

# National News

---

## Does the U.S. have a foreign policy?

Henry Kissinger flew into Washington two days ago for "private consultations" on foreign policy matters in his office at Georgetown University. The exact content of the meetings have been kept secret, as were the participants. Alexander Haig is reported to number among them. Kissinger told the press entering the meetings that he supported the Carter administration's anti-Soviet foreign policy measures as a necessary "first step." ABC-TV reported that he had different words behind closed doors, calling the Carter policy stupid and ineffective, and terming the sanctions imposed against the Soviets "useless pin-pricks." At a press conference later in the day, Kissinger rephrased his statement of "support"—the measures are nothing more than a "gun shot across the bow"; the idea is to "stop the ship" and the Soviets are not stopping.

A source at Georgetown, who helped Kissinger spin off his scenarios, says that Kissinger wants a show of force—not in Afghanistan which is a military absurdity, but in Iran. The U.S. is rapidly building up the necessary massive forces in the area and establishing the network of bases in both Africa and in the Indian Ocean. Kissinger fears that Carter's vacillations, both now and before, may have already doomed such an effort to failure. This challenge to the Soviets—and to Arab world and Europe—is nonetheless necessary to show the world that the U.S. means business.

---

## What the Democrats are really thinking

Soundings taken around the country reveal that President Carter's standing among Democrats is plummeting, with no rebound for the tattered Edward Kennedy campaign. With voter preference having rejected Kennedy and now

clearly moving away from Carter, the current leader in the Democratic race is marked "uncommitted."

The soundings: A North Carolina poll shows that 48.8 percent of all Democratic voters are uncommitted. Next comes Carter with 47.8 percent. Kennedy is dismissed as a factor with 3.4 percent. The North Carolina results are typical for the South. Once it's recognized that Kennedy is not a major threat, the anti-Kennedy sentiment that binds Southern Democrats to Carter dissipates. County leaders reached in several deep South states all confirm the existence of very large uncommitted sentiment in the Party. The "Go Uncommitted"—to the convention—phenomenon is not confined to the South. Iowa State Democratic sources foresee a 30 percent and up uncommitted vote at the Jan. 21 caucuses. In 1976, the uncommitted voters, not Carter, actually won the Iowa caucuses. In the other pre-New Hampshire caucus state, Maine, whose State Democratic Caucus will be held on Feb. 10, State Democratic officials are already talking in terms of expecting a 20-30 percent uncommitted vote.

---

## LaRouche promises a cure in 30 days

Lyndon LaRouche, candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1980, offered to cure the Iran and Afghanistan crisis "in 30 days." In a Jan. 2 release, the presidential candidate said that "Zbigniew Brzezinski's efforts to cause the United States to ally itself with those Iranian and Pakistan dictatorships which have made virtual acts of war against the United States is a symptom of the mental illness which appears to have taken over the Carter administration as a whole." LaRouche proposed to President Carter "that he, out of his love for his country, the United States, accept the resignation of Vice-President Walter F. Mondale, and appoint me vice-presidential nominee. He should plan to resign himself as soon as my confirmation is effected.

"Then I promise to get the United States out of the deadly and worsening strategic crises this administration has manufactured. I promise to cure this mess within 30 days."

---

## Carter sees no hope in Iran crisis

President Carter told a group of Congressmen in Washington this week that the crisis in Iran cannot be resolved by normal means. Because the "international terrorists" who seized the embassy and the hostages are independent of the Khomeini government, there is no entity "with which we can negotiate," he said, ignoring the facts. And he added that the terrorists are not concerned "even with the security of the country within which they live."

At a State Department briefing, spokesman Hodding Carter III implied that the terrorists holding the U.S. embassy were agents of the Soviet Union! From that standpoint, virtually every U.S. government spokesman is reiterating the importance of "moderates" like Ghotbzadeh and Co. to deal with the U.S. against the Soviet Union.

Carter's statement came just before his Secretary of State, Cyrus Vance, proclaimed before a national television audience that a United States naval blockade of Khomeini's Iran "cannot be ruled out." Then, on Jan. 12, Hodding Carter III, spokesman at a State Department briefing, said that a naval blockade of the type mooted by Secretary Vance was actually "under active consideration."

United Nations sources report that the U.S. delegation at the United Nations has been "really strongarming" other nations' representatives into voting for economic sanctions against Iran—a vote that the Soviet Union has pledged to veto in the Security Council.

Iran, for its part, has said that a naval blockade "will mean war," and that in the event of sanctions, it will cut off oil sales to any nation participating with the U.S.

The U.N. sources also say that U.S. policy appears to be a "step-by-step" pursuit of showdown with the Soviet Union, which is now said to be building two military bases in Western Afghanistan, a clear indication that should the U.S. send a "strike force" to Iran, the Soviets are prepared to also invade that nation.

U.N. sources also say that U.S. policy appears to be a "step-by-step" pursuit of showdown with the Soviet Union, which is now said to be building two military bases in Western Afghanistan, a clear indication that should the U.S. send a "strike force" to Iran, the Soviets are prepared to also invade that country.

Responding to the threat of U.S. military action, *Pravda*, the Soviet Communist Party newspaper, declared that Iran and the U.S.S.R. are "good neighbors," and added, "The United States is the real threat to Iran."

## **New York Times bids for uncommitted voters**

"Before plunging headlong into yet another Presidential election, perhaps we should stop a minute and consider whether this expensive, time-consuming and divisive process is necessary or even produces results superior to the alternative: hereditary monarchy."

So begins an Op-Ed column in the *New York Times*, Jan. 12, authored by John Steele Gordon, whom the *Times* only describes as a member of "a public relations firm" in New York "and author of a book about driving." Mr. Gordon points out that 38 men have been president of the United States, while 41 have been King or Queen of England. Dividing these egories, "great, adequate, or disastrous with regard to the fortunes of the country they led," and assigning 3 to each great leader, -3 to each disaster, and 0 to each adequate leader, Mr. Gordon finds that "monarchy wins in a walk at -3 to -12."

Mr. Gordon concludes: "Having a monarchy, then, clearly means fewer visits to the repair shop and longer intervals between major tune-ups. Since it is also much cheaper to operate (all those beefeaters, changing guards, royal yachts and castles in Scotland cost less than one big-state primary—and turn a pretty tourist penny into the bargain) it should be obvious that monarchy must be the choice of every thinking consumer."

Of course, it's all tongue-in-cheek. Isn't it? There is, of course, the fact that leading personnel at the *Times* do most of their thinking on "gouvernance" down at the New York Council on Foreign Relations, the daughter institution of the Royal Institute for International Affairs, which is in turn, "Chatham House," otherwise the executive body of Her Britannic Majesty's Secret Intelligence Services. All of which makes the *New York Times*—whatever Mr. Gordon is—something of a "public relations firm" for the British monarchy. Can it be that this Op-Ed, which takes up fully one-half of a prized p. 19 with graphics, represents a new appeal to the whopping percentage of "uncommitted" American voters, on behalf of the *Times*' preferred candidate?

## **U.S. Air Force using Egyptian bases**

The U.S. Air Force has been using Egyptian military facilities and participating in training sessions with the Egyptian Air Force from a secret base in Luxor, Upper Egypt, admitted Egyptian Defense Minister Gen. Hassan Ali. According to U.S. and Egyptian officials, the U.S. used its super-sophisticated AWACS surveillance jets with computerized facilities in the exercises, which took place beginning three weeks ago. The AWACS planes, according to reports, are capable of being used in the mooted intervention into Iran, the Persian Gulf, and the Indian Ocean to coordinate a naval blockade.

## **Briefly**

● **WARREN CHRISTOPHER**, U.S. Under-Secretary of State, hopped over to Brussels NATO headquarters yet again last week while Assistant Secretary of State Richard Cooper toured Western capitals seeking support for economic and other sanctions against the Soviet Union and Iran.

● **PRESIDENT CARTER** met with "40 former foreign policy officials" to search for a foreign policy consensus this week at the White House. The media reported the President vacillating between standing up against the Soviet Union and backing down from a direct confrontation to. The White House declined to make a statement on the meeting or even reveal the names of the participants.

● **JOSEPH HENDRIE**, chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has announced that 38 nuclear power plants in the country have not complied with new safety requirements provided by the agency's findings on the Three Mile Island facility shutdown last year. Hendrie announced that the facilities in question will have one month to comply or face shutdown risking a serious electrical blackout this winter

● **CITIZENS FOR LAROUCHE** (CFL) has announced a formal complaint with the Federal Communications Commission against NBC Television for its refusal to sell 30 minutes of political advertising time for Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

LaRouche intends to address the population on solutions to the war danger created by the Carter Administration's actions in the Middle East; CFL has stated that any attempt by the major media to block such a paid political address is "criminal obstruction" against vital United States national security interests.

into three