

French Press Hails Sadat Trip As Prelude To Mideast Development

Under the front-page banner headline, "Peace will permit a powerful economic takeoff in the Middle East, but not for tomorrow," the French financial daily Les Echos of Nov. 22 urged a cautious appraisal of Egyptian President Sadat's historic trip to Jerusalem. At the same time, however, the article, which is excerpted here, emphasized the tremendous potential for the economic development of the whole region under the terms of a successful peace settlement.

... The Egyptian President unlocked (the door to peace) by de facto acknowledging the existence of Israel, but Menachem Begin did not open the door: he will not go to Cairo.

However, hopes are still high. The negotiations between the two chiefs of state will continue. Peace in the Middle East would have a powerful economic impact. Peace would allow the resumption of aborted economic projects and the development of areas that have been sacrificed for thirty years. The southwestern part of Syria, for instance, has never been brought back to life because of the state of belligerency. The West Bank has had to stop its agricultural exports. The Arab countries that hold dollars would not hesitate to finance projects such as the creation of tax-free zones in Egypt... The Israelis, on the other hand, would not fail to provide their advanced technologies.

But all of this is utopian as long as peace has not been definitely reestablished. Everybody is speaking of peace but even the more optimistic ones acknowledge that, unfortunately, it is not for tomorrow.

The same issue of Les Echos carried an article bylined Tristan Doelnitz, which is based on an interview with Gen. Georges Buis, one of the world's foremost geopolitical experts. The headline was: "With peace, the

Middle East could again take the path toward economic unity, in General Buis's estimation." Excerpts appear below:

The main consequences of a possible peace in the Middle East are to be found on several levels:

1) The Arab states, once "liberated" from the Palestine question, will seek every means to reduce the divisions they inherited from the colonial period;

2) The development effort, thwarted by war, will be resumed, including Egypt and Syria;

3) The reduction in arms sales to the region will be more than compensated by more sales in other parts of the world;

4) The United States is bound to undergo the growing influence of petrodollar inflows.

... Independently from the regimes in power, the Arab states will endeavor to reach the unity that they have been dreaming of ever since the dismemberment of the Ottoman empire in 1920...

The Baa'th party — the party in office in Iraq — stressed the fact that the Arab problem is not sentimental but economic...

... Peace is, however, an economic must for Egypt. General Buis referred me to the case of the Answan Dam, which was a failure because of the lack of necessary investments for the completion of a power plant and the development of irrigation...

Syria ran into the same setbacks with the huge dam of Tapka, on the Euphrates, as Egypt did with the Answan Dam. With peace, the Syrians will recapture their traditional trade outlets on the Mediterranean through Tripoli and Beirut...

Capital inflows are likely to increase in Egypt... but through the mediation of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia... On the other hand, petrodollar inflows into the U.S., which now amount to \$20 billion a year, should reach the \$70 billion mark in 1982. Under those conditions, Arab investors in the U.S. are bound to exert a considerable weight against the Zionist lobby in Washington.

The Truth Of The Begin-Sadat Meeting

The following statement was released on Nov. 22, 1977 by Lyndon H. LaRouche, chairman of the U.S. Labor Party.

The way in which an American patriot should view the summit meeting of Israel's Menachem Begin and Egypt's Anwar Sadat is that, happily, once again U.S.A. intelligence services have defeated British intelligence services in a battle in the Middle East. The objections to this summit by Henry Kissinger and various Republican dupes of Kissinger should be viewed in exactly these terms of reference.

This is not to imply that Israel's Prime Minister Begin is a puppet of the U.S.A. Central Intelligence Agency. Rather, proceeding from an understanding of genuine, long-term U.S. interests, key parts of the U.S. Executive

Branch chose to support Begin's effort — with certain important conditions attached, conditions which are broadly in the genuine interest of the Middle East Arab populations. In this respect, the Carter Administration is to be credited with rejecting Kissinger's bankrupt imperialist doctrines in favor of a Republican approach to foreign policy.

As my friends in the Iraqi Ba'ath national leadership will recognize from our discussions of April, 1975, the Begin-Sadat summit is a vindication of the strategic perception which I and my associates have pursued openly as well as behind the scenes since that date. Although the Labor Committees can not take credit for the recent developments, our efforts have contributed to shaping perceptions in various relevant quarters toward this result, and because of this result, and because of

these efforts, we have been privy to enough of the proceedings overall to know the most essential features of the process.

The Intelligence Side

The most efficient point of reference for understanding the Middle East, as well as many other continuing problems of the post-war world, is knowledge of the points of conflict between the U.S.A. and British intelligence services during the World War II period. This is complicated by the fact that some elements of British intelligence tend to be pro-U.S.A. on vital points of policy, whereas a large part of U.S. intelligence and related establishments, including Henry Kissinger, are predominantly pro-British in policy-perceptions and alignments.

The case of international terrorism in western Europe is exemplary. Leaving the complicated case of post-Occupation and still semi-occupied West Germany to one side for the moment, the areas of western continental Europe from which terrorists are deployed against Germany today are those areas from which British intelligence predominantly excluded U.S. intelligence during World War II, for example, the French area adjoining the Swiss and Italian borders, and the Low Countries.

Although the USA made heavy inroads into Islamic areas, these areas were predominantly under control of British intelligence, with a limited French influence, throughout the Middle East, and into the Maghreb nations. British intelligence is the principal source of nasty problems to this present date — including Libya and Algeria, and the elements of the Institute for Policy Studies involved in Middle East terrorism, which are in close collaboration with British intelligence networks.

That conflict between U.S. and British intelligence is most relevant to the ironies of the summit meeting between Begin and Sadat. Menachem Begin has important friends in Britain, but historically he is devoutly anti-British. Although Sadat was nominally a Rommel spy during World War II, this was in fact a cover for Sadat's role as an American ally against British intelligence operations. It is Begin and Sadat's common enmity against British intelligence from the late 1930s and early 1940s which provided, not accidentally, an important contributing basis for personal accord during their recent meetings.

However, Begin was not a U.S. protégé during recent years — quite the opposite. The dominant forces of the Manhattan establishment side of U.S. intelligence were, predominantly, closely allied with British intelligence. Under this arrangement, the Socialist International, which has been predominantly under the control of British Intelligence, became the chief U.S. protégé in Israel itself. Hence, the Israeli Socialist Party, the Mapai, became the chief safehouse for Anglo-American controlled agents in Israel politics.

The Anglo-American side of U.S. intelligence networks has followed its own version of the British intelligence doctrine for the Middle East: a doctrine of keeping Israel and Arabs at each others' throats as a device for ensuring London-Manhattan control of Middle East petroleum. This agreement London and Manhattan was

complicated by competition — sometimes brutal — between the two cities. Nonetheless, the competition was pursued within the framework of a common overall Israeli-Arab conflict policy.

This is the key to Henry Kissinger's step-by-step policy. London has been consistently against any durable solution to Israeli-Arab conflicts. London's policy, shared by Kissinger, is to limit negotiations to *partial* solutions, partial agreements which keep open the possibility of London's — or, Kissinger's — launching a new Israeli-Arab war whenever the politics of oil might prescribe this.

Begin, a long-standing Israeli nationalist, has sought to get Israel out of this British trap. Given Israel's weakness, Begin has been obliged to follow the sort of Machiavellian policy previously employed by the American Revolution and the young United States. He is obliged, on the one side, to maneuver externally in respect to the relations among the great powers as well as internal complications of Arab politics. Begin, by placing his small margin of power in the balance among other forces, has attempted to use that method as a way of giving Israeli national interests the kind of leverage which could substitute for Israel's weakness as a power in its own right.

Relative to the OECD nations, Begin has exploited two features of U.S.-Soviet relations. First, despite the discredited doctrine of "non-linkage" employed during the early weeks of the Carter Administration, events have instructed the Carter Administration to the effect that the mere assertion of a non-linkage does not eliminate a linkage in fact. There can be no successful SALT agreement between the USA and the Soviet Union without neutralizing the potentiality of a general war triggered by a new Middle East war. Second, any sharp increase in oil prices or reductions in supply from the Middle East would be a disaster for western Europe and Japan, as well as a hideous blow to the oil-importing developing nations. Consequently, the USA cannot maintain and develop alliances with western Europe and Japan except by working for a durable solution to the Middle East problem. Obviously, the success of Begin's efforts to gain a durable solution for Israel coincides precisely with any intelligent perception of vital U.S. interests.

Consequently, once the State Department and Brzezinski moved on the basis of that reality, it was the clear duty of U.S. diplomatic and intelligence services to act to the effect of neutralizing and defeating British intelligence — and Henry Kissinger — in defense of the success of Begin's efforts.

Begin's Two Problems

Prime Minister Begin's two principal problems within the Middle East itself are these. Without the establishment of a Palestinian Arab nation, no durable solution to Israel's Middle East problems is available. Begin is aware of this, but can move in such a direction only if the initiative to this end is properly given from the Arab side, and if the arrangement is endorsed with guarantees of Israeli security by relevant Arab nations and the great and middle powers. This prescribes difficult, often byzantine maneuvering in respect to both internal and

external politicking. Secondly, Israel is suffering most acutely the economic problems derived from military debt and the present world depression. Israel needs hard-commodity export credit without which there is no solution to Israel's internal problem.

There are three fronts on which Israel must absolutely win a policy of regional economic growth. These are Lebanon, the Palestinian Arab area, and Egypt, with Jordanian participation in the same policy. Without technologically vectored economic growth in the Palestinian Arab areas, a Palestinian Arab state merely becomes a new political ulcer threatening to freshly destabilize the whole region. Lebanon must be economically stabilized, otherwise, Kissinger's civil war in Lebanon must rage on with an acquired life of its own. Egypt and Sudan together represent half of the World's Arab population. With Iran, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Sudan engaged in a general explosion of technologically vectored economic growth, and with Israel's variously direct and indirect participation in mediating Arab economic development, the economic preconditions for Middle East peace are established — and not otherwise.

The key to such an Israeli perspective is made clear by identifying the three points in the entire region from which nuclear technology can radiate. France, West Germany, and Japan, with Soviet cooperation, are now situated to massively export full-fuel cycle nuclear technology into the developing sector. What are required are points within the Middle East, Africa and Asia through which to mediate those nuclear exports in a general way to all the nations of the developing sector regions involved.

The primary mediating agency is the nation of India. India, which has the third largest scientific and engineering population of all the nations of the world, also has an important nuclear engineering and related research capacity, but a grievous shortage of capital. India is the primary nation for mediating nuclear technology throughout the subcontinent and the east coast of Africa. The second national economy capable of performing such a role is the Republic of South Africa. The third nation with such appropriate capabilities is Israel.

The significance of Israeli technology for Egypt is exemplary. Cooperation among Egypt, Sudan and Ethiopia as the ecological basis for a massive hydraulic engineering effort for the reversal of the process of desertification in northern Africa requires a two-fold approach. In the intermediate term, the establishment of plant moisture respiration over large areas will create new weather systems increasing significantly the natural rainfall in northern Africa. To reach that condition, we must first produce massive inputs of new water, through desalination, as well as improved uses of existing water supplies. Desalination of water will be a major consumer of produced energy, for which nuclear and later fusion power is the only suitable source in general. Also, the old bed of the Nile, leading into the Quattara Depression, represents a massive desalination process and a major engineering challenge for this reason. The opening of that old bed of the Nile is the key to qualitatively expanding arable land in Egypt, and also

key to providing the ecological basis for generating new weather systems later on.

Although Israel does not have presently the capability for exporting nuclear energy production on a significant scale, it is qualified to participate in a most useful way in realizing applications of nuclear technology, including the application of nuclear technology to ecological development programs.

This same technology is urgent for the Middle East itself, for restoring the Fertile Crescent. French and German nuclear-energy production inputs, Italian engineering inputs such as those Italstat is conducting in Iran and has projected for North Africa, typify the OECD inputs into the area. These OECD inputs must be aided by the role of mediators, such as Israel, India, and the Republic of South Africa for the nations of that part of the developing sector generally.

Given an Israel export role defined by such high-technology economic cooperation, the internal Israeli problems are eminently soluble and a durable basis for mutual security through economic cooperation is established in the region generally.

The British Saboteurs

Although there are important forces in the United Kingdom whose views converge upon our own, for the moment the dominant forces in British government, intelligence, and finance are working the side opposite to USA basic interests. In the collection of British agents-in-fact we must include Henry Kissinger as well as Felix Rohatyn.

The minutes of the Federal Reserve Board's Open Market Committee tell part of the story. With complicity of Blumenthal at Treasury, the U.S. dollar is operating in a hyperinflationary spiral, with the aid of faked statistics on M-1 and M-2 categories of liquidity. The dollar is being wrecked in value by the Humphrey-Mondale wing of the Democratic Party, with complicity from the Kissinger-duped nebbishes of the Republican National Committee. This wrecking of the dollar is being accomplished by forces allied to London to the advantage of London at USA expense.

The Fabian (British-linked) wing of the Democratic Party (Humphrey, Mondale et al.) is pushing the Schlesinger "energy doctrine." This involves a growth of USA petroleum imports caused by massive stockpiling of petroleum in anticipation of the Middle East war which London's and Kissinger's policies are working to bring into being. It involves sabotage of the U.S. dollar through an antinuclear policy which blocks the only major category of exports through which to restore USA trade balances and to restore employment in such basic industry as steel — again in favor of London at U.S. expense.

It must be understood that London wishes a new Middle East war. London views a war as cutting off Middle East petroleum and forcing a massive rise in OPEC oil prices, thus breaking the back of western Europe and Japan, and forcing those nations to submit to a neo-Schachtian (i.e., fascist) global economic and social policy. By wrecking the world economy in this way, and establishing the power of the City of London at the expense of a bankrupted U.S. dollar, the gangs

around Lazard Brothers in London aspire to establish its system of fascist world rule.

If the Geneva summit is successful, in the sense anticipated by the meeting between Begin and Sadat, the City of London and Tory traitors such as Henry Kissinger are finished. The Carter Administration would in due course abandon the foolish Schlesinger "energy policy"

— as France, Germany, and Japan push ahead with massive nuclear exports — and the wheels would get into motion for general world economic recovery. For such reasons, Begin's success, provided this means also a viable Palestinian Arab state, is a keystone of real U.S. strategic interests. And Begin must be supported to that specific effect by all the means at our disposal.

First Reactions To Sadat-Begin Meet

From European Leaders . . .

France

Raymond Barre, Prime Minister, speaking on television Nov. 20, in response to a question concerning France's refusal to back a joint EEC statement to have been issued Nov. 19 in support of President Sadat:

"We have always affirmed that Israel has the right to safe and recognized borders, and that some of the Arab countries' demands should also be recognized, France, contrary to what some claim, does not have a partisan policy... In the present state of affairs, in response to this personal initiative by the Egyptian president, such a declaration could have been premature before the situation could be appreciated in all its complexity. This declaration was requested (by the U.S. State Department—ed.) on Friday at 14 o'clock, for Saturday at 10 o'clock. France estimated that it should not associate itself with this initiative. It is true that President Sadat made a step toward the recognition of Israel, and we rejoice over this... No matter how important the event, there can be no durable settlement if the fundamental problems are not dealt with."

West Germany

Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, in an interview in the Nov. 22 daily Westphälische Rundschau:

"That is an astounding development, which can only be welcomed with all of our best wishes, for the Egyptian people as well as for the Israeli people. One can only be amazed at the boldness of President Sadat when one recognizes the severe criticism against the trip that will arise from several Arab countries. I know Mr. Sadat well and I am convinced that this man wants nothing more than peace in the Middle East and to stabilize this peace. Surely this also holds for the Israelis. On the other hand, everyone of us knows that peace in the Middle East depends not merely on Egypt and Israel..."

Hans-Dietrich Genscher, Foreign Minister, speaking in Tunis, Tunisia in a Nov. 19 West German radio news broadcast:

"Sadat's trip ushers in an important development, and the Federal Republic of Germany welcomes it.

On Nov. 22, before attending the European Economic Community Foreign Ministers meeting, Foreign Minister Genscher said:

"I will urge a formal European Economic Community welcome for the Sadat-Begin visit... France's reservations should not prevent the European Economic Community from once again expressing its fundamental interest in a Middle East peace, to which Begin and Sadat have made a very important initiative..."

Great Britain

David Owen, Foreign Secretary, on Nov. 18 termed the Sadat visit to Israel "a bold and imaginative gesture," and said he hoped it would pave the way for a resumption of the Geneva peace conference.

. . . And From Europe's Press

France

Le Figaro, "The Spirit of November 20," by Paul-Marie de la Gorce:

The formidable mobilization of world public opinion, the real moral shock which was produced in Israel, make it almost impossible for things to remain as they are. This is what the Egyptian President is counting on. In fact, he has presented a peace plan which will have the support of the great majority of states. And to use the usual formula, the ball which was thrown into the Israeli court remains there. Only with great difficulty will Mr. Begin be able to refuse to engage negotiations, even if among his future interlocutors are the Palestinians, whom he doesn't like; only with difficulty can he not respond more precisely to the Egyptian border proposals.

Le Figaro, "Portrait of Begin," Nov. 21:

"The British regime has shamelessly tricked the Israeli people," states the call launched by the Irgun, "and there is no longer any moral basis to justify its presence in Eretz Israel... We will fight." Placed in the reality of the period, this text, signed by Menachem Begin, seemed just as crazy as the June 18, 1940 call signed by a temporary Brigadier General named Charles de Gaulle.