

Israel's ten-week war scenario

From information pieced together from Arab, Iranian, European and other sources, the *Executive Intelligence Review* has uncovered the existence of Israel's "ten-weeks war scenario," ending up with a joint U.S.-Israeli intervention into the Persian Gulf. The first hint of such a strategy emerged in a conversation with a leading Arab military attache of a European embassy, who gave the following assessment:

I think that it is fairly certain that Israel is getting ready for a war, probably fairly soon. My information indicates that the Israelis are planning for war sometime around late October, or possibly early November. Such a conflict would begin with a rapid escalation of the conflict in Lebanon; indeed, that is already taking place. What I know is that the Israelis expect that, by the fall, a new oil shortage will have broken out, and the West will again be seeing the phenomenon of gas lines and rising OPEC prices. The Israelis think they can take advantage of that to win Western, especially American, backing for military action.

What the Israelis would like is to combine their offensive against Syria, Iraq, and the Gulf with a simultaneous Egyptian action against Libya. But I am not sure that the Egyptian military will play along. There is a great debate in Cairo, I have heard, on that one. I doubt that Sadat could make it work.

Several days later, at the beginning of August, a prominent Middle East source in Paris confirmed the existence of the war strategy from the Israeli side, and said the actual impetus for the war is coming from London. He outlined the scenario as follows:

Watch Sadat. I know that Sadat is not considered as a viable partner of the Israelis much longer. The new developments in Syria and Iraq make that all the more true. The Arab world is united against the Camp David agreement, despite Sadat. So I think that Sadat has become expendable. I have heard about the existence of a British-Israeli plan to assassinate Sadat, and the hit team is already in place. Sadat's assassination—which could come as early as September—is to be blamed on Syria or Iraq or the PLO, perhaps as

retaliation for the murder of (PLO Saiqa Chairman) Zuhair Mohsin. Sadat's death, of course, would lead to pandemonium, and Israel would have the pretext it needs to go to war.

Immediately afterward, Cyrus Vance and the Carter regime began to give Israel the motivation and cover it needs to launch a war. Beginning in late July, the administration set into motion rumors that it had begun a "reassessment" of its policy toward the Palestine Liberation Organization. On July 30, the U.S. delegation to the United Nations asked abruptly for a postponement of the scheduled U.N. debate on Palestine until Aug. 23. Ostensibly, the reason given was so Washington could consider a revised U.N. resolution from the Arab delegations. But Arab sources at the U.N. denied quite emphatically that there was any resolution in preparation; the only such resolution calls for "self-determination" for the Palestinians, and the draft resolution is certain to be vetoed by the United States. So why the delay? The answer soon became apparent. Gradually, and then in a rush, Israel and the U.S. Zionist lobby began accusing the United States of shifting in a pro-PLO direction under "blackmail from Saudi Arabia." No such shift, of course, was even contemplated—but the rumors of such a shift launched the Israeli war drive. The scenario is based on the "breakaway ally" strategy of the RAND Corporation, in which—in secret accord with the State Department and the NSC—a military ally of the U.S. can launch a war while allowing Washington to issue disclaimers of any involvement or responsibility for the conflict. Israel is the archetypal case in that regard.

Immediately, the ominous refrain of "ten to fourteen weeks" began to emerge. In a *New York Times* dispatch from Washington datelined Aug. 1, it was reported that administration sources believed that "if current diplomatic initiatives do not bear fruit by late fall, the result could be increased Palestinian terrorism and Arab pressure on oil supplies to the West, especially the United States." The *Times* went on to say that the stalemate in the Palestinian talks must be broken *by late October* or "the Saudis could decide to cut production in the fall if they were dissatisfied by a lack of negotiating progress on the Palestinian issue."

That was the signal for the Zionist offensive.

An editorial in the *New York Times* on Sunday, Aug. 5, quoted that dispatch, and then went on to accuse President Carter of capitulating to oil blackmail from Saudi Arabia—justifying, obviously, Israeli threats to go to war.

Not content, the next day the *Times* carried a letter from Rabbi Alexander Schindler, a leading Zionist lobby spokesman. Schindler *also* quoted the same *Times* dispatch, repeating the refrain "... by late October." He said in part:

To find members of the Carter Administration parroting this line portends an ever-mounting campaign against Israel to place its very survival at risk by accepting, as a participant in the Middle East peace talks, the PLO—which is sworn to Israel's destruction—and by making major political and territorial concessions under American pressure.

Emerging from weeks of unusual silence Aug. 7, bellicose Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan threatened to pull Israel out of the peace talks with Egypt and move toward war in retaliation for Washington's "pro-PLO" shift. In commenting on U.S. efforts to change United Nations Security Council Resolution 242 so that it includes recognition of the rights of the Palestinians—changes that are *not* being backed by the Arabs, who view the U.S. efforts, according to one responsible diplomatic source, as a "deception operation to introduce the language of Camp David into the

U.N. Security Council"—Dayan ranted: "It is not just a question of an erosion of the American position, but a real change. It comes from the fact that the U.S. is concerned about the problems of its economy, energy, and the price of oil. So it is looking for an understanding with Saudi Arabia.... The Saudis are afraid that the PLO will incite a revolution there. As a result the U.S. is ready to help formulate a new resolution."

Similarly, Interior Minister Yosef Burg, who is heading up Israel's negotiating team with Egypt, has declared that any amendment to Resolution 242 is grounds for Israel's declaring the Camp David treaty null and void. Burg accused the U.S. of forcing Egypt, which is now demanding that Resolution 242 be reworded to include a reference to Palestinian rights, into taking a tougher stand.

Litani II

The London press has done its part to fan the Israeli war scenario. In a dispatch from the Manchester Guardian on Aug. 1, correspondent David Hirst said the following, predicting a new Israeli invasion of Lebanon:

"Syria and Israel are approaching the crossroads that can bring a collision between them, not necessarily war, but most likely an aerial collision over Lebanon." Not long after Zeev Schiff, the military correspondent of the Israeli daily Haaretz, wrote those words, Israeli and

Another oil crisis in October?

An Aug. 1 report in the *Wall Street Journal* that a massive buildup of world crude stockpiles is presently occurring suggests that the major oil companies may be preparing for some militant action by the producers in the fourth quarter. Stocks are currently at 4.5 billion barrels, a mere 200,000 barrels a day under the peak of stocks during the glut of crude on world markets during 1978. Added to this, the latest figures indicate that OPEC is now producing nearly 3 million barrels a day over the level of production at this time in 1978. While consumption of crude is reportedly down in the major consuming nations, particularly the U.S. The question is whether or not the additional crude is being stockpiled in the event of another war in the Mideast.

Since the president of the oil cartel, OPEC, Mana Saeed Oteiba issued a warning earlier this year of a possible selective embargo against states who do not recognize the Palestinians' right to statehood, var-

ious insiders in the oil industry have been predicting some militant OPEC action in the autumn of 1979. Most New York sources agree that without a "serious provocation" from Israel the likelihood of either major production cutbacks or yet another large price rise is unlikely. "If Israel launches a major preemptive attack on Lebanon and hits the Syrian forces there then I think we're in for big trouble from the oil producers," said one Wall Street investment analyst.

Reports of production cutbacks by the North African producers, Algeria, Libya, and Nigeria amounting to somewhere around 500,000 barrels a day are also being read by industry sources as a quiet warning to the U.S. with respect to what the Arab oil producers perceive to be "mishandling" of the Mideast crisis by Washington. In fact these countries have only cut back sales to the multinational oil companies that market crude to the U.S. and are reportedly rerouting their crude into state-to-state deals with Europe.

Syrian aircraft did come to blows ... The whole thrust of his article should be viewed as perhaps the clearest public exposition of Israel's "Eastern Front" strategy. UNIFIL officials take it seriously.

Schiff wrote, "Israel began a new kind of warfare against the Palestinians, forsaking the old policy of reprisals for one of relentless attacks, anytime, anyplace. It is certain the Israelis will continue these methods, although it may resort to others, such as sending in land forces as in the Litani operation (the March 1978 invasion) but on a bigger scale.

"Even if Syria does not swallow such an operation, Israel should not be afraid of a collision with Syria...."

What Israel will do is keeping everyone guessing, but that it will be something on a big scale—what the Russians and others call "Litani II"—is a belief which has taken deep root....

The Syrian press warns regularly that it will stand by its patriotic obligation to protect Lebanese and Palestinians. Even more alarming would be a Litani II that brought Israeli forces up to the territorial Red Line. This would jeopardize Syria's whole military presence. It would also, Beirut observers believe, carry the following Israeli message: "Fight us if you dare. But you are on your own. Your Army would be completely destroyed. We advise you to negotiate. ... But this one would be entirely on our terms—Pax Israelica, not Pax Americana.

French initiatives in

Reaching advanced stages, French plans to build a "Euro-Arab coprosperity zone" broke into the front pages of the country's press this week, provoking an immediate reaction from Washington.

President Carter's National Security Council under Zbigniew Brzezinski has reacted by launching a secret investigation focusing on French diplomacy in the Persian Gulf, according to the daily Kuwaiti newspaper *Al Qabas*. For the first time since 1945, the investigation—which is said to place particular emphasis on oil-for-technology exchanges and French military cooperation with the states in the region—identifies a Western European nation as a potential "security threat" to the United States.

The "Euro-Arab coprosperity zone" is only the tip of the iceberg of an overall plan that includes major technology transfers, including nuclear plants, industrial development reaching into the entire Third World sector and the institution of "Phase II" of the European Monetary System, which calls for setting up a fund based on the gold-backed European Currency Unit (ECU). This plan comes under the general heading of French President Giscard d'Estaing's call for a "Euro-Arab-African dialogue."

The first major break in this story occurred on Aug. 1 with the publication of a front page article in *Le Matin de Paris*. The information in the article was, according to its authors Henri Laurent and Jean Leclerc, confirmed by "Arab diplomatic circles as well as by French political and industrial circles." *Le Matin* reported that

... For several months we have witnessed a deployment of efforts for the constitution of a Paris-Baghdad-Riyadh axis, the beginnings of a possible Euro-Arab "coprosperity zone." Coprosperity based on an objective convergence of interests....

Giscard is seeking to institute a Euro-Arab consultation mechanism which would form the first pole of the Euro-Arab-African rapprochement whose concept he launched in the beginning of the year ... The European countries which, led by France, maintained a chilly reserve towards the Israeli-Egypt peace treaty would, in this "Giscard plan," take a favorable position toward the search