

'Israel Lobby' Senators Sabotage U.S.-Saudi Relations

In a nefarious attempt to thoroughly destroy longstanding diplomatic and trade relations between the U.S. and Saudi Arabia, Senators Jacob Javits (R-NY), Frank Church (D-Id), and Clifford Case (D-NJ) — all spokesmen for the City of London-controlled "Israel Lobby" — have announced that they intend to squash sale of 60 F-15s to Saudi Arabia.

The Carter Administration has put forward a package to sell sophisticated aircraft to Egypt, Israel, and Saudi Arabia — a policy which has the firm backing of the State Department (see Javits interview). Nevertheless, these gentlemen of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee say "no deal with the Saudis", a grand design to make the U.S. appear intransigently loyal to Israel and to force the Saudis to withdraw support from the U.S. dollar in retaliation.

Orchestrating this treasonous operation is soon-to-be-chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Frank Church, who last week delivered a flat "no" to the Carter Administration's proposal to equip the Saudis with the advanced aircraft. According to Church, the F-15 would upset the balance of power in the Middle East, a contention which carries little weight if balanced against Israeli Foreign Minister Dayan's revelations that Israel has "more planes than Italy or Germany and a little less than England."

In tandem with Church's warnings was the announcement from the Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) that "in the event of war, Israel might have to launch immediate strikes against Saudi bases and aircraft" — if the deal goes through. Mimicking these bellicose statements from the "Israel Lobby", was a proposal put forth by Defense Secretary Harold Brown in the *Washington Post* Jan. 27. Fixating on the notion of "quick strikes," Brown called for the creation of a special Marine division in the event that a "half war" has to be fought by the U.S. in the Persian Gulf against "Soviet infiltration."

These war-mongering statements are a direct attack on Saudi Arabia's commitment to expanded oil production and to support a strong dollar. U.S. Energy Czar James Schlesinger (who is the architect of plans to "occupy Saudi oil fields in an unforeseen crisis") in an interview upon his return from Saudi Arabia last month, lied that the Saudis would not be willing to expand oil production beyond 12 million barrels a day and that U.S. congressmen should not rely on the Saudis to increase their oil production to 20 million barrels per day to accommodate the U.S.'s increasing needs for oil consumption.

Countering Schlesinger's phoney assessment of U.S.-Saudi relations is a statement released by Saudi Oil Minister Sheik Zaki Yamani to the *Wall Street Journal* on Jan 27: "There is a special relation between the United States and Saudi Arabia whether some Zionist wants to admit it or not." Similar sentiment is emerging among some officials of the Carter Administration who agree, as the *Jerusalem Post* pointed out recently, that a "decision to support sophisticated aircraft sales to Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Israel will help the negotiations in the

Mideast by strengthening the moderate forces in Israel and the Arab world."

Scenario Debates

The following are excerpts from an op-ed by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak which appeared in the Feb. 2 Washington Post entitled, "Carter's Dilemma on Saudi Arms Sales", expressing the vital interests which are at stake in this arms controversy. The columnists particularly stress the question of whether the U.S. has its own Mideast policy or one tied to Israel, i.e., the City of London.

...President Carter's failure to win Saudi Arabia's consent to delay the promised U.S. sale of 60 F-15 aircraft confronts him with his clearest test posed by this question: Can the United States have its own Mideast policy, or only one tied to Israel?

The answer to that question may well decide the future of the vital U.S.-Saudi connection. At issue is whether Saudi Arabia will continue to underwrite U.S. domestic oil needs.... Changes in Saudi oil production and pricing, moreover, could wedge Western Europe and Japan away from the United States, undermining political unity of the industrialized democracies.

As provided by Sen. Frank Church (D-Idaho), the answer to this crucial question is a clear "no." Indeed, Church's letter to Secretary of State Cyrus Vance ... protesting the sale ... was couched with generous overstatement in terms of how Israel views the sale, but not in terms of U.S. interests... "Church wrote the letter like a senator from Israel," one of Church's colleagues told us.... Underlying these surface hazards (Saudi break with the dollar and reduced oil supply because of U.S. equivocation—ed.) is the spectacle of the U.S. superpower once again squirming in public over an arms sale in the Middle East clearly tailored to its own interests. This spectacle reflects an increasingly dim image of the United States not only to Saudi Arabia but around the whole world.

The following editorial in the Jan. 28 Washington Post reflects a completely opposing point of view and one that is fundamentally contradictory to U.S. stability. According to the editorialist, who agrees with Frank Church, the United States should delay important arms deals in the Middle East.

...At this delicate moment in the Mideast, Sen. Frank Church suggests the U.S. ought to "review" all prospective new arms transfers to make sure they don't complicate the region's quest for restraint.... Intellectually and morally, as Zbigniew Brzezinski told National Public Radio Friday (Jan. 27—ed.), it doesn't seem right to conduct arms transactions as though peace negotiations were not under way for the first time in 30 years.... But the impact of the sale, or so the Israel lobby here is shouting, would be heavily military: the F-15s are seen as posing to Israel a real threat in a crisis....

Echoing this "Israeli fear" is an excerpt from James Reston's Jan. 27 New York Times op-ed entitled, "How to Double Trouble." Reston says that the F-15 affair will cause chaos and confusion within the government and the Carter Administration should drop it. To build his argument he features prominently a memorandum from the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) in Washington, D.C. which: "... not only calls the U.S.-Saudi deal a "threat to peace" but suggests that, if the deal goes through, Israel might have to take military action against Saudi Arabia in any major threat of war."

The following are phone interviews with aides from Senators Javits' and Church's Washington offices. Although Senator Javits appears critical of the abrupt manner in which Sen. Church delivered the ultimatum to Carter, he maintains a firm opposition to the sales.

Senator Javits' office:

The Senator has decided to supplement the Church-Case letter against the Saudi arms deal with a separate letter jointly written with Senators Baker and Pearson urging the Administration not to make the F-15s request now. Javits is concerned both with the sale itself and with avoiding the public humiliation of the Saudis.

This will, we hope, encourage the Administration to move on the request at a fairly early stage, but not right now. If the Administration brings the request in by, say February 1, this will be very counter-productive, because we at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will feel we've given the Administration every fair warning against doing so, and the fault will then appear solely on the Administration's ledger, not ours. We'll feel

less reluctance to criticize the sale then.

Senator Church's office:

The F-15s are very sophisticated aircrafts; are they the right kind for Saudi defensive needs? Church is insisting that the time is not propitious, when the Mideast talks are stalled, for the arms sale to be considered; since this would destabilize the delicate balance that has been reached. The Administration wants a package arms sale, to Egypt, Israel and Saudi Arabia. The impetus for this is coming from the State Department. They fear a general eroding of U.S.-Saudi relations, and they point out how helpful the Saudis have been in keeping oil prices down. But this kind of thinking is naive. Prices are down because there is a glut of oil, not anything else, and that accounts for the Saudi position.

The Saudis are, furthermore, not as terribly concerned about the dollar as some people claim. They like the yen a lot; I've read statements to this effect.

Another consideration of Church's is that no one in the Ford Administration ever promised arms to the Saudis like the F-15, whereas the Israelis were promised these planes in the secret accords Kissinger worked out as part of the 1975 Sinai Pact.

In a sense, we are saving the Saudis from themselves by fighting against the F-15 sale. If they had the plane, an Israeli preemptive strike against Saudi airbases would occur in time of war. The F-15 is too advanced for the Saudis to combat the real threat to them — Iraq, which is building up an astounding arsenal from the Soviets. We are completing a study on arms in the Persian Gulf which shows the threat of the Iraqi arsenal.

PRE-PUBLICATION ORDERS NOW BEING TAKEN FOR

**Transcripts
of the
FUSION ENERGY FOUNDATION'S
conference on
MIDDLE EAST PEACE *and*
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

Held in New York, January 24, 1978

Because of the historic significance of this conference, the Fusion Energy Foundation plans to immediately publish a limited number of **excerpted transcripts** for subscribers at a cost of \$25.00 each. Excerpts will deal with the highlights of the Jan. 24 conference, where more than 200 participants — including representatives from a dozen Middle Eastern and African governments, from U.S. military, intelligence, and energy agencies, and from several American trade unions, corporations, and universities — debated the need for industrial development in the current peace process in the Mideast.

Included in this document will be:

- * U.S. Department of Energy official Stephen O. Dean's announcement of new scientific results which confirm fusion power "as a practical option for future energy use" worldwide.
- * Pakistani Ambassador to the U.N. Iqbal Akhund's discussion of the need for fundamental changes in the world monetary system to facilitate expanded trade and development.
- * The conference's keynote address by Dr. Clovis Maksoud, former Arab League special envoy now at Georgetown University, on the crucial importance of a political solution in the Middle East to a workable U.S.-Soviet detente.
- * Statements by Stefan Possony of the Hoover Institution, Dr. Mohammed Rabie, a Permanent Delegate to the Euro-Arab Dialogue, Oklahoma Times editor John C. Curry, and others.
- * The FEF's proposed program for Mideast industrial and nuclear development — and part of the conference participants' debate on that program.

These excerpted transcripts will be mailed before March 1, 1978.

The **full proceedings** of the conference, at a cost of \$250.00 will be available by August 1, 1978. Orders for full proceedings will be accepted now.

FULL PROCEEDINGS

I am enclosing \$ _____ for _____ copies of the Proceedings of the FEF's Conference on Middle East Peace and Economic Development at \$250.00 each.

NAME _____
INSTITUTION _____
ADDRESS _____

EXCERPTED TRANSCRIPTS

I am enclosing \$ _____ for _____ copies of Excerpted Transcripts of the Proceedings of the Fusion Energy Foundation's Conference on Middle East Peace and Economic Development at \$25.00 each.

NAME _____
INSTITUTION _____
ADDRESS _____