



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 14, NO. 1, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

AUGUST, 1980

The Kissinger Power Grab

The grab for power attempted by Henry Kissinger on the evening of Wednesday, July 16 must be one of the most incredible events in the history of the American Presidency. While on the floor of the Joe Louis Arena in Detroit, 1,994 duly elected Delegates and 1,994 Alternates to the Republican National Convention were in the process of nominating Ronald Reagan as President, a few blocks away on the 69th floor of the Renaissance Plaza Hotel, Kissinger was promoting a secret deal under which he, not Reagan, would exercise the powers of the Presidency.

The cover for this proposed transfer of power from a constitutionally elected President to the hands of a man who is not even eligible for the office (because he is not a native-born American) was to be the nomination of a Reagan-Ford "dream ticket." But the nature and details of the deal to transfer the power of the office were completely unknown to the Delegates who told reporters that Ford would be acceptable as Reagan's running mate.

Purporting to speak as the "negotiator" for Ford, Kissinger demanded that Reagan agree to turn over to Ford and Kissinger the National Security Council (which controls U.S. foreign and defense policies), the Office of Management and Budget (which directly controls not only all federal budgeting but the purposes and way in which it is spent), and the Council of Economic Advisers (which controls U.S. economic policies). Walter Cronkite designated this as a deal for a "co-presidency," but in fact so little power would remain in Reagan's hands that he would be President in name only.

This "sharing" of Presidential powers would have left Reagan with supervision over agriculture, the Indians, and an assortment of minor matters and ceremonial duties. It would make a farce of the whole process of democratic elections. Such a division of Presidential powers would, at the very least, have been highly impractical. Successful organizations and corporations don't have co-

presidents; they have one chief where the buck stops.

Such a gutting of Presidential powers might even be an unconstitutional delegation of the President's authority. There was also the additional stumbling block of the 12th Amendment to the Constitution, which is a bar to the election of a President and Vice President from the same state. Ford would either have to give up his California residence or forgo receiving the electoral votes of our largest state.

Reagan aids expressed themselves as "astounded" at the scope of the power which Kissinger demanded, purportedly on behalf of Ford who has never impressed friends as so power-hungry. Casper Weinberger, one of Reagan's close advisers, said he "was never quite sure" whether Ford's negotiators were speaking on behalf of themselves or Ford.

Nevertheless, in the Reagan-Ford meetings, Ford said several times he wanted Kissinger as Secretary of State, and that he is "the kind of person" Ford would want to see in a Reagan Administration. Columnists Evans and Novak reported that Ford's price for going on the ticket with Reagan was the appointment of Henry Kissinger as Secretary of State and Alan Greenspan as Secretary of the Treasury.

Kissinger's Campaign for Office

For more than a year, Henry Kissinger has been "running" for the office of Secretary of State. He has campaigned with determination and deviousness.

In late 1979, Kissinger hedged his bets on the 1980 election by giving lengthy testimony to the Senate on the SALT II Treaty, parts of which could be quoted by both sides in the debate. His testimony was designed primarily to confuse the record in regard to his own views and to duck responsibility for his own mistakes. He told the Senate that our present military inferiority "is the

consequence of unilateral decisions extending over a decade and a half," failing to mention that he personally made many of those unilateral decisions. Kissinger is to blame, for example, for the deliberate decision to destroy 550 Minuteman I and II missiles when our Minuteman III missiles were built, instead of keeping them as part of our arsenal. This is why America has 550 fewer ICBMs than we could have had, and why the Soviets now have missile superiority over us.

By the spring of 1980, in a speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Kissinger attacked the Carter Administration because "it repudiated the SALT position of the previous Administration." Yet the SALT position of the previous Administration, which was designed by Kissinger himself, surrendered the U.S. right to build an anti-missile defense to protect our population, and tied America down to a 1,614 to 1,054 inferiority to the Russians in intercontinental ballistic missiles, an inferiority of 308 to 0 in heavy missiles, and an inferiority of 62 to 41 in nuclear-missile-firing submarines.

By April of 1980, Kissinger realized that Ronald Reagan would win the Republican nomination, and Henry could not count on being appointed by a President he did not support. Kissinger's powerful patron, Nelson Rockefeller, who had gotten Henry a big job in the Nixon Administration even though Kissinger had not supported Nixon, was now deceased. So Kissinger endorsed Reagan. After Reagan stated publicly he would not appoint Kissinger, Henry decided to work a power play through his old friend, Gerald Ford.

Kissinger maneuvered himself into the position as the lead negotiator for Ford in behalf of the "co-presidency." Although Ford used four negotiators, Kissinger was the one described by Reagan aides as "ubiquitous."

At the same time that Kissinger was using his talents to persuade Reagan to "cut a deal" (as the networks described it), Henry was using his oratory to induce Ford to accept it. Kissinger made "impassioned private arguments" to Ford to accept the nomination.

Ford, The Media & The Delegates

Why was Ford willing to negotiate such a deal in cooperation with Kissinger and at Reagan's expense? Gerald Ford has carried a grudge against Reagan since 1976, when Reagan ran against Ford for the nomination. The *New York Daily News* reported that Gerald Ford's animosity against Reagan was so great that last March he told friends, "Before this is over, I will get my pound of flesh out of that guy [Reagan]."

If Ford had invited Reagan to be his running mate in 1976, Ford would be in the White House today. It is very interesting that the people promoting George Bush in the name of "party unity" were not the slightest bit interested in party unity in 1976, when Ford defeated Reagan for the

nomination by the slim margin of 117 votes.

In the midst of the Reagan-Ford negotiations on that fateful Wednesday evening in July 1980, Gerald and Betty Ford went into two network booths, and exercised media leverage to promote Ford as the senior partner of the Reagan-Ford "dream ticket." Whether these perfectly timed interviews were coincidence, or were Ford-media collusion to force Reagan to accept the secret deal, will probably remain a matter of dispute.

There are those who say Reagan rejected the Ford deal at 6:00 p.m. when Ford demanded the appointment of Kissinger. There are others who say that the last straw was when Ford made his demands public on television, and the networks became a part of Ford's bargaining apparatus.

When Reagan came to the platform at midnight and first said he had asked Ford to be Vice President, there was a tiny scattering of applause. When, in the next sentence, Reagan said Ford would **not** be his running mate, the applause was tremendous. The Delegates showed their intuitive good judgment even though they then knew nothing about the secret deal on transfer of Presidential powers.

On March 28, 1980, this writer asked Ronald Reagan, "You did promise, didn't you, that you would not reappoint Henry Kissinger?" To which Reagan replied, "That's right; I did." Reagan kept his promise at the Republican Convention in Detroit. Reagan should never be allowed to forget that promise.

Republican Party Platforms

In a separate conference in Detroit, Henry Kissinger met with Ronald Reagan to discuss the Republican Platform. Immediately afterwards, Kissinger held a news conference and tried to disparage the strong section of the Platform calling for the rebuilding of American military superiority.

Fortunately, it will be the Republican Platform — and not Henry Kissinger — which determines Republican and Reagan military policy.

The 1980 Republican Platform pledges a strategy "to achieve overall military and technological *superiority* over the Soviet Union; [and] to accept no arms control agreement . . . which locks the United States into a position of military inferiority."

The most important question of our time is: what U.S. national strategy should cope with the threat to our survival from the Russian military might? "Superiority" is the key word which separates those who want peace through military strength from those who favor the McNamara-Kissinger-Brown-SALT I and II detente-accommodation approach.

There has been a persistent effort in some quarters to propagate the myth that the Republican Party Platform adopted by the Convention in Detroit is somehow the most "conservative" ever.

(Continued on page 4)

"A Shining City on a Hill"

Address by Senator Jesse Helms of North Carolina
Before the Republican National Convention
Detroit, Michigan, July 17, 1980

Ladies and Gentlemen, Fellow Delegates and Alternates:

During the past year, many of you here tonight, and other Americans across the country, have urged that I allow my name to be placed in nomination as a candidate for the office of Vice President.

I have been deeply honored by these suggestions -- indeed, humbled by the thought. I know that those who have offered their support did so not because of personal loyalty, as such; but because we have a common commitment to the pro-American and pro-family principles which all of us try to articulate. I think it is clear that I have neither encouraged nor discouraged these efforts. I have written no letters, made no speeches, pursued no campaigns for this honor.

Yet, my friends have persevered. The difference between the various Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates has not been based on personality or geography -- but on issues, and on principles.

It matters not the name of the person who serves in the White House or in the office of the Vice President -- what matters are the principles that guide them -- and their faithfulness to them.

Tonight, another name will be put in nomination for that office. I have no regrets, for the Republican Party must be a party of principles, not personalities. It is on the basis of principle that we must appeal to the people, and it is on the basis of our principles that the American people should be governed.

If there is one lesson that our nation's leaders must learn, it is that the American people are not interested in politics as usual. In fact, most Americans are scarcely interested in politics at all. The opinion polls and the elections of recent years demonstrate that there is a growing disaffection with political movements and political parties.

Millions of Americans who have been supporting Ronald Reagan owe no loyalty to the Republican Party, and are not looking for jobs in a Reagan Administration. They will not be moved by appeals to "party unity" or by wheeling and dealing in the back rooms of any convention -- whether in Detroit or New York.

Indeed, the American people are not interested in labels tossed around by the media -- "Rightwing," "Leftwing" or "Moderate" -- because generally these are deceptive and reflect, more than anything else, the opinion and the political orientation of the media themselves. The American people are interested only in what is right and what is wrong.

As Americans, we may give our votes to candidates and parties, but we give our loyalty only to God, family, and country.

There is a New Majority in America, newly emergent, but believing in the traditional values of our nation. In recent years, our people have not been stirred by politics; indeed, many of them have been disillusioned in their hopes and dreams for a better America. Our party must reach out to these millions; we must search for the support of those who yearn for a reaffirmation of traditional moral values.

Have we not seen these Americans striving to strengthen the family?

Have we not seen them concerned about a nation whose courts sanction the taking of innocent human life for social convenience?

Have we not seen them working to preserve the family-centered definition of women's rights in our Constitution?

Have we not seen them working to control the circumstances of the education of their children to preserve a God-fearing sense of moral and intellectual values?

Do not most Americans want to see an end to inflation, and the restoration of an honest dollar?

Are not most Americans fed up with the use of the tax system to redistribute their hard-earned dollars -- not to the needy, but to political special interests?

Do not most Americans want to protect their jobs and the jobs of their fellow workers from the ravages of unfair foreign competition?

And, finally, do not all Americans want to preserve our freedom and our way of life against the international assault of socialism, Marxism, Communism, and other totalitarian ideologies?

That's why most Americans are opposed to using our tax dollars and our diplomacy to support Marxist governments abroad, such as Nicaragua.

That's why they were outraged over the giveaway of the Panama Canal to a Marxist dictator who is now busy spreading his ideology throughout the Caribbean.

That's why Americans are now more concerned than ever about the aggressive spread of Soviet imperialism, and Soviet implementation of Marxist doctrine to subvert the world.

That's why Americans, more than ever, are concerned about the deterioration of our national defense. They believe that our nation is a good nation, and that our national defense should be not merely equal to, but superior to, the military might of the Soviet Union.

These are not political issues. They are moral

issues. They are issues of survival.

There is a coalition to which we must appeal -- honestly and sincerely. These are Americans -- decent, honorable, concerned Americans, who want to preserve the family, the free enterprise system, and regain a foreign policy which will allow those values to survive.

The platform adopted by this Party at this convention is a platform based upon principle. We have said what we mean -- now let us make clear to the people of this land that we mean what we say. Every Republican who embraces this platform will find himself in tune with the sentiments of the American people. We will succeed in November with the new majority coalition only to the extent that we stick to our principles.

It was gratifying to hear last night that the Republican ticket this November is pledged to support this platform across the board. And the American people will hold us to that pledge.

Ronald Reagan was selected as the candidate of the primaries and of the convention not because he is a warm and attractive leader. He was not nominated because he had a skillful campaign team. He was not nominated merely because he had a splendid record as Governor of California -- there are many other good governors.

Ronald Reagan was nominated because he has resolutely and unfailingly stood up for the principles of Americans who want to make our nation great again, morally, militarily, and economically.

This is the coalition which has called Governor Reagan, and which has brought him the nomination of our Party.

Do you remember that evening, exactly four years ago, when a great American spoke at Kansas City to the Republican Convention? Do you remember Ronald Reagan's message? I'll never forget it. He said:

"You just stay in there, and you stay with the same faith that made you do what you're doing here. The individuals on the stage may change, but the cause is there, and the cause will prevail because it is right.

"So don't give up your ideals, don't compromise. Don't turn to expedience, and don't, for heaven's sake, don't get cynical. Look at yourselves, and what you were willing to do -- and recognize that there are millions and millions of Americans out there who want what you want, who want it to be that way, who want it to be a shining city on a hill."

Ladies and Gentlemen, we can have that shining city on the hill -- but we can have it only through God's grace, our own courage, and our own will to abide by the faith of our fathers.

Our ticket has pledged that they -- both of them -- understand this. They have given assurance that they understand the miracle of America.

Let us all go from this place, this night, and set our sights on that shining city on a hill. I support our ticket, because our nominees have

emphasized their faith in, and dedication to, the platform adopted by this convention.

Let us live each day, mindful that the Lord may be giving us just one more chance to save America. With a genuine spiritual rebirth, we can do it. Let's get about it.

(Continued from page 2)

Analysis shows that the 1980 Platform is much the same mainstream Republicanism as those of the last three decades. It is the country, not the Republican Party, which has moved to the right.

The 1976 Platform pledged "a *superior* national defense . . . second to none." The 1968 Platform called for "a comprehensive program to restore the *pre-eminence* of U.S. military strength." The 1964 Republican Platform said: "We will maintain a *superior*, not merely equal, military capability as long as the Communist drive for world domination continues."

The 1960 Republican Platform promised "to maintain an armed power *exceeded by no other*." The 1956 Republican Platform boasted that "we have the *strongest* striking force in the world."

Looking at the broader area of foreign policy, the 1968 Platform stated: "Improved relations with Communist nations can come only when they cease to endanger other states by force or threat." The 1964 Platform read: "Republican foreign policy starts with the assumption that Communism is the enemy of this nation."

The 1960 Platform said: "We advocate an immovable resistance against every Communist aggression." The 1952 Platform stated: "We never compromised with Communism and we have fought to expose it and to eliminate it in government and American life."

The 1976 Republican National Convention Delegates, by floor action, added to the Platform a foreign policy section which repudiated the central elements of the Kissinger foreign policy, namely, detente, the arms control agreements with the Soviets, the deliberate snub of Solzhenitsyn, and the betrayal of the Captive Nations at Helsinki.

The recitation of the 1980 Platform on the Tuesday evening in Detroit was long and tedious. Yet it was encouraging to note that the following sentence from the section on defense drew spontaneous, enthusiastic applause: "We reject the mutual-assured-destruction (MAD) strategy of the Carter Administration which limits the President during crises to a Hobson's choice between mass mutual suicide and surrender."

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by Phyllis Schlafly, Fairmount, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

Subscription Price: For donors to the Eagle Trust Fund -- \$10 yearly (included in annual contribution). Extra copies available: 25 cents each; 6 copies \$1; 50 copies \$5; 100 copies \$8.