

cooperation which is very important. The conditions for joint research in the energy field could be created within a short time. One preliminary condition for economic cooperation would be that the CMEA and the EEC reach an agreement. That would positively affect the cooperation between East and West, and with the developing countries. The proposal for pan-European conferences includes joint research in nuclear energy. Scientists on both sides see no danger

at all in nuclear energy, if necessary measures are taken. An agreement should be reached on how to use the joint results of this research.

In general, new initiatives are needed in a constructive and positive way. The sooner this is done, the international atmosphere which has very negative aspects right now could be improved. A constructive attitude would help considerably.

Moscow is on to Brzezinski's Mideast game

Authoritative statements in the Soviet press are warning Washington that if the Camp David summit meeting adopts measures establishing a U.S. military presence on the West Bank of the Jordan River, or if widely mooted proposals for a Middle East Treaty Organization (METO) modeled after NATO are implemented, the USSR will view this as a grave threat to its national security.

These warnings do not, however, signify that the Soviet Union is reacting to Mideast developments with the hysteria that Great Britain and its agent, U.S. National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, would like to provoke. On the contrary, cool and astute analyses of the Mideast crisis, like that by leading Izvestia commentator A. Bovin excerpted here from the Sept. 6 edition of the Soviet government paper Izvestia, signal that Brzezinski's efforts to spark a U.S.-Soviet showdown are proceeding on the basis of a profile of the Soviet leadership which is dead wrong.

"Camp David: A Knot of Contradictions"

... Neither the USA, nor Egypt, nor Israel is interested now in an expanded war in the Middle East. Therefore the search for a compromise, the search for some kind of separate, partial solutions, will continue. However, success, even by the most optimistic formula, is extremely problematic. The conceptions held by the different sides of the nature of a possible peace are too different.

For Tel Aviv, peace is Israel's consolidation of the West Bank of the Jordan River, Jerusalem and other occupied territories; it is an absolute "no" to the creation of an independent Palestinian state....

Even some American friends of Israel are irritated by this inflexible, futile position. However, Begin is convinced that the grumbling in Washington will not reflect upon the active military and financial support for Tel Aviv, and therefore he has no intention of giving way.

Washington is playing its own game in the Middle East. The peace the United States is looking for is intended to expand and strengthen its influence in this strategically most important and wealthiest region. That is the goal. The means is to split the anti-Israel

front, to consolidate conservative, pro-West regimes under American aegis, to create a stable modus vivendi of Arab reaction with Tel Aviv.

The latest round of military activity in the Middle East does not correspond to American interests. War would force the Americans to quit their policy of balancing between Israel and the Arab world. War would force the Arabs to resort to the "oil weapon," as they did in October of 1973.... That is why Washington is persistently trying to find safe ground for an agreement between Egypt and Israel, but an agreement which, giving some tactical benefits to Egypt, would still preserve Israel's strategic supremacy. This is the meaning of Camp David.

Both Washington and Tel Aviv oppose the creation of a Palestinian state. At the same time, the Americans understand that even Sadat will not go for an agreement which completely ignores the Palestinian problem, since such an agreement would not be recognized by the Arabs. Therefore Washington is trying to construct a formula which would give the appearance of a solution to the Palestinian question (variations of "self-management," "participation" of the Palestinians in determining their fate, etc.). Washington evidently calculates that social and class interests will sooner or later nudge the conservative Arab states toward support of such a formula.

Both Washington and Tel Aviv oppose Israeli withdrawal from all occupied lands. At the same time, the Americans realize that Israel's aspiration, based on security considerations, to keep the West Bank as well as other "strategic points," could paralyze the negotiations. And the Americans evidently are proposing a compromise: sovereignty over these regions to be given to the Arabs (Egypt or Jordan), and as a "security guarantee," to replace (or supplement) Israeli troops there with American ones. I do not know whether American troops would be capable of guaranteeing security for Israel (or, really, oil for the USA), but they certainly would guarantee the general destabilization of the situation in the Middle East — that much is obvious. Furthermore, neither Egypt, nor even Israel, has yet agreed to Washington's long-range plans.