

# Washington Post Leads Press Crusade To Halt Bonn Momentum

The *Washington Post* is leading a press crusade in the United States to disrupt growing support for the policies implemented by the Bremen summit of Common Market countries last month, and to isolate and slander the main proponents — most notably the U.S. Labor Party — of the Bremen initiative. With its compatriots, the *New York*

---

## THE PRESS

---

*Times* and the *Baltimore Sun*, the *Post* is attempting to create a constituency for the completely untenable policies of the British oligarchy.

The U.S. Labor Party has singled out the *Washington Post* in a statement issued this week for its particularly dishonest reporting on the Bremen and Bonn summits. "Let no one believe that Katherine Graham's *Washington Post* is a neutral newspaper. Since the July Bremen summit of the European Community which set into motion an alternative to the International Monetary Fund-World Bank system, the *Post* has consistently pushed the British strategy of economic recession and depression in the United States," a Labor Party release charged.

"They are the major press outlet in the United States for the British-centered 'Black International' aristocracy, currently deploying for the assassination of U.S. Labor Party chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., whose International Development Bank proposal was the basis for the Bremen plan. The Kennedy family provides the immediate link of the *Post* to the 'Black International'."

The activities of the *Post*, as well as the *Sun* and the *Times*, bear this out. Informed sources report that the *Post* is preparing a round of libels against the U.S. Labor Party which would update the 1976 guest editorial column by *Post* editor and Kissinger intimate Stephen Rosenfeld.

In that article, entitled "NCLC: 'A Domestic Political Menace'," he wrote of the Labor Party: "The syndrome is familiar to anyone who has studied the rise of Hitler. LaRouche belongs to the radical right, the Nazi fringe. He and his apparently brainwashed acolytes (his methods seem Moon-like) are not interested in dissent or dialogue, but in disinformation and disruption."

Most recently, it was the *Baltimore Sun's* turn with a July 31 article by Carl Leubsdorf libeling New Solidarity International Press Service's White House correspondent Laura Chasen as being from "the radical-left Progressive Labor Party" only days after the Progressive Labor Party, a British intelligence-run Maoist sect, was widely covered on national television for instigating a violent brawl with the Ku Klux Klan in California. Leubsdorf accused Chasen of turning White

House briefings into "absurd plays" with questions on "obscure details" about "international monetary manipulations" and claimed falsely that the White House was upset with her disruptions.

Reed Irvine of Accuracy in Media (also named in the article) specifically asked White House press briefer Rex Granum if Leubsdorf's article was correct in stating that the White House was "upset" at the presence of certain reporters at these briefings. Granum replied, "absolutely not," and assured all those present that the White House had nothing to do with Leubsdorf's article.

In his article Leubsdorf also elaborated one of the characteristically "nutty" questions asked by Chasen at White House press briefings. Much to Leubsdorf's embarrassment, the "nutty" question was asked by UPI's senior White House reporter.

Not coincidentally, the article follows admissions from Carter Administration officials that "obscure details" like the Bremen summit and the role of LaRouche in its formation are being seriously debated in the highest circles of the Carter Administration.

While the *Times* has yet to print any post-Bremen libels of Labor Party, it is keeping the rumors flowing. A *Times* national editor has said that he won't cover the LaRouche assassination attempt because "you libeled the Anti-Defamation League." One of their reporters didn't see why the *Times* should cover "internal squabbles of the Labor Party" such as the planned hit against LaRouche at New York Supreme Court.

### *The Evolving Lies*

None of these papers has been any more honest about Bremen and Bonn than about Lyndon LaRouche and the Labor Party. Hobart Rowan's *Washington Post* coverage of the Bremen summit is exemplary. "European heads of state yesterday announced agreement to study a new monetary stabilization system for Europe," the *Post's* economic editor wrote on July 8, "but so far there is more cosmetics than substance to the scheme....The plan is sufficiently far from reality so that it can be a dominant factor in discussions at Bonn."

When that line of disinformation failed to counteract discussion of support for the Bremen policy in the U.S., the *Sun* and the *Times* started mimicking Evelyn de Rothschild's agent Robert Moss in editorial attacks on Bremen and Bonn.

On July 26 the *Sun*, in an editorial "Downer for the Dollar," wrote that "world financial markets finally have returned their verdict on the Bonn economic summit, a verdict that is strictly a downer for the dollar."

Then, in a transparent effort to "thumb the dike" in the United States, the *Times* addressed the Bremen initiative for the first time in a July 30 lead editorial. After admitting that the Bremen summit "dominates

discussion on three continents," the *Times* asserted that "no one — apparently including its architects, Chancellor Schmidt of West Germany and President Giscard d'Estaing of France — has a clear idea of how it will work." The conclusion? "But the odds against success are high and the risks of failure are real. Dramatic initiatives are no substitute for the hard decisions needed to bring order back to the international economic system. For Western Europe and Japan, that would mean a greater commitment to economic growth and open world trade. For the United States, it would require the imposition of tough measures for energy conservation and a serious effort to control spiraling prices and wages."

*Voice of the Black International*

None of this disinformation is in the slightest bit surprising, once it is known what "Black International" policy is and who runs these newspapers.

The *Washington Post* has been firmly in British hands since Eugene Meyer, Jr. bought it at public auction in 1933. Both Meyer's father and brother-in-law were senior partners of Lazard Freres bank, with which Eugene Meyer Jr. worked closely throughout his career.

At the end of World War II, Meyer became the first president of the World Bank.

The present publisher and board chairman of the *Post* is Katherine Meyer Graham, Eugene's daughter, who has diligently maintained the British-Lazard heritage at the *Post*. Lazard senior partner and New York City "Big MAC" chairman Felix Rohatyn is the *Washington Post's* financial advisor and investment banker, while Graham sits on the notorious Brandt Commission (named after West Germany's Willy Brandt), which in conjunction with her father's World Bank and the International Monetary Fund is desperately attempting to torpedo the Bremen economic proposals.

Among Graham's first moves in 1963 as publisher of the *Post*, on the advice of Round Tabler Walter

Lippmann, was to make Benjamin Bradlee editor of the *Post*. Bradlee, himself a good friend of Lippmann's, as well as one of John Kennedy's closet friends and journalistic apologists, reportedly told Graham that he "would give my right one" for the job. Bradlee, who is still the *Post's* executive editor, personally coordinated the *Post's* Watergate efforts; he has recently been circulating among Kennedy family and Rohatyn social circles, coordinating efforts to make Jimmy Carter a "one-term president."

The picture at the *Times* is essentially no different. The paper has been run since the late 19th century by the Ochs and Sulzberger families, and has dutifully supported British policies since then. Notable in this respect was the paper's blatant defense of Adolf Hitler in 1933-34, a line channeled into the *Times* by the Warburg banking family.

A look at who oversaw the *Times's* coverage at Bremen fills out the picture. Economic reporter Paul Lewis, formerly the *London Economist's* Washington bureau chief, churned out British rewrites at Bremen, while the *Times* chief European correspondent, Flora Lewis, a member of the British International Institute for Strategic Studies, helped out with background commentary. The paper's leading domestic economic commentator, Leonard Silk, drew on his experiences as a Brookings Institution fellow to illuminate readers with his behind-the-scenes view.

Then, it's time for editorial commentary. Max Frankel, the *Times* editorial page editor, has both International Institute for Strategic Studies and Council on Foreign Relations memberships to keep him on the line. And if anything is left unsaid, there is, of course, columnist James "Scotty" Reston, well tutored in the advantages of an Anglo-American alliance by his mentors Walter Lippmann and the notoriously pro-Hitler "Cliveden Set" in Britain.

—Patrick Koehlin