

Brzezinski Advises Carter To Prepare U.S. Military Move Into Persian Gulf

The National Security Council recently produced a confidential policy statement for the White House known as Presidential Memorandum 10 (PRM-10). According to the *Washington Star*, the memo contains a recommendation that the Pentagon be prepared for a possible military move into the Persian Gulf. Washington sources indicate that the memo was written by the Council's director, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and a staff member, Samuel Huntington.

A potential U.S. military move into the oil-rich Persian Gulf is not new. U.S. Energy Chief James Schlesinger first went public with the provocative plan after the 1973 Mideast war. The present resurfacing of the scheme, however, is directly associated with an international powerplay to get direct access to Persian Gulf oil and petrodollars.

It is an international investment banking group associated with Lazard Freres and its powerful "Jewish Lobby" in the United States which has most adamantly been promoting a gulf invasion scenario which uses a surrogate Israeli preemptive strike to prepare for a U.S. military occupation of the Gulf.

Both the CIA and certain Congressional circles have added to the propagandistic buildup for such a nightmare. Earlier this year, Senator Jackson (D-Wash) released a report entitled "The Geopolitics of Oil" which warned of the potential showdown between the Soviet Union and the U.S. over Gulf oil in an attempt to corner worldwide oil supplies.

More recently CIA director Stansfield Turner has authorized a report on Soviet future demands for oil which erroneously characterizes the Soviets as being in need of more imports of crude after 1980. Similarly the House International Committee released a report through the Library of Congress discussing the behavior of the Soviet Union toward the Persian Gulf as the USSR's demand exceeds its domestic oil production. In point of fact such reports are grievously in error regarding the Soviets' future oil outputs as has been pointed out by numerous honest and authoritative sources. Instead such misinformation creates the environment for an international crisis in the Mideast and the usurpation of the oilfields.

Militarization of the Middle East

A military occupation of the Gulf, as a recent statement by the Soviet government daily *Pravda* pointed out, is part of a larger deployment to militarize the region from the eastern Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean. In this connection, the views of Samuel Huntington, who during President Carter's election campaign proposed that Israel join NATO, closely mirror those of Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Dayan, who has

proposed the installation of a base for the Sixth fleet at Haifa in Israel. Dayan, who is closely associated with Lazard Freres and the Jewish Lobby, works with a group of generals in Israel who have repeatedly called for an Israeli preemptive strike into the Gulf against the Saudi Arabian oilfields.

Last week, Israeli Parliament member General Meir Amit — who covertly aided Dayan in triggering the 1967 Mideast war — stated that an Israeli preemptive strike should "destroy not only the enemy Arab armies but should inflict heavy strategic damage on targets such as the Arab oilfields." The *Baltimore Sun*, Sept. 26, reports that Israeli strategists are debating the merits of a "preemptive strike" against Israel's Arab enemies as part of an overall Israeli military apparatus. Such developments come into the context of Israeli Defense Ministry plans for new "war aims" according to the *Jerusalem Post*. Highly placed sources have indicated that Israel has aimed its nuclear warheads on Saudi oilfields.

In the last month, the Soviet Union has four times warned against such deadly adventurism in the strategic Persian gulf, leaving little doubt that such a maneuver would push the hardline Soviet military command to the button. Furthermore, the Persian Gulf Foreign Minister from the eight Arab states and Iran have called a meeting during the present United Nations General Assembly to discuss Gulf security. Both Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates last week urged such a meeting to be prepared for a possible "western invasion" of the Gulf.

— Judy Wyer

Red Star, Sept. 25:

'Threats Of An Israeli General'

ROME (TASS) — Israeli Reserve General Meir Amit stated in Tel Aviv that in "a future Mideast war" Israel would have to strike against Arab oil deposits. In his words, such an operation would be necessary since the experience of previous military conflicts with the Arabs proved the "senselessness" of simple occupation of their territory....

Amit is one of the leaders of the influential Israeli party, the Democratic Movement for Change, one of its parliamentary deputies.

It is characteristic that Amit's position coincides with recent publicity given in the American press to a secret White House document on the training of U.S. land, sea and air forces "for possible actions" in the oil-producing region of the Persian Gulf.

U.S. Think-Tanker On Israeli Strategy And PRM-10

The following is an interview with a leading Rand Corporation-connected strategist on Arab-Israeli military capabilities:

Q: Recently the former head of Israeli intelligence Meir Amit called on Israel to strike at Arab oilfields in the event of a Mideast conflict. What is the context and significance of Amit's statement?

A: Amit might have in mind that since the Arabs are using the oil weapon, the oil weapon should also be used against them. This is a game of threats and deterrents. Talking of aerial bombardment of the oil fields is another element of risk that the Arabs should now take into consideration. It's a battle of nerves, and, after all, the oil weapon is the most decisive weapon the Arabs have.

Amit is not the only one who talks in these terms. A few months ago, General Sharon, currently in the Cabinet as Agriculture Minister, raised this possibility.

It's a relatively logical idea in view of the Arab use of the oil weapon. It tells Carter that he can't just pressure Israel, he has to pressure the Arabs too.

Q: What link does this Israeli strategy have to the U.S. special PRM-10 Presidential memorandum on possible intervention in the Persian Gulf?

A: PRM-10 represents a tendency, a direction, an orientation in some quarters in Washington, demonstrated in a recent Brookings Institution study on the ratio of power in the eastern Mediterranean. The Brookings study, both a 1976 study and a more recent one released last week, strongly suggested a very different U.S. global naval strategy to mass more power in the Indian Ocean, in the eastern Mediterranean, and in the Persian Gulf. The study emphasized that since the ratio of U.S.-Soviet naval power in the eastern Mediterranean is not very rosy for the U.S., the U.S. should build up forces to stop the Soviets from intervening in the event of a new Mideast conflict.

Both Arabs and Israelis calculate their strategy based on this ratio. Israel has to take into account the possibilities of Soviet intervention. This possibility adds to the pressure coming from the U.S.; Kissinger used the Soviet intervention argument effectively in the October, 1973 war.

Amit et al. must evaluate the current naval ratio situation, and if Israel were to think that the danger of Soviet intervention is lower, that would change Israeli strategic considerations accordingly. If there is less chance of a Soviet intervention, the Israelis will orient more to a longer war perspective, including moves against Arab infrastructure such as oilfields. If there is greater chance of Soviet intervention, the Israelis will have a short, decisive war perspective.

In that sense, you can certainly draw a connection between the Brookings PRM-10 memorandum thinking and what Amit was getting at.