

## Daily Telegraph: How Long Before Fresh Riots Break Out?

*The following are excerpts from an article in the Feb. 23 British Daily Telegraph entitled "After Sadat, the deluge?"*

...The real question (in Egypt) now is how long it will be before fresh riots break out to show President Sadat that his palliatives can work only for a very limited period, for it is the President himself who is held responsible for Egypt's ills....

Egypt, according to some economists, is in a Bangladesh situation — a totally hopeless state with little prospect of improvement. Sadat ... has promised that though there will be another four "lean" years, each one will be better than the one before. There is no evidence at all to support this....

Unless Sadat can achieve in the next year what he has failed to do in the past three, some change of regime in Cairo, perhaps violent, perhaps peaceful, seems certain....

In Cairo, the well-to-do openly express their fears of a French-style revolution.... Others talk of Nasser, remembering his personal austerity and incorruptibility.

There may be some Divisional Commander who might fill the bill, for it would have to be someone very senior now to carry out a Nasser-style revolution. What is more likely, if things go on as they are, is that a deputation from the party, the Government and the arms is going to

tell President Sadat that his way doesn't work. Something else must take his place, probably austere socialism....

## Saudis to Carter: Do You Want Sadat Or Another Revolutionary Command Council?

*The following is an interview this week with a Washington-based Middle East specialist:*

**Q:** How do you see the situation in Egypt unfolding?

**A:** The situation in Egypt is very bad. Official figures say inflation is 35 percent. But the reality is that inflation is 50 percent or more. Last month or so, the Saudis sent a message to Carter that said outright, "Do you want Sadat or another Revolutionary Command Council?" After the riots last month, the Saudis eased off on their demands that Egypt tighten its belt. But the situation is still bad. Debt repayments and servicing take up 35 percent of Egypt's export earnings.

**Q:** What is the likelihood of a progressive, Nasserist coup in that country?

**A:** There is a very real possibility of a coup by the left wing of the military, which is still very strongly Nasserist. I don't have any details or names on the people involved....

## Carter To Inject Middle East War Threat Into SALT?

The Carter Administration may be contemplating an insertion of the touchy Middle East issue into the already delicate SALT negotiations with the Soviets. This is the possibility that emerged from an exchange on the relationship of Israel's nuclear weapons to the overall world strategic balance at the Feb. 22 convention of Brierley, a Jewish-Zionist organization of doves and "hawks in doves' clothing." Participants in the exchange were Marcus Raskin, the founder of the Washington-based Institute for Policy Studies who is a National Security Council-linked nuclear strategist close to the Carter Administration, and Professor Shlomo Aronson of Hebrew University, who is currently at the Brookings Institution, also in Washington.

Aronson, who spoke first, tried to develop an analysis of the Middle East situation that justifies an Israeli reliance on its nuclear arsenal as a basic line of defense, citing former Defense Minister Moshe Dayan as his authority on this issue. In reply, Raskin suggested that the U.S. and the Soviets include the threat of nuclear war in the Middle East as a "bargaining point" in the overall SALT negotiations, a proposal which would link the

threat of a Middle East "limited" nuclear war to the U.S.-Soviet relationship.

The following unofficial transcripts of their remarks were compiled by observers at the conference, and are in lieu of the official transcript which is not yet available.

*Prof. Aronson: "The Bankruptcy of Israel's Conventional War Strategy"*

The problem with the Arabs is not Arab ideology, but the actual structure of the society of the Arab world. By the inherent, built-in competitiveness of the Arab world, the Arabs can be dragged into an escalatory process leading toward war, because of powerful internal pressures on Arab elites and Arab leaders. President Sadat and Yasser Arafat may be moderates now, with the best of intentions — but developing pressures can force them to enter into war. And this can happen even if there is no intent on the part of the Arab leader to go to war, as happened to Nasser in 1967.

The political logic of the Arab world is conflict-oriented. Peace arrangements can be acceptable on a

temporary basis. The PLO, under the iron fist of General Assad, thus now looks toward the West Bank as a place for gaining a respite, rebuilding political autonomy. But because of the unstable nature of Arab politics, Israel's strategy cannot rest on the reliability of peace. Sadat? Who will be his successor? Vice-President Mubarak? All we know about him is that he was trained at a Soviet military academy....

So Israel's problem is the following: Israel is therefore not ready to concede the 1967 borders. Israel will do everything to keep the occupied territory that it can. The question then is: How to secure Israel's borders since the 1973 war, which — contrary to speculation — made the territories even *more* important as a security guarantee?

After 1973, Israel embarked on an effort to maintain the existing arms balance with the Arabs, a 1:3 ratio. But the Arabs have vast resources, and Israel cannot hope to maintain even that unfavorable ratio. As Dayan says, correctly, you cannot both get conventional weapons from the U.S. and keep the territories. The U.S. will use its leverage to force an Israeli withdrawal. Another convincing point in Dayan's argument is that the arms race is crippling Israel's economy. "We are destroying ourselves," says Dayan, and the Americans will demand a price.

So, what Dayan says is to use nuclear deterrent to retain the territories. There will be no peace, because the conflict is a basic conflict of nationalisms, and cannot be resolved. Concessions and demilitarization are impossible. So Israel can get out of most of Sinai, some of the Golan Heights, none of the West Bank, and make the cost — to the Arabs — of changing the status quo too high to pay.

This is not the government's strategy, that of Rabin and Allon. But the question is how to survive, to grow as a Jewish state? The answer is that Israel must make an all out offensive too costly for the Arabs: One atom bomb on the Aswan Dam would kill over 90 percent of Egypt's population. And thermonuclear weapons would destroy Arab oil fields, permanently. So that's the issue.

#### *Marcus Raskin: The Middle East Link to SALT*

I am not a believer in deterrence. Even between the U.S. and the USSR, other factors are more important in preventing war than the nuclear deterrent. In the Middle East, it is therefore wrong to think that nuclear weapons will allow Israel to keep the territories because that threat cannot prevent war. In an area where there have been four wars in 25 years, the danger is that one uses the weapons one has. If there is another war in the Middle East, atomic, biological and chemical will be employed. An armaments system is not a guarantee of a settlement.

Thus, there is little to trade off.

What about the great powers? Well, Dayan is absolutely right when he says that the U.S. would like to get our from under the Israeli noose. And the Soviets would like to get out of *their* locked dance in the Middle East, and their foreign commitments there. Therefore, the U.S., for instance, must not honor its arms sales commitments to Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Israel. Under the shadow of the threat of nuclear war, the U.S. and Soviets must confront the issue of armaments into the area. A Middle East settlement is ultimately linked to U.S.-Soviet disarmament, and SALT.

## All Sides Denounce Carter's 'Mediator' In Cyprus

Clark Clifford, Jimmy Carter's emissary to the Eastern Mediterranean, was dispatched to Greece, Turkey and Cyprus last week on a trip to restore U.S.-NATO control over the Greece-Turkey-Cyprus axis and block out Soviet influence in the region. He was not greeted with a hearty welcome.

First, the Clifford "mediating mission" was preempted when Greek Cypriot leader Archbishop Makarios and Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denktash met for the first time in 11 years and took major steps toward a peaceful settlement of the long-manipulated Cyprus conflict days before Clifford's arrival.

Arriving in Athens Feb. 18, Clifford was received by the Greek Communist press with headlines: "Clifford Is Delivering the New Truman Doctrine to Greece." Remembering his "key role in drafting" the Truman Doctrine, which set up Europe for post-World War II dollar domination, Clifford declared that "it is appropriate now after 30 years that the U.S. reapproach

Greece and Turkey on the same basis as they did at that time."

Serious concern was expressed by Greek officials over Clifford's pressures on the government to reinstate U.S. military bases in Greece and return the nation to the NATO military command from which it withdrew in 1974. Earlier this month, Greece sent a communique to NATO headquarters in Brussels stating that Athens would maintain a "pick and choose" relationship with NATO, similar to that adopted by Gaullist France in 1967.

The strongest denunciations of Clifford's mission, however, came from Turkey, where he arrived Feb. 20. Outraged Turkish officials recognized the trip to be part of a confrontation strategy which could lead to world war, charging that "the Clifford trip has far more significance than Cyprus per se." It marks the beginning of initiatives by the Carter Administration "to make changes in the world balance of power." This, said the officials, involves an "interventionist foreign policy,