

Kissinger in new offensive to destroy Western Alliance

by Mark Burdman

A dramatic escalation in the campaign by Soviet fellow-travelers in the United States and Western Europe to "decouple" the two continents and transform Europe into a Soviet sphere of influence, has been initiated by the syndicated column authored by Henry Kissinger, appearing in newspapers around the world during the May 9-12 period, calling for "a major reassessment of the Atlantic Alliance."

The piece followed a literal "Kissinger invasion" of the European continent and Great Britain. From April 25, through approximately May 8, Kissinger was in Europe, beginning with attendance at a meeting of the secretive "Bilderberg Group" in Scotland over the April 25-27 weekend, and then continuing with stopovers in Rome, Florence, Milan, and Venice, Italy; Bonn, West Germany; and Stockholm, Sweden.

This might be considered "Phase Two" in Kissinger's personal onslaught against the NATO alliance. In March 1984, in a piece written for *Time* magazine, the former U.S. Secretary of State demanded a phased withdrawal of American forces from Europe. Now, as then, strategists across Europe are, in private, evaluating his proposals as tantamount to a call for the dissolution of NATO, only now more blatantly. It comes at a dangerous juncture, in a policy-context defined by the Gramm-Rudman legislation's budget-cutting in the United States, and by a Soviet-authored U.S. media campaign to play up European-American tensions after the U.S. bombardment of Libya.

The best thing that can be said about the Kissinger piece is that it provides full confirmation of the charge made by

EIR founder Lyndon LaRouche that Kissinger is a "Soviet agent of influence," since the piece is entirely based on one giant lie: that "the process of dissociation" in NATO is "accelerating," and that "the U.S.

make a mistake to paper over the cracks in the alliance that recent events have made explicit." In fact, in the wake of the early-May Tokyo summit of advanced-sector nations, the relations between the allies, on the strategic front, has become better than ever, particularly concerning cooperation against international terrorism. Kissinger's piece is targeted to disrupt and undermine this new era of cooperation.

From his lying premise, Kissinger argues that "the political and military arrangements within the alliance will have to be adjusted. . . . The conclusion, I believe, is unavoidable: Some of the American forces now in Europe would contribute more effectively to global defense if they were redeployed as strategic reserves based in the U.S. and able to be moved to world trouble spots." Not only should the F-111s now in Britain be redeployed to the United States, to avoid the political controversies that erupted when British Prime Minister Thatcher agreed to F-111s stationed in Britain for use in the Libya raid, but "similar principles could be applied to other forces suitable for a strategic reserve, forces such as certain long-range fighter planes and air-transportable ground forces. The objective should be to distinguish clearly between those American forces earmarked exclusively for Europe and those available for other areas."

The second lying premise, immersed in a long-winded Kissingerian historiography over the history of NATO, is

that "the fear of Soviet invasion [of Europe] has diminished. . . . The practical consequence is that a major portion of America's armed forces is tied up where governments will permit its use only against the least likely threat, an all-out Soviet attack on the central front." Instead, he argues, remove an unspecified array of American "forces" from Europe, and deploy them, free of European political pressure, from within the United States, to fight neo-colonial brushfire wars in the Third World.

The folly of all this has not escaped European strategists. From the standpoint of "budget-cutting," the "strategic reserve" idea is ridiculous: As there do not exist adequate barracks and other facilities for such a redeployment in the United States, it would cost *more* to do what Kissinger says, than to keep the troops in Europe! More fundamentally, any literate and rational European strategist, knows that what Kissinger is saying, undermines the very foundations of NATO itself; were his proposal to be implemented, NATO would disintegrate faster than the reactor core in Chernobyl.

'Kissinger is completely crazy'

Within a week of the Kissinger article's first appearance, he had become the subject of much bitter *private* criticism in Europe, although, with one interesting partial exception, no official had yet summoned up the intestinal fortitude to take Kissinger on publicly.

The partial exception was West German Defense Minister Manfred Wörner, speaking before a May 14 conference on security policy in Bonn, West Germany, hosted by the West German Christian Democratic Union at their Bonn headquarters. Wörner, who had reportedly met Kissinger approximately one week earlier during Kissinger's stopover in Bonn, began by criticizing the opposing Social Democratic Party in the Federal Republic for wanting to "send the Americans home," and, thereby, "doing the work of the Soviets, surrendering us to their dictatorship." Then, departing from his text, and speaking in a somewhat lowered voice, the defense minister said: "I am very concerned that there is a drifting apart occurring both in Europe and the U.S. People, some of them prominent, are calling for the withdrawal of American troops, important people like Henry Kissinger. I know that the American administration does not share this view, but if we expect the Americans to stand by us, we have to stand by them."

CDU loyalists in the audience objected that Wörner was being too much of a milksop on the issue, and one challenged him to respond to "Henry Kissinger's message," by "celebrating what the Americans are doing to defend us," particularly the actions by American pilots "who flew the Berlin blockade of the Russians."

At NATO headquarters on May 14, a spokesman told this correspondent, "We've read the Kissinger article, and are offering no comment." Another source, however, commented that the reaction was "unfavorable" to the piece, and that

"Kissinger's NATO proposals, over time, have created many difficulties for us."

In Britain, France, and Italy, strategic planners were seething. "Absolute nonsense!" is how one senior British civil servant described the Kissinger thesis. "What he's saying amounts to a major element in decoupling. The fact that somebody as eminent as Kissinger would say this, I find very surprising and very disturbing. . . . The single most important factor in *coupling* is the conventional presence of Americans on European soil. Any significant movement that would undermine the components of rapid flexible response, and lower the threshold for intercontinental nuclear war, is a bad thing. Militarily, what he's saying is no good. The political repercussions are no good. I don't accept the analysis, and the remedy he proposes is a disaster."

A senior French source was blunt: "Henry Kissinger is completely crazy. We don't like his proposals for NATO. His diagnosis of NATO is largely exaggerated, his solutions completely wrong, reflecting a fundamental lack of reality. We have no sympathy for what he's saying. Over the past year, France has become staunchly Atlanticist, and Frenchmen hate anything which is said against NATO, especially against the American presence in Europe."

An Italian NATO planner, during a May 12 discussion, attacked Kissinger for "increasing resentments on both sides of the Atlantic."

Speaking only for himself?

One element of the anxiety, is speculation about the extent to which Kissinger is reflecting a wider view in the United States, whether it be in the U.S. Congress, the Reagan administration, or in American "public opinion." The *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* of Switzerland, in a May 15 feature on the Kissinger article written from Washington, reported that the tendency in Congress and in the administration to consider the Western Alliance a high priority, had "dissipated considerably." It speculated on a nightmare coalition, of "neo-conservative" Kissingerians in the Republican and Democratic parties, allying with liberal Democrats opposed to all forms of U.S. military intervention, in which case "an unholy alliance with considerable clout will have emerged on Capitol Hill," united by common opposition to the American military presence in Europe.

One West German source told *EIR* on May 15 that the evaluation in the Federal Republic is that "Kissinger is angling for a job in the *next* U.S. administration, which, we understand, he believes will be Democratic." Some political experts wonder if he is trying to link up with the ambitions of Gary Hart, whose advisory circles are known to favor a U.S. withdrawal from Europe.

In the meantime, rumors are spreading fast in West Germany, that some form of U.S. withdrawal from Europe is in the works. These rumors began in earnest, with a report in the April 21 Hamburg *Bild*, immediately following the mid-

April trip to Washington of West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher. The Hamburg tabloid reported that Genscher had picked up a strong mood in the United States favorable to pulling out of Europe.

Bonn sources inform *EIR* that Genscher is on an all-points decoupling campaign. "It won't go unnoticed that he absolutely refused to criticize the Soviets at all over Chernobyl, but will attack the United States on the slightest pretext. He is the chief of the decoupling lobby in Bonn," one source commented March 13.

On March 12, the Sunday weekly *Welt Am Sonntag*, reported that the West German Embassy in the United States had authored a memorandum, signed by Ambassador von Well, warning that the combined pressures of budget-cutting and the fallout from the Libya affair, were creating significant momentum for phasing out the U.S. presence in Europe. The memorandum reported an item from the U.S. publication, *Defense Daily*, that the U.S. Third Armored Division would be withdrawn from West Germany.

On May 16, the tabloid *Bild Zeitung* claimed to have obtained the von Well memorandum, and included a comment from an unnamed Bonn official, warning that tendencies toward decoupling in the United States were being taken "very seriously," especially as the withdrawal of U.S. troops would mean a "weakening of our defenses," and that "nuclear weapons would have to be used earlier" in case of war.

The Trilateral offensive

A major forum for the decouplers will be established when approximately 200 Trilateral Commission members arrive in Madrid May 16, for the May 17-19 annual "international plenary" of the Commission. The May 19 sessions will be dominated by a report, "Towards Perspectives for East-West Relations," prepared by William Hyland, editor of the Council on Foreign Relations' *Foreign Affairs* journal and former Kissinger aide at the U.S. National Security Council, and Karl Kaiser, research director at the German Society for Foreign Relations, the Bonn affiliate of the CFR.

Following this, Commission mentor Zbigniew Brzezinski, former national security adviser to Jimmy Carter, will give a presentation on "The Political Objectives of the Trilateral Commission." In a recent interview with the French magazine, *Politique Internationale*, he recommended the unilateral withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe.

The meeting is receiving an incredible boost from the Spanish elite. Dinner receptions are to be held at the Royal Palace, hosted by the King and Queen of Spain, on Monday evening, May 19, and there will also be dinners hosted by Prime Minister Felipe González, on Saturday, May 17, and a lunch hosted by opposition Alianza Popular leader Manuel Fraga on the same day. Remarkably, González himself will leave, immediately thereafter on May 19, for a state visit to Moscow, accompanied by 29 Spanish government officials and businessmen.

OAS sees red at U.S. meddling in Mexico

by Valerie Rush

The United States' allies in the Western Hemisphere are outraged that Mexico has become the latest target for the joint "democratization" campaign of Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) and the liberal State Department establishment. The view of the Organization of American States, according to sources quoted in the Mexico City daily *Excelsior* on May 15, is that Mexico has been set up, in hearings staged by Helms on May 13, for the "Marcos treatment."

The OAS sources minced no words: "It is totally unacceptable that Washington should arrogate to itself the inalienable right of every nation to rule itself. It appears that Washington believes that all the world is like the Philippines, but Latin America, at least, is not and we are prepared to prove it."

In a packed hearing room on Capitol Hill on May 13, witnesses at hearings called by Senator Helms alleged that "massive corruption" at the highest levels of the Mexican government—including even the family of President Miguel de la Madrid—had led to the downfall of democracy in that country, and predicted more and more instability unless the ruling PRI party yields power to the drug-trafficking National Action Party (PAN).

The Mexican government responded to the Helms-State Department assault with what has been described as "one of the bitterest statements" ever.

sovereignty and blatant interventionism which threatens to "mutilate the climate of harmony and understanding sought" by the two nations, a "strong and formal" protest was sent by the Mexican government to Secretary of State George Shultz. The statement charged that the Helms hearings, "apart from adulterating the truth and presenting a distorted view of Mexican reality, are a clear and unacceptable violation of Mexico's sovereignty. The government of Mexico does not accept that U.S. officials take it upon themselves to make statements on Mexico's internal affairs, as these affairs concern only the Mexican people and no government has the right to pass judgement. . . .

The State Department answered Mexico's formal complaint by insisting that the hearings were "a candid, public, balanced review" and by otherwise refusing to comment on the contents of the Mexican protest.