

Israeli Chief Of Staff:

'I Do Not Rule Out A Preemptive War'

The following is an interview with Israeli Chief of Staff Mordechai Gur broadcast Jan. 16 by the Israel Defense Forces:

Q: Is there a realistic possibility of a preemptive strike?

A: You must certainly remember that immediately after I was appointed Chief of Staff I said at one meeting that the option of a preemptive war or of a preemptive strike remained at the disposal of the State of Israel as it had been in the past. I said this because in the wake of the Yom Kippur war and as a consequence of its, several assumptions developed to the effect that in the new political situation that option was no longer open to the state.

I thought that assumption was wrong. A single case, like the Yom Kippur war, however sad and difficult it was, cannot be used for making inferences about the future of the State of Israel. My assumption is that the stronger the army is, the greater our freedom of political maneuver will be. When I say the freedom of political maneuver is greater, this also includes the capability of making the first strike and the capability of setting out on a preventive war...

We ourselves are in a state of preparedness for war. This is not merely a slogan. It is an operational fact, because the Arabs capable of starting a war at any time.

Israel In Mood For Preemptive Strike

The following is an interview with a spokesman of the Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C.:

Q: Who is behind the preemptive strike talk coming out of Israel these days?

A: The talk about the need for a preemptive strike reflects a certain mood, a certain fear in Israel that, given the lessons of the Yom Kippur war, Israel should not neglect war preparations and always be aware that despite efforts to make peace, war is always an option to be

ready for. There is a definite feeling in Israel that the current political process — the elections, the talk about a settlement — should not prevent Israel from taking measures in preparation for a first strike.

Gen. Tal, an advisor to the Minister of Defense, is the one who triggered the whole thing off. Tal is interesting. He's definitely dovish, and he's an outsider, not particularly close to anyone — not to Peres either. His ideas don't reflect anyone but himself. So, if he expresses some concern over the need for a preemptive strike, you can be sure that the base of support for the thing is broad.

Rabin's call for a stoppage of newspaper coverage of the thing is due only to the fact that he might have felt that the whole issue is not really propitious at this time, what with elections coming up. In any case, Rabin and his calls for a halt can't influence anyone.

There Are A Thousand Scenarios For A Mideast War

The following is an interview with a State Dept. official:

Q: How do you evaluate the talk in Israel of the need for a preemptive strike?

A: The Israelis are manic-depressive. They panic easily. But in the end, the real power rests with Rabin, at least until the May 17 election. Rabin is in hot water, of course, with the suicide of Housing Minister Ofer, the attempt by Peres to win the Labour Party nomination, the illegal bank account in the U.S., and so forth. But nonetheless, it is required that the Prime Minister give the order for a preemptive strike. No matter how mean the fight gets domestically, and it gets pretty rough in the trenches, everybody in Israel believes in the system. Ultimately, Rabin will determine things, and I don't think there can be a coup. After May, however, and the elections, well — who knows? There are a thousand scenarios.

Arab Revenge For Entebbe On NSC Agenda

This week, a line clearly emerged in the U.S. press and elsewhere pinpointing the Middle East as a strategic target of a major "terrorist incident." Making public National Security Council scripts for terror-counter-terror, State Department expert Douglas Heck announced in the *Washington Post* March 29: "We're overdue for another (Arab terrorist) episode in retaliation for Entebbe. I expected it before now."

The *Washington Post* indicated that such a retaliation was likely to occur over the recently announced secret trial in Israel against five alleged Palestinian terrorists, jailed in Israel for the past year, who are charged with trying to shoot down an El Al passenger plane in Kenya. Three of the prisoners are reportedly members of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. The trial is

thus a timely pretext for terrorist reprisals likely to be directed by Wadi Haddad, an operative of Interpol and Washington, D.C.-based Institute for Policy Studies, who is directly tied to the two NATO-controlled gangs, the Baader Meinhoff and the Japanese Red Army.

Looking forward to such a contingency, the Israeli Foreign Ministry this week made known its "regret that the international community has so far failed to find an efficient way to combat the Palestinian terror organizations."

The real target of any new Arab terror, however, is not the Israelis but the Arab nations, particularly Egypt and Saudi Arabia. Max Kampelman, executive director of the Committee on the Present Danger, identified Saudi Arabia and Egypt as the Arab states whose governments

could be toppled through an outbreak of "terrorism, war, or increased and prolonged tensions." The brains at the National Security Council are hoping that letting loose terror will disrupt continuing Saudi negotiations to nationalize the Rockefeller-controlled ARAMCO oil company and break persistent Saudi resistance to handing over petrodollars to the International Monetary Fund.

If properly targeted, an incident of Arab terror has the added advantage to the Carter Administration of creating the kind of crisis needed to impose the rigorous energy austerity on the United States industry and consumers, Carter energy czar James Schlesinger is seeking.

Below is a rundown of statements of scenarios for Mideast terror with some revealing explanations as to their functions:

Washington Post, March 29: Ambassador Heck of the State Department's Office for Combating Terrorism.

"We're overdue for another (Arab terrorist episode) in retaliation for Entebbe.... I expected it before now."

Regarding the Cuba-U.S. anti-hijacking pact: "We'll probably have to have a couple of hijackings to prove (the U.S.'s determination to win its renewal.)"

State Department Office for Combating Terrorism, March 29 interview:

"It is rational to assume that there will be an act of revenge for the Entebbe incident. The terrorists will not let Entebbe go by. The explanation for the lack of Mideast terrorist incidents is probably that the terrorists have been preoccupied with the conflicts in Lebanon and internecine warfare. It is rational to assume that extremists will do something if there is a settlement in the Mideast situation. In general, terrorism is going up, not leveling off although the nature of it is changing. The fact that there has been a lack of spectaculars means that there are going to be more due. We always feel that the

longer a period of time that goes without a terrorist incident, the more likely that one is being prepared."

Max Kampelman, executive director of the Committee on the Present Danger, March 29 interview:

"Any kind of political instability (such as a major terrorist incident) in the Mideast region could knock the present one-family regime in Saudi Arabia out in a second. The Saudis have a real jewel, their oil, which many people want to grab. I don't know how long their cooperation with Egypt can continue."

George Tyler, an aide to Senator Hubert Humphrey (D-Minn.), March 29 interview:

"They could sink a ship in the mouth of the Red Sea, capture a tanker and put a bomb in it in the middle of the Gulf of Aqaba or the Strait of Hormuz (the latter links the Persian Gulf to the Indian Ocean and is Saudi Arabia's main point of access to the sea — ed.), and if any ship passes, threaten to blow it up. They could do the same thing to the Houston (Texas) channel."

"Besides this, they could pull off an incident that could spark a Mideast war and force an embargo on us ... this would push the Administration's program along faster."

Mr. Caucasian, Ambassador Heck's top aide and Latin American terrorist expert, March 28 interview:

"Off the record ... there are two basic patterns in Latin America: A shift from attacks on American diplomats and personnel and a trend toward kidnapping businessmen. These are the people with the money anyway. Another trend in Latin America and especially in Argentina, is a shift from kidnappings to assassinations. This is aimed at driving out foreign business to diminish the economic capability of countries, and eventually bring down the government."