

State Dept. Mideast Advisor:

“The Palestinians Are Being Pushed Into A Meatgrinder And The Soviets Are Impotent”

Washington D.C., July 16 (NSIPS) — In an interview today, Dr. L—, high-ranking State Department advisor on the Middle East, expressed confidence that the Soviet Union is powerless to intervene to halt the State Department-ordered butchery of the Lebanese left and the Palestinian movement.

Dr. L—: The Soviets are talking harder, sure. The Lebanon episode is revealing their impotence. Nobody in the Middle East wants to play their game, and they are left with the most radical elements alone, the Palestinians. The Soviet failure to support their clients is hurting. Arafat wants help. The Palestinians are being pushed into a meatgrinder, not as vigorously as I would prefer, but they are. So Arafat wants the Soviets to make good on its promises. Arafat tells the Soviets, “You claim to have interests here, etc.”

The only thing they can do is send arms to the Palestinians. But the Palestinians have no lack of arms. What they lack is fighters.

What can the Soviets do? Sending airborne troops into Lebanon is one possibility. But the Soviets are not Americans. They are not legitimate. Most regimes in the area would ‘accept’ a U.S. intervention, the U.S. has a kind of phony right to do that — it is expected. A Soviet intervention would have the Arab world in an uproar.

NSIPS: What about an intervention by Iraq — like Cuba in Angola — with Soviet help?

Dr. L—: The Iraqis are not willing. As the fate of the schoolgirls from the PLO shows. This is not Africa. The Middle East has plenty of clowns, but they are not all clowns like Africa. The Soviets would have to send 50,000 Iraqis into Lebanon, and then they could be eaten up by Syria and Israel. The same 10,000 Cubans that went into Angola would, in Lebanon, be eaten alive. These people fight in the Middle East, not like Africa, where they run.

NSIPS: Can Syria do it?

Dr. L—: The Syrians are being very cautious. The only question is freedom of movement. The biggest development in Lebanon in the last two weeks is that the Lebanese Moslems have gone neutral. It is now Palestinians vs. Syrians, with a few students and intellectuals — the left — fighting alongside the PLO. The Moslems have gone out, and they are no longer calling on the Arab brothers in Syria to rise up etc. You can tell the truth of this by plotting combat points on a map.

NSIPS: What about a Syrian invasion of Beirut?

Dr. L—: Israel, Syria and Jordan have reached an agreement that allows Syria to remove troops from the Golan Heights. As a purely military question there is no question. I’m confident that things may go well in Lebanon, that Lebanon may finally be cleaned up.

NSIPS: What is your view of world reality in the aftermath of the Entebbe raid?

Dr. L—: The raid itself was not so important. Even before the raid, the attitude of the European governments had changed. All European governments accepted the Israeli policy around the raid, and had refused to give in to the hijackers’ demands. Once governments say no to this thing, there will be no more hijacks. Attempts to use the UN, I think, are useless. Resolutions have no chance of success, since the Soviets and their allies will block them.

Council on Foreign Relations Specialist:

“Nobody Can Stop” Fighting In Lebanon

July 17 (NSIPS) — The following assessment of prospects for peace in Lebanon was obtained by a reporter from J.C. Campbell, a senior research fellow of the New York Council on Foreign Relations, and made available exclusively to NSIPS.

Reporter: What are the possibilities for Soviet action in Lebanon?

Campbell: I was just looking back to see what they might do. There isn’t much they can do. They are caught and are not in control of events. They are very cautious. They might propose a UN Security Council meeting, or a “Conference of Interested Parties.”

Reporter: But how can the Lebanese fighting be stopped?

Campbell: Nobody can stop it against the will of the Syrians. The Arab Force has only been token. They are just going to have to fight it out.

It would be hard to get the Iraqis and even harder the Algerians to go in with their new Arab Force just formed. The Libyans might, they are crazy enough to try anything like that, but they are tied up in the Sudan and so on.

I suppose the most the Iraqis could do is scare the Syrians into making an agreement. It won’t work.

Reporter: Will the U.S. move in?

Campbell: I doubt it. Only to evacuate people. The U.S. doesn’t want to take the initiative and no one from the outside can accomplish anything... Both Moscow and the U.S. are very cautious.

Exclusive NSIPS Translation
from Rose-el-Yusef

Peace Shuttle Diplomacy Or The Messenger Of The Fifth War

July 17 (NSIPS) — In the third of a series of articles in the Egyptian leftist weekly, *Rose-el-Yussef* on U.S. diplomacy in the Mideast by *Ihjaz Ahmed*, a professor in Political Studies at Rutgers University, New Jersey, U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger is identified as a CIA creation and as the main ally of the Rockefeller family.

Kissinger’s cooperation with the CIA goes back as far as 1952 when he was preparing his Ph.D. theses. He was then given the mission of supervising “Harvard’s International Club,” a program widely known to be funded by the CIA. The program was aimed at bringing 55 young scientists (among the young politicians, diplomats, government officials and journalists and even businessmen) from Third World countries to spend the summer in Massachusetts. The program’s stated goal was to promote the discussion of and the exchange of views in political, historical and philosophical affairs, etc. Its real goal was to intellectually influence (the participants) and to recruit them to the CIA. In the case of the opposing elements, the goal was to establish a “warning system” to provide information about what new leaders could do in their own countries. Marvin and Bernard Kalb (CBS correspondents) in their book on Kissinger say that as the editor of the International Club’s magazine

Kissinger succeeded in shaping its anti-communist editorial policy.

Kissinger's relationship to the Rockefeller family started in the mid-1950s working as the director of a series of studies for the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. Kissinger greatly benefited from this experience, especially since the Rockefeller family has tremendous power in the "Council on Foreign Relations," a body which is sometimes described as the "Other State Department." Kissinger succeeded in establishing links with the Council which had funded the publishing of his second book, "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy." All this time he also maintained a very close personal relationship with Nelson Rockefeller and was his consultant on foreign relations. It was Nelson who offered Kissinger as a candidate for Secretary of State (to President Nixon). As he was also recommended by the CIA, the elite of Harvard intellectuals and the financial elite in the "Council on Foreign Affairs," Nixon could do nothing but accept.

Kissinger Ideology in Foreign Relations

Kissinger's understanding of the world is similar to a great extent to that of (the late, former Secretary of State) John Foster Dulles, only Kissinger's thinking is even more conservative and more aggressive. While John Foster Dulles divided the world into Communists and those who are opposed to Communism, Kissinger considers that any power that upsets the status quo which benefits the advanced capitalist countries, is an aggressive and revolutionary force. Therefore any power, whether small or big, communist or non-communist, becomes a danger when it refuses to accept the international order or other countries' internal structure. Therefore all the socialist and national movements and countries that are opposed to imperialism are all put in the same bag as hostile elements. The United States in its position of the power representing the established order must respond to these threats everywhere.

Kissinger had advocated in his 1957 writings, the use of a double edged sword (in U.S. diplomacy). First, the United States must obtain a sweeping military victory over the Soviet Union, its main rival and establish an international military order in its (the U.S.) favor; second the U.S. must create many little wars against the small powers who defy the present international order. Kissinger considers the peaceful solutions as being "dangerous" and has declared his personal regret that the United States did not take advantage of its exclusive ownership of nuclear weapons to unleash a direct attack on the Soviet Union.

By 1957, Kissinger had also adopted a concept of wars that he describes as being 'limited' instead of an overall confrontation with the Soviet Union. But even those "limited wars" included the use of nuclear weapons with a destructive power up to 500 kilotons. The events in Jordan in September 1970 and the current war in Lebanon are applications of this principle. This instinctive tendency in Kissinger led him to find military solutions to problems that were political in their essence, and to evolve three regional concepts of modern warfare: 1) the necessity of liquidating military accounts with the Soviet Union 2) the necessity of preparing for the effective use of nuclear weapons 3) the necessity of creating a new international order in which the small countries will start regional wars instead of the United States.

Despite the separation between these issues, they all represent the interlinked features of a unique world strategy aiming at ensuring a perpetual military supremacy for the United States.

In 1957, Kissinger had realized that the chances for carrying out a direct and an overall war were diminishing. His thinking was scientific. The nuclear capability of the Soviet Union had made it impossible for the United States to unleash a complete attack. The Soviet Union is also not aggressive enough and is not crazy enough to invade the NATO countries. As long as the Western European

countries had protected themselves from the outbreak of a World War on their territories, there must be therefore small skirmishes in several places of the world that do not constitute a direct attack ... Therefore in these "marginal" countries, i.e. in the Third World countries, the United States has to respond with increasingly superior forces. There the U.S. had to win a series of "limited" wars in a decisive way even if that would require taking the risk of a direct confrontation. Therefore, the direct military struggle is still possible — especially to stop this wave of wars in marginal areas where the United States finds no other alternative...According to the plans, these "wars" will lead to 'much better political results than the overall war.' The central region targetted to implement this strategy is the Mediterranean and the area surrounding it. If the dangers for reaching a solution are greater than what it could be, then there is no alternative but to go to the next stage of the operations (in the Middle East). Even if I am reporting something that has already become obvious, I predict that Henry Kissinger, the famous dove of peace, now that his "shuttle" diplomacy has stopped working for an unlimited period will be the messenger of the Fifth Arab-Israeli war.

Egypt

"Painful Solutions"

As reported last week, the Egyptian political and economic situation is rapidly deteriorating. Egypt's main problems, according to the July 14 issue of the prestigious Business International, are, rising imports, stagnating exports, domestic subsidies and deficit financing. "Any hope of a painless solution vanished earlier this year," comments the business weekly.

Plans for Egypt drawn up in March by the International Monetary Fund were designed to use up idle capacity in public sector industries, i.e., putting to work its highly educated and skilled workforce in labor intensive jobs, increasing exports (the key export, cotton, has been falling by 39 per cent, costing Egypt some \$500 million) this in turn would increase Suez Canal trade. The IMF also proposed that Egypt get long term foreign exchange from the petrodollar rich Arab states while attracting foreign private investment. To date, not one of these schemes — all aimed at guaranteeing that Egypt could meet its \$175 million monthly debt service payments — has been implemented.

A combination of the world economic depression and the fall of world trade plus the strong Nasserite opposition within Egypt, politically opposed to President Anwar Sadat carrying out the IMF's austerity programs, has made the Egyptian economy a bad risk for the international investment community.

Sadat, fully aware of this, was forced to lower his sights and is now concentrating on three main direct looting areas, Business International reports: "Austerity in public expenditures combined with higher income tax and customs receipts...substantial cuts in price subsidies and most importantly a reformed currency exchange system." The Egyptian debt (in excess of \$16 billion) is such a headache, an IMF official confirmed that West German, British and France and the World Bank have formed a committee to monitor the debt on a monthly basis. If Sadat wants to remain in power he has to be able to implement the austerity and repay his debts to the New York banks, sources report.

Business International reports that the 30-40 per cent inflation rate is unpopular with Egyptians, yet it points out that if the country doesn't comply with the "stabilization program that the IMF has been urging for some time," then the Arab countries will not give Egypt any more credits. Fearing a collapse of Sadat, the IMF has been forced to adopt a policy of "wait and see." In a