

Henry Kissinger caught in plot against beam-weapon defense

by Criton Zoakos

There are grounds for assuming that Henry A. Kissinger was personally involved in the Kremlin's June 29, 1984, proposal for a U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. conference to "ban the militarization of the space." The purpose of Kissinger's involvement, on behalf of the Kremlin's interests in the matter, was to manipulate the Reagan administration into accepting a grandiose scheme of redividing the world in favor of growing Russian appetites, the so-called New Yalta Deal. These are the conclusions to be drawn from the international publication earlier this week of a syndicated newspaper piece by Henry Kissinger advising President Reagan on the proper course to take in arms-control negotiations.

Attack on the SDI

Centerpiece in the Kremlin-Kissinger gambit was their concern and apprehension over the President's Strategic Defense Initiative, the program to develop laser-beam anti-missile weapons. Supporting cast for the Kremlin-Kissinger gambit included the Mondale campaign, the Aspen Institute, the newly formed American Academy of Diplomacy, the State Department, and the "nuclear freeze" faction in the House of Representatives, a good deal of whose draft legislation is penned inside the Soviet Embassy in Washington.

Since the spring of this year, there existed Soviet-inspired legislation which would prohibit President Reagan from going ahead with the scheduled testing of anti-satellite weapons *unless he could prove to Congress that he tried in good faith to negotiate with the Russians the banning of "space weapons."* With this legislation in mind, the Soviet General Staff made a proposal on June 29, 1984, for an urgent U.S.A.-Soviet meeting to take place in Vienna on September 18 which would "ban the militarization of the cosmos." Moscow demanded that the United States impose a moratorium on all research work in space technologies of all types before the meeting could take place. Moscow also demanded that the United States accept the entire agenda for that Vienna meeting as it was written and offered by the Russian General Staff without any modification whatsoever.

When the United States government made its own recommendations for the agenda, the Russian General Staff instructed its Foreign Ministry to reject all U.S. proposals and to announce that the Vienna talks had collapsed and would not occur, placing the blame on President Reagan and Defense Secretary Weinberger. These instructions of the

Russian Stavka were carried out on July 28, 1984 by Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Komplektov and Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko.

The entire faction of appeasers and Soviet dupes in Congress immediately started readying its arguments that Reagan failed to meet the criteria of the law, failed to "negotiate in good faith" with the Soviet Union, thus preparing to prohibit the scheduled ASAT tests next fall, and to further cut urgently needed allocations for the Strategic Defense Initiative.

In that instant, right after Gromyko's "nyet," Henry Kissinger published an article in Katherine Graham's *Washington Post* titled "Before talks with the Soviets resume." Fools and dupes in the administration hailed Kissinger's article as electoral support for the President, on grounds that Kissinger advised the President not to feel obliged to have negotiations with Moscow "at all costs."

Henry applies the brakes

In reality, however, Kissinger's article is meant to exploit the irrational climate of the presidential election period and get the "ball rolling" for his "New Yalta Deal," his great dream to replay the infamous Congress of Vienna of 1815. Kissinger proposes and offers the Reagan Administration the following:

- 1) Secret, back-channel dialogue with the Soviets to define a "concrete content for the concept of peace," namely, *"define on a confidential and unpublicized basis the objectives for East-West relations over the next two to five years."*
- 2) Postpone space negotiations till after the U.S. elections.
- 3) Assign a "bipartisan body" such as the Scowcroft Commission to "study the strategic issues."
- 4) Define American goals on the basis of "urgent consultations with our NATO allies," which for Kissinger means we should have our policies dictated by Lord Carrington, the new General-Secretary of NATO and co-chairman of Kissinger Associates Inc.
- 5) Take the issue of national security and foreign policy out of the election campaign and make it the job of a secret, select, "bipartisan" committee.
- 6) Stop space negotiations and "use the interval between now and the U.S. elections to develop a position on the relationship between offensive and defensive forces. Without it we will be whipsawed both at the conference table and at home."

The premise of the Kissinger thesis is that the Russians do not pose a threat to world peace. At least not their actions—merely their talk is nasty. He writes: “Remarkably, this nervousness is being evoked almost entirely by Soviet rhetoric. Soviet actions have been extremely cautious; there have not been in recent years any significant geopolitical challenges. The Soviets have pursued essentially psychological warfare; they seek to substitute words for deeds.”

Contrary to Kissinger’s lies, the reality is:

- The Russians have organized their military forces for an actual invasion of the Federal Republic of Germany, perhaps as early as this month.

- They have become the arbiters of the military and national security policies of the nations of the Scandinavian and Balkan peninsulas.

- They have become the instigators as well as arbiters of the Iran-Iraq conflict.

- They have become the instigators and arbiters of the difficulties between Pakistan and India.

- They have launched a campaign to become the arbiters of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the prime movers of what their Foreign Ministry calls a “Middle East Peace Conference.”

- In the last 12 months, they have captured a strategic portion of the EEC’s agricultural exports and are moving to dominate both prices and supplies in the world oil markets.

- They have increased their arms shipments to insurgencies in Central America and elsewhere.

- They are in the final preparatory phases of launching large manned orbiting nuclear-weapons platforms.

Most of these Soviet advances were consolidated after the hasty withdrawal of United States peacekeeping forces from Beirut. The power vacuum which the United States left behind in the Middle East and eastern Mediterranean after March 30, 1984, was perhaps greater and of more dramatic implications, than the hasty retreat from Saigon in May 1975.

The Beirut withdrawal signaled the beginning of America’s “decoupling” from Europe. The Russians’ advances since that time were made possible, in fact were caused, by the active pursuit, on the part of the oligarchical interests and families which stand behind Kissinger, of a grand endgame to cause a rearrangement of world power relations—the New Yalta Deal. It is this deal which Kissinger, in his *Washington Post* thesis, proposes to put into effect “on a confidential and unpublicized basis.”

Its objectives, already well on their way to being attained:

- to formalize Russian preeminence in the Near East, Middle East, the Indian subcontinent and Far East;

- to decouple Western Europe from the United States;

- to manipulate the United States into an adversary, “big stick” relationship with Latin America, in accordance with the recommendations of Kissinger’s own “Bipartisan Commission on Central America.”

How Moscow sponsors ‘peace’ in the Mideast

by Thierry Lalevée

Is a diplomatic breakthrough around the corner in the Middle East? That impression might be given by the unexpected flurry of “peace proposals” in the last three weeks of July:

- While visiting Jordan on July 11, French President François Mitterrand called for a new Geneva-type Middle East conference to convene as soon as possible. Picking up on a 1982 Brezhnev proposal, Mitterrand suggested that instead of having the United Nations as sponsor, France would be willing to hold the conference in Paris.

- On July 29, the Soviets revived their 1982 proposal, which had not been heard of since the days of the late Yuri Andropov. With no reference to Mitterrand’s proposal, the TASS press release called on the U.N. to act as sponsor.

- On July 30, Vladimir Polyakov, director of the Middle East department of the Soviet foreign ministry, arrived in the Middle East to test the waters for the idea.

- A few days earlier, on July 26, U.S. State Department representative Alan Romberg had announced that the Reagan administration might reactivate the 1982 Reagan Peace Plan.

Did we miss something? How is it that there is suddenly so much talk about a global peace agreement in the region, just as the real possibility for peace seems more remote than ever? The answer lies in some sinister deals being discussed among Moscow, the European capitals, and the Anglo-American crowd that Henry Kissinger represents.

What double-talk! When you hear about a “broad” agreement, read “limited,” and for “global,” read “regional.” These “peace proposals” are a cover for the division of the Middle East into new colonial spheres of influence. That Mitterrand’s proposal is somewhat different from the Soviet one, which in turn is different from the Reagan peace plan, merely underlines the point that there are many ways to eat the same cake.

Conspiracies in Switzerland

It is in Geneva and the Hotel Dulder in a Zürich suburb that the first round of these negotiations has been under way, approximately since the beginning of June. The Dulder Ho-