

Bush pacifies Czar Mikhail, plots against U.S. allies

by Kathleen Klenetsky

President Bush's response to the campaign of threats and intimidation which Moscow is waging against the courageous Lithuanian independence movement proves beyond doubt that Washington values its arrangements with Czar Mikhail and his Russian empire, far more than either its relations with its allies, or keeping the United States on the side of human dignity and freedom.

As *EIR* went to press, rumors of an imminent Soviet military move against Lithuania were flying around Washington. Gorbachov had issued a presidential decree ordering Lithuanians to hand in their weapons; and Soviet troops were massing on the border. But George Bush—President of the country which should be fighting most fiercely to protect the rights of subject people across the globe—responded by choosing to play Hitler to Gorbachov's Stalin, in a replay of the 1939 Hitler-Stalin Pact. Questioned about his response to the Gorbachov ukase at an impromptu press conference on the White House lawn March 21, Bush not only reiterated his refusal to recognize Lithuanian independence, but merely called on the Lithuanians to "discuss" their "problem" with Moscow, and praised Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's recent statement that the Soviets would not use force to bring the Baltic nation to heel.

Although Bush refused to get upset about such a minor thing as the future of Lithuania, he managed to muster some passion when reporters turned to the issue of his recently imposed ban on broccoli on the presidential jet—a topic Bush apparently considers more important than the fate of a nation. As Reuter sarcastically observed in a March 22 wire: "President Bush, often accused by his critics of being wishy-washy, took a forceful and unequivocal stand Thursday—on broccoli."

A new 'Hitler-Stalin Pact'

Bush's immoral connivance in Moscow's brutish behavior toward its captive nations is one aspect of the insane

direction of U.S. strategic policy being pursued by the current administration. Closely interrelated with this, is Washington's increasingly hostile attitude toward its allies, especially Japan and Germany, which the administration is now treating as virtual adversaries. The U.S. is effectively recreating the Hitler-Stalin Pact, allying with Russia against the freedom movements in Europe and elsewhere.

While de facto defending the Soviet Union's "right" to dominate the Baltics, the Bush team's guerrilla actions against Japan and Germany—publicly signaled by CIA Director William Webster's speech last September declaring that these two countries were emerging as economic threats to the U.S.—are exploding into all-out war.

On March 16, *New York Times* columnist William Safire approvingly reported that the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB) was being reorganized along economic warfare lines. Where previously, the board was supposed to advise the President on strategic military threats, particularly those posed by the Soviet Union, its new function would be to go after Japan and Germany.

From the standpoint of true U.S. national interest, such an approach is pure insanity. The U.S. has lost its economic edge not because of unfair competition from Japan and Germany, but because it has abandoned its productive manufacturing and agricultural base, for the "get rich quick" lure of "post-industrialism" and pure speculation.

Safire's report coincided with two developments that graphically expose the corruption of U.S. policy. The first was in the arena of U.S.-Japanese relations. The Bush administration decided to escalate its simmering dispute over trade with Japan to the point where Japanese spokesmen issued uncharacteristically stern public warnings that a full-fledged trade war would soon erupt if the U.S. continued its provocations (article, p. 4).

Second, the administration kicked off a new phase in its ongoing battle against German reunification. While publicly

professing to be delighted with the outcome of the March 18 East German elections, the administration's hands and feet were moving in a very different direction.

Last December, a Chicago-based German analyst with close ties to the State Department, told *EIR* that the Bush administration, despite its public stance, strongly opposed the rapid reunification of the two German states. "I absolutely don't take the administration's statements supporting German reunification seriously at all!" said the analyst. "Senior members of State's Policy Planning Department have told me quite openly that the U.S. doesn't actually support reunification. . . . The reason why Bush and others have come out so strongly in favor, is that they think that reunification will happen anyway, and they want to be in a position to ride the tiger. . . . The administration doesn't want to isolate itself; it wants to be able to keep a hand in, in order to be able to control the process as it's taking place."

That approach has not changed. In a March 22 article, Peter W. Schroeder, a usually well-informed U.S. correspondent for various West German regional dailies, wrote that despite its lip service to German unity, the Bush administration was seeking ways to obstruct the process. "It mustn't go as fast as the old government in Bonn and the new one in East Berlin would like to have it," a senior State Department official told Schroeder. "Even if we are joining the camp of the Social Democrats and the ranks of the transformed SED," the communist party, "we won't be disturbed by it." A presidential adviser told Schroeder, "There is no blank check for the creation of all-German realities," adding that administration thinks that reunification through Article 23 of the West German constitution, as preferred by Chancellor Helmut Kohl, "is not an ideal solution."

Schroeder also reported that advisers to Treasury Secretary Nicholas Brady have declared that Kohl's project of a rapid economic and monetary union with East Germany by the end of June has to be slowed down.

Anglo-Americans vs. Germany

The Bush crew is collaborating closely with hard-line anti-German factions in Britain, to slow the reunification process in the short term, and to devise a strategy to contain a unified Germany over the longer term. One proposal for accomplishing the objective of containing Germany popped into the public view the week before East Germans went to the polls. This was an analysis produced by the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), which proclaimed that the dissolution of the Soviet empire was a fait accompli, and that, consequently, the Warsaw Pact was finished as a military alliance.

Having thus eliminated the Soviet threat, the study turned toward the new enemy: Germany. Among other bizarre proposals, the report called for creating a Rome-centered "Mittleuropa," modeled on the old Austro-Hungarian empire, to check Germany on its southern flank, and the creation of a

expanded Nordic Council, under British control, to counter Germany to the north.

The report's author, senior Pentagon Sovietologist Philip Petersen, presented the paper to NATO March 19, and from there, was to head off to Moscow for discussions with the Soviet military and foreign ministry. The Petersen report's de facto call for a "New Yalta" to carve up Europe into new spheres of influence, came under sharp criticism from saner thinkers in the U.S. and Western Europe. European federalist Max Kohnstamm blasted the study as "the most destructive idea around." "We need a strong European community, not balance of power. . . . Balance of power was imposed at Versailles after the First World War, and it led to the Second World War. The idea of 'keeping the Germans in check' is ridiculous." The fact that such ideas are coming from Washington is a sign of "atavism and neanderthal thinking."

U.S. congressional candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche called the report "one of the most disgusting things ever to be issued, in the name of a U.S. thinkpiece policy perspective. What it proposes," he said, "is that, in order to destroy the potential of a united Germany to become a major power in central Europe, Europe be carved up into three assortments of states." Germany is to be squeezed between Russia and a combination of a revived Austro-Hungarian empire and a British-ruled confederation. "This is U.S. policy? This is insane," LaRouche stressed.

Yet this kind of insanity—a single-minded commitment to strangle a united Germany, even though it holds the promise of driving a generalized economic recovery that could only benefit the U.S.—is what now dominates Anglo-American policy.

The Petersen report was only one feature of an anti-German propaganda barrage unleashed by Anglo-American ruling circles. Exemplary was a speech by Sir Michael Howard, a senior strategist in the British liberal establishment, to the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London March 12. Howard called for measures to avoid a new "German hegemony" in Europe. Howard, currently emplaced at George Bush's old stomping grounds at Yale, said the U.S. must remain strongly involved in NATO, not primarily to defend against the Soviet Union, but because of the "German problem." "There is a German problem," he said. "It may only be a problem of perception, but it does exist. An alliance without the U.S. would be an alliance dominated by Germany. The peoples in Central Europe and the Soviet Union, rightly or wrongly, would see this as a threat. Even the West European allies would be uneasy, not so much because of the record of Wilhelmine and Nazi Germany, as because of more deep-rooted instincts about the need for a balance of power in Europe. So long as these feelings are strongly held, there will be an equally strong need for the U.S. to remain entangled in the alliance, to balance German as well as Soviet power."