

manipulation fails, the Castelista faction is fully prepared to do what it did during the 1968-70 political explosion — throw Brazil under violent militarist repression.

—Mark Sonnenblick

Figueiredo Gives His View

The following are excerpts from Gen. Figueiredo's debate-interview in the Sao Paulo daily, Folha, April 5:

On French Democracy

Look here, I have studied what you call French democracy in depth. When they are threatened with losing in a district, the president moves the district. They take away a city from here, add it to another district General de Gaulle created something called Article 16, which establishes a state of siege that is much worse and more arbitrary than our Institutional Act No. 5 You're not going to tell me that the French system isn't manipulative, because I've studied the matter in depth.

On The House of Lords

And what is wrong with appointing one-third of the Senate? (This "reform was decreed last April to prevent opposition from winning in November congressional — ed.)

House of Lords, and aren't you always saying that England is a democracy?

During the empire, didn't the emperor appoint everybody, and didn't everything work well for so long? (The Brazilian empire was a Rothschild front based on slavery; it crumbled under Republican pressure in 1889 —ed.)

Brazilians Too Ignorant To Vote

Are you telling me the people are ready to vote? How can Brazilians in many places in the northeast vote well when they don't even know about hygiene? The other day, right here in Brasilia, I found a soldier from Goias in the barracks who had never brushed his teeth, and another one who had never used a bathtub. And then you tell me the people are prepared to elect a president

. . . . I do not believe I am being elitist; I am a realist.

On Repression

Q: You have said that if ARENA loses in November...

A: What I said was that thing would be more difficult if the MDB (Brazilian Democratic Movement, the official opposition party — ed.) not want to yield at all. And what I say is that we all have to yield a little.

. . . . Look here, if the MDB wins, in addition to this thing about the constituent assembly, well . . . the military is not ready for it. This is when things will blow up. Either I blow up with it, or I join forces with them and we move toward a regime which will be much worse than this one.

On Public Opinion

Public opinion does not exist. You create it. If you want to, you can change public opinion.

On Labor

Q: Are you in favor of free wage negotiation between businessmen and workers?

A: I am. Now you always need someone as an arbitrator, because between a group of radical workers who only want raises and a group of profiteers who don't want to give any raises, you need the mediation of the Labor Ministry.

The French Respond To 'King' Figueiredo Doesn't the Q

The Information Director of the French Foreign Ministry made the following comments to newsmen inquiring about the postponement of Giscard's visit to Brazil following Figueiredo's insults to France. The French official was quoted in O Estado de Sao Paulo, April 22:

Officially, the French Government did not react, since it was a matter of declarations by a candidate. We think they were from a very inexperienced person who was misinformed. It is true that the candidate has already been designated President, but he has not yet been enthroned.

Israelis Talk War

Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan said that he expects a new war to erupt in the Middle East, in an interview on Swedish television May 9. Asked if he feared a new war, Dayan said:

"Yes, I do, even if it is not logical. There is a great risk of a new war as long as the conflict continues. One can never tell when it will start, but just as in the case with Lebanon something can happen. The Arab allies are prepared and they are receiving great military assistance. So there could very well be a new war.

"I think just now the greatest obstacle is that President as-Sadat is unable to get other Arab leaders to cooperate in his peace initiative. He will not have a separate peace. That is why as-Sadat is very unwilling to continue the peace talks."

Dayan's statement has heightened worries among

Middle East analysts that a renewed Mideast conflagration is in the works. These perceptions were backed up by comments made by Israeli Chief of Staff Rafael Eytan in an Israeli television interview on May 11. In the interview, which is excerpted below, Eytan provocatively discarded Sadat's peace overtures as insincere and stressed that the West Bank, Gaza Strip, and the Golan Heights are vital to Israeli "security needs" and can never be relinquished.

Eytan: "Basically, I think the basic intention of the Arabs has not changed. Namely, to fight against the State of Israel and remove it from the agenda. The basic Arab intention has not changed in my opinion. Possibly some members of the Arab world are trying different ways to realize the same end."

Interviewer: "That is, removing Israel from the agenda?"

Eytan: "Yes."

Interviewer: "Are you referring to the political negotiations?"

Eytan: "I am referring to everything they do. Unless they come up with a true declaration which says in effect that the annihilation of the State of Israel has been removed from the agenda and is no longer a short-term or a long-term goal for them, they should be treated as though they aspire to realize this goal. . . ."

While several Israeli doves and the Labour Party opposition criticized Eytan for overstepping the bounds of military propriety by making political commentaries, the provocative content of Eytan's statements was not even questioned by Israel's leaders. Defense Minister Ezer Weizman rushed to Eytan's defense, saying, "I do not view his remarks as any irregularity." At the May 14 Cabinet meeting, Israel's ministers voted to exonerate Eytan in a tacit endorsement of his position.

Eytan's exoneration was interpreted by the Egyptian press to mean that Israel indeed is preparing for war.

Weizman Backs Lebanon Invasion

Speaking before an Israeli political convention on May 17, Defense Minister Ezer Weizman announced that if United Nations peacekeeping forces in southern Lebanon do not follow Israel's dictate and crack down on Palestinian military units, "We may have to step in and say, 'Excuse me, God helps him who helps himself.'"

Weizman coupled his threats with an announcement the next day that Israel would erect six complete "urban centers" in the West Bank. Analysts expect that the announcement will be read in the Arab world as a move to annex the area tantamount to a declaration of war.

According to the May 19 *Jerusalem Post*, the Israeli government received an "angrily worded" State

Department protest against Weizman's West Bank annexation scheme, charging that "if implemented, it would torpedo all hopes for a Middle East peace settlement."

Weizman's statements highlight the mood of growing defiance of America in Israel in the wake of the Senate ratification of the Carter Administration's proposed package sale of jet fighters to Israel, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt. Immediately following the Senate approval, Weizman issued a veiled warning: "We hope we won't have to fight these planes in the air."

On May 21, the Israeli Cabinet met and issued a statement "deploring" the arms sale to the Saudis, warning that Israel is considering cutting its dependence on the U.S. and is preparing to produce its own sophisticated jet fighter, the Aryeh. The Cabinet refused to discuss suggestions by U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance for surmounting the West Bank impasse, but concentrated instead on U.S. "abandonment" of Israel to stir up anti-U.S. sentiment and prepare the country for war.

Israelis Activate Shi'ites

The war talk emanating from Israel puts into bold relief the recent announcement by Israel that all troops currently in southern Lebanon will be withdrawn on June 13.

The Israeli government's announcement coincides with the activation by Israeli intelligence, in concert with the avowedly fascist Christian forces in Lebanon, of reactionary Shi'ite Moslems against the Palestinian. Aided by Israeli and British intelligence, Major Saad Haddad, leader of the Christian forces and confidante of Dayan, Weizman, and Christian warlord Ca Chamoun, is reportedly organizing the Shi'ites into militias to replace the Israelis after their departure next month.

—Nancy Parsons

An Israeli 'Oil Embargo'?

Previewing the "new strategic considerations" being discussed in Israel following the arms sale ratification, the May 19 Jerusalem Post featured an article by Yossi Goell calling for "the destruction of Saudi oilfields" in the event of a new war:

Paradoxical and disheartening as it may sound, this week's approval of the plane sales package by the U.S. Senate may well be the death blow to any Egyptian-Israeli peace agreement in the immediate future.

. . . America's new commitment to sell Saudi Arabia 60 F-15s pales into relative insignificance when compared with America's quiet building of a major military infrastructure for Saudi Arabia.

Now, following the American decision to turn Saudi Arabia into a linchpin of the Arab "Eastern Front," it should be clear that Israel cannot and will not relinquish the air bases at Rafiah, Eilat and Sharm el-Sheikh, and the naval base at Sharm.

These bases, and especially the ones at Eilat and Sharm, will become paramount in Defense Minister Weizman's strategy to counter the new fact of Saudi air power.

How Mr. Sadat will react to this is hard to guess. What should be clear, however, is that Israel now will not yield on these bases even if it means the final collapse of the talks with Sadat.

Furthermore, it should be equally clear that Israel will have to begin thinking of Saudi Arabia in terms of a major enemy.

In the past, a Saudi military presence was considered marginal. In planning reactions to possible future attacks, the need to bring the war into Saudi Arabia — including the destruction of its oil fields — will now have to play a central role.

This may sound like empty bombast at first blush. American military studies point to the unfeasibility of a military takeover of Arab oil fields in case of a renewed Arab oil boycott.

But the problem for Israel is not taking over Arab oil fields, but destroying them, if need be, and that is definitely within Israel's military capability.

. . . It is often forgotten in the panic-stricken West that not just the Arabs can deny oil to its thirsty economies; Israel can bring about similar disruptions.