

Kissinger and Sharon are at it again

by Richard Cohen

Henry A. Kissinger and his assets in the Reagan administration have rushed into the center of the debate over U.S. Middle East policy in the wake of the Oct. 24 kamikaze bombings that slaughtered nearly 300 U.S. Marines and French troops in Beirut. Kissinger's plan calls for a strategic alliance with the Ariel Sharon gang dominant in Israel. It is designed to reverse President Ronald Reagan's policy of meeting Soviet aggression with a vigorous defense of nationhood around the globe—a policy that has won broad domestic support and ruptured the media-fostered "Vietnam syndrome" of American impotence abroad.

Weeks prior to the Beirut massacre, Kissinger, who had opposed the U.S. troop deployment in Lebanon, reportedly delivered to his protégé Peter Rodman his approved plan of action for Lebanon. Rodman, the putative ghost-writer of Kissinger's autobiography, is a member of Secretary of State George Shultz's revamped Policy Planning Staff. This staff has had as its central task maintaining extraordinarily close, and often covert, ties to Israel. The plan urged that the United States enter into a strategic alliance with Israel. On the day of the Beirut atrocity, Kissinger argued for this on national TV to "counter" Syria in Lebanon.

Ironically, also being interviewed on national television at virtually the same time was Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger—attacking the strategic alliance. Weinberger, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. John Vessey, Jr., and Central Intelligence Agency director William Casey believe that such an alliance will lead to a full radicalization of the Arab world and would endanger the stability of Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

In the days just after the Beirut bombing, Shultz, a long-time associate of Kissinger and of Kissinger NSC insider

Lawrence Eagleburger (now Undersecretary of State for Policy) openly promoted the Kissinger plan. On Nov. 5, Eagleburger was dispatched to Israel, ostensibly to get Israel to drop its opposition to a U.S. plan to train elite Jordanian troops for eventual deployment in the Persian Gulf against Iran. The week of Oct. 31, a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee voted down funds for the program, largely on the votes of pro-Israeli senators. Eagleburger's meetings with David Kimche, Israel's Foreign Ministry Secretary, also reportedly discussed a shopping list of demands including full U.S. backing for the Israeli Lavie jet fighter program. After the meetings it was announced that Israeli Prime Minister Yitzak Shamir would be coming to Washington.

White House sources report that the Shamir talks will, in essence, involve negotiations over the terms of an Israeli war in Lebanon against Syria. These sources are convinced the war will be protracted and the United States will be prepared to give full logistical backing to Israel. As one insider reported, "Shamir will come and bargain to become the first state, while Kissinger's State Department team is only prepared to take him in as the 51st state."

Ariel Sharon defends Iranian fundamentalists

What's wrong with a strategic alliance with Israel became glaringly evident when in the second week of November Ariel Sharon, the godfather of the Lavie project, showed up for a national U.S. tour and filled the U.S. media with exhortations that any "retaliation" must be aimed exclusively against Syria—not Iran, whose Islamic fundamentalist terrorists almost certainly perpetrated the Beirut bombing.

It was Sharon, as Israeli Defense Minister, whose invasion in 1982 set into motion the chain of events that destroyed

the delicate fabric of restive peace within Lebanon. The interventions of the evil Colonel Muammar Qaddafi, of Aya-tollah Khomeini's Savama, and Syria's and Israel's gambits with the Druzes—all egged on by the Soviet Union—have unleashed within that ruined nation a state of warfare resembling the 1618-48 Thirty Years' War in Central Europe.

Sharon, ousted as Defense Minister after a commission of inquiry found him responsible for Lebanon war crimes, has been exposed as a partner of Kissinger's in shady real estate deals on the West Bank, and is a well known protector of the drugs-for-arms syndicates that supply the "Islamic" terrorists Moscow deploys in the Mideast. The activities of Henry Kissinger and his cohorts in the region have all but obliterated the President's original effort, launched during 1982, to obtain the security and integrity of Lebanon within its legal borders, and to make that accomplishment the key-stone for building institutions of durable peace in the surrounding area.

It is not just the "Islamic" fundamentalists of the fanatic Iranian government, steady customers of the Israeli weapons industry, that Sharon wants to protect. Sharon has reportedly been meeting the Christian fundamentalist circles in Houston who sponsored Menachem Begin's last U.S. tour, partly in preparation for a major foray to Israel to be led by Moral Majority chief Rev. Jerry Falwell. It is said that the trip will include discussions and activities on Temple Mount, where U.S. fundamentalists plan the insane provocation of blowing up a mosque to rebuild Solomon's Temple on its ancient site.

While Eagleburger was in Israel, the terror bombing of an Israeli outpost in Lebanon served to pose the question of war more starkly to the Shamir government. Syrian forces helped Kissinger on another front by supporting a final effort to eliminate the remnants of the Arafat faction in the Palestine Liberation Organization. State Department officials on Nov. 8 gleefully reported off the record that the elimination of Arafat may not be as bad as it appears on the surface.

Washington intelligence sources report that Kissinger and the State Department believe that with Arafat diminished or eliminated, West Bank Palestinians and moderate Palestinian figures worldwide will have nowhere to go. They will not tolerate an Israeli West Bank settlement negotiated with the hated "village leagues," nor will they follow the Syrians and George Habash, whom they will hold responsible for massacring Arafat's forces. State Department Arabists believe they might become a loosely affiliated State Department faction of the Palestinian movement. In Kissinger's thinking this will force a desperate King Hussein, facing Syrian threats to focus the rage of Palestinians in largely Palestinian Jordan against him, to join them and to head into West Bank negotiations.

Kissinger also thinks it imperative to oust the Saddam Hussein leadership of Iraq and get on with an Iran-Iraq negotiated armistice in which the new Iraqi regime must pay homage to Damascus, and Iran becomes hegemonic in the Persian Gulf. Reportedly, Kissinger has made headway in selling this plan to the White House based on misinformation

suggesting a U.S.-Iranian rapprochement may be possible in the future.

A knowledgeable Washington intelligence source has informed me that this Kissinger plan has already been cleared through back channels to Moscow. Kissinger is convinced he can strike a Middle East deal with Moscow that would accept *de facto* partition of Lebanon and Soviet hegemony over Afghanistan, northern Iran, Iraq and Syria, while Moscow would guarantee Gulf oil flow and Jordanian stability. If this Kissinger scenario unfolds, U.S. troops will be fighting in larger numbers in the deserts of Saudi Arabia and in the streets of Amman, for the Soviets are sure to accept their Kissinger-drafted gains graciously, and then press for the overthrow of Hussein and the Saudi royal family.

President Reagan's options in Lebanon

Kissinger, however, has a long way to go, and it is only by abstention of Weinberger and company that he has seized momentum. With massive U.S. force in place, strong retaliation in response to any hasty Iranian or Syrian sponsored move could change the current drift of U.S. Middle East policy, and build on the crucial international and domestic momentum gained by the President by his Grenadian action. As of Nov. 4 the American naval deployment in the Eastern Mediterranean included 29 warships and 300 planes, and White House sources confirmed that the United States has assembled the required naval hardware near the Persian Gulf to swiftly open the Straits of Hormuz if the Iranians carry out their threat to close the passage.

On Nov. 4, speaking at Camp LeJeune to the families of Marines killed in the terrorist bombing of Marine headquarters in Beirut, the President again emphasized that U.S. military forces will now be ordered into action when necessary. "Let no terrorist question our will," he warned, "no tyrant doubt our resolve. . . . We commit our resources and risk the lives of those in our armed forces to rescue others from bloodshed and turmoil, and to prevent humankind from drowning in a sea of tyranny."

From the outset, as White House sources confirm, Weinberger, Vessey, Casey and former National Security Adviser William Clark, now heading Interior—the men most responsible for President Reagan's new strategic doctrine announced March 23—raised serious doubts about the limited "peacekeeping" deployment of U.S. forces in Lebanon. Vessey said this explicitly in his television interview.

EIR founder Lyndon H. LaRouche has recommended that the United States massively expand its on-the-ground policing role in Lebanon to defend Lebanon's national sovereignty, including giving the Syrians a bloody nose. But Weinberger and Vessey, who fear soaring casualties and the erosion of domestic support for troops in Lebanon, the uncertainty of Soviet reactions in light of the high-risk pattern of Soviet undertakings and Andropov's absence from public view, and a new wave of anti-American reaction in the Arab world, have flinched, and instead deployed for threatened retaliation. Kissinger is trying to fill this policy vacuum.