

truth to the electorate. For the Republican Party, Congressman Jack Kemp has attempted to bring the truth concerning the European Monetary System into public knowledge. For the Democratic Party, Senator Adlai Stevenson has taken some steps in that same direction. None of the presented candidates, except myself, has so far mentioned the most crucial issue of the 1980 election campaign, the issue on which the very existence of our nation depends.

Examining each of the announced Republican candidates, we discover that each of them is actually running for the nomination of London's choice, General Alexander Haig. Granted some of these candidates are too dumb to recognize that fact, but the evidence is clear. Examining the campaign advisory staff of each, we find a nest of persons deployed from Eugene Rostow's Committee on the Present Danger. This committee has chosen General Haig as its 1980 choice; why, then, do the other Republican candidates make themselves mere pawns of the CPD? What are Bush, Reagan, Crane, Connally, actually running for? — to be nominated as the vice-presidential candidate on a Haig ticket.

The game is clear, these other candidates will chew themselves up in the primary campaigns, creating the deadlock and factional atmosphere which ensures a Haig selection. If Haig wins, the United States would surely be destroyed and defeated in thermonuclear war before 1984, if Brzezinski, Schlesinger, et al. do not push Carter into such a war before the 1980 general elections.

On the Democratic Party side, President Carter must be helped to get successfully through the remainder of his term in office. Another term would be unthinkable! What, then, Senator Kennedy? That would be an unthinkable abomination.

Among the Republican candidates fielded so far, Governor Ronald Reagan is without doubt the best, relatively speaking. Often wrong, too easily misled, he has shown a moral quality lacking in all the rest. Connally is a better intellect, and much slicker — but the policies to which he might apply his powers are left too much in doubt by both his flipping and flopping on vital issues, and his unfortunate, pro-British record as Nixon's Treasury Secretary. Crane is bright, but massively controlled by the wrong people, which is to say, corrupt. Ronald Reagan does not know his policies are corrupted; what he becomes depends upon the quality of his advisors. It ain't much, but it is unquestionably the best the Republican Party has fielded so far.

Bush League policies

Bush's announcement of his candidacy was most unfortunate. He had the effrontery to cite a London Economist report as the basis of reference for his proposed strategic outlook.

In light of Bush's past career, and the current issue of the quality of performance of U.S. intelligence services, Bush renders himself totally unacceptable from the outset.

It was British intelligence, with complicity of such figures as Zbigniew Brzezinski and Henry Kissinger, who orchestrated the destabilization of Iran, and are overtly dedicated to destabilizing the entire "arc of crisis." Admittedly, unless the Bakhtiari government successfully stabilizes the situation in Iran, there might begin a significant direct intervention by Soviet forces — and there are, admittedly signs that one faction in Moscow is

dedicated to initial activation of political options for such a contingency.

Bush has no excuse not to know this; hence, his citing a London Economist strategic estimate as his own inclination would be, by itself, adequate reason for dumping his candidacy from the outset. He is either corrupt or is of an incurably Bush-league quality of strategic intelligence competence. Granted, he might step forward to correct his own monstrous candidacy announcement. Barring that, his case is hopeless.

At this point, he is simply another Rostow-Schlesinger "Me, too" stalking horse for the candidacy of Haig, a spoiler for both the Reagan (most notably) and Connally candidacies. He is, tactically, simply more confusion.

The CIA angle

Were Bush to be regarded as a serious candidate, he would be expected to attack the wrecking of the CIA under the direction of Brzezinski, Turner, Schlesinger, Mondale, et al. He would be obliged to point out that the problem of CIA performance is largely the increased dependency on London, Canadian, and Israeli second-hand information through the destruction of the CIA's independent intelligence-gathering capabilities. He would be obliged to attack directly the Israeli signals of an intent to effect a total British-Israeli takeover of control of the CIA. He would insist on establishing the U.S. intelligence services' independence of the British-Canadian and Israeli agencies.

Implicitly, Bush has done the direct opposite.

1980: Year of the

Chinese Vice-Premier Teng Hsiao-ping's formulations concerning the Soviet Union and the world strategic balance bear a remarkable resemblance to views recently expressed by a number of leading British agents and agents of influence in the U.S. on the same topics. From National Security advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski—who accused the Soviets last month of creating an "arc of crisis" stretching from Iran through the Horn of Africa to Afghanistan and Pakistan,—to Henry Kissinger, George Bush and NATO Supreme Commander Alexander Haig—these "policymakers" have been sounding very much alike—witness a speech Haig delivered in Paris Jan. 26, which the Christian Science Monitor characterized as "his sharpest warning yet about the dangers of the Soviet military buildup in Central Europe." One naturally wonders if they've been trying to fight inflation by sharing the same speechwriter.

Potential presidential candidate George Bush is particularly intriguing in this regard since he spent a substantial period of time in Peking as the U.S. envoy following the Nixon Administration's overture to China. Bush's current bid for the GOP presidential nomination is being backed—at least for now—by friends of Kissinger, including Anne Armstrong, the iron lady of the Texas Republican Party who was Ambassador to the Court of St. James during the Ford Administration. Armstrong sits on the board of Georgetown

Why Lowell Weicker seeks the presidency

In last week's issue, we documented the "Haig" presidential strategy — of cluttering the Republican primary field with "favorite son" and joke candidates, to enable NATO Commander Alexander Haig to emerge as the "compromise" choice of a deadlocked GOP convention in 1980. One of those joke candidates is Connecticut's GOP Senator Lowell Weicker, as yet undeclared, but emphatically running. An aide to the senator talked with Executive Intelligence Review last week about Weicker's candidacy and his view of the issues. The results:

Q. Why does Sen. Weicker think he should be President of the United States?

A. The Senator wants to be President because Carter has shown no leadership qualities and has completely botched one foreign policy situation after another. The Camp David fiasco for instance, was nothing but a media splash before the November elections. He never should have portrayed the discussions with Sadat and Begin as meaning that peace was at hand when the Palestinian rights question had not been taken into consider-

Manchurian candidate?

University's Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), one of Kissinger's current bases of operation.

On Jan. 25, Bush delivered a major speech at Georgetown under the auspices of its School of Foreign Service. At approximately the same time that Teng was burning the impressionable Hedley Donovan's ears with dire warnings of Soviet "hegemonism," Bush was echoing the Chinese leader almost verbatim.

Like Teng, Bush maintained that the "United States has been in a general strategic retreat since the early 1970s." Like Teng, Bush berated Carter for being too soft to stand up to the Soviet challenge. Like Teng, Bush accused the Soviet Union of making a global power grab, citing the recent events in Iran, Ethiopia, South Yemen, and Afghanistan as evidence. Bush concluded his tirade by quoting Winston Churchill, Arnold Toynbee and London Economist contributing editor Norman McCrae, who following a tour of Great Britain, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, Canada and the United States, observed that there is a "crisis of crumbling institutions throughout the English-speaking union."

While the audience of 400-odd people, including former CIA station chief Ray Cline (now at CSIS) took it all in, one person was heard to mutter as he left the hall: "But what I can't figure out is, who brainwashed who?"

ation much less settled. Later, he made things worse by fostering a position of linkage to Palestinian rights when the Israelis had made it clear they were not ready to do so. He made Begin into a whipping boy. And now he can't even pull Jordan and Saudi Arabia into Camp David even after we sold the Saudis all those jets.

Q. What does Sen. Weicker have to say about domestic issues?

A. The main problem is with the economy and in this area Carter has been a flop. The key to helping the economy is the energy question. We must cut down on deficit spending on our overdose of petroleum. The Senator would like to see deregulation of fossil fuel pricing and mandatory conservation. For example, he thinks there should be one day in the week, perhaps Saturday, in which people are not allowed to drive their cars.

Q. What does Weicker think of nuclear power and fusion energy?

A. He supported the Clinch River Breeder Reactor and is for the orderly development of nuclear power. Fusion — I'm not sure he knows what that is. He also thinks that nuclear energy development should be balanced by accelerated solar energy development.

Q. Rep. Jack Kemp, also a Republican, has stated on T.V. that he thinks that the role of the U.S. in the new European Monetary System is one of the most important issues facing the United States today and plans to push for U.S. involvement during his campaign. What does Sen. Weicker think the U.S. role should be?

A. I don't think the senator has ever mentioned anything about that.

Q. There is a heated battle going on across the country over whether marijuana and other drugs should be decriminalized. Has Sen. Weicker taken a stand on this issue?

A. I don't believe he has said one way or the other.

Q. Could you please tell me what issues the Senator thinks are most important?

A. He's very concerned about ethics and open government. These are very big issues with him. He would like to see the public allowed to have access to congressional and administrative proceedings and full tax return disclosure by all public officials.

He is against the public financing of political campaigns because he thinks this is a rip-off of the taxpayers. He is a leading defender of individual rights and protection from governmental interference especially in income tax returns. The Senator was a co-sponsor of the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts and also co-sponsored the 1977 amendment which made auto emission standards more stringent. He was also adamantly opposed to the Concorde. Weicker opposes the Senate ethics code because he thinks the income ceiling is unethical, and favors income tax disclosure instead.

Q. What does he think of Proposition 13 type legislation?

A. He thinks it is demagogic. They say they will cut taxes without saying where revenues will come from.