

their foreign debts. Aviles's speech demonstrated that nationalists in Peru are looking to the Club of Life as an organization whose economic program and cultural optimism are weapons against the terrorism threatening the government. "I congratulate the Club of Life for its program Operation Juárez and for the way in which the integration of the Latin American countries is evolving on the Andean level," Aviles told the 60-person gathering, which included representatives of the national APRA party.

U.S. labor and farm organization leaders spoke at the conferences held around the country July 24. In Philadelphia, over half the 235-person audience was drawn to the conference after they heard *EIR* editor-in-chief Criton Zoakos describing the urgency of the international crisis on a popular radio talk show two days before.

Ron Thelin, international vice-president of the Operatives, Plasterers, Cement Masons International Association told the Club of Life meeting in Chicago that "The U.S. labor movement has to face the fact that the AFL-CIO is controlled by the Trilateral Commission." Club of Life leader Dennis Speed, also speaking in Chicago, declared that Operation Juárez is the means by which the U.S. Congress can take back its constitutional responsibility—the issuance of credit, and the promotion of commerce, and the general good.

"Was not America settled by people seeking freedom from oppression?" Luisa Tipton from the Argentine Organizing Committee asked a 100-person Club of Life audience in Los Angeles. "Today when we see gunboats pointing at our own brothers of this continent, they don't have the British flag, they have the American flag."

Frank Endres, California president of the National Farmers' Organization, declared in Los Angeles that the plight of Ibero-America is the same as the plight of the U.S. farmer, because both are incapable of getting out from under their debt burden without a change. NFO Executive Board Member Art Wilson added that "People in this country must understand that even though we're the most efficient businessmen in the country, we just can't produce at half the cost of production."

The Club of Life held demonstrations throughout Europe in support of the July 21 general strike against the IMF in São Paulo, Brazil, and to build for conferences in West Germany, Denmark, Sweden, France, and Italy. The unchecked rampages of Kissinger and his allies in Europe, which allowed such disasters as the formation of the fascist Bettino Craxi government in Italy, were cited to show the urgency of Operation Juárez for the dying economies of Europe.

The July 20 Club of Life conference in Rome was attended by many representatives of Italian state industries, including the ICE, the institute of foreign trade, the state steel industry, and the IRI conglomerate, as well as by representatives of the budget ministry and the small industries association. Ibero-America is crucial for Italy, which not only has large investments there, but is facing a comparable debt crisis.

Kissinger's new peace writing off the Arabs

by Nancy Coker and Allen Douglas

On the advice of Henry Kissinger, President Reagan is reportedly considering "writing off" the Arab world as partners in the Middle East peace process, and making Israel the centerpiece of U.S. strategy in the region. Jordan and George Shultz's pet Syria are no longer deemed reliable countries to work with, White House sources report. Even Saudi Arabia, America's closest ally in the strategic Persian Gulf, may be blacklisted. Reagan is said to be particularly furious at the Saudis, the recipients of advanced U.S.-made AWACS surveillance planes, for not adopting a more active role in the Middle East.

In following Kissinger's advice, Reagan is shooting himself—and America—in the foot. Not only is he delivering the Arab states to the Soviets. He is also consolidating a special relationship with one of America's least reliable allies—Israel. As intelligence insiders know, Israel maintains a well-concealed back-channel relationship with Moscow, managed by David Kimche, director general of the Israeli foreign ministry, and by Edgar Bronfman, president of the World Jewish Congress. Israel and the Soviet Union share an interest in the radicalization of the Arab world, the Israelis using such radicalization to manipulate the United States into supporting Israel's "Greater Israel" designs and transformation of itself into a world-class nuclear superpower. The Soviet goal, however, is the expulsion of the United States from a position of power in the Middle East.

Behind these machinations is an elaborate, treasonous deal that Kissinger has been secretly brokering with Moscow, whereby Moscow agrees to recognize Washington as the dominant force in Ibero-America, and in exchange Washington agrees to increased Soviet influence in the Middle East.

This deal is the core of a new Middle East "peace plan" that Kissinger, having wrecked President Reagan's own peace efforts, is now putting into place.

The parameters of this plan were outlined in the London *Sunday Times* of July 24. "After 11 months of intensive American diplomatic effort, this is the gloomy scenario: Syria is in the driving seat, Soviet influence has increased," and the Americans are looking for a way out. As the *Times* notes, "There is a feeling high up in the U.S. administration that America should forget its grand designs for peace in the Middle East." The London daily quotes one source saying that "the Middle East is declining in strategic importance."

'breakthrough': in the Mideast

Assailed by crises in both hemispheres, writes the *Times*, President Reagan will find himself under pressure to pull out of one of them—the Middle East.

Enter Henry Kissinger and his peace plan.

The strategic context

It is not only the Middle East in which the United States is slated to drastically lose influence. Soon after returning from meetings with senior officials in British intelligence in London during May 1982, Kissinger began delivering speeches outlining a U.S. retrenchment to "25 percent of its former global power projection."

This was made more specific in a speech in late June at Harvard University by Zbigniew Brzezinski, the man who, besides Kissinger, did the most to destroy U.S. influence in the Middle East, with his "Muslim card" overthrow of the Shah of Iran. Said Brzezinski: "A new strategic triangle linking the U.S.A., China and Japan could become in a short while more important than NATO itself. The focus of the world interests of the United States will be more and more the Pacific, which will replace Europe as the primary partner both economically and politically. Cold war is now a worldwide phenomenon, but the actors are the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union, while Western Europe is gradually coming out from the East-West conflict."

The man who deliberately lost Iran went on to say: "The explosiveness now confined in Central America could spread in Mexico. There are sinister parallelisms between Mexico and Iran." Translated into plain English this means that an "independent" Europe will come increasingly under Soviet sway, and the United States will be tied up with uncontrollable violence on its own border. The "Pacific basin" strategy, as Brzezinski outlines it, is only for the mickeys, just as his "Arc of Crisis" was supposed to surround the Soviet Union with Muslim uprisings spilling over into the Soviet Union itself. And the key figure handling both the Ibero-American and Middle East hot spots at the moment is Kissinger.

The dirty deal in the Middle East

With the moderate faction of the Palestine Liberation Organization under Yasser Arafat virtually destroyed thanks to Soviet-Syrian-inspired "rebellions" within the PLO, the only stumbling block to Kissinger's deal are the difficulties

between Syria and Israel. To win Syrian—and Soviet—cooperation, Kissinger is offering Damascus a sizeable chunk of eastern and northern Lebanon to satisfy the "Greater Syria" passions of the Syrian leadership. In the words of one Arab intelligence source, "Lebanon is to be sacrificed in the interest of bringing Damascus and Moscow in on the deal."

In exchange for the de facto annexation of a piece of Lebanon, Syria would drop its demand for Israel's return of the Golan Heights, agreeing to an arrangement whereby only a small part of the Golan would be returned. The return to Syrian control of even a segment of the Heights, occupied by Israel since 1967, would transform Syrian President Hafez Assad overnight into a hero of the Arab world. Israel would of course keep southern Lebanon.

The last remaining aspect of the deal involves Jordan and the Palestinians. Jordan's King Hussein is being pressured to move forward into West Bank autonomy talks, speaking for the Palestinians. Until now, PLO leader Yasser Arafat has been reluctant to give King Hussein a mandate to represent the Palestinians in the talks. Now, however, thanks to the Soviet Union, Syria, and Libya, the PLO has been shattered, and Arafat is in no position to resist pressure to throw his lot in with King Hussein, in accordance with Kissinger's "peace plan." The so-called autonomy of the West Bank would make it into no more than a South African-style Bantustan, with Palestinians providing cheap labor for the massive defense industry complex which Science and Technology Minister Yuval Neeman is constructing on the West Bank.

The Israelis say 'yes'

An unmistakable signal that the Israelis have agreed to the deal is the issuance of a strategic memorandum by the Center for Strategic Studies at Tel Aviv University, shortly after Kissinger's visit to Israel in late June. In between meetings with Israeli leaders, Kissinger spoke twice at this same Center for Strategic Studies, Israel's top think tank for Middle East affairs.

The strategic memorandum, written by Zvi Lanir, states point-blank that Washington should no longer be relied on as a broker for a Middle East peace settlement. "Dependence on the American solution is fraught with danger. It might well prove to be a fragile solution, and it might lead to a situation in which the U.S. will decide to deal with the entire Middle East conflict. Israel must, parallel to dependence on the American factor, work toward opening lines of communication with the Syrians in the hope of being able to establish a dialogue with Syria, without American intercession. Of course, there is a danger that an Israeli-Syrian agreement on lines in Lebanon will, in time, create a de facto partition of Lebanon. . . . Another danger inherent in this model is that Lebanon will turn into 'the West Bank of the north.'"

Reflecting Israel's growing public antipathy to an "American solution" per se, a group of Israeli parliamentarians visiting Moscow in mid-July called for an increased Soviet role in the Middle East peace process.