

Editorial

For Lebanon, blame Kissinger

The destabilization of the Middle East began with the outbreak of civil war in Lebanon during April 1975. This civil war had been fostered then, and later, by the U.S. State Department's adaption to the so-called Bernard Lewis Plan, a policy conduited into Henry A. Kissinger's State Department by the Aspen Institute of Bertrand Russell's collaborator, Robert M. Hutchins. The tri-partition of Lebanon was a subsumed feature of that plan.

In 1975-76, various officials, including high-ranking figures from Lebanon and other nations, told *EIR* that Kissinger had been responsible for the outbreak of civil war in Lebanon through his push on behalf of the tri-partition proposal. For not unrelated reasons, presidential candidate Ronald Reagan pledged never to admit Dr. Kissinger to his government.

More recently, during 1982, *EIR* had reason to believe that Kissinger was actively supporting tri-partition of Lebanon, in opposition to the policies of the United States, the policies then associated with the "Reagan Plan." We tracked Kissinger's activities closely, assembling indications that he was collaborating with certain forces in Britain and elsewhere working to sabotage the "Reagan Plan" and push U.S. influence out of the Middle East. (We also caught Dr. Kissinger redhanded in West Bank land-scam operations.)

Since Kissinger began to re-enter the administration, beginning in approximately October 1982, the policies of the U.S. government have vacillated between a posture of implementing the President's commitment to the integrity of Lebanon and the expulsion of all foreign occupation forces, and toleration of a directly contrary policy, the so-called political solution, the same tri-partition of Lebanon first visibly set into motion during 1975, when Kissinger was Secretary of State. To the degree that the present administration has been at fault in the deterioration of the situation in the Middle East, the fault has been one of vacillation between the President's own policies and the alternative of a "political solution."

Before anyone plunges ahead to assign blame to President Reagan, we must take into account the massive pressures on the administration not only from the

supporters of Kissinger's ambitions, but also those Democrats, including the backers of Walter F. Mondale, who insist on cutting U.S. defenses at a time that the military junta now ruling in Moscow is directing all attacks against the United States in the Middle East, and is reaching also to "Finlandize" the entirety of continental Western Europe, as well as backing insurrections in the Western Hemisphere itself. These gentlemen are not unfairly compared to Britain's Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain—in which must be included, regrettably, Senate Minority Leader Robert Byrd, and Rep. Jim Wright.

If the United State backs out of Lebanon, as Lord Caradon's circles in Britain gleefully anticipate at this time, then the Soviets will take control of the entire Middle East and the petroleum supplies of Europe and Japan from that region. The conflict in Lebanon today will be on the doorstep of the United States tomorrow.

Now Moscow has announced that the long-invisible Yuri Andropov is deceased. Silly chickens in the news media and the U.S. government proclaim that the death of Andropov signals a fresh opportunity for negotiation, as if the Soviet military dictatorship had not consolidated its power over the recent six months.

In truth, the Red Army is on the march. Its surrogates—the Iranian dictatorship, the Syrians, Qadaffi, the Druzes, and Soviet military units directly, are gloating—together with Britain's Lord Caradon—that the United States is being driven out of the Middle East. Where will the Red Army march next? Into Pakistan? Into Germany? Henry Kissinger, Arthur Burns, and the Aspen Institute are demanding that the United States decouple from Europe—in Moscow's favor. Why should Moscow negotiate with a silly Kissinger? The Red Army is winning; why negotiate anything but the same terms Hitler successfully dictated to Neville Chamberlain? Only silly geese think Moscow is presently in a mood to negotiate.

Lebanon today, and Jim Wright's Texas tomorrow. The Soviet assets, the drugpushers' patron, the PAN of Mexico, will be the surrogate to spill Soviet-directed terrorism across our borders. You think not; you think like a silly goose.