

## Kissinger putsch in U.S. heightens war danger

by Webster G. Tarpley

Secretary of State James Baker chose a March 27 interview with Thomas L. Friedman of the *New York Times* to make it official: Henry A. Kissinger's policy putsch in the councils of the Bush administration is now an accomplished fact. Under the cover of the much-touted Bush "policy review" still offered to credulous gulls, Kissinger has filled the policy vacuum of the Bush bureaucratic team, a vacuum that also has its locus between James Baker's ears. Kissinger, signaled an article by Don Oberdorfer in the *Washington Post* five weeks ago, is offering—on one level—a "New Yalta" power-sharing arrangement with the U.S.S.R. which has as its centerpiece the validation of Soviet paramount interest over the satellite states of Eastern Europe for an unlimited period, in exchange for a verbal Soviet pledge to refrain from armed intervention by the Red Army in the internal affairs of the Eastern European states on the model of Budapest 1956 or Prague 1968.

In effect, the Kissinger proposal is to give over to Soviet domination the world's most decisive strategic region, traded for some pious reassurances of Soviet good intentions. The "Finlandization" proposed would apply to the European NATO states, starting with the German Federal Republic. Kissinger, in short, is dishing out that heady brew of treason and geopolitical imbecility which was ever his stock in trade.

But Secretary Baker likes the Kissinger plan; he even finds it "a novel approach." Kissinger pretends to offer Moscow a NATO pledge to refrain from subversion in the satellites and thus not to threaten the U.S.S.R.'s glacis, in exchange for the lifting of the limited sovereignty of these states under the so-called Brezhnev doctrine. The cruder Baker throws Kissinger's verbal hedging aside and makes clear that he wants to guarantee Soviet imperial rights in Eastern Europe most of all in the eventuality of a Red Army assault on

one or more rebellious satellites.

Baker says: "If progress did not continue to be made along the lines of Eastern Europe opening up to the West, if there was [sic] a reversal, or if you had anarchy and a reaction by the Soviets, it would be a much different situation. Then it would be much more appropriate in my view to look at the possibilities of the proposal that Henry advanced. It is part of the overall review." Will Kissinger dictate Bush's course through the presence of the "Scowgleburgers," Kissinger clones Brent Scowcroft of the National Security Council and Lawrence Eagleburger, number two at the State Department? Baker replies: "I think that, like this idea on Eastern Europe, to the extent that Henry has some ideas he would like to run past us or float here, we welcome those."

Kissinger has been arguing that it is time to go beyond the "numbers game" or "bean-counting" of arms control to a "political concept, including a European settlement." The whetting of the superpower carving knives to be applied to the European goose is too much for some American observers, including William Safire and the editorialists of the *Boston Globe*. In Europe, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* noted that the Anglo-German conversations of the Königswinter Meeting had recently discussed the Kissinger plan, and had delivered a reserved or outright negative verdict; Kissinger would declare the "area between the Elbe River and the Soviet border a 'sanctuary' for whatever the Soviets might wish to do." These fears, wrote *FAZ*, were shared by "governments and peoples alike." Herbert Kremp of *Die Welt* editorialized that Brussels NATO circles are worried by what they see as Kissinger's tendency to lock in Yalta, rather than loosening the Russian grip on the satellites. He labeled Kissinger as obsessed with a "new Metternichiad" of diplomacy, and pointed out that Kissinger is giving de facto rec-

ognition to the Brezhnev intervention doctrine under the cover of the Gorbachov-Genscher "common European house."

In reality, the implications of the Kissinger putsch are far more ominous. Kissinger intends to deliver not just Eastern Europe, but all of continental Europe to the Russian sphere, in exchange for pledges of Soviet moderation in Central America, along the lines of Yuri Andropov's 1983 interview to *Der Spiegel*. This will include a free hand for Gorbachov to carry out a bloodbath in Yugoslavia, should he desire one. And since Kissinger believes profoundly in limited, cabinet warfare as a tool of policy, we may expect him to press for such a war, most likely in the Middle East, followed by an oil shock, according to Henry's dog-eared 1973-74 script. Such a war would be designed to build up Syria at the expense of Israel, as suggested by Kissinger's ventriloquism through Baker's mouth that Israeli Premier Shamir had better bring some "new ideas" when he visits Washington April 6. Meanwhile Henry has left his bloody calling card in Beirut, where the civil war Kissinger provoked in 1975 may be approaching its dénouement in the massacre of the Christian, and not just the Christian, population. If the American people are foolish enough to tolerate the comeback of the butcher and madman who has earned the hate of the world, divine retribution may stalk us all in the form of general war. The alternative would include the freeing of Kissinger's arch-enemy, LaRouche.

### **Gorbachov delighted**

Gorbachov, by contrast, is delighted by Kissinger's open ascendancy. On the day after the Baker interview was published, Hungarian Communist party boss Karoly Grosz, one of Gorby's puppets, gave the Hungarian news agency MTI the following account of his recent talks with Gorbachov in the Kremlin: "Analyzing the historical lessons of 1956 and 1968, Mikhail Gorbachov said that there must be maximum guarantees today that outside force should not be used to resolve the internal affairs of socialist countries." Thus, a signal: If Kissinger is selling out, Moscow is buying in.

The same day that message was received at the White House, President Bush sent a letter to Gorbachov through diplomatic channels asking the Soviet dictator to discipline his satraps in Havana and Managua, especially by cutting military and other support to the Sandinista regime. Baker joined in with a speech delivered in the appropriate setting of the Carter Presidential Center in Atlanta, where he stipulated that Muscovite restraint on Danny Ortega is all-important. Baker addressed these words to Moscow: "Together we must send a clear message to others outside this hemisphere: This is not a dumping ground for their arms or their failed ideologies. We are looking for signs of new thinking. The Soviet Union now has an opportunity to demonstrate it in Central America."

Poor Baker. The notoriously greedy Kissinger has not provided him with a competent medium who could allow him to consult the shades of such ancient worthies as Julius Cae-

sar, Pompey the Great, and L. Crassus, or Marc Antony, Augustus, and M. Aemilius Lepidus, to name just a few among those who have attempted to divide the world with artificial lines of imperialist demarcation. These shades could have certified that condominiums such as the present one are really mutual interference pacts, tending to favor the more audacious imperialists, and that every line of demarcation ever drawn was drawn to be violated. Baker's call to the Soviets to rein in their satraps will not be honored. Since his rival Boy Gray will not enlighten him, maybe a paperback copy of Shakespeare's *Henry IV Part 1*, where Hotspur, Owen Glendower, and Lord Mortimer make the relevant point in Act III, could be provided.

The New Yalta condominium has always strongly resembled the Molotov-Ribbentrop (or Hitler-Stalin) Pact of August 1939-June 1941. By autumn 1940, that pact was crumbling: Stalin was protesting the presence of German troops in Finland, where they were sent by Hitler after the Russo-Finnish war to secure the Petsamo nickel deposits for the Reich. Hitler in turn was not happy about the Soviet encroachments on the German sphere in Bukovina, northern Romania, which increased the threat to his oil supplies in Ploesti. Through these disputes, plus disagreements about Yugoslavia in March-April 1941, the Molotov-Ribbentrop arrangement was undermined, resulting in world war.

Today's U.S.-U.K.-U.S.S.R. condominium is confronted by similar disturbances. Thanks to the KGB-MI-6 *Satanic Verses* scandal, the Soviets are gaining the upper hand in Iran, as the KGB's Tashkent and Leipzig mullahs win out over the alleged assets of Western intelligence services. Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Yuli Vorontsov has already proclaimed a regional war between Afghanistan and Pakistan, and observers are collecting clues that India may be drawn in on the Afghan side. And something big continues to loom over the Middle East. On March 30, CIA Director William Webster predicted that Iraq, Egypt, and Argentina, among a list of 15 developing nations, would soon possess their own ballistic missiles. Israel's Dirty Rafi Eytan has been calling for a preemptive attack on alleged Iraqi nuclear bomb facilities. On March 30, the *Washington Post* bought his argument, citing Israeli and U.S. sources in asserting that Iraq has a crash program to build nuclear warheads for its ballistic missiles, with chemical warheads already available. The paper also says that the Israelis will not be able to destroy the Iraqi nuclear facilities as easily as they wiped out the Osirak reactor in 1981, because the present facilities have been "dispersed, hardened, and hidden." The paper also notes that Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze has expressed concern about Israeli nuclear weapons and missiles which can strike Soviet territory. His thesis about the threat of war in the Mideast has now been repeated by Margaret Thatcher who told King Hassan of Morocco in Maarakesh that "no one should be in doubt that the present situation in the Middle East is fundamentally unstable and cannot continue."