

Yugoslavia, Caspian oil and US foreign policy

20 April 1999

Mr. Cunningham's article predicts that Korea will be the next country the U.S. attacks in its mission to achieve complete world hegemony. However, shortly before the Balkans adventure began, Madeline Albright made statements to the effect that NATO must redefine its purpose so that it can intervene proactively outside its member states in areas such as Africa, the Middle East, and Southern Asia. No mention was made of the Far East. In fact, the "Three No's" policy enunciated by Clinton during his trip to China suggests that we may have already ceded our longstanding Far East commitments to China, which we have recently declared a "strategic partner."

Since the holocaust in Rwanda took place with hardly any comment by the U.S. State Department, one must assume that Secretary Albright's inclusion of Africa on the list of foreign policy priorities is an effort to appeal to political constituents rather than a serious statement of U.S. intention. The inclusion of the Middle East and southern Asia is interesting, however, particularly coming on the eve of the Balkans escalation, since U.S. companies are now engaged in a fierce international competition to lay a pipeline from the Caspian Sea oil fields to Turkey, a feat which will require new security arrangements with countries in both the middle East and southern Asia. Also interesting in this regard is Clinton's recent apology to Iran, officially considered a terrorist state, for having been so misunderstood and mistreated by the U.S. over the past century or so. If the eventual goal of U.S. foreign policy is to expand NATO eastward into Kazakhstan, then the recent actions of Clinton and Albright in the Balkans taken together with the Iran initiative would make sense, since Albania is strategically situated between Turkey and the rest of Europe, where oil from the Caspian Sea region would be most welcome. Such a clandestine scenario would be completely consistent with U.S. long-term interests, and would render Kosovo a one-time necessary demonstration project, rather than the first in

a series of humanitarian crusades. Although continuation of imperialist business-as-usual may not be laudable, it is at least consistent with our past history and would be perfectly comprehensible to the world community. If only Clinton and Albright were not so hampered by having to drum up popular approval for their policies, they could easily justify their actions in the Balkans to the international community without having to concoct absurdly illogical pretexts, and we would not have to witness the daily spectacle of political representatives, military leaders, and mainstream media reporters struggling to untangle confused public perceptions. One can only hope that at some point popular support will not be such a necessity for their mission, so that rank-in-file citizens will not have to be pestered with images of displaced refugees, bombed-out homes, and other unfortunate but necessary collateral costs of achieving the New World Order.

SA Arlington, Virginia, US

See also:

Korea: the next Kosovo? By Philip Cunningham



To contact the WSW and the
Socialist Equality Party visit:

wsws.org/contact