

The palace guard has trapped the President

by Richard Cohen in Washington, D.C.

President Reagan's Feb. 22 press conference had gone well, as far as the dangerous self-styled "palace guard" that now dominates the White House was concerned. The President did not fumble once in regurgitating rehearsed answers crafted to fit the capitulationist reelection strategy the guard had bludgeoned the President into adopting.

The *EIR* intervention

But as the President was leaving the press conference, *EIR* reporter Laura Chasen Cohen asked the President whether he knew that *EIR* founder Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., now a Democratic presidential candidate, had been denied Secret Service protection in a decision taken by Treasury Secretary Donald Regan. Well-informed Washington sources had only days before confided that the decision to deny LaRouche Secret Service protection was a high-level "serious" decision made by Regan personally. By the looks of the President's startled response, it was clear that he had not been informed of the decision or the case.

If this be true, it would be at least the second time in recent weeks that the President had been embargoed by his own staff from getting crucial intelligence. According to Washington intelligence sources, during a February meeting with Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak, Reagan was shocked to learn that important messages from Mubarak on Middle East policy had been blocked from his attention by Secretary of State George Shultz and the top levels of the State Department, as well as the palace guard hard core of White House

Chief of Staff James Baker III, his chief assistant Richard Darman, Deputy Chief of Staff Michael Deaver, and Deputy Press Secretary Larry Speakes. Reportedly joining Shultz and the palace guard has been National Security Adviser Robert McFarlane, who has been downgraded, according to White House sources, to a "second-rate player" by the palace guard.

The last time the President was subjected to virtual imprisonment through a well-designed effort to hide critical intelligence from him occurred dramatically in the late spring of 1982. At that time, then-Secretary of State Alexander Haig—operating through well established Kissinger "back channels" to the Sharon wing of the Israeli military—conspired to initiate the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. In addition, Haig reportedly withheld from the President at least six different peace initiatives by the government of Argentina at the height of the Malvinas crisis. Within weeks of the President being tipped off to Haig's shenanigans, he was forced to resign.

But now, under circumstances where the stakes are much higher, the reinforced palace guard reacted sharply when Laura Chasen Cohen pierced the shield they had surrounded Reagan with. Speakes created what reporters later described as a "scene" when he ordered the Secret Service to block the President from Chasen as she questioned him. A short time later, Speakes sent his staff scurrying about the White House in search of Chasen. After failing to find her, the deputy press secretary called the *EIR* offices in Washington three times in

The Washington Post

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1984



PRESIDENT REAGAN'S NEWS CONFERENCE

Reporter Stops the President for Request

... Laura Chasen asked Reagan after news conference to provide details about Lyndon LaRouche's Secret Service protection.

... Reagan reportedly did not respond to the request before Secret Service agents and aides escorted him out of the White House.

... Chasen is an assigned correspondent for the Washington Post and is currently in Washington, D.C.

... Last night, a White House official asked reporters before the news conference if they would like to see LaRouche's Secret Service protection details.

... LaRouche's Secret Service protection details are being reviewed by the Secret Service.

... LaRouche's Secret Service protection details are being reviewed by the Secret Service.

The Feb. 23 Washington Post published a page-one picture with a page-eight picture and article on EIR correspondent Laura Chasen Cohen's question to the President about the denial of Secret Service protection to Lyndon LaRouche. On the following days the story was carried by UPI, radio networks, and other major newspapers.

a desperate attempt to find the *EIR* reporter. Upon finally reaching her, Speakes demanded that she "be in his office at 10 a.m." the next morning. Chasen refused.

The Kissinger gameplan

Speakes's actions are part of a broad effort to both close down the Democratic primary process early around a quick series of victories for Walter Mondale and simultaneously imprison President Reagan under a cordon sanitaire constructed by a dirty White House palace guard, so that former Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger—already ensconced throughout the State Department and White House—can take full control of administration policy. If Kissinger and the palace guard are successful in fully consolidating their position, there will be no Reagan second term—a dream with which many in Washington are still desperately consoling themselves.

The key issue upon which this consolidation can be reversed is the LaRouche Secret Service question. To reverse it, Reagan would run directly against the Shultz-Kissinger clique and the palace guard, and in so doing face a series of manipulations of intelligence that would make Haig's actions look like child's play.

But convincing the weakened and confused Reagan to reverse this decision will take massive effort. Even with George Shultz, the mastermind, along with Kissinger, of the recent debacle in Lebanon, threatening to resign, the President in his Feb. 22 press conference virtually begged the man

who had just brought us another "Saigon disaster" to say, "No, I wouldn't" accept his resignation. He added, "I think he has done a splendid job. And I hope he doesn't have any thoughts about leaving us at this point."

Reagan's humiliating nationally televised plea was almost simultaneous with a rash of rumors coming from sources connected to George Shultz. According to the rumors which flooded the State Department on Feb. 23, Shultz had already decided that he "was out" and that the only question surrounding his leaving the administration was whether it would be before or after the elections. At the same time, Capitol Hill sources were reporting that Shultz would probably be replaced by Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger and that Weinberger would be replaced by outgoing Sen. John Tower (R-Tex.), while Mideast sources were saying that Middle East Special Negotiator Donald Rumsfeld would replace Shultz.

A series of defeats

While Shultz's future may be unsure, the secretary used, along with Kissinger, the threat of resignation in the past to force the ouster of Reagan's most intimate adviser, Judge William Clark. Following the clear collapse of U.S. Central American and Middle East policy during the summer of 1983, then-National Security Adviser Clark, backed by Weinberger and CIA Director William Casey, forced a major shake-up in Shultz's State Department while moving to secure control of policy in these two areas. This led to the ouster of Thomas

Enders as assistant secretary of state for Inter-American Affairs and his replacement with Reagan ally Langhorne Motley. Then Nicolas Veliotis, a Kissinger man, was forced to resign as assistant secretary of state for Near East Affairs, to be replaced by William Murphy.

Shultz reacted violently to these moves, and, according to highly informed sources, threatened to resign, stating that it was a choice between himself and Clark on who would run foreign policy. At this point the palace guard, led by James Baker, strongly advised the President to retain (their ally) Shultz at all costs. Baker warned that if he were allowed to resign, then Reagan's foreign-policy credibility in the 1984 elections would come under grave question, after having had two secretaries of state resign. Reagan capitulated, and when the palace guard forced out James Watt from the Interior Department, Clark was pulled into the opening.

On Feb. 23, Shultz Press Secretary John Hughes publicly hinted that for the secretary to stay, he wanted a presidential commitment to appoint him for a second term.

A similar process occurred later, when Attorney General William French Smith resigned and White House Counselor Edwin Meese was taken out to replace him. The removal from the White House of Meese, a weaker yet conservative intimate of the President, gave the Baker-Deaver group free rein.

The evolution of a successful gameplan to imprison the President and its evident negative effects in the President's public appeal were also clear immediately after Mubarak broke the total control around Reagan. Having just witnessed a strategic disaster in Lebanon at the hands of Shultz based on a program that countered the President's Sept. 1, 1982, "Reagan Plan" for the Mideast, the President refused to rally to Mubarak's public appeal for a return to the Reagan Plan. After a series of timed press leaks identifying a series of secret meetings between the Reagan administration and the PLO (leaks neatly restricted to a period before Shultz's reign at State), Reagan, heeding Baker's electoral advice, pledged to Shultz's allies in Israel that the White House would not talk to the PLO. In addition to this reassurance, the White House, over Pentagon objections, released \$250 million for the important Lavie jet fighter program in Israel and appointed Lawrence Silberman, a trusted asset of certain Zionist factions, to travel with Rumsfeld.

Two prongs

Henry Kissinger's current mission to Moscow, aimed at securing his much sought-after "major negotiation" with the Soviets, may not get the response he seeks, but considering the drift of events in the White House, Kissinger could get his proposed idea of a "special negotiator with Moscow." Such a concession would mean the end of the Reagan administration.

Meanwhile, Kissinger and his friends in the Democratic Party are moving quickly to sew up the presidential nomina-

tion for Walter Mondale by mid-March. Immediately following the landslide Iowa caucus victory, due to a fear among union members of voting against their union leadership-endorsed candidate in the public caucuses, an arrogant Mondale forecast that he would nail down the nomination very soon. Failure to secure this goal early in the primary season could destroy Mondale's candidacy, as a longer Democratic primary fight would, according to well-placed Democratic sources, ensure a serious assault on Mondale. Such attacks on the highly vulnerable Carter Vice-President from within the Democratic Party could then be credibly echoed by the Republicans. A long primary season thus could easily kill Mondale's presidential chances; a short one could give him badly needed momentum.

LaRouche files lawsuit against Donald Regan

Attorneys for Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr., founder of *EIR*, and The LaRouche Campaign filed a lawsuit in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia in Alexandria on Feb. 24 against Treasury Secretary Donald Regan, demanding that action be taken to reverse the Secretary's decision to deny candidate LaRouche Secret Service protection.

The lawsuit asks for 1) a declaratory judgment that Donald Regan has acted in violation of the First and Fifth Amendments of the Constitution by denying protection to LaRouche; and 2) a mandatory injunction ordering the defendant to provide Lyndon LaRouche with the protection of the U.S. Secret Service for as long as he remains a candidate for the office of President of the United States.

The complaint notes that "on or about Nov. 8, 1983, Jesse Jackson, a newly declared candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, was provided Secret Service protection by the defendant," and that "on or about Jan. 12, 1984, the defendant provided Secret Service protection to the remaining major candidates for the Democratic presidential nomination with the exception of the candidate/plaintiff."

The lawsuit further notes that "the life and safety of plaintiff LaRouche and his wife [Helga Zepp-LaRouche] have been threatened with increasing frequency since his announcement of candidacy, a fact which the defendant is fully aware of." As a result of this awareness, "the defendant's action was a knowing and intentional attempt to strip the candidate/plaintiff of security protection and thereby prohibit him from actively campaigning in support of his candidacy."

The LaRouche Campaign has submitted extensive documentation in recent weeks to all individuals and agencies involved in the decision on granting Secret Service protection, proving a high level of threat against LaRouche from terrorist operations controlled in Libya and Moscow.