

Editorial

Time to kick Dr. K.

Henry Kissinger has been hogging the limelight. He was in China, then Japan, trying to sell the Japanese on the not very convincing idea that the moves toward a Sino-Soviet rapprochement in no way undermine the U.S. strategic alliance with Peking. On Oct. 27 he suddenly showed up in Mexico City, with his traveling piggybank David Rockefeller, and due to an "error" of the pilot of their plane, the two debarked at the main terminal and not the presidential hangar where they were expected; the result was a burst of publicity from waiting reporters. Henry did his best to convey the impression that his arrival with Rockefeller meant he was there to make a "deal" on Mexico's debt.

The same day, the *New York Times* splashed a lengthy article about Henry on its society page—the kind many "celebs" pay to have written about them—portraying the abrasive, charming, "powerful" Henry Kissinger.

Henry is saying two things. One is that the advanced sector should not give the impression of "leaning on" Third World governments too heavily for debt repayment. The "conditionalities" policy of the International Monetary Fund must be rigorously enforced, Henry reiterated in Washington Oct. 22 before the U.S. Perspectives II conference in Washington, sponsored by the American Stock Exchange. But, this must be handled "politically." Henry's other point is that the United States is finished as a world power. In July he told the American elite gathered at the occult Bohemian Grove retreat in California that the U.S. should conduct a foreign policy "more like that of Britain" in keeping with the fact that it has gone from controlling some 55 percent of the world's GNP at the end of World War II to 25 percent today.

Is there a thread connecting Henry's lucubrations on the descent of the U.S.A. into the status of "once-developed nation" like Britain, and his daily increasing prominence as the self-proclaimed arbiter of U.S. policy toward developing nations with huge, unpayable debts?

Consider another aspect of the matter. U.S. intelligence and security circles in Washington are up in arms over the refusal of Great Britain to cooperate in provid-

ing information on the extent of damage done to the two countries' intelligence estimates on the Soviet Union by the recently exposed Soviet agent Geoffrey Prime. From 1969 to 1977—years that correspond to Kissinger's tenure as National Security Adviser and Secretary of State—Prime was an encoding clerk at Britain's top secret electronic spy station at Cheltenham, England. He passed on to Soviet intelligence the codes that enabled Moscow to know every time the British were listening in on their policy discussions. The British have not only refused to inform their U.S. CIA and NSC counterparts on the damage, but allowed Prime to plead guilty to espionage charges, thereby avoiding a public trial.

The deeper issue evokes a long history of British "spy scandals." At strategic junctures, highly placed British intelligence officials were "exposed" and seconded to the Soviet Union, starting with the late 1950s Kim Philby affair. During this entire period, according to his own boasts last May in London, Henry Kissinger was acting as the faithful servant of the British Foreign Office. Now, thanks to a Middle East policy which Kissinger brags to the *New York Times* he is guiding, the U.S. is well on the way to losing any remaining shreds of influence there. It may be the rising climate of anger and suspicion in Washington about whom Kissinger is really working for that made Dr. K. lose his composure when *EIR*'s Ron Kokinda questioned him at the "Perspectives" conference on his role in the judicial murder of Pakistan's last elected President, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. Kokinda asked Kissinger if his alleged "soft line" toward debtor nations today was not in fact designed to buy time to give them the "Bhutto treatment": Bhutto wrote that Kissinger had threatened to "make a horrible example" of him for his nation-building efforts. Under Kokinda's questioning, Kissinger screamed that Bhutto's written statements were "a total lie."

How many more U.S. allies in the developing sector will Henry be allowed to destroy, and how many more assets will he deliver to America's adversaries, before somebody wakes up in Washington and makes the questions stick?