

## President Reagan's victory at Reykjavik

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The *Washington Post's* Lou Cannon described the aftermath of the Iceland "pre-summit" in the following terms, in the lead page 1 story of the Oct. 15 edition:

Reagan sought to depict the Iceland summit, which Secretary of State George P. Shultz two days ago called a "disappointment," as "a major advance" in the U.S.-Soviet relationship.

Cannon apparently refuses to grasp the crucial fact, that the President and his secretary of state have divergent views on U.S. strategy in general, and the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) most emphatically.

Shultz, White House Chief of Staff Donald Regan, Henry A. Kissinger, and "Iceland-summit architect" Zbigniew Brzezinski each oppose the deployment of an SDI "population defense," and insist that the only value of the SDI is as a "bargaining chip" in arms-control negotiations with Moscow. President Reagan views SDI as the last chance for defending the West against Soviet imperialistic expansion.

This difference in views within the administration was underlined the morning of Oct. 14, when Donald Regan, speaking on ABC-TV's "Good Morning America," insisted that SDI is "a bargaining chip." Later in the day, at a White House press conference, President Reagan's spokesman, Larry Speakes, flatly contradicted Donald Regan's remarks. Speakes stated flatly, that the SDI is not "a bargaining chip." In what the White House press corps saw as a related statement, Speakes announced, that, hereafter, no administration officials would be allowed to speak to the press anonymously, "on background."

In other words, in the final outcome at Reykjavik, Pres-

ident Reagan won, while those sharing the contrary views of Secretary Shultz lost. According to eyewitnesses at Reykjavik, Shultz's characterization of the outcome as a "disappointment" was a masterpiece of understatement. As Shultz came out to announce the breakdown of the negotiations on Sunday, reporters saw a secretary profoundly shaken, ashen-faced, and apparently at the verge of tears. Eyewitnesses contrasted Shultz's depressed mood, with the tough, confident mood of the President's impromptu address to U.S. military personnel, shortly after the Shultz press conference.

### The Soviets' personal threat to Reagan

Several senior observers emphasize, that the key to understanding the Soviets' tactics at Reykjavik, is the implied threat to President Reagan's life issued by the Soviet government immediately after the close of the "pre-summit." The Soviets compared President Reagan symbolically to the late President John F. Kennedy, whom they classify as the last U.S. President to pursue a policy of maintaining U.S. military superiority, a peace-through-strength doctrine. A comparison of the two Presidents' dealing with Moscow is key to understanding Soviet policy in the aftermath of the Reykjavik meeting.

At their first, Vienna meeting, Soviet dictator Nikita S. Khrushchov, briefly alone with the young President, assaulted the President physically, an action which analysts read as the Soviet tyrant's attempt to test the President's personal character. Based on the personal weakness which Khrushchov saw in the President, Khrushchov later ordered East Germany's Walter Ulbricht to construct the Berlin wall, predicting, accurately, that the President would "chicken."

However, later, President Kennedy toughened up. It is

generally believed among senior observers, that the connections of the President's father to military circles around Gen. Douglas MacArthur, may have been a factor. When Khrushchov pressed Kennedy to the wall again, in the Cuba Missile Crisis, the Soviets met a Kennedy significantly tougher than the President had been during the Berlin Wall Crisis of 1961. After the Cuba Missile Crisis, the President showed signs of growing toughness, right up to the "peace through strength" address which McGeorge Bundy recently stated Kennedy was to have delivered in Dallas on the day he was assassinated.

No investigator believes that Lee Harvey Oswald, a controlled asset, jointly, of the Office of Naval Intelligence and FBI's Division Five, was involved in killing President Kennedy. Suspicion naturally points to those who orchestrated the cover-up of the assassination: National Security Adviser McGeorge Bundy, and circles around Establishment leader John J. McCloy of the extended "Teddy" Roosevelt family's private intelligence arm, sometimes called "the bankers' CIA." This "bankers' CIA," an outgrowth of the old 1920s Soviet "Trust" organization at 120 Broadway, New York City, is the principal Soviet back-channel connection into the U.S.A.'s policy-shaping and intelligence community. In any high-level political assassination, professional investigators regard the agencies which orchestrate the cover-up as the prime suspects for authorship of the assassination itself.

Khrushchov's motives in ordering the assassination of President Kennedy were very, very clear ones. Through back channels such as Bertrand Russell and the Pugwash Conference, Khrushchov had reached agreements on "mutual deterrence" and "global society" arrangements, with high levels of the U.S. Eastern Liberal Establishment. Kennedy's opposition to a U.S. protracted land war in Southeast Asia, and Kennedy's 1963 doctrine of peace through strength, was directly bucking the Establishment, and a profound threat to the "nuclear deterrence" agreements which Khrushchov had negotiated with leaders of that Establishment.

The prospect of Kennedy's being re-elected, and then, probably succeeded by his brother, Bobby, signaled the possibility of 13 more years of a "Kennedy dynasty" committed to peace-through-strength policies. After the assassination of Kennedy, and the follow-up assassination of his vengeful brother, Bobby, no U.S. President, until Ronald Reagan, has threatened to upset the not-so-secret "global society" agreements between Moscow and McGeorge Bundy's Eastern Establishment. Johnson submitted without question; so did Nixon. Ford was Ford, a nice guy without much understanding of the deeper issues. Carter was a Yerkes laboratory creation by the Teddy Roosevelt clan's Georgia, Bulloch-Root "mafia."

Not only have the Soviets threatened President Reagan with the "Kennedy treatment." The Iceland "pre-summit" was a set-up from the beginning, organized by the Soviets in collaboration with the U.S. Eastern Establishment. Moscow had counted upon its admirers in the Congress, plus Estab-

lishment figures such as Shultz, Regan, and Haig-allied Brzezinski, to set the President up at the "pre-summit." The Soviet master-plan for Reykjavik diplomacy, was to assign Raisa Gorbachova's husband, Premier Mikhail, to break the Ronald Reagan's will, pressing the President to give up the only U.S. policy Moscow fears, the SDI.

The Soviets' Reykjavik tactic was to attempt to lull the President into an amiable, concession-strewn state of mind over the initial sessions, and then to hit the President with brutal force on the issue of SDI. Although there is no indication that Gorbachov attempted to assault the President physically, as Khrushchov had done with Kennedy, the sight of fist-wielding Gorbachov, right after the summit, gave a clear indication of the side of Gorbachov's personality which the President had seen in the final session, Sunday.

Moscow miscalculated badly. Try those tricks on Ronald Reagan, and you "get his dander up." He is a deeply religious, old (if spry) man, whose self-interest lies in the kind of United States he bequeaths to those who come after him. In such a situation, what passes through the President's mind runs something like this: "You Russian idiots! Do you imagine that I, a devout Christian, 75 years of age, a man who has reaped every honor his nation could bestow upon him, can be manipulated into betraying my entire life's work for sake of a few personal threats from men I regard as the emissaries of Satan?"

In the Soviet mind, Gorbachov's failure to match the President's will-power at Reykjavik, is a humiliating political defeat. To the Russian Raskolnik mind, political will is almost everything. They pitted Gorbachov's will-power against President Reagan's, and lost the battle. Worse, by going to the brink in this test of will-power, they exposed their hand. They showed the President that the only thing which stands between Western civilization and Soviet world-domination, is the SDI. If the President every had lingering doubts about pushing the SDI full-steam ahead, Gorbachov removed those doubts. Moscow is humiliated and enraged.

The post-summit personal threat against the President, is to be taken very seriously.

### **The 'LaRouche factor'**

Many of the leading journalists gathered in Reykjavik ended their visit expressing astonishment at the accuracy of *EIR* White House correspondent Nick Benton's insight into the summit from the beginning. At the outset, most journalists were convinced that the intermediate-range European missiles was the leading issue of the "summit." Beginning with the exchange between Benton and Soviet laser-specialist Velikhov, *EIR* had shown that it knew that the SDI, not the INF, was the key issue.

A half-hour before the collapse of the talks was announced, journalists gathered in press rooms were watching the Cable News Network (CNN) on the television screens. To their astonishment, a clip of National Democratic Policy Committee chairman Warren Hamerman appeared on the

screen, stating that SDI "intellectual author" LaRouche had been targeted for a police-state-style raid on his friends just days before the summit, as part of the effort to crush SDI at the meeting. Gasps of astonishment erupted from among senior correspondents. A few minutes later, they learned that the SDI was the make-or-break issue of the Reagan-Gorbachov meeting.

How did *EIR* know that the only real issue of the Reykjavik meeting was the SDI, when most of the governments and editors around the world had assumed that agreements

---

---

*If the President every had lingering doubts about pushing the SDI full-steam ahead, Gorbachov removed those doubts. Moscow is humiliated and enraged. The post-summit personal threat against the President, is to be taken very seriously.*

---

---

on INF reductions were the central theme? *EIR*'s knowledge was certainly not based on high-level background leaks; nearly all *EIR*'s usual "on background" sources in the U.S.A. and Europe, had insisted that the INF was the key issue. State Department channels throughout Western Europe had repeatedly insisted that major U.S. concessions on the INF were the only important feature of the meeting.

Simply, *EIR* was the only press service which had a correct reading on the reasons for the illegal, police-state-style raid on Leesburg. *EIR* reasoned, that if Moscow had ordered the raid over the issue of the SDI, just before the "summit," then the SDI was the only issue with which Moscow was concerned at the meeting.

Concerned figures at very high levels in several European nations, had recognized that the Leesburg raid had been carried out on Moscow's orders. However, most U.S. and European news services, avowed LaRouche-haters, had dismissed the charges of a Soviet hand behind U.S. Attorney Weld's raid, as "not credible." These news services had also dismissed as either "not credible," or "highly exaggerated," *EIR*'s document showing Weld to be part of a Soviet intelligence network inside the U.S. government. Therefore, those news services came to the wrong estimation of the Reykjavik agenda.

Although Weld himself hates me because of my part in exposing Weld's one-count cover-up for drug-money laundering in the Bank of Boston case, and although White House Chief of Staff Donald Regan hates me for this same reason,

the decision to unleash "loose cannon" Weld against Leesburg was made by those acting under Soviet pressures for exactly such a KGB-style political action.

*EIR* knew that the SDI was the only issue in the Soviets' mind at Reykjavik. *EIR* knew this not only because of the fact that Weld's Leesburg raid had been conducted under Soviet pressure. *EIR* had done a major counterintelligence job, in investigating those Soviet channels which had placed this pressure on Eastern Establishment and State Department channels.

The orders for Weld's operation against LaRouche came directly from Mikhail Gorbachov's wife, Raisa. She is, in fact, of much higher rank in the Soviet dictatorship than her husband. She is the daughter of the oldest surviving personal collaborator of V. I. Lenin, 92-year-old Maxim Titorenko. Titorenko was a leading architect of the Soviet "New Economic Policy," and is the oldest surviving Bolshevik member of the 1920s Soviet foreign-intelligence partnership with 120 Broadway's Soviet partners, the "Trust." Gorbachov rose to power largely by marrying into it.

Raisa's personal power-base in the Soviet command, is a 40-person committee heading up the Soviet Cultural Commission. A key figure of this Commission is long-time "LaRouche watcher" Julian Semyonov. Directly under Raisa's Commission is the hand-picked successor to the late Mikhail Suslov, Yegor Ligachov. Ligachov heads the Soviet Central Committee's committee on culture and ideology, a key oversight committee over both the Soviet KGB and Soviet military intelligence (GRU). It is this channel of Raisa Gorbachov's control over IMEMO, the KGB, and the GRU, which applied the pressure on both the U.S. State Department and U.S.-Soviet "back-channels," to eliminate me prior to the Reykjavik meeting.

The way in which Ligachov organized his part of the operation against me, revealed many of the details of the operation, showing *EIR* exactly what the probable outcome of the "summit" would be, and how the "summit" was being conducted, both from the Soviet side, and by the circles of Henry A. Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski from inside the United States.

There are three key figures directly under Ligachov, all three involved in a major way in bringing pressure on the U.S. to eliminate me prior to the Reykjavik meeting.

The first, in charge of the political-diplomatic operations, is former Soviet ambassador to Washington, Anatolii Dobrynin, a crony of Henry A. Kissinger.

The second is 63-year old Alexander Nikolaevich Yakovlev, chief of propaganda for the Soviet Central Committee. Yakovlev was the Soviet official directly responsible for the wave of Soviet press attacks on me during August, September, and October, and key to Secretary Gorbachov's public attack on me in an address three days prior to Weld's Leesburg raid.

The third figure, is Yuri Voronov, chief of the culture department for the Soviet Central Committee.

Directly under Yakovlev, is Albert Andreyevich Belayev, the editor of *Sovetskaya Kultura*, a publication controlled by Raisa Gorbachova.

Both Dobrynin and Yakovlev are personal cronies of both Henry A. Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski. According to an interview which Yakovlev gave to the Italian daily *La Repubblica*, on May 21, 1985, he has had a close and continuing personal relationship to Kissinger and Brzezinski dating from the time Yakovlev was studying at New York's Columbia University, in 1958. In the 1970s, he was Soviet Ambassador to Canada, where he functioned as the overseer of the connections of LaRouche-haters Henry A. Kissinger, Albert G. Besser, William Weld, Jerome Cohen, Benjamin Schwartz, William Hinton, and others, to Beijing. He organized Gorbachov's May 1983 visit to Canada, after which he was appointed by Soviet President Yuri Andropov to head the Soviet foreign-intelligence agency IMEMO, becoming the boss of David Rockefeller's crony, Georgii Arbatov.

Characterized as "an anti-American extremist," Yakovlev's current role is typified by his travels to London with Gorbachov in 1984, the year Yakovlev was elected to the Supreme Soviet. Prior to the Reykjavik meeting, Yakovlev accompanied Gorbachov to Geneva in 1985, and was part of the team directing Gorbachov's tactics against President Reagan at the Reykjavik meeting.

Yakovlev was behind the publication of the five-page attack on me in the Sept. 15 issue of the largest-circulation Soviet publication, *New Times (Novoe Vremya)*, as well as the Aug. 7 and Sept. 30 editions of *Sovetskaya Kultura*. Significantly, U.S. drug-lobbyist and Anti-Defamation League (ADL) asset Dennis King, was adopted openly by *New Times's* Sept. 15 attack on LaRouche.

When Gorbachov's top Reykjavik "summit" advisor, Yakovlev, caused Gorbachov to make the themes of the Sept. 15 *New Times* item the central feature of his Moscow "Thaelmann memorial" address, three days prior to Weld's Leesburg raid, this constituted conclusive proof that the thoughts Gorbachov had in mind for his Reykjavik meeting, were efforts to browbeat President Reagan into scuttling the SDI.

The conclusive proof came in the form of an intelligence specialist's reading of the warrants which Weld used for the Leesburg raid. Not only had the warrants been issued on Sunday, a day before the raid, but internal features of the affidavits showed that the paper-work had been pulled together over the weekend, following Gorbachov's delivery of his Moscow "Thaelmann memorial," pre-summit address. The operation was a last-minute rush, as directly ordered by Yakovlev's planted piece in the Sept. 30 issue of Raisa Gorbachova's *Sovetskaya Kultura*.

### **The danger to the President's life**

The use of the John F. Kennedy references in the personal threat which Moscow published against President Reagan, immediately after the Reykjavik events, must be read as a clear signal of an threat to the President's life. This coincides

with a hastily assembled, fresh effort to arrange my own assassination over the coming days, this attack organized by way of Canada-based circuits linked to William Weld and the mob-linked First Fidelity attorney, Al Besser. Moscow and its high-level Western hemisphere assets are in a mood to kill.

The President has one important advantage which John F. Kennedy did not have. There is advance warning of who would be complicit in any effort to assassinate him; the same apparatus tied to Weld in the Soviet-inspired operations against me.

Only very credulous people believe that major figures are killed by "lone assassins." To attempt to kill a highly protected major public figure, and to fail in an open attempt, is the most dangerous enterprise any group of assassins could undertake. Any powerful figure, especially a head of state, who survives an attempted assassination, has the means to lash back in fury against those responsible. President Charles de Gaulle demonstrated that point. It must be a "sure kill." One person or a team of persons may actually do the killing, but the assassins can not be assured of success unless there is a very elaborate and very high-level complicity, to bring the assassins to the right place at the right time, and to leave no living backtrail to the authorship of the assassination.

No public figure has absolute protection against assassination, if a major power's government, or an agency as powerful as the "bankers' CIA" is determined to kill him, although physical security of endangered public figures is an indispensable part of the effort to preserve their lives. What physical security does, is to keep out the "trash," to force the enemy to resort either to well-organized plots of covert assassinations, or to throw aside all cover, and resort to all-out brute force. Since any conspiracy has the potential of generating leaks of one kind or another, the combination of good physical security and far-reaching intelligence screening, makes political assassinations very difficult, and very risky politically.

If the intended victim knows from what quarter the threat is coming, intelligence-style precautions can be deployed, putting every aspect of that capability under the closest scrutiny. Unless the Soviets intend to kill the President by brute force methods, there is one channel of cooperation inside the United States on which they would have to depend for a covertly run assassination: the same circles represented by William Weld, and the forces behind him. Weld's backers have telegraphed their punch. Let the President's security either act accordingly, or be held guilty of reckless omission should any untoward thing happen to our President.

Finally, should any new untoward developments occur around me, after my statements beginning Oct. 6, and the issuance of this article today, then such a development signals that the threat to the President's life is a more or less immediate one.

October 15, 1985  
Leesburg, Virginia