

Which Reagan administration will rule the United States in 1985?

by Nancy Spannaus

“The key thing to understand is that there are two Reagan administrations,” Independent Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche told interviewers on Oct. 3. “One is Ronald Reagan the President, and the other is Reagan’s re-election apparatus. Kissinger’s power lies with the re-election campaign because a lot of liberal Republicans like Henry Kissinger, and want Reagan to go along with Kissinger.”

LaRouche’s statement is a concise analysis of the Reagan administration of 1984, an administration sometimes violently polarized on the approach to foreign affairs. The crucial division, of course, was between the State Department and the Department of Defense, the former a bastion of influence for Soviet agent-of-influence Henry A. Kissinger, and the latter dominated by the President’s personal friend, Caspar Weinberger, and his commitment to the Strategic Defense Initiative.

There is no question but that Ronald Reagan the President was the winner in the Nov. 6 elections. But the battle within the Reagan administration has by no means ended. In fact, Reagan has kept the very same personnel in place, leaving the Kissingerian “re-election apparatus” intact.

During the year, the Eastern Establishment families who control Kissinger did not succeed in controlling Ronald Reagan, but they did expand and consolidate their policy influence in certain crucial areas. Determined to carry out their long-term deal with Moscow, a deal based on crushing all republican nation-states in the course of clearing the decks for an ultimate battle between the oligarchies, these families have focused their efforts on eliminating the one policy initiative which could finish off their aims—the Strategic Defense Initiative. If they cannot succeed in derailing the President’s solid commitment to this policy by maneuvering, they can be expected to resort to violence.

The model to keep in mind is the Kennedy administration, the last administration which threatened to break from the dirty deals the Eastern Establishment had made with the Russian and Western continental oligarchy. Then, as now, both McGeorge Bundy, the man dubbed the chairman of the Eastern Establishment, and Soviet-handler Averell Harriman were the leading individuals working on enforcing the East-

West deal. When Kennedy didn’t go along, he ended up dead.

The Eastern Establishment is even more desperate today, and for good reason. The families are not only challenged by Reagan the President, who has the capability of sweeping them aside with the power of the presidency, but by the political forces led by LaRouche, the leading intellectual author of the Strategic Defense Initiative strategy. Indeed, there is every indication that the families have decided to focus primarily on knocking out LaRouche, as a prerequisite for changing Reagan’s policy by blackmail, or worse.

Incredible as it may seem, the families have still put their money behind Henry Kissinger and his lackies in the State Department to carry out this policy. In a very real sense, who wins the battle within the Reagan administration will be determined by who wins the battle between Kissinger and LaRouche.

Reagan the President

Although President Reagan clearly made a deliberate decision *not* to run his election campaign by mobilizing the American public on the Strategic Defense Initiative program, his behavior over the year left very little question that he and Secretary of Defense Weinberger intended to hold to that policy as a defense for the United States and for all the United States’ allies, emphatically including Western Europe.

In retrospect, the record is astonishingly consistent.

One of the White House’s first acts of 1984 was to release an interview given by the President to *Le Figaro Magazine* in France. “I have asked for a complete study and for research into trying to develop a defense weapon against nuclear weapons. . . . If we could succeed and bring about a realistic defensive weapon against them, then my next step would be to inform the Soviet Union that we have this, and now we were prepared to join them in eliminating all such weapons in the world.”

In response to a question about whether the United States would put itself on the line for Western Europe, the President replied: “The United States would consider any attack on its NATO allies as an attack on itself.”

Although the issue was certainly downplayed in all but the European press during most of the year, the Republican Party platform did contain a statement of commitment to Mutually Assured Survival. And despite his own political silence, the President refused to compromise on the SDI during his Sept. 28 meeting with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko.

President Reagan began a new phase of his campaign for the SDI after the election, when Weinberger and Abrahamson began to be even more pointed in their expositions, underlining the huge program which the Soviet Union has had underway for more than two decades!

The high point of the President's consistent campaign for the SDI so far has been Secretary of Defense Weinberger's Dec. 17-19 speeches and press conferences in Washington, D.C. The time to go beyond general policy statements, and into building support for *funding* the program, has finally come. This puts into focus the economic program of the President, which has consistently undermined his intent.

Deadly enemies

We can expect that the Eastern Establishment will throw everything in their arsenal against the President and Weinberger to defeat the SDI. Their capabilities, developed in depth since the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, are indeed great.

1) **The Families themselves** are the controllers of major investment houses and financial institutions, which represent extensive blackmail capability against the President.

2) **The Kissinger apparatus** is a thug network which the families deploy in order to threaten recalcitrant politicians into line. While it has tentacles into the government, its extra-governmental activities are equally significant.

3) **The media**, which has been virtually enshrined as an untouchable force in American political life, has the demonstrated capability of making or breaking politicians, and, in the case of President Nixon, governments. Since all the major media in the United States opposed Reagan's re-election, it is not to be expected that they will stand passively by.

4) **Presidential opponents in the Reagan administration** include most of the ranking State Department bureaucracy, led by George Shultz; a large portion of the Treasury Department, headed by Donald Regan; and a powerful anti-SDI clique located in the White House staff.

5) **Assassins** are at the disposal of the American families, who, throughout their history, have been responsible for the murder of at least six American Presidents who threatened their power.

The Eastern Liberal Establishment did not hesitate to use most of these capabilities during 1984. For a certain time, the families toyed with the idea of dumping Reagan and bringing in Walter Mondale, a more pliable tool. Having rejected this tack—perhaps because it was just too unbelievable—they instead concentrated on trying to create a controlled political environment around President Reagan, and

on planting their agents within his administration.

The fact that they have so far not succeeded is a testament not only to the President's convictions, but also to the effect which the section of the population mobilized by the LaRouche movement can still have on politics. This fact enrages the pretentious scions of the American oligarchy, who have increasingly come out *in their own name* to mobilize against the SDI. Frustrated and forced out of the shadows, this oligarchy has put its very existence on the line as well.

The Bundys, the Harrimans, and the Soviets

While we have limited information on what has been going on behind the scenes, the public activity of the leading American "bluebloods" who personally made the deals creating Mutually Assured Destruction during the 1950s demonstrates that they were not only fully mobilized against the President, but increasingly open apologists for the Soviet Union itself.

In January of 1984, both Harriman, the grand old man of the Democratic Party, and Bundy, the former head of the Ford Foundation who now is a professor at New York University, began their own publicity campaign against the SDI. Harriman's op-ed, entitled "Three Years of Ronald Reagan: An Opportunity Squandered," appeared in the *International Herald Tribune* on Jan. 4. Bundy took to the pages of the *New York Times* to write about the Cuban Missile Crisis—to "remind" the appropriate individuals of the deals made with the Soviet Union at that point—deals which included a U.S. backdown on a number of issues of strategic significance.

In March, the campaign became more direct and personal. In a March 10 article in the *New York Times*, Bundy pontificated against the technological arms race which the SDI represents as against his own "deterrence" approach. He then excoriated Secretary of Defense Weinberger for being the new policy's strongest advocate.

When the head of the Eastern Establishment makes such a statement, one can expect its pet institutions to respond appropriately. Over the next three months, the traditional liberal foreign policy apparatus controlled by Bundy went into action. Conferences were held at the Wye plantation of the Aspen Institute. Dozens of Russians were invited to the United States to participate in conferences with "experts" at Harvard, in Washington, and so forth. Certain groupings, such as the Brookings Institution, actually *disinvited* Reagan administration spokesmen to meetings.

What was happening was the regroupment of the Pugwash Conference networks which had originally cooked up the Mutually Assured Destruction strategy. Pugwashites in Congress and the Senate were mobilized to try to stop U.S. space research in the same period. The legislation to this effect was discovered by *EIR* to have actually been written in collaboration with the Soviet embassy! (See *EIR*, June 5.)

May was also the period in which the bluebloods launched their heaviest financial warfare, in particular the jump in interest rates. The campaign to blame the defense budget for

this danger has continued, but has not succeeded in changing the President's strategy—especially as he succeeded in getting the rates back down. There have been small indications that the President continually threatened to treat the Fed as President Kennedy treated the steel companies in 1960—a threat that seems to have kept them from carrying out their worst threats and bringing down the economy.



"Sharing the gravest reservations about [the SDI], and believing that unless it is radically constrained during

the next four years it will bring vast new costs and dangers to our country and to mankind, we . . . call for the closest vigilance by Congress and the public, and even to invite the victorious President to reconsider."

—McGeorge Bundy et al. in *Foreign Affairs*

Having reaffirmed their deal with the Russians, Bundy took to the hustings. In a May 28 speech to the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Bundy echoed Soviet President Chernenko by denouncing the SDI as "one of the most irresponsible and destructive utterances that a President has made in a nuclear age" and a "major contribution to international danger."

In June, the bluebloods' hysteria level got even greater. George Ball, a leading Eastern Establishment spokesman, penned a *New York Times* article on how Reagan was too old to be President—in terms that can only be characterized as an assassination threat. New committees and declarations to stop the President were rallied. On June 6, a group was formed with the purpose of saving the ABM Treaty, the treaty which banned ballistic missile defense for the United States, but not for the Russians.

Then, on June 19, a large group of "leading citizens" announced a Campaign to Save the ABM Treaty. Both Harriman and Bundy signed the Campaign's manifesto against the national security, which featured such statements as, "We

must live with the threat of mutual suicide [emphasis in original]." Never a mention, of course, that the Russians have taken the necessary measures to defend a substantial portion of their population against nuclear bombardment.

The conspiratorial meetings between the bluebloods and the Soviets continued. In July, meetings of the Pugwash Conference, the Club of Rome, and the Harvard Crisis Management Group were held, as well as another Aspen Institute meeting, this time in Venice. It is likely that it was within these meetings that the strategy for setting up the Reagan-Gromyko meeting, or the never-held meeting in Vienna, was worked out.

By September, however, Chairman Bundy appeared to be going out of his mind. On Sept. 6 he addressed a conference at the University of Maryland, again excoriating Weinberger and the SDI. But this time, a new twist was added. Evidently desperate to bring the dissatisfied Soviets to the bargaining table, Bundy answered a question on the possibility of Soviet invasion of Europe as follows: "*All they could get in Europe without facing a European deterrent is West Germany, and that would be an unfinished chapter.*"

By September, it was clear that the Establishment families felt that they had to work with Reagan. Harriman wrote a new article on Sept. 2, this time offering a bipartisan effort against the SDI, rather than pushing for a Mondale presidency. Bundy, although near despairing, gave a campaign speech for Mondale and against the SDI at Columbia University on Oct. 30.

It didn't work, of course. Reagan won the election by such a large margin that he really didn't need the boys at the Council on Foreign Relations. Chairman Bundy had prepared for that, however. On Nov. 26, the CFR issued a new manifesto by Bundy and his arms-control comrades Robert McNamara, George Kennan, and Gerard K. Smith. This time they said it even more threateningly: The SDI is not "realistic," and it must be stopped.

What do the oligarchs of the Eastern Establishment think they're going to get from the Soviets if they succeed in killing the SDI? Insanely bent on purging America of its nationalism, they just haven't realized that the Soviets will take their gift of the United States, and throw *them* away.

The growing grasp of Kissinger

As point man for the operation against Reagan and against LaRouche, Henry Kissinger may very well have hoped to be rewarded for his pains with a post in the second Reagan administration. Instead, he finds himself head of a successful multinational extortion racket, Kissinger Associates, but a political liability to every cause he seeks to promote.

Substantively, of course, Kissinger has made gains in the Reagan administration. On March 2 he was appointed to the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, a post which puts him in a position of behind-the-scenes power. And although his official tenure as head of the Commission on Central America lapsed early in the year, Kissinger clearly

controls the direction of policy for not only Central America, but Ibero-America a whole.

Throughout the year, however, Kissinger has had one monotonous theme—to set up a super-negotiator or super-commission which will make a New Yalta deal with the Russians. His bombshell *Time* magazine article of March 5, on removing U.S. troops from West Germany, was subordinated to this end, and, if implemented, his proposal would give the Russians the opportunity to move against Europe without firing a shot. His advice on the Central American crisis and Mexico—to be as provocative as possible up to and including a U.S. invasion—is tailored to create crises that will bring about a similar weakening of the United States in NATO, and corresponding advantage to the Soviets.

Kissinger began this theme in Brussels in the beginning of the year. Most of his organizing to achieve a new East-West negotiator, now called “arms-control czar,” in fact occurred in the European press, until the *Los Angeles Times* began to syndicate his column in June. The major exception is the *Washington Post*, which began a promotional for Henry as super-negotiator in January, and was the chosen conduit for Kissinger’s proposal for back-channel negotiations with the Soviets on July 26.

Kissinger, enraged at the massive exposure by Lyndon LaRouche of his ambitions to once again sell out the United States to the Soviets, prepared to strike back. LaRouche’s media campaign against Kissinger was only two months old when Kissinger issued the following threat at a California press conference on March 25: “I will decide on what I wish to do with him [LaRouche] after the primaries.”

Kissinger’s concern about his unpopularity due to LaRouche’s exposures was indeed justified. From April through July, numerous conservative congressmen and Texas Rep. Henry Gonzalez raised questions about Kissinger’s sellouts to the Soviets and the conflict of interest between his role in Central America and his position on the boards of several New York banks and investment firms. When Kissinger went to Ibero-America in September, he was denounced in the Argentine and Venezuelan press.

Kissinger did, however, get an open door into the White House to consult with the President on the latter’s September talks with Gromyko. All the more to Kissinger’s disgrace, when the President failed to turn the SDI into the bargaining chip which Kissinger wants it to be.

Even the London *Times* started warning President Reagan against Kissinger by Nov. 26.

Kissinger, in typical thug-like fashion, has proceeded to act out his vendetta against LaRouche, and most likely Reagan as well. Met at a meeting of American Express on Nov. 7, he said that he found the Reagan administration’s contacts with Lyndon LaRouche, just exposed in *New Republic* magazine, “almost unforgivable.” “I will do everything in my power to break the links between LaRouche and the Reagan administration, and you can quote me,” he told a journalist.

Kissinger is continuing his monthly syndicated column,

in which he uses erudite, opaque language to say what he told a journalist at the *New Republic*’s birthday party on Nov. 28: “The Strategic Defense Initiative has no future. . . . The funds will be whittled away.” Unfortunately, his career is not ended, and until it is, it will become even more dirty and dangerous.

The media

The major assignment to the Eastern Establishment media in 1984 was quite simple: Destroy LaRouche. Every other more ordinary “Watergate-style” operation was subordinated to that.

Playing the leading role were the *Washington Post* and NBC-TV. Together, they pulled together anti-LaRouche forces from the Anti-Defamation League, Federal Election Commission, the Mondale camp, and the Secret Service into one conspiracy to “get LaRouche.” They thought they were on the verge of success when the FEC denied campaign matching funds to LaRouche on Jan. 26, and the Secret Service also denied protection. But they were dead wrong.

It is obvious why NBC and the *Washington Post* were particularly suited for this job. NBC is a wholly owned subsidiary of RCA, whose chairman, Thornton Bradshaw, is a leading member of the Aspen Institute. It is also the network which had been chosen by the Soviets to get expanded facilities and broadcasts from Moscow, and which has taken a leading role against the SDI.

As for the *Washington Post*, it is almost as pro-Soviet as *Pravda*, as well as being the leading Malthusian newspaper in the United States. Publisher Katie Graham, after all, is a leading member of the genocidal Brandt Commission. This is not even to mention the recent charges by Weinberger that the *Post* acted against national security interests by publishing classified information on the space shuttle.

NBC took the front end of the assignment, beginning with a 5-minute Nightly News smear on Jan. 30, and proceeding with its 20-minute First Camera segment on March 4. Hit by LaRouche’s suit for libel, NBC then showed the real purpose in its “journalism” by trying to set up a situation for an assassination attempt against LaRouche.

With the aid of a corrupt court ruling, and a *Washington Post* effort to influence the jury by publishing a story alleging “death threats” against jurors, NBC succeeded in preliminarily fending off the libel charge and in getting an outrageous judgment of \$3 million against LaRouche. Although NBC has so far not moved to collect directly, it is clearly collaborating with the FBI, Secret Service, and the very same dope-lobby interests who provided “witnesses” against LaRouche to carry out financial warfare against him. The front-end of building up a climate for “collection” has been taken up by the *Washington Post*.

The inside job

The real flunkies in the oligarchy’s war against the SDI are their tools in the Reagan administration. The damage

these flunkies have been able to inflict, however, is substantial.

The **Palace Guard** of James Baker III, Michael Deaver, and Richard Darman has tried consistently to get the President to drop the SDI as an "unnecessary fight." In February, the evil power of this group was dramatically exposed when the Guard ostentatiously prevented the President from being briefed on the unlawful denial of Secret Service protection to LaRouche.

Equally dangerous has been **Secretary of State Shultz**, who has flagrantly opposed the Weinberger course on foreign policy all year, and confessed through an official spokesman in March that Henry Kissinger was his "valued confidant." While Shultz has not been able to kill the SDI, he has severely damaged U.S. interests in the Middle East, beginning with the killing of military deliveries to Saudi Arabia and Jordan in March. At the same time that he has tried to cut the United States off from moderate Arabs, he has inflamed the situation in Israel by demanding huge budget cuts.

Shultz has also done major damage in Ibero-America by

pushing the Kissinger policy of interfering in Central America and destroying the Contadora Group's effort to achieve a regionally-based solution to the conflict there. Although Weinberger opposed Shultz's thrust in Ibero-America as early as March, it was not until November that the secretary of defense came out with the decisive policy line against U.S. engagement in "new Vietnam wars." Weinberger's exposition of a war-winning strategy for the United States exposed Shultz's alternations of "hard" and "soft" lines for what they are—setups for crisis management à la Kissinger.

Shultz's State Department is the source of the Malthusian population policy the President has wanted to eliminate also.

Yet the economic policy of supporting IMF looting in the Third World continues, pushed by Shultz, Secretary of the Treasury Regan, and Fed chairman Volcker. This crew is an albatross around the President's neck—one that sabotages his broader strategic objectives in the name of "fiscal responsibility," and remains a vital danger to the nation—until the power of the oligarchical families behind them is destroyed.

1984 foreign diplomacy of Lyndon H. LaRouche

As a presidential candidate, Lyndon LaRouche visited France, Argentina, and Japan, and in each visit graphically portrayed what the policies of the U.S. President must be:

Western Europe: Keynoting a March 22-23 Paris conference which turned out to be France's most important military-strategy meeting of the year, LaRouche called on the United States and Western Europe to jointly develop directed-energy beam weapons as the key to restoring the Western alliance. The event, sponsored by the Fusion Energy Foundation, was attended by 40 military officers and spokesmen of most of the French political parties, as well as many unofficial representatives of the government.

Other prominent speakers included: Scientist Dr. Robert Budwine from Lawrence Livermore Laboratory; Colonel (ret.) Marc Geneste, vice-chairman, Paris Center for the Study of Total Strategy; Gen. Etienne Copel, former deputy chief of staff, French Air Force.

Ibero-America: Were he elected President, LaRouche told a Buenos Aires press conference following a meeting June 28 with Argentine President Raúl Alfonsín, he would aid Argentina "with justice and equality to overcome the crisis unleashed by its foreign debt." He committed himself to reestablishing an alliance of the sover-

eign republics of the Western Hemisphere, noting that Argentina has a vigorous republican tradition based on American System economics, which must be revived.

Illegal U.S. State Department-directed efforts to keep Argentine leaders from meeting with LaRouche during his visit on June 24-30 failed, and the candidate had far-ranging discussions with not only the President, but high-ranking leaders of the country's political parties, trade unions, scientific community, and armed forces.

Following a speech LaRouche made to the Foundation for a Project Argentina, Dr. Cosentino, a nuclear physicist instrumental in launching the country's nuclear program in 1953, commented: "Thirty years ago, I heard a powerful speech given by Gen. Juan Perón, when he announced his decision to initiate the nuclear program, and the strength of it has carried me through the last 30 years. Now today, I have heard a similar speech. . . ."

Asia: "It is my hope that my own country will enter into a new kind of special relationship of cooperation with Japan," LaRouche told the Japanese Institute for Developing Economies in Toyko on Sept. 14. "The cooperation should be dedicated to improvement of the condition of nations on the shores of the Indian and Pacific Oceans," he continued. "We have underrated the threat to the general security of the world erupting from the effects of insufficient economic development of the so-called developing nations." Japan, as the last bastion of capitalist industrial progress, has a world-historical role to play.

Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche spent six days in Japan, where they met with the country's top economic and military policymakers, and some of its leading scientists.