

## Kissinger Watch by M.T. Upharsin

### Henry wants a war, as soon as possible

ABC News's host Ted Koppel has yet to comment on the public meltdown of his friend and foreign policy mentor, Henry Kissinger, who ended the Nov. 30 Nightline broadcast near tears, saying: "I feel isolated, totally isolated."

The immediate cause of Kissinger's pain was President Bush's announcement that morning that he would be willing to meet with Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz in Washington, while Secretary of State James Baker would meet with Saddam Hussein in Baghdad. Though many observers think this is just a ploy to deflect congressional criticism, the mere prospect of going through the motions of negotiations undercut Kissinger's call in three syndicated columns for the soonest possible preemptive strikes against Baghdad.

Kissinger was so worked up that he came close to accusing the President of Munich-like appeasement, stammering that it was "highly inappropriate" to send Baker to meet with Saddam Hussein whom the President had characterized as a "new Hitler." Twice Kissinger slipped, saying "the President is sending Secretary Bush." Two weeks earlier on CBS, he had twice referred to the Persian Gulf as "Vietnam," while denying that a war in the Gulf would be as bad as the Vietnam conflict.

### I love Maggie, 'cause she's so mean

Henry's Dec. 2 syndicated commentary was not, for a change, on the need to start bombing Baghdad, but a love

letter to ousted British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, who had nudged a willing Bush into making the huge U.S. military deployment in the Persian Gulf. She was forced to resign as prime minister on Nov. 22.

Kissinger made it clear that the reason why he so cherishes the Anglo-American "special relationship" is that the British are unabashedly immoral. Sections of the column emphasizing this are paraphrases of Kissinger's May 1982 speech to the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) in London, where he admitted that while he held office, he worked more closely with the British Foreign Office than the U.S. State Department.

Kissinger extolled Thatcher as "a great exponent of the special relationship between Britain and the United States that has been so crucial in shaping the postwar world. . . . The virtue of the special Anglo-American relationship was that it helped bridge this gap between American moral absolutes, which equated foreign policy with universal principles, and [Britain's assumption] that what was good for the nation was best for the rest of the world."

As *EIR* has previously shown, even Kissinger has had to admit that British balance-of-power geopolitics lit the fuse for World War I and II. What else would anyone expect from a nation that hates applying "universal principles," like the republican system of government, to foreign policy?

Nowhere was Kissinger's role as a mouthpiece for British imperialist aims in the Persian Gulf clearer than in his Nov. 28 testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Kissinger's testimony was a pastiche of his three newspaper columns of Aug. 19, Sept. 30, and Nov. 11,

which repeated several themes: 1) Once the President decided to deploy forces to the Gulf, the only legitimate debate was over the size of forces. 2) Having decided correctly to deploy massive forces, it "would shake international stability," if the U.S. did not go to war. 3) The goal of the war must not only be to force Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait, but it must destroy Iraq's nuclear, chemical, and biological warfare capabilities with preemptive strikes. 4) The entire U.N. course of sanctions merely undermines the will of the international coalition for war. 5) In some fashion, the U.S. must use overwhelming air strikes against Iraq, and keep ground fighting to a bare minimum, despite Iraqi superiority in quantity and quality of tanks and artillery. 6) The U.S. must not do more harm than "destruction of the Iraqi military complex," so that the balance-of-power would be preserved in the Gulf.

Even if one were wrongly to accept Kissinger's reasons for war, anyone schooled in military science would recognize these goals as lunacy of a potentially catastrophic dimension.

While even the dean of the liberal Establishment, McGeorge Bundy, who helped launch Kissinger's career, has deserted Thatcher's war policy, Kissinger is by no means bereft of influence. On Nov. 14, he gave the keynote speech titled "The New World Order: Risks and Opportunities" at an award dinner for *Los Angeles Times* publisher David Lavenhol, sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. Eyewitnesses report that Kissinger, a friend of several ADL leaders, devoted much of his speech, on "the New World Order," to the importance of a Persian Gulf war in shaping it.