

by the Sunni majority as well as Moslem fanatics, and the possibility of a bloodbath looms on the near horizon. War with Israel, as an option, would be attractive but suicidal, without Egyptian support on the southern flank. But a negotiation with Israel, focusing on a phased return of the Golan Heights, might save Mr. Assad's regime by restoring national honor, so long as it does not appear as though he is abandoning the Palestinian cause in the process....

No two negotiations are alike; and no doubt Israel and Syria would both find ready reasons for initially rejecting or disparaging the concept of negotiating their differences *before* the Palestinian problem could be settled in a parallel set of talks. But that predictable response should not discourage the United States, working this time with the French, from going down the route of realism by playing on what is, after all, still the strongest force in the Arab world—the force of nationalism.

Financial Times, editorial, Sept. 4:

Syria's opposition to Egypt has been characteristically hedged. ... This suggests, as has been hinted at through recent Romanian contacts in Israel, that Syria might not be totally averse to being co-opted into negotiations with Israel—given the right terms.

[The article then discusses the mounting instability in Syria, citing in particular the role of the Muslim Brotherhood, which, writes the *Financial Times*, "has caught on as a means of expressing opposition to an apparently well-entrenched regime."]

The temptations to leave the Syrian Government to cope with its own largely self-created problems are considerable. The Camp David framework agreements and the Washington treaty, for example, make no direct reference to the Golan Heights, still occupied by Israel. But there is a strong case for trying to involve Syria in negotiations with Israel.

As long as only Egypt and Israel talk together on the Middle East no breakthrough on the wide issue is feasible. Syria's involvement, perhaps through an ad-

Turk calls for 'Islamic NATO'

Necmettin Erbakan, leader of Turkey's National Salvation Party, has called for the creation of an Islamic defense organization modeled on NATO. At a press conference in Turkey on August 11, Erbakan, an adherent of the fanatic Muslim Brotherhood and an outspoken admirer of Ayatollah Khomeini of Iran, said that it is time for the Islamic world to unite and form "a NATO-style defense organization." The establishment of a Middle East NATO is part and parcel of ongoing Anglo-American efforts to pull together a Middle East Treaty Organization as an outgrowth of the Camp David accords, now in the process of being expanded to include the PLO and Syria.

Erbakan also called for a "U.N. of Islamic Countries," and an Islamic Common Market based on an "Islamic dinar," and an "Islamic Countries' Culture and Research Organization." Erbakan's efforts to pull together an Islamic Common Market are linked directly to parallel British efforts to take over and dominate the European Monetary System. In his press conference, Erbakan compared his Common Market proposal with European efforts to "destroy the dollar"—which is precisely what the British want to use the EMS for.

dendum to the basic U.N. resolution 242 (treating the Palestinians only as a refugee problem), might lead the way to others, Jordan and the Palestinians, joining in.

Finally, there is a precedent. Syria complained bitterly when Egypt in January 1974 concluded the first interim withdrawal agreement with Israel. But four months later, thanks to tireless shuttling by Dr. Henry Kissinger, it concluded its own partial withdrawal agreement with Israel on the Golan Heights. Instability in Syria is more likely when it is isolated.