

Treason in Washington on the Malvinas question

by Richard Cohen, Washington Bureau Chief

At no time in the post-World War II history of the United States has the nation's capital witnessed the kind of shocking display of treachery on the part of leading government officials as in the days since the early April recapture of the Malvinas Islands by Argentina. For three and a half weeks, Washington has been increasingly transformed into a city operating on a wartime footing. Shocked White House sources observe that the obeisance offered to the British Crown during this period has outranked anything the formidable "Zionist Lobby" has received from official Washington.

That is the meaning of the Senate's April 29 vote by 79 to 1 to abjectly support Great Britain in the Malvinas conflict, and of Secretary of State Haig's April 30 announcement of U.S. sanctions against Argentina combined with "matériel support for British forces." Reliable sources report that Navy Secretary John Lehman (a former Cambridge University student) has given two nuclear-powered U.S. submarines in the South Atlantic sealed orders to enter the fighting on the side of the British if need be. In complete violation of the NATO charter, a NATO South Atlantic monitoring unit has been set up to track the military operations around the Malvinas; the treaty organization is defined as a defense alliance restricted to a specific treaty area. Sen. John Tower (R-Tex.), reported to be among those Americans responsible, is also said to be seeking an official Senate repudiation of the Monroe Doctrine.

Pro-British pressures both inside and outside the

White House have forced President Reagan to abandon a centerpiece of his original foreign policy approach and act against both his own better judgment and commitments to legally binding guidelines of American foreign policy, the Monroe Doctrine and the Rio Treaty, by condoning the treasonous renunciation of the Treaty by Secretary of State Alexander Haig at the April 26 session of the Organization of American States (OAS). In fact, Washington-based think tanks with ties to the intelligence community have recently been spreading scenarios on the imminent collapse of Reagan's already tattered commitment to a policy of pre-eminence for hemispheric security and the spread of anti-Americanism throughout Latin America due to administration actions in the crisis.

Aside from Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. and his National Democratic Policy Committee (NDPC), only one voice in Washington has been raised to defend the Monroe Doctrine and hemispheric security during the course of the crisis. And, following Sen. Jesse Helms's (R-N.C.) initial assertion of the applicability of the Monroe Doctrine in the Malvinas case, "he was cut off from the White House," according to sources close to the Senator. These sources now say that Helms will be the target of an AFL-CIO-sponsored nationwide effort led by Victor Camber to oust him from office.

The crushing of Presidential commitments and the silencing of virtually all opposition to British designs have been carried out with an obedience from high-ranking U.S. officials unmatched in the postwar period.



The U.S. State Department on C Street in Washington. Outside the Union Jack-bedecked window is a monument to General Bernardo Gálvez, the Spanish Governor of Louisiana who in 1776 joined the Americans in fighting the British.

Active in blackmail, lies and deceit on the Crown's behalf have been Secretary of State Haig, Secretary of Defense Weinberger, the majority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, senior White House staff closely associated with Vice-President George Bush and White House Chief of Staff James Baker III, decisive elements of the U.S. intelligence community, and important Senators and Congressmen. Through use of wartime censorship and psychological warfare techniques, they have maneuvered the President into capitulation, silenced opposition, and integrated Washington into the overall British effort against Argentina. Now, as these efforts have apparently failed to secure an Argentine capitulation, these forces are moving with speed, almost unopposed, to bring the United States into a bloody war against the Argentines.

On the evening of April 28, Haig met in closed-door session with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. According to Capitol Hill sources, Haig told the Committee that negotiations on the Malvinas had reached a dead end and that the United States would now have to deliver an ultimatum to the Argentines. If the Argentines still refuse to leave the Islands, Haig continued, then Washington would have no choice but to launch an economic embargo against Argentina as well as abide by as yet undefined deeper commitments to the British war effort. Even before Haig's appearance on the Hill, National Security Council staffer Dr. Norman Bailey was directed to tell a Washington press breakfast that "when the shooting starts, we will of course back the British

short of direct military action."

Senator Joseph Biden (D-Del.) had moved on April 28 to introduce S.R.378, which the Administration has not objected to. It calls for open U.S. support of the British position and open-ended U.S. assistance for the British in the event of fighting. The resolution, according to Capitol Hill sources, will pass easily even if some Senators heed the warnings of Ted Stevens (R-Ala.) and Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.) that the resolution amounts to another Gulf of Tonkin. A similar resolution passed the House International Relations Committee on April 29, sponsored by Stephen Solarz (D-N.Y.).

Now everything has been set up for the President to jump even deeper—a trap which can only lead to irrevocable U.S. humiliation.

The President's early desire to avoid asserting a Monroe Doctrine policy based on U.S. national interest, and instead to fall into the role of "honest broker," opened the door for that calamity. Haig was swiftly integrated into the British game of deceit. He has functioned as an open British agent through the course of the crisis. Haig, for instance, was reportedly guaranteeing that the British would not invade South Georgia Island until after the April 27 OAS meeting, while at the same time urging the British to speed up their plans for invasion in order to give Haig an additional "stick" in talks with the Argentines.

The latter have not been the only victims of organized "wartime" deceit, however. On April 26, the White House Press Office under the direction of Bush-Baker asset David Gergen reportedly had only logged 12 telegrams and telephone calls to the White House on the Malvinas crisis. Sources close to the White House have told me that the suppression of this evidence—a widely used measure of public attitudes—was part of a broader campaign directed by James Baker to shape a perception for the President of pro-British popular sentiment. In fact, sources extremely close to Bush in the White House were blunt in conversation with me about their emotional pro-British approach only three days into the crisis.

Private briefings from the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) claimed that Argentina would get no military help from any other Latin American country, two days before Peru and Brazil offered Argentina military aircraft. This pattern of misinformation from the intelligence community has not been restricted to the Pentagon.

Washington-based think tanks, reflecting the outlook of the majority of the intelligence community, have been gushing from the onset of the crisis with pure British-scripted psychological warfare. Think tanks usually representing "liberal" policies, such as the Carnegie Endowment for Peace, agree with "conservative" American Enterprise Institute that the Galtieri government miscalculated diplomatically, politically, and militarily.