

President Reagan caught in Kissinger-KGB trap

by Kathleen Klenetsky

If the Reagan landslide confidently predicted by pollsters and pundits and eagerly anticipated by euphoric Republicans does indeed take place this November, it could turn out to be a Pyrrhic victory for those who cling to the belief that a second Reagan administration will *necessarily* salvage the United States from the economic and strategic disasters staring it in the face.

As of now, the Kissinger faction is solidly in control of administration policymaking, and is rapidly maneuvering to consolidate its grip over every important cabinet and sub-cabinet-level position.

If this situation prevails past November—as it surely will unless the American population undertakes a political blitzkrieg over the next two months to make its will felt in Washington—no significant difference will exist between the general policies that a reelected Reagan White House will pursue, and those that a Mondale White House would have. Seen in the context of the massive and unmistakable war preparations which the Soviet Union is now undertaking, that outcome will mean the end of the United States as a sovereign republic.

Already, the so-called palace guard—the cozy little clique consisting of James Baker III, Michael Deaver, and Richard Darman, who run day-to-day operations at the White House and exercise near-total control over President Reagan's reelection campaign from the West Wing of the White House—is deliberately withholding vital intelligence from the President, while feeding him a completely false view of

the strategic and economic crises. The palace guard has made it clear, as a Washington “insider” publication recently reported, that “Dr. Kissinger is probably the only man who could put coherence back into American foreign policy during a second Reagan administration.”

EIR has reason to believe that the Democratic National Committee is carrying on an active correspondence with the Soviet Politburo, the main subject of which is how best to “educate” the American public into believing that the Reagan program for defending U.S. citizens against nuclear attack, the Strategic Defense Initiative to develop beam-weapon systems, is “dangerous, destabilizing, and ridiculously costly.” Reportedly, this explosive information is available to the White House. Yet, there hasn't been a word about it from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue!

The only possible explanation is that Baker is either deliberately keeping this crucial intelligence from the President, or has somehow convinced him that to release it would be politically inexpedient. Baker, who hails from an old Houston family of lawyers and Scottish Rite Freemasons, is a collaborator of Kissinger and a close personal friend of such Democratic bigwigs as Robert Strauss.

This wouldn't be the first time that Reagan has been conned by his “political advisers” into committing political and policy suicide. Reagan's capitulation to palace guard pressure to adopt a “moderate” approach, especially in the strategic-policy realm, has already led to disaster—a fact sharply underscored by the current deadlocked status of the

1985 fiscal year Defense Department budget. After okaying a series of “compromises” urged on him by the James Baker-Michael Deaver-Richard Darman palace guard clique, Reagan is now facing a situation where the military budget is being held hostage by Congress, and is effectively being told that unless he agrees to abandon the MX altogether and accept a pitiful 5% increase in military spending, the budget will remain stalemated indefinitely.

Meanwhile, the KGB-orchestrated attack on the SDI—the most significant policy initiative which President Reagan has undertaken—is moving into high gear, at the same time that every potential supporter of the President’s so-called Star Wars program is being pushed out of the administration.

The third Kissinger administration

There are numerous indications—not least of which is the night-of-the-living-dead status of the Mondale-Ferraro campaign—that the Eastern Establishment has agreed to let Ronald Reagan have a second go-round in the Oval Office, but only at a price that spells disaster for the nation.

Under the terms of this “agreement,” the second Reagan administration will be purged of anyone who does not wholeheartedly support the “New Yalta” policy pushed by Henry Kissinger and his backers. Cooked up by the circles associated with McGeorge Bundy and Cyrus Vance in the United States, and Lord Peter Carrington in Europe, this New Yalta policy stipulates that the United States dismantle its defenses—particularly the Strategic Defense Initiative—and leave Western Europe to the Soviet Union. In exchange, the peace-loving leadership in the Kremlin has promised to go along with a division of the world into “eastern” and “western” spheres of influence. (But the Russians have embarked on the most massive military buildup ever witnessed, and have no particular reason to accept only half the world—a matter overlooked, it would seem, by Lord Carrington’s associates.)

Reliable sources report that a series of watergatings, based primarily on financial and related “scandals,” is ready and waiting to be unleashed on Reagan personally and anybody else in the administration who tries to buck the Eastern Establishment’s policy directives.

The process of eliminating any potential opposition to this policy from the ranks of the administration has already reached the point that not one person who could accurately be described as having the best interests of the United States at heart has a good chance of holding a top government position come next January.

With the help of its friends in the media and in the Democratic Party, the palace guard has been systematically pushing out one Reagan loyalist after another, and just as systematically replacing them with their own. Over the last 18 months, this treacherous bunch has seized control of the National Security Council and the White House (the State Department has been a Kissinger stronghold since the begin-

ning), and is now moving on the rest of the cabinet and related posts. Indeed, Baker is reported to be eyeing at least five different top posts—ranging from Defense to Justice—for himself, and is simply calculating which one would be most opportune before making his final choice.

“Reagan’s capitulation to palace guard pressure to adopt a ‘moderate’ approach, especially in the strategic-policy realm, has already led to disaster.”

According to numerous sources, including Aug. 27 columns by Evans and Novak and by *Washington Times* White House correspondent Jeremiah O’Leary, the Kissinger-James Baker clique is operating on the following script: Judge William Clark will be knocked out as a contender for the White House chief of staff position, in favor of Michael Deaver. Another Baker lieutenant, Richard Darman, is slated to become director of the Office of Management and Budget, replacing David Stockman who is reportedly anxious to leave government. Yet another ally of the Kissinger-Baker crew, former *New York Times* employee Richard Burt, currently Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, is being pushed into the NSC slot, while current NSC director Robert McFarlane is reportedly headed for a senior State Department post. As for Ed Meese, who has been dangling in political limbo for the past 10 months, congressional sources say that even if he is cleared of the charges of financial misdealing pending against him, the Senate will not confirm him for the Attorney-General post.

Even more ominous are the recent deployments against Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and CIA director William Casey. Both men, but especially Weinberger, have opposed Kissinger’s decouple-from-Europe proposal and staunchly supported the SDI—Weinberger to the point of going on national television Sept. 9 to tell the American population that Henry Kissinger’s ABM Treaty of 1972 must be abrogated if the United States intends to match Soviet missile defense capabilities.

So intent is the Eastern Establishment on getting rid of Weinberger that its top spokesman, McGeorge Bundy, has been hitting the lecture circuit rabidly denouncing the defense secretary, particularly over the issue of his support of beam-weapons. Bundy’s latest assault on Weinberger came Sept. 6, in a keynote speech to a University of Maryland conference on NATO nuclear strategy attended by V. V. Aleksandrov of

the Soviet Academy of Sciences, Kissinger associate Helmut Sonnenfeldt, and quite a few Mondale strategic policy advisers. Bundy coupled his denunciations of Weinberger and the SDI with a virtual invitation to the Soviets to annex West Germany, indicating that a Red Army invasion of that nation would meet with no strategic response from the United States.

Casey and Weinberger have been the subject of a nasty, Baker-orchestrated whispering campaign so successful that it is already accepted as a foregone conclusion on Capitol Hill that Weinberger is out as Pentagon chief. Most members of Congress are convinced that retiring Sen. John Tower (R-Tex.) will replace Weinberger, who in turn may be dispatched to the Court of St. James or some other ambassadorial post to place him as far away from the seat of power as possible.

The *Washington Times*' O'Leary gives Weinberger "about even money to leave in the first year."

The move against Casey, which has been on the burner ever since the "Briefinggate" case broke in June 1983, was revived once again in early September, when a spate of stories hit the major press that he, too, will be "resigning" at the end of the year. Casey, however, is trying to fight back. Using the pages of the Sept. 6 *Washington Times* to counter-attack, Casey deployed a "source close to the director" to disavow rumors that he will be leaving his post. The source charged that reports about Casey's imminent departure "may have been disinformation, byproducts of internecine power struggles in the recesses of the White House. . . . I think you can characterize the story as totally untrue. . . . The director was highly amused. . . . These stories appear in almost exact ratio with the ambitions of certain people in the West Wing." The *Times* points out that James Baker's name was on the top of the list which is allegedly circulating to replace Casey.

'Most dangerous period ahead'

Although Casey has his faults, he is considered much less likely to go along with the New Yalta crowd than some of the people now being mooted as his possible replacements—Robert McFarlane; Laurence Silberman, a former ambassador to Yugoslavia and close Kissinger ally; and James Baker himself. That fact was underscored by an internal CIA document on the international strategic situation reported by Evans and Novak Sept. 27. Prepared for Casey by one of his closest collaborators inside the agency, Herbert C. Meyer, the 11-page memorandum is analytically contaminated by the KGB disinformation line that the "Soviet Empire is crumbling." However, it then draws a conclusion sharply countering the "business-as-usual" nonsense coming from the State Department and the palace guard, that this means there is no military threat posed by Moscow.

The "days ahead will be the most dangerous that we have ever known," warns the memo. The Soviets might well shift to a "high-risk course designed to change the correlation of East-West forces before it is too late," and are now consid-

ering a "grab for power in the Persian Gulf, an attack on Western Europe, or even a first strike on the U.S."

Kissinger backchannel

Kissinger is taking advantage of the turmoil in the White House and the election period to advance his policy agenda as far as possible between now and November. During early September, despite public acrimonies between Moscow and Washington, extensive "backchannel" contacts were made between American and Soviet diplomats in various locations in Europe.

These contacts took place in an atmosphere of "privacy" and "confidentiality," precisely as prescribed by Henry A. Kissinger in a remarkable article published by the *Washington Post* on July 27. They also occurred on the theory, also publicly expounded by Kissinger, that the Soviet government is making preparations to begin arms control negotiations right after the November elections. Part of these "private and confidential" backchannel discussions, was the agreement between NBC and Soviet Ambassador Anatoli Dobrynin for a series of TV broadcasts on the subject of "Star Wars" from Moscow into American living rooms—between now and election day.

One of the purposes of these talks is, as Kissinger also recommended in his July 27 article, to arrive at a "definition" of what a "defensive weapon" is which will be mutually acceptable to both the United States and the Soviet Union.

The Soviet contention is that space-based anti-missile laser-beam weapons are not defensive but rather "first-strike" weapons. President Reagan has argued that these weapons, which can only destroy nuclear missiles if these missiles are already launched, are nothing but defensive weapons. Henry Kissinger has proposed that his private, confidential backchannel diplomacy can bridge this difference—in other words, either by keeping the U.S. beam-weapons program eternally in the research and development stage, or by dismantling it altogether.

Kissinger's effort is getting significant support from the Democratic Party's controllers. The Sept. 2 *New York Times* carried a special article, signed jointly by Averell Harriman, Clark Clifford, and Marshall Shulman, which was the "official" Democratic Party response to Kissinger's July 27 article. The Harriman article stated that these Democrats agree on the matter of private backchannel talks with the Russians, on the matter of finding a suitable "mutually acceptable definition" of what is a defensive weapon and on the proposal that this whole project should be a "bipartisan effort."

Harriman, by nodding to this "bipartisan approach," has indicated to Moscow two conclusions: First, the Democratic Party by itself could not derail the Strategic Defense Initiative; second, that he, Harriman, is now confident that the Kissinger operation inside the White House is sufficiently far advanced to justify the expectation that a "bipartisan" approach would accomplish the SDI derailing.