

Presidency 1980

This week: who's running Ronald Reagan

In 1976, Ronald Reagan, the titular head of an aroused and vigorous national conservative movement, allowed a coterie of Buckley-oriented liberals headed by his aide John Sears to disorient his presidential campaign to the point that he blew certain victory in both the GOP nomination sweepstakes and—had he won the Republican nomination—in the general election against the hapless Jimmy Carter.

Is history repeating itself in 1980?

On August 15, the ultraliberal *Washington Post* published an OpEd which presented the standard Zionist lobby argument that the United States should treat Israel as its main ally in the Middle East. Attacking American policymakers for “downgrad[ing] Israel’s geopolitical importance as a stabilizing force ... in the ever-turbulent Mideast,” the article concluded that “only by full appreciation of the critical role the State of Israel plays in our strategic calculus can we build the foundation for thwarting Moscow’s designs on territories and resources vital to our security and our national well-being.”

The author of this piece wasn’t Henry Kissinger or Henry Jackson or any of the other stars of the thoroughly discredited British school of geopolitics, but “conservative Republican” Ronald Reagan.

Not surprisingly, Reagan’s rabidly pro-Israel statement has provoked considerable comment. While such Zionist lobby spokesmen as Rita Hauser (one of John Connally’s key advisors) were elated with “Ronnie’s shift toward our point of view,” reaction among the ranks of Reagan’s grassroots loyalists has ranged from confusion and disbelief to dismay and outright anger.

And well it should. Actually written by Joseph Churba, a former Air Force intelligence operative who collaborates closely with Israel’s Mossad, Reagan’s “Israel right or wrong” statement is persuasive evidence that the undeclared presidential candidate—the man whom millions of Americans have rallied behind in the hope that he will rescue the nation from the Eastern Establishment—has been effectively captured by these very elements.

Reagan’s *Washington Post* OpEd is by no means the

only factor which is leading many of his closest supporters to suspect that his tendency to overdepend on a tight-knit circle of advisors and longtime financial patrons has reached the point where the former movie star, wittingly or not, is playing a part in the New York Council on Foreign Relations’ script for the 1980 presidential elections.

For the past six months at least, Reagan has been taking positions on issues which smack of CFR liberalism: his pro-Zionist stand and his attack on SALT II from the same standpoint as George McGovern—that it doesn’t limit arms development enough—are just two examples.

This kind of talk has alarmed the traditional conservative Republicans who make up the bulk of his supporters. Also deeply disturbing has been the slowness with which Reagan’s campaign is moving, and his silence on many critical issues. Some GOP insiders even suspect that Reagan may not be going to make a serious bid for the nomination after all.

Adding to their worries is the ouster two weeks ago of Lyn Nofziger from Reagan’s campaign apparatus. One of Reagan’s oldest political lieutenants, Nofziger was the last representative of the old-line conservative wing of the Reagan movement within the candidate’s inner circle of strategists.

According to published reports, Nofziger resigned when the faction led by John Sears and Michael Deaver, Reagan’s top political strategists, won its fight to “moderate” the former California governor’s “right-wing” image to make him palatable to East Coast constituencies. It is reported that Nofziger particularly objected to the kind of “packaging” exemplified by the by-now notorious *Washington Post* article.

What is being described as the “Sears coup” raises very serious doubts about Reagan’s ability to act as the national spokesman and presidential candidate for the kind of antiliberal, pro-American System movement that most of his followers are counting on him to lead.

There is every reason to believe that Sears is acting in cahoots with the CFR’s scheme to rig the Republican nomination contest so that Reagan, despite his current

overwhelming lead in the polls, will lose the nomination to Alexander Haig or, should Haig's campaign continue to lag, John Connally.

In the interim, according to the CFR's scenario, the Reagan "campaign," under Sears's stage-management, will serve two main functions: selling the Haig-Connally platform to the Reagan base, as the Californian's Mid-east statement was meant to do; and keeping Reagan's massive following from bolting to a more viable independent candidate, such as U.S. Labor Party Chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, until it can be delivered to either Haig or Connally at the Republicans' convention next summer.

Peter Voss, director of Reagan's campaign in Ohio in 1976, warned in a *New York Times* interview: "If there's an effort to make Governor Reagan what I would consider a 'born-again moderate,' I would personally think it would be a serious mistake—I've had too much experience with the problems you create when you give up a political base and attempt to reach out for another.

"I had a meeting yesterday with a man who had personally raised \$150,000 for Reagan, and he was very concerned over whether he was going to veer away from his conservative values," Voss continued. "He's a very important person who is doing what he's doing not for Reagan but for what Reagan has long stood for. If he walks away from those values, a lot of the allies he has had will just become neutral." And Clymer Wright, Reagan's director of fundraising in Texas, told the *Times* that the ramifications of the Sears coup "can turn a situation from one in which you have a candidate who can't lose to one who probably couldn't win."

Meanwhile, there is no indication that Reagan is picking up any compensating support for the liberal layers to whom Sears has persuaded him to pander.

John Sears: A CFR sleeper in the Reagan camp?

Just who is Sears, who has so gained Reagan's confidence that he can now proceed openly to rip the Californian's traditional campaign apparatus to shreds with Reagan's apparent approval?

Often described by Reagan intimates at the candidate's "alter ego"—and by others as "Reagan's Rasputin"—Sears has a history of political chameleonism that would make Brutus blush. A graduate of Notre Dame, where he led the "Kennedy for President" forces in 1960, and of the Jesuit-run Georgetown University Law School, Sears joined a clique of Young Turks who were extremely active in GOP internal politics during the 1960s. Sears's closest collaborators at this time included CFR member Robert Ellsworth, a member of Lazard Freres (the New York "Our Crowd" investment banking firm which handles both the *Washington Post* and Kennedy family portfolios). Ellsworth later became

Ambassador to NATO and then one of Defense Secretary James Schlesinger's chief aides during the Ford administration.

Recruited to Richard Nixon's 1968 presidential campaign through the Nixon, Mudge, Rose, Guthrie law firm, Sears was subsequently booted out of a White House post in 1969 by Attorney General John Mitchell. Mitchell suspected Sears of leaking information to his cronies in the liberal Washington press corps, notably *Washington Post* columnist Joseph Kraft.

From the Nixon White House, Sears journeyed to Harvard University's Kennedy Institute for Politics to polish off his liberal education. Then, in early 1974, Sears startled his Washington buddies by hooking up with "arch-conservative" Reagan, who was finishing off his second term as governor of California.

Sears is very open about why he chose to offer his services to Reagan. According to one source, Sears believed that Reagan's Hollywood training made him "malleable" and "easily handled and educated"; someone who "could be directed and could learn his lines." Unfortunately, Sears's estimation of Reagan's character appears to be all too true.

There are, in fact, indications that Sears was deliberately deployed into the Reagan camp as part of the CFR's gameplan for putting Jimmy Carter in the White House—just as his current role is to use the Reagan campaign to get Alexander Haig elected president.

Although a newcomer to Reagan's circle, Sears began to dominate it almost immediately. Sears had come to Reagan with a specific proposal. Predicting that Nixon would not survive Watergate (this was in early 1974, making it highly probable that Sears had inside knowledge of the Eastern Establishment's plans for usurping Nixon's presidency), Sears suggested to Reagan that he consider running for the GOP nomination. Nofziger and other Reagan advisors flatly rejected the idea but Sears persisted and finally convinced Reagan to challenge President Ford in late 1974.

In order to ensure that Reagan would be persuaded, Sears enlisted the help of British Tory agent William Buckley and *National Review* publisher William Rusher. Both talked up the "Reagan option" constantly, both in private discussion and in the pages of *National Review*. Nevertheless, it is clear to most observers that had Reagan not pulled his punches, he could have walked into the White House. Instead, guided by Sears and Jimmy Carter's subsequent energy secretary James Schlesinger, Reagan was made to play the role of a "spoiler" on behalf of Carter.

Even after Ford was renominated, Sears, in particular, continued to sabotage the GOP campaign. In an open letter to the President, which the *New York Times* obligingly printed as the cover story in its Sept. 19, 1976 *New York Times Magazine*, Sears advised Ford to go on national television and tell the American people that "if Mr. Kissinger [then probably the most hated

Is the Zionist lobby writing Reagan's lines?

Ronald Reagan startled his conservative supporters when he published a vehemently pro-Zionist op-ed in the Washington Post Aug. 15. Though bearing his byline, the piece was actually drafted by former Air Force Middle East intelligence expert Joseph Churba. Excerpts follow:

Stripped of rhetoric, the paramount American interest in the Middle East is to prevent the region from falling under the domination of the Soviet Union. Were Moscow, or even its radical allies in the region, allowed to establish dominance or acquire a stranglehold on the West's sources of petroleum ... the economies of the major industrial states would be jeopardized and the capacity of NATO and Japan to resist Soviet pressure would be dangerously impaired....

The existence of Israel has served as a convenience for the Soviet Union as well, but Russian aims for control over the entire [Mideast] region existed long before Israel's birth in 1948. Without this bastion of liberal democracy in the heart of the area, the Kremlin would be confined to supporting the militant regimes against pro-American conservative governments which would not be able to divert the

attention and energies of the radicals away from themselves by using the "lightning rod" of the "Zionist State."...

The fall of Iran has increased Israel's value as perhaps the only remaining strategic asset in the region on which the United States can truly rely. ... Israel's strength derives from the reality that her affinity with the West is not dependent on the survival of an an autocratic or capricious ruler. Israel has the democratic will, national cohesion, technological capacity and military fiber to stand forth as America's trusted ally.

... Her intelligence services provide critical guidance to ongoing regional development, the technical know-how of her specialists could be used to service American equipment in a crisis, and her facilities and airfields could provide a secure point of access if required at a moment of emergency....

Therefore, it is foolhardy to risk weakening our most critical remaining regional strategic asset. Yet, if administration policies should serve to weaken Israel either through building the basis for a radical Palestinian state on her borders or through providing her with insufficient military assistance, the task of Kremlin planners dealing with the Middle East would be enormously eased and a determined barrier to Soviet expansionism in the region would have been withdrawn....

man in America, especially among conservatives] is unpopular, I assume it is because of decisions I have made in the foreign policy field. ... Henry Kissinger is the most knowledgeable man on foreign policy today and of course I would ask him to continue as my Secretary of State" if reelected.

Sears's open praise of Kissinger was a blatant rejection of Reagan's platform, and a stinging insult to both Reagan and Reagan's supporters. During his fight to wrest the GOP nomination from Ford, Reagan had continually targeted the despised Kissinger and his policies. More than anyone else, Kissinger had come to symbolize the Eastern Establishment's control over the Republican Party, and Reagan's attacks on him drew the support of many conservatives of both the Republican and Democratic parties.

Coupled with Ford's decision not to dump Kissinger—which reliable sources say was heavily based on Sears's "conservative" advice—Reagan's Sears-engineered challenge to Ford and his unenthusiastic support for the President's campaign probably did more to give Carter the winning edge on election day than any other factor.

Ford wasn't the only victim of Sears's treachery, though. Reagan's chances for the nomination were just

as insidiously undercut. Among the incredibly stupid tactics that Sears came up with during the final days before the Republican convention was to have Reagan name liberal GOP Senator Richard Schweiker as his running mate. That move promptly set the stage for Bill Buckley's brother James, then a Senator from New York, to offer himself as a last-minute "conservative" alternative to Reagan. Sears's Schweiker gambit not only temporarily paralyzed Reagan's machine and cost him crucial delegate votes, but also badly discredited the Californian in the eyes of many formerly staunch supporters. No wonder that many Reagan loyalists concluded that Sears was an agent of the "Rockefeller Republicans."

Reagan: The malleable man

Why does Reagan continue to rely so heavily on Sears's advice in spite of his demonstrable disloyalty both to himself and the Republican Party, and his obvious ties to the CFR?

That question goes to the heart of the Reagan problem. If Reagan has displayed one fatal flaw during his political career, it is that he has never really been his own man.

Like many other American political leaders, Reagan has failed to put himself through the arduous process of intellectual self-development which would enable him to translate his basically decent "gut instincts" into viable policy initiatives. Instead, he has relied upon the advice of others, making him for all intents and purposes the creature of the financial circles and policy advisors who engineered his rise to political power.

The malleability which Sears praised so highly in Reagan has been evident from the beginning of his public career. A product of Hollywood—which is controlled top to bottom by British and Zionist lobby influence and serves not only as a mass brainwashing machine but as a key nexus for organized crime drug-running and dirty-money operations—Reagan has never escaped this milieu. In fact, these very networks have masterminded his entire political career.

His much-touted "Damascus Road" conversion from an ultraliberal member of the World Federalists and the Americans for Democratic Action into a friendly witness at HUAC investigations into alleged communist influence in the movie industry was orchestrated by two of his Hollywood patrons, Jack Warner of Warner Brothers, and Lew Wasserman, now head of MCA and a leading Zionist lobby and Democratic Party financier. Ironically, this transformation from what Reagan now describes as "bleeding heart liberal" into "free enterprise conservative" amounted to little more than exchanging one form of British liberalism for another.

Under Warner-Wasserman tutelage, Reagan became deeply engaged in the movie industry's union politics.

During the McCarthy period, while head of the Screen Actors Guild, Reagan began to make the transition from movie star to politico through his involvement in the huge fight for control over the unions.

Reagan's first major push into the political limelight came in 1954 when Ralph Cordiner, president of the Morgan-controlled General Electric Co., hired the fading actor to travel to every GE plant in the country—accompanied by an FBI man at every stop—to preach the message that the Communists were about to take over.

More important, Cordiner turned Reagan into a household word by putting him on national television as the host of the long-running GE Theater, a deal arranged by Reagan's friends at MCA.

During this time, Cordiner also helped mold Reagan's newly adopted "conservative philosophy." The GE head introduced his protégé to influential money-men in Morgan-connected circles, and put him in touch with Stanford University's right-wing think tank, the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace (see box).

More national visibility came Reagan's way in the early 1960s, when U.S. Borax hired him to emcee its popular Death Valley Days television series.

Reagan's break into the big time came in 1965 through a group of wealthy California businessmen led by Union Oil's A.C. Rubel, oilman Henry Salvatori (a member of Litton Industries' board of directors), Holmes Tuttle of Dart Industries, and Schick president Patrick Frawley (a funder of such causes as Roy Cohn's American Jewish League against Communism and the

Reagan's brain trust

Next to John Sears, the most influential Reagan adviser is "chief issues person" Martin Anderson, whose status as a former member of the MIT-Harvard Joint Center for Urban Studies typifies the influence of laundered, Buckleyite liberals in the Reagan inner circle. A product of the same liberal circles that advise the Kennedys, Anderson, a "free enterprise" liberal, is responsible for Reagan's simplistic attacks against "big government," "overregulation," and "government spending" as the chief sources of the nation's economic woes. Like economist Milton Friedman, a Mont Pelerin Society member and Harvard-connected

British-style liberal who also advises Reagan, Anderson believes that high interest rates, tight money, and increased unemployment are the best methods for beating inflation.

Among his other credits, Anderson drafted the legislation which created that national security disaster known as the all-volunteer army, rather ironic in light of his membership in the Cold War-style Committee on the Present Danger which supposedly wants to build up American military strength.

In addition to serving on Nelson Rockefeller's Commission on Critical Choices from 1973-75, Anderson is also an associate of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, located at Stanford University.

Hoover has provided most of Reagan's policy advisors—and Reagan himself is an honorary fellow of Hoover's domestic division. The Hoover Institution has functioned as one of the most important channels for British Tory profiling and manipulation of U.S. conservative layers. Heavily funded by the Mellon Foundation and the Lilly Endowment, Hoover's current roster of "big names" underscores its role in shaping national political trends. Among them are Seymour Martin Lipset, a founding member of the Coalition for a Democratic Majority, which represents the Jackson-Moynihan wing of the Democratic Party; Sidney Hook, a longtime British Fabian agent and friend of John Dewey and

kook-cult-run "Sing Out '66"). They formed a "Friends of Reagan" committee to give him his best part yet: California governor.

Leaving nothing to chance—or to Reagan, for that matter—"Friends of Reagan" hired professional behavior modifiers and campaign "image makers" to put Reagan through his paces. The group hired one of California's premier campaign consultants, Spencer-Roberts, to run the Reagan for Governor operation. In turn, Spencer-Roberts—which had handled Nelson Rockefeller's bitterly-fought battle against Barry Goldwater in the 1964 California presidential primary—contracted with a Los Angeles-based market research firm, Behavior Science Corporation (Basico), to turn Reagan into a candidate.

Two of Basico's top behavioral psychologists sat Reagan down and drilled him on the issues for weeks. To shore up his rather weak image as a policymaker, they supplied him with index cards containing quotes from Aristotle, William Buckley, David Hume, Edmund Burke and other "intellectuals" who form the core of the British liberal tradition.

"We were hired to do for Reagan what the academicians did for Rockefeller," is how Basico president Stanley Plog describes the services his firm supplied Reagan. "We had to get more informational input into Reagan's speeches and to provide a philosophical and historical framework for his beliefs."

After intense preparation, Reagan was now deemed ready to meet the public. But not without his trainers. Plog and another Basico psychologist, Kenneth Holden, accompanied Reagan on all his public tours up to

election day. "We made certain that Reagan came across as a reasonable guy," said Holden. "One of the first things I got Ron to do was to stop using that terrible phrase, 'totalitarian ant heap.' It just sounded too harsh. His basic speech was too negative, so we provided him with creative alternatives to combat that Far Right image with constructive proposals. ... Ron made it clear that he did not want to look like a mouthpiece for someone else. That mouthpiece thing bothered him throughout the campaign."

The Basico/Spencer-Roberts packaging of Reagan was a roaring success: the former movie star beat incumbent governor Pat Brown (father of California's current guru governor, Jerry Brown) hands down.

But was Reagan's victory at the polls a victory of California's "silent majority?" Not by a long shot. Despite his widely publicized showdown with the University of California over student radicalism, Reagan's governorship was marked by the proliferation of the drug-rock counterculture throughout the state. Reagan's touted "budget-cutting" actually enabled government funds to be channeled into programs which not only encouraged the state's drug problem but created the synthetic-terrorist Symbionese Liberation Army.

"Pro-growth" Reagan drew paeans of praise from California's far-out environmentalists for his commitment to preserving the environment from industrial development projects. On the education front, Reagan appointed the notorious Wilson Riles as state Superintendent of Education. Riles served on Nelson Rockefeller's Commission on Critical Choices, and many of the

Bertrand Russell, who is the moving force behind the Social Democrats USA; and Thomas Moore, director of Hoover's domestic division who, in addition to advising Ted Kennedy on trucking deregulation, is a leading member of the Libertarian Party. Moore supports the full Libertarian Party platform: decriminalization of drug use, prostitution and gambling; an end to government "subsidies" of nuclear power; etc.—all on the grounds of protecting individual freedom.

Hoover's current president, the Canadian-born, Harvard-trained Glenn Campbell, was appointed to the California Board of Regents by Reagan shortly after he became governor.

Working under Anderson are a number of advisors specializing in specific issues. Prominent among them is General Daniel Graham (USAF (ret)). A former head of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Graham, like his friend Joseph Churba, is deeply implicated in Israeli intelligence activities. Currently based at the American Security Council—a Washington defense think tank set up in the mid-1950s with financing from Sears Roebuck and GE in collusion with the FBI—Graham is a key member of a team advising Reagan on military matters. Another ASC member is Richard Allen, a onetime aide to Henry Kissinger at the National Security Council. Formerly of Hoover, Allen recruited

James Schlesinger to Reagan's advisory circle shortly after President Gerald Ford fired him as defense secretary in 1975. Allen, Schlesinger, Anderson, and John Connally then founded the above-mentioned Committee on the Present Danger.

Michael Deaver and Peter Hannaford, the Bobsey Twins of the Reagan inner circles, are reportedly strongly pro-Libertarian and are believed to be responsible for Reagan's attempts to play up to the Libertarians in an interview with *Reason* magazine last year. Hannaford is a member of the environmentalist Sierra Club.

hideous educational programs he developed for Rockefeller—including using the schools as the kernel of communitywide blockwatching networks, modeled after the Nazis' gauleiter system—were implemented in California.

Many conservatives became disillusioned with Reagan's performance in short order, and several withdrew from his administration in protest. But these screams of protest from the very conservative layers who put him in office did not sway Reagan from his liberal path. By this time, Friends of Reagan had expanded to include such bigwigs as movie producer Armand Deutsch; Alfred S. Bloomingdale, head of Diner's Club; William French Smith, a partner in the wealthy law firm of Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher and Reagan's personal attorney; Leonard Firestone, president of Firestone Tire and rubber Co.; and Justin Dart, president of Rexall Drug and Chemical Co. This "Millionaire's Club," as it was known, was calling the shots in the Reagan Administration.

Sears: Electing Presidents is "peculiar"

In the same New York Times article in which he called on President Ford to declare Henry Kissinger "the most knowledgeable man on foreign policy today," Reagan's campaign manager John Sears revealed contempt for the office of the presidency and the U.S. political system generally. We quote:

That we elect our Presidents is really an accident of our peculiar political history. Having made a revolution because of the supposed excesses of kings, and having written a declaration of independence that drew heavily on the inviolate rights of man, the Founding Fathers realized that a new office must be created; and, after some trial and error, considerable uncertainty about the powers of such an office and 200 years of constitutional pettifoggery by the Supreme Court, we have evolved the modern American Presidency. That Presidency, at any given time, is an accumulation of the fears and inadequacies of the American people. The people expect the President to lead. Since we live in a democratic society, leadership means absorbing the national anxieties and proving either that there is less to worry about than the people thought or that there are ways to solve the problems that do exist. Presidents themselves cannot really solve anything, but they can serve as a point of focus for the problems that do exist. Presidents themselves cannot really solve anything, but they can serve as a point of focus for what is bothering the country...

Reagan's refusal to dump Sears and his collaborators from his campaign underscores the unhappy fact that the Californian is as manipulable today as he was as governor.

Reagan for President?

Reagan's increasingly liberal posture on certain key issues is compounded by his irresponsible failure to speak out on others. In the midst of the greatest crisis facing the country since World War II, Reagan—a man who has aspired to the presidency for 15 years and claims to speak for the "silent majority"—has been strangely silent. When he has condescended to comment, his statements have either been startlingly liberal, or stock "conservative" assaults on big government, the Soviet menace, etc.

Take the energy question, for example. Reagan has not only failed to put forth a viable program for expanding low-cost energy supplies—a goal easily within reach if nuclear fission and fusion power were properly encouraged and funded—but has endorsed the supposed need for conservation and costly synthetic fuels and currently harbors a leading antinuclear lobbyist, Rep. John Hinson, on his campaign steering committee!

On the economy, Reagan's record is no better. With the country facing the worst industrial production crisis since the 1930s, Reagan has merely called for tax cuts and reduced government spending, as though these measures by themselves would miraculously spur an economic recovery. Moreover, Reagan has said nothing about the European Monetary System—the Franco-German initiated plan which could, with U.S. backing, initiate a new, gold-based development-oriented world monetary system to replace the industry-killing International Monetary Fund.

On drugs, Reagan hasn't let out a peep. And on the rapidly spreading moves to make homosexuality an acceptable "life style" Reagan—who once tolerated a homosexual orgy ring in the highest levels of his Sacramento administration—has lined up with William F. Buckley and the liberals in opposing attempts to restrict California homosexuals from openly flaunting their perversions.

At the same time, Reagan may also be steered into an ultra-hard-line Genghis Khan role, to make Connally and Haig appear "moderate." Reagan was quoted as saying this week that the U.S. should break off all contact with the Soviet Union until an alleged Soviet "combat brigade" is withdrawn from Cuba. Reagan's stance drew from the Connally campaign the response that "Connally would never say anything that stupid."

Is this the man conservatives really think can beat the CFR, or don't they deserve better?

—Kathleen Murphy