

Georgetown Dems plan anti-democratic attack on Reagan administration

by Mark Burdman

Barely having begun to lick their wounds after leading the Democratic Party to the worst electoral defeat in its history, the KGB-linked party leadership of banker Charles Manatt and friends chose the site of the Jesuits' Georgetown University on Nov. 8-10 to map out plans for sabotaging President Reagan's mandate to mobilize the American nation behind his strategic defense policies over the period ahead.

Appropriately enough, the Manatt mafia's planning against Reagan and the electorate were worked out in the auditorium of Georgetown's Intercultural Affairs Center, the entrance to which is graced with the late Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's injunction: "The age of nations is past."

The occasion was a conference organized under the auspices of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, based in Santa Barbara, California. On its board of directors sits Manatt, two of Manatt's California law partners, Mickey Kantor and George David Kieffer, and Democratic Party national finance chairman Peter G. Kelly. The conference was entitled "Pacem in Terris V," in memoriam to the 1963 encyclical of that name authored by the late Pope John XXIII, under whose papacy the past two decades' of East-West "ecumenical dialogue" and Western churches' growing subservience to Russian Orthodox Church policy was begun.

Manatt cohort Kelly, a Jesuit-trained trustee of Georgetown, outlined the KGB Democrats' post-election strategy during his Nov. 8 luncheon keynote address: to make national policy behind President Reagan's back via "bipartisan commissions" of the kind recommended by Henry A. Kissinger in the months leading up to the Nov. 6 election.

Kelly cited key issues around which this sneakery would take shape. First, he and Republican Party national chairman Frank Fahrenkopf, who also sits on the CSDI board, would establish a "task force" on "campaign financing." Then, joint efforts would be sought to create a "special envoy" for arms-control negotiations with the Russians, and for foreign-policy flashpoints like Nicaragua, South Africa, and the Philip-

pinas. Special "bipartisan" efforts would be directed to determining the "limit and extent of 'Star Wars,' which has to undergo a far greater scrutiny than it has in the past 30 days or even over the past year, if the very proposal itself is not destabilized."

Kelly insisted that Reagan had to be directed to look at an "expanded and somewhat different base" than that which voted him back into office on Nov. 6, and warned Reagan "not to stretch victory into a blind ideological win."

He raised the spectre of a "forced-march compliance of a mandate to rule invoking memories of Washington"—i.e., that the main danger facing the United States was that Reagan would rise to the occasion and act like a republican leader in the spirit of the American Founding Fathers!

An official of the Center explained privately that Kissinger's "bipartisan" strategy would be carried out through discussions with "members of the White House staff like James Baker and Michael Deaver. . . . We are also thinking about the 'George Bush Republicans.'"

So much for democracy

This hanky-panky is not only extraordinary in light of the fact that the Kissinger policy-orientation represented at the conference was resoundingly defeated by the American electorate on Nov. 6, but especially in light of the cooptation of the words "democracy" and "democratic" by these schemers.

The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions itself was originally created by one of the most evil individuals of the 20th century, Robert M. Hutchins, former president of the University of Chicago and founder of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies. Hutchins, a protégé of Britain's Bertrand Lord Russell, sought to model all these institutions on Oxford and Cambridge Universities. His passion for democracy and freedom were revealed in his opposition to U.S. entry into the Second World War against Adolf Hitler, claiming that the anti-fascist policy of Roosevelt was a "materi-

alistic crusade.” His descendants today use the same arguments to justify U.S. desertion of Europe to the freedom-loving rulers of Moscow.

In recent months, the Center has been trying to shed its past years’ radical-liberal reputation and to become a nationally reputable institution harboring “neo-conservatives” and “moderates” as well. In March 1984, the CSDI was put under the direction of Allen Weinstein, who had until then headed the Washington, D.C.-based National Endowment for Democracy, the congressionally funded and mandated policy arm of the “Project Democracy” program.

Under “Project Democracy,” policies drawn up by the KGB-linked circles of Kissinger and Lane Kirkland’s AFL-CIO have been infiltrated into the Reagan administration, to redirect the President and his advisors away from the national defense mobilization implied in the President’s space-defense program and into foreign-policy disasters in Central America, Eastern Europe, and elsewhere.

The Center, in conjunction with the Democratic Party’s Institute for International Affairs, is planning a major expansion of activities into Asia and Ibero-America over the immediate months ahead.

‘A popular uprising’

If anything, the Manatt mafia’s concept of “democracy” is in policy content more akin to anarchism.

During the first day’s session on “arms control,” the tenor of the event was set by Jeremy Stone, head of the Federation of American Scientists (FAS), a front for “back-channel” U.S.-Soviet discussions of how to destroy the U.S. space-defense program. Jeremy Stone is the son of aged anarchist scribbler I.F. Stone, whose passion over the past years has been to praise the poisoning of Socrates and to attack the republican philosophy of Plato.

Like father, like son. . . .

In his presentation, FAS head Stone repeatedly insisted that a “popular uprising” was the unique means by which “arms-control” treaties would have to be achieved in the months to come. He claimed that it was only “popular uprisings” that caused the past SALT treaties and the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972, which he took personal credit for having brought about.

Apparently on some hallucinogen, Stone claimed that there is a “current uprising in favor of a nuclear freeze. Eighty percent of the population supports the freeze.”

This invocation of Jacobinism bothered some of his fellow “arms-control” exponents on the panel. Carter-Mondale era arms-control insider Leslie Gelb, currently back with the *New York Times*, was asked privately what Stone was talking about in view of the fact that the American population had massively repudiated the freeze on Nov. 6. “I haven’t the slightest idea what he’s talking about,” Gelb muttered.

Equally hallucinogenic was that neither Stone nor Gelb, nor any of the panel advocates of “arms control,” ever re-

ferred to the President’s actual perspective on this issue: attempting to make the era of nuclear weaponry “obsolete” by achieving a joint U.S.-Soviet commitment to the development of space-based anti-ballistic missile systems. Since the President strongly reiterated this policy in his second debate with Walter Mondale on Oct. 21, an observer might well conclude that the participants’ obsession with denying the President the right to exercise power on the basis of his stunning electoral victory could be easily extended to denying that the President himself exists!

Anarchy, empire, and war

The extension of the anarchist world view into the realm of U.S.-Soviet relations was made by a number of speakers on the conference’s second day.

Georgetown University Political Science Professor Robert Lieber attacked Reagan’s strategic-military policies as “nostalgia for a world gone by. . . . In practice, there is little reason to believe either superpower has the ability to gain superiority. This is existential reality, the loser can destroy the winner. . . . We live in an anarchic or semi-anarchic environment. Rivalry is unavoidable.”

Lieber insisted that “Mutually Assured Destruction”—the policy that President Reagan has formally and adamantly repudiated—is the only policy fit for this “anarchic” environment. He warned also of the growing potential of a “nuclear Sarajevo,” triggering a conflagration much worse than that of World War I:

“Given the incredible instability of the Middle East, Eastern Europe, and Central America, the task of arms control is to lessen the dangers rising from regional conflicts. As McGeorge Bundy says, regional conflicts are like streetcars; if you wait long enough, one will come along.”

If other panelists shied away from such explicit formulations, the bias against the idea of a determining scientific morality and truth guiding creation of policy nonetheless ruled. U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Jeanne Kirkpatrick argued that U.S. foreign economic policy toward the developing world would stay away from any kind of grand development design, but would be based on looking at various regional and national circumstances on a case-by-case basis. From this standpoint, she justified the current development-aid levels allotted by the Reagan administration during past years.

The historical standpoint from which the “Project Democracy” advocates are operating was enunciated by one British attendee, who referred to the statement of the cynical [recently deceased] French writer Raymond Aron:

“Empires have coexisted for centuries, like Byzantium and Rome. . . . The limited hazards of an armed peace are preferable to the measureless risks of war.”

It is from that oligarchical-imperial policy standpoint that the organizers of the conference would hope to undermine the republican potentials of the second Reagan administration.