

George Shultz's treasonous 'hidden agenda' at Halifax

by Criton Zoakos

This season's semi-annual meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's 16 foreign ministers which was held in Halifax, Nova Scotia, May 29-30, ought to be the last foreign ministers' meeting allowed to be held if the Western Alliance is to survive. *EIR*, harboring no sympathy for the current crop of bureaucrats running the Alliance's foreign ministries, has been both documenting and warning, in the last three years, of the large-scale treachery being woven by this exclusive club of diplomatic professionals since March 23, 1983, when President Reagan first announced his Strategic Defense Initiative.

U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz has been the principal inspirer and leader of this cabal in the West's foreign services. Halifax was no exception.

The significance of that meeting was not so much in what deliberations it promoted, but rather in the context of the strategic circumstances in which it promoted them. The deliberations themselves were simple enough: First, unanimously, all NATO foreign ministers announced a policy of a "Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals," strongly echoing Soviet General-Secretary Gorbachov's favorite theme: "Within the alliance," the ministers' statement reads, "we cherish the ideal that all the peoples of Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals, should live in peace, freedom, and security. To achieve that ideal, bold new steps are required in the field of conventional arms control. To work urgently towards the achievement of this objective, we have decided to set up a high-level task force on conventional arms control." Sources close to the meeting, confide that this "high level task force" is intended to pursue the heavily disadvantageous "comprehensive disarmament proposals" made by Mikhail Gorbachov last Jan. 15.

Second, all foreign ministers vehemently attacked President Reagan's announcement that the United States is no longer holding itself bound to the SALT I and SALT II agreements—despite the fact that all ministers conceded that the Soviet Union has consistently violated the agreements.

Third, George Shultz's behavior, in light of this orchestrated criticism of President Reagan, was most curious. In response to his colleagues' orchestrated bickering, Shultz stressed that the "SALT Agreements are increasingly obsolete as means of restraint," and that the United States is "not throwing away the concept of mutual restraint, but is seeking to develop a truly effective form."

The diplomatic "form of mutual restraint" alluded to by Shultz is generally recognized by diplomatic observers as the infamous "New Yalta Agreement" to which NATO Secretary-General Lord Peter Carrington and his associate Henry Kissinger are known to be committed. Shultz, in effect, informed the NATO foreign ministers that the State Department's response to President Reagan's scrapping of SALT, will be a redoubled effort to put into effect a new redivision of international spheres of influence known as "New Yalta."

The most essential component of "New Yalta" is a military disengagement of the United States from Europe, the so-called "decoupling." Precisely the kind of task assigned by the Halifax cabal to its newly appointed "high-level task force," concerning itself with the military affairs of "Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals."

'New Yalta,' Shultz, and Kissinger

The known elements of the "New Yalta" were identified in two published locations during 1982. The first was a March 1982 interview of Soviet leader Yuri Andropov in the West

German weekly *Der Spiegel*, and the second was a speech by Henry Kissinger in August of the same year at the Bohemian Grove in California, in the presence of a very select audience which included the then just-named Secretary of State George S. Shultz. Andropov's formulation proposed that the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union accept the designation "sea power" and "land power," respectively, the United States taking control of all the affairs of the Western Hemisphere (presumably including Cuba, Central America, and other unwilling nations), and the Soviet Union maintaining supremacy over the Eurasian landmass—by means of a special Soviet-Western European arrangement which would exclude the United States.

Kissinger's 1982 speech put matters slightly differently: "The worldwide sphere of influence of the United States," Henry argued then, "should be reduced to approximately 25% of its post-World War II extent," in order, presumably, to be made proportionate to the decline of United States military and economic power.

Shultz, at the time, went on record that he is in agreement with Kissinger. In the week before the Halifax cabal, Shultz went on record, together with Richard Perle, supporting Henry Kissinger's most current proposal, published in a syndicated column just prior to Halifax, recommending withdrawal of United States troops from Europe. Kissinger's recommendation was no idle speculation—it has been introduced in bill form in Congress by Rep. Pat Schoeder (D-Colo.), and is viewed with sympathy not only by Shultz and the State Department, but also by the leaderships of both House and Senate Armed Services Committees.

The context

The Halifax cabal took place at a time in which European NATO is rapidly unraveling:

1) Its northern flank is in a process of collapse, as a group of quisling Soviet collaborators took over the government of Norway, and are now energetically pursuing a policy to establish a "Nordic nuclear-free zone," according to the specifications of the Soviet Union.

2) NATO's southern flank has all but disappeared as Turkey, cynically maneuvered by the State Department and Ambassador Strausz-Hupe, was forced to announce that it intends to seek its own accommodation with the Soviet Union, preparing to purchase its own national security by offering to the Soviet Navy a separate agreement for passage of warships from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean through the Turkish Straights.

3) Most important, (see cover story, page 36), the Federal Republic of Germany, NATO's pivotal central sector, is under general assault from the Soviet Union in the form of an already unleashed political civil war. As we document elsewhere, the shock-troops of this civil war are under direct Soviet control, but its cannon-fodder is supplied by the State Department-sponsored "Green Party."

The cancer of the foreign-service brotherhood

One senior diplomat who was forced into retirement during the previous decade, when Henry Kissinger and his masters were revamping the foreign services of the alliance, remarked: "Something very unusual was going on in the ranks of the West's foreign services, a certain kind of 'affinity group' is emerging in the foreign policy milieu . . . a sort of 'homintern,' whose loyalties transcend loyalty to any particular nation's interest."

It appears that this "affinity group" came fully of age during the tenure of George Shultz in the State Department, and established control in virtually all Western foreign ministries, especially after 1983, when the struggle to derail President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative became a central and single-minded objective. From the beginning, in March 1983, the State Department has been the main bastion of opposition to the SDI. The British, West German, and Italian foreign ministries almost immediately followed suit, even though those nations' elected governments and military establishments had gone on record supporting President Reagan on this particular policy. During last year, for instance, NATO displayed the incongruous phenomenon of having all of the alliance's defense ministers endorsing the SDI and, subsequently, all of the foreign ministers' during their previous semi-annual meeting, in Madrid, condemning it.

The Halifax meeting is the follow up of that in Madrid. These two meetings' express opposition to the SDI and to President Reagan's rejection of the SALT treaties is informed by a doctrinal commitment to the perverse theory of "Mutually Assured Destruction," which in turn, gained currency during the 1952-58 period when hydrogen bombs and intercontinental rockets were first developed. The initial authors of this theory, for the most part major supranational financial interests known to specialists by the designation, "The Trust," had sufficient clout to push through the ranks, over the decades, a selected type of foreign-policy bureaucrat whose outlook cohered with the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction and its cognates. The results of this selection process now dominate the top ranks of Western foreign services.

By training, upbringing, and selection, this layer is impervious to the realities of the Soviets' military drive for world domination. A massive and deeply entrenched phenomenon of appeasement, fueled by hundreds of little Neville Chamberlains, is, so far, the West's diplomatic corps' response to the Soviet onslaught against all of NATO's fronts. President Reagan's SDI of 1983 and nullification of SALT of 1986, are simple, necessary responses to this Soviet challenge—these two Presidential acts, have, in effect, put an end to the era of MAD. The contest which has now emerged as a result, requires a general cleanup of this legion of little Chamberlains in the ranks of the West.

George Shultz, the dean of the West's appeasers, ought to be the first to go. His firing will have salutary effects on the rest of the alliance.