

---

## News Analysis

---

# Has the Soviet Trust steered Project Democracy since 1980?

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Even the most jaded Washington political observers were taken aback during the first week of May, by Gen. Richard Secord's strident defense of the secret parallel government and his equally abrasive attacks on officials of the Reagan administration, including Attorney General Edwin Meese and Special Prosecutor Lawrence Walsh, during his first several days of televised testimony before the congressional special panels on Irangate.

Secord, the retired Air Force general who was effectively the chief logistics officer for the Iran-Contra arms shipments program, not only defended the policy of trading arms to the ayatollah and using the profits to conduct "private" covert operations and foreign policy on a global scale. He insisted that on the basis of legal "opinions" that he had obtained from a prominent Washington D.C. law firm, believed by some sources to be Edward Bennett Williams, the entire program was 100% within the law.

As the result of General Secord's defiant assault against the constitutional instruments of government, the issue of the existence of a secret parallel government has been placed even more at the center of the Iran-Contra stage.

Secord's performance would not have come as a surprise to readers of the *EIR*'s 341-page April 1987 special report on Project Democracy. We documented, in painstaking detail, that the Iran-Contra effort was the culmination of a 20-year program to overturn the Constitution and impose a corporatist, fascist-communist form of rule over the United States—dominated by a right-wing social-democratic apparatus led by former Comintern associates of Bolshevik leaders Nikolai Bukharin and Leon Trotsky, such as Jay Lovestone, Irving Brown, and Armand Hammer, and apologists for Mussolinian "universal fascism" such as Michael Ledeen.

Now, the continuing investigation by the same *EIR* research team has unearthed an even deeper problem within our national security establishment—a problem that has all of the earmarks of a long-term Soviet Trust penetration and takeover of elements in our intelligence community. Not surprisingly, this Trust operation centers out of the very institutions presenting themselves as specialists in Soviet active measures, or *dezinformatsia*, low-intensity conflict, and in-

ternational law. It is precisely this network for which General Secord was speaking when he defended the legality of the secret government's Iran-Contra debacle.

In this first article in a series, we explore how the Iran-Contra bait was set for the Reagan administration, as early as December 1980, and thereby introduce some of the key players and institutions who must be investigated as part of the cleanout of the Trust apparatus from our national security agencies.

### The Trust sets the monkey trap

In December 1980, a rather extraordinary series of conferences took place in the Washington, D.C. area. These conferences both set the stage for the escalation of Soviet and Cuban insurgency in Central America and set the ground-rules for the incoming Reagan administration's bungling, and now criminally culpable, response.

First, in the early days of December, the Socialist International gathered to plan its challenge to the incoming Reagan administration. Led by Willy Brandt, François Mitterrand and the late Olof Palme, the predominantly pro-Moscow European-centered socialists focused their attention on luring the incoming Reagan government into a protracted military involvement in Central America, a "monkey trap" that would paralyze the new administration. Spanish Socialist leader Felipe González stopped off in Havana on his way to Washington to coordinate with Fidel Castro the setting up of arms-trafficking routes from European Socialists into the Cuban- and Nicaraguan-backed insurgents in Central America.

On Dec. 5-6, 1980, the fourth of a seven-part series of seminars titled "Intelligence Requirements for the 1980s" took place under the sponsorship of the Consortium for the Study of Intelligence (CSI), a Georgetown University-anchored project launched by Roy Godson, the Jesuit university professor who would play a central role in the Project Democracy debacle.

The consortium was founded in 1979 to serve as a "magnet" for drawing intelligence professionals, many of whom had been purged during the Carter administration from long-time posts with the CIA, into a controlled debate on the future

direction of U.S. intelligence.

In a sense, the CSI was an adjunct to an earlier project, the Nathan Hale Institute, founded in 1976 as a lobby in support of a U.S. intelligence community beset by scandals and purges. As of 1985, the Nathan Hale Institute was co-chaired by Gen. Daniel P. Graham, the ex-Defense Intelligence Agency chief and Eugene Methvin, a senior editor of *Reader's Digest*.

Two features of the Dec. 5-6 colloquium, which centered on "covert operations," stand out. First, Theodore G. Shackley—the former CIA Deputy Director for Operations (DDO), who has been identified by several CIA sources as the person who prepared the "pink slip" list for Stansfield Turner's wholesale purge of the Agency's covert division, and who was deeply implicated in the Terpil-Wilson affair (involving illegal arms supplies to Libya's Qaddafi) along with Irangate figure Thomas Clines—delivered a presentation on the "Use of Paramilitary Covert Action in the 1980s." Shackley's presentation spelled out in detail the program subsequently adopted by the Reagan administration, and particularly by Lt. Col. Oliver North, in its "private" Contra war against the Nicaraguan regime, a war guaranteed from the outset to be an even more dismal replay of Shackley's earlier 1960s CIA Cuban exile fiasco.

Second, Donald Jameson, a career CIA covert operations specialist who went to work for Shackley's Research Associates International after his departure from the Agency, delivered a paper on "Trends in Soviet Covert Operations," in which he inserted an extensive ID format slander against Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr. and *Executive Intelligence Review*, implicitly labeling them as a channel for Soviet disinformation.

This gratuitous attack by Jameson was widely read as a signal that the Godson-centered apparatus was bent on blocking any LaRouche influence on the Reagan administration, particularly influence that might run counter to the "agenda" spelled out at the CSI seminar series. As an *EIR* report on the Heritage Foundation published in early 1981 pointed out, only the Soviet government stood to ultimately benefit from such a blackballing of LaRouche influence on the incoming regime.

In the audience at the Shackley-Jameson panels were: Frank R. Barnett, director of the National Strategy Information Center and an intimate collaborator of Godson; Kenneth deGraffenreid, soon to join the Reagan National Security Council staff; British author Robert Moss; Dr. Allen Weinstein, the architect of the National Endowment for Democracy; Herbert Romerstein, then a staffer on the House Select Committee on Intelligence and a longtime collaborator of British-Mossad spook John Herbert Rees; Samuel Huntington, author of the Trilateral Commission study *The Crisis of Democracy*, which first proposed the Project Democracy "democratic fascism" agenda in 1975; and Professor John Norton Moore, director of the University of Virginia's Center

for the Study of Law and National Security.

Dr. Norton Moore would figure prominently in the third Washington event of December 1980, a conference of the American Bar Association's Commission on National Security, a conference which apparently plotted the legal foundations upon which the Reagan Doctrine of covert operations would be launched. A former international law counsel to the Kissinger-era State Department and NSC, a former ambassador, along with Elliot Richardson, to the Law of the Sea conferences, Norton Moore is now a permanent consultant to the Intelligence Oversight Board, a Reagan administration intelligence panel created in 1981 through National Security Decision Directive 12334. It is this board, according to published testimony by Oliver North, that issued a pair of findings approving the legality of the North-Secord covert Contra arms programs during the period of the Boland amendment.

### Constitutional end run

As later articles in this series will detail, Godson, Moore, and other key figures in this tightly knit apparatus of LaRouche-haters, formulated, by no later than the December 1980 gatherings, the "legal" justification for the invisible government's overturning of the Constitution in: unleashing the Iran-Contra operations; involving the United States in support of the British in the Malvinas conflict; reactivating (outlawed) domestic FBI "Cointelpro" dirty tricks, including an alleged string of over 50 break-ins, mainly against groups targeted for opposing the Reagan Contra policy.

As Godson argued in a 1984 book, *Dezinformatsia: The Strategy of Soviet Disinformation*, co-authored by Richard H. Shultz, Western democracies are inherently incapable of responding to the Soviet regime's basic belief that "in a world of differing social systems, war and conflict are the normal state of affairs," so long as they cling to the principles of constitutional rule by law.

Professor Norton Moore, a prominent figure in the International Law Association of Permindex assassination-bureau chief Louis Mortimer Bloomfield, and the recently created U.S. Institute for Peace, was a proponent of the idea that since the signing of the U.N. Charter, there is no longer such a thing as "just wars." Rather, conflicts ranging from acts of terrorism to wars of national liberation should be governed by laws of war that pose limits on permissible escalations of conflict. All of this, Norton Moore casts in an environment defined by neo-malthusian requirements for population control that make limited wars convenient instruments for keeping population levels down, particularly in the Third World.

It is precisely this crowd that sold President Reagan on the "legality" of the Reagan Doctrine, a "legality" that is now being called sharply into question by Special Prosecutor Walsh and members of the Congress such as Sen. Daniel Boren, who pointedly asked General Secord during the third day of televised hearings: "General, when is the last time that you read the U.S. Constitution?"