

## Kissinger offers Europe to the Soviet Union

by Criton Zoakos

Henry Kissinger's article on "The Plan to Reshape NATO" in *Time* magazine of March 5 puts forward a plan that constitutes a major threat to the Western alliance, second only to the rapidly growing military pressures from the Warsaw Pact forces. Unless Kissinger's influence in the Reagan administration is eradicated in a demonstrable and publicly visible fashion, the spring and summer of 1984 will witness a devastating unraveling of U.S. influence in Western Europe which would leave that continent defenseless before Marshal Ogarkov's threats.

Kissinger's *Time* magazine piece, which was in preparation for a long time, is designed to destroy President Reagan's March 23, 1983 doctrine of "Mutually Assured Survival" based on laser-beam anti-missile technologies. To remedy the dangerous strategic situation, the President proposed that the two superpowers move away from the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD). Kissinger's current reply is "redeployment" of U.S. forces out of Europe.

He is employing the term "redeployment" in the same sense that it was used to describe the retreat of the U.S. Marines from Lebanon last month; Kissinger, as is now known, was also the principal author of the "redeployment" out of Lebanon. Henry Kissinger is the man who also "redeployed" the United States out of Vietnam, out of most of Asia, and the one who managed the SALT I and SALT II treaties which "redeployed" the United States out of strategic security and thus helped Marshal Ogarkov's military junta gain the strategic superiority it now enjoys.

Kissinger's *Time* article underlines why he is mobilizing all his resources to wipe out the policy influence of Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., the most prominent American political spokesman for the March 23 beam-weapons defense policy. Kissinger, hot on the trail of reasserting total policy domi-

nance over the White House, has assigned his friends in the White House palace guard to deprive LaRouche of the Secret Service protection to which he is legally entitled as a presidential candidate (see page 48). Thus the achievement of Secret Service protection for LaRouche is a matter touching the most basic national security interests of the country.

### Kissinger versus LaRouche

In August 1982, after George Shultz had been nominated Secretary of State, Kissinger had proposed a worldwide reduction of U.S. influence and presence to approximately 25% of its post-war extent. And Shultz, present when Kissinger had made his proposal, concurred.

It should be noted that Kissinger's *Time* piece was written to generate a wide-ranging, noisy discussion on both sides of the Atlantic, to facilitate the former Secretary's now-unfolding moves behind the scenes. His article has received more advance publicity before *Time* appeared at the newsstands than President Reagan's March 23, 1983 speech received after it was made. And Henry is already in control of the State Department and already attempting to control the President's electoral campaign. Unless the g :tlessness and betrayal in Washington is reversed, there will hardly be a place in the world left by Election Day from which the United States can "redeploy."

*EIR* is in possession of information which indicates that Henry Kissinger and his group in the administration have been engaged in an extensive unlawful and conspiratorial effort to silence the voice of candidate LaRouche by a variety of means which, ominously, include security threats of which the denial of Secret Service protection is typical. Kissinger considers LaRouche to be the one public personality who has the capacity to cause a reversal in Washington's current at-

mosphere of political cowardice and irrational pessimism.

Even if no further evidence were available, Kissinger's *Time* magazine piece by itself would be sufficient to show conclusively exactly what Kissinger considers his adversary relation to Mr. LaRouche to be. Contrast, for example, LaRouche's nationally televised Jan. 21, 1984 half-hour message to the nation on the subject of our national security and the security of the alliance. How do the two strategic security perspectives, LaRouche's and Kissinger's, compare?

Kissinger, in his plan to reshape NATO, assumes that NATO is in deep crisis because 1) the alliance "lacks an agreed, credible strategy," 2) "NATO conventional ground forces are not adequate to repel a major Soviet conventional attack," and 3) "a public climate of growing nuclear pacifism undermined what credibility remains."

All these are patent lies—the alliance is in crisis because of Henry A. Kissinger's 1969-77 policies, and for no other reason. These were the policies of Kissinger's Eastern Establishment sponsors, from Henry Cabot Lodge and McGeorge Bundy to Robert McNamara, policies which included the promulgation of the strategy of "flexible response" which was enforced during Kissinger's tenure.

However, Kissinger proceeds with his proposals:

1) That the Western Europeans be given full authority to redesign Western Europe's concept and organization of defense.

2) That this defense be based on conventional and not nuclear weapons.

3) That the Supreme Allied Commander of NATO be a European military officer, and not an American, as has been the case since the founding of the Alliance.

4) That the Western European members of the alliance be given exclusive authority to negotiate the presence of American nuclear weapons in Europe.

5) Most important, Kissinger proposes that if Western Europe refuses to acquiesce to the above four measures of what amounts to formal abrogation of any U.S. obligation toward Europe's defense against the Soviet threat, then the United States will unilaterally withdraw "half" of its ground forces from Europe.

In short, Kissinger proposes a decoupling of Europe's defense from the United States within the next five years. The proposals themselves ought not be addressed. They are wrong, harmful, and treasonous. The premises of those proposals should be brought to light.

### **Premises of appeasement**

The unspoken premise of the *Time* proposals is that Kissinger has struck an agreement with the Soviet military junta to *kill* Reagan's doctrine of "Mutually Assured Survival" before the presidential election.

Moscow has repeatedly stated that it is ready to go to war in order to stop America's effort to develop defensive anti-

missile weapons systems. Since March 23, 1983, Kissinger has repeatedly stated that he is against the deployment of these systems as "destabilizing." Kissinger and the Soviets, either directly or through intermediaries, have repeatedly demanded that the Mutually Assured Survival perspective be replaced by the old doctrine of "Mutually Assured Destruction" and its cognates such as "flexible response."

Kissinger and the Soviets, in coordination, have attacked Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. as a major threat to their policies. The Soviet *Izvestia* and *Literaturnaya Gazeta* have called LaRouche their "enemy number one," a "militaristic warmonger," "warmongering troglodyte," and similar venomous epithets. They have further indicated repeatedly, both publicly and privately, that so long as President Reagan does not abandon his March 23, 1983 program, they shall proceed on the assumption that "LaRouche says what Reagan thinks" and therefore they shall refuse any contacts and negotiations with the Reagan administration.

Kissinger on his part has complemented these Soviet efforts with his own private endeavors and vendettas against LaRouche, including potentially criminal activities which are expected to draw the attention of numerous court cases now under litigation. Simultaneously, Henry Kissinger, together with his friends at the State Department and with Britain's Lord Peter Carrington, have been arguing that the West's strategic vulnerability will be redressed if the United States continues to capitulate to Soviet military pressures.

Kissinger has repeatedly offered to be appointed a "special Presidential envoy" to negotiate a comprehensive agreement between Washington and Moscow. His colleague Lord Carrington, the incoming general secretary of NATO, has spelled out the contents of such an agreement: a "New Yalta" deal to redefine the world's "spheres of influence." Kissinger in *Time* has now "translated" Carrington's scheme into a language that can be digested by weary and confused Washington policymakers: Rather than define alliance strategy around Reagan's March 23 beam-based strategic defense, hand Europe over to the Russians, Kissinger proposes.

Matters have become very serious indeed for this nation, when Kissinger and his cronies feel safe enough to propose downright treason as he did, confident that bureaucratic cowardice, "election strategy" cretinism and mental feebleness in Washington will permit him to get away with it.

*EIR* is prepared to publicly raise the issues of Kissinger's treason. We are prepared to lift the veil and pry into Kissinger's connections with the Soviet KGB which go as far back as 1946 in Oberammergau in occupied Bavaria. We are prepared to raise again, as Mr. LaRouche has done, Kissinger's treasonous role in the SALT negotiations, which permitted the Soviets to establish the strategic superiority they now enjoy. And we are also prepared to defeat Kissinger's latest piece of treason. Such efforts, as Kissinger well knows, can turn around the climate of stupor and cowardice which Kissinger is exploiting to slip through his proposals.