

maliciously mentioned the Venezuelan President, connecting him to false incidents, and this seriously attracts our attention."

In Caracas, Interior Minister Octavio Lepage issued a similar statement. "I doubt this is a product of the tactlessness nor the irresponsibility of a correspondent anxious to produce sensational information," he said. "It is directly related to the firm and resolute nationalist position that the Venezuelan government and in particular the President has assumed. It is a reaction to the position of President Perez in demanding a new world economic order."

On Feb. 21, Perez issued the demand for a retraction. "The government of the United States is obligated before the Venezuelan nation," said Perez, "to refute this indignant and mendacious charge. It cannot be believed that the lying accusation published by one of the most important dailies in the United States, and the mention of the CIA as the source of information, was not done without adhering to plans that involve very high circles of the government." The ambassador to Washington was recalled indefinitely, while Escovar, referring to relations between the countries as "difficult," called Vaky into the Foreign Ministry office to demand a "categorical" explanation of "these slanderous deeds." Reporters, meanwhile, spoke of a possible breaking of relations.

The following day, the Venezuelan ambassador to the Organization of American States, Machin, labeled the incident part of a "conspiracy" carried out by "certain economic groups" — a thinly veiled reference to the Trilateral Commission and Rockefeller-connected

banking and oil interests. The Venezuelan Peasant Federation backed up Machin's indictment by declaring that the CIA slander against Perez was planted by "the same scum" who were behind the Jan. 5 article by syndicated columnist Eliot Janeway, who suggested Brazil "overrun" Venezuela the way "Hitler overran Alsace and Lorraine." Janeway is a former editor of *Time* magazine, whose publisher, Hedley Donovan, is a member of the Trilateral Commission.

Despite Carter's letter, the issue is far from settled. Perez has promised to investigate the maneuvers behind the accusation to its "ultimate consequences." In accepting the letter from Vaky, Escovar emphasized that the Venezuelan government intends to press legal charges against the "authors" of the attack — a move which, if followed through to precisely its "ultimate consequences," would lead back to the National Security Council and the Trilateral Commission.

A unanimous wave of support for Perez and denunciation of the CIA from all political parties has swept Venezuela. Most importantly, Defense Minister General Alvarez Torres, in a highly unusual political statement, pledged the full support of the armed forces, adding that "all Venezuelans" rightfully react with repugnance to the CIA allegations. Even Luis Pinerua Ordaz, the Rockefeller-linked chairman of Perez' *Accion Democratica* party and the figure who has led the insurrection against the government within the party's own ranks, has been forced to concede. Although openly contradicting the President by stating, "there is no reason to believe the U.S. government is implicated," Pinerua grudgingly admitted that the whole country must reject the accusation.

## New Entebbe Next Step In Brzezinski Confrontation Policy?

Jimmy Carter's cabinet officials are deliberately encouraging the wild-eyed actions of Idi Amin, the unstable dictator of Uganda, in the hope that this affair will afford Zbigniew Brzezinski's National Security Council the opportunity for a second "Entebbe" raid, imparting a fuller "aura of power" to the administration. With Amin engaged in pogroms against Uganda's Christian population and indecent provocations of neighboring Tanzania in the service of one of his frequent paranoid episodes, Brzezinski trotted the President out before the Washington press corps this week for a calculated personal attack on Uganda's dictator, who reacted as expected, forbidding 240 Americans from leaving this country.

What is now shaping up is a dangerous "international incident" giving Brzezinski pretext for a pre-planned act of military aggression against Uganda. No threat to the Soviet Union in itself, the implied doctrine of "limited sovereignty" for the nations of the developing sector infringes directly on those Soviet strategic defense capabilities which depend on the Third World's continuing sove-

reign neutrality. Amin's antics do not endanger U.S. national security; Brzezinski's policy of provocation does.

Most relevant, Idi Amin has never had any resemblance to legitimate African or Third World regimes. Mr. Carter's makers-of-policy have a full psychological profile of the easily manipulated dictator, who was installed in power through an original collaborative effort of U.S. and Israeli intelligence agencies, with his personal instability profiled and marked for its perennial usefulness in discrediting both African unity efforts and European initiatives in support of Third World goals generally.

Brzezinski's Uganda "crisis" not coincidentally occurs just before the important Afro-Arab summit meeting Mar. 7 in Cairo, and at a time when both southern Africa and the Middle East are suffering from the effects of war tensions introduced to the regions by Carter cabinet emissaries. Should a *causus belli* now be made of Amin's antics, it will be an exercise of the National Security Council's pre-conceived policy of confrontation with the Third World and Soviet bloc.

The Carter policy-makers themselves explain the ulti-

matum to Amin as part of Carter's accelerated campaign for "human rights."

It is of one fabric with Mr. Carter's outrageous personal communication with Soviet subversive Sakharov. The New York Times' James Reston interviewed Brzezinski himself on the unprecedented letter Feb. 20: "There was nothing inadvertent... It was thought through and discussed with the responsible officials at the NSC and State Department before the president made his 'prudential response'." Brzezinski's policy is to challenge Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe under "human rights" auspices, the surest way to shorten the lives of 160-180 million Americans.

Brzezinski left these implications of his "human rights" campaign to C.L. Sulzberger, who developed them adequately in the same day's *New York Times*. "Finally, suppose the flame of liberty we now so proudly fan flares into another Eastern European crisis? Do not think such a possibility excluded... Are we prepared to have the liberty tree be refreshed by blood?"

It is Brzezinski's firm belief that James R. Schlesinger's "doctrine" of *military bluff* will suffice for a Soviet

"roll back" in Eastern Europe. In two detailed feature articles complete with maps and arrows showing the Soviet Union entirely "contained," the Washington Post expresses the National Security Council's profile of Soviet "oblomovism" — "the Russian view of the world — suspicious, insecure, and cautious."

Under a headline "Moscow Saber Rattling Only a Memory," Post Peter Osnos declares that "no authoritative Soviet spokesman now rattles a saber publicly the way Joseph Stalin and Nikita Khrushchev did regularly. Even rhetorical calls for Soviet strategic superiority that used to be a staple of Soviet military journals have largely disappeared."

The delusion is that Brzezinski's "gamesmanship" can be expected to succeed — the Soviet Union will give the U.S. "free play" in the world. In the Soviet press, says the Post, "the Middle East and southern Africa are presented as serious but residual, while scores of recent agreements with the U.S. and other western states are endlessly praised as contributions to the relaxation of tensions..." No matter what Brzezinski has Carter do, it is imagined the Soviets will not go to war.

## Rabin Victory, European Pressure Counters Vance 'War Shuttle'

Israeli Premier Yitzhak Rabin this week turned back a major challenge from his hawkish Defense Minister, Shimon Peres, and won the ruling Labour Party's nomination for the premiership for the country's May 17 elections. In an extremely close vote — hardly more than 40 of over 2000 votes cast separated the two candidates — Rabin defied the last-minute predictions of observers who had calculated that weeks of devastating Watergate-type scandals had thoroughly undercut the traditional Labour Party machine's base, upon which Rabin depended for support.

Two related factors explain the Rabin win. First, making a last-minute appeal for an Israeli peace initiative in positive response to months of Arab peace overtures, Rabin on the first day of the Party convention drew out fears of the "Masada" consequences of having such a notorious warhawk as Peres represent Israel in dealings with the Arab states. Second, this was made possible by a decisive intervention in recent days by European Socialist International leaders, acting as spokesmen for governments now progressing toward a break with the Carter administration and the U.S. dollar.

On the first day of the convention Second International President Willy Brandt appealed to the delegates to "strike out a war policy, war solves nothing." Brandt stressed the recent signs of moderation from Israel's Arab neighbors and the necessity of recognizing the rights of Palestinian Arabs. He insisted on a theme repeatedly stated in this week's West German press, that Israel can and must end its sense of isolation from the rest of the world. After other Socialist leaders spoke,

Rabin echoed the sentiments, striking a "responsive chord" and winning marginally important delegate support, according to the Feb. 23 *Baltimore Sun*.

The Rabin victory can thus legitimately be regarded as a signal to the Europeans and Arabs that there are significant forces in Israel who have not bought the "peace is impossible" theme of Peres and U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance. Initial post-convention signs from Israel would tend to bear this out, including Feb. 23 BBC reports that Rabin made an optimistic post-victory peace appeal. He is strongly backed by the electoral alliance of the Labour Party and the pro-socialist Mapam Party — an alliance that had been threatened by the potential for a Peres victory — and, according to BBC, has decided to remove Peres as Defense Minister if re-elected. The Feb. 24 *Baltimore Sun* reported that a substantial minority in Israel's cabinet now feels that the extreme anti-Palestinian public line expressed by Israel during and immediately after the Vance visit was wrong and will now "backfire."

These first optimistic signs to emerge from Israel in weeks will be short-term, unless Rabin correctly regards his victory as a *mandate* to go for an overall Arab-Israeli peace settlement, including recognition of both Palestinian Arab national rights and Israel's necessary contributions to regional economic development. Failure to drive Israel's policies in that direction could be catastrophic, as the Carter administration remains fully committed to regional instability and conflict to prevent the consolidation of a European-Arab development axis. The Carter team has numerous in-place destabilization