

Kissinger Watch

issue #16 22 March, 2002

About This Issue

Dear readers,

On March 28, Kissinger Out – K.O.!, a new inter-NGO campaign will be launched. The campaign will target organizations in which Kissinger holds posts, including the International Olympic Committee and the UNESCO peace prize jury. The purpose and scope of K.O.! will be outlined later this month in a press conference in Geneva. On March 29, the Geneva Film Festival will show “The Trials of Henry Kissinger” (http://www.fifdh.ch/e/programme/kissinger_e.html), followed by a debate involving the filmmaker Eugene Jarecki, Reed Brody (HRW), Eric Sottas (The World Organisation against Torture), Bruno Cathala (ICC) and a KissingerWatch representative. Thanks to the “Comité Memoria y Justicia: Chile - Suiza - América Latina”, a member of the K.O.! campaign, for co-organising this event.

In a recent interview, the current US Secretary of State Colin Powell was questioned about US involvement in the 1973 Coup d’Etat in Chile. Powell’s replied, “With respect to your earlier comment about Chile in the 1970s and what happened with Mr. Allende, it is not a part of American history that we’re proud of.” His response is at least a partial acknowledgment of the fact that the CIA (under Kissinger’s supervision) helped overthrow the democratically elected Allende Government (article 1),

Martin Almada, a winner of last year’s The Right Livelihood Award (known as the alternative Nobel prize) maintains that Kissinger is responsible for many more deaths than Bin Laden. Almada was tortured by the Strossner Regime of Paraguay, discovered the Operation Condor archives and campaigns for justice for the victims of this intergovernmental killer network of Latin American dictatorships. (article 2 in French)

Henry Kissinger is accused of having endorsed and

continued on page 2

Contents

1. Colin Powell: “Not Proud” Of Us Role In Chile
2. “L’ex-ministre américain Henry Kissinger a tué plus que Ben Laden”
3. Henry Kissinger and the Angola Saga, by Sietse Bosgra, special to Kissinger Watch
4. The Kissinger Factor and US Policy on the International Criminal Court
5. Is Kissinger a criminal?

1. COLIN POWELL “NOT PROUD” OF US ROLE IN CHILE: Transcript of BET

Source. Pinochet Watch 47, <http://www.tni.org/pinochet/>

Comment

During a Youth Town Hall Meeting on Black Entertainment Television, U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell was questioned about U.S. involvement in the 1973 Chilean coup. In his response, which attempted to differentiate U.S. action in Iraq from U.S. interventionism in Chile, Powell admitted that he was “not proud” of the U.S. role in overthrowing democratically-elected Chilean President Salvador Allende. A transcript of the question and response follow below.

The remark, which attracted little attention in the U.S., made headlines in Chile. A spokesperson for the Chilean government told press, “We are glad that they recognize that the intervention in 1973 is not a part of U.S. history that fills them with pride and that today it is considered to have been a mistake.”

When asked to clarify what Powell meant, U.S. Ambassador to Chile William Brownfield seemed evasive. “At some point,” he told Chilean paper *El Mercurio*, “we didn’t say things when we should have said something; or we said something that perhaps we shouldn’t have said, or we had opportunities that we didn’t take [advantage of.]” According to news reports, the Ambassador went on to say that Chileans should draw their own conclusions about what did or did not happen during that period.

EXCERPT FROM BET TRANSCRIPT, February 20, 2003
<<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2003/17841.htm>>

QUESTION: My name is James Dubek (ph). My question is that undoubtedly the United States considers itself the moral superior in this Iraq confrontation. My question is, despite past events such as in 1973 when the United States staged a coup in Chile on September 11, despite the wishes of the Chilean populace against the coup, and in support — and the populace in support of the democratically elected President Salvador Allende, the CIA, regardless, supported the coup of Augusto Pinochet and that resulted in mass deaths.

And my question is: Why does the United States now consider itself the moral superior enough to have nuclear weapons while Iraq — while demanding that Iraq disarm,

continued on page 2

About—continued from page 1

supported Operation Condor. In June 2001, Kissinger went to Paris to award the UNESCO Peace Prize to the otherwise laudable Mary Robinson, then UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. While in Paris, Kissinger was summoned by a French judge to answer questions about 'Operation Condor.' He immediately departed, asking the US embassy to deal with this 'contemptible' attempt at interrogating him about state-sponsored and US supervised terrorism.

One of the least known of Kissinger's crimes involves his role in the civil war in Angola. The Dutch journalist Sietse Bosgra has specially contributed an elaborate analysis of the genesis of the Angolan war to this issue of Kissinger Watch. (article 3)

There is growing awareness in the US administration that Henry Kissinger faces the threat of prosecution. John Bolton, Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, speaking before the conservative Federalist Society about the International Criminal Court said that if officials had to worry constantly about the danger of being indicted, "over time that's going to have an effect on your decision-making." "If you're Henry Kissinger," Bolton continued, "and every time you go to this European country or that European country you have to worry if you're going to be served with a subpoena, it has an effect." (article 4)

Last but not least, the film "the Trials of Henry Kissinger is inexorably conquering cinemas across the US and television in Europe (arte-tv). (article 5)

Michael Schmitt
The International Campaign against Impunity
michael@icai-online.org

John M. Miller
East Timor Action Network
fbp@igc.org

Gérman Westphal
Instituto Cono Sur
westphal@umbc.edu

Philip Grant
TRIAL
philip.grant@trial-ch.org

Kissinger Watch

www.icai-online.org/kissingerwatch
a joint project of:

East-Timor Action Network (www.etan.org)

International Campaign against Impunity
(www.icai-online.org)

Instituto Cono Sur
(<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/politicaconosur/>)

TRIAL - Track Impunity ALways
(www.trial-ch.org)

Powell—continued from page 1

yet we still maintain our weapons?

SECRETARY POWELL: It's not a matter of us believing that we are morally superior. It is a matter of us recognizing a danger to the region and to the world. I wish nuclear weapons didn't exist. They do exist. The United States were the ones, we were the ones who invented them in the first place and we used them to end World War II. And other nations have acquired those weapons over the years, but for the most part, the major nations of the world who have nuclear weapons have arrangements with each other and they are under control and nobody is worried about that kind of a nuclear conflagration any longer.

But with Iraq, we have a regime that has attacked its neighbors, that has used gas against its neighbors, that has used chemical weapons, gas, against its own population, and has demonstrated an intent for years to use these weapons for not peaceful purposes and not to protect itself, but to be aggressive against other nations. And it is for that reason that the international community, not just the United States, but the United Nations, passed 16 resolutions, now with 1441 a 17th resolution, saying this is unacceptable.

So it is the will of the international community that Iraq disarm, and not just the moral superior position, as you describe it, of the United States. We have no desire to impose upon the Iraqi people a leadership that is to our choosing, but to give them an opportunity to choose their own leadership.

With respect to your earlier comment about Chile in the 1970s and what happened with Mr. Allende, it is not a part of American history that we're proud of. We now have a more accountable way of handling such matters and we have worked with Chile to help it put in place a responsible democracy.

One of the proudest moments of my life was going to Chile in the late '80s and speaking to all of the military officers in the Chilean armed forces, all the senior officers, and talking to them about democracy and elected representative government and how generals such as them and me — I was a general at the time — are accountable to civilian authority so that incidents of that kind or situations of that kind no longer arose.

For more information:

- Full transcript of BET Town Hall Meeting, <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2003/17841.htm>
- Reuters, "Chile Cheers Powell Remarks on 1973 Coup," February 22, 2003. http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=/nm/20030222/pl_nm/chile_usa_pinochet_dc_1
- El Mercurio, "Embajador Aclara Dichos de Powell," 24 de febrero de 2003. <http://diario.elmercurio.com/nacional/politica/noticias/2003/2/24/303313.htm?id=303313>

2. «L'ex-ministre américain Henry Kissinger a tué plus que Ben Laden»

<http://www.courrier-international.com/interview/avec/almada.htm>

MARTÍN ALMADA,
(20 décembre 2002)

Martín Almada, 65 ans, enseignant et avocat aux Etats-Unis et au Paraguay, est le découvreur des archives du plan Condor, le gigantesque réseau de répression mis en place par les dictatures d'Amérique du Sud (Chili, Argentine, Paraguay, Uruguay), qui a servi à torturer et à assassiner des milliers de personnes avec l'accord des États-Unis. Sa découverte, "les Archives de la Terreur", a ouvert une brèche dans le mur d'impunité qui protège encore les responsables des dictatures. Il a reçu le 9 décembre 2002 le prix Nobel alternatif pour son action en faveur des droits de l'homme et la protection de l'environnement dans son pays. (20 décembre 2002)

Où se trouvent actuellement les "Archives de la Terreur" ?

Elles ont été transportées au palais de justice d'Asunción (Paraguay). Nous sommes en train de les microfilmer. L'accès du public est libre. L'idée est ensuite de mettre toutes ces informations sur Internet afin que chacun puisse y avoir accès. Il y a encore beaucoup de gens en Amérique du Sud qui recherchent des informations sur cette période (en gros, du début des années 70 à la fin des années 80), qui veulent désespérément trouver comment sont morts leurs disparus ou un indice concernant le lieu où se trouvent leurs cadavres. C'est toute l'histoire de la répression qui se trouve là. Le Paraguay de Stroessner a joué le rôle de banques de données. Il y a beaucoup de choses à voir, des documents très variés : revues, livres, fiches d'identité, papiers administratifs, correspondance militaire et d'espionnage, photos, lettres...

Pourquoi les grands dictateurs d'Amérique latine sont-ils encore libres ?

C'était et c'est toujours une véritable mafia militaire. Ils se protègent tous entre eux et ils en ont les moyens financiers. C'est comme ça que Stroessner bénéficie de la protection des militaires brésiliens actuellement. Ceux qui sont poursuivis dans leur pays passent dans les pays voisins Kissinger Watch.....

IMPORTANT - donations required

We require your financial support to step up our efforts against the impunity of Henry Kissinger. Together with our new partner organisation, the Geneva based anti-impunity network "TRIAL" (www.trial-ch.org), we are planning a whole range of activities as well as the establishment of a special campaign office this summer.

- For US foundation grants and personal donations from Americans requiring tax deductibility, please send an e-mail to icai@icai-online.org for information on how to make out your check and where to send it.

- All other donations will be administered by TRIAL. Please transfer your donation to:

Bank: Swisspost – Postfinance, CH - 3030
Berne
International Swift Code: POFICHBE
Recipient: TRIAL (for KissingerWatch), 1211
Genève 11

où ils ont un réseau de complices. En un sens, le plan Condor continue à fonctionner. Ces tortionnaires ont amassé illégalement des fortunes colossales qui leur permettent d'acheter l'aide ou le silence de beaucoup de monde.

Mais alors, que faudrait-il faire pour les coincer ?

Eh bien justement, une bonne piste serait d'enquêter sur la partie économique des dictatures. De mettre en lumière les richesses accumulées par les répresseurs, et avec quelles complicités. On découvrirait des choses terribles. La chambre d'industrie et de commerce du Chili doit posséder des documents prouvant la complicité des industriels locaux avec Pinochet et établissant leurs liens avec l'armée chilienne. De surcroît,

on doit y trouver de nombreuses références de comptes bancaires en Suisse. Et au Paraguay, en Argentine, il faut suivre la trace des biens volés aux disparus. L'impunité génère deux choses : plus de corruption et plus de répression. Nous devons connaître la vérité. Si nous possédons des documents écrits, nous pouvons traîner ces gens en justice.

Depuis l'affaire Pinochet, des avancées ont quand même eu lieu concernant l'impunité.

Oui, heureusement. Mais tout avance lentement en matière de droits de l'homme. En avril dernier, un mandat d'arrêt international a été lancé contre Stroessner et Sabino Montanaro [son ex-ministre de l'Intérieur], ce qui est une bonne chose. En Argentine, de nombreux tortionnaires sont en résidence surveillée. Les associations appartenant à la société civile font un travail formidable pour faire triompher la vérité.

FAIR USE NOTICE: This bulletin contains copyrighted material the use of which has not been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We distribute this material without profit and believe this constitutes a fair use of any such copyrighted material as provided for in 17 U.S.C § 107. If you wish to use copyrighted material from this site for purposes of your own that go beyond fair use, you must obtain permission from the copyright owner.

alternative. Soixante-dix femmes s'occupent de faire tourner cette affaire. Les ressources en jeu sont l'imagination, la créativité, la reconnaissance du potentiel humain et la valeur des éléments naturels. Nous fabriquons aussi du papier végétal fait à la main à partir de feuilles de fruits ou d'arbres. Nous le vendons pour les arts plastiques, les faire-part... Avec une ONG suisse, Volog, nous avons créé un village indien qui fonctionne entièrement à l'énergie solaire. Le tout à l'échelle humaine : 42 familles bénéficient ainsi de la lumière, de réfrigérateurs, de ventilateurs, de cuisinière... avec, bien sûr, zéro pollution.

L'environnement est votre autre domaine d'action ?

Vous savez, protéger l'environnement, c'est aussi protéger les droits de l'homme. Créer des emplois, c'est également agir en faveur des droits de l'homme.

Que représente ce prix Nobel alternatif pour vous [le prix est doté de 220 000 dollars à partager entre quatre lauréats] ?

Pour moi, c'est tout d'abord un grand soutien moral. La reconnaissance de ma lutte. Ensuite, c'est le moyen de former une équipe en matière de droits de l'homme. Je n'ai pas de relais dans les autres pays d'Amérique du Sud, car les gens n'ont pas les moyens, et en plus ces recherches sont risquées. Avec le prix, je vais pouvoir rechercher des gens pour m'aider. Je voudrais par ailleurs agir dans le domaine de l'éducation. Transmettre aux générations futures cette histoire. Au Paraguay, par exemple, je me rends compte que les jeunes ne savent pas ce qu'il s'est passé pendant les dictatures. Et pourtant ce sont eux qui feront la nation future. C'est de la prévention, et puis c'est le moyen de contrer cette politique de "mémoire interdite" pratiquée par les gouvernements et qui entretient l'impunité. Au Paraguay, 50 % de la population est jeune. Les vieux sont résignés et trop occupés à survivre pour penser. Ce sont les jeunes qui bougent, l'espoir de temps meilleurs réside là.

Propos recueillis par Christine Lévêque,
© Courrierinternational.com

BIOGRAPHIE

Une découverte de plus de cinq tonnes

Martin Almada fut emprisonné et torturé entre 1974 et 1977 dans un camp de concentration paraguayen sous la dictature d'Alfredo Stroessner (1954-1989). Exilé au Panamá, puis en France, il a été mandaté par l'UNESCO pour promouvoir de 1986 à 1992 le développement rural en Amérique latine et en Afrique. Il présenta en 1992 devant les tribunaux paraguayens une demande d'accès à ses antécédents policiers et militaires et commença parallèlement sa propre enquête. C'est comme ça que le 22 décembre de la même année, guidé par des informations anonymes, il découvrit dans un bureau du siège de la police de Lambaré (à quelques kilomètres d'Asunción) les gigantesques archives de la police de Stroessner (actuellement réfugié au Brésil), preuves de la véritable

dimension du plan Condor. Une documentation de plus de cinq tonnes, appelée "les Archives de la Terreur", brèche dans le mur de l'impunité qui protège encore les responsables des dictatures. A ce jour, le dépouillement des archives continue. Seulement 80 % des documents ont pu être examinés.

4. The Kissinger Factor and US Policy on the International Criminal Court, November 15 2002

Anthony Dworkin, first published on
<http://www.crimesofwar.org/onnews/news-icc-us2.html>

Leading European states appear to have rebuffed the latest attempt by the United States to secure exemption for its citizens from the new International Criminal Court. A recent trip by the State Department official who is handling bilateral negotiations on the ICC, Marisa Lino, has failed to persuade European governments to sign agreements with the US that would guarantee that American citizens would not be handed over to the court.

At the heart of the dispute with the Europeans is an issue that is apparently of central importance in the Bush administration's opposition to the court. This is the prospect that former government officials, travelling in a private capacity, might be called before the court as defendants or witnesses. You could call it the Kissinger Factor, since former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger is an emblematic figure for many of those who oppose the court – as indeed he is also for some of the court's most enthusiastic backers. (Kissinger himself could not actually be indicted by the ICC, which only has jurisdiction over actions that take place after July 1 of this year. It is the Kissingers of tomorrow who are at issue here.)

Under Article 98 of the ICC statute, states are not required to hand suspects over to the court if they have signed an exemption agreement with the suspect's country of origin. This article was framed primarily to take account of agreements governing the deployment of troops overseas, which routinely include a provision that they should be returned home if they accused of any crime. However the United States has used it as the basis for a campaign to press countries to sign more sweeping immunity agreements – Article 98 agreements, as they have become known – under which no US citizen would be delivered into the court's clutches.

So far, the United States has signed Article 98 agreements with fourteen countries – El Salvador, Afghanistan, the Dominican Republic, East Timor, Gambia, Honduras, Israel, the Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Micronesia, Palau, Romania, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan.

Government Officials Are Key US Concern

Under the template drawn up for these agreements, those who may not be handed over to the court are listed as
continued on page 10

3. Henry Kissinger and the Angola Saga by Sietse Bosgra, Special to Kissinger Watch

One of the biggest crimes of Henry Kissinger was the U.S. intervention in Angola in 1975. However, in the present campaign to bring Kissinger to court little attention has been paid to his role in Angola.

In 1975 Portugal decided to wash its hands of its rebellious colonies. It agreed to negotiate a handover of Angola to three rival independence movements, which had consented to abide by the results of elections. If democracy had been allowed to prevail then, more than a million lives might have been saved.

Instead, Henry Kissinger talked President Ford into a clandestine adventure that was to lead Angola away from the ballot to the bullet. Only days after the January 15, 1975 signing of a peace agreement establishing a transitional power-sharing government and October elections, the CIA intervened. It sent \$300,000 in cash to one faction, the CIA's long term client the FNLA., which most likely interpreted it as an indication of unconditional US support. This payment was made without the knowledge of the US Congress or the public.

The FNLA used the money to finance an all-out military attack on the MPLA in February. In March, Zaire's Mobutu, a child of the CIA, sent his army troops into Angola. The war had started.

In July 1975, President Ford gave Kissinger approval for a covert military operation designed to install a pro-US government in Angola. On July 18, President Ford authorized a first disbursement of \$6 million, followed by another \$ 8 million on July 27 and \$10.7 million more on August 20. The CIA covert operation in Angola dubbed IAFEATURE had begun. The United States was in the lead, flanked by Zaire and South Africa. England and France took up the rear by starting their own clandestine assistance programs. This coalition backed UNITA and FNLA. "They are the same, those who yesterday supported [the Portuguese dictators] Salazer and Caetano", MPLA-leader Neto remarked. At the same time the Chinese and North Koreans supported the FNLA with arms and training in order to strengthen the anti-Soviet forces.

GLEIJESES

The full truth about the American operation in Angola was not known until the extensive documentary record assembled by John Hopkins University professor Piero Gleijeses. Gleijeses was the first non-Cuban scholar to gain access to the closed archives of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Cuba. He obtained extensive U.S. documentation through the Freedom of Information Act, and worked in the government archives of Belgium, Great Britain, and West and East Germany. His book "Conflicting Missions: Havana, Washington and Africa 1959-1976" constitutes an indictment against Henry Kissinger.

More detailed information on the role of the Soviet Union in Angola has since become available. Norwegian Kissinger Watch

scholar Odd Arne Westad is the only researcher who has had access to the relevant Soviet archives. And the head of the Soviet Solidarity Committee, Shubin, has added additional information by publishing his experiences.

MOTIVES FOR U.S. INTERVENTION

The motives for the active US intervention against the MPLA were not based on Angolan or African realities, Gleijeses writes. The suffering of the Angolans did not matter. In fact, in the minds of U.S. strategists as far back as Kissinger, that suffering barely appeared to exist. To Kissinger, the situation in Angola was simply a clash between American and Soviet power. Kissinger was wholly obsessed with countering Soviet influence anywhere on the planet, real or imagined. "My assessment was if the Soviet Union can interfere 8,000 miles from home in an undisputed way and control Zaire's and Zambia's access to the sea, then the Southern countries must conclude that the US has abdicated in Southern Africa", Kissinger wrote in his memoirs.

However, according to Gleijeses, American prestige was the point. The ghost of Vietnam would be exorcised by a display of American power in Africa. "For Kissinger the final debacle in Vietnam was both a national and a personal humiliation.... It is unclear whether Kissinger truly believed that a Soviet power grab was occurring in this remote African country. What is clear that he chose Angola as the place to show America's resolve in the wake of Vietnam. In Angola, he would take the offensive, he would send a signal." In the words of Kissinger: "Playing an active role [in Angola] would demonstrate that events in Southeast Asia have not lessened our "determination to protect our interests."

Both U.S. intelligence and policy makers concluded in 1975 that an MPLA regime in Angola did not threaten significant U.S. interests. "But for Henry Kissinger this was irrelevant: U.S. policy towards Angola would be determined not by what happened there, but by his conception of the U.S. position in the world at the time," Gleijeses wrote.

SOVIET AGGRESSION

U.S. policy was based on the false assumption that it was fighting 'Soviet aggression' in Angola. The same simplistic thinking that was the cause of the war in Vietnam received its follow-up in Africa. But like the Vietnamese resistance movement, the MPLA was not a willing tool of Moscow. The Soviet Union had not trusted the MPLA-leaders during the war of independence against Portugal, and they still didn't trust them in 1975.

In the 1960s the MPLA had received some Soviet and Soviet-bloc aid, but Angola was a low priority for Moscow. The paucity of this aid was consistent with Soviet policy toward sub-Saharan Africa. The Soviets were neither impressed with the MPLA's military performance nor with

its leaders, particularly Neto. They suspected that Neto and his organisation were pro-Chinese.

Through the years relations between the USSR and the MPLA were strained. The former head of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee of the Soviet Union, Shubin, has published some examples,

In December 1962, after Neto had escaped from custody in Portugal, he first went to Washington to put his case before the American government and press. Coming up empty he continued his trip to Moscow. Nikita Khrushchev, the Soviet Premier, was on holiday in the Crimea when he heard the news of the launch of an Angolan government-in-exile. He was angry that the Soviet Union had not yet recognized the new government and decided this should urgently be done. When Neto was informed of the decision, the message "sounded like a death sentence", as this government-in-exile was part of the CIA-backed FNLA. Before the recognition was published in the Pravda, the decision was at the last moment rescinded."

In 1967, Neto travelled to Beijing, Moscow and Belgrade. In Beijing, the Chinese pressured Neto to condemn Soviet revisionism. Neto refused and the Chinese refused to provide any aid. In Moscow, the Russians pressed him to condemn the Chinese. A request and Neto also refused. He decided to forgo the plane ticket to Belgrade the Soviets had offered him, and bought with his own money a ticket for an exhausting trip by train. "This incident illuminates both Neto's personality and the travails of a small, proud, and unsuccessful guerrilla movement", Gleijeses comments.

In 1972, the aid to MPLA from Moscow and the other countries of the Soviet bloc was stopped. Chronic Soviet suspicions that the MPLA was pro-Chinese had probably been fanned by the limited aid given by China in 1971 to the MPLA. Moreover there was an internal split in the MPLA in 1972, and the Soviets favored the anti-Neto faction that had decided to leave the organisation.

When in 1975 Kissinger decided to fight "Soviet aggression" in Angola, Moscow's relations with the MPLA were at its lowest ebb. This was known in Washington. In March 1973 Assistant Secretary of State Newsom told British officials that "we [the United States] were surprised by the low level of Soviet support to the liberation movements in the Portuguese territories".

The MPLA was clearly not a tool of Moscow, but a non-aligned organisation. The MPLA's closest friends were Yugoslavia and Algeria. Most of its non-military support came from the governments of Scandinavia and the Netherlands.

In reaction to the CIA donations and Chinese weapons deliveries to FNLA and to the invasion by the Zairan army into Angola early 1975 the MPLA asked for urgent support from the Soviet Union and Cuba. "The available evidence indicates that the Soviets intervened in Angola slowly and reluctantly. Their aid to the MPLA began in early 1975, well after Beijing had sent instructors and weapons to the FNLA", Gleijeses concludes. The Soviet leaders were worried that such a move would damage their policy of Kissinger Watch.....

detente with regard to the US. In August 1975 Brezhnev suggested to president Ford a visit to Washington.

In August 1975 the MPLA complained to a Cuban delegation about the paucity of the aid from the Socialist camp. "Neto complained that the Soviet Union stopped aiding them in 1972 and that although it is now sending them weapons, the amount of assistance is paltry." The most important Soviet contribution to MPLA during this period was the specialized military training of approximately 100 Angolans in the Soviet Union. The Soviets refused however to send military personnel to Angola before November 11, with the sole exception of one military adviser, called Yuri.

The reaction of most African countries to the South African invasion in October 1975 led the Soviets to believe that it would be less dangerous than before to intervene in the Angolan conflict. The documents show that the Soviet Union only reluctantly backed Havana's intervention in Angola and tried to put strict limits on it. Moscow decided moreover that it would assist the Cuban operation in Angola only after its declaration of independence on November 11 1975. Before that date no Soviet transport planes were used to support the Cuban with their transport problems.

No meaningful effort was made by the United States to discuss Angola directly with the Soviet Union in an attempt to avoid escalation Kissinger: "If we appeal to the Soviets not to be active, it will be a sign of weakness".

KISSINGER'S LIES

Gleijeses argues that Kissinger's account of the US role in Angola was misleading, both in his testimony to Congress in 1976 and a quarter of a century later in the third volume of his memoirs "Years of Renewal". There was virtually no important aspect of the Angolan intervention which Kissinger and CIA-chief Colby did not misrepresent.

One lie is that Washington intervened in Angola in 1975 only after large numbers of Cuban troops had been sent to that country to support the MPLA. Kissinger testified before Congress in January 76 that "in August (1975) intelligence reports indicated the presence of Soviet and Cuban military advisers, trainers and troops, including the first Cuban combat troops". This was in flat contradiction to the now declassified CIA and other intelligence reports of the time, Gleijeses notes. Kissinger "was rewriting the history".

"When the United States decided to launch the covert intervention, in June and July, not only were there no Cubans in Angola, but the U.S. government and the CIA were not even thinking about any Cuban presence in Angola." said Piero Gleijeses. "If you look at the CIA reports which were done at the time, the Cubans were totally out of the picture." Kissinger forced the CIA to rewrite a document on Angola to show an earlier Cuban presence than was accurate. "So the poor CIA ended up lying."

THE DISINFORMATION CAMPAIGN

On January 1976, William Colby sat before the Senate investigating committee and solemnly assured the Senators:

“We have taken particular caution to ensure that our operations are focused abroad and not at the US to influence the opinion of the American people about things from the CIA point of view.” There were well over a hundred CIA officers and American military advisers helping to direct military operations and one third of them were practicing their propaganda skills. Through recruited journalists the CIA was able to generate international coverage for false reports of Soviet and Cuban advisers in Angola. One CIA story in November 1975, announced to the press in the name of UNITA, was that 20 Russians and 35 Cubans had been captured in Angola. The story was widely reported in the American and foreign press.

MERCENARIES

Kissinger initiated a ambitious, covert program to have American and European mercenaries fight with the FNLA. In November 1975 the CIA began to recruit them. Over a hundred British mercenaries plus a scattering of American, French and Portuguese mercenaries were involved. The CIA was also financing their arming. In total the CIA spent over a million dollars on the programme. Subsequently Henry Kissinger informed the Senate that “the CIA is not involved” in the recruitment of mercenaries in Angola.

COLLABORATION WITH SOUTH AFRICA

Another lie is the myth that there was no collaboration between the US government and the apartheid regime of SA, which was also engaged in a massive operation to block the victory of MPLA forces. Testifying before Congress in 1976, Kissinger stated: “We had no foreknowledge of SA intentions, and in no way cooperated militarily.” Twenty years later, in his memoirs, he was even more specific: he learned of the invasion only at the end of October, two weeks after it had begun.

Wayne Smith, director of the State Department’s Office of Cuban Affairs from 1977 tot 1979 has written that “in August and October (1975) South African troops invaded Angola with full US knowledge. No Cuban troops were in Angola prior to this intervention.”

Gleijeses presents evidence that Henry Kissinger urged the South Africans to assist FNLA and UNITA and that the CIA helped the SA army ferry arms to the key battle fronts in Angola. Moreover the CIA set up a covert mechanism whereby arms were delivered to the South Africans.

South African defence minister Botha stated on April 17, 1978 to the SA parliament: “When we crossed the border in Angola we did so with the approval and knowledge of the Americans... They encouraged us to act.”

SOVIET MERCENARIES

Havana was not acting on behalf of the Soviet Union, even though Kissinger liked to call the Cuban troops “Soviet mercenaries”. The Cubans sent their troops to Angola on their own initiative and without informing or consulting the Soviet Union.

MPLA-UNITA

The US was unwilling to allow a negotiated settlement. Late August 1975 the MPLA and UNITA had made a serious attempt to come to a peaceful solution through a political accommodation. They met in Lisbon under the auspices of Portuguese president Costa Gomes. This alarmed Washington. UNITA was admonished by the CIA. The response from Washington was: keep fighting.

The following month an MPLA delegation went to Washington to once again express their potential friendliness to the US. They received a cool reception, being seen only by a low-level State Department official.

HULSTLANDER

Gleijeses demonstrates the CIA and State Department officials frequently ignored the accurate facts they had in order to pursue their ideological bents. The CIA station chief in Luanda Robert Hulstlander criticized US policy in Angola as “shortsighted and flawed”. “The briefings and orientation I received prior to arriving in Luanda”, Hulstlander recalled, “emphasized the communist orientation of the MPLA and convinced me of the urgent need to stop the MPLA from taking power”. But after three months Hulstlander changed his opinion. He made known to Agency headquarters that he had come to share the view of the US Consul General in Luanda, Killoran, “that the MPLA was best qualified to run the country. They were more effective, better educated, better trained and better motivated. The rank and file also were better motivated, particularly the combatants, who fought harder and with more determination. They were not demonstrably hostile to the United States, and the US should make peace with the MPLA as quickly as possible”.

“Kissinger feared that an MPLA victory would have destabilising effects throughout Southern Africa. Of course, the opposite proved true. It was our policies which caused the ‘destabilisation’. Kissinger was determined to challenge the Soviet Union, although no vital US interest were at stake”.

Hulstlander came in problems when the chair of the Senate Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Dirk Clark, visited Angola at the end of August 1975. Hulstlander defended the CIA covert action Programme. “My heart was not in it, and I finally admitted that I personally thought our support for FNLA and UNITA would prove disastrous. This position, as you can imagine, caused me problems with my superiors, and infuriated Kissinger.”

“The State Department was very uncomfortable with the Luanda consulate’s contacts [with the MPLA] and its reporting on the MPLA in early 1975”, Hulstlander writes. Killoran adds:” Everything I sent [to Washington] I never heard anything about. It was like sending all that stuff into a black hole.” But Hulstlander and Consul General Killoran refused to bend their reporting to Kissinger’s policy. Both maintained their assessment at the cost of their foreign service career.

Gleijeses concludes that Kissinger's Angola policy was amoral. "He committed the United States to a policy that was inimical to the interests of the people of Angola. As Killoran and Hulstlander argued, the MPLA was by far the best of the three Angolan movements. As the U.S. State Department noted, it commanded 'the alliance of most of the best educated and skilled people in Angola.' The relentless hostility of the United States forced the MPLA into an unhealthy dependence on the Soviet bloc."

STOCKWELL

John Stockwell, the task-force commander of the CIA's secret war in Angola in 1975/6, based in neighbouring Congo/Zaire had a similar experience. In the first briefings we received on the Angola operation, CIA Director William Colby literally said, "Gentleman, this is a map of Africa. Here is Angola. Now, there are three fractions in Angola. The FNLA they are the Good Guys; we have been working with them for fourteen years... The MPLA they are the Bad Guys, led by a drunken psychotic poet called Neto.

"I sat on a sub-committee of the National Security Council, so I was like a chief of staff, with Henry Kissinger, Bill Colby, making the important decisions.

"I spent six months reviewing all the files and then resigned from the agency. After publishing a letter in the Washington Post, I testified for five days to congressional committees proving specific lies. They were asking if we had to with South Africa, that was fighting in Angola. In fact we were coordinating this operation so closely that our airplanes, full of arms from the States, would meet their airplanes in Kinshasa and they would take our arms in Angola. I gave them chapter and verse of what we had done in the misguided Angola operation. I gave them the numbers, dates and texts of cables and memoranda that proved we had broken laws and then lied about breaking them. I gave them combinations to the safes where the documents were stored, and told them where in the CIA headquarters those safes could be found. I challenged them to investigate thoroughly and do their duty. They did nothing. The hearings were conducted in secret, and after the Watergate scandal, the ouster of President Nixon and the defeat in Vietnam, they were not willing to tackle another big scandal that might oblige them to put Henry Kissinger and the CIA Director in jail."

THE WAR

Gleijeses concludes that a close look at U.S. government sources indicates that until October the FNLA and UNITA received at least as much military aid as the MPLA. But because it was better organized and better motivated already in July the MPLA had the upper hand. As the MPLA controlled the capital city of Luanda, which housed almost the entire government machinery, it was poised to form the new government.

Both Washington and Pretoria launched their covert operations at roughly the same time, in mid-July, and both had a military presence in Angola by early September.

Kissinger Watch

Prodded by Mobutu and the U.S., white-ruled South Africa decided to escalate. A South African army column (called Zulu) entered Angola from Namibia on October 14.

The aim of both the CIA-funded covert operation from the North and the South African army advance from the South were to take the capital Luanda before 11 November, independence deadline. The Cuban presence in Angola was primarily a direct response to South African attacks against the MPLA. The first Cuban combat troops –158 men– arrived in Luanda on November 9, two days before independence. Together with the MPLA-army they were able to stop both invasions on a short distance from the capital.

The South Africans, echoed by the entire Western press, absolutely denied that their troops were fighting in Angola. The SA troops disguised themselves as mercenaries. Gleijeses: "Without the Cuban intervention, the South Africans would have seized Angola's capital before anyone reported that the South Africans had crossed the border. The CIA operation in Angola would have succeeded."

In terms of control of the central regions the Angolan war was over by early March 1976. The MPLA, with indispensable help from Cuban troops and Soviet military equipment, had all but routed their opponents out of the country. The South African and CIA intervention had swung African opinion solidly behind the MPLA. The MPLA-government of Angola achieved widespread diplomatic recognition, amongst them all West European countries, who started programmes of development aid.

The MPLA victory did not threaten major U.S. interests in Angola. Luanda's economic ties continued with the West, the Soviet Union gained no naval bases, and the Angolan government sent soon signals of its willingness to improve relations with the United States. The MPLA government urged Gulf Oil Co to continue its exclusive operation in Cabinda province and guaranteed the safety of the American corporation's employees while the fighting was still heavy.

In 1976, Senator Dick Clark piloted an amendment through Congress outlawing any more clandestine aid to Angola. But the CIA found third countries willing to channel the continuing CIA military support to UNITA. A vengeful Kissinger sought to undermine the MPLA government and pursued his policy that has, at its heart, full disregard for the ordinary people trapped in a conflict from which they have nothing to gain.

UNITA in 1976 again considered reaching an understanding with the MPLA. The response from Washington was: keep fighting. Kissinger personally promised UNITA continued support if they maintained their resistance, knowing full well that there was no more support to give.

COUP AGAINST NETO

The Norwegian researcher Odd Arne Westad has recently described how Moscow wanted to build a new MPLA. Local Soviet observers postulated in 1976 that Soviet assistance to Angola had not only helped to win the war but also laid the foundation for the building of a "vanguard

party". The Angolan movement had earlier been plagued by "careerist and fellow-travellers" but due to Soviet guidance the "internationalist" were in ascendance. These new MPLA leaders understood that the MPLA was part of an international revolutionary movement led by Moscow. Moscow stayed suspicious of the MPLA president Neto.

The May 1977 Havana and Moscow supported opposite sides in an attempted coup by Soviet favorite Nito Alves to overthrow the government of Neto. The attempt was blocked by Cuban tanks. Gleijeses: "The Cubans played a decisive role in defeating the revolt."

Shubin described how the conflict ended:

"When Neto came to Moscow on an official visit in August 1976, he surprised the Soviet interlocutors with a sudden statement. At the start of his meeting with Leonid Brezhnev he suddenly turned to the theme of the recent military mutiny in Luanda. Ignoring diplomatic nuances, he said: "I want to find out from you personally, has Moscow taken part in a conspiracy against me or not? I have been informed many of your people have been involved."

Brezhnev, who was already partly incapacitated, did not reject the accusation, but began to read from a prepared text regarding "the expected excellent harvest" in the Soviet Union. Moscow's relations with Luanda survived this episode but the Soviets suffered some 'casualties'. As a

result the head of the military mission in Angola and others military were recalled."

If the government in Washington had not been blind they would have used this serious conflict between the Angolan government and Moscow to end their conflict and recognise the Angolan government.

27 YEARS OF WAR

The war that Kissinger started continued for more than a quarter of a century. The tap that Kissinger had turned on in 1975, and Carted had turned off, was opened again in 1981, when Ronald Reagan approved a covert aid package for UNITA.

Beginning in 1986 the US supplied UNITA with US \$ 15 tot 20 million annually in "covert" military aid funded out of the budget of the CIA.. Angola became the bloodiest battlefield in Southern Africa

In 1992 the US decided it had no longer an interest in supporting UNITA. In May 1993 Washington finally recognized the Angolan government. The appalling suffering continued until the death of UNITA-leader Savimbi in 2002. With a total estimated population of 10,3 million the "World Factbook 2002" of the CIA concludes: "Up to 1.5 million lives may have been lost in fighting over the past quarter century."

ICC—continued from page 5

"current or former Government officials, employees (including contractors), or military personnel or nationals" of the United States. The order in which they are listed seems to confirm the suspicion that government officials are the group about whom the Bush administration is most urgently concerned.

In any case, the administration official who has spear-headed opposition to the court this week made his thinking on the subject clear. John Bolton, Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, said in a speech on November 14 to the Federalist Society that if officials had to worry constantly about the danger of being indicted, "over time that's going to have an effect on your decision-making."

"If you're Henry Kissinger," Bolton continued, "and every time you go this European country or that European country you have to worry if you're going to be served with a subpoena, it has an effect."

Bolton said that the United States was committed to investigate and, if necessary, prosecute serious and credible allegations of war crimes made against US citizens. But he claimed there was a real danger that the United States would be accused of war crimes "for legitimate but controversial uses of force to protect world peace."

Although the United States has not ratified the statute of the ICC, the court could still have jurisdiction over cases in which US officials were held to be responsible for

criminal acts committed on the territory of states that are parties to the court.

The European Guiding Principles

In the face of the US campaign for bilateral Article 98 agreements, the countries of the European Union decided earlier this year to try to come up with a common position. While some countries (notably Germany) pushed for the Europeans to refuse to sign any agreements, it soon became clear that Britain and Italy, among other countries, would not go along with such a hard-line stance. However, the Europeans did agree a common set of guidelines, announced on September 30, that are supposed to regulate any agreement they might sign with the United States.

The European Union announcement was greeted by many human rights organizations as a climb-down, but in fact the guidelines would clearly forbid the kind of all-embracing immunity agreements that the US is seeking. Most importantly, the guidelines say that any agreement should only cover people who have been sent abroad in an official capacity – in the legal language of the EU document, "only persons present on the territory of a requested State because they have been sent by a sending State". This would cover military personnel, special envoys and serving officials, but would seem to exclude Kissinger-type figures – former government officials travelling in a private capacity.

The guidelines also insist that any agreement should

ensure that suspects sought by the ICC but returned to the United States not enjoy impunity – in other words, the United States would have to give some kind of guarantee to investigate the crimes in question itself, and prosecute them if appropriate.

According to European government lawyers, only agreements that meet these criteria are compatible with the statute of the International Criminal Court.

Responding to the EU guidelines, the State Department Spokesman Richard Boucher said on October 1 that the United States would continue to try to conclude bilateral agreements with European countries that met all US requirements. “Some elements in the guidelines section of the ministers’ decision we do not agree with,” he said, “and we’ll continue to pursue these matters in the bilateral discussions that we expect to have.”

Last month, the State Department envoy Marisa Lino visited a number of European countries, including Britain, Italy, and Spain (which have been the most sympathetic to the US position) to make the administration’s case. But it appears that she has not had any success in persuading these governments to depart from the agreed guiding principles, and no agreements have been announced.

The ICC Interprets Its Own Statute

Another consideration, which has not been picked up in the press coverage of the issue so far, is that the ICC will ultimately be able to rule on whether Article 98 agreements are compatible with its statute, since it has the final say on the interpretation of the statute. The relevant article of the statute uses language similar to the EU guiding principles (it talks of “agreements pursuant to which the consent of a sending State is required to surrender a person of that State to the Court”), which seems only to cover a limited group of military personnel and government officials. The court would be likely to rule that when it comes to private citizens, sweeping bilateral agreements signed with the US do not take precedence over the obligation to hand people over to the ICC.

In other words, when a US national sought by the court is not travelling in an official capacity, the ICC might require the country where he is present to surrender him, even though it had signed an immunity agreement with the United States.

5.The Trials of Henry Kissinger: Is Kissinger a criminal?

<http://www.sun-sentinel.com/entertainment/sfl-mvparadisofeb26,0,1435236.story?coll=sfla%2Dreviews>

By Laura Kelly

Staff writer

Posted February 26, 2003

The Trials of Henry Kissinger

Directed by: Eugene Jarecki

Running Time: 80 minutes

The charm of simplicity Director Eugene Jarecki’s documentary *The Trials of Henry Kissinger* explores Christopher Hitchens’ dogged insistence that the American diplomat is really a war criminal who helped bring about atrocities in Cambodia, Chile and Indonesia. The film title is taken from Hitchens’ book on the same subject, *The Trial of Henry Kissinger*.

Whichever side of these political gymnastics you favor — Kissinger as hero or Kissinger as criminal — this documentary keeps the questions coming. The film’s only downfall is that it poses more questions than it answers, perhaps because the main question it asks — is he guilty? — is unanswerable and surely more complex than can be addressed in 80 minutes.

The BBC’s Jarecki and writer Alex Gibney structure the proceedings like a battle between pro and con, although the atmosphere broods with the inference of guilt. They allow a balanced representation of talking heads, from Hitchens to Kissinger supporter Alexander Haig (who calls Hitchens a sewer pipe on tape). The charismatic Kissinger is seen only in archival footage, and some of his more nasty-edged quotes linger over his unemotional, bespectacled face.

But the talking heads don’t sway opinion as much as the images of brutality seemingly caused by brazen American nonchalance and the “dark side” of a Nobel Peace laureate bent on stemming communism at any cost. Footage of Cambodian bombings and Indonesian massacres, and the words of the now-graying son of an assassinated Chilean general, are much more powerful than the polemics of politicians.

The atrocities will leave you with a sick feeling in the pit of your stomach. But the film as a whole is likely to create as many different viewpoints on Henry Kissinger as there are viewers.

Laura Kelly can be reached at 954-356-4889 or lkelly@sun-sentinel.com.