

Kissinger traps Reagan in Central America

by Vin Berg

Over a seven-day period beginning April 9, leading members of the U.S. Congress exposed themselves as outright liars or merely hypocrites on the subject of U.S. covert operations in Central America. By April 16, it was clear that Averell Harriman's Senator D.P. Moynihan was an outright liar on the issue. Others in both houses were opportunists on the issue. Members of relevant committees had been duly informed of the Nicaraguan port-mining operations, including Moynihan. As usual, the liberals had leaped up to denounce the CIA operations after the Soviet news agency Tass had issued such a denunciation. They were acting in collusion with Soviet agencies, which have laid a trap for President Reagan in Central America, a trap he is now blithely walking into.

Admittedly, Reagan is tragically doing so at the urging of a Soviet agent-of-influence, Henry A. Kissinger. In an interview on ABC-TV April 15, and then again in a speech at the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, Kissinger supported the mining of Nicaragua's ports; condemned the current level of spending on covert operations in Central America as too low and "a recipe for failure"; and argued that there is a "very real danger" that U.S. troops would eventually be needed. It is now no doubt our foolish President's perception that Henry Kissinger is his only real friend!

What the administration has overlooked, along with the congressional opportunists—but not Kissinger or the liars—is that the Soviets have repeatedly endorsed U.S. intervention into Central America and Ibero-America at large, dating from an April 1983 interview granted to *Der Spiegel* of Germany by Yuri Andropov, who referred to the region as a U.S. "sphere of influence" recognized as such by the Kremlin. Since then, the point has been repeatedly reaffirmed in the Soviet press, and endorsed by leading members of the current Russian military junta.

Accordingly, Henry Kissinger's policies, even before he was selected to head a revival of the Carter administration's "Linowitz Commission" on Central America, have entailed U.S. redeployment of troops into Central America, and eventually Ibero-America at large, leaving Asia, the Middle East, and Western Europe Soviet "spheres of influence."

The very liberals who leaped up on the floors of Congress to denounce Reagan administration militarization operations in Central America were equally loud in supporting the humiliating U.S. withdrawal from Lebanon, and so forth. Moreover, these liberals are the loudest advocates of the genocide in the southern hemisphere ("population control") which is the objective of Kissinger's policies. Since the congressional liberals and opportunists have not demanded that Kissinger's policies be rejected, their complaining about the U.S. implementing Kissinger's policies is hypocrisy.

The trap

How could the Reagan administration permit itself to be lured into what was so plainly a Soviet trap laid in Central America? There is no doubt whatsoever of a significant and growing Soviet hand in the trouble-ridden region. But, as *EIR* founder and current Democratic presidential contender Lyndon LaRouche wrote recently:

"It works like this. Take an area of the world in which the U.S.A. has or formerly had political influence. Stir up trouble in that region, and make Soviet or Soviet-asset presence among the troublemakers conspicuous enough to provoke a knee-jerk 'anti-communist' covert-operation or outright military action. Whether the U.S.A. wins or loses the insurgency-battle in that part of the world, the U.S. has totally or partially destroyed its influence in that part of the world, and has helped to ruin the very areas which U.S. forces were

assigned to 'rescue from a communist-insurgency threat'. . . . The Reagan administration has responded to the combined effects of Soviet surrogate-warfare insurgency and the pressures of the Moscow-directed Nuclear Freeze movement by limiting its concrete objective to 'giving Moscow a bloody nose' in some 'handy area' such as Central America. The massive deployment of Soviet strategic capabilities, including escalating naval capabilities, thus proceeds without significant countermeasures by the U.S.A., while a Reagan administration encircled by the Nuclear Freeze liberals inside and outside both political parties, attempts to earn 'counter-insurgency brownie-points' in places such as Central America."

In short, by stirring up insurgency in Ibero-America, and promoting growing hatred of the U.S.A. throughout the continent, as Reagan administration adoption of Henry Kissinger's policies is doing most successfully, Soviet agents of influence such as Kissinger are pinning down the United States in this hemisphere. By this means, the "New Yalta" agreements negotiated between the Soviets and Kissinger's sponsors among the Anglo-America "liberal" establishment are being implemented, handing the Middle East, Scandinavia, increased portions of the Balkans, and West Germany over to the Soviet Union as "spheres of influence," and virtually assuring the establishment of Soviet strategic military superiority in the world as a whole.

Reagan's ignorant blindness

Certainly, no President of the United States would succumb to the advice of a Henry A. Kissinger—especially not a President who won the nomination by promising to keep Kissinger out of government—unless he were ignorant to the point of hysterical blindness on the leading issues confronting his administration's foreign policy. The ignorant blindness of the Reagan administration is most astonishing when it comes to the subject of economics. Because of this, the President would be doing quite nicely in wrecking our allies in Ibero-America and elsewhere even were Henry Kissinger not now his foreign-policy Svengali. The President's own monetary and foreign policies, as these affect all of Ibero-America in particular, are the principal factors virtually assuring Soviet strategic success.

EIR wrote as far back as January 1981 that the President had to dump Paul A. Volcker as Federal Reserve chairman, or his administration's policies would be tragic failures in all fields. The administration's backing of the policies of Volcker, which were dubbed "controlled disintegration of the world economy" by Volcker himself in an April 1979 London speech, meant turning his administration into what the Carter administration always was, a mere errand-boy for David Rockefeller, Walter Wriston, and the banking clients of Kissinger Associates, Inc. Reagan's support for IMF "conditionalities" has driven every Ibero-American nation into a state of desperation at the lunacy they experience from Washing-

ton, while the social effects of those "conditionalities" plunge most countries of Ibero-America into insurgencies and potential states of major civil warfare.

LaRouche provided the alternative in a 1982 publication, *Operation Juarez*, which has gained widespread support among both official and private layers below the Rio Grande. Urging formation of a "debtors cartel" if necessary to compel rescheduling of debts at reasonable terms with the usurers of New York, London, and Zürich, LaRouche proposed both an Ibero-American Common Market to integrate the continent's productive capacities through regional trade, and a set of credit and trade agreements with the United States (for example) focusing on gear-up of U.S. capital-goods producing capacities for export to supply great Ibero-American development projects. Essentially, the unused capacities of the depression-ridden North would be matched to the crying needs of the impoverished South.

"These policies are in the mutual interest of the economies of the United States, and each and all Ibero-American states," LaRouche wrote, "through promoting increased levels of trade, and thus promoting the political and social stability required throughout the Americas. Through related features these policies define the Americas as a more or less solid bastion of strategic security and strength, within which context, the majority of these nations are motivated and enabled to take effective, concerted action against trouble-spots such as those of Central America. Although these policies address directly the specific circumstances of the Western hemisphere, they are a model of reference for defining analogous policies for many among other parts of the world."

The tragedy into which Ronald Reagan is about to plunge stems from his ignorant rejection of such a policy, muttering to himself "free enterprise" while he extends support to the International Monetary Fund. Here we have an administration which professes all regulation of interstate commerce to be virtually immoral, and yet that same administration supports energetically the brutish dictatorship of "IMF conditionalities" upon entire continents! It supports the privilege of corporations to abrogate outstanding union contracts by the ruse of voluntary bankruptcy, and yet insists on reducing entire nations to misery and insurgency as a matter of enforcing payment of interest at higher rates than those nations contracted in incurring the original debt!

The President of the United States is not a traitor as some among those who advise him. He has not comprehended that strategy is essentially political-economic. If the nation's political-economic strategy is a disaster, as Reagan has merely continued Carter's policies on this account, then strategic military options for controlling the results of political-economic failures are at best limited and temporary alternatives. As LaRouche summarizes the matter: "Reagan's anti-insurgency policies in Ibero-America remind us of a man setting forest fires with a flame-thrower, while trying to put out those fires with a garden watering-can."