

Ben-Aharon Scores Peres Putsch

Although the peace faction in Israel is resigned to the likelihood of a Peres victory there is still opposition to the adoption of a military solution. Last week Yitzhak Ben-Aharon, leader of the traditionalist Ahdut Haavoda faction in the Labor Party, labeled the Peres consolidation against Rabin as a "Rafi putsch," a reference to the hawk Rafi faction in the Labour Party led by former defense minister Moshe Dayan. Ben-Aharon also denounced the Peres campaign as a "conspiracy" against Rabin, and charged Abba Eban with complicity. The confrontation between Peres and Rabin is undemocratic, he charged, since the Labour Party constitution provides no objective criteria to choose between Rabin, a member of the core Mapai bloc of the Labour Party, and a member of a Labour Party faction, such as Peres, who is a member of the Rafi bloc.

**Israeli Predicts Military Coup
In Israel In Summer 1977**

The following is an interview concerning the current political crisis in Israel with a former member of the Israeli Knesset (Parliament) who now resides in the United States:

Q: We've just received information that a Middle East war could erupt as early as March, in part because of the deep political crisis in Israel. What do you think?

A: Your timetable is wrong. There will be no crisis until June. A real crisis will develop then, because Israel will find itself without any political leadership whatsoever, not even the phony leadership it has now. The new party of Yigal Yadin will be victorious, not in terms of a majority, but in terms of putting an end to the old, traditional system of Israeli politics, which is weak anyhow.

After the elections, the government will be like the emperor in his 'new clothes' — naked. There will be a collapse of morale. So far, there has always been some kind of leadership in Israel, maybe crazy, maybe wrong, and ridden with complexes — but it will be far worse after the May elections than France in the Fourth Republic. How will they put Humpty-Dumpty together again? God knows. I would not rule out the very real possibility of a shift to the right, and a sort of Jewish-Yiddish military coup.

Q: Can Prime Minister Rabin survive the challenge and make peace?

A: The problem with Israel is that nobody in Israel speaks a language that other people understand. They don't make sense. For everyone except the real hawks, the slogan in Israel is: "Both a Jewish and a Democratic State." This is the slogan of Yadin, of Allon, of Eshkol, of Rabin and Meir. For this, they know they cannot keep the West Bank, since it is populated by Arabs.

But their other slogan — and this is the hawks as well — is: "Our military frontier is the Jordan River." Nobody, especially the Arabs, can agree with that.

Israel needs outside intervention. In 1948 and in 1956, the U.S. told Israel to get out, and they got out. In 1956, it took one phone call to Ben Gurion. He was mad, but he could do nothing.

The Israelis, however, will try to convince Vance that he should leave them alone for six weeks, for three months — but in June, after the elections, there will be no government to talk to. Nobody. Israel will refuse to enter into any new agreements.

After that there will be war.

You know, the Trilateral Commission does not care about the Middle East; they care about Russia. They want Russia, and Europe, out of the Middle East, period. But Europe is at a turning point. Brzezinski and his men will try to figure something out to stop them.

EXCLUSIVE

New Urgency For MBFR Agreement

*by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.
Chairman, U.S. Labor Party*

Reported new progress in Mutual Balanced Force Reduction (MBFR) discussions could not be occurring at a more appropriate time. Outrageous blunders in the Soviet Politburo's public profile concerning "SALT II" agreements have already proven themselves an incitement for the Carter administration to step up its attacks against Saudi Arabia and Europe's imported energy supplies. Early ministerial-level agreements concerning MBFR are, at the moment, the best available means for preventing Brezhnev blunders from leading into an early thermonuclear confrontation.

We do not wish to encourage pacifist sorts of delusions concerning the value of disarmament and related agreements in themselves. In and of themselves "SALT II" and MBFR agreements are worse than useless diplomatic charades. At the present moment the Carter administration is committed to an *operational* policy

leading toward early general confrontation. (Some leading circles deny this, but such denials are without basis in any fact by the denier's need for consoling delusions of that sort.) Under these circumstances, the Carter administration (i.e., the Chase Manhattan Bank-IMF administration) has a fundamental, irrepressible conflict with Western Europe and most of the developing sector — as the case of the West Germany-Brazil nuclear energy development agreement illustrates. That conflict between Chase Manhattan and those nations is unavoidably translated into an irrepressible military conflict between the Carter administration and the Soviet leadership, *which Soviet concessions would merely aggravate, not lessen. Under these conditions any "SALT II" or MBFR agreement acceptable to the Carter administration is a preparation for and acceleration of early thermonuclear confrontations.*

However, just because Europe's self-interests are now directly opposite to all the main policies of the Carter ad-

ministration, it is feasible for Western Europe to utilize the context of the MBFR negotiations for quickly establishing broad and durable conditions of European security in concert with the CMEA nations. Although the Trilateral Carter Administration would make great howls and threats against such a European security agreement, Western Europe would win such a showdown with Carter *in the U.S. Congress* and among major industrialist and trade union forces in the USA generally.

Western European fundamental self-interests in maintaining anti-Carter industrial development and energy policies provide the premise for agreements based on the most fundamental mutual self-interests of the Western European and CMEA nations. The acceleration of the convertible Transferable-ruble program, one leg of the new Euro-Arab, three-way, gold-based monetary system now emerging, provides the political-economic basis for a self-interested demilitarization of the borders between Western Europe and the CMEA countries. With such political-economic agreements placed on the lead of the MBFR agenda, an MBFR agreement would provide a durable basis for European security on terms absolutely acceptable to both principal European sets of parties.

Such an MBFR agreement will, at the same time, pull the plug on Chase Manhattan Bank and Carter administration military and energy policies.

The Crux: Soviet R and D

At this moment, the Soviet leadership has two vital levers for preventing general war. As long as the Soviet leadership presents the world with its open commitment to accelerate research and development around breakthrough areas of plasma physics, and pushes aggressively toward economic partnership with Western Europe and sections of the developing sector, these two indispensable pillars of a self-interested Soviet policy provide the essential pre-conditions for stopping the war drive of the Carter administration. Conversely, any retreat by the Soviet leadership on either point quickly makes thermonuclear war an irreversible inevitability.

The leading political forces in the USA, of which the U.S. Labor Party has been a recognized part since its Nov. 1, 1976 election-eve nationwide television broadcast, are all acutely sensible of these connections. The case of the February 1977 report of Chief of Staff General George Brown underscores the crucial role of highly-visible Soviet R and D in this connection.

As long as the issue of Soviet R and D is prominent in U.S. strategic policy discussions the Carter administration dares not go ahead full steam with its "deindustrialization" and "deenergizing" policies. If Carter et al. are thus forced to make grudging concessions to U.S. industrialist and trade-union factions, the administration is hampered in its efforts to impose an inflationary austerity package of the C. Fred Bergsten-type upon Europe and Japan.

We of the USA's conservative-labor pro-industrial progress faction are acutely sensible of such connections. So are our enemies, the Trilateral apostles of rapine and Fuggery generally.

Carter administration sensitivity to this issue is openly expressed by such confrontationists as Paul Nitze and Bradshaw of the Committee on the Present Danger. At

present, the Carter administration believes gloatingly it has "helped" Soviet Secretary Brezhnev to turn Soviet strategic policy back to the Khrushchev era, and to reach agreement with Brezhnev in concealing and preparing to abort Soviet R and D. Obviously, if Brezhnev were to commit such treachery in fact, and to compound that by slowing down monetary cooperation efforts with Western Europe and the Arabs, such treachery would virtually throw Europe and the Non-Aligned nations to the Trilateral rapists, and create exactly the "geopolitical" combination which Rockefeller's strategic utopians prescribe for conquest of the Soviet Union itself.

The Countdown to War

If one believed that that notorious, lying "Euro-Communist," Arbatov, or Bovin (*bovine?*) represented the balance of Soviet leadership forces, one would have to conclude that Carter did in fact succeed in prompting Brezhnev to make a total capitulation to Rockefeller forces shortly after the Jan. 20, 1977 inauguration. The outrageous lying concerning the identities of "peace-lovers" and "war-mongers" by Soviet "Euro-Communist" contributors to Pravda, Izvestia and Krasnaya Zvezda would indeed suggest that Brezhnev has already agreed to Carter's "SALT II" terms.

However, even if a temporary Politburo majority were to have made such a monstrously stupid agreement, it could not last much longer than a few weeks longer now. By the end of March, inevitable developments in the Middle East and elsewhere would put the Soviet leadership on an operational war-preparations basis.

Whatever either Carter or the Politburo imagines or does not imagine has been agreed around the "SALT II" charade, the public policy-profile offered by Pravda and Izvestia articles is already a monstrous Soviet leadership blunder, which has incited the Trilateraloids to accelerate their already operational confrontation policy (with heavy emphasis on the Middle East and Cyrus Vance's Israeli client-factions), and Saudi Arabia the most prominent immediate target of Carterite aggressions. It is the show of fear (by the Soviet leadership in this case) which incites Carter's mad dog to hasten its aggression.

Although the March date for a Middle East outbreak is only tentative — to the best of our present information, everything is going into place for such an Israeli launching of war. (The pretexts will be, as usual, manufactured as the occasion requires.) That outbreak either deliberately (or, by unforeseen chain-reactions) starts the hard confrontation with the Soviet leadership. Hence, we must proceed on the assumption that we have only a very brief "safe" interval in which to neutralize confrontation configuration.

An MBFR agreement based on economic and related agreements would disrupt the present confrontation configuration.

Tactics For Fast Agreement

Naive people could, of course, recite many reasons why such an MBFR agreement could not possibly be reached by so early a date. Such objections fall into two classes: (1) an obsessive fetishism toward diplomatic formalities, and (2) childish misconceptions of political processes.

The fact that certain negotiations have been tentatively scheduled for certain advanced dates is really of little fundamental relevance. Western European leaders can reach one another by telephone within an hour; signals can be exchanged with the Soviet leadership in time-periods of the same order of magnitude. Granted, the grand diplomatic formalities have some uses, just as great circuses have their entertainment value; however, in an urgent situation chancellors and foreign ministers use more direct and efficient means to predetermine what will be formally institutionalized later on.

It is merely necessary to say to the Politburo through appropriate, non-compromising exploratory channels, "Let's pull the plug on our common problem with the Carter administration," and the appropriate initiatives can proceed as rapidly as the parties desire this to occur.

Naturally, Messrs. Schmidt and Genscher could give us useful instruction from experience in such technicalities; we report such facts here not for their edification, but to correct popular illusions among leading journalists, parliamentarians generally, and so forth.

The useless politician is the cautious fellow who waits until a favorable correlation of forces is acknowledged in his breakfast newspaper before launching enterprises of importance. The competent political leader determines public opinion and other essential conditions for an operation by acting in such a preemptive way as to mold public opinion and so forth. This does not suggest that any bold effort will succeed on that account; it merely emphasizes that *where a favorable correlation of forces potentially exists*, such forces become actualized by appropriate initiatives.

What is wanted in Western Europe is a bold initiative by key leaders which actualizes industrialist and trade-union active support for policies which are already visibly in the urgent self-interest of those broader social forces. It is the oppressive stink of vacillation and inaction under conditions of crisis which threatens to turn a potentially favorable correlation of forces into the atomized victims of defeat.

The projected Naderite obscenity for Brockdorf is a case in point. A mass of supporters of Carter's Trilateral policies wish to turn the clock back in Europe. If the action were successful, it would gut European industry and bring the full weight of a global economic collapse down upon European trade-unionists. Then, where are the masses of trade-unionists mobilized to defend their most vital interests against the Zero Growth-shouting beggars'-opera rabble? The social potential for a mass trade-union force to crush Naderism in the BRD exists; why has it not already been realized? Simply: the workers need a leading initiative, to give an institutional form to the further expression of their urgent self-interests in this matter. It is in this way that leadership initiative is decisive in shaping history.

This principle applies to the MBFR and related measures. If Europe publicly slaps David Rockefeller in the face, in sensuous expression of its vital self-interests, such leadership action will decide the political opinion of Europe.

Can MBFR Succeed?

Muddleheads who have read too many think-tank papers shake their head over MBFR, muttering such

terrifying words as "Finlandization!" What nonsense! Putting the worst construction upon some future Politburo leadership, a Soviet intervention into Western Europe has a high threshold — as General de Gaulle tried to explain with his "Force de Frappe" policy. If the CMEA countries have a vital economic interest in a rational international division of labor involving Western Europe and key parts of the developing sector, Warsaw Pact troop movements in Western Europe would be limited to invited parade-duties at major international sports events and such festivities.

It is not weapons and armies that cause wars, but the deployment of military force as an instrument of a major conflict of vital interests. It happens to be in the most vital interest of both European OECD and CMEA countries to establish a joint new monetary system. Once that interest becomes fully actual, rather than chiefly potential, the internal peace of Europe is easily secured.

It might be objected: Does not the USA as an industrial nation, have the same major potential interest in a new monetary system? The answer is "Yes, absolutely." However, the executive branch of the U.S. government is not presently governed by USA national interest as an *industrial power*. The USA's executive branch is presently occupied by the common enemies of the USA, Western Europe, the developing sector, and the CMEA countries. Until we USA patriots, with aid of your concerned cooperation, rid ourselves of the traitors occupying the U.S. executive branch, the world is not safe. Whereas, in Western Europe, the coalition around the Andreotti government, the Schmidt government, the Callaghan government, the Gaullists in France, and so forth, are governments responsive to the vital industrial and related interests of their nations.

On strategic economic and related political policies the fundamental interests of Western Europe and the CMEA countries coincide. It is merely necessary to transform this potential reality into an institutionalized actuality — and then MBFR becomes a mere certification and administrative fulfilment of an established political-economic reality.

Moreover, the early establishment of steps toward such a political-economic reality takes Western Europe out of the theater of general war, and strengthens the developing sector. It also breaks the will of the Trilateral Washington administration, to the point that a combination of conservative Republican and Democratic forces, allied with industrialists and main bodies of traditionalist trade-unionists, farmers, and others, will then be able to quickly clean up the mess in the U.S. Executive Branch, and join Western Europe in the new reality under way.

There is no guarantee of victory, of course. Too many have vacillated too long. The danger of war could have been absolutely prevented had the developing sector, for example, nations not been predominantly guilty of foolish vacillation on the debt issue at the United Nations during September of last year. Now, we have only good probabilities. Yet, if we experience more flinching and vacillation because of such admitted risks, we shall, most of us, be radioactively dead in a short time. A 1977 thermonuclear war is one of those horrors, which, like World War I and World War II, "absolutely could not occur." At the moment, the MBFR tactic by Europe is the world's best chance of preventing war.