

U.S. dollar lacked the resources to buy up factions and nations, and the most vital interests of European and other nations forced them to come out in bolder resistance to threats, and terrorist and environmentalist goonery.

Now Kissinger and his duped admirers, all howling like the band of nebbishes they are, insist that since Kissinger's policies worked in the past, they are the policies which must be applied to the present. One is reminded the nebbishes canoeing eastward across Lake Erie, reaching Niagra Falls, at which point, the nebbishes reject warnings from the river bank, yelling to one another "keep paddling forward." Kissinger's policies have reached their lawful destination, and are thus exposed for their intrinsic incompetence which they have, in fact always represented.

Metternich and Bismarck

It is well known among those Kissinger associates who are gullible to listen to such nonsense that Kissinger pridefully models himself on study of the roles of Metternich and Bismarck. To anyone who knows the real history of Metternich and Bismarck, Kissinger's recitals in themselves give away the secret of his essential incompetence.

Both Metternich and Bismarck were essentially tools of London financial interests. In either case, the diplomatic and military successes attributed to those "statesmen" were arranged for them by, principally, the House of Rothschild.

The case of Bismarck is sufficient to illustrate the principle involved.

In the aftermath of 1848-1849, the House of Rothschild recognized that inevitable doom of the political obscurity known as the Austro-Hungarian Empire and played alternately with Napoleon III and Bismarck as the new, alternative instruments of British continental policy. Bismarck himself was an adopted protege of the House of Rothschild, which used its influence in Britain and on the continent to bring Bismarck from relative obscurity to power in Prussia.

In each case of Bismarck's famous successes, it was the role of the Rothschilds in manipulating the credit of the states involved, and the politics of Napoleon III's armaments industry, which rigged the military and diplomatic games of Europe to the effect that Bismarck's success was prearranged.

Thus, to adduce from the case of Metternich and Bismarck a doctrine of diplomacy and strategy is to presume that the British-centered power of a force like the Rothschilds enjoys political and financial hegemony over the states involved behind the scenes. Without that latter consideration, a Metternich or Bismarck would have been nothing but discredited public jokes in world affairs.

A Bismarck or a Metternich without the House of Rothschild arranging history behind the scenes is nothing but a pathetic nebbish, like the nebbish trying to put the African bull elephant into a one-horse trailer.

Kissinger: Disregard Carter's Mideast Peace Efforts

In an intimate closed-door session with the World Jewish Congress Nov. 3, former Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger urged the American Jewish community to defend Israel at all costs, regardless of U.S. policy. Kissinger's diplomatically worded statement, delivered in an atmosphere that one participant described as "almost like a family affair," was an unmistakable cut at President Jimmy Carter's overtures for peace in the Middle East and, in fact, followed the President's own remarks to the Congress.

Nahum Goldmann, a leading WJC member, made the point obvious to all by telling the participants to "read between the lines" and remember that Kissinger was of necessity speaking only in very general terms.

The Congress meeting was closed to the press, but NSIPS has obtained a paraphrase of Kissinger's speech from which the following excerpts are taken.

The present situation must fill all Jews with a sense of responsibility and concern. All Jews must be for peace, and peace does not rest only on statements — because Jews have seen too much of the transitoriness of human intentions. Jews know that they must not be seen as the cause of international difficulties. Peace must reflect an equilibrium of strength. No nation can entrust its security simply to trusting in another state....

I believe, and have always stated, that a separate Arab state on the West Bank — whatever the declaration or intention — inevitably must have objectives that are not compatible with the tranquility of the Middle East; it has nothing to do with professions, guarantees, assurances, promises....

To understand the real concerns of both sides (i.e., the U.S. and Israel): the U.S. is a superpower — but for the Jews and Israelis, the margins of safety are very narrow. The U.S. can afford certain experiments because if we are wrong, our worst penalty is to redouble our efforts. For Israel, certain experiments cannot be tried because Israeli leaders get only one guess — if they are wrong, it may involve the survival of their people.

Jews in America and around the world can best assure their interests by understanding the interests of the countries in which they live, but similarly, the U.S. and other countries have to understand the insecurity and the traumas of a people that has barely survived the holocaust and never known a day of peace in its existence, and knows that, in the final analysis, it is no good to any country unless it is meaningful to itself.

And therefore, it must maintain its faith in itself and its confidence that it is a master of its own destiny, and not just the protectorate of some other country, however well-intentioned that country may be.