

## Is the Zionist lobby writing Reagan's lines?

*Ronald Reagan startled his conservative supporters when he published a vehemently pro-Zionist op-ed in the Washington Post Aug. 15. Though bearing his byline, the piece was actually drafted by former Air Force Middle East intelligence expert Joseph Churba. Excerpts follow:*

Stripped of rhetoric, the paramount American interest in the Middle East is to prevent the region from falling under the domination of the Soviet Union. Were Moscow, or even its radical allies in the region, allowed to establish dominance or acquire a stranglehold on the West's sources of petroleum ... the economies of the major industrial states would be jeopardized and the capacity of NATO and Japan to resist Soviet pressure would be dangerously impaired....

The existence of Israel has served as a convenience for the Soviet Union as well, but Russian aims for control over the entire [Mideast] region existed long before Israel's birth in 1948. Without this bastion of liberal democracy in the heart of the area, the Kremlin would be confined to supporting the militant regimes against pro-American conservative governments which would not be able to divert the

attention and energies of the radicals away from themselves by using the "lightning rod" of the "Zionist State." ...

The fall of Iran has increased Israel's value as perhaps the only remaining strategic asset in the region on which the United States can truly rely. ... Israel's strength derives from the reality that her affinity with the West is not dependent on the survival of an an autocratic or capricious ruler. Israel has the democratic will, national cohesion, technological capacity and military fiber to stand forth as America's trusted ally.

... Her intelligence services provide critical guidance to ongoing regional development, the technical know-how of her specialists could be used to service American equipment in a crisis, and her facilities and airfields could provide a secure point of access if required at a moment of emergency....

Therefore, it is foolhardy to risk weakening our most critical remaining regional strategic asset. Yet, if administration policies should serve to weaken Israel either through building the basis for a radical Palestinian state on her borders or through providing her with insufficient military assistance, the task of Kremlin planners dealing with the Middle East would be enormously eased and a determined barrier to Soviet expansionism in the region would have been withdrawn....

man in America, especially among conservatives] is unpopular, I assume it is because of decisions I have made in the foreign policy field. ... Henry Kissinger is the most knowledgeable man on foreign policy today and of course I would ask him to continue as my Secretary of State" if reelected.

Sears's open praise of Kissinger was a blatant rejection of Reagan's platform, and a stinging insult to both Reagan and Reagan's supporters. During his fight to wrest the GOP nomination from Ford, Reagan had continually targeted the despised Kissinger and his policies. More than anyone else, Kissinger had come to symbolize the Eastern Establishment's control over the Republican Party, and Reagan's attacks on him drew the support of many conservatives of both the Republican and Democratic parties.

Coupled with Ford's decision not to dump Kissinger—which reliable sources say was heavily based on Sears's "conservative" advice—Reagan's Sears-engineered challenge to Ford and his unenthusiastic support for the President's campaign probably did more to give Carter the winning edge on election day than any other factor.

Ford wasn't the only victim of Sears's treachery, though. Reagan's chances for the nomination were just

as insidiously undercut. Among the incredibly stupid tactics that Sears came up with during the final days before the Republican convention was to have Reagan name liberal GOP Senator Richard Schweiker as his running mate. That move promptly set the stage for Bill Buckley's brother James, then a Senator from New York, to offer himself as a last-minute "conservative" alternative to Reagan. Sears's Schweiker gambit not only temporarily paralyzed Reagan's machine and cost him crucial delegate votes, but also badly discredited the Californian in the eyes of many formerly staunch supporters. No wonder that many Reagan loyalists concluded that Sears was an agent of the "Rockefeller Republicans."

## Reagan: The malleable man

Why does Reagan continue to rely so heavily on Sears's advice in spite of his demonstrable disloyalty both to himself and the Republican Party, and his obvious ties to the CFR?

That question goes to the heart of the Reagan problem. If Reagan has displayed one fatal flaw during his political career, it is that he has never really been his own man.