

Pentagon leaks plan for for U.S. world dictatorship

by Leo F. Scanlon

A classified Pentagon planning document calling for a U.S. strategy based upon the United States asserting itself as the dominant world power has been leaked to the press, providing new evidence of the imminent danger in which George Bush's "new world order," his *pax universalis*, has placed the world. The document is the main component of the bi-annual Defense Planning Guidance, and represents the official Pentagon interpretation of the Bush administration's national strategy.

The war planning document illuminates the British geopolitical strategy lurking behind George Bush's talk of a universal peace: The administration is pursuing policies which will foment instability, while proposing to achieve "control" through measured military intervention. The administration has repeatedly made clear that the target of this strategy is central Europe, with the goal of preventing the emergence of an independent concert of nations intent on economic development outside the constraints of the International Monetary Fund system. In the language of the Pentagon planners, the United States must pursue strategies which will convince "potential competitors that they need not aspire to a greater role" in the defense of their legitimate interests, and which will "discourage them from challenging our leadership or seeking to overturn the established political and economic order."

The Pentagon planning document represents the military component of a series of Bush policy revelations which began with the "Thornburgh Doctrine" promulgated to legitimize the invasion of Panama through asserting a U.S. right to violate the national sovereignty of other nations. The architect of that doctrine, Attorney General William Barr, has recently added the corollary, that U.S. super-sovereignty

extends not only to alleged violations of U.S. criminal law, but to matters of commercial law as well. These doctrines are complemented by the assertions of former CIA head William Webster, made during congressional testimony, that the CIA should henceforth direct its efforts against the chief economic adversaries of the United States, such as Germany and Japan.

Disturbing evidence that these erosive and unconstitutional notions are being fully assimilated by the military, turned up in the recent congressional testimony of U.S. Army Chief of Staff Gen. Gordon Sullivan. He reported that his reorganization of the Army "supports the role of the United States as the preeminent power of our age." He reiterated a point he previously made in a *Washington Post* commentary, that the United States considers economic threats and "unfair trade practices" as potential causes for military action, and that his command is prepared for that eventuality.

The politics of arrogance

The excerpted versions of the Pentagon report support Gen. Sullivan's outlook. The report was prepared by Defense Undersecretary for Policy Paul Wolfowitz, and was circulated on Feb. 18 to top defense officials, with a cover letter signed by Wolfowitz's deputy, Dale A. Vesser. A copy of the cover memo and the accompanying 46-page document was leaked to *New York Times* reporter Patrick E. Tyler by an administration official who wanted to force a public debate over the assumptions underlying the strategy.

The release of the document has provoked a domestic and international uproar, especially among erstwhile allies of the United States, who have characterized the proposal that the U.S. should, in effect, become the policeman of the world, as "shocking" and not "oriented to reality." Many

American military officers have expressed scorn at the arrogant assertions of the planning guidance as well.

But the harshest response has come from the Russian press, civilian and military, which has condemned the document as an insult and a warning to "Russia and to the other CIS [Community of Independent States] nuclear weapons-carrying states," in the words of Radio Moscow commentator Viktor Innikeyev. Innikeyev concluded that the report should help leading people in Russia to "part with their illusions that the good old Americans will raise our living standards and take care of our interests."

The particular section of the document which has provoked the most reaction, contains the following paragraphs:

"This Defense Planning guidance addresses the fundamentally new situation which has been created by the collapse of the Soviet Union, the disintegration of the internal as well as the external empire, and the discrediting of communism as an ideology with global pretensions and influence. The new international environment has also been shaped by the victory of the United States and its coalition allies over Iraqi aggression—the first post-Cold War conflict and a defining event in U.S. global leadership. In addition to these two victories, there has been a less visible one, the integration of Germany and Japan into a U.S.-led system of collective security and the creation of a democratic 'zone of peace.'

"Our first objective is to prevent the re-emergence of a new rival, either on the territory of the former Soviet Union or elsewhere, that poses a threat on the order of that posed formerly by the Soviet Union. This is a dominant consideration underlying the new regional defense strategy and requires that we endeavor to prevent any hostile power from dominating a region whose resources would, under consolidated control, be sufficient to generate global power. These regions include Western Europe, East Asia, the territory of the former Soviet Union, and Southwest Asia.

Clinging to the 'established order'

"There are three additional aspects to this objective: First, the U.S. must show the leadership necessary to establish and protect a new order that holds the promise of convincing potential competitors that they need not aspire to a greater role or pursue a more aggressive posture to protect their legitimate interests. Second, in the non-defense areas, we must account sufficiently for the interests of the advanced industrial nations to discourage them from challenging our leadership or seeking to overturn the established political and economic order. Finally, we must maintain the mechanisms for deterring potential competitors from even aspiring to a larger regional or global role. . . .

"While the U.S. cannot become the world's 'policeman,' by assuming responsibility for righting every wrong, we will retain the pre-eminent responsibility for addressing selectively those wrongs which threaten not only our interests, but those of our allies or friends, or which could seriously unset-

tle international relations. Various types of U.S. interests may be involved in such instances: access to vital raw materials, primarily Persian Gulf oil."

The scenario blythely assumes that no matter what type of government evolves in Russia, even a resurgent imperial faction could not pose an immediate threat to Europe without the Warsaw Pact. The threat to the Bush administration is perceived as coming from other quarters: "There are other potential nations or coalitions that could, in the further future, develop strategic aims and defense posture of region-wide or global domination. Our strategy must now refocus on precluding the emergence of any potential future global competitor."

Pentagon spokesman Pete Williams insisted to reporters that this refers only to a "hostile power," an assertion which may provide small comfort to allies who are wondering exactly what that means. The Pentagon insists, for example, that the United States "must seek to prevent the emergence of European-only security arrangements which would undermine NATO." This posture produced a direct clash between Secretary of State James Baker and French officials at the Brussels meeting of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council, who reject the Bush administration plan to use NATO as the mechanism to preserve the European borders, drawn up at Versailles and Yalta, even when that policy produces wars and chaos which threaten the stability of Europe.

The Italian newspaper *Corriere Della Sera* editorialized on its front page that the Pentagon document "is shocking in many respects, starting from the frankness, to the brutality with which it theorizes the permanent subordination of allies-competitors and explains how to use military power and nuclear force to reiterate this subordination." U.S. correspondent Rudolfo Brancoli goes on to call it a "foolish ambition" that pushes somebody "to design such ambitious plans while belonging to an administration which is every day forced to realize that it has no money to help the new democracies in the East, no means to help paying the costs of the U.N. peacekeeping missions, and is not even able to pay its own quota to the international financial organizations."

Lyndon LaRouche was the first statesman to predict that on the basis of administration performance and stated goals, George Bush will be vilified in history as the man who lost the peace in Europe. But now Bush's refusal to respond to reality has even drawn fire from former President Nixon (see page 4).

Indeed, one Army strategist pointed out that the only parallel to the insanity which is being expressed by these Pentagon documents, is the effort by U.S. military officials to become a major instrument of the Versailles Treaty in the 1920s. The officer observed that at that time, only sheer intransigence on the part of the Congress saved the military from that fate; but he added that if there is no similar opposition today, he would be "pulling the hair out of my head in frustration."