

of the most devout believers in gnosticism in the Middle East. Lami reveals that Kamal made frequent trips to India and Nepal to reinforce this kind of training.

The "Rasputin" of the Moukhtara Druze court is one Monsignor Bustari, nominally a Maronite priest. The key spiritual chief ("capo") is Abu Shakra, associated with the order of St. Lazarus, believed to be linked to the order of the same name centered in Venice.

The cult of the moon

It is generally known that the Druzes as a sect came under the official protection of the British Crown down to the most recent times. In the bitter fratricidal wars of Lebanon of the mid-19th century that were a foretaste of recent events, elements of Her Majesty's Secret Service whipped up the Druzes into hysterical attacks against the French-supported Maronites.

The ties that bind British cult-worshippers and the Druzes are described in a fascinating account in the book, *Harem*, written by self-professed witch and member of the lesbian "Muslim Sisterhood," Vittoria Alliata di Montreale, whose father is a powerful scion of one of the most evil families in the Italian "black nobility."

Sra. Alliata di Montreale reports a visit to the Druze haven of Deir el-Qamar, translatable as "convent of the moon." It was founded in the 16th century by the witch-prophetess Siti Nasiba, who trained her son, Druze leader Fakhr el-Din, "in the art of black magic." He built extensive connections to Tuscany and other Italian states and regions. In later years, Deir al-Qamar was frequented by duchesses and ladies from the British aristocracy, interested in studying the moon-worship cults of the convent and what Sra. Alliata di Montreale calls "the old Islamic gnosticism."

She describes the Druze belief in reincarnation and freemasonic-type rituals, but the moon-worship is most interesting. One of the crazes that began to undermine the structure of late-Elizabethan England, as Shakespeare parodies in his comedy *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, was the cultish belief in the power of the moon and the goddess Diana. Fetishism about moon-cults has persisted in the inner circles of British anthropology, freemasonry, and the psychological warfare divisions of British intelligence located at the Tavistock Institute.

The cult-mother of British psychological warfare intelligence in the 20th century, anthropologist Margaret Murray, propounded the idea in several books that witchcraft and moon-worship cults represent the real historical tradition of religious belief. Murray was the founder and mentor of the assassin "Wicca" cult, and inspired Tavistock's William Sargent ("Battle for the Mind") and homosexual poet Robert Graves, who in turn is Britain's most vocal patron for the pseudo-Islamic cults of Sufi Brotherhood leader Idris Shah.

The paths that converge at the Druze sect's sanctuaries, then, are among the most important in the control of irrational cults and terrorism internationally.

Reagan proclaims a good' in U.S.-Japan

by Linda de Hoyos

In his first major foreign policy initiative since the U.S. invasion of Grenada earlier this month, President Reagan reaffirmed in his five-day trip to Asia from Oct. 9 to 14, that, as he stated in Seoul, "The self-doubts in the 1970s are giving way in America to a new era of confidence and sense of purpose." The trip was a demonstration that the demoralization and lack of support for allies that characterized the Carter administration are at an end. The United States, President Reagan told Japan and South Korea, is fully prepared to defend its allies against the Soviet threat, which threat has been made all the more real in the Pacific in the wake of the downing of the KAL-007 airliner Sept. 1, and the terrorist murder of Korea's highest government officials Oct. 9.

By the time the President was preparing to leave for the trip to Asia, the Soviet aggressions in the area had forced the economic policy issues—issues of contention—to take a back seat to the more pressing issues of Pacific security. Yet, the President made clear, this security is necessitated and fostered by the drive for economic growth and technological progress that have marked the economies of Japan and South Korea, and which now the President wants the United States to more forthrightly aid and join. That is the theme that was sounded throughout the trip, and it is a theme that, according to Secretary of State George Shultz and National Security Advisor Robert McFarlane, the President has himself decided upon.

The primary focus of that policy is Japan. In an interview on NHK television Nov. 11, Reagan told the Japanese people: "Our two countries are far from perfect. But in this imperfect and dangerous world, the United States and Japan represent the deepest aspirations of men and women everywhere—to be free, to live in peace, and to create and renew the wealth of abundance and spiritual fulfillment. I have come to Japan because we have an historic opportunity, indeed, an

'partnership for relations

historic responsibility. *We can become a powerful partnership for good, not just in our own countries, not just in the Pacific region, but throughout the world.*" Citing the fact that together Japan and the U.S.A. produce 35 percent of the world's output, Reagan stated that "Japan and America are the nations of the future, the builders of tomorrow . . . and together there is nothing Japan and America cannot do."

This call for a U.S.-Japanese "partnership for good" was an implicit slap in the face to Great Britain, whose Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher has attacked Reagan for precisely the attempt to overthrow the Carter aura of appeasement and defeatism, as signified by the Grenada invasion. It is also a slap in the face to Britain's agents-of-influence in the United States, centered in the administration around the State De-

partment and Henry Kissinger. In fact, on Nov. 9, just as Reagan was on his way to Tokyo, Kissinger let loose a torrent of hostility toward Japan during an address in Australia. "I believe the present alliance structure serves the interests of Pacific peace quite well," Kissinger said. "Rearming Japan . . . cannot be our objective and it should not be encouraged," especially since, he also said, it could lead to a new rise in Japanese nationalism.

It remains to be seen how the concretes of the partnership that Reagan envisages will be worked out. The joint communiqué, entitled "Tokyo Remarks," issued by President Reagan and Premier Yasuhiro Nakasone includes a promise from Japan that it will increase its own defense capability. There is a longstanding demand that Japan take on the task of defending the waters in its 1,000-mile radius, and of the country's leaders, Nakasone has gone farthest in his expressed willingness to build up Japan's defense, in the face of a largely pacifist population, the fears of Japan's Asian neighbors, and loud rumbles from the Soviet Union. While Nakasone did not specify how Japan would take on greater responsibility for Pacific security, the day before Reagan arrived, Pentagon representatives finally reached an agreement with their Japanese counterparts on one issue that has been a source of tension between the two countries: the transfer of military technology from Japan to the United States. A Joint Military Technology Commission has been formed to oversee exchanges in military technology, particularly in the areas of fiber optics, lasers, and robots.

The Military Technology Commission itself, which includes the Japanese Defense Agency, could potentially be the vehicle through which the Japanese contribute to a U.S. program for the development of beam weapon defensive systems. Such systems are ideal for Japan, which is limited by its constitution to measures of self-defense. Although

From President Reagan's Tokyo press conference

President Reagan used the opportunity of his trip to Japan and the Republic of Korea to express a new-found sense of "technological optimism" as exemplified by this excerpt from his remarks at a joint press conference with Japanese Premier Nakasone Nov. 10:

Democratic freedoms, we both know, make a nation not only noble, but dynamic. Individuals in democracies can give full scope to their energies and talents, conducting experiments, exchanging knowledge, and making breakthrough after breakthrough. In just the past few decades, men and women acting in freedom have markedly im-

proved the health and living standards of the whole human race. Innovations in fertilizers, farm machinery, and land use made in democracies have increased agricultural output across the world. Medical advances made in democracies, from the discovery of penicillin to the identification of vitamins, means that people everywhere on earth live longer than before. And electronics breakthroughs made in democracies have produced a telecommunications network that links nations around the globe. . . .

Today it's the democracies—especially Japan and America—that are leading the high-tech revolution that promises to change life on earth even more profoundly than did the industrial revolution of a century ago. This revolution ranges from electron microscopes that can inspect molecules to satellites that are probing the dark infinities of space.

Reagan did not publicly mention beam weapons during the trip, he reaffirmed in his television interview his opposition to the Kissinger doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction, which the development of beam weapons would bring to an end. In a reference to the doctrine of nuclear deterrence, Reagan noted that President Dwight Eisenhower had written "that we had to face the fact that weapons were being developed in which we could no longer see a war that would end in victory or defeat as we had always known it. But the weapons were such that it would end in the destruction of human kind. And, as he said, when we reached that moment, then let us have the intelligence to sit down at a table and negotiate our problems before we destroy the world."

"I see it also in another way that he didn't mention. Once upon a time, we had rules of warfare . . . by which we made sure that soldiers fought soldiers, but they did not victimize civilians. That was civilized. Today, we've lost something of civilization in that the very weapons we're talking about are designed to destroy civilians by the millions. And let us, at least, get back to where we once were. That if we talk war, at all, we talk it in a way in which there could be victory or defeat, and in which civilians have some measure of protection."

On the economic front, Treasury Secretary Donald Regan and his counterpart Noburu Takeshita emerged to announce that the two countries had agreed *in principle* that Japan would take measures to close the gap between the yen and the dollar, thereby moving toward decreasing the Japanese trade surplus. Japan has taken certain steps in this direction and the finance ministry also agreed that it would take steps to open up its markets to foreign investment. But the thorny issue of U.S. beef and citrus exports to Japan was left unsettled.

Despite the major implications of Reagan's announced partnership with Japan and his turn toward the Pacific, the U.S. Eastern Establishment media gave only limited coverage to the trip, charging that it was "all pomp and no circumstance." In the case of Reagan's trip to South Korea, however, the liberal media, led by *The New York Times*, began to reveal their policy objections:

President Reagan's visit to Seoul and to the Demilitarized Zone to see the Second Infantry Division of the U.S. Army stationed there was designed to be a demonstration both to Moscow and American allies in Asia that the Reagan administration will back them against Soviet and North Korean aggression. This has by no means been assumed, given the secret contacts with North Korea's madman-president Kim Il-Song initiated by the Carter administration, and the cut-back of U.S. troops in the Korean peninsula in 1979.

In the joint communiqué published by Reagan and President Chun Doo Hwan, Reagan also specifically endorsed the diplomacy the Korean president has been carrying out. The Rangoon bombing Oct. 9 had cut short a Chun itinerary that was to take him to Australia and India to begin the process of organizing a Pacific Rim community that would cooperate

for security and economic growth. Eighteen months earlier, Chun had toured the ASEAN countries of Southeast Asia in an attempt to end South Korea's isolation from the region. Chun had also conveyed the offer that Seoul was willing to share its middle-level technologies with Southeast Asia, circumventing Japanese unwillingness to transfer its high technologies to the area.

It is widely suspected that Chun had discussed this plan with Reagan when the two met in Washington in January 1981. The communiqué from this meeting removes any doubt: "President Reagan expressed his admiration and support for the expanding and increasingly active internationalism of the Republic of Korea, and took note of the determination of the Republic of Korea to pursue an open door policy of dialogue with all nations. . . . Recognizing the growing importance of the Asia-Pacific region and also the growing sense of community among the Pacific rim countries, the two Presidents agreed that frequent exchanges at all levels among the nations of the Pacific are necessary to enhance regional cohesion. They also agreed that multilateral relations among the countries in the region should be further strengthened in the fields of trade, finance, science, technology, and tourism."

A reading of the North Korean press shows that the Rangoon bombing had been perpetrated, with Soviet explicit backing after the fact, in order to bring Chun's "open door diplomacy" to a deadly halt. But *The New York Times* also printed a near-apologia for the North Koreans in an article attacking Presidents Chun and Reagan Nov. 15: "North Korea has been blamed for the incident [Rangoon bombing], but some South Koreans suspect that their own foreign policy style may have been a factor. In particular, the Seoul government in recent years has successfully courted third world countries—an activity that the North Koreans apparently felt was intruding on their territory. They may be driven 'simply wild,' one European said, by a string of South Korean diplomatic successes. Some government officials have already been talking about the possible need for a more 'prudent' approach to avoid isolating North Korea further."

The *Times* exemplifies the kind of equivocation that Reagan successfully overturned in his trip to Tokyo and Seoul. Speaking from Alaska Nov. 8, the President said: "My visit to Japan and Korea will, I hope, underline the significance that we place on our ties with Northeast Asia and the countries of the Pacific. In the 21st century, we can foresee vastly expanding economic, political, and cultural bonds with these countries. I believe we will witness a wave of production and creative endeavors improving the quality of life on both sides of the Pacific. The peoples of the Pacific understand hard work. They are not afraid of technology and innovation. We are in the midst of restoring that spirit."

In this way Reagan has stated the "new aim and purpose" he wants to impart. The battles in Washington on the concrete issues of economic and defense policy will determine whether that aim is realized.