



Why There Is Peace In Asia And What Kissinger Would Like To Do About It

by Daniel Sneider,

USLP Nominee for Secretary of State

July 24 (NSIPS) — Henry Kissinger is unhappy about Asia. There are no wars in Asia and despite Henry's valiant efforts Asia keeps denying him the opportunity to start any. In Africa, in Latin America — wherever Henry has plopped down in the last months, destabilizations, regional tensions, subversion and war have followed. But there are no open doors for Kissinger in Asia. Kissinger has lost the key to his entire Asian strategy — his warmongering Maoist friends in Peking are incapacitated by a raging internal factional battle that is on the verge of open civil war at the point of the death of Chairman Mao.

Kissinger has not given up however. In his speech on Asian policy two days ago in Seattle, Kissinger declared that, "while a great deal has been accomplished (for peace — ed.) Asia remains a region of potential turbulence...there are no grounds for complacency." Look around Henry says, there is still plenty of room for improvement in Asia: "Soviet activity in Asia is growing. North and South Korea remain locked in bitter confrontation. Hanoi represents a new center of power and its attitude toward its neighbors remains ambiguous and potentially threatening. Most developing nations remain afflicted by social and political tensions. And the scramble for oil and ocean resources raises the spectre of future territorial disputes."

Kissinger's frustrations stem directly from the near total breakdown of the Maoist regime in China — the regime that Kissinger counted on as his chief instrument for countering the pro-development forces in Asia, led by India, Vietnam, and backed by the Soviet Union. It is the Maoists whom he hoped would "fill the vacuum" in Southeast Asia following the U.S. defeat in Indochina; who would be the allies of destabilization in the subcontinent against India; who would help entice the Japanese into a Peking-Tokyo-Washington axis against the Soviet Union in the Far East; and finally who would back up every move by Kissinger and Rockefeller throughout the world to engage the Soviet Union in a thermonuclear confrontation and a decisive strategic defeat.

However, in his calculations Kissinger ignored the overriding public strategic policy of the psychotic Maoist clique: wait patiently for the two "super-powers" the United States and the Soviet Union to blow each other up and in final victory, Red China will march to inherit the radioactive earth.

In the last months, however, what has emerged is the outlines of a peaceful and developing Asia — a nightmare for Henry Kissinger. In Southeast Asia, the newly unified Socialist Republic of Vietnam and its Indochinese allies have embarked on the road to economic reconstruction and broken Kissinger's policy to isolate them from the non-Communist states in the region grouped in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN — Philippines, Thailand, Singapore, Malaysia, and Indonesia). In South Asia the persistent efforts of the Indian government of Indira Gandhi have foiled the attempts at regional tension and brought detente between India and Pakistan as well as Bangladesh and Afghanistan. In East Asia, the government of Japanese Prime Minister Takeo Miki has

rebutted the Maoist offers of an anti-Soviet alliance, renewed efforts to develop friendly relations with the Soviet Union, consistently sought to maintain peace in Korea, and opened up expanding economic ties to Vietnam.

The fruits of Kissinger's Sino-centered policy in Asia are that the United States is more isolated than ever. Its only sure allies are the arch-reactionary regimes in Singapore, Australia and New Zealand, and South Korea.

The China Recognition Question

Kissinger's answer to this dilemma is to desperately seek means to shore up the Maoist clique in Peking, to reassure them of the American presence and power in Asia and tie them in to his efforts to counterattack the forces of peace in the region, including the Soviet Union. This is what lies behind the debate in Washington and New York policymaking circles on the so-called China Recognition issue — Kissinger and his Atlanticist allies have been promoting a press and private campaign for the diplomatic recognition of the Peking regime and the dumping of official U.S. recognition of Taiwan. The Taiwan issue itself is trivial and only a cover for Kissinger's desire to deliver to the Maoists some tangible benefits of their alliance with the American imperialists — like arms and sophisticated military technology. Such benefits are needed by the Maoists to use against their factional opponents inside China who increasingly favor distancing China from the U.S. and possible reconciliation with the Soviet Union. The fear of a Sino-Soviet detente now hovers over the Atlanticists as the final blow to the disintegration of their Asian strategy and from every Atlanticist thinktank — the Brookings Institution, the Rand Corporation, and the 'Old China Hands' at Harvard, the University of Michigan, Columbia University and so on — the cries for recognition of Peking can be heard.

Informed sources close to the White House have revealed that President Ford has blocked this move. While the press lies that Ford's opposition is motivated by a desire to conciliate Republican conservatives, Ford balked last year when Kissinger tried to persuade him to recognize China on the occasion of his trip there. Ford's reasoning, according to our informed source, is that the current instability in China makes it unwise to make such a move when no one knows who will be in power in Peking in six months. The Miki government in Japan has also made it clear that it too would oppose any such destabilizing move in East Asia, a view made clear to Ford in his meeting with Miki two weeks ago.

Ford's concern for stability in the region prompted the proposal which Kissinger reiterated, on Ford's specific request, in his Seattle speech — a proposal for a big power agreement on maintaining peace in the Korean peninsula to replace the existing outmoded United Nations Armistice agreement from the Korean war. This proposal according to its original author, an East Asian expert close to the White House, was opposed tooth and nail by Kissinger who did not want to jeopardize his precious alliance with the Maoists by insisting they put pressure on their North Korean friends. This expert, and the saner layers he represents, fear the danger of a "breakaway ally"

development by the unstable Park dictatorship in South Korea, triggering an unwanted war — unwanted by any of the region's big powers including the Soviet Union and Japan.

The only hope for Kissinger's China strategy is the election of a Carter administration. All of Carter's foreign policy advisors, grouped around Trialteral Commission director Z. Brzezinski, favor China recognition (all are from the Brookings-Rank-Harvard axis) and further favor the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Korea, which Carter himself has publicly supported. A U.S. withdrawal, in the absence of such a big-power guarantee of peace in the Korean peninsula, is viewed in some circles as the precise formula for activating the 'breakaway ally' tendencies of the paranoid Park regime.

The Development Alliance Emerging in Asia

Without Kissinger pulling off a war in Korea or some other destabilizing move in Asia, the present developments are leading to the emergence of a firm alliance of forces supporting accelerating economic growth and a system of collective security in Asia — within the framework of a new world economic order. The foundations of that alliance are India, Vietnam, Indonesia (and neighboring Malaysia and Philippines), Japan, the Soviet Union, and — in a post-Mao era — China. There have been definite signs in the past weeks of that alliance coming together.

In Southeast Asia, the just concluded tour of Vietnamese Deputy Foreign Minister Phan Hien to Malaysia, Singapore, Philippines and Indonesia has established the basis for regional cooperation in trade and economic development. The warmest reception for Phan Hien was in Indonesia, the largest and potentially richest nation in the region, where Indonesian Foreign Minister Malik declared that the principles of the two country's foreign policies are "completely identical." Yesterday the Indian Foreign Minister Chavan and Malik issued a joint statement calling for a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, opposing the U.S. military buildup in the area. In Indonesia there is also a convergence of Japanese business interests tightly tied to pro-development circles in the nationalist Indonesian military who are battling the Rockefeller oil companies. Rockefeller companies, like Caltex operate in Indonesia, along with Western creditors and the International Monetary Fund have been trying to force austerity policies on the Suharto government. The Japanese have maintained and increased investment in capital intensive development projects in aluminum production, oil and natural gas production, and agriculture, which the IMF has insisted be scrapped to maintain Indonesian debt payment.

The Crucial Role of Japan

Any development policy for Asia must look to Japan as the crucial contributor of technology and capital in the region. Kissinger has consistently treated the Japanese — while praising them as America's great allies in the Pacific — as a subordinate tool in his Sino-American alliance against the Soviets

Union and its allies and has used threats and intimidation against any Japanese effort to open up relations in the region independent of the U.S. The State Department has fervently worked to prevent Japanese participation in the joint development of oil and other natural resources in Siberia and the Soviet Far East. At the same time, Kissinger has encouraged Japanese alliance with Peking and a NATO-style tight defense cooperation with the U.S. which would put Japan in the position of automatically supporting U.S. military deployments outside Japan (using U.S. bases in Japan) such as Korea or elsewhere in the Western Pacific.

In recent weeks, emerging from the political destabilization carried out under the cover of the Lockheed bribery scandal, the Miki cabinet has made clear steps toward repudiating these pressures and resuming efforts toward a peace policy in the area. Japanese Foreign Minister Miyazawa issued a public warning in the Japanese parliament to the Peking regime to cease its efforts in Japan to interfere in Japan-Soviet relations. A prominent columnist in the Japanese daily Mainichi further revealed last week that Miki's private hope for making his mark in foreign policy is not to further the relations with China, as has been alleged, but to conclude a Japan-Soviet Peace and Friendship Treaty which would settle the outstanding territorial dispute dating from World War II (the issue of the Northern islands ceded to the Soviet Union after the war) and provide the basis for deepening relations. Similar evidence of progress in this regard is the Aug. 8 visit to the Soviet Union of the first official delegation from Keidrandren, the Federation of Economic Organizations representing the top Japanese corporations. The delegation, led by Keidrandren head Doko, will discuss Japanese participation in the Soviet 5-year plan and hopefully the stalled Siberian projects as well. Keidandren is also sending a mission in August to Vietnam where they will discuss Japanese aid to Vietnam reconstruction and industrial development. The Japanese are already engaged in expanding trade there and have bid to participate in the exploration and development of Vietnamese off-shore oil resources.

Miki has also bucked Kissinger around Korea where Miki has made it clear that Japan will do everything to maintain peace in the peninsula. Increasing trade and political contacts have been opened up with North Korea. Japan already has extensive economic interests in the South and has essentially agreed to a 2 year debt moratorium for North Korea on some \$300 million in outstanding trade credits. The Japanese daily Yomiuri reported that Miki pushed this out of concern that economic difficulties might push the North Koreans to war. On this same basis the Japanese Foreign Minister opposed Kissinger's attempt at the last OECD meeting to use Eastern European debt to the West as a lever for destabilizing the socialist community.

Needless to say, without the enthusiastic participation of Japan, as well as a Maoist regime actually in control in China, Kissinger will fortunately remain frustrated in Asia.