

Kissinger strategy gains ground in Central America

by Donald Baier and Mary McCourt

The first stage of Henry Kissinger's policy for Central America—laid out in the report of his Bipartisan Commission issued Jan. 11—is already in effect. State Department officials said that El Salvador's upcoming national elections, scheduled for March 25, would result in an expanded civil war, regardless of the outcome of the vote. While Secretary of State George Shultz, who visited El Salvador on Jan. 31, was saying that the United States would support whoever won the elections, unnamed officials in his entourage leaked to the *New York Times* of Feb. 2 that "the balloting might lead to a confrontation of political leaders on the left and right that could set the stage for a military coup."

If rightist candidate Roberto d'Aubuisson, one of the two leading contenders, wins, "it will polarize El Salvador's civilian leadership," increase human-rights abuses, and strengthen the cause of the leftist guerrillas. Conversely, if the other front-runner, Christian Democrat José Napoleón Duarte, is the victor, the military will rebel and stage a coup, the unnamed Shultz officials told the *Times*.

Once El Salvador deteriorates even further, then the second phase of the Kissinger plan takes effect, when Kissinger himself, or one of his mouthpieces, announces that the problem cannot be solved without reference to Moscow, and then launches "negotiations" with various fronts for the Soviet Politburo along the Middle East model—that will leave the United States in the same untenable situation it now faces in Lebanon.

This second phase for Central America—a program which Kissinger has so far been able to use to escalate conflicts from Vietnam to Lebanon—is subsumed in "the New Yalta Plan." According to this scheme, initiated by Kissinger's business partner, Britain's Lord Carrington, the Central America conflict is to be tied in with all the other regional wars in a grand global "spheres of influence" deal with the U.S.S.R., a second version of the 1945 Yalta agreements.

Of course, what Carrington and Kissinger have in mind is nothing so generous as a 50-50 split. Some of their colleagues in the liberal Eastern Establishment leaked some of the details in the latest issue of the Morgan banking interests'

left-wing journal, *The New Republic*.

The leak is an article by Costa Rican Social Democrat Luis Burstin, who has been used as a go-between by the Soviets and the Cubans to negotiate with the United States. If the United States grants diplomatic recognition to Cuba, and implicitly agrees not to intervene in other places the Soviets consider within their sphere of influence, Burstin suggests, the Soviets would agree not "to sabotage the security of the United States in the Caribbean area." The Soviet Union, said Burstin, would also agree that it "has an obligation to help towards world peace and this they will not obtain by meddling, directly or indirectly, in an area which the United States considers vital to its security."

This proposal is reminiscent of the statements made by Soviet President Yuri Andropov in a 1983 interview with the German magazine *Der Spiegel*, in which he implied, with reference to the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, that if the United States would acknowledge the Kremlin's "right" to military intervention in Asia and the Middle East, the Soviets would recognize the U.S. "right" to intervene in Nicaragua or other Central American countries.

The Eastern Establishment makes its allegiance clear. The "New Yalta" will give the Soviets control of Europe's and Japan's Mideast oil supply, and the United States will be left enforcing the "drugs and equity for debt" policies which Kissinger and the International Monetary Fund have decreed for Latin America.

Ibero-America reacts

Clearly the United States will not win "peace" south of the border by these means, whether or not the Soviets actually pull out of the U.S. "backyard." By wholeheartedly endorsing the Kissinger Commission's line that U.S. strategic interest gives it the "right" to intervene militarily against sovereign governments in this hemisphere, the Reagan administration is destroying its relations with the nations of Ibero-America. Almost every country in Ibero-America has rejected the report because of its emphasis on U.S. "gunboat diplomacy and Hong Kong-style economics."

In Caracas, Venezuela, on Feb. 2 seven Ibero-American presidents and Spain's Prime Minister Felipe González signed a declaration reaffirming their support for the efforts of the Contadora Group—Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and Panama—to establish conditions for a negotiated settlement.

Mexican President Miguel de la Madrid blasted the Kissinger report for failing to note that most of the arms in the hands of the leftist guerrillas have come from among those shipped by the United States, and criticized Kissinger's recommendation that U.S. aid be conditional on an ideological "purity" test. At a Feb. 7 press conference, de la Madrid contrasted Kissinger's efforts to increase bloodshed in the region with the efforts of the Contadora group, which "does not believe economic and social development can be achieved through war or could be aided by heightened international tensions and resentments among the populations."