

supportive policy for the new Israeli state. A Proskauer family member is on the executive board of the New York chapter of the American Jewish Committee.

A Proskauer, Rose partner, George Shapiro, was counsel in the 1940s to New York Governor Dewey and was the coordinator of Rothschild operations in the United States.

The Investment Houses

A small number of disproportionately powerful New York German-Jewish investment houses have for nearly a century controlled networks in the manipulation of the immigrant East European Jewish communities in New York who have formed the base for the Zionist appeal. These houses — Warburg-Schiff's Kuhn Loeb; Warburg, Pincus; Goldman, Sacks; and Lehman Brothers (the

latter two allied since 1906) — as early as the 1890s set up the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies as a "charity" cover for domestic counterinsurgency programs among American Jews. In the pre-World War I years, these banking houses set up the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee as a penetration network into Russia. The AJJDC was used as an organizational front for creating and sustaining Jewish "experimental communities" in Russia and Poland. Today Edward Warburg is the international chairman of the AJJDC.

During WWI the Rothschild-Brandeis Anglo-American conspiracy momentarily pre-empted and usurped the Schiffs' Jewish networks, which were operating primarily through Britain's war opponent Germany. Brandeis and Schiff had bitter fights about Brandeis' launching of a pro-Zionist crusade in the U.S. But with

What's Behind the 'Arab Boycott' Bills

In the coming weeks, the Carter Administration will attempt to get through Congress legislative action which would impose strict penalties on U.S. companies who participate in the so-called Arab boycott against Israel — despite clear warnings from the Arab oil producers and, in particular from Saudi Arabia, that if such legislation passes, they will view it as an attack on OPEC and will retaliate by cutting off all oil shipments to the United States.

The purpose of the legislation is in fact to provoke the Arabs into carrying out their threat. In the view of Carter's advisors, the U.S. would then have a pretext for direct U.S. intervention in the Middle East and increased leverage for the "energy crisis" crackdown at home. That U.S. military intervention is central to the "anti-boycott" bills was confirmed to NSIPS by Norman Podhoretz, member of the Committee on the Present Danger, an editor of *Commentary* magazine, and a prominent member of the 'Zionist lobby.' Podhoretz, asked if the threat of an oil boycott wasn't a big risk for the "Anti-boycotters" to take, replied, "We should take bigger risks. We should not allow oil blackmail. The U.S. should have threatened military intervention three years ago," during the October war. He went on to make a confident prediction that the Carter Administration will only "make passes" toward a Geneva Conference.

Carter has appointed two of his top aides, Bob Lipshutz and Stu Eisenstadt, to coordinate and prepare "public support" for the anti-Arab legislation through cultivation of the 'Zionist lobby.' Most of the important bills have already been drawn up and introduced in both the House and Senate.

The Senate Bill, S.92, was introduced on Jan. 10 by Harrison A. Williams (D-N.J.) and William Proxmire (D-Wisc). It is clear from the remarks by both Proxmire and Williams that their bill, which amend and extend the Export Administration Act,

is designed not just to prevent a boycott, but to bust up OPEC, prevent the Arabs from selling their oil, and prevent oil-for-technology trade agreements. Refusing to even mention the political demands of the Arabs, Williams and Proxmire, both advocates of a labor-intensive public works economy in the U.S., admit that an Arab oil and trade embargo against the U.S. would have severe consequences for the U.S. economy in that there is a "continuing increase in the level of trade in the Middle East as these countries continue to reinvest their petrodollars in American products, technology and know-how."

The provisions of the bill broaden the anti-Arab boycott restrictions to include any foreign instituted boycott and, therefore, could be utilized in moving against, for example, an EEC-initiated boycott of South Africa. It states that "it would be a violation of the Export Administration Act for any U.S. person to do or agree to comply with, further, or support a foreign boycott or restrictive trade practice against a country which is friendly to the United States and is not the object of any U.S. embargo." A similar bill was introduced in the House on the same day by Jonathon Bingham (D-N.Y.) and co-sponsored by another New York Democrat, Benjamin Rosenthal.

Senator Adlai Stevenson (D-Ill.) has sponsored yet another "anti-boycott" bill, S. 69. Although Stevenson claims his bill "bows to reality that an end to the primary boycott rests upon resolution of the underlying issues in the Middle East conflict, and that an attempt by Congress to legislate an end to the boycott would be futile and contrary to the interests of both Israel and the United States," he retains many of the Proxmire-Williams provisions. The bill does, however, permit Congress to override Presidential embargoes on agricultural sales abroad.