

the proceedings and followed up his query with related questions of their own for the panelists to answer.

Khomeini embraced

One of the most disturbing panels took place the afternoon of Oct. 5. Speaking as part of the panel, James A. Bill, a professor at the University of Texas and one of the architects of the revolution in Iran, presented what amounted to an apology for the feudal, fanatic Ayatollah Khomeini. At the end of his speech, Bill made six "policy suggestions" for the U.S. to follow:

(1) The U.S. should admit some of its past errors in Iran, i.e., its hesitancy to openly back the Khomeini takeover.

(2) The U.S. must begin speaking favorably of the Khomeini revolution.

(3) The U.S. must begin studies on Iran's culture, religion, and related matters to better appreciate and spread appreciation of the Khomeini takeover.

(4) The U.S. must send a new breed of foreign service officers to Iran who appreciate Khomeini.

(5) The U.S. must express its support for Khomeini by sending in agricultural and technological aid.

(6) The U.S. must not contact exiled Iranians who want to drive Khomeini out of power and establish a republican form of government committed to industrialization.

The following day, during a question-and-answer session, EIR editor Drefuss challenged Bill and the officers of the Middle East Institute to explain this outrageous endorsement of Khomeini in light of the fact that Europe and the Arabs—as well as the U.S.S.R.—will soon put an end to the Khomeini cancer that has overrun Iran "because he threatens the economic development and political stability of the entire region." Panel moderator Dayton Mak punted: nobody is qualified to answer Dreyfuss' question, he said.

Doom and Gloom

The rest of the conference was doom and gloom, with no solution in sight. James H. Noyes of the University of California at Berkeley ticked off a series of catastrophes that are about to engulf the Middle East: Iran is on the verge of disintegrating, affecting the world's oil supplies; Iraq could disintegrate as well; the Gulf states are also on the brink; the Soviets are building up a "beachhead" in South Yemen and Afghanistan. Endorsing Bill's six-point program for U.S. policy toward Iran, Noyes talked of the "growing panic in the U.S. over the collapse of Iran's role of policing the Gulf," a role that the U.S. can readily fill. "We are extraordinarily vulnerable in the Gulf," Noyes shrieked, plugging proposals for a U.S. military intervention.

—Nancy Coker

John Connally urges armed takeover

In a major policy statement that harked back to the coldest days of the Cold War, Republican presidential candidate John Connally called this week for a U.S. military takeover of the Middle East from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf and Iran.

Connally pledged a massive increase in U.S. naval presence in the Indian Ocean, the creation of a new Fifth Fleet, American bases in the Persian Gulf and Oman, U.S. air force bases on the Sinai peninsula, and the establishment of a Middle East Treaty Organization linked to NATO and committed to "taking on the Soviet threat" to the region.

To entice "moderate" Arab states into tolerating the plan, Connally endorsed "self-determination" for the Palestinians and the possibility of an "independent entity" in the occupied West Bank and Gaza after Israel withdraws.

Almost as soon as the plan was made public, it drew sharp denunciations from Western Europe and the Arab world. When asked about Arab opposition to the Connally plan, Sam Hoskinson, a former CIA agent who is campaign coordinator at Connally-for-President headquarters, replied, "tough shit."

Hoskinson, who authored the plan along with such other Connally consultants as Fletcher School professor W. Scott Thompson, Wall Street lawyer Rita Hauser, Charles Walker, and the Committee on the Present Danger, also voiced the negative attitude toward Europe the candidate will adopt in his presidential race. Connally has already stated his opposition to the European Monetary System, and has endorsed the genocidal Pol Pot regime of Kampuchea.

The presidential policy statement released by Connally is the first sign of a serious statement on an issue by any contender except for Democratic Party candidate Lyndon LaRouche. Connally's efforts, however, runs directly counter to LaRouche's development-oriented, Europe-linked Middle East peace formula.

Excerpts of the Connally proposal follow.

In some quarters, there is presently a notion that no serious attempt to achieve a comprehensive Middle East settlement should be pressed until after our elections in 1980. Advocates of this course propose that our government try merely to keep the peace process alive by focusing on preparatory discussions, peripheral issues and frequent expressions of faith and optimism until our presidential election is out of the way.

In my view, such temporizing is unacceptable. The quest for peace should never be secondary to domestic politics. Playing for time always involves risks. To play for time in regard to a region where the fuses are so short as in the Middle East would be to play a most dangerous game.

Tensions which threaten the peace span the globe. Nowhere, though, are the stakes so high as in the Middle East.

The oil of the Middle East is and will continue to be the lifeblood of Western civilization for decades to come. The continued flow of oil from that region is and will continue to be critical to the realization of the aspirations of the millions who live in the developing world.

Soviets and Palestinians

The Soviets clearly benefit from continuing regional instability. The constant tension and warfare in the region provide them with virtually unlimited opportunities for exploiting the free world.

Because of this, we cannot count on Soviet help to bring peace to the Middle East. On the contrary, we should expect them to throw every road block they can think of in the way of peace. We must simply move ahead without them and in spite of them.

It is vital to neutralize both the Soviets and the extremist Palestinian elements.

We should also be willing to give the Palestinian leadership a chance to talk provided they are prepared to accept Resolution 242 and hence the territorial integrity of Israel, and renounce all terrorist tactics.

Peace plan and diplomatic strategy

1. Except for minor border rectification, mutually agreed upon, Israel must withdraw from the West Bank, Gaza, and Golan, all of which will be demilitarized. Israel would, however, be permitted to lease military strongpoints in each of these areas for a mutually agreed upon period of time, and have guaranteed access to these points.

2. All Israeli civilian settlements, including the so-called paramilitary ones must be withdrawn from the West Bank, Gaza, and Golan

3. The Palestinian people should decide for themselves whether they prefer the West Bank and Gaza to be governed as an entirely independent entity *or* to be an autonomous area within the Kingdom of Jordan. The latter approach has great merit and should be thoroughly explored....

8. The United States should organize a new treaty alliance to cover the Middle East, as a further guarantee of the ultimate settlement, and to protect regional oil fields and shipping lanes from Soviet or terrorist interference. The alliance should include Israel, the moderate Arab states, NATO and Japan.

The geostrategic vortex of the struggle between the Free World and Communism has shifted to the Middle East and all of the states with a critical interest in its outcome should bear their fair share of the defense burden.

Therefore, for the critical key that can make a reality of the previous eight points, the United States should maintain a strong military presence in this vital area, including major Air Force components. It may be possible, for example, to lease the former Israeli airfields in the Sinai.

I would propose further that we take elements of the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean and the Seventh Fleet in the Far East and, with such augmentation as necessary, create a Fifth Fleet to be stationed in the Indian Ocean.

An immediate approach should be made to the Sultan of Oman with a proposal to develop Masirah Island or other appropriate site into a U.S. naval base to support the new Fifth Fleet and provide security for the Arabian Sea and the strategic Straits of Hormuz.

Since World War II we have maintained military forces in the Far East and Western Europe.... We must now provide a military shield for our Middle East interests as well.

**Israel: the biggest
government crisis ever**

Israel has now entered what France's *le Figaro* newspaper Oct. 23 justly called "one of the gravest crises in its history." As a result of the stall in the Camp David talks, a domestic economic collapse rapidly getting out of control, and a government coalition permeated by corruption and malfeasance, the Israeli situation has become more polarized and chaotic than ever before.

The danger of an actual fascist insurrection, or an overtly annexationist government coming to power, looms very large.

Public awareness of the depths of the crisis has been catalyzed by two major events that took place this week.

First, Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan resigned, citing the government's failure to soften its position toward the Palestinian Arabs, and counterposing his own, more "pragmatic" approaches to the problem.

While the departure of the "pragmatic" voice from the cabinet could force leading Israelis to come to grips with the failure of Camp David in an honest fashion,