

renewed Camp David negotiations — and a spreading destabilization from Iran. The ultimate goal is the break-up of OPEC and the establishment of a Middle East Treaty Organization (METO) whose nucleus will be Israel and Egypt, and which is projected to include the Sudan, Morocco, Yemen, and Oman as well. METO and the threat of Iran-style destabilizations are to serve as clubs, to keep powers such as Saudi Arabia and Iraq, which are oriented toward development-project cooperation with both Europe and Third World countries, in line.

Europe and Japan: Dependent on outside sources for their oil, Europe and Japan are particularly vulnerable to oil blackmail. The London gameplan is to jack up the price of oil to the \$20 per barrel range, which would wreck plans for European Monetary System-centered industrial development, and to use energy austerity as a battering ram to force the NATO countries onto a war confrontation course with the Soviet Union.

The Western Hemisphere: Using the "oil shortage" as a

pretext, the Carter Administration is threatening military intervention into oil-rich Mexico, a leading developing sector force for industrial development, to force Mexico to abandon its industrialization plans and to incorporate Mexico's oil into its "strategic reserve." Venezuela is similarly targeted.

United States: With London control of the Carter Administration, the United States is being again subjected to the 1977 Schlesinger fascist austerity program, which was previously rejected by the Congress. The essence of this program, as epitomized by the renewed calls for the ENCONO program in the Northeastern states, is the deindustrialization of the U.S.

In the following series of reports, Executive Intelligence Review explains just how the latest oil hoax is being perpetrated, and we review its potential and real impact in OPEC, in North America, in the United States, and on the industrialized nations of Europe and Asia, to assess the chances that the new oil hoax scenario might actually succeed.

The calls for U.S. troops in Mideast

On Sunday, Feb. 25, U.S. Defense Secretary Harold Brown on CBS's Face the Nation, and Energy Secretary James Schlesinger on NBC's Meet the Press, declared that the Carter Administration is planning the use of military force in the Middle East. Both men referred to "protection of the oil flow" as a matter of "vital U.S. interest." "We will take any action that is appropriate, including military force," said Brown, who also said that if the Soviet Union honored its commitment to Vietnam and intervened in Southeast Asia, the situation could "get out of hand."

In fact, as Senator Henry Jackson revealed to a Feb. 24 audience at George Washington University, the projected American military deployment to the Mideast is overtly antiSoviet in nature. "The fact is that we have been witnessing for some time an effort by the Soviets, through the use of proxies and surrogates, to encircle the oil-producing countries on which the West depends. It is time to stop repeating the silly cliché that we cannot be the world's policeman and to begin to think about our future in a world without a cop on the corner. Saudi Arabia, like Iran before it, is in danger of being encircled by friends of the Soviet Union. The danger that the Soviets and their friends will gain control over the 9 million barrels of oil that the Saudis ship daily to the United States and its allies is real and growing."

An appropriate introduction to James Schlesinger's way of enunciating the same policy is his "Meet the Press" appearance. The following are excerpts.

The United States has vital interests in the Persian Gulf. The United States must move in such a way that it protects those interests, even if that involves the use of military strength or of military presence.

I think the President indicated in his speech at Georgia Tech recently that the United States must intensify its efforts to bring stability to the area to ensure the stability and the independence of the states in that area. That is of vital importance to the United States

The President has stated, I think repeatedly, that we must live up to our commitments even to the extent that will require the use of military strength. The United States has substantial influence in the area and we should seek to maintain that influence because it is in our vital interests to do so. . . .

Secretary Brown was recently in the area and he had extended discussions with regard to the future of the United States' role in that area, and the relationships between the moderate countries of that area and the United States. I think that that is a start. . . .

I think that the point . . . is that the United States has a vital interest in the area, that we have been prepared to discuss the question of a military presence in the area with the states involved.

As yet, however, it would be inappropriate to comment further, save to underscore what the President said at Georgia Tech, that we will live up to our commitments, even if it requires the employment of military strength. . . .