

ly radio address, praised Tunisian President Bourguiba, he again defended the Israeli raid, not once referring to the obvious fact that Tunisian sovereignty had been violated by Israel. As observers commented, in any normal world this would mean war between Israel and Tunisia, but this is no "normal world." Going further, a British diplomat was quoted commenting that the American approval of the raid meant that London would be justified "to bomb Dublin in retaliations for the operations of the IRA in Northern Ireland."

Such behavior left many friends of America stunned with disbelief, and has created a situation where most of them are being undermined and set up for overthrow. In the days following the Israeli raid, all of the Arab capitals were hit by anti-American demonstrations, more than anti-Israeli demonstrations. In Libya and Syria, this was a normal sight. In other places, like Cairo, these were organized by the secular and Islamic opposition, using anti-American ferment as a way of striking, again, at the government in power. In others, as in Tunisia, the government itself led peaceful demonstrations to express its anger, and prevent extremists from using the occasion.

The climate has been provided for the Muslim Brotherhood—the Islamic fanatics who engineered the Khomeini takeover in Iran and the assassination of Egypt's President Anwar Sadat—to mobilize throughout the region, with marching orders to strike at Israeli, Jews, and Americans whenever they can. On Oct. 5 an Egyptian soldier, later described as "mad," machine gunned seven Israeli tourists. On Oct. 8, a Tunisian policeman machinegunned several Tunisians around the Synagogue of the Island of Jerba, killing three, including two Tunisian Jews. Though the spotlight has been focused on Palestinian terrorism, Israeli retaliations, and counterretaliations, these two actions are ultimately more important.

If they go unchecked, it is the Tunisian, Egyptian, and other moderate Arab regimes whose survival will be at stake. Compared to a northern African region dominated by fundamentalists of the ilk of Qaddafi and worse, the present violence may begin to look like child's play. There may be very little time before the secular forces with whom a peace process can be developed either fall prey to the fundamentalist onslaught, or decide to join Moscow.

Trilateral plan: after Tunisia, Nicaragua?

President Reagan's quick endorsement of the Israeli military strike against U.S. ally Tunisia on Oct. 1 was read abroad as a sign that the United States plans similar action against Nicaragua, and thus could not criticize Israel's justification of its raid as a strike against terrorism. Radio Jerusalem broadcast on Oct. 5 that Reagan "wanted Israel to set a precedent that he can do the same in Central America."

New signs suggest the Trilateral Commission bunch has sold the U.S. administration on the idea that now's the time to take a "tough stand" in Central America. A provocation from Soviet assets in Nicaragua is to be watched for.

The Trilateral's ex-director Zbigniew Brzezinski floated a "new" proposal for a U.S.-Soviet deal in the Oct 6 *New York Times* Oct. 6: "a trade-off on Afghanistan and Nicaragua." Jimmy Carter's old national security adviser wrote, "contrived arrangements" between "the superpowers" on these two regions of the world are "the *sine qua non* for any wider Soviet-American accommodation."

He suggests that the Soviets might agree to let Afghanistan, now used for Soviet live war games, be policed by "international peace-keeping forces" made of troops from Islamic countries "not unacceptable to the U.S."—

such as Libya!

The State Department began gearing up propaganda to justify U.S. action against Nicaragua as a strike against "terrorist bases" in August, when it issued an unclassified document detailing Nicaragua's ties to Middle East radicals, playing the well-established links of Nicaraguan Sandinistas to the PLO as proof that Nicaragua is an "international terrorist haven."

A group of "neo-conservatives" around former U.N. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick is promoting Brzezinski as a "talk tough" hardliner, promising to publish a longer version of his proposal in the first issue of their new magazine, *The National Interest*.

However, the "Afghanistan/Nicaragua" exchange is not exactly original with Zbig and his boosters. Soviet leader Yuri Andropov had made the *same proposal* in April 1983, in an interview with a West German weekly. Andropov said that the Soviets could accept U.S. security concerns in Central America, if the Soviet Union were granted similar privileges in countries along its borders, such as Afghanistan. Andropov's "offer" meant the United States had Soviet "permission" to run amok in the Western Hemisphere, while the Soviets seized domination of the Middle East, Europe, and Southeast Asia.

The Soviet game centers on enticing the United States into a military redeployment out of Europe, and into a Western Hemisphere crisis zone. Ibero-American leaders have warned Washington that U.S. military action in Nicaragua will hand the region over to the Soviets, provoking continent-wide "anti-imperialist" revolts.