

EIR Special Report

Is Kissinger defining policy toward NATO?

by Nancy Spannaus

When Henry Kissinger's article on the reshaping of NATO came out in the March 5 issue of *Time* magazine, there was practically no one who did not profess to be surprised. From *EIR*'s administration sources, to sources in NATO headquarters itself, the word was that this was a private, wild move from a private individual. No one could possibly agree with this nut, the line went. The U.S. commitment to NATO is absolutely firm.

Executive Intelligence Review didn't buy the story then, but we decided to check it out. Three weeks later, we can say with certainty that Henry Kissinger's treasonous plan to sell out Western Europe to the Soviet Union is well on the way to being *implemented by default*.

The first to realize the seriousness of this move by Kissinger were governments in the developing sector whom we talked to. Already in shock at the withdrawal of the United States from Lebanon, these governments were not overjoyed with the Kissinger proposal to "redeploy" U.S. troops out of Western Europe—especially since he made it perfectly clear that they would be redeployed for population wars in the developing sector. But the response was unanimous: we have to deal with him because he is the *incoming* secretary of state.

In Western Europe, a similar phenomenon developed very rapidly. While official spokesmen for the ruling Christian Democratic Union led the way with unambiguous attacks on the Kissinger sell-out, the unhappy press began to point out the obvious: an opinion from a man on his way back into power had to be taken seriously, no matter how objectionable it was. Kissinger was acknowledged to be defining the terms of the NATO debate.

So-called influentials in both the Republican and Democratic parties still proceeded to pooh-pooh the Kissinger influence. "He put himself out on a limb," was a common refrain in Washington. "Kissinger is acting stupid," said a Democratic party academic specializing in NATO affairs.

The denials continued, up through March 2, when Kissinger was appointed to the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. Soon afterward an orchestrated wave of support for the Kissinger proposal began to appear in the U.S. Senate, and the European press. "Authoritative" news outlets, of such apparently opposite political stripes as *Der Spiegel* in West Germany and the *Daily Telegraph* in London, began the constant refrain: Kissinger is heading toward becoming



NSIPS/Stan Ezrol

Kissinger's 1983 program for the U.S. to smash the debtor countries has been adopted by the Reagan administration.

secretary of state. The world federalist Pugwash group, correctly sensing the compatibility between their proposals for nuclear free zones in Europe and the elimination of the President's plan for NATO-wide beam weapons defense, and Kissinger's "anti-pacifist" proposal, decided to hold a meeting in Stockholm to discuss the Kissinger proposal.

Will the U.S. population, especially the Reagan administration, be the last to know that Henry Kissinger has taken over U.S. foreign policy once more?

A recent object lesson

Those who persist in denying the obvious control which Henry Kissinger is exerting over the White House need look no further than the events since January of 1983, *during which time Kissinger pulled off exactly the same ploy in the area of economic policy.*

It was January 24, 1983 when Kissinger, who never hesitated to declare his ignorance on economics, was splashed all over the cover of *Newsweek* magazine with a four-page story entitled "Saving the World Economy." While everyone in Washington officialdom was confidently mouthing the Volcker-Shultz line that the United States was spearheading a new world economic recovery, Kissinger declared that the world economic crisis was so severe as to threaten the survival of the Western democracies.

No one in Washington wanted to listen. They were counting on the recovery.

But, looking back at the decisions that have actually been made over the last year, one can see that Kissinger was not only correct that there was a crisis, but that he put himself in the precise position to determine administration policy as the crisis developed.

The major recommendation of Kissinger was that the

debtor countries be deprived of the weapon of default, through the adoption of bank safety nets in the industrialized nations. "This would reduce both the sense of panic, . . . and it would permit a more far-sighted approach to the debt crisis focusing on the long-term growth of the developing world."

Take a look at Ibero-America today, and you will see that both of Kissinger's proposals have been implemented. A safety-net *has* been created to protect the banks in situations where nations *cannot* pay. Debtors are being creamed economically and deprived of the weapon of default.

In fact, the strategic situation has been created that is a precise complement to the NATO troop pullback which Kissinger proposes. Kissinger's success in determining Reagan's administration debt policy has virtually dictated a Malvinas-style military confrontation between the United States, Britain, and Ibero-America. Once again, the Soviet Union will be the prime beneficiary of the policy of their agent-of-influence, as the United States is tied up in regional wars, leaving the Soviets to take over the Middle East, Asia, and Western Europe.

Sins of omission

There was, of course, a ready alternative available to the Reagan administration on the debt issue, just as there is on the NATO policy crisis. That policy is defined by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. LaRouche vs. Kissinger on economic policy, on strategic policy, on NATO policy—that is the choice that faces any Washington administration which does not want to walk blindfolded into total disaster.

But the White House refused to face the existence of the crisis. When it came, they relied on Kissinger—by default. There is not much time before the travesty is repeated—to the equal benefit of the aspiring Russian world empire.