

## British agent Kissinger sets up U.S.-China conflict

by Jeffrey Steinberg

On July 26, Katherine Graham's *Washington Post* turned over two-thirds of its op-ed page to Henry A. Kissinger. The recently knighted Sir Henry spun out one of his typical pieces of amoral geopolitical drivel, on U.S. policy in Asia, particularly U.S.-Chinese relations, titled "Heading for a Collision in Asia."

Kissinger's piece was a carefully worded attack against the Clinton administration—one of a string of recent public and private assaults on the Clinton Presidency to come out of Dr. Kissinger's mouth. From beginning to end, the Kissinger piece was consumer fraud. He began by lying that "the United States and China are on a collision course. Twenty-five years of U.S. bipartisan policy pursued by six administrations is coming unglued. Chinese leaders fear that America, afraid of growing Chinese economic power, is embracing a two-China policy as part of a strategy designed to contain China. . . . Sino-American relations are becoming vulnerable to accidents beyond the control of either side."

Ever since March 29 of this year, when Kissinger appeared as a keynote speaker at the London Chatham House, headquarters of the Royal Institute for International Affairs (RIIA), the former U.S. secretary of state has been a leading spokesman for the House of Windsor/Club of the Isles drive to break up China and plunge all of the Asia-Pacific Rim into chaos. This is at the heart of British policy in the Far East—not American policy.

Six days after Kissinger's article appeared, on Aug. 1, the *Washington Post* published an abbreviated rebuttal to the Kissinger piece titled "China: What Kissinger Leaves Out." The author was Harvey J. Feldman, who was the State Department country director for Taiwan from 1977-78. Reportedly, Feldman's piece was drafted in consultation with current State Department officials, and was intended to be a put-down. The mere fact that the *Post* published a reply to the high-flying Dr. Kissinger by a lowly ex-State Department functionary must have sent Sir K into orbit.

It is a healthy sign that the Clinton administration is apparently making even a



*Henry Kissinger (left) and David Rockefeller in Washington, D.C., April 1992. Now that President Clinton is defying British policy in crucial areas, Sir Henry is shuttling around the world to try to undermine White House initiatives.*

veiled effort at showing its disdain for Kissinger. This is a measure of Kissinger's diminished influence over American policymaking; but it is insufficient. In many world capitals, among powerful but poorly informed officials, Kissinger's name is still synonymous with American foreign policy, with the Republican Party legacy of Richard M. Nixon—in short, with a segment of the American policymaking establishment. When Kissinger showed up recently in Beijing to confer with the Chinese leadership, his confident forecast that the Republican Party would sweep into the White House in November 1996, and his sober pronouncement that President Clinton is already a "lame duck," was reportedly taken as the well-informed word of a legitimate American political insider.

But nothing could be further from the truth! Kissinger is, after all, a publicly confessed British agent. On May 10, 1982, speaking at Chatham House, Kissinger confessed his lifelong loyalty to the British Crown and to the British Foreign Office, whose 200th anniversary he had come to London to commemorate. Years earlier, this news magazine had published extensive evidence that Kissinger was a British agent throughout his career in U.S. government service. But, as of May 10, 1982, that evidence was corroborated by Kissinger—in his own written and spoken words. Kissinger is no different than confessed Soviet spy Aldrich Ames, or confessed Israeli double agent Jonathan Pollard—a traitor to all things genuinely American.

Between the death of President John F. Kennedy in November 1963, and the inauguration of William Clinton in

January 1993, no American President has dared to defy the City of London and the British Crown on any significant policy matter. Before the Kennedy assassination, the last American President to systematically challenge London was Franklin Roosevelt, despite Dwight Eisenhower's brief challenge to London during the Suez crisis of 1956. British agent Henry Kissinger's emergence as a powerful force within American policymaking in the period 1969-92 was the clearest evidence of London's domination over Washington since the Kennedy murder.

Now, for the first time since JFK, the Clinton White House, with the backing of some until-recently slumbering American institutions, is defying British authority on a range of fronts. The Anglo-American conflict is most evident in the Balkans and in Northern Ireland.

But, in Asia as well, American and British policies are as different as night and day. American policy is to attempt to encourage stability and to ensure that British efforts to break up China into a string of petty warring principalities are blocked. The American policy may be severely limited in scope and flawed in its execution, but it nevertheless stands in sharp contrast to that of the British Crown.

The repeated failure of many important world policymakers, as well as the overwhelming majority of too-often-British-controlled American news media, to treat Kissinger as the pathetic British pawn that he is, has made it necessary for this news service to once again expose the sordid career of one of London's most significant propaganda assets.