force the Iraqi population to create a government acceptable to Washington.

A crisis in **Panama** is precipitated when "right-wing police" and "narco-terrorists" based in Panama and Colombia seize the Panama Canal and threaten American military personnel and civilians. Again, the leading feature of the theme is chaos, provoked in this case by the disintegration of a government which was created by the Bush administration.

The imperial arrogance extends to the **Philippines**, where a scenario predicts that another U.S. puppet government disintegrates in the face of a resurgent New People's Army.

It is not hypothesized who might be funding the "anti-American" insurgencies in **Asia**, and except for the possibility that North Korea might invade South Korea, no real assessment of the prospects facing China or Japan is presented in those scenarios which have been leaked so far. Although George Bush's friends in Beijing are not mentioned, the scenarios do include the possibility that a nameless superpower develops into a "resurgent/emergent global threat," or "REGT," and initiates a prolonged global war. Significantly, that scenario is the only one for which there is no outcome favorable to the United States.

## 'The biggest killer on the block'

The planners using these scenarios will build a military which is not designed to defend the United States or its allies, but one which is intended to intervene into these crises as a primary aspect of foreign policy. Rep. Les Aspin (D-Wisc.), the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and a leading saboteur of the original Strategic Defense Initiative military strategy, has emphasized that U.S. policy must be premised on a willingness to carry out "preemptive intervention" into Third World countries which achieve a technological sophistication sufficient to challenge U.S. conventional military technologies. Aspin is reported to have gloated to a group of NATO strategists in Munich recently that this threat will deter, because the U.S. is certified as "the biggest killer on the block."

The policies which have brought the country and the military to this sorry state pre-date the Cold War, and actually are a continuation of the pattern established at Versailles in 1919: the creation of political alliances, backed by military might, to defend a world power system based on usury.

Chief of Staff of the Army Gen. Gordon Sullivan recently wrote in the *Washington Post* that military conflict could be caused by "unfair or governmentally restricted competition for resources and markets that threatens our economic well being." The International Monetary Fund's austerity conditionalities and the Bush free trade dogma will guarantee just those conditions.