

Kissinger's hand in the dirty little colonial war in the Gulf

by Scott Thompson

Henry Kissinger sat at Richard Nixon's right hand and personally directed the bombing of Cambodia two decades ago. Today, his clone Brent Scowcroft occupies the same position in George Bush's National Security Council, and if Kissinger gets his way he will propel us into World War III.

It might appear that Kissinger is taking a back seat in world politics today. In reality, his global influence-peddling firm, Kissinger Associates, Inc., gave bad economic "advice" to Iraqi President Saddam Hussein which helped precipitate Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, while the British-controlled press with which Kissinger is associated published wild charges that Saddam was the "new Hitler" and that war was inevitable. Meanwhile, Kissinger's protégés are in the inner councils of the Bush administration, where they have been overseeing the massive deployment of American GIs to fight Kissinger's dirty little "colonial war" in the Gulf.

On Aug. 19, self-admitted British agent Kissinger wrote a syndicated column entitled "The game has just begun: We have crossed the Rubicon, and time is not on our side," which appeared in press around the world. In this piece, Kissinger joined the chorus of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, who triggered President Bush's "flight forward" deployment of forces into the Persian Gulf, by calling for pre-emptive strikes against Baghdad.

Kissinger's so-called expertise on the Middle East is based on what the British call the "Great Game." This "game" combines balance-of-power geopolitics with cultural warfare, such as that which vectored British-inspired Islamic fundamentalism against Iraq, and had more generally followed the plans of British Arab Bureau member Bernard Lewis. The "Bernard Lewis Plan" underlies former National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski's so-called "Arc of Crisis" which pitted each against all in tribal and ethnic warfare—including Muslim versus the British "Marcher Lord" state of Israel—to deny the emergence of strong nation-states in the region. The point, as Webster Tarpley makes clear in his article in the Aug. 17 *EIR* entitled "The Persian Gulf: British lake," was to combine geopolitical goals like "control of sea-lanes" with the desire to loot raw materials from the

powerless. Already, these policies, as implemented by Kissinger, have triggered two oil-price spirals.

In his article, Kissinger draws a parallel between the President's decision to send massive forces to the Persian Gulf and Julius Caesar's act of crossing the Rubicon River that won him the Roman Empire. So-called British "game-masters" of Kissinger's geopolitical stripe have long drawn parallels between their imperial designs and various attempted recreations of the Roman Empire. Kissinger's comparison of President Bush to Julius Caesar is consistent with Kissinger's life-long effort to recreate Castlereagh and Metternich's Holy Alliance. Although the foremost goal of the Holy Alliance was to stop a spread of the American Revolution, Kissinger has consistently argued that America must forget its republican revolutionary origins to swagger around the world as an imperial power. The U.S. would survive by looting smaller nations of raw materials subdued in such dirty little colonial wars, rather than through disseminating scientific and technological progress.

Crossing the Rubicon

In his column, Kissinger makes clear that by "crossing the Rubicon" the U.S. is to become a permanent "stabilizing" force in the Middle East. And, as many other Anglo-Israeli sources have done of late, he calls for immediate military escalation:

"A sharp and short crisis is far more in the interest of all concerned with moderation than a long siege. . . . The United States stands to lose the most from a long siege—whatever the relative immediate economic impact on Europe and Japan. An ignominious withdrawal . . . would end America's stabilizing role in the Middle East. . . .

"The United States . . . simply cannot afford to lose. If it should be concluded that sanctions are too uncertain and diplomacy unavailing, the United States will need to consider a surgical and progressive destruction of Iraq's military assets—especially since an outcome that leaves Saddam Hussein in place and his military machine unimpaired might turn out to be only an interlude between aggressions. . . .

It is important to understand that America has crossed its Rubicon. All . . . should subordinate whatever tactical misgivings they may have to standing behind the only policy that can now succeed.”

It seems Kissinger’s solution is to bomb Baghdad back to the stone age regardless of human or economic concerns.

Economic warfare

As *EIR*’s cover story on Aug. 17 showed, Saddam Hussein’s decision to invade Kuwait was the culmination of a process that involved intensive profiling. An external financial squeeze, accompanied by a shutoff of credit for reconstruction from the Iran-Iraq war and of food imports, had been combined with media depiction of him as being out of control. Clearly Saddam Hussein was getting some poor “advice” from certain Westerners.

One candidate for such “advice” would be Alan Stoga, the senior economist at Kissinger Associates. Stoga joined Kissinger Associates while he was serving as a consultant to Dr. K’s National Bipartisan Commission on Central America in 1983. A major focus of the Kissinger Commission was how to get Ibero-American countries to accept genocidal levels of austerity while maintaining debt service payments to prop up Anglo-American banks, through Project Democracy counterinsurgency.

Stoga had previously directed the country-risk department of the First National Bank of Chicago, where he worked under A. Robert Abboud. After a brief stint as Armand Hammer’s deputy at Occidental Petroleum, Abboud is today chairman of the United States-Iraq Business Forum and of First City Bancorporation of Texas. Stoga traveled with Abboud and representatives of the oil multinationals and other member firms of the U.S.-Iraq Business Forum to Baghdad in June 1989. It now appears that Stoga played an insider role in the Anglo-American economic warfare that placed Saddam Hussein into the corner from which the logical reaction was to invade Kuwait.

This economic warfare denied Iraq credit for reconstruction and food. It was unleashed after Saddam Hussein rejected requests by Stoga, Abboud, and others to let the Six Sister oil companies develop major new oil finds that had boosted Iraqi reserves to number two in the world. It was fostered by wild charges through press outlets, like Canada’s Hollinger Corp., on whose board Kissinger sits, and by Britain’s affiliated Pearson PLC, that Saddam was using these reconstruction credits to prepare for war. There was not a shred of evidence.

Stoga followed Kissinger’s call for a preemptive strike with an article on Aug. 22, which was exclusive to the *Christian Science Monitor*, entitled “Long siege of Iraq would be worst scenario for the West.” In his piece, Stoga echoes Henry, writing “that the worst scenario for the West would be a drawn-out economic and military siege of Iraq.” Next, Stoga argues for more economic warfare against Iraq: “Sad-

dam Hussein is not invulnerable. His economy is in shambles, badly damaged by a decade of mismanagement and war. He has too much debt and too little money. His country imports three-quarters of its food and will be badly squeezed by the blockade.” Thus, Stoga supports the Bush administration policy of using “food as a weapon,” which, because the first victims of starvation are the ill, elderly, and children, is the moral equivalent of biochemical warfare.

Stoga is perfectly clear that the “vital interests” that sent U.S. troops to the Mideast are oil, not morality: “If Saddam realizes his ambitions, Iraq would gain effective control of oil prices and, thus, of a world economy which still runs on oil.” Stoga concludes by saying that the main lesson of the crisis so far is that as East-West conflict declines, the U.S. must be prepared for global North-South conflict: “The cold war may be ending, but regional conflicts will persist. This may be . . . a more, rather than less, dangerous world.” He adds: “The Middle East is inherently unstable. . . . Under such circumstances, the U.S. and its allies cannot afford to disengage from the area.” Apparently, Stoga foresees occupation of the Middle East.

Two birds in the bush

Although Kissinger was forced to resign from the President’s Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB) last January because of conflict-of-interest scandals arising from his role in Kissinger Associates, he is not an outside “kibbitzer” in the present crisis. Gen. Brent Scowcroft, who was Kissinger’s deputy at the National Security Council (NSC) and later vice chairman of Kissinger Associates, is now President Bush’s National Security Adviser. Scowcroft has reportedly stopped dozing off from boredom at the NSC recently, to egg on President Bush’s “flight forward” syndrome in the implementation of “Operation Desert Shield.”

Scowcroft has learned from Kissinger that Iraq’s major crime is its lack of geopolitical significance. He assisted Kissinger in several anti-Iraq actions, including:

- In 1974, Kissinger joined forces with Israel to threaten Iraq during the “Black September” crisis in Jordan, where Palestine Liberation Organization members had been slaughtered. The crisis ostensibly arose when “Palestinian terrorists” tried to kill Jordan’s King Hussein and hijacked several planes. But U.S. intelligence sources have demonstrated that Kissinger’s NSC manufactured those terrorists together with British intelligence.

- In the same year, Kissinger encouraged a Kurdish separatist uprising against Baghdad, that forced Iraq to mount a bloody crackdown. Kurdish terrorism has been directed against Baghdad and the world ever since.

- In 1973-1974, through lies spread as he shuttled from one Mideast capital to the next, Kissinger triggered the first oil hoax, and through his conscious failure to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict, he sowed the seeds for the 1978-1979 second oil shock. The rapid jump in oil prices—from \$3 to

\$12 per barrel in the first go-round—beggared “developing countries,” but sent a stream of “petrodollars” to Anglo-American banks and oil multinationals that postponed financial collapse for a decade.

● In 1987, Kissinger denounced the Reagan administration’s “tilt to Iraq” in the Iran-Iraq War, including the reflagging of Kuwaiti ships and their protection by the U.S. Navy. Thus, Kissinger continued to favor Iran, despite its being run by Islamic fundamentalists “made in Britain.”

Beyond Scowcroft, Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger had been president of Kissinger Associates before being appointed to his Bush administration post. As President Bush indicated in his Aug. 23 news conference, Eagleburger has major responsibility for lining up diplomatic support for the Anglo-American Gulf adventure.

Henry Kissinger: British agent

When the corpses of America’s youth begin to come home, it is important to know that the man who helped rig this crisis has admitted to being the agent of a foreign power. On May 10, 1982, in a speech entitled “Reflections on a Partnership” given at the Royal Institute of International Affairs at Chatham House in London, Henry Kissinger revealed he had been a British agent while holding high office:

“The British were so matter-of-factly helpful that they became a participant in internal American deliberations, to a degree probably never before practiced between sovereign nations. In my period in office, the British played a seminal part in certain American bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union—indeed, they helped draft the key document. In my White House incarnation then, I kept the British Foreign Office better informed and more closely engaged than I did the American State Department. . . . In my negotiations over Rhodesia I worked from a British draft with British spelling even when I did not fully grasp the distinction between a working paper and a Cabinet-approved document.”

Part of this speech projects a growth of North-South conflict, where U.S. muscle would enforce British imperial designs as is taking place today in the Gulf. First, however, Kissinger says that Britain had to overcome American antipathy to balance-of-power doctrine:

“Americans from Franklin Roosevelt onward believed that the United States, with its ‘revolutionary’ heritage, was the natural ally of people struggling against colonialism; we could win the allegiance of these new nations by opposing and occasionally undermining our European allies in the areas of their colonial dominance. Churchill, of course, resisted these American pressures. . . . In this context, the experience of Suez is instructive. . . . Our humiliation of Britain and France over Suez was a shattering blow to these countries’ role as world powers. It accelerated their shedding of international responsibilities, some of the consequences of which we saw in succeeding decades when reality forced us to step into their shoes—in the Persian Gulf, to take one

notable example. Suez thus added enormously to America’s burdens.”

In conclusion, Kissinger said that in future North-South conflicts, the U.S. must never again undermine Britain’s “vital concerns” as it had done at Suez.

Castlereagh versus republicanism

For Kissinger and his British controllers, the system that they would like to recreate for global North-South conflict is similar to the Holy Alliance. Kissinger was indoctrinated in this model by his Harvard professor, William Yandell Elliott, who had been an American member of the Cecil family’s Round Table movement. Elliott openly espoused American membership in an English-speaking commonwealth after World War II where the darker-skinned races were to be ruled by Anglo-Saxons. Kissinger’s thesis was later published as a book, *A World Restored: Metternich, Castlereagh and the Problems of Peace 1812-1822*.

In his book, Kissinger makes no bones about the fact that when he says a “world restored,” he means to restore the oligarchic system before the American Revolution. “It was clear,” writes Kissinger of 1812 when Britain invaded the United States, “that there were new forces loose in the world clamoring for popular participation in government. But it seemed equally evident that these forces had been responsible for a quarter-century of turmoil.” Of Kissinger’s two heroes whom he believes saved the world from American-style revolution, the more important is Britain’s Castlereagh, who had been a protégé of William Pitt the Younger, when the latter combatted the American Revolution. Pitt was an agent of the British East India Co., which was a paradigm for Adam Smith-style raw materials looting schemes, and which gave birth to the Tory families who sided with Britain in the American Revolution.

Writes Kissinger of Castlereagh’s design:

“That Europe rescued stability from seeming chaos was primarily the result of the work of two great men: of Castlereagh, the British Foreign Secretary, who negotiated the international settlement, and of Austria’s minister, Metternich, who legitimized it. . . . Because Britain was threatened only if Europe fell under the domination of a single power, Castlereagh was primarily concerned with constructing a balance of forces. Because the balance of power only limits the scope of aggression but does not prevent it, Metternich sought to buttress the equilibrium by developing a doctrine of legitimacy. . . . Each failed as he succeeded. . . . Their achievements were not inconsiderable: a period of peace lasting almost a hundred years, a stability so pervasive that it may have contributed to disaster.”

Yes, even Kissinger acknowledges that the seeds of World War I and World War II lie in Castlereagh’s policies: A lesson all should learn now that British “moles” like Kissinger are propelling the U.S. into a dirty little colonial war that may hold the seeds of World War III.

War hysteria built by Anglo-Americans

The British war propaganda machine is beating the drums for early U.S. military action against Iraq. Here are a few selections.

Great Britain

George Bush has to launch a dramatic military action fast against Iraq, or he will risk looking like a new Jimmy Carter, wrote Andrew Sullivan, correspondent for the Hollinger Corporation's *Daily Telegraph* on Aug. 15. "Unless there is a swift and decisive defeat of Iraq, Mr. Bush's options are gloomy. The way out, if there is one, is to seize upon the current mood of clarity and capitalize on it. . . . It is quite clear that nothing less than the outright defeat of Saddam can secure the West's interests in the region. An attack carries enormous risks, but so too does the policy of mere wait and see."

The *Sunday Telegraph* of Aug. 19 argued, "The American force is, quite simply, too large to be purely defensive and not yet heavily armed or large enough to take on the Iraqi army in a desert slogging-match. In this simple fact lies President Bush's current dilemma. . . . The West now has a short-lived opportunity to launch air strikes against Iraq's chemical weapons plants, nuclear facilities and military installations before the arrival in the area of Western civilians."

Bush has no more than a month or two to do something militarily dramatic against Iraq, since after that time the political tide in the U.S. could turn decisively against him, a senior British defense adviser told *EIR* on Aug. 14. "It's difficult for America to keep in this position for long. It's a matter of politics. Bush now has everybody in the so-called 'body politic' with him. But that can only last 1-2 months. With 50,000 men, four aircraft strike fleets, and the latest in air power all over there, if Bush does nothing now, he'll have real problems. Bush has got to get the temperature up fast. He can't just sit there. . . . If I were a Machiavellian, I would provide a reason, from Saddam Hussein's side, for a sting against him. It could be the matter of ill-treatment of hostages. I'm talking about maybe creating a pretext, or better yet, have it created for you. He hasn't got full control over his army, there are a number of lapses. . . . Once there is evidence of mistreatment of hostages, maybe a rape or

something, there could be a preemptive strike, like the one against Qaddafi in 1986, except this time for real."

The July 10, 1990 issue of the newsletter *Special Office Brief*, written by British intelligence operative Duke de Grantmesnil, Kenneth De Courcy, states that confrontation involving Iraq is certain to occur. The danger, according to De Courcy, arises from "the assistance of imprudent German and French concerns" that meant that Iraq "not only now has a lethal chemical warfare outfit, but missile guidance systems." "By 1995," he adds, "Iraq will be able to exterminate Israel altogether—to Russian applause." After praising Israel's raid upon Iraqi nuclear facilities nine years ago, De Courcy says that the Atlantic Powers could win the conflict with Iraq "only if they were ready to threaten use of major nuclear devices which if used in or near the Gulf would render a large part of the oil-producing areas uninhabitable for at least 25,000 years."

Israel, De Courcy says, will neither allow a Palestinian state to be created with "all the Iraqi lethal kit," nor will it "sit back until 1995 awaiting extermination." "It is therefore on the platform of Palestine and at the gates of Jerusalem," De Courcy concludes, "that the present epoch will face its ultimate drama. We can prepare for it but not now avoid it."

Israel

The Aug. 12 *Jerusalem Post*, under the headline, "Sharon to Americans: Blast Iraqis immediately," reported statements by Israel's Housing Minister Ariel Sharon to Israel Radio, warning that an economic blockade of Iraq would not deter Saddam Hussein, and that its effect would dissipate in time. "Soon we shall see pictures of hungry Iraqi babies and children on television, the demand will grow to bring home the troops, the hostage problem will grow acute, and America's partners will tire of the long wait in the desert. If action is necessary—then now is the time for swift military action. The more time passes, the more the world will grow accustomed to the idea that Kuwait is part of Iraq and it will become more difficult to get the Iraqis out."

Science Minister Yuval Ne'eman, speaking at a terrorism conference in Jerusalem, declared that Israel's bombing raid against Iraq's nuclear power plant nine years ago prevented the threat of nuclear weapons being used by Iraq against the American forces now in Saudi Arabia.

Italy's Aug. 18 *Corriere della Sera* was told by Foreign Minister David Levy that the West should "not lose time with Saddam Hussein, give him an ultimatum and then move." He continued, "If we give him space, then the leaders of the Arab countries will become afraid of being accused of having become 'collaborators of the imperialists.' . . . The West must set a deadline, it does not matter which one—October, November—and after this one must act. Who dreams about peace, must be prepared for war, otherwise why has this big armada been sent to the Mideast? One must not behave like the Americans in Lebanon."