

Kissinger policy takeover: a strategic disaster

by Richard Cohen in Washington, D.C.

The United States of America is heading toward strategic disaster and assured Soviet world domination, if not world war. The reason is that the President of the United States of America, Ronald Reagan, has capitulated on all important policy questions to a Soviet agent of influence, Henry Kissinger.

“Defense Secretary Weinberger’s trip to Pakistan was a strategic failure. The handling of the situation in the Philippines is a strategic disaster. The U.S. position in the Middle East is a strategic disaster. The U.S. position in Central America is a strategic disaster. The U.S. position on Latin American indebtedness is a strategic disaster,” said *EIR* founder Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. on Oct. 6.

“Henry Kissinger is running U.S. Central American policy. Henry Kissinger is running U.S. Latin American policy. Henry Kissinger is to accompany Ronald Reagan on his China trip and is running U.S. Asian policy. Henry Kissinger, through special envoy Robert McFarlane et al., is running U.S. Middle East policy. By spring, Henry Kissinger will be running U.S.-European relations. And Henry Kissinger is running U.S. arms control policy.”

Kissinger and the ‘build-down’

The latest evidence that Henry Kissinger is a Soviet agent of influence can be found in the missile and warhead figures associated with President Reagan’s “build-down” proposal in arms negotiations with the Soviet Union. Were the Soviets to accept that proposal, which was first outlined by Henry Kissinger in a March 21 *Time* magazine article, the strategic

forces of the United States of America will be destroyed—and if the Soviet Union does not accept that proposal, the strategic forces of the United States of America will be destroyed: Kissinger demanded in *Time* that the United States carry out this proposal unilaterally!

Washington think tankers and presidential campaign advisors have begun to spin scenarios for a 1984 Soviet Politburo surprise aimed at tilting the outcome of the 1984 presidential election. What none of them has recognized is that, through Kissinger and the AFL-CIO’s Lane Kirkland, Yuri Andropov has already successfully intervened into both the White House and the Democratic Party.

Sources privy to the thinking of the Politburo said this summer that Moscow’s greatest fear is the influence that *EIR* founder Lyndon H. LaRouche might have in helping convince the President to press ahead with his March 23 defensive weapons doctrine, and scrap both Kissinger-promoted arms control concessions and any lip-service to the farcical “High Frontier” conventional-technologies anti-missile proposal of Daniel Graham. It is no accident that Henry Kissinger, Daniel Graham, and the Bundy-Harriman Democrats have launched a crusade against LaRouche’s candidacy and organizations.

On Oct. 4, the President announced a revised position for the START talks, a position bitterly opposed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the National Security Council: acceptance of the “build-down” concept first proposed by Senator Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) and Sen. William Cohen (R-Me.), whereby both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. would dismantle two of their

land-based ICBMs for every new one installed. As I predicted (see *EIR*, Oct. 11), the proposal was brokered by Kissinger surrogate Brent Scowcroft, who used congressional blackmail in league with Sens. Charles Percy, Sam Nunn, William Cohen and Reps. Albert Gore, Les Aspin, and Norman Dicks, who threatened to torpedo the MX missile funding bill if the White House refused to officially incorporate "build-down" into its START offer.

State Department sources say that support for the proposal within the administration came most emphatically from Jonathan Howe, the Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs (a key position in the arms-control structure), who is a longtime associate of Henry Kissinger.

Senior NATO military and political officials meeting at the Atlantic Assembly in Brussels Oct. 6 have meanwhile passed a resolution calling for unilateral cuts in the alliance's arsenal of short-range nuclear weapons. The resolution will be discussed by NATO defense ministers when they meet for the Nuclear Planning Group in Ottawa on Oct. 22. Unofficial estimates set the size of the cutback at 1,500-2,000 nuclear warheads, including artillery rounds and bombs, atomic demolition mines and nuclear anti-aircraft shells.

All this at a time when the Soviets are moving into a first-strike mode, the U.S. land-based deterrent is totally inadequate, and the submarine-based deterrent could be completely overwhelmed by Soviet SS-20s. The American public is not aware of the strategic situation; Mr. Reagan is not telling them about it; and since the KAL 7 attack on Sept. 1, the "bluebloods" of the Harriman-Bundy ilk, who control the news media as well as the Kissingers and Manatts, have maintained a barrage of propaganda portraying the Soviets as, at worst, "paranoid" victims of error or U.S. subterfuge.

Assistant Secretary Howe joined a host of Kissingerites, including Eagleburger, Burt, Secretary of State George Shultz and Soviet specialist William Hyland on Sept. 24 to review U.S.-Soviet relations. The results were evident in Kissinger's statements before a Sept. 30 press conference at the State Department and in an interview in the West German magazine *Der Spiegel* (see Kissinger Watch, page 59).

Kissinger and his crowd moved to cover themselves with Reagan, saying that a "major negotiation" with the U.S.S.R. in the post-KAL environment is hardly possible and went so far as to suggest that the Soviet leadership under Andropov may be shifting to a "Bonapartist" military police-state structure. After rendering their feeble excuses, the Kissingerites joined their partners in the Harriman-Bundy camp. Howe, Scowcroft and others would promote the START concessions. Burt, Eagleburger, and others would push the INF concessions.

On Oct. 2, Trilateral Commission executive board member Joseph Kraft used his syndicated column to warn that negotiations with the People's Republic of China should be tempered so as not to antagonize Moscow further. Premier

Zhao Ziyang will visit the United States in January and Reagan's visit to Peking is scheduled for April. Kissinger had originally intended these events as a "balance of power" wedge preceding the hoped-for U.S.-U.S.S.R. summit. On Oct. 3, Kissingerite Alexis Johnson, promoting yet another Kissingerian bipartisan commission (this time on China policy), said its aim should be to deemphasize potential U.S.-China strategic military relations and emphasize economic ones.

Reagan on the defensive

Throughout September, elements of the New Right and conservative Republicans blasted the President for what they termed his inadequate response to the KAL shutdown. The pressure intensified as the White House, while sending out promises of a autumn fight to expose Soviet violations of SALT, announced its series of arms control initiatives. Then on Sept. 27, the President declared in a speech before the annual International Monetary Fund meeting in Washington that failure to pass the \$8.4 billion IMF quota increase would bring sure financial catastrophe. Republican conservatives in the House of Representatives were the clear target of his remarks; they had united behind the Gramm Amendment, which stipulates that no IMF funds can go to "communist" countries, and torpedoed the quota increase bill. Liberal House Democrats want the President to publicly attack the Gramm Amendment before they yield the necessary number of votes to pass the bill.

Thus Reagan has placed himself on a tightrope that must delight Andropov. The President is supposed to make policy concessions to his left and to the New Right.

During the week of Sept. 26, Richard Wirthlin, the administration's senior political pollster, met with the President and reportedly told him that deep suspicions have been building in what is considered the bedrock of the President's constituency. Wirthlin said that if the President accepted the advice and pressure of Kissinger Republicans to fire Interior Secretary James Watt, hero of the New Right, he would walk into the 1984 elections with a standing among conservatives much as Carter entered the 1980 elections vis-à-vis liberals—with their votes, but without their activist enthusiasm.

On Oct. 3, Reagan spoke at the 10th anniversary of the Meese-endorsed New Right Heritage Foundation in what promises to be a continuous effort to keep the New Right in tow. Indeed, sources involved in promulgating the President's March 23 defensive weapons doctrine say that while New Right hero General Danny Graham's "High Frontier" program has nothing to do with their policy, electoral necessities force them not to offend him.

The Kissinger policies have been emphatically promoted by White House Chief of Staff James Baker III and Deputy White House Chief of Staff and Reagan family intimate Michael Deaver, who now dominate Reagan re-election policy.

Arguing that Reagan's re-election requires an effort to remove the President's alleged "warmonger" image and win large numbers of liberal Republican and women's votes, Baker and Deaver, coached by Kissinger's friends, have crafted a re-election strategy that will minimize independent presidential action on the strategic danger and the economic crisis. Concessions to Kissinger's circle on arms control and economic policy, in addition to a laundry list of other complaints, have sent Reagan's political base into near rebellion.

Kirkland and the 'freeze' bishops

Walter Mondale is merely one-seventh of a seven-pack of Moscow-preferred candidates. Officially backing Mondale is Soviet agent of influence Lane Kirkland, who on Oct. 6 endorsed the Soviet-sponsored nuclear freeze. American labor leaders are now in outright support of Yuri Andropov.

On the heels of the National Education Association's Sept. 30 endorsement of Mondale, the AFL-CIO executive board's Oct. 1 endorsement, and Mondale's Oct. 2 Maine Democratic straw poll victory, came his Oct. 5 endorsement by the delegated membership of the AFL-CIO.

The emergence of Jimmy Carter's Vice-President as the confirmed frontrunner was months in the planning. In September, the final decision to push Mondale was made by Kennedy family, former Kennedy and Johnson National Security Adviser McGeorge Bundy, former Kennedy and Johnson Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, Averell Harriman, AFL-CIO president Lane Kirkland and frontman National Democratic Committee chairman Charles Manatt. These strategists intend to shape the entirety of the Democratic Party presidential debate around defense cuts, the nuclear freeze, and unilateral disarmament.

Large sections of the Kennedy machine had already been turned over to Mondale. Well before New York Gov. Mario Cuomo, a Kennedy associate, began hinting his preference, former Wisconsin governor Patrick Lucy joined the Mondale effort, following a decision by the pro-nuclear-freeze U.S. Catholic bishops, led by Joseph Cardinal Bernardin of Chicago, to support Mondale. Sources report that the bishops' effort is supervised by Boston-based Father Hare, author of the nuclear freeze letter and a longtime intimate of the Kennedys.

Then in mid-September, National Democratic Committee Chairman Charles Manatt, speaking alongside Harriman at Georgetown University in Washington, issued the Democratic response to Andropov's first move. He proclaimed that all candidates support the nuclear freeze. Manatt was speaking on the 20th anniversary of the first success of Bertrand Russell's Pugwash Conferences: the Harriman-negotiated Limited Test Ban Treaty. On Sept. 14, McNamara went further, emphasizing that U.S. policy should repeal massive retaliation—exactly the opposite of the required policy of "launch on warning"—should the Soviets launch a nuclear

attack, in order to open a window for negotiations.

During the final two weeks of September, the West German terrorist-connected peace movement leader Petra Kelly was shuttled to the United States by McGeorge Bundy and the Kennedys for a fundraising and speaking tour which included the National War College and the New York Council on Foreign Relations. On Oct. 5, following Mondale's triumphs, Bundy brought together the arms-control community to hail Harriman on the 20th anniversary of the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty negotiated by Harriman.

Documentation

Manatt says freeze is now Democrats' policy

Democratic National Chairman Charles T. Manatt delivered a speech at Georgetown University on Sept. 20 entitled, "Reflections on the Bishops' Letter: The Democratic View of the Challenge of Ending the Arms Race and Insuring National Security." Manatt declared the freeze on nuclear weapons and non-proliferation of peaceful nuclear technologies to be "the consensus" of the Democratic Party during a question-and-answer period after the address. On the podium were also Georgetown's Father Timothy Healy and Averell Harriman, the investment banker and former New York governor who for decades has promoted eugenics against what he considers "lesser races," environmentalism at the expense of nuclear energy, and arms-control agreements at the expense of the United States. Excerpts follow:

. . . Let me begin by acknowledging with gratitude Governor Harriman's contributions to the nation—and to the world: the depth and breadth of his experience, the scope of his accomplishments—and above all—his unlimited willingness to be of service.

His personal history is an inspiration to generations of Americans in public life. In his presence, the torch of freedom burns brightly—and because of his work, it will be handed down to generations yet to come.

Father Healy, we admire your leadership in the fields of religion, of scholarship, and in the Church's role in the debate on nuclear arms control. . . . As the Bishops' letter [supporting the nuclear freeze] set a standard for national debate, so you have set an example for the role of the university in national life. . . .

Some day the young people in this room will tell their children and their grandchildren that they heard Averell Harriman speak of the first nuclear test ban treaty. . . .

As the harsh rhetoric and threats erupted out of Moscow and Washington following the downing of Flight 007, I could not help but think of the 1962 crisis. I could not help but think of the repeated near-confrontations between Soviet and American ships and planes. I could not help but remember that, even in the hostile, nearly apocalyptic climate of 20 years ago, an American President and American statesmen such as Averell Harriman, exerted true leadership and pursued a nuclear test ban treaty to a stunning success. . . .

Twenty years later. . . I believe that the American people would respond with one voice to say, arms control is not a gift to Moscow—it is the imperative goal of America.

The American people are united on this issue, as on few others. Every public opinion poll reflects this concern over the danger of unlimited competition in nuclear weaponry. . . . And even after the Soviets' barbarous destruction of the Korean airliner this month, the determination of ordinary Americans to pursue arms control has held firm.

The evidence is not confined to the decision, by a margin of 238 to 9, of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops to press for a "curb" on the race toward Armageddon. . . .

For all of us, a simple truth has crystallized. It is not with our friends that we must bargain to limit the threat of annihilation, but with our foes.

Precisely because the Soviet regime is repugnant, because it is rigid, militaristic, paranoid and hostile to our most sacred values—because it menaces peace and freedom—we must exert every effort to restrain its capacity and our own to commit mutual, global suicide. . . .

It is because of such [Soviet] conduct, not just in spite of it, that we have sought, seek and must continue indefinitely to strive for reliable, binding agreements that limit and cut back the arsenals of holocaust.

The fact is that the Soviet Union is a formidable adversary. . . . But it is also a fact that, unlike America's strength in international affairs, the Soviet Union's power is almost exclusively military. It is a deformed giant—crippled by a stagnant economy, a restive set of captive allies, and an ideology that inspires less and less support at home and abroad.

Our greatest error, in facing such a competitor, would be to play only to its military strength when our own strength is so much more diverse. . . .

Our strength in arms makes our pursuit of arms control our imperative. . . . [N]o outlay for defense can give us greater security than an agreement of equal benefit to Americans and Soviets on how much defense is enough.

Even in 1963, when Averell Harriman, whom we honor today. . . was negotiating with Nikita Khrushchev, Americans disagreed strongly about the wisdom of halting nuclear tests. Before those Moscow talks, the Joint Chiefs of Staff

opposed efforts to obtain a comprehensive test ban because they feared the Russians would cheat. After the Treaty had been signed, Edward Teller, an important figure in the development of the American hydrogen bomb, testified in the Senate: "If you ratify this Treaty. . . you will have given away the future safety of this country [ellipsis in Manatt's text]"

Because of such fears and opposition, the treaty was a *limited* one. . . .

We have not moved as fast as we must. . . . And this effort must continue despite provocation from the Soviets. . . .

Since that beginning in 1963, we have retained the goal of a *comprehensive* test ban treaty. . . . The Reagan administration, however, halted those negotiations and repudiated the objective itself. That action is a grave mistake. It is long past time to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. . . .

I said at the beginning of this talk that I am here as a spokesman for my party. Let me conclude by saying that the position I have tried to voice and the prescriptions I have tried to offer are those of the Democratic Party, united in a common effort to make arms control an American priority and a global reality.

The seven distinguished candidates seeking our party's presidential nomination understand something which the present occupant of the White House does not—that arms control is vital to the security of this nation and to the survival of humanity. . . .

. . . Contrary to the Reagan Republican Party's continued opposition to halting the arms race now, the Democratic Party calls for a mutual and verifiable freeze on the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear warheads, missiles, and other delivery systems [ellipsis in original];

. . . Contrary to the Republican administration's continued foot-dragging and delay, the Democratic Party calls for progress now on major, mutual, balanced and verifiable reductions of nuclear forces to lower equivalent levels, with special attention to *destabilizing weapons that are vulnerable to or capable of preemptive attack* [ellipsis in original, emphasis added].

. . . While the administration of Ronald Reagan has actually relaxed efforts to halt nuclear proliferation, the Democratic Party, unlike its Republican counterpart, calls now for a systematic and vigorous effort to restrain the reckless commerce in sensitive nuclear materials and technology. [first ellipsis in original]. . .

President Reagan views the Russians' murderous destruction of the Korean airliner as supportive of his position on increasing America's procurement of nuclear weaponry. But let us recall that, in the aftermath of the Cuban Missile Crisis, when the world had peered over the brink of the nuclear chasm, President John F. Kennedy did not use those tensions to urge acceleration of the arms race. . . .