

Brzezinski Stages Coup In White House:

Israeli Invasion Of Lebanon Hurls World Toward U.S.-Soviet Showdown

The Israeli invasion of Lebanon, raising the threat of a confrontation with Syria, has drastically raised the stakes in international relations and pushed the world closer to a Cuban missile crisis-style showdown between the United States and the Soviet Union.

As a result of the Lebanon invasion, the Cold War faction led by National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski has staged a coup within the Carter Administration, seizing control of the White House and plunging the country into a direct confrontation with Moscow. The State Department and its allies, sources report, have been shut out of policymaking.

The Brzezinski triumph was signaled by a sabre-rattling speech by President Carter on March 17. In a message that the *Washington Star* called the Administration's "new tough line," Carter warned in the strongest terms that present Soviet military policy is unacceptable to the United States, and threatened to unleash an arms race, effectively destroying the SALT talks. The Soviet Union, Carter warned, is pursuing an aggressive policy of "projecting its military power" around the world in hotspots like Africa, the Middle East, and the Persian Gulf, and had thereby undermined American public support for détente! Any Soviet attempt to pursue a war-winning policy would be tantamount to "national suicide," concluded the raving Carter.

Soviet response was immediate. Against the background of strong USSR warnings about Lebanon, Moscow — via TASS — condemned the Carter speech as "moving away from détente," an "alarming" provocation signaled by a "policy of threats."

Backing up its strong response, Moscow made a series of on-the-ground moves last week that left no doubt about the seriousness of the emerging crisis. A Soviet delegation arrived in Zambia, the *Daily Telegraph* reported, to plan for Soviet and Cuban assistance to the African front-line states in their war against the British-Rhodesia bloc. In the Horn of Africa, Moscow made it clear that it would not withdraw its forces from Ethiopia until there was a normalization of the regional situation, despite the Somali withdrawal, and Cuban Premier Castro echoed the Soviet statement. On the Middle East, the Soviets began the closest consultation with Syria and the Palestine Liberation Organization — after visits to Moscow by PLO Chairman Arafat and Syrian President Assad — and demanded an immediate withdrawal of the Israeli invaders, linking the U.S. to the invasion (see below).

From all indications, however, Washington is ignoring the pattern of Soviet activity and plunging ahead with its

confrontation policy. A virtual troika has assumed power, over Carter's head, composed of Brzezinski, Energy Secretary James Schlesinger, and Treasury Secretary Michael Blumenthal. Their goal is to effect a permanent alignment of American policy with Britain in both economic and military policy, namely a Cold War policy toward the USSR and a policy of Schachtian austerity and dollar collapse on the economic front. A crucial aspect of the Brzezinski-Schlesinger-Blumenthal thrust is to sever American ties to Saudi Arabia, the main prop of the dollar and the only source of additional petroleum supplies for the medium-term period.

War In Lebanon

According to the latest reports, the Israeli army in Lebanon is extending its presence and introducing a series of new elements into the already highly explosive situation. Despite reports that only a limited "mopping up" is taking place, it is apparent that Israel intends to expand its occupation to include the key port city of Tyre and possibly parts of the Hasbaya and Bekaa valleys in southeastern Lebanon as well. Israeli Prime Minister Begin stated defiantly that Israel would stay in Lebanon "indefinitely" until the security of Israel could be guaranteed by the Arabs, who must, in effect, dismantle the PLO! Physical evidence supported this concern, including the construction by Israel of roads and infrastructure that indicated that the Israelis were digging in for a long stay.

At least 25,000 Israeli forces are involved in the invasion. Air force jets hit targets as far north as Beirut, Damur, and Sidon, and for the first time the highly sophisticated F-15 fighter bombers were used in offensive actions. Hundreds of civilian casualties were reported in Lebanon, and some accounts told of atrocities committed by Israeli forces, including deliberate mass murder of Lebanese civilians and Palestinian women and children. In addition, Syrian and Saudi peacekeeping forces in and around Beirut have come under Israeli attack, but so far there has been no direct military response.

Immediately threatened was Syria, which, while maintaining close contact with the Soviet Union, has been extremely cautious in its response. The Syrians pledged the use of their Air Force to defend Palestinian camps in north and central Lebanon, and some Syrian troops have reportedly shot at Israeli jets, downing at least one. On March 15, the 30,000 Syrian peacekeeping troops in Lebanon were placed on alert, and then on Thursday the entire 227,000-man Syrian Army was

alerted. On the same day, Syrian President Assad received a letter from Soviet President Brezhnev.

The Israeli blitzkrieg followed a staged provocation on Saturday, March 11, when Palestinian terrorists seized an Israeli bus, an event that ended with a bloody massacre of several dozen Israelis by Israeli troops. The massacre whipped national emotion into hysterical demands for revenge, and gave Begin and Foreign Minister Dayan their pretext for launching the invasion.

State Department Isolated

Although the Israeli invasion of Lebanon was ostensibly aimed at crushing the PLO in Lebanon, in fact the operation has no real military objective. It is meant as a purely political provocation. It was launched in the midst of intensive U.S. and West German efforts, backed by Saudi Arabia, to establish the cornerstone of a new world monetary system initially by stabilizing the falling dollar and then pegging the dollar to the deutschemark at a much higher dollar value. This effort, which had the backing of the State Department and the Office of Special Trade Negotiator Robert Strauss, was wrecked by the Israeli terror and counterterror and the continuing refusal of Treasury Secretary Blumenthal to stop the dollar rout.

Throughout last week, the State Department played a rear-guard role in defending the national interest, but was increasingly isolated by the Brzezinski faction. After a paralyzing two days in which the Administration did not respond to the Israeli invasion, in the early evening of Thursday, March 16, the State Department issued a mild condemnation of Israel and demanded its withdrawal from Lebanon. Although this was a shift from previous Administration positions, which had virtually endorsed Israeli actions, the Thursday official statement did not set any time limit for the Israeli withdrawal. "The State Department virtually admitted Israel's right to invade Lebanon!" said a jubilant spokesman for the Israel Lobby.

An initial U.S. call for a United Nations peacekeeping force for the south of Lebanon was quickly wrecked by Israel, and Brzezinski forced the U.S. to go along. Israel demanded that any withdrawal by Israeli troops be linked to the arrival of an "active" UN force with "muscle" for use against the PLO, a condition that neither the Arabs nor the USSR could support — but the U.S. accepted the Israeli position. Thus, the specter loomed of a Soviet veto of the UN Security Council resolution, and apparently Lebanon is considering withdrawing its request for such a Security Council meeting.

Meanwhile, the Brzezinski forces' pressure on the Administration was stepped up to coincide with the crisis in the Middle East. In a speech to the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations Friday, March 17, Aspen Institute co-director Harlan Cleveland warned the President against breaking with Brzezinski. In his speech, which was entitled "The Carter Administration — Some Lessons He Should Have Learned," Cleveland declared that Carter had done well in his 1976 campaign because "his speeches were written by Zbigniew Brzezinski." He then went on to say that there would be a "Cabinet reshuffle which could go two ways — if Carter breaks with Brzezinski's policies now, he warned, it would mean a whole new leadership in the U.S. If Carter followed Brzezinski's lead, then the changes would be minor. Cleveland called the President inept without Brzezinski. This speech followed an article in the London *Times* of March 16, entitled "Carter at the Crossroads." The British paper warned that Carter faced major challenges, on the Middle East situation, the coal strike, the Panama Canal Treaty, with the fate of the Administration resting on how he handled them.

Earlier this week Senator Henry Jackson (D-Wash.), a key collaborator of Brzezinski and Kissinger, launched an all-encompassing attack on the President's domestic and foreign policies. Jackson at a press breakfast March 14 said an inadequate White House staff had made bad decisions and showed indecision on the Middle East, Angola, the Horn of Africa, the coal strike, precisely the issues the Administration began to handle in a more positive way this week.

White House spokesman Jody Powell acknowledged in his press briefing Monday that the President's special assistant, Hamilton Jordan, has been asked by the President to conduct an Administration reshuffle. Cleveland's wild statements reflect his associates' fears that this reshuffle may well mean the sacking of Brzezinski, Blumenthal or Schlesinger.

Columnist Eliot Janeway, who is close to Administration members, noted in the *Chicago Tribune* Tuesday, March 14, that the President was interested in firing Treasury Secretary Blumenthal but was afraid of anger from the business community. Joseph Kraft noted in his syndicated column the same day that the President should centralize all domestic policy in his hands and rely on the State Department and Defense Department for policy. This would necessitate some Cabinet ousters, he noted approvingly, but added that Carter might feel still politically too weak to do so.