

## Special Report:

# USLP, Kissinger Critics Testify in Senate Hearings on the Sinai Pact

Oct. 8 (IPS) — Strong opposition to U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's brand of secret diplomacy and policy by executive agreement emerged this week at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings into the Egyptian-Israeli disengagement accord. In testimony before the Committee, whose hearings were ostensibly confined to the question of whether to station 200 American CIA-trained "technicians" in Sinai, leading Kissinger critics George Ball, Paul Warnke, and Charles Yost, all former government officials, and Sen. James Abourezk voiced broad attacks on every aspect of the Kissinger policy. The opposition at the Senate hearings represented the crystallization of direct factional resistance to the Rockefeller-Kissinger goals of Cold War-style containment and economic brinksmanship, against both the Soviet bloc and the Third World.

Despite the hearings and overwhelming public opposition to the dangerous Sinai pact — Senator Mike Mansfield reported his mail as being "98 per cent against" the accord — the Senate and the House are both expected to approve the agreement by large margins later this week. Yesterday, the Foreign Relations Committee voted 10-2 in favor of the accord, sending the measure to the Senate floor.

The Committee also heard testimony on Monday from U.S. Labor Party spokesman Bob Dreyfuss that Kissinger had secretly agreed with Syria, Israel and Egypt to fan the flames of civil war in Lebanon in order to destroy the Lebanese left and the Palestinian movement and thus pave the way for an extension of Kissinger's diplomacy to the northern front. Iraq, Algeria, and East Germany have all charged that the Lebanon civil war is a consequence of the Sinai pact. Dreyfuss testified that acceptance of the accord by Congress would lead to renewed explosions in Lebanon and a likely

nuclear confrontation between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Although one Senator privately told the Labor Party that he agreed that the U.S. "and Israel, too" were actively provoking the civil strife in Lebanon and that Kissinger was directly responsible, neither the Committee nor the other witnesses mentioned the Lebanese situation in their remarks. Overcome with parliamentary politeness, the bourgeois opponents of the accord confined their criticism to veiled references to the dangers of secret diplomacy.

"I believe the days should be over when the Secretary of State and the President can be allowed to shoot dice under a blanket," said Sen. Abourezk in his testimony, "where they are the only ones allowed to see the dice."

Tottering old skeptic George Ball, former Undersecretary of State, was the clear leader of the hounds of dissent against Kissinger's provocative agreement. Ball correctly identified the futility of the Kissinger approach and added that provisions of the Sinai accord "can lead to a highly dangerous explosion in the next two or three years."

Ball, whose consistent opposition to step-by-step diplomacy since late 1974 has earned him a wide reputation as a Kissinger critic, was explicitly recognized as the leader of Kissinger and Rockefeller's factional opposition by Sen. Charles Percy. Percy noted that his mail from constituents contained innumerable references to Ball's writings and that Ball had "catalyzed" latent opposition to the agreement.

Visibly upset by Percy's acknowledgement of Ball's role were the two leading pro-Rockefeller agents on the Committee, Senators Jacob Javits and Clifford Case, the "Senators from Mobil (Standard Oil of New York) and Exxon (Standard Oil of New Jersey)," respectively. Throughout the hearings,

Javits and Case unashamedly defended the Kissinger policy, claiming repeatedly that Congressional approval of stationing 200 American "technicians" in Sinai did not signify acceptance of the numerous secret provisions and assurances contained in the accord. Ball, Warnke and several Senators disagreed, and urged that Congress vote an amendment that would disassociate Congress from any other aspects of the agreement.

Javits' strongly disagreed with such efforts, including a proposed amendment by Sen. Dick Clark.

Slick counterinsurgent Sen. Frank Church also slyly tried to imply that Congress was voting only on the strict issues of sending Americans into Sinai, to which Ball replied that this issue was a "red herring," and tried to refocus the discussion onto more significant, larger issues. Ball did not, however, have the courage to urge rejection of the pact, preferring to regard the measure as a fait accompli by Kissinger to which Congress must acquiesce, and only then seek to reorient U.S. Middle East policy.

Reflecting the pressure against continuation of step-by-step diplomacy and for an overall agreement, Kissinger doubted yesterday under questioning from Sen. George McGovern that he could pursue Syria-Israel bilateral talks via shuttle diplomacy. "We're coming to the end of the step-by-step process," Kissinger lied, seeking to quiet Senate opposition until after the vote this week.

Meanwhile, Sen. Joseph Biden, a young freshman Democrat, voiced the otherwise unspoken fears about the accord, raised elsewhere only by the Labor Party. "How do we know," he asked, "that what has been already revealed represents all the secret provisions?" Then, realizing what he had said, Biden added, "the President says they are, and I believe him. But...."