

38 Republicans Issue A Statement Of Kissinger's Views

"We believe the Carter Administration incorrectly interprets the intentions of the Soviet Union and its commitment to achieve conventional military and nuclear superiority to secure wide-ranging geopolitical goals," declared a 29-page policy statement by all 38 Republicans in the U.S. Senate, issued May 3. The statement attacked the President for refusing to confront the Soviets in Africa, for not giving the "internal settlement" for Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) a chance, and demanded better relations with China.

THE GOP

The Senatorial Republicans have thus publicly certified themselves to be British policy spokesman Henry Kissinger's band of bleating sheep. They should at least have had the honesty to admit that "their" policy statement in fact consists of statements made by Henry Kissinger, Lord Alec Douglas Home and others during and after the Bilderberg Conference two weeks ago.

Kissinger, only a week after he attended the top-secret Bilderberg policy session, was on Capitol Hill meeting with Republican Senators Baker, McClure, and Laxalt. The following day the Republicans issued their report, which was coordinated by the Republican Policy Committee. A source close to the Committee declared that "Kissinger does have influence," although he disclaimed any direct hand by Kissinger in writing the report.

Kissinger's "influence" was also seen in a speech given by former President Gerald Ford who told a national television audience last week that he strongly supports the "internal settlement" for Rhodesia, a British blueprint for a U.S.-Soviet showdown in Africa; Ford also opined that the Carter Administration was leading towards a "give-away agreement" in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks.

Many conservative Republicans realize that they sound very much like Kissinger. Therefore they bleat: "Kissinger is a dead letter—he's just sounding like us conservatives because he knows we dominate the Republican Party and he wants a base," as a leading member of the American Conservative Union put it. What the same smart fellow should have added is that, indeed, he has become Kissinger's "base," and is now being led by the nose by the man who had been one of the conservatives' most hated enemies. If the Republican

Party had any real leadership, it would be forcefully enunciating an industrial growth policy, and concentrating on ensuring U.S. collaboration with those forces driving for a worldwide economic boom—including the Soviet Union. But no, the sheep allow their paranoid anti-Sovietism to come to the fore, to Kissinger's delight.

Kissinger's Chorus

The following are excerpts of a statement issued by Senate Republicans May 3, as printed in the Washington Post.

"We believe the Carter Administration incorrectly interprets the intentions of the Soviet Union and its commitment to achieve conventional military and nuclear superiority to secure wide-ranging, geopolitical goals." The Administration was charged with failing "to understand adequately and communicate to the American people the nature of the Soviet threat."

"It is evident that no one, including the President, is in control of the foreign policy process," the Republicans charged. The president, personally, was charged, in part, with commenting "impulsively on critical foreign policy positions" producing a policy that is "a patchwork quilt without continuity... frequently charged at a whim without a glaring absence of toughness and firmness."

Around the world the administration was accused of:
"Feeble handling of the Ethiopian-Somalia conflict (that) opened the way for the Soviets to carry out their naked geopolitical power play (in the Horn of Africa)... Failure of Middle East policy... largely attributable to a seemingly never-ending series of gaffes, miscalculations, imprecisions, indecisions and indiscretions of word and action... Placating (in Africa) the most militant common denominator in disputes such as Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) and Namibia (Southwest Africa)... (rather than) letting the moderates work out a solution themselves."

"(Following, in nuclear negotiations), a frightening pattern of giving up key U.S. weapons systems for nothing in return, (permitting) glaring deficiencies in NATO's defenses... timidly (failing to resist the) growing influence of Eurocommunism, and making America's European allies (feel compelled) to go their own way in defense... and make unilateral accommodations with Moscow."