

Oil chaos to launch new Kissinger rampage

by Criton Zoakos

One of the most despicable spectacles is that of our corpulent Secretary of State, George P. Shultz, slyly orchestrating his own "resignation," some say in order to have himself replaced by Henry A. Kissinger, preferably before the Republican Party's nominating convention this summer, while others say that Kissinger would find it counterproductive to take such a prominent post now. Whether Kissinger becomes Secretary of State, or only Special Envoy to Moscow, will depend on how much humiliation President Reagan undergoes. The matter is part of a drama whose final scenes are now unfolding in the Middle East—the cratered battlefields of the Gulf War, and the smoking neighborhoods of Beirut.

Observe the following brief sequence:

On Feb. 17, when the withdrawal of the U.S. Marines from Lebanon had been ordered by President Reagan, George P. Shultz takes a four-day vacation in the Bahamas. He leaves behind him a "senior State Department spokesman who preferred to remain unidentified," to announce to the press that the Middle East crisis is of such character now that "it will require the type of action Henry Kissinger had taken back in 1973 when he went to Moscow" to negotiate a comprehensive superpower arrangement on the terms of settlement of the Egyptian-Israeli "October War."

A few days later, Henry A. Kissinger gives an interview to the *New York Times* which the *Times* considers fit not to publish yet, but provided to the Milanese *Corriere della Sera* for publication. In the Feb. 22 issue of that newspaper, Kissinger is quoted as saying:

"I would be ready to go to Moscow at the proper time, to meet with the top Soviet leaders. There is no reason why I cannot go to Russia. But I would only go if I would be able to meet with all the people who count there."

On Feb. 21, a *New York Times* gossip column reports that Secretary Shultz is considering resigning before this year's election. The inspiration appears to have come from Bernard Gwertzman, who already knew of the Kissinger interview (unpublished in the United States).

The following day, the President gives his first televised press conference of the year, in which he is set up to publicly and passionately defend the record and policies of the secretary of state. With the President's flank thus exposed, Shultz leaks the following to Associated Press on Feb. 23: "Secretary of State George P. Shultz was described Thursday as worried that the failure of U.S. policy in Lebanon could cause considerable harm to American interests throughout the Middle East. One key Shultz aide said he was willing to accept the blame for that failure even though President Reagan declared that Shultz 'had not failed in Lebanon.' But this official said the Lebanon situation 'is infinitely more complicated than that' and that 'all along there have been only limited options we could take.' This aide and other senior State Department officials spoke of Shultz's views on Lebanon and the Middle East only on the condition that they not be identified. . . . Rumors that Shultz might resign surfaced over the weekend when the secretary of state decided to spend a long holiday weekend in the Bahamas at a time when the U.S.-backed government in Lebanon floundered further. Criticism of the Bahamas weekend was widespread, even within the State Department. It wasn't the first time there have been rumors of a resignation for Shultz. . . ."

Kissinger, Shultz, and the Foreign Office

This sordid palace intrigue is played out as the Iran-Iraq war has reached new devastating levels of violence and is

about to result in a chaotic disruption of Middle East oil shipments. Unbeknownst to the American public, the Defense Department is waging a losing battle against the British government in a vain effort to force the British to stop supplying Ayatollah Khomeini with the military supplies which went into organizing the current Iranian offensive into Iraq. The State Department has sided with the British government's right to supply the Ayatollah and against the Defense Department.

Moreover, and here is where Kissinger's role becomes most prominent, Shultz's State Department is organizing, together with Britain's Foreign Office, a deal to bring the Soviet Union into the Middle East in a fashion similar to 1973. On Feb. 21, the following exchanges transpired:

During a debate in the British Parliament, M.P. Denis Healey, speaking for the opposition Labour Party, demanded: "Her Majesty's government should not undertake any action with respect to the Gulf War without prior consultation with the Soviet Government." The Tory government's response came from Sir Geoffrey Howe, the foreign secretary: "Her Majesty's government has already pledged that any action we might take in this regard, by ourselves or in conjunction with the United States, will be with prior consultation with the Soviet government." During the same day, the State Department made the following statement to the American press, reported in the *Wall Street Journal* of the following day:

"Any U.S. naval movement to keep the Strait of Hormuz open will be coordinated with Britain. The British are the people we're talking to in terms of military actions. We are reasonably confident that on a short notice we could put something together with the British."

Kissinger is to come in for the final consummation of this atrocity before the presidential elections.

The New Yalta nightmare

Unless stopped now, Kissinger will be going to Moscow on a mission similar to that of 1973. Recall the fruits of that trip: Immediately, it plunged the world economy into one of its most catastrophic collapses, starting with a now legendary oil hoax which produced a 400% increase in the price of petroleum. It was followed by the collapse of every single major government in the world within 1974 (including the U.S. government), and the emergence of new, curiously maneuvered socialist movements in Europe starting with the so-called Portuguese revolution and ending with the Papan-dreou movement in Greece. Finally, Kissinger's 1973 trip to Moscow produced the conclusive decline of United States strategic strength, Soviet superiority in nuclear weapons systems, a collapse of U.S. power around the globe, and the emergence of the famous "window of vulnerability."

Should Shultz and Kissinger succeed now in repeating that piece of betrayal, the consequences will be on a much grander scale, of a scope so sweeping that they will dominate world history for centuries to come. For one, according to

news reports arriving from the Iran-Iraq front as this article is being written, we are on the verge of a Middle East oil shutdown.

Iran has massed up to a million Iranian youths, backed up by Iran's military, on three fronts north of the oil refining Iraqi town of Basra, near the head of the Persian Gulf, with the objective of cutting the Baghdad-Basra highway and thereby eliminating the only supply route to the Iraq's Third Army at Basra. The danger in the current escalation is that both sides will introduce weapons that have heretofore not been employed in the three-and-a-half year war. Iraq, freshly supplied with Soviet-made SS-12s as well as French-made Super-Étendards and Exocet missiles, is poised to hit Iran's oil installations at Kharg Island. Iran has warned that should Iraq take such action, it will disrupt oil flows. This is expected to occur either through sinking an oil tanker, or aerial attacks on the oil installations of Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, or the United Arab Emirates.

According to best estimates, by the middle of April 1984, according to a scenario played out earlier last year at the International Energy Agency, the price of oil in the United States will go up to \$95 per barrel; within one month, unemployment will increase by 2 million people; GNP will decrease by 9%; the energy input into the U.S. economy will decline by 22%.

What Kissinger would do

Kissinger's and Shultz's scenario calls for this calamity to be compounded by a simultaneous massive collapse of the Third World payments structures. Thus, under conditions of national disaster, President Reagan, besieged and isolated by the palace guard, is expected to relent and send Kissinger to Moscow. If Shultz decides to administer the *coup de grâce* to a demoralized Reagan, he will tender his resignation—on condition that Kissinger succeeds him, since Kissinger has already made known the conditions under which he will condescend to accept the assignment to Moscow: "*I would only go if I would be able to meet with all the people who count there.*" One surmises that "the people who count" in Moscow will demand that they can only see Kissinger if he is actually an official of the American administration. Will the great man settle for anything less than the Secretary's job for such an exalted assignment?

Kissinger in Moscow would first and foremost negotiate an unconditional abandonment of President Reagan's March 23, 1983 doctrine of strategic defense, his space-based laser-weapon defense program. Kissinger will then arrange for the so-called "decoupling" of the United States from Europe—the dissolution of the NATO alliance; he will seal the transfer of the Middle East to the Russian Empire; and he will secure the large-scale implementation in the Third World of the genocidal policies of the *Global 2000 Report*. He did such things on a smaller scale in Vietnam, in the Middle East, in Europe, and in the arms-control domain during 1973-75. If allowed, he shall do them again.