While an enchanted America cheered Jimmy Carter’s “success” in getting Egypt and Israel to sign the peace treaty — reminiscent of the crowds that applauded the fabled emperor’s new clothes — the Middle East careened toward a war that threatens to engulf the entire world in a thermonuclear holocaust. 

It is generally acknowledged that Carter’s vaunted treaty leaves untouched the basic issues in the Middle East: the question of Palestinian statehood, the issue of the West Bank, the Jerusalem problem. But even more, the treaty is only a cover for a tightening of the U.S.-Israeli security relationship and for a great NATO military buildup across the entire “arc of crisis” from North Africa through Pakistan.

Egypt’s President Sadat, who has now sold his soul to the devil, is already being discarded. According to information from intelligence sources, Sadat has been targeted for assassination by a British intelligence operation conducted through the Muslim Brotherhood, an act that is to be blamed on the Iraqis or the PLO and used as a pretext for Israel to launch a war against the Arab East.

As the Arab states meet to plan strategy against the Camp David threat, British and Israeli intelligence has already set into motion Phase II of the Camp David process: the balkanization of the Middle East according to the design of Bernard Lewis, the Oxford Zionist now based at Princeton. Among the states slated for attack are Libya, Syria, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia — while the Soviet Union, which has close ties to some of these Arab states and which is seeking links to the Saudis as well, quietly discusses how to support its allies.

Although the results of the Baghdad Arab summit are not yet known as we go to press, virtually every Arab state has roundly condemned the Camp David treaty as a threat to the vital interests of the Arab world. Where Europe stands is still an open question, despite French opposition to the treaty. Most shocking is the lack of American opposition to Carter’s public-relations hoax.

We present below a comprehensive survey of the real story behind the Egypt-Israeli pact and its expected impact on the Middle East and the world.

London’s divide and conquer plan

Within the next year, British and allied oligarchs in London and Jerusalem hope to subvert the Middle East, particularly those politically moderate or industrially ambitious countries, into squabbling feudal fiefdoms. They have calculated that all resistance would be destroyed to the imposition of a supermilitary alliance linked to NATO surrounding the Soviet Union’s southern flank. The Camp David agreements mark a crucial institutionalization of this divide and conquer tactic in which National Security Chief Zbigniew Brzezinski and other administration officials in Washington are fully involved.

The major architect of this strategy is Bernard Lewis, a British-born professor now at Princeton University. Lewis has conceptually outlined the triggering of tribal and religious rebellions from the subcontinent to the Mediterranean. This geopolitical strategy is in line with Lewis’s well-known thesis that indigenous tribalism and sectarianism determines the politics of a region.

Lewis’s strategy also fits well with investigations the Defense Department acknowledges have been made by the Israeli intelligence unit, the Mossad, on the feasibility of tribal and religious, and regional conflicts.

Below is a description of what has become known as the “Bernard Lewis Plan” for the Mideast.

Iran. Since the overthrow of the Shah by forces allied with Ayatollah Khomeini, Iran has been plagued by increasing separatist insurgencies which have seriously impaired Premier Mehdi Bazargan’s ability to centralize his authority. The Iranian daily Kayhan has gone as far as to report that these insurgencies, which include the Baluchis, the Azerbaijanis, the Turkmans, and Iranian Arabs in the Arabistan region of the Persian Gulf, are the work of foreign agents bent on transforming Iran into another Lebanon. But they have not identified the roles of British or Israeli intelligence.

The situation on Iran’s northwest border remains tense, although a truce was worked out with Tehran and the heavily armed Kurds. Within days following the truce, the Turkmans in the Northeast began an uprising over land rights. This week Iranian Arabs in the oil-producing Khuzestan region militantly demanded regional autonomy under the name Arabistan. Increased militancy in this area could lead to a renewed shutdown in Iranian exports of oil.

According to well-informed Arab and Iranian sources, the Kurds and the Turkmans are “armed to the hilt” with Uzzi submachine guns and other weapons
peddled through Israeli blackmarket networks, which are remarketing weaponry previously resold following the 1973 Middle East war.

The volatile climate is further complicated by the fact that the major ethnic and tribal minorities in Iran are not of the same religious belief as over 90 percent of Iran's 35 million people. This creates a rivalry which is expected to be exacerbated if the Shiite Muslim Khomeini succeeds in winning his referendum for an Islamic Republic.

Khomeini, as the Executive Intelligence Review has documented, is working with Muslim Brotherhood-dominated Islamic fundamentalists within the Arab world as well as those associated with the reactionary Jamaati Islami. Last week, a Soviet Persian language broadcast to Iran openly warned against this new upsurge of Islamic fundamentalism, emphasizing that the Muslim Brotherhood was created by British intelligence.

Equally important for Iran's future is the presence of a clique of ultra-radical "advisors" around Khomeini, who are associated with Ibrahim Yarsi, Saad Ghothzadeh, and Abdul Bani-Sadr. They are London's "inside men" in controlling both Khomeini and challenging the nationalist forces allied to Bazargan which only further enhances the climate for separatist upsurges.

Throughout the Middle East such leftists have consistently backed the "rights of minorities" and effectively acted as a key support to London's separatist insurgencies.

According to the British Broadcasting Company, which before Khomeini's return to Iran, functioned as his mouthpiece into Iran, the Azerbaijanis who share the country's northwest border with the USSR, are now planning an insurrection and are heavily arming. This rebellion is particularly dangerous given the history of Azerbaijani separatism and their relations with the USSR. While there is no evidence today of any Soviet input, various British-allied segments of the U.S. political elite, notably Averell Harriman, are "predicting" Soviet influence will dramatically increase in Iran as a pretext for a possible superpower showdown.

Pakistan-Afghanistan. The fate of Pakistan's imprisoned Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto — presently slated to be executed approximately April 1 — will be a crucial determinant of whether the region will erupt into Islamic fundamentalist feuds. The efforts of the Pakistani Jamaati Islami and the regime of Pakistan's chief martial law Administrator Ziaul Haq have been geared toward collaboration with Iranian leaders, notably Ayatollah Khomeini and Ayatollah Sharit Madari, to overthrow the Afghan government of Premier Noor Mohammed Taraki.

Any armed insurrection against Taraki could have global consequences since his government has a friendship treaty with the Soviet Union. The destabilization there is ominously reminiscent of an assertion by U.S. National Security Advisor Brzezinski that "Islamic fundamentalism can stop communism."

Taraki himself minced no words in publicly stating that the Muslim Brotherhood is behind the offensive against him and that it is headquartered in London and Paris. Regional figures, as well as the Soviet Union, are well aware that Peking is also behind the current offensive. Last week Moscow charged that the aggression against Taraki is directed by the American and British secret services.

The destabilization is in part being carried out by a clique of Jamaati-allied Afghan exiles who are being stirred for the rebellion against Taraki. A recent meeting of Afghan exile groups held in the northeast frontier province of Pakistan, which borders Afghanistan, called for a holy war against the Taraki government. There are also reports of antigovernment elements being supported by the Iranian military in the city of Herat in Afghan territory on the Iranian border. Radio Moscow reported that Afghan forces found large stocks of U.S. and Chinese manufactured arms in Herat.

Although President Carter recently exacerbated the delicate situation by openly accusing the Soviets of arming Afghanistan, the dismemberment and war confrontation scenario may yet take some maneuvering to pull off. Even in Baluchistan there is a division between a Maoist, anti-Soviet Baluch movement based in the Marri tribe, which has been the source of the secessionist guerilla movement, and a moderate secular Baluch movement.

Turkey and Iraq. On Iran's Northwestern borders, both
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or four minuscule and semiautonomous entities based on historical references to Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria, and Gaza and northern Sinai, Israel is impelled by its security concerns to encircle these proposed Bantustan-like areas with rings of Israeli settlers.

The possible fresh movement of tens of thousands of refugees from occupied Palestine into Jordan and the Arab oil states coincides with what appears to us in the Middle East as a determined radical push aimed at the intensification of the global conflict that has reached a flashpoint in Africa recently and has manifested lately on the fringes of the oil-producing Arabian peninsula, particularly in the Horn of Africa, Yemen, and Iran.

Events such as we see in Iran today, many weeks after revolution there, make us wonder seriously whether Arab public opinion would be able to withstand a similar determined push by organized groups basing their claims on ideological or ethnic grounds.

A polarization of the Arab world into global ideological extremes would shake the very fiber of the commitment of the Arab man in the street toward his nation, his concept of pan-Arabism and even the very God he worships. Such a reaction would likely isolate him and increase the feeling that the only identity he has, be he Kurdish, or Azerbaijani, be he Maronite, Druze, Palestinian, Jordanian, Armenian or Eritrean, is to a lesser entity, a lesser unit and a lesser loyalty — the loyalty of tribalism.

The Camp David approach threatens to accelerate the destabilization process in the Middle East that is a function both of indigenous radicalization trends and global rivalries. We still hope that our friends in the United States would see this as clearly as we do.

Turkey and Iraq have felt the impact of growing sectarian violence. Both countries are threatened by a spillover of Kurdish unrest from Iran.

According to the Iranian daily Kayhan, Feb. 28, Iraqi air power was used to put down limited violence by the Kurds just inside Iraq's border with Iran last month. The Kurdish issue in Iraq is complicated by the fact that the Iraqi Communist Party, whose leader last week announced plans to quit the National Front in protest over ruling Baath Party policy, has always supported the "rights of minorities" such as the Kurds. A Kurdish uprising would now intersect tensions between the Iraqi Communist Party and its long-time allies the Baath Party, which has more than once forcefully dealt with the Iraqi Kurds.

Informed sources indicate that the Iraqi leadership which is Sunni Muslim has become increasingly anxious about Khomeini forces triggering Shiite rebellions in Iraq. Yasdi-ally Rouhani, who is Khomeini's spokesman in Washington, told the Village Voice last month that other regimes in the area would feel the effect of Khomeini's takeover, and named Iraq and Saudi Arabia.

In last December Eastern Turkey briefly erupted into a melee of bloodshed as Sunni and Alevi (Shiite) Muslims battled. At the time Bernard Lewis was reported to have told a journalist that the upsurge confirmed his thesis that sectarianism was the basis of "the realities of the region." Lewis's remarks paralleled the incident which involved Kurdish mercenary tribesmen who had threatened to wage renewed strife against the Ecevit government.

Behind the insurrection was the well-known opposition figure Arpaslan Türkes, the leader of the self-professed fascist party, the Nationalist Action Party. Türkes, according to Washington sources, maintains clandestine links to both the People's Republic of China and the Mossad, the Israeli intelligence agency. Türkes's prime function is to smuggle arms for the British and Israelis into remote areas of eastern Turkey and other countries of the region.

Lebanon and Syria. Lebanon may well face another round of bloody civil war very soon if Syria removes its peacekeeping forces, as Damascus has stated it is preparing to do. Lebanon has been the victim of a powerful and well armed clique of Maronite Christians associated with the Falange and the National Liberal Party of John of Jerusalem. A polarization of the Arab world into global ideological extremes would shake the very fiber of the commitment of the Arab man in the street toward his nation, his concept of pan-Arabism and even the very God he worships. Such a reaction would likely isolate him and increase the feeling that the only identity he has, be he Kurdish, or Azerbaijani, be he Maronite, Druze, Palestinian, Jordanian, Armenian or Eritrean, is to a lesser entity, a lesser unit and a lesser loyalty — the loyalty of tribalism.

The Maronites have been nothing more than a front for the Israelis in Jerusalem's efforts to eliminate the half a million Palestinians from Lebanon and are a key proponent of cantonizing tiny Lebanese enclaves which would create an independent Maronite entity.

To date, the Saudis have removed their peacekeeping troops from Beirut, and France has also pulled out half of its forces. This occurs against a background of increasing Israeli overflights of Lebanon. Tensions between the Palestinians and the Maronites are still far from resolved, and the Camp David agreements have already prompted PLO chief Yasser Arafat to warn of an upsurge of terrorism.

Sources indicate that though Syrian President As-
Sad is firmly in control, insurgencies from Lebanon and Iraq could have an impact on Syria. Both the Kurds and the Turkish Allevi spill over into Syria, and there have been reports of increased tensions between the Shiite Allevi leadership from which Assad comes and the Sunni population. According to a source with the Defense Department, the Mossad has a carefully prepared profile on an upsurge of Allevi separatist insurgency.

**Saudi Arabia.** Saudi Arabia is reported by numerous sources to be threatened by a coup against the powerful Crown Prince Fahd. While the population of Saudi Arabia is small, there are a number of non-Arab tribal formations under the control of Fahd’s adversary, Second Crown Prince Abdullah, a top Muslim Brotherhood member. A number of sources with close ties to British intelligence have stated their preference of Abdullah over Fahd. Under conditions of increasing regional instability the likelihood of its reverberating into Saudi Arabia increases. A shift in power in Abdullah’s favor would assuredly mean a major drop in Saudi Arabia’s oil output and accompanying price hikes, and an end to moderate politics in the Mideast.

— Judith Wyer

---

**Britain’s “new” Middle East:**

The Bernard Lewis plan, named for its author, British, Princeton-based Middle East specialist Bernard Lewis, is a plan to fragment present Middle Eastern nations along tribal, ethnic and religious lines. Key to the plan is the breaking of Arab unity envisioned in the Camp David peace treaty, and the use of British and Israeli subversion to incite tribes and religious groups. Note that, in its latest revisions, the plan moots tribal and ethnic rebellions in portions of the Soviet Union as well as throughout the Arab world.