

## Kissinger Watch by M.T. Upharsin

### A harsh message from the London Times

The over-exertion might be troublesome to Henry Kissinger at a time when the Massachusetts hospitals that he frequents are openly espousing cutbacks on new heart-surgery technologies, but evidently Henry has a bee in his bonnet about stopping the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI)—at whatever cost to his failing personal health.

There he was at the *New Republic's* 70th-birthday cocktail party, telling listeners in private that the SDI would be "whittled away" by lack of funding.

The next day, the "crème de la crème" of the Aspen Institute reported seeing Dr. K. at private Aspen events whose central focus was mapping out warfare against the SDI.

By the weekend of Nov. 30-Dec. 1, our sources in West Germany report that (barring ill health), Kissinger was expected at the side of former West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt at an Aspen Institute-Berlin conference on security and technology.

And, informed rumor has it, Dr. K. is one of the invited guests for a Dec. 15-16 meeting of the *primus inter pares* of appeasement organizations: the Pugwash conference. Topic Number One, Pugwashers report: stopping the SDI.

All this activity has not gone unnoticed in the offices of one of the most influential newspapers of the City of London, the *London Times*. For almost a year, the *Times* has been lining up, with increasing frequency, as a strong advocacy journal for beam-weapon development for the West. Now, evidently, Kissinger's antics have gone beyond the threshold of the

editors' toleration.

Echoing the tone and substance of the kinds of things Winston Churchill would say about Neville Chamberlain in the 1938-39 period, the *Times* editorialized on Nov. 26 against the "detente and appeasement" of the Kissinger years. It warned the Reagan administration against being seduced by Kissinger's admonitions, expressed in his most recent internationally syndicated column (which appeared, among other places, in the *Sunday Times* of London, which bears no editorial relation to the daily *Times*), to ignore his "traditional constituency" and adopt a "middle ground" toward the Soviet Union.

Said the *Times*, in part:

"Fortunately the American electorate held its nerve. . . .

"After his re-election, there is now a recurring and world-wide attempt to induce President Reagan to change his policies and attitudes on which he has twice been elected to represent his country. That is not surprising given the persistence of Soviet diplomacy. Soviet leaders work in long rhythms which outpace the historic breathlessness of western electoral timetables. Soviet leaders exploit their advantage and they are always helped in this, not always unconsciously, by the pervasive cultural refusal in the western liberal establishments to recognize and accept the hard simple principles of Mr. Reagan's leadership for which he received such decisive confirmation in the election, against all liberal hopes and predictions.

"This principle is the reassertion of American power and self-confidence and an end to appeasement. So, why is it that now, after a second endorsement, there is so much pressure for change? One can see it even in Dr. Kissinger's recent article in *The Sunday Times*, where he starts by deplor-

ing the fact that 'for too long presidential elections have led to reassessments of American foreign policy' and then contradicts himself a few paragraphs later by suggesting that 'the deepest significance of Reagan's second term is that it has liberated the U.S. to undertake in a climate of conciliation a long overdue reassessment of the basic assumptions of its foreign policy.' Double-speak indeed.

"The deepest significance of Reagan's second term is that it has indeed liberated the U.S. from . . . a period of detente and appeasement. . . .

"Appeasement is based inevitably on wishful thinking about the people whom one is trying to appease.

"Soviet society is mobilized for war, both a shooting war and a class war. . . .

"It is thus important for Mr. Reagan to persist with the Strategic Defense Initiative. . . .

"It would be fatal to change course now in response to pressures to restore the dangerous illusions of the period of detente in the 1970s. The Soviet Union is showing a positive reaction to President Reagan's policy of increasing American military strength. He should not now allow his dealings with Moscow to develop into a web-like system such as Dr. Kissinger tried to weave, to the point where the system became an end in itself so that the United States was deprived of the freedom to apply strict conditionality to each and every individual act of mischief perpetrated by Soviet hostility. That freedom must be preserved if the United States and its allies are to be able to cope with a system which operates on an inherently outmoded, malevolent, discredited and dishonourable ideology: evil empire indeed."

As we have been saying: Henry Kissinger is Moscow's favorite agent of influence indeed.