

matum to Amin as part of Carter's accelerated campaign for "human rights."

It is of one fabric with Mr. Carter's outrageous personal communication with Soviet subversive Sakharov. The New York Times' James Reston interviewed Brzezinski himself on the unprecedented letter Feb. 20: "There was nothing inadvertent... It was thought through and discussed with the responsible officials at the NSC and State Department before the president made his 'prudential response'." Brzezinski's policy is to challenge Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe under "human rights" auspices, the surest way to shorten the lives of 160-180 million Americans.

Brzezinski left these implications of his "human rights" campaign to C.L. Sulzberger, who developed them adequately in the same day's *New York Times*. "Finally, suppose the flame of liberty we now so proudly fan flares into another Eastern European crisis? Do not think such a possibility excluded... Are we prepared to have the liberty tree be refreshed by blood?"

It is Brzezinski's firm belief that James R. Schlesinger's "doctrine" of *military bluff* will suffice for a Soviet

"roll back" in Eastern Europe. In two detailed feature articles complete with maps and arrows showing the Soviet Union entirely "contained," the Washington Post expresses the National Security Council's profile of Soviet "oblomovism" — "the Russian view of the world — suspicious, insecure, and cautious."

Under a headline "Moscow Saber Rattling Only a Memory," Post Peter Osnos declares that "no authoritative Soviet spokesman now rattles a saber publicly the way Joseph Stalin and Nikita Khrushchev did regularly. Even rhetorical calls for Soviet strategic superiority that used to be a staple of Soviet military journals have largely disappeared."

The delusion is that Brzezinski's "gamesmanship" can be expected to succeed — the Soviet Union will give the U.S. "free play" in the world. In the Soviet press, says the Post, "the Middle East and southern Africa are presented as serious but residual, while scores of recent agreements with the U.S. and other western states are endlessly praised as contributions to the relaxation of tensions..." No matter what Brzezinski has Carter do, it is imagined the Soviets will not go to war.

Rabin Victory, European Pressure Counters Vance 'War Shuttle'

Israeli Premier Yitzhak Rabin this week turned back a major challenge from his hawkish Defense Minister, Shimon Peres, and won the ruling Labour Party's nomination for the premiership for the country's May 17 elections. In an extremely close vote — hardly more than 40 of over 2000 votes cast separated the two candidates — Rabin defied the last-minute predictions of observers who had calculated that weeks of devastating Watergate-type scandals had thoroughly undercut the traditional Labour Party machine's base, upon which Rabin depended for support.

Two related factors explain the Rabin win. First, making a last-minute appeal for an Israeli peace initiative in positive response to months of Arab peace overtures, Rabin on the first day of the Party convention drew out fears of the "Masada" consequences of having such a notorious warhawk as Peres represent Israel in dealings with the Arab states. Second, this was made possible by a decisive intervention in recent days by European Socialist International leaders, acting as spokesmen for governments now progressing toward a break with the Carter administration and the U.S. dollar.

On the first day of the convention Second International President Willy Brandt appealed to the delegates to "strike out a war policy, war solves nothing." Brandt stressed the recent signs of moderation from Israel's Arab neighbors and the necessity of recognizing the rights of Palestinian Arabs. He insisted on a theme repeatedly stated in this week's West German press, that Israel can and must end its sense of isolation from the rest of the world. After other Socialist leaders spoke,

Rabin echoed the sentiments, striking a "responsive chord" and winning marginally important delegate support, according to the Feb. 23 *Baltimore Sun*.

The Rabin victory can thus legitimately be regarded as a signal to the Europeans and Arabs that there are significant forces in Israel who have not bought the "peace is impossible" theme of Peres and U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance. Initial post-convention signs from Israel would tend to bear this out, including Feb. 23 BBC reports that Rabin made an optimistic post-victory peace appeal. He is strongly backed by the electoral alliance of the Labour Party and the pro-socialist Mapam Party — an alliance that had been threatened by the potential for a Peres victory — and, according to BBC, has decided to remove Peres as Defense Minister if re-elected. The Feb. 24 *Baltimore Sun* reported that a substantial minority in Israel's cabinet now feels that the extreme anti-Palestinian public line expressed by Israel during and immediately after the Vance visit was wrong and will now "backfire."

These first optimistic signs to emerge from Israel in weeks will be short-term, unless Rabin correctly regards his victory as a *mandate* to go for an overall Arab-Israeli peace settlement, including recognition of both Palestinian Arab national rights and Israel's necessary contributions to regional economic development. Failure to drive Israel's policies in that direction could be catastrophic, as the Carter administration remains fully committed to regional instability and conflict to prevent the consolidation of a European-Arab development axis. The Carter team has numerous in-place destabilization

capabilities regarding Israel, using Peres, "Masada" archaeologist and social fascist Gen. Yigal Yadin, his Democratic Movement for Change, and warhawk crazy Gen. Ariel Sharon. Carter's policy-makers may also rely on extreme instability in Egypt and the U.S. National Security Council's capability for maintaining "Palestinian terrorism" to keep the Mideast off-balance and leaning toward war.

But at the same time, the Europeans have not only renewed but intensified their political and economic intervention into the Mideast region, largely in response to the provocative tour of Secretary Vance.

The Vance Trip: An Unbalance Sheet

The Vance trip as a whole was planned to induce confusion of the type which, in the Middle East, is favorable to war. No sooner had the grinning Secretary arrived in Israel than he had totally upended his recent "balanced" statements on possible U.S. recognition of Palestinian rights and support for "moderate" factions within the Palestine Liberation Organization. At a Tel Aviv press conference, he announced that the U.S. would be against any PLO presence at a Geneva conference, until that group recognized Israel — exactly the Israeli position.

At the weekend Cabinet meeting following the Vance mission, Israeli Foreign Minister Yigal Allon claimed that Vance had promised "absolute U.S. opposition" to a Palestinian state between Israel and Jordan. Peres announced on Israeli radio Feb. 20 that "Kissinger had always advised us to avoid anything that could contribute to the creation of a Palestinian state, or anything that could define, at this stage of negotiations, our eventual frontiers. After our meetings with Vance, we have the strong impression that there is a continuity in American policy." Even Rabin the next day proclaimed that Israel would "forever" maintain control over much of the occupied territories, as they constituted a part of Israeli territory.

This Vance work in Israel could only have a devastating effect on Egyptian President Anwar Sadat, desperately needing a peace settlement in order to stabilize a virtually unmanageable internal political and economic situation. But upon arriving in Cairo, Vance grinned and nodded as Sadat called for the formation of a PLO-Jordan "confederation" before any Geneva conference takes place. Back in Washington, National Security Council head, Zbigniew Brzezinski, was simultaneously leaking through notorious Washington Post Watergate conduit Bob Woodward a patchwork story "revealing" that King Hussein of Jordan was on the payroll of the CIA. The revelations were timed precisely to discredit Sadat's plan and plan prepare for the unleashing of "radical Palestinian terrorism" against the unpopular King. In addition, Vance's public support for the Sadat plan, which was unacceptable to the Israelis because it upheld the PLO's existence as an independent entity, worked to the advantage of the Peres "breakaway ally" faction in Israel, dependent for its growth on signs that the U.S. would "isolate" Israel.

In Lebanon Vance refused to publicly support the nation's territorial integrity, thereby giving a green light to provocative Israeli incursions into the highly unstable

southern Lebanese area. In Saudi Arabia, Vance was reminded that Saudi moderation on the oil price issue depended on U.S. recognition of the PLO; Vance replied by quibbling over whether the Palestinian issue was "at the core" of the Mideast conflict.

In his final press conference before returning to Washington, Vance gleefully proclaimed that the Mideast remained "deeply divided," with a "very hard and difficult road ahead." Vance announced that he would probably return to the Mideast for a new shuttle in June. According to Beirut's leading daily, *An Nahar*, Vance also thought that a Geneva conference this year would be "unlikely," since the Palestinian movement remained "divided and confused." In short, Vance considered his mission a complete success.

A source who has met with Vance since the Secretary's return was "not optimistic about anything at all. This administration will try to put off any motion until the second half of the year, if then. They will do everything in their power to circumvent the PLO."

The initial reaction of the Trilateral Commission's U.S. press to the Rabin victory has been to emphasize instability and social problems in Israel. A source at the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee in Washington, which has ties into Brzezinski's National Security Council, commented on the eve of the Labour Party nominating convention that "even if Rabin wins, Yadin is coming on fast and well." Their favorite, Gen. Sharon, has been shipped to the U.S. to win support of his fascist "Shlomzion" movement in Israel.

Europeans React With New Peace Moves

Hardly had Vance left the Middle East than the British and Italian press blasted him for perpetuating and worsening the Mideast crisis by having refused to meet the PLO while in Lebanon. The *London Times* Feb. 21 commented that Vance had failed to "really grasp the attitudes and feelings of the Palestinians." The *Times* angrily quoted a journalist in Beirut: Vance could have saved "days of work and misunderstanding" if he hadn't tried to avoid the Palestinians, especially as "precedents" existed for such a meeting. The article concluded by quoting PLO leader Yasser Arafat that "Vance should realize that the crux of the problem is the Palestinian people."

Both the British and Italian governments stepped up their active intervention into the region. British Prime Minister James Callaghan held meetings Feb. 21 in London with Saudi Foreign Minister Prince Saud on the re-convening of the Geneva conference. Also in London this week were the Kuwaiti Prime Minister and the U.S.-maligned King Hussein, both ostensibly to see Saudi King Khaled in a British hospital. Veteran British Middle East envoy Lord Caradon, in an interview with Beirut's *Safir* newspaper Feb. 22, charged that developments in Egypt could "endanger and impede progress toward a settlement." He informed Carter that a peace settlement without the Soviets and without PLO participation at a Geneva conference was out of the question.

Throughout last weekend, both Italian Minister of Foreign Trade Renato Ossola and the head of the state-owned ENI group Sette were in Saudi Arabi offering a deal involving Saudi petrodollars for Italy's banking

system in return for a major Italian peace initiative in the Mideast. The two envoys of Italian Premier Giulio Andreotti stressed that they had come to discuss "not just economics, but politics." The Feb. 23 London Financial Times identifies these moves as part of an escalating Italian "Mideast strategy," involving the exchange of technology and industrial development for energy resources, modelled after the policies of ex-ENI head Enrico Mattei.

The British and Italian efforts are being closely followed by the West Germans. When the Egyptian

government Feb. 22 released the original text of the January, 1977 West German-authored European foreign ministers' statement on the Mideast — calling for the recognition of a Palestinian national entity and European security guarantees for the Mideast, squelched under U.S. State Department pressure one month ago — sources at the West German Foreign Ministry were reportedly "delighted." An editorialist for West Germany's Die Welt newspaper proclaimed that the release of the text demonstrated that "Europe was independent from the U.S." in its Mideast policy formulations.

The Statement of the EEC On A Middle East Peace

The Cairo daily Al Ahram of February 21 first published the full text of the January 31 declaration of the Nine countries of the EEC on the Arab-Israeli conflict originally suppressed under U.S. State Department pressure. The following is a translation:

1) Recent developments in the Middle East present serious possibilities for negotiations. The EEC countries express their direct interest in rapid progress toward a global solution to the conflict. They are aware that a "neither war nor peace" situation seriously harms the security of the region and the world;

2) The Nine affirm the necessity for a peace accord based on resolutions 242 and 388 of the United Nations Security Council and on the points of their communique of November 6, 1973, which are:

- the rejection of the occupation of territory through force;
- the necessity for Israel to cease the occupation which has been going on since 1967;
- the respect for sovereignty, the safeguarding of territories and the independence of each country of the region as well as its right to live in peace behind secure and recognized borders;
- the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians when a just and durable peace is established;

3) We want to reaffirm that all these points must form a whole and that Israel, in the framework of a settlement, must be ready to recognize the rights of the Palestinian people. We also deem it necessary that the Arab side must be ready to recognize Israel's right to live behind secure and recognized borders;

4) As for the rights of the Palestinians, the Nine believe that a solution to the Middle East conflict will only be possible if the right of the Palestinian people to express its national identity is concretized;

5) The Nine deem it necessary that peace negotiations aiming at a global, just and durable settlement be re-started immediately. They appreciate the efforts deployed to this effect by the General Secretary of the United Nations, in conformity with the U.N. General Assembly resolution of December 9, 1976. They deem it

necessary that the interested parties, including the Palestinian people, undertake discussions in an appropriate form. They insist that all parties begin realistic and constructive negotiations as soon as possible;

6) The EEC countries are disposed towards participating in a Middle East settlement in a concrete fashion. They remain equally disposed to examining the possibility of participating in guarantees which would be necessary to ensure the security of all the interested parties.

Financial Times:

Vance "Misleading" on Mideast Peace Prospects

The following are excerpts from the Feb. 21 lead editorial of the Financial Times of London, entitled, "The Change in the Arabs":

Mr. Cyrus Vance, the U.S. Secretary of State, has reported after his initial fact-finding trip to the Middle East that while both the Arabs and Israelis expressed a strong desire for peace, they remain deeply divided on the key issues. He is also said to have discovered that the Arabs themselves are still divided on what is probably the key issue of all, namely the Palestinian question.

That statement is undoubtedly true, but it is also superficial and potentially misleading. For while it is clear that the divisions still exist, and indeed it is possible to argue that on fundamentals they are still as deep as ever, this is to ignore the extent to which the atmosphere has changed. On the Arab side at least, it is already the period of pre-negotiation. Scarcely a week has passed in the past few months without an Arab leader putting forward new proposals related to a settlement.

It is true that these are sometimes contradictory....The contradictions abound. They can be exploited by anybody who wishes to exploit them. What they should not obscure, however, is the fact that the great majority of Arabs and Palestinians have begun to talk about the same thing, and that is a negotiated solution. Some of their differences cannot, by their nature, be resolved until negotiations get under way. None of them are fundamental in the sense that they prevent the negotiations from doing so, at least so far as the Arabs are concerned.

There is, for instance, by now a pretty clear readiness on the part of the Palestinians to accept a Palestinian 'mini-state' on territory evacuated by Israel — mainly the West Bank and the Gaza Strip....By being ready to negotiate the PLO has at least temporarily rejected its belief that the armed struggle is the only way. To put it crudely, it is not credible today to present the PLO as simply a bunch of terrorists....

Neither the Palestinians in particular, nor the Arabs in general, however, can be expected to make all their concessions in advance even before negotiations begin. In the meantime, it would be useful if the Israelis, despite their internal problems and forthcoming elections, could give some indication that they have noticed the change in the Arab mood. It seems unlikely that the Arabs will go on offering concessions indefinitely without some more positive response.

“Dr. Kreisky Reminds Israel Of Palestinian Rights”

The following are excerpts from a front-page London Times article Feb. 24 on Austrian Chancellor Bruno Kreisky's speech before the Israeli Labour Party congress.

Dr. Kreisky...appeared before 3,000 delegates to the Israeli Labour Party's convention and told them boldly that the Palestinian people had as much right as Israelis to demand recognition of their national entity.

Referring to Israel's insistence that Jordan should represent the Palestinians in peace negotiations, the Chancellor said: “I want to tell you, dear friends, that you will not be able to choose who shall represent those people...”

He said sharply that it was not for Israel to say whether the area where the Palestinians want their homeland was viable. “When you established your state,” he asked, “could it have been foreseen you would develop in such a fashion?”

Brandt:

Exclude War As Political Instrument

The following are extracts from the speech by Willy Brandt, Chairman of the West German Social Democratic Party (SPD), before the Israeli Labour Party in Jerusalem, February 23:

...Israel is not alone. Israel has not become isolated in its difficult position. It cannot and does not desire to be isolated in its battle for peace....In my part of the world we have achieved some results in ensuring peace. From this position, I am directing the following call to the responsible politicians of the Middle East: Exclude war as a political instrument! Take recognition of the fact that war solves nothing. Follow the sign which points out the only path towards solving the political conflicts in this region: negotiations for a fair balancing of differences....

The time has come to organize actively for peace....Israel has a right to exist and have safe and recognized borders. This certainly includes the Palestinians being allowed to realize their own national identity in a way acceptable to them. This means secure prospects for a secure existence within secure borders for all relevant elements in the region....We must make possible developing relations between Jews and Arabs, between Israel and her neighbors, just as we already have in Europe....

The Mideast and Europe have become close neighbors. Here I am speaking neither for my government, for the EEC Council of Ministers, nor for the Brussels Commission. But I believe that the economic cooperation which the EEC and Israel and the Arab nations have begun in the context of a thoughtfully balanced policy, represents Europe's contribution....

The principle of co-responsibility for world war or world peace has become universal....Perhaps we have arrived at this point extremely late, but we cannot without emotion look at the alarming growth of the chasm between the industrialized countries of the Northern Hemisphere and the poor nations of the Southern Hemisphere....