A presidency left without any clothes?

by Richard Cohen, Washington Bureau Chief

Direct discussions with sources close to the President have supplied convincing evidence that neither Mr. Reagan nor his most loyal advisers are yet fully aware of the shocks delivered to the world strategic situation during the President's carefully orchestrated tour of Europe which concluded June 11.

Washington intelligence and diplomatic sources are increasingly horrified by the administration's conduct. The U.S. is ceasing to function as a superpower capable of asserting its own national interest, and is instead letting minor powers like Britain and Israel lead it around by the nose. President Reagan, despite the theatrics of the European trip and its "presidential power projection," is rightly seen as impotent on the world scene. One analyst likened the President to the unclothed emperor in the fairy tale, existing in a fantasy world created by treacherous advisers.

Why the crises emerged

The British deliberately triggered the crisis over the Malvinas Islands. They then demanded that the United States back its colonial expedition to butcher the Argentines, despite the obvious damage to U.S. hemispheric relations. A superpower would have told the British to take their fleet and stay out of the hemisphere, invoking the principles of the Monroe Doctrine.

Instead, on his European tour, the President reaffirmed his backing for the British. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, in an interview with the West German daily *Die Welt* June 4, made the bald admission that the Malvinas War was a test case for NATO out-of-area deployments—the British-sponsored plan to extend NATO southward as a colonial army to police wars of depopulation in the developing sector.

"The Falklands situation is just such an occurrence outside the NATO area—thousands of miles away—which concerns NATO and should therefore belong to advance NATO planning," said Weinberger. "There have been other instances in the past in which military forces were temporarily diverted and that is just what happened here."

"Many countries would rather not think about what goes on outside the NATO area," Weinberger continued. "Great Britain is an exception to that. . . ."

Weinberger's statements confirm the charges made by *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche,
were orchestrating the Malvinas war from the outset to implement their genocidal conventional-war doctrine.

As Weinberger spoke, Israeli troops were already preparing to launch their final solution against the Palestinian population of Lebanon. Sources close to the Joint Chiefs of Staff report that the Israelis threatened the United States that unless they were allowed to go ahead with their invasion, they would be forced to use their nuclear weapons. The United States refused to call the Israelis bluff. Instead, once the invasion was launched, Secretary Haig on June 7 referred to Israeli military losses as "ours."

This ongoing strategic humiliation has already created a perception of President Reagan in world capitals

Weinberger inspecting M-1 tanks: he admits the Malvinas crisis was launched as a test run for NATO expansion.

as a "weak leader," unprepared to secure U.S. national interests. And this perception has itself become a crucial piece in the strategic puzzle. This, my sources emphasize, could well be decisive in encouraging an Israeli decision to go well beyond conventionally accepted threshholds in their current invasion of Lebanon, a move that the Soviet leadership on June 10 warned President Reagan they will not tolerate.

The particular vulnerability of the President and his allies, operating under the consistent intimidation of Haig and the Baker-Deaver White House group, crystallized for me in recent discussions with individuals known to reflect the President's own thinking. I learned that there is an unpublicized but entrenched consensus at the White House that Britain's war in the South Atlantic will not only be a "long drawn-out affair," but will with each passing day increase the deadly consequences for U.S. relationships with Latin America.

However, during his European trip, the President, operating more and more under the influence of Haig, meekly accepted a blunt rejection by British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, when, on June 4, in a private meeting he pleaded for British sensitivity to U.S.-Latin American ties. Then, on June 8, speaking before the British Parliament, the President turned around and made his strongest emotional statement supporting the "full" British cause in the South Atlantic.

Similarly, my discussions revealed intense White House suspicion as to possible Israeli complicity in setting up their own Ambassador to London in order to secure a pretext for invasion of Lebanon. However, within 24 hours of the invasion, Haig had not only subdued voices within the administration demanding an immediate condemnation of the invasion, but had persuaded the President and his most trusted people to issue statements justifying Israel's incredible Lebanon objectives, short of direct confrontation with Syria.

My sources report that both the British and Israelis are privately seeking the introduction of U.S. military forces into the front lines of their military adventures. Reportedly, the British are seeking a Malvinas solution that would establish a joint Anglo-American military presence on the islands following an Argentine withdrawal. In addition, the Israelis are said to be circulating a "postwar" Lebanese plan that would place U.S. forces in southern Lebanon, making them a prop for the planned "final solution" to the Palestinian problem.

There is a sickening feeling among many Washington diplomatic veterans that they are living through the extension of the nightmare known as the Carter administration. What passes for the Reagan foreign-policy establishment resembles in all its ineptitude the Vance-Brzezinski mess, with the traitorous Haig playing the key role.

Reliable sources are reporting that Haig is in fact taking some of his orders from Cyrus Vance, Jimmy Carter's discredited Secretary of State. In particular, Vance and Haig are cooking up schemes to further compromise U.S. sovereignty—and further emphasize the U.S. as a castrated superpower—to the United Nations. The plans center around having the United Nations function as the key crisis management institution to deal with "regional conflicts" such as Lebanon, enhancing its peace-keeping powers. Vance has also reportedly instructed Haig to "get U.N. Ambassador Jeanne Kirkpatrick out of the way," sources report.

Will the White House wake up?

President Reagan certainly has the capability and instincts necessary to assert U.S. interests as a superpower, provided he can see the world as it is and not through the deliberate distortions of advisers like Haig. There is also the question of whether well meaning advisers are willing to tell him how bad things really are.

There are signs that his exchanges with Soviet President Brezhnev on the Mideast crisis may have sobered the President up a little. He seems to be relying more on trusted advisers like Meese and he has kept Haig from flying off on a disastrous shuttle mission. But this is a long way from acting as the leader of one of the world's only two superpowers. As long as the United States continues to refuse to accept that role, the world remains on a path toward nuclear annihilation.