

fascism. This is at the least frivolous. It must be recognized that the "Fourth Party" can play a dangerous role in BRD political life for a variety of reasons.

Even the ministry of internal affairs of the BRD, in an account of its activity, has had to admit that never since 1945 has national socialism been so openly extolled in speeches, brochures and in various actions, as at the present time. The journal Spiegel identifies the new alarming tendency: along with the remnants of traditional "brown" unions with the Great German chauvinism and militarism, Spiegel writes, it is becoming more and more possible to make out the contours of a movement called the "new right," which counts among its members significant numbers of youth.

This does not just mean such extreme reactionary organizations as the "Fourth Party," "German Citizens Initiatives," or the "Military Alliance of German Soldiers," which are trying to openly whitewash the crimes of National-Socialism. A false sense of national exclusiveness is being heated up through ever more subtle methods. For example, the widely discussed theme in the press of the "Ugly German." This refers to the indulgence in national self-satisfaction of certain layers of the population, who are filled with the idea that "West Germans are too good-looking for their neighbors to like them," that others in the West are dissatisfied with the Federal Republic because economically and politically it is becoming the leading force in Western Europe, that they "envy" it. Such "argumentation" has its influence on the average man.

The impression is taking shape that the growing ideological and political pressure from the right is beginning to influence

the position of the parties of the government coalition. It is no coincidence that at the recent electoral congress of the SPD in Dortmund certain politicians, under the influence of conservative layers, had recourse to the lexicon used by the opposition.

But the rightist forces of the BRD are poorly taking into account the real international situation. The idea of detente has put down deep roots today in the consciousness of the broad masses of the population in all European countries. To oppose detente means to go contrary to the fundamental interests of the peoples of Europe, whose main desire is to ensure reliable conditions for peaceful development on the continent. The final act of the Helsinki conference, stresses the government of the BRD in its recent declaration, serves as a basis for concretizing the policy of relaxation of tensions in Europe.

The policy of our country and the entire socialist community on the whole complex of these questions is well known. "The Soviet Union," says the Declaration of the Soviet government of May 22, 1976, "intends to patiently and steadily look for new ways for the development of peaceful and mutually beneficial cooperation of states of differing social systems, to regulate disputed questions at the negotiating table. This is how the Soviet Union has conducted and will conduct its affairs with the Federal Republic of Germany." But we cannot bypass the growing activation of those circles in the BRD who are trying to undercut the good that has been accomplished in Soviet-West German relations, who are unpardonably distorting the foreign policy of the USSR, spreading falsehoods about its goals....

Kissinger's Lebanese Time Bomb Still Ticks

Soviets In Peace Offensive In Mideast

July 31 (NSIPS) — The Middle East this week was the scene of a powerful battle between the Soviet Union, which launched a two-pronged effort to end the bloodshed of the Lebanese civil war and to reconvene the Geneva Middle East peace conference, and the Rockefeller forces, who brought to bear the full strategic weight of U.S. military and political pressure to prevent the Soviet initiative from succeeding.

The Soviet campaign was announced in a July 27 Pravda article condemning present U.S.-Israeli policy in the Middle East and urging the immediate convening of Geneva. According to the London Observer, Soviet diplomats have recently begun a major effort to convey the importance of settling the crisis at Geneva before the outbreak of another Arab-Israeli war.

At the same time, the Soviet ambassadors in Beirut and Damascus quietly worked behind the scenes with Libyan Prime Minister Abdessalam Jalloud to reconcile Syria and the Palestine Liberation Organization, and, at Soviet prompting, after a series of preliminary contacts the head of the foreign relations department of the PLO, Faruq Kaddumi, went to Damascus to talk with Syrian Foreign Minister Abdel Halim Khaddam.

Yesterday, however, the tense negotiations in Damascus broke down under pressure from Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and Saudi Arabia, who sought to urge Syrian President Hafez Assad to continue his moves in Lebanon to exterminate the Lebanese left and the PLO. Heavy fighting again swept the Lebanese capital and the northern port of Tripoli after the collapse of the talks. There was no word on whether the negotiations were expected to resume.

Immediately following the end of the PLO-Syria talks, the U.S. and Israel directly threatened Lebanon. The commander of the U.S. Sixth Fleet naval task force that evacuated American citizens from Beirut last week told the press that his forces had stood ready during the operation to launch an assault by sea and

air, including air strikes against artillery positions, if the evacuation vessel had been attacked. At the same time, a leader of the Israeli Mapam party called for Israel to invade and occupy southern Lebanon as protection against guerrilla raids.

The Soviets demonstrated quite clearly that they will not tolerate such actions. The government Izvestia said that the struggle in Lebanon is a matter of "life and death" for the PLO, and added that the battle to defend the PLO was a crucial one for the entire Arab sector and the Third World. Three additional Soviet warships joined the Soviet fleet in the Mediterranean yesterday.

Iraqi president Bakr sent an urgent message to Moscow to Soviet Communist party chairman Leonid Brezhnev describing the situation now in Lebanon as "extremely serious." An Iraqi official told the Washington Post, "The regime in Syria will fall and it must fall." Indicating Syrian fears, the Syrian Defense Minister Ustafa Tlas toured the Iraq-Syria border area where Iraq has stationed six divisions of troops.

Libya sent a large number of troops and 66 armored cars into Lebanon via the southern port of Saida, to join the ineffectual Arab League peace-keeping force there.

With the fighting continuing to rage in Lebanon, the Mideast thus remains a flashpoint for escalation to a U.S.-USSR nuclear confrontation. Kissinger and his insane circle of advisors continue to smack their lips at the prospects of confrontation. This crew, which should be locked up in some funny farm rather than directing U.S. foreign policy, are back to repeating "their assessment" that the Soviets will never intervene in Lebanon — this despite direct and repeated, explicit warnings from the Soviets to the contrary.

The Kissinger circle has been aided in their war push by the Atlanticist press, especially the West German variety whose bloodlust is seemingly insatiable. This week they added a new

target — President Ford — for his praise of the PLO in aiding the successful sea evacuation of several hundred foreign nationals from Beirut via a U.S. Navy ship earlier in the week.

And while it is known that the White House stands privately committed to Geneva, they are moving only slowly if at all towards that direction — perhaps too slow to prevent Kissinger's mideast time bomb from going off.

Exclusive Interview

L. Dean Brown: "There Is No Initiative Except The Use Of Force" In Lebanon

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 29 (NSIPS) — The following interview was conducted several days ago with L. Dean Brown by an independent reporter who has made it available exclusively to NSIPS. Brown was recently Henry Kissinger's "trouble-shooter" in Lebanon, and served as U.S. Ambassador to Jordan during the 1970 "Black September" massacre of Palestinians. He has been publicly accused by Arab sources of deliberately fomenting the Lebanese civil war to its current intensity.

Q: Mr. Brown, Lebanese leftist leader Kamal Jumblatt earlier this week announced that his forces were setting up administrative governments in the territories they control. There are also reports that the Syrians are attempting to sever the alliance between the Palestine Liberation Organization and Jumblatt. Could you comment?

Brown: Yes, you could say there is pressure on the left in Lebanon and the PLO to make concessions that could lead to the breaking up of the resistance to peace. It is plausible and quite possible that that is what is going on right now. The various sections of the resistance will be isolated and forced to make concessions. If politically they won't concede, then there will be more bloodshed against these isolated pockets of resistance. Once again, I refuse to speculate, but that is plausible as a scenario.

Q: What about Mr. Jumblatt's administrative governments?

Brown: (laughs) So Jumblatt said what he said. What difference does it make anyway? If the Soviets were going to make any move, they would have done it by now. They didn't have to wait for Jumblatt to form a government to request it. Just because Jumblatt made that call, it doesn't mean that the Soviets are going to up their presence in the Middle East. They could have sent materiel in long ago, into Sidon, and they didn't. Do you really think the Soviets would put themselves on the side against Syria? Impossible! The Soviets are just looking on, and they are horrified.

Q: What about the Soviet policy of drawing the line, a nuclear trip-wire?

Brown: There is none. The Soviets won't intervene. On whose side?

Q: What about the role of the Egyptians behind the scenes?

Brown: No comment.

Q: Sadat has attacked the Syrians and...

Brown: Sadat is in a shaky position, but I don't think I should elaborate. He's interested in Egypt's economic development primarily.

Q: How so? What pressures would you say are on Sadat?

Brown: I really don't want to talk about Egypt. Except that Sadat maybe would like to send his army into Lebanon, but he can't — he has no men to spare.

Q: What about Army unrest. Many of Sadat's officers are Soviet-trained. Do you think they would end up on the PLO-left side?

Brown: No comment.

Q: What about the reports of a new peace accord between the PLO and Syria?

Brown: I'm skeptical until I see the details. We have seen so

many agreements come and go. The last time, they forgot Chamoun. Of course, I don't make policy, I can only comment, so I don't know if I can help you.

Q: The Financial Times of London has given full details on the proposed accord.

Brown: I haven't seen any details.

Q: Well, if there is a settlement, what role would Egypt play?

Brown: The Egyptians don't have much of a role. They are position-seeking, constantly worrying about who will replace Nasser. Sadat is not interested in playing that role. Remember, Sadat offered support to the left, but refused to send any troops, or tanks.

Q: What would the Soviets do if there is an accord?

Brown: I don't know, as I said, and they don't know. They are basically torn between their client states. They want peace. The Soviets are taking a broad view of the area. Remember what George McGovern said about using force to solve the Lebanon situation. Using force to do what? What is the purpose of force? It's nice to have statements. What is peace? What do the Syrians mean by peace?

Q: Well, what will the U.S. do? It cannot stand by and see a bigger war grow, can it?

Brown: The U.S. won't do anything. In normal circumstances, it is a threat to world peace. But there is no UN discussion. The Arab League will take care of the Arabs and the OAU will take care of the Africans.

Q: But there has to be some peace initiative the U.S. can take.

Brown: There is no initiative except the use of force, probably by one of the Arab League countries in the context of the Arab League.

Council On Foreign Relations: As Long As We've Got Chamoun We Can Mess Up Anything In Lebanon

July 29 (NSIPS) — The following July 27 interview with Joseph Campbell of the New York Council on Foreign Relations has been obtained exclusively by NSIPS. Campbell is one of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's unofficial but close advisors.

Q: Mr. Campbell, how would you evaluate the new peace accord between Syria and the Palestine Liberation Organization? Reportedly, the Soviets mediated the tentative agreement.

Campbell: I couldn't comment until I have seen the details. There is no authoritative proof that there really is an agreement. I can't follow the day-to-day details of this sort of thing. The PLO feels betrayed, put upon, and are in a difficult position. If the accord is for real, it will be very temporary anyway. The Arab League couldn't put together a peace force. It's all very unlikely. Even the Christians are strong enough for any army of the Saudis or Libyans. No, there could be no settlement by force. It must be by negotiation. As the Syrians are the power at hand and have the stronger force, it's up to them. They could, of course, support the PLO, but they don't want to do that.

Q: Do you think Egypt is playing an important role behind the scenes?

Campbell: Yes, I suppose they are working behind the scenes. They have an active military force in Lebanon and could be sending more armed troops. But Egypt's major concern is to end her isolationism. She is in relative diplomatic difficulty and has no way out. Lebanon puts Syria in the dock and takes the pressure off Egypt. No, Egypt cannot bring peace to Lebanon. Sadat's long range view is that he wants people to stop talking about what he did with Israel and get on with development and economic deals.

Q: What about the Soviets? What can they do in the situation?

Campbell: It's hard to see that they can do anything. I'm puzzled about that. How can they deal with Egypt, Syria and the

PLO? They don't want to put all their eggs in one basket, and don't want to support the PLO alone, nor give up the Syrians. The Soviets want the Arabs to turn to them, which will put them back in the picture in the old Turkish Empire.

Q: What do you think about the article in today's Christian Science Monitor by Lebanese A.J. Kfoury of MIT which attacks your policy of backing Syrian intervention, and calls for a new form of government in Lebanon centered around class-based rather than religious-based political parties?

Campbell: People in charge in Lebanon are animated by the old antagonisms. As long as people like Chamoun are in charge, there is no likelihood of change. Even when Franjeh has to step down, there will be no change. Franjeh ought to be pushed. He's been voted out, a new guy has been chosen and he is still there. You would think that everyone in the world would insist that he gets out.

Pentagon On Soviet Mideast Stance: "They Could Come On Fast"

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 32 (NSIPS) — The following interview was conducted three days ago with a man associated with the Pentagon. He is a Middle East expert who had just returned from a trip abroad relating to the Lebanese civil war.

Q: What do you think the Soviets might do in Lebanon?

A: They could come on quickly. They have a hell of a lot of hardware. They've upgraded the command quality and fleet deployments they have for the region. What's more, the people they've taken into the command units are important politically. At least one of them has to top political, not just military clout.

Q: What would you say the Soviets are considering?

A: The Soviets are trying to extricate themselves from a difficult situation. There's been too much written about links between the Palestinians and the Soviets. These two have always had a difficult time. The Soviets, I guess, are more worried now about their client-state Syria than they are about the PLO.

Q: Well, if the Soviets intervene it would be for the PLO, wouldn't it?

A: Concern about the Soviets moving into Lebanon is well-founded. There is now a greater potential for desperate or ill-conceived moves from the Soviets, because we've prevented an easy interchange through our method of diplomacy.

Q: I understand there is tremendous pressure on Sadat to do something about Lebanon, not only from the Soviets but internally, from his army and the Nasserite bureaucracy in Egypt.

A: Oh, yes, that's there. But one thing the Egyptians do pretty well is the secret police business. Sadat's boys are pretty well piped-in to these things, although they're worried about the universities. But they have confidence about the military and the state structures. Sadat publicly doesn't want to appear too cozily in the U.S. camp. There's genuine concern that he may have gone too far. The communiques about the recently signed loan agreement in Cairo between Eilts (U.S. Ambassador to Egypt) and Sadat's representative took pains to indicate that Egypt was not a U.S. "cats paw."

(A portion of the interview at this point must be considered confidential for the present.)

Q: Do you consider the tensions between Egypt and Libya a flashpoint?

A: Libya is worried, and so are the Egyptians. They're watching closely whether Libya moves are theirs or the Soviets. This is a key determination. Otherwise, an invasion of Libya is high on the Egyptians' agenda. They're just watching very closely. Their lines of communication are very good. The Egyptians trained most of the Libyan Army.

Exclusive Translation from Pravda

"A Firm Peace For The Mideast"

July 29 (NSIPS) — The following editorial appeared July 27 on the front page of Pravda, the official newspaper of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It is reprinted in full.

Settlement of the dangerous conflict in the Middle East, where the situation continues to be extremely tense, remains not only an important, but an urgent task. For many years now, this region has lived in a state of constant tension, and has become one of the hottest 'hot spots' on the planet. Four times in a relatively brief historical period, the lack of a settlement of the conflict has led to large scale armed clashes between Israel and the Arab states. And each flare-up in turn has taken more human lives and left more suffering and destruction in its path.

In the report of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party Soviet Union comrade L.I. Brezhnev to the 25th Congress of the CPSU, it was noted that the dangerous situation in the Middle East will remain "as long as the Israeli armies remain on the occupied territories. It will remain, as long as hundreds of thousands of Palestinians, driven from their land, are deprived of their legal rights and live in deperate circumstances, and as long as the Arab people of Palestine is deprived of the opportunity to create its own national state."

The responsibility for this abnormal situation lies above all on those imperialist forces which attempt to reign supreme in the Middle East and to keep control over its natural resources, above all oil. These forces support the expansionist policy of the ruling circles of Israel, which is occupying almost 60,000 square kilometers of Arab land. Israel refuses to satisfy the just national demands of the three-million-strong Arab people of Palestine. While the aggressor continues illegally to enjoy the fruits of its criminal policy, the legal interests and rights of the victims of aggression are trampled on. Under such circumstances, there can be neither stability nor calm in the Middle East.

The bloody events in Lebanon prove anew how unstable is the present Mideast situation, and how dangerous for the cause of peace is the artificial delay in settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. It is clear that no internal contradictions in that Arab country could have led to such destructive consequences, had it not been for the interference of Israel and the imperialist circles which are its protectors, who strive to ignite disputes between Arab states, to distract them from the struggle for their national interests.

Although the process of relaxation of tensions taking place on the world scene has created new conditions for the solution of Mideast problems, the arms race is not slackening in this region; the militarization of Israel is proceeding on a huge scale. The United States are sending there various types of modern weapons, including missiles capable of carrying both conventional and nuclear charges. A number of Persian Gulf countries, where rightist, conservative regimes are in power, are simultaneously receiving many billions of dollars worth of arms. The Arab press reports attempts to forge a military bloc there, which would be subservient to the West, under the false pretext of defending the wealth of the Gulf from a supposed "communist threat."

The ruling circles of Tel Aviv continue to justify their illegal territorial pretensions against the Arabs by their aspiration to establish "secure" borders for Israel. But the experience of history teaches that it is impossible to ensure security through aggression and seizure of others' land. Political settlement is

the only alternative to tension in the Middle East. In this, one of the basic principles of international life must be strictly observed — the principle of not taking territory by war.

In the recently published Statement of the Soviet Government on the situation in the Middle East, it is stated that the USSR decisively advocates a radical political settlement of the Mideast conflict. The basis for such a settlement should consist of three organically interconnected elements. These are the withdrawal of Israel troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967; the satisfaction of the legal national demands of the Arab people of Palestine, including its inalienable right to create its own state; and the creation of international guarantees of the security and inviolability of borders of all states in the Middle East, and of their right to independent existence and development.

This is the realistic basis for settling the conflict, and corresponds to the resolutions of the U.N. Security Council and General Assembly. There is also an international mechanism for working out the necessary agreements — the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East. For a long time the conference has not been functioning, above all because of the stand of the USA and Israel. The Soviet Union is for the renewal of its work with the participation of all sides immediately interested, including the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Rightist Arab circles have recently been putting forward the idea that calm in the Middle east should be achieved by any means, even political and economic concessions to imperialism or yielding several national and social gains of the Arab countries. As was noted at the recent Third Congress of the Iraqi Communist Party, the Arab East has become the arena of intense struggle between the Arab liberation movement and its allies — the forces of progress and socialism — on the one hand, and imperialism and its henchmen — Israel and the reactionary regimes — on the other. Progressive Arab circles consider that a genuine settlement in the Middle East can and ought to be achieved under conditions of unflagging development along the path which corresponds to the interests of the popular masses. The Soviet Union steadfastly supports the just stands of the Arab states in the struggle for peace and the aspiration of the Arab peoples towards freedom and progress in advocating a comprehensive settlement of the Mideast problem.

The program put forward by the 25th Congress of the CPSU, for further struggle for peace and international cooperation, for freedom and independence of peoples, posed the task of “con-

NATO Provocation In Aegean

Wall Street Manufactures Greece-Turkey Crisis

July 31 (NSIPS) — Greek and Turkish armed forces remain on high alert following the sailing of a Turkish oil exploration vessel, the Sismik I, into the Aegean Sea this week. Despite pledges by Turkish Prime Minister Suleyman Demirel that the ship would not enter Greek waters, units of the Greek navy and airforce have been deployed to monitor the ship's movements and retaliate militarily in the event of any incursion into Greek territory.

Such a Greek-Turkish clash in the Aegean would cap U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's month-long effort to manufacture a confrontation. This campaign has involved manipulation of traditional Greek-Turkish rivalries, using the NATO-concocted issue of oil rights, in the Aegean Sea, to set the stage for a NATO intervention to “solve” the crisis. The entire region would then fall under a NATO directed, Wall Street-backed austerity regime.

For several weeks, the NATO-controlled Turkish National Se-

curity Council and Turkish “social democratic” opposition leader Bulent Ecevit have been exerting extreme pressure on the Demirel regime to go ahead with the Aegean provocation and send the exploration ship into the disputed waters. The issue is designed to destabilize Demirel, who, pushed by pro-development Turkish businessmen and industrialists, is considering expanding ties with the Soviet bloc and possibly declaring a debt moratorium on debts owed to Wall Street and the IMF. Hasan Isik, Ecevit's chief aide and former defense minister, announced this week in an exclusive interview: “If Demirel even considers debt moratoria, we won't allow him to get any support. We prefer to reduce our consumption.” Ecevit is currently in the U.S. on a 10-day visit, personally arranged by Henry Kissinger, who is grooming Ecevit to topple Demirel and impose austerity measures in Turkey.

The Greek left, the Soviet Union, and the German Democratic Republic (DDR) have responded to the Aegean war scenario. The Greek Communist Party has charged NATO for “culti-

West German Editorials on Mideast

July 30 (NSIPS) — The following are two editorials which appeared recently in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, both signed by Harald Vocke, from Damascus. The *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* is one of West Germany's leading newspapers. Its editorial policies for an extended period have both directly reflected U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's latest policy decisions, and directly signalled that such policies in each particular case were now adopted Atlanticist-U.S. policy.

July 24 — “Courage Against Terrorism”

Syrian President Assad gave an important speech this week. With unmitigated sharpness, he settled accounts with the Palestinian partisans whose goal in the fighting is to grab all the power in Lebanon for themselves... In Damascus, people no longer have any illusions about people like Arafat or the chief terrorist in Beirut, Salah Chalaf; if they finally gained power, they would have SS torture methods used, and they bear the responsibility for the gruesome war conduct of the Fatah partisans...

Today, Syrian President Assad is what Egypt's Sadat is unfortunately no longer: a courageous man.

July 28 — “Thank You Terrorists”

President Ford expressed his thanks to the American soldiers, diplomats and “the others” who participated in the Tuesday evacuation of 300 foreigners from Beirut. A press spokesman said that “the others” meant the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). The Palestinian terrorists who have destroyed dozens of Christian churches in Lebanon, who have shot thousands of Christian Lebanese, who have recently carried out barbarically cruel acts... have earned thanks, according to President Ford...

America's friends will have to accept that in an election year, the U.S. will reject for its own reasons any intervention into the Lebanese muddle. But the President's words of thanks to the partisans in Lebanon — that's going too far. With that kind of opportunism, Ford can scarcely win the election in his own country.