

Another of Weizman's scenarists is Hebrew University Professor Shlomo Aronson, a pro-Dayan strategist and associate of the U.S. RAND Corporation, who supports Israel's adoption of a "nuclear option" for its military strategy. The RAND Corporation was one agency responsible for Carter's adoption of the provocative PD-59 "limited nuclear war" doctrine. RAND has long foreseen the Middle East as the likely flashpoint for this doctrine.

Weizman's suggestion of Dayan as his party's standard-bearer could create a potent wrecker action. On Jan. 11, the London *Observer* claimed that Dayan is now the "crucial factor" in Israel's elections, especially if he chooses to link up with Weizman and former Finance Minister Yigal Hurvitz, Dayan's old comrade in the "Rafi" 1960s split-off from Labour.

On Jan. 12, after resigning from the government, Hurvitz said he would like to join a Dayan-led "centrist" party. According to France's *Le Monde* of Jan. 12, Hurvitz "stressed that such a centrist initiative could prevent the Labour Party from obtaining an absolute majority during the next vote."

One priority of Dayan and Hurvitz is to prevent any territorial concessions on the West Bank, as favored by the Labourites' official platform. On this issue, Dayan is secretly collaborating with his old "special operations" buddy, Gen. Ariel Sharon, Begin's agriculture minister and the top backer in Israel of the Gush Emunim fundamentalist fanatics.

Sharon is desperately trying to create a crisis in Israeli-Arab relations on the West Bank and in Israel proper, to undercut Peres's policy options and, in the worst case, to keep Begin in power.

Sharon has threatened to bring 200,000 people "out on the streets" at the first sign of any Labour willingness to negotiate on the West Bank. In a Jan. 7 press conference, the Gush Emunim promised to create a coalition of all Israel's pro-annexationist groups "that could deny any other party or party coalition the majority needed to form a government."

NATO and SATO

At the same time, a new strategic geometry is being erected by the Kissingerians in Egypt, led by Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Butros-Ghali, a protégé of ancient feudal families based in Italy.

During early January, Butros-Ghali made a tour of Latin America, intersecting a criss-crossing pattern of Israeli arms sales on the continent. According to the Egyptian press, the purpose of his trip was to discuss creation of a new South Atlantic Treaty Organization (SATO), a NATO affiliate extending into Africa and with support from South Africa and leading Latin American regimes.

Several top-level Egyptian strategists are also dis-

cussing the possibilities of an imminent invasion of Libya and other military actions in Africa conforming to the exigencies of a new expanded military pact of the sort long advocated by Haig and Kissinger.

Opposition to this global extension of NATO is reported to be growing in Egyptian nationalist military layers, centered around Vice-President Husni Mubarak. If this faction's views prevail, Egypt and Israel may be able to relate to each other on the basis of mutually respected national interests, rather than the geopolitical straitjacket defined by Camp David.

The options for Iran after Khomeini

by Judith Wyer

At a State Department meeting on U.S. policy toward Iran in early November, pro-Khomeini specialist Prof. Richard Cottam unhappily stated his conclusion that the only alternative to the crumbling regime of Ayatollah Khomeini is a "centrist military coalition."

Sources present at this and other meetings conducted by the State Department's Iran working group confirm that over the last six months, the Carter administration has been pondering the question of how to shore up the flagging Khomeini regime. But numerous Iran hands now concur with fundamentalist sympathizer Cottam that there is no way to bolster the unpopular government of mullahs that Carter created.

A statement by President Ronald Reagan in last week's *U.S. News and World Report* indicates that he has no intention of following the Carter policy toward Iran. Reagan bluntly stated that he favors a "friendly" relationship between Iran and the United States, but only if "sensible people" head the government.

According to intelligence sources, Paris has become the clearinghouse for a plan to oust the Khomeini regime by no later than March. The source indicates that Britain, Israel, Iraq, Pakistan and Turkey are cooperating through Paris-based channels in plotting a counter-revolution which will probably see the exiled monarchy reinstated.

Government collapsing

Iranian sources report that over the past two weeks, demonstrations have occurred throughout Iran in support of the monarchy. Last week, for the first time since he was crowned shah, the 21-year-old Reza Pahlavi made his first public call for an uprising against Khomeini. It is reported that Reza recently visited Europe to more closely coordinate with exile Iranian opposition

groups on the overthrow of the mullahs.

Fearing that Reagan and the French government will impose a secular government in Iran, the Carter administration is scrambling to arrange a hostage release. The ruling Islamic Republican Party is frantically looking for a way to release the hostages so as to create the appearance of a revolutionary victory for Iran.

An insider with close ties to Iran, however, stated that "the IRP is riding a sinking ship; no matter what they do, they hurt themselves. . . . If they give up the hostages, there are many in Iran who will say they capitulated to the U.S., the 'Great Satan.' If they don't, they are blamed for the economic hardships caused by the isolation of Iran thanks to the hostages.

Carter also hopes that he can lock the incoming administration into a complex long-term set of legalistic negotiations over Iranian assets frozen in U.S. banks and the wealth of the late shah, and force Reagan to accept the mullahs as a legitimate government.

Numerous intelligence sources now concur that Carter, Vance, and Brzezinski, on behalf of their policy of promoting primitivism in the region, gave the green light for the taking of the hostages, whom the hated ayatollahs used to boost their factional strength in Iran.

But Carter's gamble will fail. Some of the mullahs are reported to already be preparing their exodus from Iran. Ayatollah Khalkhali, known as the "blood judge," has fled Iran, taking exile in France.

Reagan and hostages

The Iranian regime has not concealed its anxiety about the Reagan administration. Ahmed Azizi, the spokesman for Prime Minister Rajai, attacked Reagan last week for his statement that he would not give Carter a blank check on the hostage agreement. The same day, Berzhad Nabavi, the head of the Parliamentary Committee on the Hostage Affair, declared: "It is not clear how the negotiations will be conducted with the next government."

The pro-Khomeini *Christian Science Monitor*, which has been a conduit for the Carter administration, reported on Jan. 14 that Carter would like to see his chief negotiator on the hostages, Warren Christopher, stay on with special responsibilities for the talks under Reagan.

Christopher would find himself quite comfortable working under Reagan's appointee for Secretary of State, Alexander Haig. As *EIR* has documented, it was Haig who played a key role in installing Khomeini through the deployment of General Huyser to Iran from NATO headquarters in early 1978. Haig, like Zbigniew Brzezinski and Henry Kissinger, views Khomeini's Iran as an excuse for the cold-war military buildup in the Middle East that he will try to sell to Reagan.

Libya declares war on France

by Douglas DeGroot

Libyan dictator Muammar Qaddafi threatened on Jan. 11 to turn loose his infamous international terrorist networks against the French. This was Qaddafi's response to the recent French decision to put a stop to Qaddafi's dreams of spreading his Khomeini-like ideology all over Africa.

In a message delivered by Islamic fundamentalist demonstrators at the French embassy in Libya and broadcast on Libyan radio, Qaddafi, an avowed admirer of Nazi dictator Adolf Hitler, threatened "an African armed struggle with the goal of destroying French interests in the world if France persists in its interventions on the African continent." A

the demonstrators stated that "All the French attempts to get involved in the internal affairs of the African continent will be pushed out with unbelievable violence."

Qaddafi's tantrum is a direct reaction to the decision taken by French president Valéry Giscard d'Estaing to prevent Qaddafi's planned *Anschluss* of Africa.

The sudden reversal in French Africa policy came two days after Qaddafi announced on Jan. 6 the formal annexation of neighboring Chad by Libya. On Jan. 8, Giscard met with his top political and military advisers to organize a strong French intervention into Africa to forestall Qaddafi from carrying out his scheme throughout central and western Africa.

Although such meetings are usually kept secret, a public announcement was made afterward saying the meeting was held to study "means of increasing the security of those African states linked to France by defense agreements." On the same day French Foreign Minister Jean François-Poncet left on a trip to Africa. In the Ivory Coast, François-Poncet said, "The development and security of Africa are the two preoccupations of France" and pledged to help any country requesting aid to counter Qaddafi's destabilizations. François-Poncet also met with 25 French ambassadors to Africa to map out the French policy shift. A visit to Senegal by French Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Olivier Stirn, announced for later this month, is part of the French mobilization. The French have also begun bolstering their troop deployments in Africa.