

Butros specifically appealed to the U.S. Ambassador in Lebanon to cool down the Israelis.

Speaking in his first public address as Israeli Prime Minister, Likud party leader Menachem Begin indicated his awareness of the war danger and declared that the main task of his new government is "to avoid a new Mideast war." Begin also indicated that his regime would favor a "normalization" of relations with the Soviet Union.

But while Begin spoke, Israel continued its shelling of southern Lebanese villages. Latest reports from Beirut indicate that heavy Israeli reconnaissance flights over Lebanon have started again. Since the May 17 Israeli elections, Israel has been playing a more active role in its northern border with extensive "road carving operations." They are now completing a road going from Israel into southern Lebanon which, said the *London Times*, "could prove to be the flash point for another Mideast war." Israel also carried out a test of its emergency mobilization system this week.

On the ground in Lebanon, a major onslaught against the Palestinians is being prepared with a 2,000-man Christian force backed by the Israelis, now massed in the south for an "all out battle" that could drag both Israeli and Syrian troops into the battle. If the Palestinians respond by moving their entire strength to the southern town of Arkoub, they could, says the *Financial Times*, come into "full confrontation" with the Israelis whose "strategic road" gives easy access for their troops. Observers in Beirut now say that "time is already running out for any hopes of a peaceful settlement."

#### *Arab Mediation*

Lebanese President Sarkis is now seeking a settlement in a meeting with PLO Executive Committee member Hani Hassan. Sarkis has been trying to form a independent Lebanese army to reinstate Lebanese control

over the country, an effort sabotaged largely by the Chamounists.

From the Arab side, the primary task is to find a military force that can crush the extremist Lebanese right in the south of Lebanon which, backed by Israel, threatens to explode the area. Syrian troops, 30,000 of which are now stationed in Lebanon, cannot enter the south without giving Israel a pretext to invade Lebanon.

A head-to-head clash is shaping up in the Arab world between a bloc of states led by Libya and another bloc that is leaning toward Carter. The Libyans — backed by Iraq, Algeria, the PLO, and several small pro-British oil sheikhdoms in the Gulf — are organizing for an Arab heads of state summit to deal with the Lebanon crisis. On the other hand, Egypt has said that it opposes the idea of an Arab summit, calling it "unnecessary" and preferring to wait until after the Vance trip in July. Foreign Minister Tareiki of Libya arrived yesterday in Saudi Arabia, which holds the decisive vote, to push for an immediate summit to draw up a common Arab position.

Throughout Lebanon, Syria and Jordan, a battle is also raging in political circles over the crisis. Yasser Arafat of the PLO and his deputy Farouk Kaddoumi, and King Hussein of Jordan, arrived in Damascus for talks with President Assad of Syria, whose troops hold the balance of power in Lebanon. According to the *Financial Times* of London, the Syrians are attempting to work out a formula that will create a Lebanese national army (the original was shattered during the two-year civil war), and thus establish a ceasefire in the south along with joint Palestinian-Christian truce patrols.

But, the entire Arab East is split over this policy: evidence of how deep the fight goes is the fact that in the past month there have been attempted coups in Saudi Arabia, Syria and Jordan — all of which failed.

## U.S. Mideast Policy:

# 'Amateur Night In Washington'

The May 17 victory of the Likud Party in Israel, which was in large part attributable to Jimmy Carter's reckless Mideast policy pronouncements during the first four months of his presidency, has created intractable policy dilemmas for the Carter Administration. Carter has been reduced to a mess of carelessly thought-out improvisations and bluffs, aimed, alternately, at Israeli and Arab leaders and supporters, as the Administration tries to cover up for the embarrassment of having to integrate the fanatical Likud into a coherent policy overview. In the words of one veteran U.S. Mideast strategist, "It's amateur night in Washington."

The Administration's impasse is like the "Scylla-Charybdis" myth of Greek mythology; whatever direction Carter now takes toward Israel threatens to be a disaster for the U.S. strategic position in the Mideast. Continuing along the path charted by National Security Council head Zbigniew Brzezinski, by which Carter is to issue emotionally-laden pronouncements, ostensibly

pleasing to manipulable Arab leaders and seeming to "pressure" Israel into concessions, will either destabilize Israel's sense of security enough to force a preemptive strike, or encourage ruling Israeli circles to seek alternative security guarantees from the Europeans and Soviets.

A Carter "pro-Israel" turn, however, will only hasten Arab moves toward the Europeans and Soviets, and will risk a nuclear war showdown with the Soviet Union which the United States will lose. Moreover, there is no guarantee that at this point, the newly installed Begin government will choose to be a sacrificial pawn for Trilateral Commission global policy.

The collapse of Carter's Mideast approach is being increasingly recognized in U.S. circles. A Midwest think-tanker affirmed this week that if clear policy formulations are not forthcoming from the Administration within two to three months, the U.S. will face a "complete disaster" in the Mideast. An aide to U.S. Senator Javits

told reporters this week that the Mideast threatens to become Carter's "third foreign policy failure" — after the boomeranging of both the Administration's recent SALT talks bluff with the Soviets and the "human rights" issue at Belgrade's European security and cooperation talks.

According to the French daily newspaper *Le Matin*, "a nightmare" haunts Washington because of Carter's "equivocation." There could be a "fifth Arab-Israeli war, which could set off a nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union."

A key feature in the widely recognized U.S. policy collapse has been the openly bitter attacks against Brzezinski, especially from layers within the U.S. "Jewish Lobby" leadership, but also the Israelis themselves. A top Jewish lobby spokesman in Washington has complained to reporters that "Brzezinski is leading Carter astray, down the garden path" with his "academic" advice. Max Fisher, the top fundraiser for Israel in the United States, exclaimed in an interview recently: Brzezinski is a "stinking bastard" who is undermining Israeli security, distorting the Arab countries' real need for peace, and ruining U.S. influence in the Mideast.

So disturbed is the Israeli leadership by Brzezinski's formulations that a special study has been initiated by the Israeli Foreign Ministry of all of Brzezinski's Mideast policy ideas throughout the past decade; this study was denounced by the National Security Council as an "unfair" attempt to expose Brzezinski.

Throughout this month, numbers of Israeli analysts have charged the Carter Administration with responsibility for raising the war danger in the Mideast. Reporting on signs of increased Arab military movements, a right-wing Israeli paper commented June 9 that this activity "results to no small extent from Carter's statements." During his visit to the U.S. earlier this month, Begin's special envoy, Samuel Katz, warned that the policies of both Brzezinski and his predecessor, Henry Kissinger, would be relegated to the "garbage can of history." He told reporters in New York that Brzezinski's policies would force Israel to "fight for its existence in the streets of Tel Aviv" in a devastating fifth Arab-Israeli war. He informed reporters that Israel wanted "real peace . . . but not along the lines laid down by the *New York Times*."

Whether this reaction in Israel can possibly break decades of shifting tactical and strategic alliances with the reigning U.S. and British monetarist factions, provoking constructive Israeli approaches to the western Europeans, is at this point a moot question. One Washington source speculated that Israel could open up conversations with western Europe simply to "alarm the U.S."

#### *Carter Maneuvers*

Carter himself has repeatedly tried over the past ten days to "reassure" Israel's supporters that U.S. policy, is, as ever, to back up a "strong Israel," but the efforts so far have all been flops.

A June 17 San Francisco Mideast policy speech by "friend of Israel" Vice President Walter Mondale was touted before its delivery as a major attempt to win Israeli allegiance to Carter policy. Once delivered, it was

labeled "warmed-over Brzezinski" by U.S. Jews, and was also derided as the "same old formulas" in Israel. The speech in fact turned out to be a repetition of the Carter homilies that have flowed out of a 1975-76 Brookings Institute Mideast policy study in which Brzezinski participated. The *Washington Post* simply noted it was written in large part by the National Security Council staff.

Two days earlier, "pro-Israel" U.S. Senator Humphrey emerged from meetings with Carter to "reassure" American Jews that Carter supported a "strong State of Israel." According to the June 17 *New York Times*, Humphrey's words were "received coolly" by the Jewish leaders.

Carter also has held meetings with several leading U.S. Jewish leaders and with the Chief Rabbi of Israel, Shlomo Goren. In the latter case, Carter threw a bluff at the Arabs, ostensibly proclaiming the he "never supported a Palestinian state," despite his provocative proclamations in favor of a Palestinian "homeland." The words were an obvious trial balloon to the effect that Carter would veer toward Israel openly if the Arabs consolidated a post-dollar set of financial and political alliances with the Soviets and Europeans.

A second Carter bluff will come with the visit of U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance to the Mideast late next month. During this visit, Vance will carry to all the Arab states and Israel a series of promises that he has no intention of fulfilling, just to keep the Arab states from bolting from Carter for a few months.

Vance is working from a position of weakness. *Le Matin* insists that "if the U.S. is to maintain its credibility in the eyes of the Arabs, he had better not return empty-handed."

Carter's "credibility" on Capitol Hill is also at stake. Leading senatorial offices are sending out the word that Carter has until the mid-July meetings with Begin in Washington to produce some concrete U.S. policy initiatives before his Mideast formulas are treated as a thorough failure.

These senators, as well as veterans of Mideast diplomacy, know that time is short. The leading advocates of a policy of "allowing Carter time to work out his policy," Egypt's Sadat and Syria's Assad, are under enormous pressure from Iraq, Libya, and nationalist forces within their countries to break with this patient attitude. Meanwhile, the volatile southern Lebanese situation is increasingly raising the spectre of an uncontrollable regional war, forcing Syria and Egypt to maintain near war mobilization. Finally, both Assad and Sadat are faced with massive economic problems of their own, and are not expected to survive long if the current Mideast impasse continues.

#### Javits Aide: Mideast May Be Carter's 'Third Disaster'

*The following is part of an interview this week with an aide to Republican Senator Jacob Javits of New York:*

**Q:** Are the rise to power of the Likud in Israel and the failure of the U.S. to promote a clear Middle East foreign policy precipitating a profound crisis among our European allies? A disaster in U.S. foreign policy seems to be definitely emerging.

A: A disaster? Well, obviously, Carter's top three initiatives — human rights, SALT, and the Mideast — have gone sour. Carter has spent a tremendous amount of time on Mideast questions and obviously has a big stake in bringing peace to the area. It's very serious for him. As perceived here, the problem with Carter is this: There's no firm hand on the rudder. His relations with Congress are very poor. These poor relations have been highly exacerbated by the bizarre performances coming from the White House, the goofs and the gaffes. There are no people in charge of relations with Capitol Hill. Carter, Brzezinski, Vance — all have no feel for the Hill. Mondale is, of course, different on this. The problem, then, is that as long as there's no hand at the tiller in Washington, the mice will begin to play. That is happening here now with senators and congressmen.

### Jackson Aide: Brzezinski's Policy 'Bush League Stuff,' No Peace In Sight

*The following is an interview with an aide to Sen. Henry Jackson of Washington.*

Q: Do you think that Brzezinski's Mideast policies have been a disaster, as Joseph Kraft outlined in his article this week?

A: It's not quite a disaster. But their idea of keeping the Israeli Labour Party in power was counterproductive — this was bush league stuff. If you add this up with their hope to buy off the Arabs with promises, the whole policy is unrealistic. It's nice to get the Arabs to feel good, but if they aren't going to get anything — and they won't because Israel will not give back anything — then it could lead to disaster. What you'll get pretty soon is not an event, but a process, more of the salami tactics. You can call it a return to the step-by-step strategy of Kissinger. You won't get a comprehensive deal. No one is ready for that. No one trusts each other. And speaking as an Israel watcher, this wariness is justified on Israel's behalf. You can't trust the Arabs.

Q: Is that to mean a resumption of cold war tactics?

A: Yes, if you like. But if you have a choice between cold war and hot, at least in a cold war no one gets killed. The U.S. has had such relations with the Soviets for years and no one was killed. No, this thing can go on for years — 10, 20 years or more. Some international situations cannot be resolved.

Q: Isn't what you're saying contrary to what Begin means when he calls for face-to-face talks with the Arabs?

A: Face-to-face can lead to step-by-step. It's all part of the same thing. When Begin says he wants face-to-face talks, he doesn't mean he intends to solve the problems there and then. It doesn't mean a comprehensive deal.

### Jewish Lobby: Carter and Brzezinski Going 'Down Garden Path'

*The following is an interview with a spokesman close to the U.S. "Jewish Lobby."*

Q: I understand that you people don't like Brzezinski?

A: It's not that we don't like Brzezinski. We don't like the line that is coming out of the National Security Council. This stuff on an Israeli withdrawal and a Palestinian homeland may be a real disaster for the U.S. So far, U.S. policy has been pure Brzezinski, and that's bad. Brzezinski has a total lack of perception of Israeli fears. He wants an imposed settlement, period! On the other hand, the State Department is more perceptive.

Q: The State Department! I was under the impression they were pro-Arab.

A: Yeah, but they're professionals. They know that it's no good for Carter to say, "There should be a return to the 1967 borders, but the parties involved should work it out," because then the Arabs know the starting point once he's said it. And that in turn creates the danger of rising expectations in the Arab world, and therefore increases the danger of violent tactics on their part.

Look, the problem is this. Carter is not responsible. It's the advice he's getting. It's bad advice from Brzezinski. And Mondale's speech today — the one that was to be so pro-Israel — is not a Mondale speech. It's warmed-over Brzezinski.

Vance and Habib in the State Department have more of a sense of how the Middle East works. Brzezinski feels he has to have a confrontation in U.S.-Israeli relations. You know, Brzezinski is taking a private sounding in the Senate on support for an imposed solution. He's an academic, who is leading Carter astray, down the garden path.