



SOVIET MILITARY DEPLOYMENTS FOR A GLOBAL SHOWDOWN

Do you buy the line that the Red Army has been downgraded to make way for a deal at the Geneva talks?

While the Eastern Establishment press spreads such disinformation, *EIR* tells you the real story. How far will Moscow go to stop the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative? What is the military significance of current terrorist actions against NATO targets? Look how we called the shots on the supposed "demotion" of Soviet Chief of Staff Nikolai Ogarkov:

- SEPT. 6, 1984:** Soviet Chief of the General Staff Nikolai Ogarkov is officially "transferred to another post."
- SEPT. 10:** The *Christian Science Monitor* comments: "Suddenly, the man who earlier in the week had been at the side of Defense Minister Dmitri Ustinov had . . . become a nonperson. Most Western analysts are convinced that Ogarkov is at least in limbo, and perhaps in disgrace."
- SEPT. 25:** *EIR* publishes its evaluation: "The most important economic and military changes in the Soviet Union have been done under the guidance of Ogarkov. It is unlikely that he would have been demoted just at the point that the reorganization process is to be completed."
- OCT. 12:** Ogarkov resurfaces for a meeting with East German party chief Erich Honecker. Western news services learn that he has been named commander of the Western Theater of War.

- A special dossier is now available of photocopies of the highlights of *EIR*'s exclusive intelligence on Soviet military deployments and policy shifts, for **\$100**.
- A companion dossier, "Who Really Rules Russia Today?" is also **\$100**.
- Or, you can order both for **\$150**.

Campaigner Publications, 304 West 58th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019 Attention: Editorial Office ☎ (212) 247-8820

Mubarak, Peres chart

by Thierry Lalevée

A rapid exchange of proposals between Cairo, Jerusalem, and Amman has definitely set a new course for peace negotiations over the next couple of months. Much will now depend on the ability of the Reagan administration to display the same kind of boldness toward the Middle East it displayed toward Europe around the Strategic Defense Initiative.

What is now required is that the United States sponsor direct negotiations between Israel, Jordan, and the Palestinians as proposed by Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak in an interview to the *New York Times* on Feb. 25. Mubarak's proposal, which came as a bombshell and took many leading American officials by surprise, was clearly carefully thought through before being publicized. What Mubarak announced is that direct negotiations between a "Jordan-Palestinian" team and Israel are now possible.

For such a simple statement to be made, a lot of groundwork had to be laid on many fronts. First, there was the Feb. 11 agreement in Amman between PLO leader Yasser Arafat and Jordanian King Hussein, which, as Mubarak described it, was a first and important step. The Jordanians released the official contents of the agreement on Feb. 23: The PLO had entirely accepted the idea of a "confederation." The "right of the Palestinians to self-determination," it said, "will be expressed within a Jordan-Palestinian confederation."

Similarly, as King Hussein emphasized in an interview with the British Broadcasting Corporation, both Jordanian and Palestinian officials said they had accepted "all previous U.N. resolutions," hence including the controversial Resolution 242. As the agreement reads, this implies the "right of all states in the region to security."

Mubarak-Peres talks

Seizing upon the opportunity this offered, Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres announced in Rome on Feb. 20 that he was ready to go to Amman to meet with Hussein, and was ready to invite him in turn to speak at the Knesset in Jerusalem. Hence, the idea of direct negotiation was mooted for the first time.

Mubarak's proposal went a step further by recommending that such negotiations be directly sponsored by the United States, and be held either in the United States or in Egypt. He himself would be ready to act as a mediator, said the Egyptian President, if both concerned parties desired so.

In less than 24 hours—Mubarak's special envoy, Osama al Baz, had not even reached Israeli soil—the office of prime

peace negotiations

minister Peres announced that this "new and important" proposal by Mubarak was "positive and welcome," as it "makes no reference to any U.N.-sponsored international conference with Soviet participation," and also "makes no particular reference to the PLO."

These are the next two points to be concretized. The Amman agreement did refer to an international conference and made a specific point of PLO participation in such negotiations. Israeli officials quoted on Radio Jerusalem on Feb. 26 echoed Mubarak's declarations to the *New York Times* on this issue, saying that Palestinian members of the negotiating team should merely "not be leading PLO members. They should be Palestinians. But Israel is likely not to look too closely at their credentials." On the issue of an international conference, Mubarak announced that this could be held afterward as a way of ratifying the results of direct negotiations.

In all probability, as *Al-Ahram* noted on Feb. 22, Moscow itself has killed this idea by blasting the Amman agreement as an "imperialist plot," amounting to a total break with the Palestine Liberation Organization as well as Jordan.

What happened between Peres's Feb. 20 announcement and Mubarak's new proposal is anybody's guess. It is clear, however, that consultations at the highest level have been held.

As Peres was arriving in Bucharest on Feb. 21, Mubarak sent a special envoy, the chairman of the foreign affairs commission of the Egyptian parliament, to deliver him a letter of "utmost importance." A day later, another Egyptian envoy was on his way to Washington to bring fresh news on the Palestinian-Jordanian discussions, preparing the ground for deeper discussions when Egyptian Defense Minister Marshal Abu Ghazala arrived for talks with Reagan administration officials on Feb. 24.

Meanwhile, high-level discussions between Jordan and the Palestinians have continued. One of the most interesting expressions of this was a speech made by PLO executive committee member Abdul Rahman Ahmad in Amman. In light of the Amman agreement, he said, "the United States should now recognize the rights of the Palestinians."

Though it is likely that the White House has been privy to all such discussions and was not surprised by Mubarak's latest proposal, it decided to react cautiously. Administration spokesmen merely stated that the "time was not yet ripe" for the United States to take such an initiative. While Washing-

ton may want to wait for Mubarak's upcoming visit to hear directly what is really going on behind the scenes before making any public commitments, such caution also reflects indecision.

That this can prove counterproductive is obvious. From Syria to Israel around Foreign Minister Yitzhak Shamir's Likud Party, voices are being raised in opposition to any negotiations which would change the present no-war/no-peace stalemate.

The White House's "caution" clearly reflects, at least in part, the policy of Henry Kissinger's minions in the State Department, who propose to make of Syria the central country to be dealt with by the United States in any peace initiative. In other words, as part of "New Yalta" agreements with the Kremlin leaders, who are to be ceded the entire Middle East, a Soviet puppet is to be elevated to the status of number-one negotiating partner.

It was not by chance that State Department spokesman Marvin Kalb made a point of talking about the need for

The Reagan administration must now display the same kind of boldness toward the Middle East it displayed toward Europe around the Strategic Defense Initiative.

negotiations over Syria's Golan Heights—when everyone else has been focusing on the West Bank and Gaza. Such references to the Golan Heights are codewords for a limited Israeli-Syrian agreement over Lebanon's partition.

It is no surprise that, from preliminary indications, the Vienna discussions between State Department Undersecretary Richard Murphy and Mikhail Poliyakov of the Soviet foreign ministry seemed to have focused on Syria, Moscow's last wildcard. That Syria still holds four Americans as hostages, under the cover of the Islamic Jihad terrorist group, exemplifies the kind of blackmail that Moscow is using.

The point is underlined by President Reagan's telephone call to Assad on Feb. 14, to congratulate him on his reelection and to thank him for the release of an American journalist who had been held hostage for more than a year! If anything, the Jihad and the Syrians released that particular individual only to remind Washington that they still hold four others. A few days later, the Jihad announced that it had condemned one of them to death and would shortly execute him.

Is that sufficient blackmail to prevent the White House from acting more boldly in the peace process initiated between Egypt, Jordan, and Israel?