

The premise of the Kissinger thesis is that the Russians do not pose a threat to world peace. At least not their actions—merely their talk is nasty. He writes: “Remarkably, this nervousness is being evoked almost entirely by Soviet rhetoric. Soviet actions have been extremely cautious; there have not been in recent years any significant geopolitical challenges. The Soviets have pursued essentially psychological warfare; they seek to substitute words for deeds.”

Contrary to Kissinger’s lies, the reality is:

- The Russians have organized their military forces for an actual invasion of the Federal Republic of Germany, perhaps as early as this month.

- They have become the arbiters of the military and national security policies of the nations of the Scandinavian and Balkan peninsulas.

- They have become the instigators as well as arbiters of the Iran-Iraq conflict.

- They have become the instigators and arbiters of the difficulties between Pakistan and India.

- They have launched a campaign to become the arbiters of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the prime movers of what their Foreign Ministry calls a “Middle East Peace Conference.”

- In the last 12 months, they have captured a strategic portion of the EEC’s agricultural exports and are moving to dominate both prices and supplies in the world oil markets.

- They have increased their arms shipments to insurgencies in Central America and elsewhere.

- They are in the final preparatory phases of launching large manned orbiting nuclear-weapons platforms.

Most of these Soviet advances were consolidated after the hasty withdrawal of United States peacekeeping forces from Beirut. The power vacuum which the United States left behind in the Middle East and eastern Mediterranean after March 30, 1984, was perhaps greater and of more dramatic implications, than the hasty retreat from Saigon in May 1975.

The Beirut withdrawal signaled the beginning of America’s “decoupling” from Europe. The Russians’ advances since that time were made possible, in fact were caused, by the active pursuit, on the part of the oligarchical interests and families which stand behind Kissinger, of a grand endgame to cause a rearrangement of world power relations—the New Yalta Deal. It is this deal which Kissinger, in his *Washington Post* thesis, proposes to put into effect “on a confidential and unpublicized basis.”

Its objectives, already well on their way to being attained:

- to formalize Russian preeminence in the Near East, Middle East, the Indian subcontinent and Far East;

- to decouple Western Europe from the United States;

- to manipulate the United States into an adversary, “big stick” relationship with Latin America, in accordance with the recommendations of Kissinger’s own “Bipartisan Commission on Central America.”

## How Moscow sponsors ‘peace’ in the Mideast

by Thierry Lalevée

Is a diplomatic breakthrough around the corner in the Middle East? That impression might be given by the unexpected flurry of “peace proposals” in the last three weeks of July:

- While visiting Jordan on July 11, French President François Mitterrand called for a new Geneva-type Middle East conference to convene as soon as possible. Picking up on a 1982 Brezhnev proposal, Mitterrand suggested that instead of having the United Nations as sponsor, France would be willing to hold the conference in Paris.

- On July 29, the Soviets revived their 1982 proposal, which had not been heard of since the days of the late Yuri Andropov. With no reference to Mitterrand’s proposal, the TASS press release called on the U.N. to act as sponsor.

- On July 30, Vladimir Polyakov, director of the Middle East department of the Soviet foreign ministry, arrived in the Middle East to test the waters for the idea.

- A few days earlier, on July 26, U.S. State Department representative Alan Romberg had announced that the Reagan administration might reactivate the 1982 Reagan Peace Plan.

Did we miss something? How is it that there is suddenly so much talk about a global peace agreement in the region, just as the real possibility for peace seems more remote than ever? The answer lies in some sinister deals being discussed among Moscow, the European capitals, and the Anglo-American crowd that Henry Kissinger represents.

What double-talk! When you hear about a “broad” agreement, read “limited,” and for “global,” read “regional.” These “peace proposals” are a cover for the division of the Middle East into new colonial spheres of influence. That Mitterrand’s proposal is somewhat different from the Soviet one, which in turn is different from the Reagan peace plan, merely underlines the point that there are many ways to eat the same cake.

### Conspiracies in Switzerland

It is in Geneva and the Hotel Dolder in a Zürich suburb that the first round of these negotiations has been under way, approximately since the beginning of June. The Dolder Ho-

tel, located in the middle of the forest surrounding Zürich, was the best location possible for discreet political and diplomatic meetings, bringing together such public enemies as Syrians, Israelis, and Iranians.

Indiscreet investigators could find gathered there around June 12 the Syrian chief of military intelligence, General Ali Duba; the deputy minister of foreign affairs of Iran, Sheikh Islamzadeh; and Jacob Nimrodi of Israel, the former aide to Ariel Sharon when the latter was defense minister, who is now in the arms business.

Overshadowing this meeting—one of many in the last two months—has been the presence in Geneva of Rifaat al Assad of Syria, the Syrian President's brother. Rifaat arrived there after his mid-May visit to Moscow, and has been visited there from time to time by Ariel Sharon himself. According to the July 26 issue of the French weekly magazine *Vendredi-Samedi-Dimanche* (VSD), their meetings discussed the first steps of a security agreement for Lebanon between Israel and Syria—the kind of limited regional agreement that those who claim to advocate new global peace plans are really working for.

### Rifaat's Soviet connection

That such discussions began immediately upon the return of Rifaat al Assad from Moscow is obviously no coincidence. This was, indeed, one of the main topics of his discussions with Soviet officials. Contrary to previous reports, Rifaat al Assad has become the number-one Syrian for Middle East politicians to negotiate with. His official visit to Moscow was aimed at bolstering his international diplomatic stature; his stay in Geneva allowed his dying brother, Hafez al Assad, to concentrate on stabilizing the Syrian domestic situation for Rifaat to succeed him. Indeed, Col. Aly Heydar, chief of the special forces and an opponent of Rifaat, went to Moscow and then to Bulgaria, only to return from an extended stay to find that he was out of a job.

The secret negotiations involve basic points concerning the Israeli and Syrian military presence in the Lebanon, the division of the country into mutually accepted spheres of influence.

Reached before Israel's elections, the agreements call for a step-by-step withdrawal of Israeli and Syrians troops from the south or from the Bekaa Valley and central Lebanon, but define precisely where the troops can stay. Southern Lebanon, from Israel's borders to the Awali River, will be handed over in a few months to Gen. Antoine Lahad, nominally under the control of the Lebanese military high command in Beirut, but actually running things on his own—with the help of Israel.

Israel will be allowed to keep its monitoring post at the Mt. Barrou fortress; Syria will keep its own at Dahar al Baydar and Mt. Sannine. Syria will also keep military units in Tripoli, Shtaura, and in some locations in the Bekaa.

Such an agreement, about which the government in Beirut has not been consulted, would lead to numerous changes regionally. It would mean the re-opening of the Zahrani oil terminal in south Lebanon under the control of General Lahad. Saudi Arabia and other oil-exporting countries have been saying that they are ready to use the terminal again. This would also strengthen the economic potential of the northern Israeli port of Ashod.

### The basis for Syrian-Israeli agreement

The United States government has played little role, if any at all, in these negotiations; Moscow was the direct mediating agency. This was underlined when, in late June, Syria agreed to an exchange of prisoners with Israel.

The agreement had no other purpose than to provide Israel's Likud Party with a badly needed boost during the electoral campaign. That Syria, as well as Moscow, wanted a Likud victory in the elections was no secret.

Damascus and Jerusalem converge in their rejection of negotiations over the West Bank. Indeed, Jerusalem's refusal to negotiate on the Palestinian question is the best card the Assads can have to ensure their own control over the Palestinian movement—at the expense of Palestine Liberation Organization chief Yasser Arafat and others. A Labor Party administration in Israel would mean danger for Damascus, since it could give the Palestinians a freedom of maneuver which would not be appreciated by the ruling Alawites.

Comfortable with the Israeli electoral stalemate, Assad is now considering a reconciliation with the isolated Arafat who, like Jordan's King Hussein, would like to see a Labor Party victory.

Ultimately, if there are negotiations over the West Bank, the Syrians want them on a very concrete basis: Let Israel keep it, provided Israel agrees to withdraw from the Golan Heights.

Another aspect of the ongoing discussion directly concerns King Hussein of Jordan, who feels more and more that he has become the principal target of the Syrians, as well as Syrian-controlled Palestinians, despite the developing relations between Moscow and Amman. Adding to this pressure on Hussein was the message sent on July 29 by the underground Israeli terrorist group "TNT," warning the King to "quit the territories occupied by your ridiculous mini-kingdom."

Closer Israeli-Syrian relations are hardly comforting for Amman, especially when, as *Vendredi-Samedi-Dimanche* revealed, Israelis of the Ariel Sharon coloring are sending close to 1,000 tons of weapons a day to Iran via Damascus. Forty truckloads of 35 tons each leave Israel and reach the Damascus airport daily via Kuneitra, where the weapons are loaded on Syrian military planes headed for Teheran.

This agreement was recently negotiated in Switzerland, on condition that both Iran and Israel pay Syria.