

Turning the White House over to Henry Kissinger

by Graham Lowry

Henry Kissinger became the hottest issue in the Reagan White House during the week of Feb. 13, as the former secretary of state launched a drive for outright control of the Reagan administration.

The “practical” men around the President are telling him that he has no choice but to make a deal with Kissinger and Kissinger’s Eastern Establishment sponsors, such as David Rockefeller, given the pressures of the re-election campaign. That advice will lose Reagan the election as well as the country—but it is having an impact.

On Feb. 13 it leaked out that the President, who was elected by American voters who despised Jimmy Carter’s Trilateral Commission regime, would host a reception for the Trilaterals during their meeting in Washington April 1-3. Such red-carpet treatment for the Kissinger crowd—Kissinger moved over to direct Rockefeller’s Trilateral Commission when Carter moved into the White House—further indicates Kissinger’s tightening grip over administration policy making. It’s almost like inviting the Mondale campaign in for tea.

The latest demonstration was the forced resignation of Special Envoy to Central America Richard Stone on Feb. 16, and his replacement by Harry Schlaudeman, longtime Kissinger hatchetman and Kissinger’s on-the-scene operative for the bloody 1973 coup in Chile.

Intelligence sources also report that during the time officially scheduled for Kissinger’s mid-February vacation in Acapulco, he instead was dispatched on a secret mission to the Middle East, involving meetings with Syrian, Lebanese, and Israeli officials. Kissinger allies Robert McFarlane, the

National Security Adviser, and Secretary of State George Shultz were prime movers in the drive to force the United States out of Lebanon and collapse U.S. influence throughout the Middle East. Before leaving for his own announced vacation in the Bahamas on Feb. 16, Shultz virtually wrote off any prospects for a continuing U.S. role, declaring in Boston, “I can’t resist using that old image that the light you see at the end of the tunnel may be the train coming towards you. The situation in Lebanon is marked by violence, and is in no way satisfactory and is not at all what we have been trying to bring about.”

The so-called Soviet peace offensive

The Pugwash appeasement crowd in the Republican Eastern Establishment and the wing of the Democratic Party run by former Ambassador to Moscow Averell Harriman are backing the Kissinger coup project, so he can sell out the United States in a “New Yalta” deal with the Soviet Union. Since the death of Soviet President Yuri Andropov was announced, the liberal media and think tanks have poured forth propaganda designed to foster the illusion that the changing of the guard in the Kremlin means “new openings” to negotiate “détente” and “arms control” with the Russians.

In *EIR*’s Jan. 31 issue, we published part of a speech Kissinger gave on Jan. 13 in Brussels, headquarters city of the NATO alliance, calling for the creation of a special presidential envoy to put East-West negotiations on a “back-channel” basis of private talks. Within hours of the announcement of Andropov’s death, Kissinger declared, “I expect a Soviet peace offensive in the next months, because they will

have to sort out the leadership question." That bald-faced lie was Kissinger's public version of his backroom bludgeon-and-blackmail campaign to seize control over U.S. strategic policy.

Kissinger's pawprints on U.S. foreign policy were detected during Vice President George Bush's pilgrimage to Moscow for Andropov's funeral. Bush, a former member of the Trilateral Commission, took a message from Reagan to Chernenko which sources in Washington report was in the spirit of Kissinger's Brussels proposals.

Bush announced that the statement "conveyed the President's determination to move forward in all areas of our relationship with the Soviets, and our readiness for concrete, productive discussions in every one of them." Bush called the "spirit" of his own meeting with Chernenko "excellent" and added that he believed "we can build from there."

The appeasers are currently poised to move rapidly, using Bush as a temporary "go-between" with Moscow until Kissinger's proposal for a special envoy is implemented. According to a top Carter official, Kissinger is the preferred choice of the arms-control elites for special envoy, but his nomination is not yet regarded as politically feasible. As a stand-in, Kissinger's long-time flunkey and the executive director of Kissinger Associates, Brent Scowcroft, is the current favorite.

"Scowcroft is perfectly acceptable," the Carter official stated. "He is the same as Kissinger," and Kissinger would play a critical role in shaping all policy decisions under Scowcroft.

Within the administration, the Harrimanites are looking to White House Chief of Staff James Baker and his deputy Michael Deaver—just as Reagan's conservative supporters have feared—to push the President into creating a "back-channel" special envoy to Moscow. The Harrimanites report that Baker and Deaver are telling President Reagan that dramatic action on arms control is required to "guarantee" his re-election. "Baker and Deaver are realists," the former Carter official said. "They are important assets." In addition, the media will step up its propaganda barrage against Reagan's "inaction" on arms control.

Harrimanite sources report that the White House is being advised by the Kissinger-Harriman group to restructure "the framework of arms-control negotiations," merging the so-called Euromissile talks with the strategic-arms negotiations, under a single negotiating team, as the Soviets have demanded. The rationale is that such restructuring will make it easier for the Soviets to return to the negotiating table, and also permit the United States to seek an interim arms-control agreement.

Moscow is also putting out the word that it will respond "favorably" to such overtures from Washington. But the Soviets have made it clear that they intend to reject any and all U.S. negotiating offers. Instead they expect to have Kissin-

ger and his fellow appeasers in power to negotiate the strategic surrender of the United States during a full-scale U.S.-Soviet confrontation.

Even the current public clamor by the Harrimanites for negotiations with Moscow makes no claim that the Soviets will pull back in their global drive for empire. Dimitri Simes, a Harrimanite analyst for the Carnegie Endowment, wrote in the *Christian Science Monitor* Feb. 15, "No one can predict whether the Soviets will respond to any American overtures that are short of major concessions. . . . Still, Andropov's replacement—even if he does not change much substantively—provides the U.S. administration with a good excuse to communicate its interest in normalization to the Politburo. But for this message to be taken seriously in Moscow, it has to be delivered subtly and tactfully, and certainly without the insistence that the Soviets are obliged to reciprocate right away."

The President's allies are most concerned about electoral image, not policy disasters.

To foster such delusions of "peace around the corner," Kissinger's cronies inside the administration are mootng a possible summit meeting between Reagan and Chernenko. Following Bush's return from Andropov's funeral, word leaked to the press that Bush reported to the President that there is "a whole new ballgame" with the change of Soviet leadership and that a summit was now possible. The Harrimanite press has promoted this fraud with the added claim that such a summit would have "obvious political advantages" if held this fall during the election campaign. Washington sources report that Sen. Paul Laxalt (R-Nev.), the head of the Reagan reelection team, is peddling the same line.

Some signs of counterattack

Kissinger's increasingly prominent role in the administration—and the resulting string of disasters ranging from the Middle East to Central America—is a subject of concern but not yet an issue for direct action among the "kitchen cabinet" and other old friends and political allies of the President. Their primary concern is less over policy than the President's standing with his supporters.

No friends of Kissinger, these men want the President to appoint a replacement for Ed Meese, the White House adviser nominated to become Attorney General. With Meese out of the White House inner guard, following the earlier transfer

of National Security Adviser William Clark to the Interior secretaryship, conservatives fear that Trilateral Commission congenials James Baker and Michael Deaver have cut off the President from old and trusted friends, and will tilt the White House policy apparatus to Kissinger's advantage. Leading Republican conservatives plan to meet soon to mount pressure on the President to name an acceptable replacement for Meese.

Baker and Deaver oppose such a move, Sen. Steven Symms (R-Idaho) reported recently, claiming it would lead to "unnecessary contention and infighting." But without such a counterweight to Eastern Establishment influence, as White House aide Morton Blackwell observed recently, Reagan's conservative supporters are likely to desert him in droves.

Moscow is betting that election-year pressures on Reagan will cause him to back down in the strategic confrontation that the Soviet military junta—fronted for by Andropov, his successor Konstantin Chernenko, or whomever—remains committed to force over the months ahead. Kissinger's babbling about a new Moscow "peace offensive" is rather a proposal for a "surrender offensive" by the United States, to be accepted by President Reagan in order to overcome the "warmonger" image projected by the media to the electorate.

The U.S. Press leers at White House infighting

Excerpts from an article by George Archibald in the Washington Times of Feb. 13:

President Reagan has agreed to meet with his "kitchen cabinet," a group of influential business friends, to discuss the possibility of appointing a prominent conservative to replace Edwin Meese III as his White House counsellor, it has been learned.

The President, who said he does not plan to fill the post when Mr. Meese becomes attorney general, agreed to the meeting Thursday in a telephone conversation with Colorado brewing magnate Joseph Coors, *The Washington Times* was told.

Mr. Coors was in Washington to promote the addition of an influential conservative to the president's inner circle of advisers. He is a leading candidate for the post.

The "kitchen cabinet" meeting will take place in about three weeks. . . . Other members of the group include William A. Wilson, recently named U.S. envoy to the Vatican; California business executives Holmes Tuttle, Earl M. Jorgensen, and Jack Hume; and Jack L. Hodges of Oklahoma City.

Proponents of filling Mr. Meese's slot are said to believe White House staff director James A. Baker III and Michael K. Deaver, another top lieutenant—both considered pragmatic moderates—will isolate Mr. Reagan and move White House policy making in a more liberal direction. . . . About 14 GOP senators are reportedly behind the move, said to be backed by Interior Secretary William P. Clark, CIA Director William J. Casey, Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger, and several prominent GOP political leaders.

Rep. Trent Lott (R-Miss.), House Republican whip, said it would be "a mistake" not to fill the slot with a high-profile conservative. "I think that additional voice is an important one that needs to be heard. It might keep some problems from developing."

From a Feb. 13 column by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, titled "Succumbing to the Establishment":

As he was indignantly denying the need for Joe Coors or any conservative activist other than himself in the White House, Ronald Reagan routinely approved an event certain to infuriate his right-wing constituency: an April 1 presidential reception for Trilateral Commission members.

The Trilateralists are seen by the conservative movement as symbolizing the international establishment targeted by Reagan's right-wing populist supporters of 1976 and 1980. The commission members—consisting of business, intellectual, and political leaders from the United States, Western Europe, and Japan—are far from the communist sympathizers portrayed by the paranoid Right, but tend to an elitist, antipopulist world view. Thus, the April Fool's White House party illustrates insensitivity, shared by Reagan, toward his core constituency.

The most conservative president since Calvin Coolidge faces trouble from the Right for succumbing to the establishment on issues far more important than the Trilateral Commission. Back-bench House Republicans are nearing open revolt protesting Federal Reserve Board and State Department policies that threaten calamities for the economy and Lebanon. Reagan's State of the Union, enveloped in euphoria, seems buried in a past more distant than Jan. 25.

It was during this euphoric afterglow that Chase Manhattan Bank Chairman-emeritus David Rockefeller informed the White House that the Trilateral Commission was meeting in Washington April 1-3. The famed international banker, symbol of the Trilateralists, asked whether the commission's members might be received by the President.

The reception was quickly approved, with the stipulation that it be announced eventually by the White House rather than by the commission. When the April 1 date appeared on Reagan's closely held advance schedule, one politically astute insider assumed it was a tired April Fool's joke. . . . It was no joke. . . .