

Editorial

Reagan, Gromyko, and Beirut

First, President Reagan agreed with the White House palace guard that a crash program for beam-weapons development would not be “good electoral politics.” Then, President Reagan agreed that the program should be kept in a “research only” phase. He did not agree to send a representative to the Schiller Institute’s West German conference to save the Atlantic alliance. Now, we fear, President Reagan has agreed to make major concessions to Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko on the beam-weapons program—if the Russians will return to the arms-control talks which Reagan has agreed *would* be “good electoral politics.”

Step by step, Ronald Reagan has become a practitioner of appeasement in the name of “good electoral politics.” And step by step, this encourages the Russian drive toward war. They are behaving toward West Germany in every respect the way Hitler behaved on the eve of the Polish invasion—even portraying the Gromyko-Reagan meeting as the equivalent of a Hitler-Stalin pact, which preceded the Polish invasion by nine days. Despite months of brazenly provocative “biggest ever” Soviet military dress rehearsals for a European blitzkrieg, Reagan has not put content into his words about America’s commitment to defend Europe. His abstention from the Schiller Institute campaign is as chilling to our allies as it is relished in Moscow.

Appeasement, in the name of “good electoral politics” or any other, leads to war or to surrender. The Russians have responded once again as Hitler would have: with a brutal bombing murder of over a score of Americans at the Beirut embassy in Lebanon, a rerun of the attack on the embassy more than a year ago. A crazed fanatic from the Islamic Jihad group, loyal to the bestial Islamic Revolution of the Kremlin’s Geidar Aliyev, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Ruhollah Khomeini, drove an explosive-laden truck through the entrance to the embassy compound, and attempted to crash into the building.

The terrorists responsible have now threatened the President’s life. The attack comes as part of a general upsurge of religious warfare in the area, as Russian diplomacy moves to consolidate regions being trans-

ferred into its sphere of influence through the treachery of Western oligarchic Trojan Horses like Britain’s Lord Carrington, Austria’s Bruno Kreisky, and Italy’s Giulio Andreotti.

More significantly, the attack once again confirms what Lyndon LaRouche has often repeated to be the guiding maxim of Russian diplomacy. Prostrate yourself before this kind of thug, and he will kick you in the teeth. This Russian kick answers the Reagan administration’s capitulation to Carrington and Kissinger in Washington the week of Sept. 10.

There is talk about retaliation. But that would require defining what would be effective, and that means defining the relation of Moscow to the killers.

A few “objective” facts: Iranian “kamikaze” terrorists are trained by North Korean “spetsnaz” professionals under Soviet GRU command; Politburo member Geidar Aliyev’s Oriental Institute in Tashkent intersected and took control of the “Islamic fundamentalism” network at large from Lord Carrington’s helpful “Arab bureau” boys; virtually every mullah in Iran was trained in Russia.

The more important facts are “subjective.” “Islamic fundamentalism” is a Sufi, Gnostic-cult belief structure, indistinguishable in its axiomatic features from the “Christianity” of the Russian Orthodox Church, whose prophetic “Third and Final Roman Empire” underlies Soviet strategic policy—not communism and Karl Marx. As such, it is also indistinguishable from the Gnosticism of Scottish Rite Freemasonry and the Church of England, whose recognition of affinity with Russian mysticism lies behind the collaboration of the Anglo-American Liberal Establishment, Kissinger’s masters, with the Kremlin for the destruction of the United States.

It is not to be ruled out that the United States could take some military action against the perpetrators of the Beirut atrocities. But any military action must be preceded by driving the Kissinger-Bundy gang out of our foreign policy and defense establishment—the people who have made the appeasement “deal” to let Moscow take over the Middle East *and* Western Europe.