

The U.S. electoral outcome: Reagan versus Kissinger

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The following article was released on Nov. 5.

This past week's congressional elections in the U.S.A. were, in the words of a popular U.S. idiom, a "Mexican stand-off." The Democrats gained 25 seats in the lower House, a gain of no trend-setting significance, while the Republicans held their majority in the Senate. As a result, the real factional issues in the nation's capital at this moment are not between the two major parties, but across party lines. The major fight at this moment is between backers of a Kissinger-guided State Department and backers of a push for the development of space-based antimissile beam weapons.

Otherwise, the important feature of the elections is a profound discrediting of the right-wing conservative factions of both major parties, and also a significant, if indecisive weakening of the left-wing forces of the Democratic Party. Under the pressure of a new economic depression, increasing portions of the electorate are looking back affectionately to the memory of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and are turning their backs to both right-wing and left-wing varieties of political eccentricities.

Although candidates of the National Democratic Policy Committee (NDPC) were shut out of the Democratic tickets, through a massive effort by Democratic chairman Charles B. Manatt and AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland, the NDPC's demonstrated support among approximately one-third of Democratic voters did have decisive effects in several elections, especially in California and New York.

In California, NDPC efforts during 1982 to date destroyed the political career of Governor Edmund "Jerry" Brown, and nearly sank the "nuclear freeze" referendum in that state. In New York, NDPC efforts sank the political ambitions of Lewis Lehrman, Roy M. Cohn's candidate for governor. This significant "negative" strength of the NDPC is best understood as based on the NDPC's growing image among voters as the Democratic faction leading a return to the standpoint of President Roosevelt's war-time leadership.

The beam-weapon issue

Although the proposal to develop space-based antimissile beam weapons is only one among many major issues dividing forces in Washington, D.C., it is at the present moment the single issue upon which the entirety of near-term U.S. policy directions will turn.

A summary of the history of the beam-weapon policy helps to make the issue and its connections clearer.

The discussions leading to the proposal of beam weapons began during the summer of 1977, through collaborative deliberations between retired Air Force Intelligence chief Major-General George Keegan and Dr. Steven Bardwell of the Fusion Energy Foundation. Putting their heads together, Keegan and Bardwell established beyond doubt that both superpowers had the scientific and technological means to launch crash programs to develop and deploy beam weapons capable of destroying large parts of the nuclear-missile arsenal of the opposing superpower.

Although Keegan broke off direct collaboration during autumn 1977, over the issue of this writer's opposition to the "Camp David" policy, Keegan's and Bardwell's collaborators separately launched public campaigns for beam-weapon development during that autumn period, over hysterical opposition to both from the London International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS).

During early 1982, this writer composed a comprehensive strategic policy-draft, centered around a detailed proposal for a U.S. space-based antimissile beam weapons development. This policy draft was circulated in prepublished form to key military and other circles, and later published with wide circulation as a policy study issued by the NDPC. A concerted effort of support for this policy proposal was launched during April-May 1982. Despite difficulties of collaboration arising as by-product of U.S. support for Britain in the Malvinas war, knowledge of and support for the NDPC proposal spread.

As Dr. Edward Teller reported during an October 26 public address in Washington, D.C., some of his "younger friends" won him over to becoming a spokesman for this policy. Dr. Teller has adopted the full range of proposed features of the policy. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger has publicly supported, at the very least, the military hardware features and implications of the same policy.

Currently, the opposition to the policy comes chiefly by the applied forces of Henry A. Kissinger and AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland, both supported by the "conventional weapons" buildup liberal faction of Governor Averell Harri- man, Senator Edward Kennedy, and Senator Gary Hart.

In layman's terms, the NDPC's beam-weapons policy has the following leading points:

(1) That the only possible means for ending the age of nuclear terror is the development of technologies through which nuclear missiles can be destroyed with more than 99 percent effectiveness in mid-flight. Without beam weapons, under present or foreseeable political conditions, neither superpower would be willing to reduce nuclear capability below its estimate of assured minimal capability for total physical destruction of the home-base of the opposing power.

(2) That the science and technology for such weapons systems deployment exist at the established or early-potential capacity of both superpowers.

(3) That a "crash effort" to develop and deploy such antimissile defenses would incur no net cost to the U.S. economy, since the civilian-technological by-products of the development effort would stimulate a high technology economic boom in the U.S.A.

(4) That the only foreseeable trigger for actual thermonuclear war between the two superpowers now in sight would be a combination of "conventional wars" among regions of the developing sector and a significant weakening of the relative strategic power of one of the two superpowers. A weakened and threatened superpower, either the U.S.A. or

the U.S.S.R., would fall back on the last resort of its thermonuclear arsenal, using thermonuclear blackmail to correct the imbalance. Thus, the savage weakening of the West through the present world economic depression, combined with regional conventional warfare in the developing sector, makes the otherwise unthinkable thermonuclear war increasingly a possibility for the years immediately ahead.

(5) That the agenda of arms negotiations between Washington and Moscow must be scrapped and replaced with a new agenda based on a policy of development of defensive beam weapons to the end of ending the age of thermonuclear terror (mutually assured destruction—MAD).

Although the general U.S. public is only dimly aware of the crucial policy issues up to the present moment, there has been an eruption of rage against the effects of Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker's policies among the population generally. The voters voted less frequently for candidates than against candidates. The voters are not to be blamed for this; with few exceptions, they had no candidate or party policy worth voting for. Now, whether President Reagan capitulates to Kissinger will probably determine the way the United States and the world go.

(6) That this qualitative change in military technology will, by itself, merely postpone the danger of nuclear war. We must include a feature which carries us beyond mere war-postponement into circumstances of durable peace.

(7) The basis for durable peace, as Dr. Teller emphasized in his own choice of terms, is a U.S. commitment to high technology economic development of the developing nations, seeking to win the Soviet Union to cooperating in this effort on behalf of "the common aims of mankind."

The additional special feature of the NDPC policy outline is that it specifies that the research and development for this is civilian-based, rather than locked away in secret military

projects. The NDPC has proposed that the United States launch several civilian-economy crash programs to perfect the technology used in antimissile beam weapons. For example: NASA should be given the assignment for keystone tasks, including the development of manned Earth-orbiting space laboratories, and a manned Mars-landing objective, as well as manned moon stations. Such civilian research will develop all the technology required to be properly repackaged as space-based beam-weapon systems.

An intensive schedule of speaking engagements by Dr. Steven Bardwell substantially weakened the cause of the "nuclear freeze" movement in California during the two weeks immediately preceding the election. That view of Bardwell's influence has been offered by leading spokesmen for the "nuclear freeze" referendum.

Bardwell's speaking tour had two significant kinds of effects. Although Dr. Bardwell was one of the designers of the beam-weapons project, he has done his work outside the bounds of secret research. Therefore, Dr. Bardwell is free to offer the kind of technical-scientific clarifications of beam-weapons principles which Dr. Teller is not presently legally free to reveal publicly. Second, Dr. Bardwell succeeded in winning a significant number of university students and some specialists away from the "nuclear freeze" cause, by convincing them that beam-weapon deployment is the effective approach to ending the age of thermonuclear terror.

The general line-up

At the highest level of U.S. circles, the practical division of forces is between the supporters and adversaries of the "New Yalta" policy of Britain's Lord Carrington. Carrington, a long-standing controller of Henry A. Kissinger, is at the center of an Anglo-Soviet game intended to break Europe away from the U.S.A., and to kick U.S. influence out of the Middle East and other parts of the world.

The principal bastion of pro-Carrington policies in the U.S. government is the State Department. Kissinger allies in the State Department and ultra-liberals in the Democratic Party are the principal backers of Neo-Malthusian policies concerning population reductions, technology, and economic policy. This faction opposes beam-weapons development, and proposes to develop a reduced U.S. conventional military establishment, designed to conduct regional wars against nations in South and Central America and elsewhere in the developing sector.

This division of forces along policy lines overlaps a second division within U.S. leading circles. This second issue centers around the publicized case of alleged Soviet spy, Geoffrey Arthur Prime, alleged to have delivered detailed NATO plans and U.S.-NATO codes to Moscow. British refusal to inform the U.S. government of the massive leak of U.S. secrets by Britain's secret services, and massive other indications of Anglo-Soviet collaboration against the U.S.A., have infuriated large parts of leading military, intelligence, and other circuits in and around Washington, D.C.

Informed sources indicate that the Prime affair is generally viewed as a British smoke-screen, a diversionary operation, covering up a much more serious business. The fingers point in the direction of Lord Carrington's "New Yalta" package, viewed as "treasonous" by some critics, and also repeated charges to the effect that Kissinger was a Soviet-intelligence asset during the period of his postwar service in the Oberammergau center in occupied Germany: the so-called Odra Cell affair.

Although the general U.S. public is only dimly aware of such issues up to the present moment, the lines of cross-parties' divisions in and around Washington, D.C. circles, intersects an eruption of rage against the effects of Federal Reserve chairman Paul Volcker's policies among the population generally.

Vote fraud and vote rigging are significantly influenced by the relatively low participation in elections among U.S. voters, relative to behavior of European voters. In the Federal Republic of Germany, where election participation is approximately twice that of the U.S. electorate, traditional party attachments determine all but a small margin of voter behavior so far. In the United States, party loyalties are much less significant influences on vote totals. This partisan liability of U.S. voters, combined with low-percentage participation makes large-scale vote fraud and vote rigging an easy matter in most parts of the U.S.A., especially in urban centers. One of the favorite methods of vote fraud, especially by trade-union-linked political machines, is to cast votes on behalf of union members who do not appear at the polls. This is done by aid of computer-monitoring and check-offs of names of union members as they enter their local polling-place.

So, as in last Tuesday's U.S. elections, the factor to watch closely is tendencies among voters to resist or overwhelm the substantial margin of voting which is either rigged or fraudulent. This resistance occurs chiefly as sections of the population not normally voting turn out to the polls in relatively increased numbers, or as sections of the public traditionally supporting the machine candidates stay away from the polls.

In last Tuesday's elections, the voters voted less frequently for candidates than against candidates. With relatively few exceptions, voters in last Tuesday's elections voted for candidates not because they liked those candidates, but because they wished to destroy the political career of the opponent. The voters are not to be blamed for this; with few exceptions, they had no candidate or party policy worth voting for.

At the top, and among the electorate, the politics of the U.S.A. are wobbling on a political knife's-edge. Both the government and the electorate could easily fall to one side or the other, to the side of beam-weapons supporters, or to the side of Kissinger's friends. Whether President Reagan capitulates to Kissinger and Kirkland, or, overrides Kissinger's State Department-centered backers, will probably determine the way the United States and the world go during the months immediately ahead.