

fornia on December 23, it featured on the front page an article entitled, "Stop the Pay Hike." The piece pointed out the congressional liberals—Teddy Kennedy, Howard Metzenbaum, etc.—who'd get hefty pay increases under the commission's plan. And it took on the issue of judges. "Though the commission points with alarm to the resignations of 57 judges since 1974, that's fewer than four per year out of more than 1,000 on the federal bench—an annual attrition rate of less than half a percent." Reagan was taken aback, and he showed the article to aides.

Duberstein, who supported the pay increase but didn't lobby Reagan for it, assigned his assistant John Tuck to analyze the article. Tuck responded with a briefing paper for Reagan to read on Air Force One en route to California. The paper said most of those who'd get raises are in the administration, not Congress. It declared that judges are quitting as never before, and added that while Reagan had appointed half the federal judiciary, President Bush has a chance to pick another quarter. Tuck encapsulated the argument this way: "The thing we'd worked so hard for—getting our judges on the bench—would be very, very difficult to sustain" without the full pay raise. Reagan was a believer again. When he returned to the White House on January 6, he ordered the 51 percent increase. What's more, he harped on the matter in his next-to-last Saturday radio chat. "Federal judges are leaving the bench in record numbers, partly because they're paid less than junior members of some law firms," he said.

BY THE TIME Bush was inaugurated, the pay raise was extraordinarily unpopular. Public opinion was running 9-to-1 against it. This presented the Bush White House with an interesting political opportunity. Though as vice president he'd said he supported Reagan's view, Bush could jump to the populist position and attack the pay raise. He'd surely be able to defeat the hike, but there would be a downside. He'd sour his relations with Congress. Bush never seriously considered the populist option. His budget director, Richard Darman, was for the full increase. His legal counsel, Boyden Gray, was too. His treasury secretary and pal, Nicholas Brady, not only was for it, but in his farewell address in the Senate in 1982, had appealed for higher pay for officialdom. The only skeptical voice was Chief of Staff John Sununu's.

Sununu was worried about where the money for higher White House salaries would come from. Cutler had consulted the budget office months earlier and found that large agencies could offset the pay hike by cutting elsewhere. But the White House was a small operation with a \$9 million budget. Already it had been forced to come up with \$1 million for unused leave accumulated by Reagan aides. Then it had to pay a four percent cost-of-living hike to most personnel. And the White House had lost all its detailees from other agencies, thanks to the efforts of Democratic Representative Pat Schroeder of Colorado. Sununu feared that Bush would be criticized for sending up a supplemental budget request to pay higher staff salaries. And without a supplement, clerical workers would have to

be laid off to accommodate the higher wages of senior officials. But Sununu was assured by congressional leaders that a special appropriation would sail through, so Bush strongly endorsed a full raise as "overdue" at his January 27 press conference.

Assurances from Capitol Hill turned out to be worthless. For example, Wright had assured everyone that he'd hold off a vote in the House and let the raise go into effect automatically. He buckled, and the raise was voted down overwhelmingly February 7. Wright took a lot of heat for this, but he had been put in an untenable position by the White House. True, he could have told Reagan to send up a smaller pay increase or asked Bush to pare the hike Reagan had urged. He didn't do either. But the White House could have shown a little political foresight by doing that on its own. It didn't. Duberstein and Tuck felt there'd be the same public reaction regardless of the size of the proposed hike. Cutler thought the same. The Bush crowd didn't give it much thought.

The 1987 experience should have taught them all a lesson. Back then, Donald Regan, the White House chief of staff, got the final word with Reagan on the pay raise in a one-on-one session. This was important because on non-ideological issues Reagan ordinarily sided with the last person he spoke to. Regan told him the Meese idea was fine, but a big pay hike just wouldn't fly politically. So instead of boosting congressional salaries 50 percent, Reagan sent up a 10 percent hike. It cleared Congress. What would have happened in 1987 if Regan hadn't horned in and Reagan had gone with Meese's advice? Now we know.

FRED BARNES

It just won't be the same.

LIFE WITHOUT LAROUCHE

ON JANUARY 28 political extremist Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr. was sentenced to 15 years in prison for mail fraud and tax evasion. Since 1983, LaRouche's group had solicited millions in loans from private individuals (many of them the "elderly female retirees" of bilking lore) whom, it was shown in U.S. District Court in Alexandria, Va., LaRouche never intended to repay. LaRouche had not filed a tax return since the early '70s, claiming he owed no taxes because he received no salary, only "expenses." These were paid by companies LaRouche owned. Along with all of life's necessities, they included extras such as a 200-acre Leesburg, Va., estate and (to those of us who pay \$15 a pop, this one really rankles) LaRouche's nifty, salon-style haircut.

It's clear what all this means for LaRouche, who is now in Alexandria City Jail awaiting transfer to a federal prison. Bowl trims. And for a while at least, no more presidential

bids. But the question of note to all U.S. airport patrons is: Will those bug-eyed LaRouche people still be around, explaining how Kissinger, the Pope, the Queen of England, and the International Swiss Drug Cartel are using “attack mosquitos” to spread the AIDS epidemic worldwide? Probably. LaRouchians are a resilient bunch who thrive on societal disfavor. As John Mintz put it in a 1987 *Washington Post* article, “LaRouche’s followers denounce every critic—prosecutors, politicians, people at the airport who disagree with them—as cretins, communists, traitors or homosexuals. . . . They think LaRouche is the planet’s only chance for survival—and people must be crazed not to accept him.” At the Alexandria trial, former LaRouchian Charles Tate described how LaRouche’s fund-raising chief, William Wertz, would psyche up telephone solicitors with zesty readings of poems by Gen. George Patton.

IN SHORT, LaRouchians aren’t the kind of people to throw up their hands and say, “Fair enough, feds. You win.” On sentencing day in Alexandria, a lively support crew was on hand with signs explaining that LaRouche is being set up for assassination by the Justice Department. There was also a makeshift cappella choir singing 19th-century Germanic songs, battle hymns and civil-rights anthems. When I called LaRouche spokeswoman Dana Scanlon, she promised a worldwide outburst of such protests. “It’s already started! I just got off the phone with someone in Germany. A man in Bonn has chained himself to the gates of the Münsterplatz. His name is *Andreas . . . Ranke . . . Heinemann*. He’s the grandson of. . .” This went on for a minute. Trying to bait her, I asked if the group expects lean fund-raising times now that its führer is a jailbird and the government is suing for some of the cash he stole from little old ladies.

With a sort of why-dwell-on-downers sigh, she said, “Hey, if I sat around worrying about things like that, I just wouldn’t get a whole lot done.”

Fine, LaRouchians. I have just one request. As long as you’re not going away yet, please husband your resources carefully. If the pinch *is* felt, cut back on your publications (there are many overlapping LaRouche newspapers and magazines), and don’t underfund one of Washington’s great institutions: The LaRouchian “Human Rights Violations” press conferences. These, always conducted by LaRouche subalterns, usually deal (better make that *dealt*—chillingly, there hasn’t been one since LaRouche’s December 17 conviction) with the government’s “Human Rights Violations” of you-know-who. Scanlon says no such meetings are “scheduled at this time.” That’s too bad, because if these disappear it means the loss of one of journalism’s most savory experiences: a press conference, with all the trimmings, at which one is almost certain to be the only reporter present. Luckily, before it was too late, I attended the group’s December 14 event at the National Press Building.

It’s cheap to dwell on the contrast between LaRouchians as billed (in his autobiography, LaRouche describes them as “golden souls” destined to save the world for us “poor sheep”) and LaRouchians up close and personal. But they

force my hand. As I waited for an elevator in the NPB lobby, that morning’s honchos marched glumly in, displaying all the unmistakable style clues: the fish-belly skin tone, the dark eye circles, and the sports jackets that hang as gently as formica sandwich boards. That I expected. What I didn’t expect was that two of the golden souls (tall, burly guys) would gang up on the third golden soul (a little, skinny guy) in a way usually seen only in junior high gym class.

You know the dynamic. The skinny guy was last to get on the elevator, so Hefty Guy 1 pushed the CLOSE DOOR button just in time to give him a “torso compacter,” then said, “Oh! *Sorry*.” As the elevator lurched into motion, Skinny regained his composure, hitched his pants, sniffed à la Barney Fife, and stepped over to a posting of upcoming National Press Club lunch speakers. “Wellllll,” he exhaled, “let’s see if they have anybody . . . of *interest*.” The other two rolled their eyes. “Nnn-nope.” The elevator stopped on floor 12. We were heading for 13, but Skinny erred and strode out resolutely. The Hefties (charitably, I must admit) called him back, but he waved them off, pretending to have “business” on the floor. The Hefties grinned steadily until we got out on 13, and the three of us walked in silence (in keeping with my sheep status, I was not acknowledged) to the designated conference room.

I TOOK ONE of many, many available seats. (For a while I was the entire audience, but a LaRouche photographer and another observer later showed up.) For the next five minutes the two now-all-business Hefties worried over water jugs and papers. Skinny returned from his hike and got a prompt knuckle rap. “Has this man signed the sign-up sheet? NO? Well get it!” He did, I signed in, Skinny took his seat and announced, “So! Without further ado I guess we should. . .” But the Hefties gunned him down (“We’ll *wait* for late arrivals”) and five agonizing minutes of silence oozed by. Then the Hefties, addressing spaces over my head all the while, served the meat of the press conference: A Chicago convention of Food for Peace (this is a LaRouche farmer-recruitment organization that operates mainly in the Midwest) had issued a resolution the previous weekend to stop the KGB-Justice Department frame-up of LaRouche, “the third Socrates.” After this there was a discussion of Food for Peace’s policy, which sounded like a standard call for increased global food production until Hefty 1 summed up: “Once again, our position is this: There *has* to be a rapid increase in worldwide food production—and anybody who tells you otherwise is a liar and a murderer.”

After that I tuned out until the big moment at press conference’s end, when Hefty 1 cleared his throat, surveyed the room and said, “We are now prepared to take your questions.” I sportingly asked, “What documentation do you have to prove the KGB-slash-DOJ murder plot?” The convincing answer: “Ohhh, ho ho! We’re sure all right.”

On my way out I discovered that a fourth LaRouchian had arrived and set up a long table that was groaning under a load of LaRouche books and publications. Pointing at a

magazine I asked, "Can I have one of these?" He gave me a long look. Then he narrowed his eyes, nodded knowingly and said, "Sure."

ALEX HEARD

Alex Heard is a free-lance writer in Washington.

Among the anti-Semites in Japan.

DAVID AND GODZILLA

"THE JEWS own all the 'seven sisters.' They control agriculture in America and the international precious metals market. Both George Bush and Michael Dukakis are related to Jews."

Those words were spoken last September by Masaaki Nakayama, then Japan's Posts and Telecommunications minister and still, believe it or not, the best Japanese friend that Israel and the Jews have. Nakayama, one of the country's most powerful political players, serves as secretary-general of the Japan-Israel Parliamentary Friendship Association. He explains: "I am trying to educate my fellow Japanese that even though there is only one Israel against 22 Arab nations, if you bash Israel, you are actually bashing 14.5 million Jews all over the world."

Most Japanese have never met a Jew (there are only 150 Jewish families in Japan), they don't know what one is, and for the most part, they don't care. But in recent Japanese books, many of them best sellers, Jews have been held responsible for the rising value of the yen, trade disputes, Japan-bashing, the Chernobyl nuclear disaster, even AIDS. Fundamentally, today's Jewish-book boom has less to do with profound anti-Semitism than with a deep-seated Japanese xenophobia and Japan's current financial ills. But it coincides with continuing support by most of Japanese officialdom for the Arab economic boycott of Israel and with continuing avoidance of even the most cursory political connections to Israel. Most major Japanese companies still refuse outright to do business with Israel, a result of a perceived dependency on Arab oil and of threats from Arab nations that any company trading with Israel cannot also deal in the Arab market. Now that Jews in America and elsewhere have put two and two together, Japanese officials are doing what they always do when facing a crisis: staging an elaborate public relations program designed to tell their critics whatever they want to hear.

A look at the cyclical history of anti-Semitism in Japan attests to its weak hold on the national character. During the 1930s, amid a militaristic backlash against all things Western, a particularly vicious cycle of anti-Semitism saw the Jews blamed for diluting Japan's spiritual ideals. But although one of the wartime Axis powers, Japan did not subscribe to Hitler's anti-Jewish doctrines. In the summer

of 1940, Senpo Sugihara, the Japanese consul in Kovno, Lithuania, issued at great personal risk more than 5,000 transit visas to Jews fleeing oncoming Nazi troops. Less altruistically, the Japanese also initiated a pre-war project called the Fugu plan to develop a Jewish community in Japanese-controlled Manchuria as a buffer against the Soviet Union. Although the plan fell through, 20,000 to 30,000 European Jews did manage to find safe haven in Japan and 99 percent of them survived the war.

The latest anti-Semitic wave to hit Japan broke in early 1986, when the Japanese economy was just beginning to reel under the impact of an appreciating yen. An obscure Japanese author and self-proclaimed Christian minister, Masami Uno, released the first of three best-selling books claiming that an international Jewish conspiracy was secretly plotting the destruction of the Japanese economy en route to the Jews' stated goal of world domination. (These books—all ghostwritten for Uno by an equally obscure Tokyo editor, Teruo Takahashi—together have sold more than 1.5 million copies.) At the center of the conspiracy, Uno explained, were four great "Jewish" families—the Mellons, Rockefellers, Du Ponts and Morgans. He also blames other famous Jews, like former Saudi Arabian Oil Minister Sheikh Ahmed Zaki Yamani. Uno says he realizes that the Mellons, Rockefellers and the sheikh are not Jewish, but feels such misinformation is essential to convey a higher truth—the imminent danger facing his country. Lacking much first-hand information, the Japanese have read his books and believed them. Other writers have jumped on the bandwagon.

Cheaply bound and inexpensive by Japanese standards, more than 80 books about Jews are now available in Tokyo bookstores. Not all the books, of course, deal with Jewish conspiracy theories. But those that do typically characterize the Jews as being organized, shrewd, powerful, and able to manipulate international political and economic forces for their own gain. In effect, the Japanese have accused the Jews of beating them at their own game. For that reason, the Japanese do not see the books as inherently anti-Semitic, and among their most eager buyers have been middle- and high-ranking company employees. Den Fujita, the dynamic president of the McDonald's hamburger chain in Japan, proudly calls himself the "Jew of Ginza." In his book, *Jewish Business Methods: Controlling the Economy of the World*, Fujita explains how Japan "is being ravaged by a pack of Jews" and then concludes that his fellow Japanese should emulate Jewish business practices.

IN PART because of the influence of former Minister Nakayama and others of his ilk, and in part because of a series of visits by concerned Jewish leaders and politicians, Japan launched a public relations campaign about two years ago to curry goodwill with the American Jewish community. Japanese officials are worried that American Jewry will join hands with Capitol Hill's Japan-bashers or, even worse, stop buying Japanese goods. A legion of Japanese diplomats, sporting Brooks Brothers suits and Ivy League degrees, has set out to convince American Jews that