

## France's *Le Figaro* hits palace guard surrounding Reagan

*The conservative Paris newspaper Le Figaro has published an analysis of the crisis in the Western alliance and the factional battle in the U.S. administration which closely echoes what EIR has been reporting for many months. This is the first time that a leading international daily has reported the real story of what is going on behind the scenes at the White House. What we have called the "palace guard" surrounding President Reagan is here described as the "entourage" that is filtering the intelligence reports reaching the President and deciding who will have access to the Oval Office.*

*The palace guard's briefing to the President was responsible for his poor showing in the first nationally televised debate with Walter Mondale; this provoked a backlash from the opposing administration faction (Reagan's close associate Sen. Paul Laxalt (R-Utah) said the President had been "smothered"). At least temporarily, the President was freed from the grip of Michael Deaver, James Baker III, Henry Kissinger, et al., and the outcome was the much more successful debate of Oct. 21, in which the President vigorously defended his Strategic Defense Initiative and denounced the "Malthusians" who claim that population control is the "solution" to the world's economic problems.*

*Le Figaro commentator Jacques Guilleme-Brulon published the article which we excerpt here on Oct. 27, under the headline, "A few days before the U.S. elections—Reagan: the drift?"*

A few days before the U.S. presidential elections, cracks are being heard on the Western front, on the two sides of the Atlantic, particularly in the Federal Republic of Germany and in the United States. In West Germany, the signs of uneasiness are multiplying, and Mr. Helmut Kohl's authority seems to be evaporating, slowly but surely. Even before the the Barzel scandal [Rainer Barzel, the president of the West German parliament, resigned in October because of accusa-

tions that he was involved in political pay-offs from the Flick Corporation—ed.], in the recent elections in Rhineland-Westphalia, a traditional stronghold of the CDU, the Christian Democrats were defeated by the Social Democrats; and the Greens managed to eliminate the Liberals. . . .

The drift toward the East is such, on the government side, that a public veil has been cast over the sordid transactions [with the East]. . . . Now that it has shown its will to remain faithful to the Atlantic alliance by accepting the deployment of a few Pershing IIs on its territory, the Bonn government has, in fact, no more urgent priority than trying to negotiate with the Soviet Union, precisely at a time when the campaign against the "German revanchists" has reached its paroxysm in Moscow. Foreign Minister Genscher undertakes the impossible, trying to serve as a relay to Washington in order to relaunch détente, whose sour grapes Europe and the United States are still gathering, four years after its official end.

### **Back-channel maneuvers**

But there is much more. On the occasion of the maneuvers of the Fifth U.S. Army Corps in Hesse in September, the peaceniks broke loose with sabotage activities aimed against the military communications network and other equipment. When General Wetzel complained to the Hesse governor, Mr. Börner, the latter answered that he [Wetzel] was meddling into business which was not his own, and that he understood nothing about the situation. Further, the traditional Social Democrat added that, like "the majority of the Germans"—a questionable claim—he [Börner] was supporting the peace movement. Yet, since the SPD has no absolute majority in this state, he can only govern through an alliance with the Greens.

On the U.S. side, an evolution is underway which, if not parallel, is strange enough to cause some concern. After the last bombing of the U.S. embassy in Beirut, President Reagan publicly stated that this type of drama had become inevitable since the previous administration had "broken the back" of the CIA. But what is less well known is that, half a day later, the President called Mr. Carter to apologize for having publicly stated that assessment—which was, however, fully justified. Given that it is difficult to believe that Reagan could have changed his mind so quickly on such an important matter, we are forced to look for the reasons in the maneuvers being carried out by his entourage. Yet, this entourage, including Messrs. James Baker and Michael Deaver, is hardly reassuring. These two men . . . are in favor of returning at any cost to discussions with the Soviet Union. However strongly Mr. Weinberger might be fighting to make sure that the U.S. military buildup program continues at an accelerated rate, specifically in the area of "Star Wars," he feels more and more shortcircuited by the President's men.

Thus Mr. James Baker controls all the documents coming to Mr. Reagan's desk; he receives and filters visitors, favor-

ing those whose will to accelerate appeasement of the East seems to him to be the most obvious.

Thus a few days before Mr. Andrei Gromyko's visit to Washington, Mr. Ronald Reagan was indoctrinated at length by Mr. Henry Kissinger. And Henry Kissinger, contrary to all expectations, had already recently crossed Central and South America on his request, in order to give him a full briefing on the balance of forces there and to draw the main lines of a settlement in these troubled regions.

"Dear Henry" is known to be a luminary of the Trilateral Commission, yet this honorable international enterprise gathers Western figures for whom success in business is worth some concessions on the altar of Marxism-Leninism. . . . Isn't it bizarre that these people, who had been courteously but firmly ousted from power just four years ago, came back through the window after having left through the service door? Isn't it bizarre that one of the moving forces of Reagan's first presidential campaign was the slogan, "Kick out the Trilateroids," and now we can see them coming back in force? This is a puzzle which disturbs many supporters of the White House.

### **Six months later**

The propaganda campaign around Mr. Gromyko's visit has displeased the circles which are fighting to get the United States to be itself again. . . . It is clear that the defense secretary, Mr. Weinberger, and the Pentagon have been kept away from the discussions in which they should have taken part. Thus an idea is becoming popular in the political circles of the American capital: that, in matters of foreign policy, Mr. Reagan is following a scenario prearranged by more or less occult advisers, a scenario that would push him to do just the opposite of what he stood for just six months ago. According to these same circles, this tendency goes beyond the framework of the electoral campaign, in which the most optimistic of these circles at first saw the reasons for this surprising shift.

There also can be observed now the recently renewed activities of rundown so-called "liberals," such as Cyrus Vance and Harriman, among others, who are dancing a war dance around the presidential couple. . . . Even the secretary of state, Mr. Shultz, does not remain insensitive to the charm of these sirens. As for the vice-president, Mr. Bush—a true Janus—nobody would dare to claim to know the depth of his thoughts on these fundamental problems. What is becoming clear, anyway, to informed observers, is that if Mr. Reagan does not change his team when he starts his second term, including by putting at the top personalities cast in the same mold as Mrs. Jeane Kirkpatrick, for example, we may end up watching events which are as decisive as they are surprising, and which would call into question the fate (so far perfectly defined) of the United States and its Western allies on the issues of the East-West relations.

## **United States plans a return to the Moon**

by Marsha Freeman

During the last three days of October, a historic conference sponsored by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) convened in Washington, D.C., to plan the return of the United States to the Moon. Conference participants included some of the men who have been to the Moon, the NASA administrator who led the space effort when Apollo 11 landed there, and scientists and engineers who are taking on the job of planning how and when the United States will return.

This time, the people who go to the Moon will not just visit and explore. They will move human civilization off the planet Earth to the heavenly body nearest to our own, with one eye always on Mars. The great task between now and the end of the century will be to prepare the technology and infrastructure for human settlements on the Moon, which will prepare for even more ambitious voyages to Mars and beyond.

For the past three years, small groups of space scientists and engineers at NASA's Johnson Space Center, the Los Alamos National Laboratory, and elsewhere have been studying all aspects of this question. NASA's Washington conference, introduced by NASA administrator Jim Beggs, gave needed legitimacy to the "bootleg" work already under way, and laid the basis for a serious planning effort for extra-terrestrial colonization.

### **Why the Moon?**

Not only is the Moon the nearest heavenly body to the Earth, this airless and desolate world is actually much more like the Earth than any other planet. It is so close, only a quarter-million miles, that we can go and return in a few days. The resources of the Moon, including lunar oxygen and metals, can support a multitude of industries, providing shielding material for spacecraft, construction materials, oxygen for space fuel, and even food from the fertile lunar soil.

The Moon will also be a laboratory for scientific study. Study of the Moon will teach us much about the evolution of the solar system. Radio and other telescopes placed there, perhaps on the "dark" side, will give us a new window on the universe. Whole cities, with new universities for the study of