

# A shock wave from the Mideast

*Can it jolt the United States back to reality?*

If anything can jolt the leadership of the United States back to reality, the latest phase of the "Camp David process" ought to do it. Even as the Egypt-Israeli peace talks in Washington were coming apart, the Camp David accords received another decisive setback from one of America's most trusted moderate Arab allies.

Jordan's Crown Prince Hassan arrived in Moscow for talks on the Middle East with Soviet Prime Minister Kosygin, and the two issued a stinging joint communiqué condemning the Camp David accords for "ignoring the legitimate rights of the Arab people and . . . the Palestine Liberation Organization." The communiqué also affirmed the Geneva conference, chaired by both the U.S. and the Soviets, as the only way to reach a viable overall settlement in the Mideast. Moreover, Hassan declared his gratitude to the Soviets for their support of the Arab world, and announced that Jordanian-Soviet ties in all fields will be expanded.

Hassan's trip leaves no doubt that his brother, King Hussein, will refuse to join the Egypt-Israeli dialogue. Jordanian participation, recognized on all sides as a necessary precondition for extending the accords to the West Bank, had been relied on by Washington because of Jordan's close ties to the U.S.

It should come as a healthy shock for the U.S. leadership that Jordan, one of the leading Arab moderate states and a long-time U.S. ally, is not hesitating to strengthen its ties with the USSR as a result of the

Carter Administration's backing for the bilateral Egyptian-Israeli talks. The fact that Camp David, hailed as sweeping aside Soviet influence in the region, is instead having the opposite effect might tell President Carter something about Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski's competence as policy-makers.

In the face of the threat to Arab unity posed by an Egyptian-Israeli "separate peace," the leaders of the Arab world have put aside their ideological differences to forge a new era of unity. Most striking in this process is the role that erstwhile radical Iraq has taken in organizing a November heads of state summit in Baghdad to which all the Arab capitals, including the conservative Gulf States and Saudi Arabia, have agreed to send representatives. In this connection, the intense and long-standing ideological differences between Iraq and Syria are being

overcome, exemplified by Syrian President Assad's agreement to make his first-ever trip to Baghdad to attend the summit.

The Arab leadership has also agreed to contribute to a fund which will provide Egypt with \$5 billion annually in badly needed development aid if Egyptian President Anwar Sadat agrees to renounce the bilateral negotiations with Israel.

Egypt as yet has not officially responded to the offer. However, the ongoing talks in Washington to finalize an Egyptian-Israeli treaty have now broken down. Informed sources indicate that the Egyptians are now demanding that the treaty concerning the Israeli return of the Sinai include a clause linking it to a resolution of the West Bank problem, which Israel refused to accept. This demand indicates that the Egyptian delegation is having second thoughts. What about Jimmy Carter?

## Saving the U.S. from suicide

There is now a consolidated bloc in continental Eurasia, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, that "represents the greatest concentration of economic — and political — power the world has ever seen," writes U.S. Labor Party chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. in the Oct. 20 issue of his party's newspaper, *New Solidarity*. This "new, dominant combination of world leadership," says LaRouche, is now "bypassing

the gone-lunatic U.S. government in shaping the policies among nations." The United States, he warns, will either join in that alliance, or face thermonuclear Armageddon.

The Labor Party leader describes the new power bloc as centered "around the spiritual power of the Vatican, around the *Populorum Progressio* doctrine already embedded in the 'constitutional' resolutions of

Vatican II. The temporal leadership of the world at this moment is exemplified by France's President Giscard d'Estaing, West Germany's Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, and Japan's Prime Minister Takeo Fukuda. Although the Soviet leadership is the principal muscle behind this leadership force, the Brezhnev leadership views the possibility of world peace as best served by its own cooperation with forces currently centered around Giscard, Schmidt, and Fukuda.

"At this moment, Schmidt and Fukuda, both in close cooperation with Islamic and other humanist leaderships, represent the leading forces in economic policy. France's Giscard has assumed world leadership in strategic affairs on behalf of the overall forces within whose ranks he is otherwise a peer.

"The industrialized nations represented are complemented by leading forces among developing nations, with the Islamic proponents of a new world economic order and Mexcco's President Lopez Portillo most prominent."

The economic power of this combination, LaRouche explains, is "based on the keystones of the European Monetary Fund, the Arab Monetary Fund, the Mitsubishi-colored policies of forces behind the Tokyo capital market, and the May 1978 Schmidt-Brezhnev treaties." "Let it also be clear," he adds, "that this present configuration is what the U.S. Labor Party program and policy for the 1975-1976 general elections and presidential campaign, and the policy for which the U.S. Labor Party alone has been the consistent spokesman in the USA over this entire period to date."

### **A new American leadership**

The men currently at the helm in the United States are presiding over the lawful disintegration of their initiatives — and proposing still more of the same as the solution. Under these conditions, says LaRouche, "the U.S. Labor Party declares the de facto existence of a new political leadership in the United States. We propose to name this new leadership the *American Whig Policy-Coalition*. The Coalition will include the U.S. Labor Party, of course, but will also include Republicans, Democrats, and independents, which, as a combination, will determine who is President of the U.S. in January 1981"

This grouping will be committed to "the new world monetary system," LaRouche says, "to be based on bringing the U.S. dollar up to 3.00 deutschemarks and pegging the open-market price of gold to 720 deutschemarks an ounce." The policy of a "global, 'dirigist' monetary system" is "in absolute agreement with the Federalist-Whig policies of Presidents Washington, John Adams, James Monroe, John Quincy Adams, and Abraham Lincoln."

This program spells out the alternative to national destruction — "to seize the policies forwarded by Giscard, Schmidt, and Fukuda as our own, and to assume our proper leading place in the shaping of the next hundred years of the world's history according to those principles. The United States can take great pride in the fact that the U.S. Labor Party and its chairman have been among the leading intellectual influences contributing to the emergence of the new world monetary order. The United States

has proven, through the existence and activity of the U.S. Labor Party, that our nation is still capable of producing greatness in the leadership of world affairs."

Those who are bringing this Policy-Coalition together have three principal tasks, according to the Labor Party chairman. First, the U.S. must be brought into the new global monetary system centered around the European Monetary Fund. Second, the drug plague — marijuana and other illegal drugs — destroying the nation's youth must be eradicated. Third, the accelerating destruction of U.S. scientific and engineering resources must be reversed, starting at the secondary school and college level.

### **Otherwise, Armageddon**

If the Carter Administration and the majority of the business community continue on the course of economic rapine and war provocations, LaRouche concludes, then this country is "at most weeks away from being destroyed through the consequences of Hour One of general thermonuclear war." That is one way of settling the policy debate. "If Armageddon occurs, then the state of monetary, drug, and scientific policy in the USA will be of little continuing interest to those 150 to 180 million of us who are dead — or to those survivors who will have little direct authority for making the policies under which they and their posterity crawl out of the radioactive nightmare the USA then becomes.

"If there is no Armageddon, then U.S. policy will change drastically through the formation of an American Whig Policy-Coalition."