

2. A vehicle for East-West showdown

A campaign to paint the Soviet Union as the "great danger" in the Middle East was launched to coincide with the start of the Camp David meeting, and as the results of the summit were announced, the anti-Soviet drive reached a new level of intensity.

The Camp David outcome is to be the latest vehicle for the consolidation of an anti-Soviet, China-linked Middle East Treaty Organization (METO), modeled after NATO, a scheme that is being urged on the U.S. as vital to national security, but that will in fact ensure regional war and a direct U.S.-Soviet face-off.

Complementing this strategy to polarize the region into two hostile camps is an ongoing effort to carve up the Mideast into a multitude of tiny tribal states. This plan to "redraw the map" — at a minimum a promise of "tribal" destabilizations against existing governments — not only seeks the decimation of the Soviet Union's Mideast allies, but looks to surround the Soviets' southern flank with a tangle of unstable, British- and Israeli-controlled puppet states.

The primary aim of the backers of the METO option is to use both the war threat over Lebanon and the civil strife in Iran as triggers for a U.S.-Soviet confrontation. Sounding one of the first alarms about the "Soviet threat" to the northern tier and the oil-rich Persian Gulf, Senator Henry Jackson (D-Wash.), a stalwart of the British-allied Zionist lobby, made a hysterical plea on Sept. 10 for "a Middle East Defense Pact to stop the Soviet encirclement of the Gulf."

With the culmination of the Camp David talks, the British press unleashed a barrage of articles cultivating the myth of the "mounting Soviet danger." An article in the Sept. 17 London *Observer* entitled "Russians Threaten Arab Oil" by Patric Seale is like a virtual printout of Aspen Institute and Rand Corporation perceptions of the Middle East and the proposed METO-style solution:

In a flurry of secret consultations over the past few

Exclusive: Think-tanker on the Mideast 'China card'

In a Sept. 18 interview with the Executive Intelligence Review, Marshall Goldman, a Harvard Sovietologist, described the developing Chinese-Zionist relationship and its importance in "containing" the Soviet Union.

Q: What do you think of the Camp David results?

A: I think it's terrific. Carter has managed to bring two people together who refused to have anything to do with each other not long ago. The agreements reached at the summit will introduce an element of stability to the Middle East that will be good for everyone but the Russians.

They should bring about stability in oil prices as well. The Russians are the only ones who benefit from higher oil prices, you know.

They're the third largest oil exporter, and while the Saudis and Iranians are not particularly interested in hiking oil prices because they're not running a deficit, the Russians are.

Q: Yet there has been a lot of negative comment on the summit results, not only from the Soviets and the radical Arabs, but from the Europeans as well, and on top of (Egyptian Foreign Minister) Kamel's resignation, other top Egyptian officials are also reportedly preparing to abandon the Sadat government.

A: Did you see Kissinger on television this morning? He pointed out that it's a matter of tradition for Egyptian Foreign Ministers to resign when there is a new peace initiative. Fahmi resigned after Sadat's trip to Jerusalem. I think Kissinger's absolutely correct, and, in my view, it's a good sign — a sign of progress — that Kamel resigned.

Q: But what if the Saudis do come out against the agreements?

A: That would be difficult, but even if they did, I think Sadat would stick to his guns because he detests the PLO....(If the Saudis withdraw their financial support from Sadat) the U.S. could step in and take over that role.

Q: Begin indicated today that the U.S. will build two airbases in the Sinai. Do you think there is anything to this?

A: I don't have any inside information, but I do think it is likely.

Q: Do you think this will lead to greater U.S. military involvement?

A: Probably not, but conceivably, the Chinese will come in. The Chinese couldn't have designed a better agreement themselves. I wouldn't be surprised if the Chinese had a hand in this. (The Camp David agreements) give the Chinese a much freer hand in Asia because they cut Soviet access to the Suez.

weeks, the principal Western Powers and Saudi Arabia have been attempting to hammer out a strategy of containment to check Soviet expansion towards the vital oilfields of the Middle East.

These contacts are judged as important as the more publicised Camp David talks. . . . The prime underlying object of both is the defense of oil.

The turmoil in Iran is only the latest of a series of recent developments which have demonstrated the extreme vulnerability of the West's oil supplies.

This year has seen a fundamental change in the balance of power on the periphery of the Middle East. With startling rapidity, the Soviet Union has captured strategic positions in Afghanistan, Ethiopia, and South Yemen. It has thus breached the "Northern Tier," that ring of States on Russia's southern frontier which constituted the West's traditional defense line, and, by straddling the Bab al-Nandab Straits, has become a major power in the Red Sea.

Sudan, Egypt and especially Saudi Arabia now feel they are next in line for a Soviet assault.

On Sept. 18, the London *Daily Telegraph* reported allegations by the Iranian Information Minister that the unrest in Iran is a "Communist plot." Significantly, the Shah has denied any involvement by the Soviets and instead is blaming "Islamic Marxists" — who are known to be controlled by British intelligence — for the rioting. Ironically, despite all the talk of Soviet "sabotage" of Iranian oil, it has been British

Petroleum and the allied Royal Dutch Shell group which have been effectively impeding oil production in Iran by their reluctance to heed contractual arrangements for production levels.

Like Senator Jackson, other Zionist spokesmen in the U.S. are lobbying for METO. In a Sept. 16 interview with the French daily *Le Matin de Paris*, Sen. Frank Church called for a "grand alliance" against the Soviets. "The game at Camp David," said Church, "is the creation of a grand alliance that will prevent Soviet penetration in the Middle East, thereby safeguarding the vital interest in the Western world.

Echoing Church, Steve Bryen, special adviser for Middle East affairs for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee who was brought under interrogation earlier this year for passing on restricted intelligence to Israel, proposed that Egypt and Israel join NATO.

In a recent interview, Bryen was asked what he thought of the METO idea. He answered, "It's good but a long way off . . . First, I can see two other options. Number one, associate membership in NATO for Egypt and Israel, so as to untangle them from regional politics. Number 2, U.S. presence in the region, complete with naval calling stations or whatever."

"If Israel and Egypt join NATO, won't that drive the rest of the Arab states more closely into the Soviet camp?" he was asked.

Q: Do you know for a fact whether the Chinese consulted with the Israelis on Camp David prior to the summit?

A: Well, I do know that there has been a lot of very recent diplomatic activity between the Chinese and the Israelis.

Q: How about the Lebanese situation? How do you think the summit will affect it?

A: I don't anticipate any increase in fighting. The PLO has been virtually wiped out in Lebanon, and I don't think the Syrians will want to unleash what's left in any case.

Q: In terms of the radical Arab states — do you think that they are likely to develop even closer ties with the Soviets, especially in light of (Syrian Foreign Minister) Khaddam's recent statements calling for the Arab nations to sign a defense pact with the USSR?

A: No. The Arab radicals do not trust the Russians, and will not bring them in to the Mideast.

Q: Senator Percy yesterday suggested that if Camp David failed, Henry Kissinger should be brought in to negotiations. What's your reaction to this idea?

A: Kissinger is not needed now, given what's happened in the last 24 hours. This is the same agreement he would have negotiated. Yes, I think you can call it a separate peace.

Q: Don't you think that the Soviets will see the settlement as part of a Brzezinski-Chinese strategy to encircle them, and consequently a direct threat to their strategic integrity — and consequently a casus belli?

A: Of course the Soviets see these developments, especially (Chinese party chief) Hua's trip, as an effort to encircle them. I do think it's a real possibility that the Soviets will launch a military attack against China. This is one reason why we should develop even stronger ties with China, as a way of preventing such an attack.

However, there is no way the Soviets will launch a nuclear attack against the U.S. It doesn't make any sense. If they do, they'll open themselves up to an Asian war with the Chinese. They are very afraid of this.

Q: What will the U.S. do if the Soviets attack China?

A: We'll just sit there with our mouths open and watch. The Soviets insist that the U.S. won't be able to remain neutral — they're very scared about this — but I believe we can.

What's been going on recently is great. It's just like watching a tennis game. The Russians are really getting hurt. The Chinese are the best thing that has happened to America in a long time.

"Of course, that's what this game is all about!" Bryen replied. "Any kind of agreement between Egypt and Israel is going to do that. I've always thought that a comprehensive settlement is bunk."

An editorial in the Sept. 20 Baltimore *Evening Sun* likewise stressed that the overriding importance of Camp David was to bolster "Western" Security.

Bluntly, what is at stake is this: It is the Persian Gulf oil pool and the increasingly naked Soviet design to encircle it and by one or another exertion of leverage to dominate it and have to dominate those nations whose economic welfare is almost literally hooked to it by pipeline. Nowhere else on the earth just now does Soviet and American interest confront one another so directly. . . .

Camp David cannot by itself blot out all this. What it can do is help drain away the old Arab-Israeli poisons and substitute for them a sense of unity and common purpose among those — Iraq and Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Jordan and, yes, Israel — whose interests parallel western interests. Beyond that, suggestions begin to surface about western military installations if in a different context talk arises of U.S.-built air bases in Israel's Negev as an even more stabilizing force. Looked upon as a southern extension of NATO to a neighboring region where the familiar East-West antagonists now confront one another with a fresh urgency, the notion is likely to gain appeal.

Last week, the Soviet press agency Novosti blasted Zbigniew Brzezinski, Carter's security adviser, for trying to set up "an extension of NATO" in the Middle East.

One prominent Israeli spokesman, in commenting on Camp David, pointed out that with a separate Israeli-Egypt pact, a Middle East Treaty Organization might not even be needed, given the anti-Soviet orientation of Egypt and Israel! This source went on to say: "We don't have to think about the creation of a Middle East Treaty Organization as such against the Soviets. There's no point to it, we don't need it. Rather, if we sign separate pacts with Egypt and Israel, and take into account already-existent agreements with the Saudis, we will have a *virtual* Pax Americana in effect.

"As this takes shape, the U.S. will increasingly be in a position to tell the Soviets, 'If you don't like it, screw! The Middle East is a matter of life and death to us, not to you, and we'll go to war over it, and you won't.'

"The Soviets will have to understand this. What alternative do they have? If Syria gets into any war, they'll get clobbered, and if the Soviets move in to fight Israel, there will be U.S.-Soviet war.

"What is now taking shape, therefore, is an *implicit* agreement that the U.S. should have a sphere of influence in the Middle East, and will not contest a Soviet sphere basically consisting of Syria and Iraq. This may polarize things, but that's the way things are shaping up, and the Soviets will have to face it."

The plan to 'redraw the map of the Mideast'

British and Israeli secret intelligence services are preparing to Balkanize the Middle East, from the Syrian-Lebanon region to the borders of Pakistan and Afghanistan. The means: a series of separatist and tribal insurrections across the region.

The central architect of a set of secret plans for the region is British academic Bernard Lewis, now a professor at Princeton University, a longstanding and vocal proponent of "tribalization." Over the recent months a number of seminars and articles on the subject have appeared; most importantly, this summer Princeton University held a closed seminar led by Lewis and an international colloquium on tribalism was held in Rome. As long as a year ago the widely circulated *Events* magazine ran an article titled "Tribalism in the Mideast" which introduced the notion of "redrawing the map of the Mideast" and cited Bernard Lewis as an advocate of the plan. In this connection a book called *Black Lebanon* reveals documents from Israeli intelligence laying out similar guidelines for altering the borders of many of the sovereign states of the region.

The ideology of tribalism

This fragmentation would involve minorities and tribes such as the Baluchis, the Kurds, the Alawites, the Maronites, and the Egyptian Copts, and from a strategic standpoint would interface British-Israeli intelligence support of Chinese domination of the region against the Soviet Union. Significantly, Lewis just completed a trip to Yugoslavia and Iran only weeks after Chinese Premier Hua Kuo Feng had visited there.

The Balkanization scheme would transform the region into a scramble of fiefdoms whose primary economic strength would derive from the black marketeering of drugs and other contraband from Asia, principally China, to the Mediterranean. Many of the tribal and religious minorities in the area—for example, the Kurds, the Alawites, and the Maronites — are already involved in such black marketeering operations. These nefarious activities are the prime source of income for powerful financial interests connected with the City of London and the international Zionist establishment, which jointly have billions invested in drugs and other illegal traffic internationally.

For the tribalization process to succeed, a number of prodevelopment governments in the oil-rich region of the Persian Gulf, most importantly Saudi Arabia and Iran, will fall. These governments have consistently fought to displace the feudal tribal potentates

of the area in favor of centralized government structures. Toppling these governments in order to impose tribal communalist entities would be a catastrophe for the world economy, as well as a grave threat to world peace.

The oligarchic links

The elite around these City of London and Zionist establishments is organized into a number of "secret societies," such as the Most Venerable Order of St. John of Jerusalem, the Mont Pelerin Society and the associated Jerusalem Foundation. These societies interface with prominent old families in the Mideast whose lineage goes back as far as the ancient Phoenicians and who form networks that are intimately involved in the "tribalism" racket. For example, the Coptic Sursok family, half of which resides in Egypt and half in Lebanon, are intimately connected to the European oligarchy centered in London, and are intermarried into European nobility such as the Roman Coloma family that are part of the conspiracy to carve up the Middle East. Significantly, the Sursoks, along with other of their feudal allies, are known proponents of the Osiris cult, an ancient secret cult whose ideology holds tribalism to be the basis of all human social organization.

From the Lebanon side, the extremist elements within the Maronite community also interface with the Order of St. John in London and are intimate collaborators with Israeli intelligence in efforts to partition Lebanon. Ultrarightist warlord Camille Chamoun last month paid a personal visit to the home of Israeli Premier Begin to discuss such plans.

Israeli Infiltration

Numerous informed sources state that Israeli intelligence has infiltrated nearly every important tribal and separatist movement in the area. A Turkish diplomat in Bonn last month stressed that the British have never given up their hope of creating a Kurdish state in Eastern Turkey, Iran, and Iraq. According to one Mideast specialist, the Kurds might well be revved up now in Iraq in the wake of the Camp David talks, to keep the ardently anti-Zionist Iraqis "off guard."

Moreover, numerous sources fear an imminent upsurge of the large and powerful Baluchi tribe which spans Iran, Pakistan, and Afghanistan. A Baluchi upsurge could in turn trigger a number of other large tribes in the area, such as the Pathans, to seek autonomy. A Well-informed source in Washington noted that the emergence of tribal uprisings would directly correlate with the weakening of central governments, and noted the immediate cases in point of Pakistan and Iran. He cited the recent destabilization of the Shah of Iran as a precondition for a regional tribal uprising.

How a "redrawn" Mideast would look

A prominent Washington-based specialist in Mideast affairs spelled out some facets of the Balkanization scenario in an interview last week:

"Any Alawite separatist entity would be up there near the Turkish border with Syria. This kind of thinking goes back to old Bernard Lewis. He has a rather prudent notion that it is not right-left politics that are important in this part of the world, but tribal relations. While the Alawites are only 10 percent of the Syrian population, you know they are the ruling clique, from which President Assad comes. They hold many powerful military and political posts in the country and for that reason are despised by many of their fellow Syrians. An Alawite state would be part of a Greater Syria plan. This has been around for a while.

"It would mean that Israel would annex southern Lebanon, with a buffer Maronite state in central Lebanon, and Syria would take north Lebanon.

"However, a lot of these plans ran into trouble because of the Palestinian presence in Lebanon. The Palestinians botched it. Lewis has been talking about this kind of thing for a long time, at least the mid-1960s . . . and the Israelis are still studying this kind of thing very intently.

"But then you've also got the Pushtus, the Balushis, and the Pathans to mention a few of the tribes in the Pakistan-Iran-Afghanistan area. You know, old Daoud (of Afghanistan) had connections into these tribes, but now with the coup and Taraki it's hard to say what will happen. The Shah has given both Afghanistan and Pakistan a lot of money to keep a lid on these tribes. Under the government of Bhutto, the tribes were silenced due to Bhutto's strong centralization policies, but it is different with Zia. The key element in a Baluchi upheaval is watching the weakening of the governments in the area, especially Pakistan and Iran. They watch, and at the point that they feel centralization is breaking down they move for autonomy.

"It's a disaster in Pakistan. The announcement of Zia's presidency is ridiculous. This means he is here to stay and he is not the strong man Bhutto was. If Bhutto is hung we're going to see trouble.

"As for Iran, the overthrow of the Shah would lead to the country coming apart. This is enough of a problem for the Shah with the riots and all. Now he looks over there at Pakistan, his traditional buffer state, and he gets pretty damned nervous. The Shah doesn't like what he sees in Pakistan. If he fell, there would likely be a partition of the country. There could be a republic of Azerbaijan. You know, many of the religious and opposition figures see the old 1906 constitution as leading to partition . . . This is what the Shah means when he says there would be 'Iranestan' if he were overthrown."