

## George Shultz and the back channels to Moscow

by Richard Cohen in Washington, D.C.

A high-level White House source has conveyed growing fears that President Reagan, under the coaching of some of his political and media aides and the intense lobbying efforts of Secretary of State George Shultz, may opt to support former British Foreign Secretary Lord Peter Carrington to replace outgoing NATO Secretary General Joseph Luns later this year. The contestants for this critical position are now said to be Carrington, who is Henry Kissinger's business partner, and former Belgian Prime Minister Leo Tindemans. Presidential support for Carrington may, according to these sources, be the "sweetener" for what several White House sources have told me is the President's adamant refusal to walk through a "back-channel" to Moscow, a channel being carved by Shultz and a clique of Kissinger followers.

These sources also insist that the President has no intention of renegeing on his commitment, made in a nationally televised address on March 23, to develop anti-ballistic missile systems and simultaneously pursue serious arms control negotiations without the 20-year doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) framework. The President, according to these sources, has no intention of bargaining away U.S. strategic rearmament to either the Soviets or the U.S. Congress. To emphasize this point, early reports are that the President will reject State Department plans and instead side with his Defense Department and National Security Council aides the second week in June when the full National Security Council meets to examine changes in the U.S. posture for the renewed START strategic arms-control talks. The President is prepared to back off from all verbal commitments made in late April and early May under the guiding hand of the Com-

mission on Strategic Forces headed by Brent Scowcroft, former Kissinger National Security Council aide and board member of Kissinger Associates, Inc., including the so-called "bulldown" tactic.

As a sop to his opponents for refusing to reverse March 23 and slink pliantly, hat in hand, to Moscow under the guidance of Shultz and Scowcroft, Reagan may support Carrington's bid. My sources see such a "sop" as dictated by a misguided sense of legislative imperatives. On the same track, the President reportedly asked a reluctant Scowcroft at a private May 23 White House meeting to maintain his Commission into the indefinite future, a move which is considered necessary if funding for MX missile development is to be forthcoming from Congress.

Since mid-April, forces associated with Shultz and Kissinger have dramatically escalated their bid to seize policy control within the Reagan administration. They have entered into increasingly open collusion with Soviet chief Yuri Andropov and the Soviet KGB for the purposes of constructing a "back channel" of negotiations under their supervision between Andropov and the White House. The immediate target of those "back channel" negotiations is the substance of the President's March 23 announcement, a topic upon which Andropov and his assets have made themselves quite clear. Indeed, FBI Director William Webster, a member with Shultz and Kissinger in the Mandalay Lodge of the Masonic Bohemian Grove cult, has kept silent on a massive influx of Andropov KGB operatives into the United States this month (see Editorial). The clear purpose of the KGB move is to profile the American people and government in order to as-



Mary Anne Fackelman/The White House

*Shultz and Reagan in the summer of 1982 as the "faceless administrator" was beginning to set in place his special operations.*

sess how Soviet blackmail might weaken Reagan politically at home, thus increasing Shultz's leverage at the White House.

Yet, however they may seize upon the President's legislative vulnerabilities, which were highlighted by the creation of the Scowcroft Commission, the Shultz gang will be solidly rebuffed by the President on their entire "back channel" operation, and it is by no means certain that they will get their important consolation prize of Presidential acquiescence to the Carrington appointment.

In mid-April, the Shultz forces escalated, identifying two other overlapping Reagan vulnerabilities to be manipulated. The immediate failure of the White House to construct without hesitation economic and foreign policy on the basis of the President's new strategic doctrine left the White House in a position to be blackmailed as they sought allies for their short-term policies in the Middle East and Central America. Secondly, manipulated disasters in those and other "hot spots" combined with a sharp collapse of the world economy by late 1983-early 1984—all reversible by the full implementation of the March 23 commitment—could be transformed into bludgeons in the 1984 presidential race, as I will outline next week.

AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland, now on the public record as an opponent of the March 23 "Mutually Assured Survival" strategic policy, and Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Arens, both Shultz intimates, have been recruited for this task. They have been joined by a large supporting cast including former Ford administration Treasury Secretary and longtime Kissinger co-plotter Alan Greenspan, plus the four leading announced Democratic candidates for president,

Walter Mondale, John Glenn, Alan Cranston, and Gary Hart, all of whom have condemned Mutually Assured Survival.

### **The Shultz plan**

On May 23, the same day Scowcroft met privately with Reagan, the general told the Washington press corps that the United States must "turn to a new kind of private discussion altogether out of public view" in negotiations with the Soviet Union. Scowcroft was echoing a call made earlier this year by his boss Kissinger in an interview in *Parade* magazine, a call for a "back channel" to the Soviet leadership to be arranged by the Reagan administration. Kissinger emphasized in the interview that it was under this cloak of secrecy that he established private contacts with the Soviet leadership in 1969-71 which ultimately led to "détente" and SALT I. The interview was conducted by Tad Szulc, a former columnist for the *New Republic* and colleague of its former editor Michael Straight, now a self-admitted KGB agent. *Parade* itself is reputed to be an outlet for anglophile elements within the CIA.

On May 26, the day after Kissinger had a private luncheon with President Reagan, Shultz dispatched former New York Governor Averell Harriman and an entourage including former State Department Soviet specialist and Harriman hand Marshall Shulman (who is also an official consultant to Shultz's State Department) to Moscow for four days of meetings with Andropov and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko. According to State Department sources, Harriman had maintained consistent contact with Shultz prior to his trip and will be the first official he reports to on his return.

However, well before the highly public Harriman trip, close associates of Shultz, Kissinger, and Carrington had entered into "back channel" negotiations with representatives of Andropov. For several months Helmut Sonnenfeldt, a consultant to the Secretary of State and Henry Kissinger's alter ego for a very long time, has been secretly meeting with Egon Bahr, the originator of "détente," chief adviser to former West German Chancellor Willy Brandt, and a communication link to the Soviet Politburo. It was Bahr whom Kissinger secretly met with in 1969-71 to establish his "back channel" to Moscow; reportedly, Bahr has acted as a channel for private discussions on intermediate-range missiles for Andropov and Sonnenfeldt's current boss.

In addition, earlier this year Kissinger Associates, Inc. board member and former Kissinger Undersecretary of State for Economic Affairs William D. Rogers joined one of Bahr's co-thinkers, Socialist International celebrity Anthony Wedgwood Benn, and current British Labour Party candidate for Prime Minister Michael Foote for meetings at the KGB front IMEMO in Moscow. Benn and Foote are in turn allied with two Carrington intimates, Scottish Freemasonic leader and Soviet expert John Erickson, and Field Marshal Michael Carver, chairman of the Scottish-Soviet Friendship Society. Reportedly the discussion centered on an Anglo-Soviet separate deal on Euromissiles.

On the day Harriman left for Moscow, ABC correspondent John Scali broadcast that he had received confidential information reporting that the Soviet ambassador to the United States, Anatoly Dobrynin, is now personally heading up an embassy task force to gather information and assess for the Soviet Politburo the political state of the Reagan administration and the prospects for the 1984 American elections. While White House sources could not confirm the Dobrynin operation, they indicated that the Soviets have initiated a scaled-up profiling operation designed particularly to assess potential points of intervention against the President in the 1984 presidential election process.

In addition to those operations, during the week of May 23 high-level Soviet/KGB operatives flooded into Minneapolis to start a series of 33 meetings across the nation with the Washington-based KGB-linked Institute for Policy Studies (IPS). The institute is headed by Marcus Raskin and Arthur Waskow, radicals who as high level staffers in the Kennedy National Security Council rebelled against the President's handling of the Cuban Missile Crisis and later organized the "Days of Rage" siege against the Democratic Party Convention in 1968.

According to informed sources, the conference series form part of a psychological warfare campaign being orchestrated by the "Arbatov mafia" to influence U.S. popular opinion on the issues of the nuclear freeze, the defense budget, and Central America—in short, to set up the national apparatus to assault Reagan as a "warmonger" while the conflict in Central America heats up and the U.S. deployment of

Euromissiles draws near. An eyewitness at the Minneapolis event has reported that the focus of all 33 conferences will be a full-scale attack on the President's March 23 beam weapon development commitment.

Washington intelligence sources say that representatives from the Soviet Embassy in Washington, D.C. now meet every two days with representatives from IPS and the IPS-penetrated and -controlled American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE), the only AFL-CIO union supporting the presidential candidacy of Alan Cranston. Using IPS capabilities, the AFGE runs a massive snooping operation throughout the federal bureaucracy; it becomes a matter of interest that FBI director William Webster and Lane Kirkland have not whispered a word about this security threat.

### **'Project Democracy': from strategic consensus. . .**

Soon after George Shultz assumed his position at State, last summer he initiated regular meetings at the State Department with an old acquaintance he had made during his tenure as Secretary of Labor, Lane Kirkland. It was those early meetings between the two which gave impetus to "Project Democracy."

Project Democracy is on paper a bipartisan global outreach program to be run through the AFL-CIO in coordination with Democratic and Republican Party committees and foundations.

The true purpose of Project Democracy, however, is to provide worldwide cover for espionage, propaganda and special operations directed by the State Department, the AFL-CIO, and Israeli intelligence. In short, under the banner of bipartisanship, the United States would gradually hand over to the anglophile State Department, to Kirkland, and to the Mossad, central control over various levels of foreign covert operations.

On the Hill, Project Democracy is strongly supported by the Democratic leadership, especially by Rep. Dante Fascell (D-Fla.) of Miami, a longtime asset of the Foreign Affairs division of the AFL-CIO and certain elements of the Zionist Lobby.

Shultz and his collaborators saw in the plan an opportunity to seize upon a glaring vulnerability in the Reagan administration's strategic approach. Reagan's initial strategic rearmament plan was aimed at closing a "window of vulnerability" which, unless the United States undertook strategic modernization, would give the Soviet Union widening military superiority in the 1980s. Yet even with fullscale modernization, the administration projected a period between now and the mid-1980s in which the "window of vulnerability" would still remain open. Administration strategists were also convinced that the Soviets would use this superiority to push insurgencies and press for concessions from the United States.

To counteract Soviet moves during the period of vulner-

ability, the administration undertook a policy of so-called "strategic consensus" aimed particularly at the Middle East, but with global application. "Strategic consensus" required the building up of regional fortress-like "anti-communist" alliances aimed at withstanding Soviet-backed pressures.

Kissinger and Shultz, in collaboration with Harrimanites in the Democratic Party, strongly opposed Reagan's strategic modernization program, piously invoking "fiscal restraint."

Thus, "Project Democracy" is a first step in getting the United States to hand over to Shultz, Kirkland and Arens centralized control over the mechanisms of "strategic consensus." With this in hand, they believed they could gradually contain a U.S. strategic buildup by redirecting military expenditures toward beefing up capability for Vietnam War-style low-intensity operations, ostensibly for use against Soviet surrogates, as Gen. Maxwell Taylor and former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara have hysterically demanded.

### . . . to 'Project Lavie'

The Shultz plan suffered a mammoth blow on March 23 with the announcement of Reagan's new defense doctrine. Moving beyond initial attempts to contain the President through the creation of the Scowcroft Commission, Shultz consolidated his relationship to the new Israeli defense minister, Moshe Arens.

Thus in mid-April, alleging he was too busy with preparations for the Williamsburg summit, Shultz sat on his hands while war between Israeli and Syrian-PLO forces in the Bekaa Valley appeared imminent. The President urged Shultz to make an immediate trip to the region. Shultz, having gleefully watched the Israeli-Soviet rigged pressure build, told Mr. Reagan that in exchange for Israeli flexibility, he would require at minimum presidential approval for part of the centerpiece of Arens's new global Israeli military doctrine, the Lavie jet fighter. Reagan gave in, despite the objections of Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger.

However, as described in detail in a new *EIR* multi-client report, Lavie is far more than a new advanced Israeli jet fighter. These sources report that Lavie is, in fact, the "hardware" component supplementing "Project Democracy."

First, Lavie is aimed at making Israel a center of "Western" arms shipments to "allies" in the Third World. Second, Lavie is aimed at promoting Israel as an intelligence and logistical reserve for low intensity counterinsurgencies and insurgencies in the Third World. Finally, under Lavie, Israel, and its central collaborator South Africa would use former West German intelligence bases in Zaire for high-tech military research and development—including the testing of intermediate-range ballistic missiles.

According to my sources, Shultz sought immediate implementation of Lavie in his shuttle negotiations with Arens. And, as part of the ostensible quid pro quo, he sought and obtained a more direct Israeli role in Central America.

Regarding the Middle East, national security sources in

the Pentagon and White House are privately warning that the Shultz orchestrated Lebanese-Israeli withdrawal agreement transfers U.S. prerogatives in the region to Israel and the Soviet Union. They agree that Syrian conditions for withdrawal from Lebanon would certainly be vetoed by Israel, putting the region on an even tighter hairtrigger—and leaving only Israel and Moscow with their fingers on the triggers.

In addition, individuals associated with the Washington-based Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) and the British-front Heritage Foundation who are fierce supporters of "Project Democracy" and "Project Lavie" are reported by my intelligence sources to have recently put tremendous pressure on the government of Taiwan to invest their surplus foreign exchange in the new Israeli jet. In return, the Israelis would promise to become a larger, reliable supplier of arms to Taiwan in the future, particularly in the area of aircraft.

My source also indicates that these individuals have simultaneously joined the State Department in a covert campaign against Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone because his strategic and defense policies might provide an alternative to the Israeli Lavie in the region. The attack on Nakasone hit a snag, however, when the National Security Council staff in the White House on May 26 overruled a State Department handout for the Williamsburg summit that included an only slightly veiled attack on Japan for supposedly unfair trade practices. Summit documents were under the control of Shultz mentor Undersecretary of State for Economic Affairs W. Allen Wallis.

Lavie backers at Kissinger's Georgetown University have been deployed to Africa to oversee security for Israel, and are testing facilities in Zaire, according to intelligence sources. Reportedly these individuals have recruited the help of West German intelligence, the Belgian government, and troops from several French-speaking African countries, as well as South African military intelligence, to oversee Lavie security.

Weinberger has resisted the Lavie Project, while Sen. Paul Laxalt (R-Nev.), one of Reagan's closest confidantes and General Chairman of the Republican National Committee, was responsible for torpedoing temporarily "Project Democracy" in a Senate appropriations subcommittee vote during the week of May 23 (see *Congressional Closeup*). Such opposition will ultimately fail, if the President and his advisers miss the opportunity for immediately closing the "window of vulnerability" and replacing the compromise-forcing policy of "strategic consensus" with the full military, political, and economic breakthroughs possible through immediate action on the President's March 23 commitment.

Some people at the White House are sensitive to their predicament. In the late summer, an inter-agency task force will be initiated to study the full impact of the March 23 policy announcement, including its economic spinoffs. Others want to speed up the actual implementation of the new doctrine. All this may fall short if action is not immediate.