

SUPPORT THE LABOR PARTY

The Labor Party has a plan for Middle East peace, a plan already being widely discussed in U.S. and foreign government, scientific, and industrial circles, a plan totally technically and politically feasible. The core of this plan is joint economic development for Israel and the Arab countries based on nuclear and agricultural projects financed by U.S., European and Soviet credits and technological input. Israel has to do nothing but recognize the PLO and withdraw to her recognized borders, and peace, progress, and security will be hers.

If she won't do it voluntarily, the U.S. and Soviets must impose it in the world's interest.

The U.S. Labor Party program is the only one that will work. Right now Carter is being insulated from this program by Brzezinski, Schlesinger, and Blumenthal. To shake him loose, your voice must be heard.

Declare your support for the Labor Party Mideast program. Announce you agree with the Labor Party's demand to oust British agents Brzezinski, Schlesinger, and Blumenthal. Speak out for the Labor Party and America. It's the psychotic Jewish Lobby or the U.S.

An American Policy For The Middle East

An Israeli-PLO Accord At Geneva

The United States of America must immediately join with the Soviet Union in a joint effort to reconvene the Middle East peace talks at Geneva in order to prevent the ongoing serious deterioration of the Palestine conflict from sliding toward general war. President Carter and Secretary of State Vance should announce that the national interest of the United States fundamentally requires that a peace settlement be imposed with utmost urgency, and that the Egypt-Israel bilateral talks have failed.

The situation demands that the Administration be brutal. The President must seek a national consensus behind the policies outlined below, and make use of the enormous weight of Presidential prestige to rally American public opinion. The posturing of loud-mouthed Congressmen and the broken-record braying of the Israel Lobby should be branded, not so subtly, for what it is: Treason. And the leading upholders of the inglorious Lord Balfour tradition in the American Cabinet, James Schlesinger and Michael Blumenthal, must be made to join the ranks of the unemployed.

The President must read the riot act to Israel. No dramatic ultimatums will be necessary; but a firmly delivered statement to the Israelis — that their childish and hypocritical policy must change, and change radically — will be effective if it is coupled with an unequivocal refusal to underwrite Israeli military adventurism. Israel is an American client state, and should be treated as such. Under such circumstances, the despicable irresponsibility shown by virtually the entire Israeli leadership will come to an end, and a responsible group of leaders will emerge to bring Israel peace.

The terms of a Middle East settlement are quite simple. Israel must be compelled to come to an agreement with the Palestine Liberation Organization on a permanent division of historic Palestine into two states, one Jewish and one Arab. Such an arrangement would be endorsed without hesitation by the Arab world, and would bring about a stable set of peace treaties between Israel and its neighbors. The responsibility of the United States, together with its Western partners and the USSR, is to underwrite the political agreement with a package

of economic development credits, capital, and technology.

There is no alternative to such a policy. To fail to act in such a manner is to give the City of London and Henry Kissinger a license to murder peace in the Middle East. President Sadat, Prime Minister Begin, and PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat have proved themselves incapable of negotiating a settlement alone. In the best interests of the parties concerned, Washington and Moscow should impose a solution — ruthlessly ignoring squawks of protest from Israel and from irredentist Palestinians.

AMERICAN NATIONAL INTEREST

There is no question that a permanent peace in the Middle East is a matter of the most urgent national interest. First, in strategic terms, the security of the Middle East is intimately related to a stable East-West balance in global terms, and any attempt to shift that strategic balance unilaterally by confrontation in the Middle East is certain to plunge the world into thermonuclear holocaust. The anti-Soviet "step-by-step" diplomacy of Henry Kissinger, which was aimed at expelling Soviet influence from the Arab world and the Persian Gulf, and which is the guiding philosophy of Zbigniew Brzezinski, is a suicidal game of chicken.

Second, for the next ten years, the oil-producing nations of the Persian Gulf, particularly Saudi Arabia, will be the sole available source of petroleum for an expanding world economy. Until advanced forms of nuclear power, including fusion energy, can be brought on line, the industrial might of the Western world must depend on Saudi Arabia. That fact, which is unchallengeable, makes political stability in the area imperative.

A stable Middle East will free the Arab states to develop healthy economic ties to both the Western industrial and Comecon sectors, and long-term oil-for-technology arrangements between OPEC and the industrial world will replace the shaky and uncertain price and supply relationships that now prevail. The Arab surplus petrodollars will be made available to help finance a vast

expansion of industrial output in the West and to fund a Renaissance in the Middle East itself, in which the state of Israel will benefit enormously.

These considerations largely motivated President Nixon and then Secretary of State Rogers in the period after 1969. In conjunction with the Soviet Union, Nixon and Rogers sought to propose an equitable Middle East solution and brought to bear the full weight of the United States to achieve this objective. Plans initially developed in the Eisenhower Administration for regional nuclear power development were updated and put forward as concrete proposals. Careful diplomatic moves were set into motion to win Israeli and Egyptian support for the Rogers Plan, in the framework of the United Nations.

But, as history records, from his command post at the National Security Council Henry Kissinger worked tirelessly to undermine the Rogers initiative. Under Kissinger's guidance, Jordan exploded in bloody civil war in 1970-71. In 1973, Dr. Kissinger ousted Rogers and replaced him as Secretary of State just weeks before the October 1973 war. And, with the advent of Kissinger's shuttle diplomacy, a civil war wracked Lebanon from 1975 through 1976.

Now, Brzezinski, Schlesinger, and Blumenthal have formed a troika in the Administration to continue the Kissinger method. They and the "Israel Lobby" have entered a conspiracy to destroy the U.S.-Saudi relationship — and the U.S. dollar — and force America into Nazi-modeled austerity and autarky. In the United States, a great deal of the political power of the industrial faction associated with the Rockefellers, John Connally, and Bert Lance is dependent on Saudi Arabia, and a rupture of the American-Saudi relationship would vastly weaken that faction relative to the Lazard Freres monetarist clique that sponsors Blumenthal, Felix Rohatyn, George Meany, and the Israel Lobby.

WHY SADAT FAILED

The Sadat initiative begun with his state visit to Israel in November 1977 did not necessarily have to end in failure. Sadat's action came as a desperate response to a growing crisis in which the Kissinger forces and the Israel Lobby had paralyzed the Carter Administration with respect to the Oct. 1 joint U.S.-Soviet statement on Geneva. His goal was to achieve a joint Egyptian-Israeli "statement of principles" in which Israel would commit itself to recognize Palestinian national rights.

The collapse of the Sadat initiative is directly to be attributed to the intervention of British Intelligence through the exercise of a powerful international apparatus involving key agents-of-influence not only in Israel, but in Egypt, the PLO, Iraq, Libya, and Western Europe. Inside Egypt, the clique of fervent Anglophiles associated with the pre-Nasser regime of the perverted King Farouq, now centered around the Cairo daily Al Akhbar and Prime Minister Mamdouh Salem, have a powerful hold over the Egyptian President and his entourage. The various factions of the PLO are ridden with rabble-rousing extremists who recall the anti-Jewish fanaticism of the Nazi Mufti Haj Amin al-Husseini, and can be traced to explicit British Intelligence channels through "radical" Arab nests in Iraq and Libya, but which primarily operate from British safehouses in Jordan and Iran. It was this rise in power of British in-

fluence in the region recently that was welcomed by Israeli Foreign Minister Dayan upon the visit of Foreign Secretary David Owen to Israel and Jordan last month.

At the time of Sadat's trip, he had valid reason to believe that Begin, who is by no means a British stooge like Dayan, might be able to rise above the organized psychosis that passes for Israeli politics and lead the nation to a compromise for peace. The qualities of a statesman were not absent in Begin, and at the start it was apparent that Begin had begun to move toward peace. For the first time, the Israeli state acknowledged that the Palestinian problem was the core of the conflict in the Middle East.

But gradually, Begin's position hardened. After a visit to the United States in December, Begin increasingly became a prisoner of Dayan and the hawks in the Cabinet, and as a result the Christmas Day summit between Sadat and Begin in Ismailia, Egypt, was a miserable failure. A deterioration began, in which the deeply religious Jew and holocaust-dominated Begin was more and more provoked into intransigence. Within Israel and Egypt, British Intelligence networks began an anti-Palestinian putsch, aimed at cutting loose Sadat and Begin from their commitment to a Palestine resolution, and pushing them toward a separate peace. With Sadat's — and King Hussein's — refusal to travel that route, the deadlock was complete, the talks broke down, and the stage was set for the Israeli blitzkrieg into Lebanon.

During this process, the United States failed to recognize the ongoing deterioration and threat of war. Under pressure from the City of London agents in his Cabinet and from the Jewish lobby, Carter insisted on what proved to be hopeless efforts to breath life into the dead Israel-Egypt talks. Thus, the world was to watch the pathetic spectacle of State Department Undersecretary Alfred Atherton being batted helplessly back and forth like a shuttlecock from Cairo to Jerusalem to Amman in search of an impossible formula.

Throughout this period, neither Egypt, Israel, nor the PLO exhibited the necessary political responsibility for actual peacemaking. Sadat, blinded by anticommunism and forced to deal with a hardened pro-British faction within the Egyptian establishment, blundered his way into isolating Egypt from its Arab allies, from key African countries, from Cyprus, from the PLO, and from the Soviet Union. Begin proved sadly incapable of filling the role of the world-historical statesman into which he had been cast. PLO Chairman Arafat, instead of leading a disciplined Palestinian government-in-exile, found himself weak and unable to control the extremist and terrorist factions of the Palestinian movement, which culminated in the successful effort of British Secret Intelligence Services to implicate Arafat's Fatah organization in the March 11 terrorist atrocity in Israel.

ISRAEL'S PROPER ROLE

Provided that the United States takes the situation in hand and determines to crush the "rejection front" on both sides of the Arab-Israeli conflict, then Israel will have an important role to play in the future of the Middle East. Otherwise, the state of Israel is likely to disappear in a radioactive cloud.

First of all, it should be made clear that informed Israeli circles are fully aware of the enormous leverage

that Israel has by obstructing a Middle East peace. A recent conversation with an active Israeli Intelligence officer revealed the extent of this irresponsible cynicism: When apprised of the tremendous importance that the U.S., Europe, and the Arabs place on a stable Middle East, including its implications for urgent efforts to establish a workable new monetary system and a coherent energy policy, he replied, "Then all this can be blocked if we refuse to cooperate, can't it?"

It is that kind of remark which provides some justification for the view that Israel — if it refuses to cease its actions in Her Majesty's secret service — may do more than "call into question its justification to exist," as the Soviets wrote in 1956. It may forfeit its right to exist at all.

Surely not all Israelis intend so cynically to hold the world hostage to their distorted concept of the Israeli security. In the context of a no-nonsense American ap-

proach to Israel, which is totally dependent on almost an hour-to-hour basis on U.S. infusions of food, fuel, weapons, and money, thoughtful Israelis will happily accept parallel American offers to guarantee Israeli security and to provide stable, long-term security through plans for economic cooperation with the Arab states. In this context, Israel's highly developed technology and capital goods industry will become an important component of an expanding Middle East economy.

Israel must learn, finally, to act as a state among states, and must be made to swallow the concept of a Palestinian state.

—by Bob Dreyfuss
U.S. Labor Party Director of
Middle East Intelligence

**The Industrial Development
Of Southern Africa
conference sponsored by the
Fusion Energy Foundation
May 2, 1978**

Madison Hotel Washington, D.C.

"The United States and southern Africa — all the countries of southern Africa — have a profound common interest in a vast expansion of mutually beneficial trade. An industrially advanced and advancing southern African region should not only be at the forefront of American policy toward the region, but the very process of that development, creating as it will a tremendous market for American high-technology exports and capital equipment, will be a powerful stimulant to the U.S. economy, creating jobs and gearing up industrial capacity..."

—from the Fusion Energy Foundation's conference proposal

Frederick Seltz,
President, Rockefeller University

Peter Vanneman,
*Professor, Department of Political Science,
University of Arkansas*

W.C.J. van Rensburg,
*Professor, Department of Geology & Anthropology,
Western Texas State University*

Carlos DiArregunaga,
Senior Vice President & Economist, Bank of America

(affiliations are for purposes of identification only)

For further information contact:
the Fusion Energy Foundation
G.P.O. Box 1843, New York, New York 10001
(202) 583-8845

Advertisement