

Elephants and Donkeys by Kathleen Klenetsky

An indefensible defense plank?

The Democratic Party's 1984 platform plank on defense policy is shaping up into a document which will bring hilarity into the dour halls of the Kremlin. Work on the plank began April 9 in Manhattan, where the party's Platform Committee, chaired by the up-and-coming Rep. Geraldine Ferraro of New York, held the first in a series of cross-country hearings which are supposed to produce a final platform before the July nominating convention.

The April 9 hearings, ostensibly devoted to foreign and strategic policy, were a five-ring circus. Dominated by the "peace" wing of the party, the proceedings opened with a series of panels featuring the usual assortment of Democratic "policy experts" and publicity-hungry windbags like Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan.

Star speakers included Ambassador Sol Linowitz; Sidney Drell, the rabid anti-beam weapons spokesman from the Stanford Linear Accelerator; Kenneth Blaylock, vice-president of AFL-CIO; and "nuclear winter" scenarist Carl Sagan—whose teeth are beginning to look as though he brushes them with Glo-Coat. Of course, in the interests of democracy, there were other witnesses, too, like the Bicycle Riders of America. . . .

Some wrangling broke out over Central America policy, nearly every

speaker retailed the official Democratic Party line on defense: "no" to the MX missile, "no" to beam weapons, "no" to virtually every proposal for strengthening the country's ability to defend itself against the growing Soviet threat.

'The party must move on the beam issue'

Then the committee heard from Mel Klenetsky, representing presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, and Paul Gallagher of the LaRouche-founded Fusion Energy Foundation. The two stated bluntly that it's time for the Democratic Party to assume its responsibility for the survival of the U.S. by including a pro-beam weapons plank in the party platform.

"The United States can and must have an operational capability for anti-missile defense based on both conventional and directed-energy technologies within five years," Gallagher stressed. If it doesn't, "the result will be early and complete Soviet military superiority over the United States." It is particularly urgent for the Democratic Party to move on the beam issue now, Gallagher said, because President Reagan has succumbed to pressure from the Kissinger crew and adopted a "go slow" approach.

In his testimony, Klenetsky summarized LaRouche's Jan. 21 nationally televised appeal for a national emergency defense mobilization, as well as the candidate's blueprint for a worldwide economic boom. "LaRouche has presented the only competent proposal for dealing with the ominous international financial situation and the Third World debt crisis," said Klenetsky, warning that unless the LaRouche program is adopted, "the world will face a catastrophic economic collapse."

If the Democrats go with the kind of Neville Chamberlain defense plank that now looks likely, many many moderate and conservative Democrats

will just sit out the November elections. Rep. Charles Stenholm, a conservative Democrat from Texas, told *EIR* April 10, that "if the Platform Committee moves to the left of 1980—this will send a message to the South that they're being written out of the party."

Will the real Ronald Reagan please stand up?

Given Ronald Reagan's current cozy relations with Henry Kissinger and Kissinger's proxies, some people are wondering whether their memories of Reagan as a staunch anti-Kissingerite might be figments of their imaginations.

Yes, Reagan did make ousting Kissinger from high office the principal theme of his 1976 presidential bid. The following account of a Reagan speech during the 1976 Florida primary tells the story. We quote from *Marathon: The Pursuit of the Presidency*, by Jules Witcover.

"According to Reagan, Gerald Ford had shown 'neither the vision nor the leadership necessary to halt and reverse the diplomatic and military decline of the United States.' Ford and Secretary of State Kissinger, Reagan said, 'Ask us to trust their leadership. Well, I find that more and more difficult to do. Henry Kissinger's recent stewardship of U.S. foreign policy has coincided precisely with the loss of U.S. military supremacy. . . . Under Messrs. Kissinger and Ford, this nation has become number two in military power in a world where it is dangerous—if not fatal—to be second best. . . . All I can see is what other nations the world over see: collapse of the American will and the retreat of American power. There is little doubt in my mind that the Soviet Union will not stop taking advantage of détente until it sees that the American people have elected a new President and appointed a new Secretary of State. [emphasis added]'"