

Kissinger Plan for Lebanon: Death by ‘Democracy’

by Michele Steinberg

If Lebanon survives the upcoming May 29 election and beyond, it will be despite the George W. Bush Administration, not because of it. Bush’s claim of “his” victory for democracy in Lebanon, is widely viewed with bitterness and suspicion inside Lebanon, and for good reason. It is recognized by the leaders of both the Lebanese opposition and the Lahoud government that was close to Syria, that the Bush Administration’s major—and perhaps only—interest in Lebanon, is to use the country against Syria. For the neo-conservative fanatics run by Vice President Dick Cheney, Lebanon is seen as useful for either military strikes against Syria, or as a staging ground for a special operations regime-change in Syria. (See *EIR*, Feb. 25, 2005, “Lebanon’s Hariri Killed To Make a ‘Clean Break.’ ”)

When Syrian President Bashar Assad made good on his promise to pull all Syrian military troops out of Lebanon, and did so on April 29, the neo-conservative faction that is itching for a war and regime change in Syria lost its excuse for an immediate confrontation. There is now a struggle inside and around the dysfunctional Bush Administration over what to do about Lebanon. But, the one thing in common among all the factions is that they have *no respect for the sovereignty of Lebanon*. In fact, the Bush policy could be well called “democracy without sovereignty.”

One view is represented by a threat—delivered twice in one week by Henry A. Kissinger, in the May 12 *International Herald Tribune*, and the May 16 *New York Times*—to have U.S. or “international forces” invade Lebanon. Kissinger wrote, “Three times since 1958 . . . foreign intervention held the ring in Lebanon to prevent collapse into violence and to arbitrate among the Christian, Sunni, Shiite, and Druze groups that constitute the Lebanese body politic. The test will be whether the United States and the international community . . . can mobilize an international presence to guarantee that the conflicting passions do not once again erupt.”

The Dick Cheney view is to install a puppet leader in Lebanon, who will back a U.S. invasion of Syria. As the neo-conservative-created Syrian exile “leader,” Farid Ghadry, rhetorically asked at the June 2004 founding meeting of the Committee on the Present Danger, “When is this Administration going to invade Syria?”

Ghadry, who is considered by regional experts as a “joke,”

has already been brought into the highest levels of the Condoleezza Rice State Department—the office of Assistant Secretary of State Liz Cheney, daughter of the Vice President—to discuss his plans for taking over Syria. The U.S. invasion of Syria, long planned by the Cheney-centered neo-cons again surfaced, when Rice made verbal attacks on Syria a centerpiece of her May 15 surprise visit to Iraq.

Another view, and perhaps the most dangerous, is to let the election proceed without destabilizations and ultimata from the United States about disarming the Shi’ite group Hezbollah. Then, *after* the election, as was done in Georgia, Ukraine, and even earlier in Peru, the U.S.-British imperial forces would use their covert and semi-open “democracy” funds to unleash Jacobin mobs in the streets of Lebanon to overturn the election. The stage would be set for another tragedy.

But, given that Iraq is turning into a killing field, and that Ariel Sharon is backing off—perhaps permanently—from the Gaza “disengagement” plan, the U.S. Administration does not have the means to execute its plans of aggression. As a senior Central European source told *EIR*, “The U.S. is ‘militarily stretched, diplomatically isolated, and financially eroding.’ ”

A Temporary Solution

For now, reports a well-placed Washington specialist on the Middle East, the Administration has accepted a plan presented by the Saudi Arabian government to provide “stability” in Lebanon, which involves the election as Prime Minister of Saad Hariri, a 35-year-old businessman, who is the son of the slain former Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri. It was the assassination of his father, Rafiq Hariri, on Feb. 14 in Beirut, that led to mass demonstrations, the resignation of Prime Minister Omar Karami (who was not opposed to the Syrian presence), and the formation of an interim government in Lebanon.

The sudden central role of Saad Hariri—with reluctant U.S. approval—came as somewhat of a surprise. It had been largely overlooked on April 25, that Saad Hariri, who, like his father, is close to the Saudi Arabian royal family, was part of the entourage of Saudi Crown Prince Abdullah, when he met President Bush in Crawford. Young Hariri also met with

Vice President Dick Cheney, and then travelled to Washington, D.C., where he held private meetings with the top leadership of the Bush Administration's "Middle East hands," including Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz.

Soon after the U.S. visit, Saad Hariri, announced that he would return to Lebanon to run for the Parliament. Heading a slate that includes a Maronite Christian, and a Shi'ite leader of Hezbollah, Hariri has been endorsed by interim Prime Minister Miqati, and his slate has already "won" 9 uncontested seats, as of May 20. (By law, the Prime Minister must be a Sunni Muslim, the President must be Christian, and the Speaker of the Parliament a Shi'ite Muslim.)

In proposing Hariri as Prime Minister of Lebanon, *EIR*'s source reported, the Saudis also indicated that loans and investments would be made available to build and reconstruct Lebanon, which is one of the most heavily indebted countries per capita in the world. The Saudis want stability and will pay for it.

"The truth is that the Bush Administration is *afraid* of democracy in the Middle East," the *EIR* source said. "That's why the Saudis could have so much sway. The Administration may not admit it, but it is understood by the U.S. institutions that if there were truly free elections in the Middle East, particularly in Egypt and Saudi Arabia, anti-American governments would win by overwhelming margins." The Administration is faced with "hostile populations," not hostile governments. Another problem is that the Bush Administration is offering no economic future for Lebanon.

LaRouche Offers a Real Solution

On May 18, in a written communication to his "Lebanese friends," American statesman Lyndon LaRouche offered a solution based on the "common aims of mankind." LaRouche wrote: "The time has come to free Lebanon forever from Kissinger's evil legacy. With the Syrian army having withdrawn from Lebanon, it is also time for Israel to truly and fully withdraw—with no more incidents of overflights or artillery fire which erupt with such frequency, and disregard for Lebanon's sovereignty that they threaten the peace." LaRouche also called for all the forces in the region to apply the principles of the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, instead of falling victim to the Kissinger trap.

"As a friend of Lebanon," said LaRouche, "I must again recount my experience of April 1975, when I warned people in the region of Southwest Asia, that the policy of Henry A. Kissinger, then U.S. Secretary of State, was to plunge Lebanon into a civil war. At that time, I was in Iraq attending a joint celebration of the Syrian and Iraqi Ba'ath parties, and told a group of participants that as the direct result of Kissinger's manipulations, I anticipated the imminent outbreak of a civil war in Lebanon. The group was so struck by these warnings, that they scheduled, for the next day, a more extensive briefing to be given by me.

"The invitation to Baghdad had been extended to me, in

response to a paper I had written entitled, 'The Middle East Peace and Development Plan of 1975,' which proposed to set the foundations for Arab-Israeli peace via large-scale regional development projects, including water management, transportation, energy, education, health care, etc., utilizing the combined scientific, technological, and material resources of all the nations of the area. In that paper, I called on the Persian Gulf states, freshly awash in petrodollars, to create a Middle East Development Bank, to channel a portion of their oil revenues into long-term, low-interest development credits.

"In response to my warning about Kissinger, a large group of diplomats, government officials, academics, and other guests of the pre-Saddam Hussein Iraqi Ba'ath Party government was flown by helicopter to an oil production facility, Public Station IV, where the day-long dialogue proceeded. I identified for the participants the RAND Corporation's 'chicken game' scenario of manipulated conflict as key to comprehending Kissinger's schemes to provoke sectarian violence in Lebanon. Before the Ba'ath celebration ended, on April 13, 1975, word arrived of the outbreak of civil war in Lebanon."

LaRouche said that the person directing operations to again thrust Lebanon into chaos, today, is George Pratt Shultz, who had been in the Nixon Administration with Kissinger in 1975, and then in 1982, as Secretary of State, had blessed the Israeli and Syrian occupations.

It is Shultz who "organized the Bush Administration . . . that picked Condoleezza Rice and caused her to organize something called the 'Vulcans.' He was the one who appointed Dick Cheney, to organize a new Bush Administration under George W. Bush, Jr.," said LaRouche.

In fact, LaRouche added, the crisis in Lebanon beginning in 1975 "is a product of Shultz; who brought Kissinger into power, to create the mess, which you're now looking at in Southwest Asia. So, the crimes of Kissinger actually come from people like Shultz."

"Once again, in 2005, as Lebanon moves towards its national election, Kissinger again rears his head in the pages of the U.S. media to issue a veiled threat of a foreign invasion. . . . Fortunately, my Lebanese friends tell me that the lessons of 1975 to 1990, have been learned, and Kissinger has lost his grip," LaRouche noted.

LaRouche emphasized that "the crisis facing Lebanon is a global crisis . . . a global economic crisis that is far greater than any that has been experienced by any living person today." LaRouche also invites the Lebanese to join his movement for a new, just world economic order: "As I have emphasized since January 2005, in trying to get nations together, rather than trying to argue about bits and pieces of cultural this, and cultural that—flotsam and jetsam—why not take the most fundamental thing? The human race is in danger. We have a common interest. We have a common interest, above all, in development; in development and management of such things as the mineral resources of the planet."