

part of the same problem. Not to make such corrective actions respecting personnel is virtually to ensure the collapse of the U.S. dollar and of the U.S. economy and to make general thermonuclear war increasingly probable during the weeks and months ahead.

It should also be emphasized that the ordinary Jewish-American is an honest person, who predominately desires Middle East peace, but who is also terrified by the evil power of top circles of the leading Zionist organizations — especially the Joint Distribution Committee, the international B'nai B'rith, and the USA's ADL and French LICA organizations. Many Jews have been personally ruined or worse merely for bucking these institutions, organizations which have an assassination capability linked to the Mossad element of Israeli intelligence and to the Bronfman-linked mafia forces. If the Carter Administration wishes the support of American Jews for a USA imposition of Middle East equitable peace, along UNO 242 lines, the Administration must recognize its obligation to afford the majority of American Jews the protection they require against "Zionist" reprisals.

The Administration must come to understand how the policy enunciated by President Carter to a UNO audience has been repeatedly undermined and sabotaged by the persons we have identified and their allies. The mere fact that an intelligence estimate is pushed by Brzezinski, Kissinger or Turner is sufficient reason to doubt its veracity. The mere fact that a policy is pushed by these cited persons is sufficient reason to suspect its contrariness to the most vital interests of the United States.

Once again, the British and their agents within the Administration have pushed the U.S. government toward supporting a deadly adventure on the basis of false information to the effect that the Soviet leadership will not honor its agreements with its allies. In this case, it is argued that by doing the very maximum in the way of provoking the Soviet leadership to the most extreme rage, that this course of action will make the Soviets impotent and irresolute in dealing with the proposed adventure.

Gentlemen, the misinformed gamble to which I point is sheer strategic lunacy.

—Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr.

4. The Active Israeli War Strategy

Israel is openly threatening to launch an attack on Syria via Lebanon, a move that could readily trigger a fifth Middle East war that, given the Soviet Union's commitment to defend Syria, could quickly escalate into a U.S.-Soviet confrontation.

Prime Minister Menachem Begin held two urgent meetings on Aug. 28 with senior members of the Israeli Knesset to discuss intervening militarily in Lebanon under the pretext of "saving" Lebanese Christians from being "massacred" by the Syrian peacekeeping forces. One account of the meeting appeared in the Aug. 29 *Christian Science Monitor* in an article datelined Jerusalem and entitled, "Israel Yearning to Aid Christians":

Powerful voices here are calling for direct military intervention by Israel to relieve the hard-pressed Christian militias in Lebanon.

(After meeting with Begin on Aug. 28), the chief whip of the ruling Likud majority, Pessah Grupper, told the press:

"I see no way out but a direct intervention. The Syrians are aiming at conquering the Mount Lebanon Province."

Any such Syrian move, it is said here, would lead to a slaughter of the Christian population there and threaten Israel's own security.

Influential circles in the Israeli Defense Ministry have voiced the view that it is precisely because of the inhibiting effect of Camp David that the Syrians dare to conduct their offensive now. Others feel the direct danger to Israel could prove so great, that it would far outweigh a possible failure of the Camp David conference.

The chairman of the Israeli Parliamentary Committee

for Foreign Affairs and Defense, Prof. Moshe Arens, commented, "We must not let the Syrians take advantage of the conference to conquer all of Lebanon."

Professor Arens, who subsequently took part in both of the Aug. 28 meetings with Mr. Begin, also stated that the Syrian offensive was meant to pulverize the resistance of the Christian population. A military intervention by Israel, therefore, in his view, "should no longer be delayed."

Former Foreign Minister Yigal Allon, currently the chairman of the Knesset subcommittee on Lebanon, also attended the meeting with Begin, piously stating afterward, "As much as we want to avoid any military confrontation, (Syria's actions in Lebanon) are beyond what we can accept."

In an Aug. 27 commentary in the Hebrew language newspaper Ma'ariv, reporter Shemu'el Segev reports that while the official Israeli cabinet position toward Lebanon at this point is a "cautious approach" toward becoming "embroiled in war," this approach is "(not) accepted by the entire political establishment in Israel."

Segev explains:

There are factors in Israel who believe that . . . Israel ought to exploit the situation in order to deliver a decisive blow to Syria — be it for the purpose of breaking the Syrian's war machine, or to mellow Syria's positions on the subject of the political negotiations with Israel. The proponents of this view believe that even if President Al-Asad (of Syria) perseveres in his refusal to join (Egyptian President) As-Sadat's initiative and conduct peace negotiations with Israel, then a serious blow will

incapacitate the ability of the Syrian army to wage war, and will limit Al-Asad's maneuvering space in his struggle against As-Sadat. Those who subscribe to this view think that a death blow to the Syrian war machine will limit the ability of the "eastern front" to function properly, facilitating the removal of a danger of war for many years.

While reiterating that the current Israeli cabinet is not operating according to these assumptions, Segev concludes that "this consideration, no matter how great the element of risk, is not to be rejected out of hand."

Fired up by Israel's war cries, an official Falangist spokesman, "Munzer," predicted in the Aug. 25 *Christian Science Monitor* that the ceasefire in Lebanon would break down completely before the Camp David summit begins. If Syrian troops advance against the rightists on any front, "our reaction would be immediate throughout all of the country's Christian areas," warned Munzer.

With Israel on a war footing, Syria, backed by the Soviet Union, is bracing for an attack. On Aug. 29, Syrian Foreign Minister Khaddam paid a surprise visit to Moscow to meet with Soviet President Brezhnev and Foreign Minister Gromyko to discuss the deteriorating Lebanon situation — a clear indication that the Soviets have no intention of tolerating Israel's provocations against Syria. In a statement on Aug. 30, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko stressed Soviet desires to "further strengthen relations with Syria" in the context of a just solution to the Middle East dilemma.

Assad's firmness, combined with his surgical military operations in northern Lebanon last week, are aimed squarely at preempting a planned "declaration of independence" by the Falangists, who, at the behest of Israel, were reportedly on the verge of forging a separate mini-state allied with Israel.

To prevent the Israeli-Falangists from setting up a separate "Maronite Republic" around Beirut, the Syrians took important steps last week to disarm the Falangist separatists in the north in a short but precise three-day operation. On Aug. 30, the Syrians announced that the entire northern part of Maronite turf had been occupied by the Arab Peacekeeping Forces, including 12 villages, with only 65 killed in the process.

The Syrian show of force and the effects of the offensive, while severely limiting Israeli capabilities in Lebanon, have not deterred Begin. On Aug. 30 East German radio reported new Israeli shelling of Nabatiyeh in southern Lebanon. At the same time, right-wing Christian extremists are threatening "guerrilla warfare" against Syria in Lebanon.

Both France and West Germany have expressed their satisfaction with Syria's role in Lebanon. At the Aug. 24 weekly ministerial meeting in Paris, it was agreed to endorse Syria's actions to stabilize the

U. S. Military Spokesman Warns of Israel's Lebanon Invasion Plans

A high-level Washington military spokesman, in an interview last week with the Executive Intelligence Review, expressed deep consternation over the possibility of war as a result of Israel's provocations in Lebanon and intransigence in peace negotiations:

Q: How do you evaluate the Israeli threats to Lebanon?

A: I'm extremely concerned. What worries me most is not the situation in the south, but more importantly the recent claims by the Israelis that they intend to protect and defend the Maronites in the north of Lebanon and in the Beirut area.

That is very ominous. There is an underlying assumption here that Israel has a right to protect its proxies in the fight with Syria. It has highly dangerous implications.

Q: Do you think Israel might move first?

A: Frankly, I have been mulling over in my mind the possibility that Israel might blow up Lebanon in an effort to undermine Camp David.

It seems that Begin has resolved in his mind that he does not intend to compromise, and he may be thinking, "What can I do?" I hope he doesn't look toward Lebanon.

But I will say this: If Israel takes actions against Lebanon, I am sure that Begin and his cronies know that the U.S. will not countenance it. But the U.S. must explicitly disapprove of such action beforehand. It is very serious.

situation. Last week, West German Development Minister Offergeld, recently in Syria, praised Assad's role in Lebanon.

A top-level U.S. military commander known for close ties to Israeli strategists referenced Israel's desperation as well as willingness to "break" with the U.S. in a recent interview:

The Israelis have no choice but to intervene. They won't and can't allow the Christians to be destroyed or uprooted, and the Syrians on their border.

...Israel will look to bloody Assad's nose and do it well. In fact, I can fairly say that Israel is looking for the opportunity to do this.

In an attempt to abort this scenario, Lebanon is taking steps to apply Chapter 7 of the United Nations charter that would allow United Nations peacekeeping troops in Lebanon to use "coercive force" against Israel, including blockages and embargoes as well as direct armed action.

— Nancy Parsons

UN Official Says Sanctions Possible Against Israel

In an Aug. 28 interview with the Executive Intelligence Review, a United Nations Secretariat official well acquainted with the Lebanon situation assessed that the U.N. has the means to apply coercive force against Israel in Lebanon. He claimed that such a scheme is under study by the Lebanese government, but is being blocked by the U.S. Here, his comments:

“At present, there is no motion before the Security Council to try to get the UN to act coercively in southern Lebanon. Privately, this is under discussion, but not at the actual discussion stage yet. UNIFIL’s mandate will be evaluated Sept. 18, so something could develop by then.”

“One legal possibility, admittedly very remote at this point, is to use force in the sense laid down by U.N. Security Council charter Chapter 7, which first makes provisions for peaceful measures, but, if these are not sufficient, Chapter 7 allows for the Security Council, under conditions of a threat to international peace and security, to force the aggressor to yield. Sanctions and blockades can then be applied. A force with coercive powers can be created. This would be a very special force, directed by the UN Security Council, with a special military staff committed composed of top-level representatives of the general staffs of the major powers.

“This has never been applied because of the postwar U.S.-Soviet cold war, but theoretically it can still be created, under which conditions Israel will be viewed as the aggressing party against which action must be taken.

“In lieu of Chapter 7 being implemented, the Secretary-General can apply what we call 6 and a half, which alters the deployment of the *voluntary* peacekeeping forces such as those currently in Lebanon. This would occur, in most cases, after a request made to the Security Council by a UN country which is then voted up favorably by the Security Council members.

“These initiatives can be raised by Lebanon, or any of its friends in the Arab group, at the Security Council at any time. There is nothing before the Council now, but the Lebanese government is raising the possibility privately, making studies and so on, of such a coercive operation being implemented. At present, the Lebanese are known to be upset that the U.S. is indicating firmly that it will block any such measure and is therefore committed to throwing up obstructions to its implementation.”

Syrian Peacekeeping Efforts In Lebanon

