



## Henry Kissinger: This Man is on the Other Side

by William P. Hoar

Reprinted with permission from *American Opinion*, June 1975

William P. Hoar, a 1967 graduate of Bowdoin College, is a feature columnist and Contributing Editor for *The Review Of The News*, where his "The Right Answers" is published regularly. He is an *American Opinion* Editorial Assistant. William Hoar's independent travels have taken him across North America and ranged from the Arctic Circle to North Africa and behind the Iron Curtain.

Henry Alfred Kissinger, often pictured by cartoonists in a Superman suit, habitually bites his fingernails. And he has good reason. Americans are at last beginning to realize that the U.S. Secretary of State, and his policies, are anything but pro-American.

That conclusion is buttressed by considerable evidence, not the least of which was his successful plan intentionally to abandon South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia to Communist takeover. During his tenure as National Security Advisor and Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger has also arranged to recognize the "legitimacy" of the Berlin Wall and of permanent Communist occupation of East Germany. Working behind the scenes he engineered the ouster of Free China from the United Nations, managing to be in Peking during the fateful U.N. vote. He has even attempted, despite overwhelming Congressional and public opposition, to give away the U.S.-owned Panama Canal to a Marxist dictator.

And when the U.S.S.R (which maintains military bases in Cuba) grew tired of subsidizing Castro, Kissinger initiated "reconciliation" with Communist Cuba and proposes to help the Soviets bear their burden there. He supported a boycott of anti-Communist Rhodesia to make America dependent on the Soviets for vital defense supplies, even as he arranged shipment of our latest technology to Communist dictatorships from Peking to Moscow, and waived billions of dollars owed us by the Soviet Union.

According to his friend, Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin, Henry Kissinger is so completely trusted by Moscow that he negotiated in the Middle East on behalf of the Soviets as well as the United States. Yet he has so alienated both Turkey and Greece as to shake our alliances and threaten us with loss of our military bases in those countries. One U.S. air base in Greece is already scheduled to be closed, and Greece has withdrawn from the military arm of N.A.T.O. Kissinger has even underwritten the Communist-dominated military dictatorship in Portugal, now a Trojan horse within the N.A.T.O. alliance, despite the heavy and obvious interference there of the Soviet K.G.B. And, of course, through his SALT agreements, Henry Kissinger has guaranteed the Soviets a strategic military superiority and deprived us of an effective anti-missile system to protect us from nuclear attack, even as he arranged to strengthen Soviet military capacity through massive credits at giveaway rates of interest.

In view of such a record one is not surprised to find that Henry A. Kissinger was years ago



identified as a K.G.B. undercover agent, code-named Bor, assigned to a Soviet spy ring called ODRA. Our intelligence agencies were briefed on this as long ago as 1961 by an important anti-Communist who had for years operated behind the Iron Curtain at a high level of Communist intelligence and personally saw Kissinger's K.G.B. dossier. The source of this information supplied data resulting in the exposure and arrest of scores of other K.G.B. agents planted high in the Governments of Britain, Sweden, France, Germany, and Israel. He was formally voted the thanks of the American people in a special Congressional Resolution. Yet his detailed revelations about Kissinger have been buried. And Henry A. Kissinger, who worked with the Reds in Germany after World War II, now runs the U.S. intelligence network from above.\*

In fact, aside from his important functions as Secretary of State and head of the National Security Council, Kissinger also chairs the Intelligence Committee (which sets policy for the Central Intelligence Agency, Defense Intelligence Agency, National Security Agency, etc.); the Defense Program Review Committee; the Washington Special Action Group; the Verification Panel in the White House; all covert intelligence operations under the control of the "40 Committee"; and, the Net Assessment Group. Bluntly put, there is not only a fox in the chicken coop but he has been put in charge of security on the farm.

Before Henry Kissinger began to play at intelligence games his highest ambition was to be an accountant in New York City. But that wouldn't do for an agent Bor. Sent to Harvard for training, he was soon being moved through the Eastern Establishment by the Rockefellers and the Council on Foreign Relations until he was advising Presidents in both major parties. The Rockefellers had arranged a \$28,000 grant for him. The C.I.A. had funded his International Seminar at Harvard, where he founded *Confluence* magazine-which came under Defense Department scrutiny for its pro-Communist bias. He had been made a Director of Special Studies for both the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Council on Foreign Relations. The conspiratorial and elitist C.F.R., says Kissinger biographer and friend Stephen Graubard, had given "confidence and encouragement to an awkward and lonely individual...." (*Kissinger: Portrait Of A Mind*, New York, Norton, 1973.)

It was in 1957 that the C.F.R. arranged for Kissinger to write *Nuclear Weapons And Foreign Policy*, a volume declaring that "all-out war has . . . ceased to be a meaningful instrument of policy." His ideas on limited war appealed to "Liberals" anxious to involve us in the brewing war in Vietnam, but Conservatives were reassured that the author believed any Soviet version of "peace" meant the triumph of Communism throughout the world, and that Moscow saw "peaceful coexistence" as the "best means to subvert the existing structure by means other than all-out war." The Soviet leaders, wrote Kissinger, "have advanced variations of the same disarmament proposals since the mid-20's." In fact, Dr. Kissinger noted the popularity of anti-Communism and declared that "it is futile to deal with a revolutionary power by 'ordinary' diplomatic methods." Stephen Graubard points out that Henry Kissinger later decided that one could deal with the Reds because Peking and Moscow had in his eyes ceased to be "revolutionary" states.

In any event, despite its turgid prose, Kissinger's first book for the C.F.R. was promoted heavily, made the best-seller lists, and was a Book-of-the-Month selection. The man identified as agent Bor was up with the big boys now, and was soon attending meetings with Communists at the Pugwash



Conferences, funded by Cyrus Eaton, the millionaire former secretary to John D. Rockefeller who has long supported Communist interests. Ralph Blumenfeld reports that “Kissinger used to lobby strenuously each year at the Pugwash Conferences of scientists and philosophers, urging East European officials to get their intellectuals” to his International Seminar at Harvard. (*Henry Kissinger: The Private And Public Story*, New York, Signet, 1974.)

By the mid-Sixties, Dr. Kissinger was wafting another volume for the Council on Foreign Relations, this one entitled *The Troubled Partnership*, which called for a merger of our country with the socialist nations of Europe as part of what he called the Grand Design. “In moving from alliance to community,” wrote the man who would become Secretary of State, “the United States will not long be able to evade the issue of how much of its freedom of action it is prepared to give up.” There was also a related appeal to surrender our sovereignty because of threatening Communism, which was at the time on one of its periodic “peace offensives.” Feigning anxiety, Kissinger correctly noted: “On each occasion [since the Bolshevik Revolution] the period of relaxation ended when an opportunity for Communism presented itself.” So we should give up sovereignty before it is taken away from us.

Most of *The Troubled Partnership* argued for what amounts to the end of the United States as an independent power. “No final solution,” wrote the refugee from Nazi Germany, “is possible so long as the [Atlantic] Alliance remains composed of sovereign states.” An end to the sovereignty of the United States of America was to be part of the Grand Design, a point made repeatedly by the Harvard professor:

... institutions based on present concepts of national sovereignty are not enough The West requires a larger goal: the constitution of an Atlantic Commonwealth.... Clearly, it will not come quickly; many intermediate stages must be traversed before it can be reached. It is not too early, however, to prepare ourselves for this step beyond the nation-state.

One of these “intermediate stages” is now being reached in Western Europe. And, according to *U.S. News & World Report* for May 5, 1975, Dr. Kissinger “is saying in private that ‘all of Europe will go Marxist within 10 years.’ ” His “concern” over this likelihood is purest tartuffery. Kissinger knows very well that Atlantic Union, which he has long supported as a “Liberal” goal, is meant to be a Marxist partnership leading toward merger with the Soviets. It is an objective that Henry Kissinger has for decades shared with Nelson Rockefeller, whom he served as policy advisor, receiving fifty thousand dollars from the New York governor as a token of gratitude when Henry went to work for President Nixon.

Kissinger was said to have wept in disappointment when Nelson Rockefeller was denied the Republican nomination in 1968, but despite his open contempt for Nixon, Kissinger joined his White House staff to help with the Grand Design. Even after the Soviet tanks rolled into Czechoslovakia in 1968 to impose the Brezhnev Doctrine with blood and iron, “Kissinger remained committed to the ideas he had developed for Rockefeller,” declares Stephen Graubard, a fellow



member of the C.F.R. "His concern was with a 'creative world order'; that presupposed improved Soviet-American relations." One consequence of this was the surrender of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

Henry Kissinger's Vietnam "solution" was no surprise. Pentagon Papernapper Daniel Ellsberg, of the C.F.R., has declared: "Kissinger had an attitude in 1968 that made him look far more liberal than anyone in government. Literally no public figure had come out for unilateral military withdrawal. Kissinger was saying fairly early that what you wanted was a facade or delay before the Communists took over." (David Landau, *Kissinger: The Uses Of Power*, New York, Crowell, 1972.)

In fact, it was Henry Kissinger's belief as far back as 1957 that, in modern limited wars, we must explain our strategy to the other side lest they become suspicious that we will escalate the conflict and win. Perhaps this was the reason that in 1970 Kissinger reportedly informed the Soviets of the impending invasion of Communist "sanctuaries" in Cambodia. Henry was at the time partying in the Soviet Embassy at a celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Russian dictator V.I. Lenin even as our boys were being betrayed to the Communists in the Cambodian and Vietnamese jungles. Nothing interferes with Henry's quest for a New World Order. Not even treason.

In negotiating the sellout of South Vietnam, Dr. Kissinger explained that "Hanoi cannot be asked to leave" the Vietcong "to the mercy of Saigon." So he arranged to leave Saigon to the merciless Vietcong, forcing our allies to accept hundreds of thousands of North Vietnamese troops in their territory. Former White House speechwriter William Safire has described Kissinger's comments while attempting to surrender Saigon. "The big question is,' Henry said, 'does the other side want to settle for anything less than total victory? Their demands are absurd: they want us to withdraw and on the way out to overthrow the Saigon Government.' He brooded about that a minute. 'If we ever decide to withdraw, it'll be up to them to overthrow the Saigon Government — not us.'" (*Before The Fall*, New York, Doubleday, 1975.)

Eventually, of course, South Vietnam was told there could be a quick surrender or a slow surrender. The South Vietnamese attempted to delay their destruction as long as possible. Marvin and Bernard Kalb have related how Kissinger's aide Alexander Haig (C.F.R.) "arrived in Saigon with a presidential ultimatum: if Thieu persisted in holding out against an agreement, the United States would sign a separate peace with North Vietnam, and all military and economic aid to South Vietnam would be cut off." (Kissinger, Boston, Little, Brown, 1974.) So President Thieu took Kissinger's word that Peking and Moscow would curtail their supplies to Hanoi. What followed was Dr. Kissinger's "decent interval," with the result that Saigon has been renamed Ho Chi Minh City.

And yet Henry Kissinger is still contending that détente is "an imperative." He has told the Anglo-American Insiders of the Pilgrims Society: "In a world shadowed by the danger of nuclear holocaust there is no rational alternative to the pursuit of relaxation of tensions." Time magazine picked up on the theme in April, noting: "What's more, in spite of the recent gains by revolutionary forces around the world, Soviet leaders themselves were showing no signs of losing interest in East-West



détente.” Why should they? We provided them with credit terms better than those afforded American citizens, cut-rate grain, the largest truck plant in the world, sophisticated computers, the wherewithal for development of M.I.R.V. missiles, and status as the world’s most powerful military force. And all of this was done by the same Henry Kissinger who has written that “peaceful coexistence,” or détente or whatever the current euphemism, is a Communist “tactical device to overthrow the West at minimum risk.”

So Dr. Kissinger knows very well that helping the Reds now will lead to more aggression later. It is their standard practice, as he pointed out in *American Foreign Policy*:

There have been at least five periods of peaceful coexistence since the Bolshevik seizure of power, one in each decade of the Soviet state. Each was hailed in the West as ushering in a new era of reconciliation and as signifying the long-awaited final change in Soviet purposes. Each ended with a new period of intransigence....

Make no mistake, the Secretary of State knows what he is doing. But he does it anyway. And the Kissinger surrender policies are moving ahead as fast as he can move them. Before the fall of Saigon, according to *U.S. News & World Report* for April 28, 1975: “. . . the Ford Administration was considering a proposal to cancel the U.S. defense treaty with Taiwan to open the way for a new agreement with Communist China during the President’s visit to Peking later this year. The proposal has been dropped because, to quote a ranking Administration official, ‘we can hardly sell two allies down the river in a single year.’ “

You might have trouble getting a bet on that in Cambodia right now, where all anti-Communist officers, down to second lieutenant, are being liquidated along with their wives.

Much has been made of the “difference” between the remarks of President Ford and Henry Kissinger concerning the roles of Peking and Moscow in overthrowing South Vietnam. Ford didn’t blame them; Kissinger said “we shall not forget who supplied the arms ....” Yet, even in his “tough” criticism, Henry could not bring himself to mention the U.S.S.R or Red China by name. And, as reported in the *Los Angeles Times*: “In his criticism of Moscow and Peking, Kissinger was careful to state that the US policy of détente with both capitals is still in effect.” What is a little mass slaughter between future partners in the New World Order?

Labor leader George Meany of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. is not among those who are deluding themselves about the planned New World Order. Meany warns: “Everywhere communism is on the march. Everywhere the West is in retreat. Such are the fruits, the bitter fruits, of détente.” Another not blinded by Kissinger’s policies is Dr. Robert Morris, who has just updated his excellent 1955 book, *No Wonder We Are Losing* (Plano, Texas, University of Plano Press), to include the debacle wrought by Robert McNamara as Secretary of Defense and Henry Kissinger as Secretary of State. Dr. Morris writes of the Kissinger reaction in the face of Communist imperialism:

. . . incredible as it seems, our response to this implacable thrust has been to make our preeminent effort in foreign policy the strengthening of world Communism in economic,



agricultural and industrial spheres, where it is still weak and poorly structured And we do this even while Brezhnev, after the fashion of Hitler and *Mein Kampf*, keeps telling us that the present situation of “détente” calls for an “intensification” of the world struggle and more rather than fewer “confrontations.”

Despite such rising criticism, Henry Kissinger persists in pushing the Grand Design – a plan to insure us of the “peace” of the woeful Gulag Archipelago. United Press International reported in April: “Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger said Thursday Americans must ‘pay the price of our setbacks in Indochina’ by striving even harder to lead a new world order.” In truth, if Henry Kissinger has his way, we are not going to “lead” the New World Order in anything but sacrifice and appeasement. As Phyllis Schlafly and Admiral Chester Ward observe in *Kissinger On The Couch* (New Rochelle, Arlington House, 1975): “Only one of the two can survive; the Kissinger policy or the United States of America.” Kissinger is using détente and the SALT agreements to at once strengthen the Soviet Union and mentally and physically disarm the United States. Schlafly and Ward found the evidence is “clear that ‘sufficiency’ did not mean equality, or even near-equality, but was a flexible term to cover a level that is substantially inferior to the Soviet Union.” Based upon their 846 pages of careful documentation the authors (who long had a reputation for opposing conspiracy theories out of hand) conclude:

It is therefore established that [Robert] McNamara, [Paul] Nitze, and Kissinger are all conspirators who secretly plotted to disarm the United States unilaterally; and who were so ruthless and dishonest that they brought the United States down from what Henry Kissinger admitted was “overwhelming” strategic superiority in 1962, to a Kissinger-admitted Soviet advantage in missile throw-weight of 4-to-1 against us, which translates into a 10-to-1 to 20-to-1 superiority over us in missile-deliverable explosive power.

Nor has Kissinger ignored the role of economic pressure in furthering his Grand Design for the New World Order. Here the plan is not only to loot America on credit but to depress America’s standard of living to make possible a Great Merger with the less-developed nations under Communist control. We discussed Kissinger’s international food and energy programs at length in *American Opinion* for March 1975. Since then, he has announced global, designs for the oil market involving “recycling” of money and a guaranteed minimum price for petroleum-producing countries now facing a glutted market. Columnist Eliot Janeway has noted of the price-floor proposal:

The spectacle of America offering to guarantee a minimum price for oil as a reward for petropiracy conjures up visions of a gunman being begged not to bind and gag his victim until the latter could write him a life-insurance policy.

The recycling system is compared by Janeway to that imposed on the Germans after Versailles, under which Germany was stripped of her wealth, then lent money on her debt (by the U.S.) to be



collected in Britain and France. We paid both winners and losers. In time the results – the planned consequences -were runaway inflation, depression, totalitarianism, and war. And every effort is being made by conspirators in our government to keep America from again becoming independent of foreign fuel by pushing ahead with development of our coal and nuclear capacities while virtually stifling development of new oil and gas reserves.

Syndicated columnist Paul Scott reports: “The world-minded Kissinger hopes to use his proposal for an ‘oil price floor’ and offer ‘to sell a large chunk of America’ to the major oil producers to convince them to formalize their support for the ‘new world order.’” It is sort of a perpetual hijacking plan whereby we pay tribute continually to the major petroleum interests,\*\* who are guaranteed a minimum price regardless of supply or demand; they are offered “security” and a piece of the action here in return for their petrodollars; Americans are assured only of a high price for fuel and that the wealth of all but our tax-protected Insiders will be “redistributed” to those with low incomes, domestically and abroad.

International bankers would of course have a field day tending to such a daisy-chain. But the objective is not mere looting for profit. It is much more sinister. Paul Scott warns: “In Kissinger’s opinion the merging of the standards of living is necessary to create the climate in industrial nations like the U.S. and West Germany for support for the formation of a loosely-knit world government. His plan provides for the eventual merging of the Communist and free world systems in the 1980s.” That, after all, is the Grand Design.

Henry Kissinger is supported in managing all of this by an able staff of conspirators who, like him, have ties to both the Communists and the Establishment Insiders. Kissinger brazenly admits approving a number of security risks over the objections of worried officials. The security dossiers of U.S. Ambassadors he sent to anti-Communist Chile and the Republic of China, for instance, contain reports linking both men to the underground Communist apparatus. Our Ambassador to Portugal boasts to the Comrades with whom he is working that America is not a capitalist nation, but well on the way to being a Socialist Welfare State, a development he finds to his liking. Boris Klosson, Kissinger’s top man at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), has not only been identified as a K.G.B. contact but arranged the return of Marxist Lee Harvey Oswald from Moscow despite his known K.G.B. connections- The subsequent assassination of President John Kennedy was coordinated, according to an important defector in Britain, Oleg Adolfovich Lyalin, by the K.G.B.\*\*\*

Another top Kissinger appointee, Helmut Sonnenfeldt (who was a major culprit in helping the Soviets to pull off the Great Grain Robbery), was caught passing Top Secret information to a foreign power and the F.B.I. recommended prosecution under the espionage statutes. When the House Internal Security Committee took notice of this and other suspicious Kissinger appointees, and began to look into substantiation of the report that Kissinger is himself a K.G.B. agent, the Committee was abolished in a back-room coup by pro-Communist Congressmen.

Then there is Defense Secretary James Schlesinger, Kissinger’s college classmate and a protégé of Kissinger’s man Daniel Ellsberg, whose short tenure as boss of the C.I.A. resulted in the ouster of



hundreds of “old-fashioned” anti-Communists unhappy about bunking in with the Reds. Incredibly enough, the Defense Secretary was recently quoted as declaring: “Since a position of strength failed to achieve all the objectives that the United States might set, perhaps we should substitute a position of weakness. It is an interesting thought....” And you wonder why we are losing?

One of his former confidantes, Danielle Hunabelle, has written that Henry Kissinger “was not a dyed-in-the-wool nationalist and did not believe in America’s absolute superiority.” Which is hardly news, in view of Kissinger’s disarmament of the U.S. military and his repeated calls for surrendering U.S. sovereignty to the New World Order. What is surprising is the arrogance of the man identified as Soviet agent Bor. For Kissinger offhandedly boasted to Miss Hunabelle that he could perform the same service in the Soviet Union, “but in the Kremlin I’d be more influenced by Marxism.” This is our modern Vicar of Bray- with the patriotic principles of a parasite looking for a host. “Power is the ultimate aphrodisiac,” says Henry Alfred Kissinger.

The man’s audacity is awesome. He announced recently in the White House: “At times, I believe we have better relations with the Russians and [Red] Chinese than Congress.” Radical as the Congress is, that is probably so. Clark Mollenhoff reports that, angry over Soviet duplicity in matters of trade and emigration, even Senator Adlai Stevenson III has “charged that Kissinger ‘misled the Congress’ into believing there were assurances from top Soviet leaders when he knew there were none. ‘Then, instead of defending the U.S., Secretary Kissinger blamed Congress and defended the Russians,’ Stevenson said. The State Department explanation that Kissinger simply ‘forgot’ to tell Congress was incredible to both conservatives and liberals in the Senate and House. If it was a deliberate deception it was difficult to exaggerate its importance, for it involved the rights of millions of people and billions in trade agreements.”

The point is that when in trouble Kissinger lies, and the “Liberal” press lets him get by with it. Former Presidential aide William Safire, now on the staff of the New York Times and certainly no Right-winger, notes of Kissinger that “intrigue was second nature to him.” Consider the case of his role in initiating the infamous White House wire taps. In *Before The Fall*, Safire comments on the controversial taps over which Kissinger threatened to resign if not quickly “cleared” by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

The reason why it is logical to assume that the wiretap program had Dr. Kissinger’s enthusiastic support, and why his subsequent protestation of distaste rings false, is the operation of the “dead key.” All telephone calls to Henry Kissinger, except those few from girl friends, were monitored by a relay of stenographers in his outer office. President Nixon knew his calls were being taken down verbatim whenever he spoke to his national security advisor.... Henry Kissinger was deft in beguiling the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but he cannot escape history’s judgment of the way he watered the roots of Watergate.

But possible perjury by the Secretary of State didn’t bother Joseph Kraft of the *Washington Post*, who declared: “While he may have lied, the untruths are matters of little consequence when



weighed against his service to the state.” Kraft, who is a member of the C.F.R., went on record as a hypocrite to protect Henry. And the telephone of Joseph Kraft was one of those Henry had tapped. As C.B.S. commentator Jeffrey St. John told a press convention last year: “He has managed to manipulate the press until you reporters have become mere shoeshine boys for Kissinger in Washington.”

A Washington journalist told the *New York Post*: “He [Kissinger] has the problems of anyone who trades in misrepresentation and duplicity. He can’t let people compare notes and find his lies.” According to a former National Security Council aide: “He’s so pathological he could probably pass a lie [detector] test.” He lies to everyone, say former associates. Perhaps Henry A. Kissinger’s middle initial really stands for Ananias.

Whatever the cause or motivation, the result of Kissinger’s lying to defend his pro-Communist policies has been disaster. He has gone so far, report Admiral Chester Ward and Phyllis Schlafly, as to provide Moscow and Peking with “a commitment by the United States *not* to oppose Communist ideology and *not* to oppose expansion of communism. That is not speculation or hypothesis. It is embodied in the Declaration of Principles that Henry Kissinger talked Richard Nixon into signing at the Moscow Summit of ’72.” And that declaration, signed by Nixon and the boss of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, formally announced the official goal as disarmament in favor of a new international order:

The U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. regard as the ultimate objective of their efforts the achievement of general and complete disarmament and the establishment of an effective system of international security in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

According to *Aviation Week & Space Technology*, the Soviets are already breaking the SALT agreements. The result is that, by the design of the Secretary of State, we are being unilaterally disarmed in the face of a massive Soviet buildup even as everything possible is being done to keep the American people from discovering what is happening. The so-called SALT agreements approved by “our” Secretary of State are in fact Soviet plans, drawn up in the Kremlin, meant to deny us protection from attack. And the Soviets know, as does everyone else who has taken the trouble to read Kissinger’s 1957 book, *Nuclear Weapons And Foreign Policy*, that Mr. Kissinger doesn’t believe in massive retaliation after a sneak attack. If the Communists attacked us first, knocking out half our retaliatory force, Kissinger wrote: “Considered purely rationally, there would be little sense in American retaliation.” Yet, under the Kissinger-Schlesinger policy, we are committed to a policy of ignoring advance warning and withholding response to any nuclear attack until our cities or military installations are actually hit. It is clearly a setup to make credible any necessary Soviet nuclear blackmail should Americans grow restless about being goose-stepped into the New World Order. The idea of our having a strategic superiority of force doesn’t fit the plans of those who seek what Walt Rostow called “an end to nationhood.”

As we are moved toward World Government, Marvin Kalb and brother Bernard write that Kissinger



“will deal with the devil, if necessary, to come Up with the right agreement.” He is said to prefer “injustice” to “disorder”; and, though there would be great injustice, there would certainly be a great deal of order in a world slave state. Under the New World Order, an international elite would run the rest of humanity like robots, and claim to be doing us a favor.

Fortunately, Kissinger is now in trouble with both “Liberals” and Conservatives. *Newsday* and *New York* magazine have called for his resignation, as have a number of Conservative leaders. In the wake of his Vietnam sellout, Congressman Lawrence McDonald has demanded that Kissinger return his Nobel Peace Prize. Former U.S. Ambassador William Pawley declares: “He scares me to death.” And even John Roche, former head of the Americans for Democratic Action, is concerned-noting that every matter of American interest Kissinger gets “involved in suddenly becomes ambiguous.”

Senator Jesse Helms, who voted against Kissinger’s nomination as Secretary of State, is among those who are infuriated over Henry Kissinger’s plan to bypass the Congress and turn over de facto sovereignty of our vital Panama Canal to the local dictatorship. The Republican Senator angrily asks:

What is Mr. Kissinger up to? What meat does this self-appointed Caesar eat? This Senator is sick and tired of it. Let the press heap upon this man all the flattery and all the praise, but I want to know where his successes are. Henry Kissinger is like the emperor who has no clothes. Only one little boy stood and said, “I don ‘t see any clothes. ” And I do not see the successes of Henry Kissinger.

In the matter to which I am referring, clearly the proposed actions... are in direct opposition of the expressed opinions of a sizable bloc of Members of this body. I believe that any effort that the executive branch may take to arrogate to itself the rights provided in the Constitution to the Senate and the House of Representatives could lead to one of the most serious constitutional crises which our country has faced in the 20th century. I doubt very much that a majority of our colleagues in this Senate would tolerate such an arrogation of power by the executive branch, depriving Congress of its constitutional rights in a matter involving sovereignty over territories of the United States.

No doubt Henry Kissinger was greatly amused. The *New York Times Magazine* of October 28, 1973, quotes him as remarking: “The illegal we do immediately. The unconstitutional takes a little longer.” These who take Kissinger’s “jokes” lightly do so at their own risk.

In early April, New Hampshire’s Governor Meldrim Thomson delivered an angry speech before the California Republican Assembly calling Henry Kissinger the “cunning architect of America’s planned destruction” and declaring that he should be discharged immediately.

Governor Thomson was on target with his observation that “Kissinger, the protégé and beneficiary of the largess of Vice President Rockefeller, stands for everything that George Washington



abhorred and warned against – compromise, duplicity with foreign nations, and unpreparedness for a war of survival. America will never be safe as long as Kissinger is Secretary of State.”

Yet Kissinger’s plans for a New World Order are moving ahead. A proposal was recently presented to the Council on Foreign Relations by the head of the international Trilateral Commission to center “energetic supra-departmental integration of our global policy” in the office of Vice President Rockefeller. Henry Kissinger and the C.F.R. Insiders are much too close to their goal for comfort.

William Safire reports that Henry and top Communists frequently joke about secret police tactics and slave camps in Siberia. It is no laughing matter when Kissinger is consulting regularly with Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin, the top K.G.B. officer in the United States and first member of the Soviet politburo to maintain residence outside of the Soviet Union. Comrade Dobrynin has even presented the man identified as K.G.B. agent Bor with a photo of a bulldog, which Kissinger hung on his White House wall. The top K.G.B. officer inscribed the photo: “Henry, don’t be too serious. Take it easy. Relax. Anatol.” But Henry Kissinger cannot relax. To be exposed is to be destroyed. So he plays at secrecy, telling reporters: “No, I won’t tell you what I am. I’ll never tell anyone.”

One understands why. But to understand is not enough. To know what Henry Kissinger is up to, and to fail actively to seek his immediate resignation, is not tacit acquiescence in error but countenance of treason.

Henry Kissinger was identified in 1961 by a top anti-Communist operative who had risen to the rank of colonel-general in Communist intelligence as a member of a secret R.G.B. ring, known as ODRA, that was in place inside U.S. Army intelligence. Kissinger had been working with the Communists in post-war Germany under the code name of Bor. Although his highest previous ambition had been to become an accountant he was moved on to Harvard where his K.G.B. file showed him to be maintaining contact with the C.I.A. The man identified as agent Bor was soon provided with a \$28,000 Rockefeller grant, his seminar was financed by the C.I.A., he was made a director of studies for both the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Rockefellers’ secretive Council on Foreign Relations. The C.F.R. published his books, he acted as personal advisor to Nelson Rockefeller, and he was maneuvered into place under President Nixon as chief of national security and Secretary of State. Trusted by the Communists and by the Establishment Insiders, Kissinger proceeded to support Communist interests in the name of détente, to disarm the United States in the face of a Soviet arms buildup, and to arrange a massive looting of the American economy on credit. All this, he claimed, was in the interest of achieving a New World Order.

\* Details of Kissinger’s activities as agent Bor can be found in Frank Capell’s long intelligence monograph, *Henry Kissinger: Soviet Agent* (The Herald Of Freedom, Zarephath, New Jersey, 1974, \$3.00). As it happens, the investigative staff of the House Internal Security Committee was documenting Capell’s charges when the Committee was suddenly abolished. And Saudi Arabia’s anti-Communist King Faisal had ordered copies of Mr. Capell’s book a scant three weeks before his assassination by a radicalized nephew, said to be “into Marxism” According to Dublin’s authoritative *Special Office Brief*, the nephew visited the assassination section of the K.G.B. in East



Germany before the shooting.

\*\*As we go to press, Exxon has just replaced General Motors atop Fortune magazine's list of the five hundred most powerful U.S. corporations. But the real question is: Will Rockefeller replace Ford?

\*\*\*Lyalin was the informant whose exposure a few years ago led to the deportation of 105 K.G.B. agents from Britain. Dublin's *Special Office Brief* reports: "The U.S. Government (under Kissinger's particular influence) has kept both the Kennedy and Faisal assassination details connected with Department V of the KGB secret. It has been argued that the truth would upset détente. "