

Congressional Closeup by Kathleen Klenetsky

All the Queen's Men in the Congress

The Queen of England, who has provoked a constitutional crisis in her own country by publicly attacking Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher for opposing sanctions against South Africa, has found no lack of support among the spalpeens in the U.S. Congress.

The Queen's Men in the Senate have been on a rampage ever since President Reagan's speech July 22, in which he rejected sanctions and asserted the priority of industrial development in bringing apartheid to an end.

At least four different versions of sanctions are currently under Senate consideration, and it is expected that some punitive measures will be adopted. The only question at this point is how harsh they will be.

As one would expect, Sen. Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.), has carved out the most radical position for himself. Along with Alan Cranston (D-Calif.) and Lowell Weicker (R-Conn.), Kennedy is sponsoring a bill that would impose a near-total ban on all forms of U.S.-South African economic activity. It closely parallels the sanctions bill, sponsored by radical leftist Rep. Ron Dellums (D-Calif.), which has already been passed by the House.

Taking a supposedly more "moderate" stand is Sen. Richard Lugar (D-Ind.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. With a Rhodes scholarship to certify his white-racist pedigree, Lugar has proposed a package of punitive measures which were the major subject of debate at a closed session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee July 29.

Lugar's proposals, no less than Kennedy's more extreme ones, come straight from the Queen's circles. Lugar's plan would:

1) ban imports produced by quasi-governmental companies, including steel, uranium, cement, and aluminum;

2) deny South Africa's airline U.S. landing rights;

3) allow the U.S. to freeze the U.S. bank accounts of South African government officials or companies;

4) and ban visas for South African journalists and employees of the government or government-run companies.

It also includes the five limited sanctions which President Reagan imposed in an executive order last year, which are scheduled to expire September 9: banning computer and software exports, new bank loans, and the sale of nuclear and military technology to South Africa.

But the centerpiece of Lugar's package is enabling legislation for the President to sell off U.S. gold stocks at the old price of \$35 an ounce. This would supposedly hurt South Africa, by driving down the price of gold.

The idea was first raised by the London *Economist*, which is factionally allied with the Queen on the issue of sanctions. In an editorial entitled "Go for Gold," in its July 19 edition, the *Economist* demanded that the North American governments, the European Community, and the Commonwealth should issue the threat: "Unless Mr. Nelson Mandela is released by September 30, the central banks signing this statement will start to sell gold from their vaults, with the object of slashing gold's market price."

South African Bishop Desmond Tutu, probably acting on orders from his superior, the Queen's Archbishop of Canterbury, Robert Runcie, repeated the same proposal in an interview on U.S. television July 27.

During the July 29 Foreign Relations Committee session, Lugar reportedly waved the relevant issue of the *Economist* around, to motivate his gold-dumping plan.

Senator Lugar's fool's gold

Flooding the market with U.S. gold isn't going to help South African workers one iota. Those who really benefit from the sale of America's remaining hard assets at bargain basement prices will be the powerful financial speculators in Switzerland, London, and the Soviet to mention the Queen, who is doubtlessly clearing out room in Windsor Castle's subbasement in anticipation of huge new shipments of gold.

What Lugar and his British mentors are proposing will wreak havoc on the tottering international monetary system. In the ensuing chaos, the entire structure is likely to come tumbling down.

Lugar's hodgepodge of measures will also do grave harm to South Africa, politically and economically. They will throw South Africa into the camp of the debtors who will not pay Western banks, drive hundreds of thousands of black workers out of their jobs, and create such political instability that the Soviet-dominated African National Congress could conceivably come to power.

Moreover, they will deprive the United States of access to South Africa's strategic mineral resources, leaving the Soviet Union the only remaining source of many of the substances on which the American civilian and military industries depend.

There is no question but that Queen Elizabeth, unable to bludgeon Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher into imposing sanctions on South Africa, is playing her assets in the United States to force Reagan to accede to sanctions. That, in turn, would make it much more difficult for Thatcher to hold out.

Ted Kennedy said as much July 27. Appearing on NBC-TV's "Meet the Press," Kennedy emphasized that "strong action" by the Senate "will spur Western European countries and the Commonwealth, which is meeting early in August" to take action against South Africa.

Kennedy caused a ruckus in the Senate July 31, when he attempted to attach his sanctions package to the debt-ceiling bill, provoking a fight with Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole.

House panel wants Soviet grain subsidized

The House Agriculture Committee approved legislation July 30 that would require subsidized U.S. grain sales to the Soviet Union and China. A similar bill was passed by the Senate a week earlier, thanks to the yeoman efforts of Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole (R-Kan.).

The proposal has generated intense controversy. Within the administration, Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger and others have forcefully argued against the sale, on the grounds that it would simply feed the Soviet war machine.

Secretary of State George Shultz has also publicly opposed it. In hearings last week, he termed the notion

"ridiculous," and said it would violate agreements between the U.S. and its allies. But the President's key domestic advisers, including Treasury Secretary James Baker and Agriculture chief Richard Lyng, support it. Key farm-state members of Congress also back it.

The measure has drawn the ire of the Australian government. Prime Minister Robert Hawke warned that the legislation would have "devastating implications" for his country. In a letter to about 50 members of Congress, Hawke predicted that application of the U.S. subsidies to wheat sales to the Soviet Union and China, his country's two top wheat buyers, "would inflict critical damage on the well-being of all Australians." He also said that subsidizing the Soviet state at the expense of "America's friend and ally Australia" would inevitably raise questions "about America's commitment to its leadership of the West."

Warner pushes national strategy act

Sen. John Warner (D-Va.) has been plumping his National Strategy Act measure, ever since he introduced it last winter. Sponsored by some of his more prominent colleagues, including Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman Sen. Richard Lugar (R-Ind.), Sens. Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz) and Sam Nunn (D-Ga.), chairman and ranking minority member, respectively, of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and Senate Intelligence Committee head David Durenberger (R-Minn.), the measure would mandate the President to issue a report to

Congress every year, defining, in detail, U.S. national strategy.

Major parts of the bill, which also exists in a House version, have been incorporated into the House and Senate defense-department reorganization bills.

Now, Henry Kissinger has come forth to give Warner's proposal a boost. In a syndicated column which appeared in the *Washington Post* July 29, Kissinger asserted that the fight within the country—and the Reagan administration—between the "defense unilateralists" (read: Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and other supporters of the SDI) and advocates of arms control should be resolved, by creating a "panel on national strategy" similar to the Packard and Rogers Commissions.

The panel "should be charged not with developing actual negotiating positions, but with developing a strategic doctrine by which negotiating positions can be judged," said Kissinger, and "could begin with seeking to answer the key questions raised by the Strategic Defense Initiative. Against what dangers does the [SDI] seek to protect: The defense of missile bases? Of population centers? And against what level of attack? And how will each proposed deployment be modified by various reduction proposals?"

Although Warner's legislation does not call for the creation of an independent panel, one of his aides said, "Kissinger and the Senator have discussed the question of arriving at a national strategy [and] are very much on the same wave length."

The aide also disclosed that Warner, chairman of a key Armed Services subcommittee, "spends a lot of time at CSIS"—the Washington think-tank where Kissinger hangs his hat.