

LaRouche: Panama invasion is treason to United States

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Whether or not President George Bush explicitly discussed the pending invasion of Panama with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachov at their December summit meeting in Malta, the U.S. pre-Christmas action signaled a Bush administration embrace of the global condominium arrangement first spelled out by Mikhail Gorbachov's mentor and once-removed predecessor, Soviet Communist Party General Secretary Yuri Andropov, in April 1983.

If there was any doubt that the Bush administration was operating from the terms of surrender that Andropov presented in his interview with *Der Spiegel* publisher Rudolf Augstein shortly before Andropov's death, all such doubts were dispelled on Dec. 24, when, in a televised interview, Secretary of State James Baker III endorsed a Soviet invasion of Romania in order to consolidate the overthrow of the Ceausescu regime. Four days earlier, Baker had averred to the Foggy Bottom press corps that "both the United States and the Soviet Union today are supporting democracy."

Both the illegal American invasion of Panama to overthrow the Noriega government and install the dope-tainted Endara puppet regime, and the endorsement of the principle of Soviet armed intervention inside the Warsaw Pact, conform precisely to the Andropov Doctrine. In April 1983, the Soviet boss proposed explicitly that the United States and the Soviet Union mutually acknowledge new spheres of strategic influence—with the United States sphere limited to the Western Hemisphere and the Soviet sphere subsuming all the European and Asian regions bordering on Russia, as well as sections of Africa. Within these spheres, each side would accept the other's right to use military force or any other means to achieve stability and maintain political control.

Congressional candidate Lyndon LaRouche has denounced this condominium arrangement and has branded the December "M(Y)alta" summit as a Bush administration

embracing of this doctrine and a betrayal of all U.S. and Western alliance basic strategic interests. LaRouche underscored the role of Henry Kissinger in shaping this condominium arrangement in a statement issued on Jan. 4:

"The Bush administration is in effect a Kissinger administration. Kissinger is a property of Chatham House. He always has been, apart from his special connections pointed out by the late James Jesus Angleton, who regarded him as a Soviet spy, which is not entirely incorrect. This is Kissinger. He represents powerful forces; he is not a power in himself. He is a sort of poor imitation of the 18th-century Lord Shelburne, the Lord Shelburne who controlled King George III and much of the British parliament in the same manner that Kissinger and his friends own George Bush, the Bush administration, and a significant part of the Congress, among other things.

"What we have seen is not a Bush-Gorbachov agreement, but essentially a Kissinger agreement with Andropov and Gorbachov. This Kissinger agreement represents, actually, the interests of the controllers of the U.S., otherwise known as the Chatham House/Wilton Park apparatus of which Kissinger is formally a spawn within the U.S. intelligence services.

"The Panama action was a part of the taking down of the U.S. military capabilities as [Defense Secretary Richard] Cheney has proposed in the preceding period, to limit its capabilities essentially to that of a condominium partner of the vastly superior Soviet military capability. The reorientation from defending the U.S. against a Soviet assault, which is the looming threat of the first half of the 1990s, in order to occupy itself with shooting our friends or our erstwhile friends in the Western Hemisphere. That is what must be understood, and that is what has happened."

LaRouche, who was railroaded into federal prison on

“conspiracy” charges on orders from the Gorbachov regime and its U.S. allies, minced no words in dismissing Bush’s claims that the invasion was only to capture Gen. Manuel Noriega as an alleged drug trafficker. “This is not a war on drugs. . . . The U.S. put the drug-pushers into power in the Endara government! . . . We are being betrayed by the Bush administration. And it is not patriotism or soldierly ethics to uphold treason.”

New role for military?

As of Jan. 4, such prominent military policy spokesmen as the retired chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Adm. William Crowe and Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.), who chairs the Senate Armed Services Committee, were appearing on ABC-TV’s nightly news commentary program “Nightline” and being asked to discuss whether the Panama adventure might not be the pilot project for a redirecting of the U.S. Department of Defense into so-called “war on drugs” deployments, since allegedly, the Cold War is coming to an end.

LaRouche blasted this dangerous folly on Jan. 5, stating that “we may be in the beginning of a new strategic crisis—an East-West strategic crisis, with complications elsewhere.

He emphasized, “Peace has not broken out strategically. We are headed for potential confrontations; they could come at any time. Everyone in the business knows that the fall of Gorbachov—which could happen any time and then again might be delayed—means the unleashing of an East-West strategic crisis.”

LaRouche warned, “We’d better get turned around fast; we’re headed for big trouble, including the setting off of the biggest depression of the 1990s,” adding, as if to remind President Bush, who has the power to release the exculpatory federal documents needed to overturn the judicial frameup of LaRouche and his associates, that there is a rational way out of the mess: “That is, it’ll be the biggest depression unless I’m in there straightening out the past 25 years of rotten U.S. economic, financial, and monetary policies.”

Other voices echo similar views

LaRouche’s assessment that the Panama invasion and other recent events signaled the acceleration of a “second Yalta” deal out of the “seasick summit” in Malta have been echoed in recent days by other voices in both the United States and Western Europe.

In the closing days of 1989, syndicated columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak reported that the Bush administration had made a pledge to Gorbachov to slow down the pace of German reunification in order to give the Soviet leader sufficient time to solve his internal economic problems. Bush, according to the generally well-informed columnists, had also made a firm commitment to seal a START treaty by June in order to give Gorbachov a measure of breathing room with his own Red Army high command.

Evans and Novak warned that the rush to conclude such a complicated treaty by an early fixed date would only benefit the Soviets and might leave the West thoroughly vulnerable to an intact Soviet nuclear first strike capability.

In a followup column on Jan. 5, Evans and Novak reported deep concern among Bush and Baker’s Texas constituents over the administration’s failure to launch a Marshall Plan for Eastern Europe, and the President’s wishy-washy attitude in general toward the surge of democratic values among the peoples of the East. They cited Housing and Urban Development Secretary Jack Kemp as being deeply disturbed at Commerce Secretary Robert Mosbacher’s endorsement of International Monetary Fund austerity medicine for Poland. And if the columnists are correct, the Bush administration is prepared to carry the doctrine of “benign” Soviet military intervention into the Baltic states as well:

“On the last Friday of 1989, mid-level diplomats prepared answers for the Jan. 3 State Department briefing on expected questions about Gorbachov’s imminent visit to Lithuania and his warnings of bloodshed. The proposed reply would have reminded him of his pledge against force in the Baltics, emphasized that the United States never condoned their incorporation in the Soviet Union and endorsed continued growth of pluralism in the region. But these remarks never saw the light of day. When the Lithuania question was asked at the briefing, spokesman Richard Boucher seemed singularly remote.”

The Thornburgh Doctrine

Knowledgeable Washington analysts have told *EIR* that the Bush-Gorbachov discussions at Malta did not directly touch on the pending American invasion of Panama. Rather, the two heads of state spoke in aesopian terms about joint commitments to fight “the war on drugs.” In the jargon of superpower summitry, this was a reference to a series of joint intelligence and “law enforcement” agreements hammered out between the Soviets and Americans during Attorney General Richard Thornburgh’s Oct. 14-20, 1989 extended visit to Moscow. These agreements, according to one source, represent a “new modality” for Soviet-American collaboration, in which, for the first time, government agencies publicly engage in joint actions in the international arena. In short, the Thornburgh trip and the subsequently elaborated “Thornburgh Doctrine” brought the old Anglo-American-Soviet Trust arrangements out of the closet and into the diplomatic light.

According to this source, the December 1988 United Nations convention against narcotics had already planted the seeds of the Thornburgh invasion of national sovereignty in “hot pursuit” of dope traffickers, and that increasingly both the United States and the Soviet Union would use this ostensible concern over the drug plague to install puppet regimes in their designated strategic spheres—as per the Andropov Doctrine.