

Shimon Peres. Rabin announced June 4 that he will introduce legislation allowing him to dismiss ministers — a measure aimed squarely at Peres, who has been at odds with Rabin for months. Rabin's actions are fully backed by the Mapam party, a left-leaning coalition partner of the ruling Labour party. At its annual congress this week the Mapam backed Rabin and demanded the ouster of the Dayan-Peres outlaws from the regime. A Mapam spokesman said that his party is seeking to build a governing coalition with Labour party doves, led by Abba Eban.

In a significant acknowledgement of the ICLC's central role in backing moves for Middle East peace, the Mapam daily newspaper Al Hamishmar printed the text of a message sent from USLP Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche and the European Labor Committee's Executive Committee to the Mapam congress.

## Top State Department Advisor:

“Ford Is Playing President...

We Should Send the Marines”

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 17 (NSIPS) — The following interview was conducted today by NSIPS with a top U.S. State Department advisor for Middle East Affairs following the assassination of U.S. Ambassador to Lebanon Francis Meloy.

**NSIPS:** Dr. L—, there are high-level reports being issued concerning a revision of United States policy toward Lebanon in the wake of the recent Syrian invasion of that country.

**Dr. L—:** Bullshit. That's White House crap. It's Ford playing President. We have no policy in Lebanon. We're not going to do anything. You do not influence events in a country like Lebanon without putting your blood and your money on the table. We are doing neither. He's acting Swedish.

And the Russians have no policy either. The last hope the Russians had to kill Jews was the PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization), and now they will be crushed.

If the U.S. were not totally corrupted, then the U.S. would have done the right thing: send in Marines to clean up. But we're not doing fuck-all. The whole thing was run out of the White House, and it's bullshit. Ha! If you believe the White House is saying that we are revising our policy, that we will send a new Ambassador to walk around stupid and blinking and doing nothing, that we will “continue the search for peace,” that we will “discuss with all parties,” etc. then you are very naïve. The President is fighting for his life against (Republican Presidential hopeful) Mr. Ronald Reagan; are you aware of that? Are you? So he's acting like a stupid Swede, acting Presidential, making grand, sweeping statements that have no force whatsoever behind them. We have no influence in the Middle East.

**NSIPS:** Are you advocating the use of U.S. military forces in Lebanon even after warnings last week from the Soviet Union against any such intervention by the U.S. or France?

**Dr. L—:** Ha! The Soviets have no military options. Of course, I cannot exclude insanity. But, if we introduce our divisions there, they cannot stop us. What can they do? Fly in troops to the airport? The Syrians control the airport totally, and could

close it down with a single 22-millimeter cannon produced by the Syrians' fraternal socialist allies and their comradely workers in the people's democracies. The Soviets can say whatever they like. This is 1958 (the U.S. sent a “peace-keeping” force to Lebanon in 1958-ed.). What crisis would erupt?

**NSIPS:** What about the Iraqis? and the (Egyptian newspaper-ed.) Rose al-Yousef scenario of a Soviet, Iraqi and Algerian military response to an intervention by the United States, France or Israel?

**Dr. L—:** The Iraqis are a joke. The Iraqis — who committed two divisions to the 1973 (Arab-Israeli) war, one of which was wiped out in 25 minutes and the second two hours later — the Iraqis have only killed defenseless Kurdish civilians, with your support, I suppose. The Syrians have a battle-trained army that has fought the Israelis a few times. Israelis wiped out the Iraqis, and even the Syrians would massacre them. An Iraqi intervention would be a political move, but its military weight would be less than nothing. And if those Iraqi divisions would be chopped up, that would not do so well for the regime back in Baghdad.

It's a question of training and technology. Fifty Europeans could march from one end of Africa to the other. The same in the Middle East. But you'll write what you want anyway. Just say this: That the U.S. is acting like goddamn Sweden, and that Ford is play-acting President.

**NSIPS:** All reports indicate that the Assad regime in Syria faces imminent collapse and possible coup. . . .

**Dr. L—:** Of course, there could be a coup! There is always a potential coup in that backward desert. Damascus (Syria) is run by a bunch of paranoid, stupid, narrow-minded soldiers. Now the pressure is relatively increased — but on any sunny day, with no war, there might be a coup in Syria.

## Mideast Thinktanker Pins

### Faisal Murder on Kissinger

June 18 (NSIPS) — A leading liberal policy analyst from the Mideast, reviewing the current situation in Lebanon, pinned the blame for the March 1975 assassination of Saudi Arabia's King Faisal squarely on Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, and termed the assassination key to understanding Kissinger and his present policy.

“I really believe that since 1973 he (Kissinger) has been systematically working on destabilizing Lebanon, taking Egypt out of the picture, giving the Syrians promises. Systematically, Kissinger has been working on a clear pattern: the seduction and taming of Sadat and the luring of Syria, reminiscent now in the latter case of Jordan in 1970,” the thinktanker said.

Developing this analysis, the Mideast policy analyst said “The key thing in understanding Kissinger is the Faisal assassination. I knew Prince Faisal, the alleged assassin, very closely when he was in Colorado. I've never been convinced that King Faisal's death was accidental; this is not persuasive. The removal of Faisal was a critical event in Mideast politics.”

The thinktanker then laid out piece by piece what the Faisal murder accomplished in Mideast politics: “(Egyptian

President) Sadat wouldn't have done what he did (sign last year's Sinai Accord with Israel) without (the removal of Faisal)...Faisal was becoming difficult to deal with, a tough nut to crack. The Saudi defection from a somewhat tougher policy toward the United States dates from March, 1975 to the present. If Faisal were still around, Saudi Arabia would have acted differently, more committed to the Palestinians, and against the Sinai accord. Faisal thought the accord was a mistake; he thought step-by-step negotiating was a mistake and he advised against it. After his death, the accord became possible."

As for the Syrians, the Mideast expert continued, "It's unlikely that the Saudis (under Faisal) would have given the Syrians the green light (to invade Lebanon). The current Saudi regime is much easier to deal with and treats Kissinger's policy much more favorably.

Finally, the thinktanker discussed Faisal's changing philosophy, and its incompatibility with Kissinger's needs.

"Faisal was a fundamentalist in his last days, and Kissinger has his theory, and he's written about it, citing the Russian Czar Nicholas to prove that diplomacy can't deal with fundamentalists. Faisal became totally impossible to integrate into Kissinger's policy. As for the Prince (the alleged assassin) he was just a counterculturalist, he didn't have that tendency of murder. And the idea that it was a blood feud was ridiculous. Why did he wait 10 years to supposedly avenge his brother's death?"

#### Who Benefited

"Putting it simply," the thinktanker concluded, "King Faisal couldn't have been accommodated in Kissinger's geopolitics. Sadat's moving with Kissinger increased after Faisal's death; the Saudis are acting now in a way that Faisal never would have; they are taking too many risks. I ask simply, who benefited from Faisal's death? Mr. Kissinger and the Kissinger line."

### Exclusive Interview

## Atlanticist Economist: Kissinger Ordered Syrian Invasion of Lebanon

*NEW YORK, June 18 (NSIPS) —In an interview here today a leading Atlanticist economist who is in close contact with the U.S. State Department and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger stated without qualification that Kissinger ordered the Syrian invasion of Lebanon. Excerpts from the interview follow:*

**Q:** What is your analysis of the situation in Lebanon?

**A:** Kissinger wanted (Syrian President) Assad to move into Lebanon weeks ago and partition the damn place, but that would have provoked Israel to intervene, leading to the total breakdown of the Sinai pact and the overthrow of Egyptian President Sadat. Sadat is very weak, much weaker than Assad. The military in Egypt is very restless and wants to see Sadat fall. So, not wanting to risk Sadat's overthrow, Kissinger waited and finally he pushed Assad to move into Lebanon. But it was too late. Major concessions will have to be made to the left now.

**Q:** So Kissinger ordered the whole invasion?

**A:** Kissinger and the State Department are definitely behind Assad. Kissinger and the State Department definitely ordered the invasion of Lebanon. Likewise, Kissinger ordered

the French to come out with the warning several weeks ago that France would intervene militarily. Just because the threat came out of French President Giscard's mouth, it didn't come out of his head. It came straight from Washington, from Kissinger.

**Q:** How do you view the situation in Israel and the present situation of Prime Minister Rabin?

**A:** Kissinger and the State Department want retired general Yigal Yadin to come to power in Israel. Kissinger is trying to arrange that he somehow gets in. Personally, I like Yadin very much and think he is a good choice. He has been in the shadows a long time, but Kissinger knows that he is the best one to be on top in Israel now.

**Q:** The Soviets have stated clearly that they will not tolerate any foreign power intervention in the Lebanon situation. How do you think this alters the situation in the Middle East?

**A:** The Russians don't mean a thing they say. They are very conservative people who want to conserve what they have. And in the Middle East, the Russians don't have anything. In reality, they would like to see a war in the Middle East. They would even like to see the Turks and Greeks go at it again over Cyprus.