war against Israel," and Israel Lobby spokesmen Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.), Sen. Pat Moynihan (D-N.Y.) and Sen. Richard Stone (D-Fla.) are already "predicting" Arab "intransigence," "renewed Soviet influence in the Middle East," and so on. "This victory will come back to haunt Carter,"

Post, a British-owned Israel Lobby mouthpiece.

Moreover, Congress will remain a fertile field for combined operations by the Kissinger-Israel Lobby axis. The coalition put together to defend the plane sales drew more than half its strength from conservative Republicans and Democrats sensible of the lunacy of present Israeli policy. But these same forces are open to

Kissinger's anti-Soviet manipulations if not offered a positive definition of U.S. national interest in the Middle East. And more than half the Senators in Carter's own Democratic Party voted against him on this key issue, including "off-and-running" 1980 Presidential candidate Ted "China Doll" Kennedy and the usually pro-Carter stalwart Herman Talmadge (Ga.).

Israel Lobby spokesmen continue to brag about the campaign funds that will not be flowing into the Democratic treasury in this election year: "If I were working at the Democratic National Committee, I'd worry about not getting paid."

Hornswoggled Again

Kissinger Leads His GOP Opponents Against The Soviets

Much of the debate over the Carter Administration's Middle East arms sales package was shaped by former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, in conjunction with such organizations as the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), around the "issue" of a purported growing Soviet "geopolitical strategic threat" to the existence of the United States. Kissinger was especially effective in playing on the anticommunist fears of conservative Republicans. Many of these same conservatives backed former California Governor Ronald Reagan in his unsuccessful 1976 campaign for the Republican presidential nomination in part because of their hatred and mistrust of Kissinger's foreign policy. AIPAC, the Committee for Democratic Majority, the Committee on the Present Danger and other organizations and associations comprising the network popularly known as the Israel Lobby, plug directly into such Democratic Senators as Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-NY) and Lowell Weicker (R-Conn).

The following excerpts from recent statements on Mideast policy by Reagan, Weicker and Moynihan, show a trend now widely in evidence in Congress.

"Reagan Sheds Light On Palestinian Question"

The following excerpts from Ronald Reagan's April 10 address at a Bonds for Israel dinner in Chicago were printed in the Citizens for the Republic Newsletter, Vol. II, No. 7, May 1, 1978:

...The best and most helpful thing we can do is to stand by, meanwhile keeping the Middle East free of Soviet influence. That, I'm afraid, will require more will and determination than this administration has displayed in these last several months. It does not reassure our friends nor discourage our enemies when we cancel the B-l bomber, stop production of our Minuteman missiles, withhold funds for the MX mobile missile and show a lack of resolve about producing and displaying what could be the most effective deterrent weapon yet conceived—the neutron bomb....

U.S. Responsibility

The Soviet Union is building the most powerful military machine ever devised. While we are determined to prevent a war, they are preparing to win one. Are we going to close our eyes and minds as we did almost a half century ago when the thunder of hobnailed jackboots echoed on the wind, foretelling the inhumanity, the slaughter of the innocents that followed?...

Weicker: Carter Pursues Showdown With Israel

We reprint a statement released May 8, 1978 from: Senator Weicker's office:

WASHINGTON—Senator Lowell Wiecker (R-Conn) said today that "the Carter administration, from its inception had deliberately pursued a policy of confrontation with the government of Israel."

Weicker said the policy began before Prime Minister Menachem Begin took office and is a "blatant effort to divide both the American people and even the people of Israel on the matter of the government of Israel."

On the other hand, Weicker said, "Our relationships with the Arab states carry the unmistakable odor of appeasement, and the arms package is only the latest evidence of it."

The Connecticut Republican noted that Carter's National Security advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski "has made abundantly clear his view that the world order politics, which he believes will replace balance of power politics, requires that the U.S. disengage from its historic alliance with Israel.

"When people start talking about world order, I have a chilling sense of deja vu," he said. "The vision of a world order always seems to require that certain groups be trimmed off in the interest of orderliness and a neat package.

"We know from history that time and time again, when national leaders run into difficulties, they found it convenient to blame their problems on the Jews. And we know the results. If there is a meaningful distincition between those historical proclivities, and the signals

U.S. REPORT 3

. EXECUTIVE INTELLIGENCE REVIEW

which Brzezinski is sending, I don't know what it is," said Weicker.

Weicker's comments came during a speech before the annual policy conference dinner of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee.

Moynihan: Soviet Goals "Wholly Contrary" to U.S.

Below are excerpts from a speech made by Senator Daniel Moynihan at the annual policy dinner of the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee in Washington on May 8, 1978:

...Even a Congressional rejection of the arms sales proposal will not put things right. And the problem is not the sincerity of the President or the Secretary of State, or the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs.... Nor yet a weakness in their desire to do the right and honorable thing. They are men of transparent honor and integrity.

Who was not moved by the simple humanity of President Carter when he welcomed Prime Minister Begin just a week ago? (May I). "We will never waver," the President said, "... from our deep friendship and partnership with Israel; our total absolute commitment to Israel's security." And "the establishment of the nation of Israel is a fulfillment of Biblical prophesy. In Jewish tradition, 30 years stands for the age of strength, and Israel, thank God, is strong."

In a recent issue of *Moment* magazine, Dr. Zbiginew Brzezinski had this to say: "The American commitment to Israel is unshakeable. It is deeply engraved in the fabric of our own society. The ties that bind us to Israel are not just political ties; they are not security ties; they are not economic ties. They are deeply binding moral ties. I cannot think of anything stronger."

Now I have known the President but for a relatively brief period, and while I have known the Secretary of State for a long while, I have never known him that well. But I have known Zbigniew Brzezinski as a personal friend, as a fellow academic, and as a fellow Democrat through the administrations of five presidents. His integrity in these matters is as perfect as that of the President and the Secretary of State.

If this is what the men who make our foreign policy believe—and I am certain these statements honestly reflect their deepest feelings—why then the unease among so many about the administrations's Near East policy, and foreign policy in general?

...On April 7, I spoke at Temple Israel in New York, and I said: "For three years now I have been speaking

of the failure of nerve in American foreign policy. I find it more pronounced now than ever. And I do urge the friends of Israel to consider that, now more than in the past, American policy in the Middle East reflects our policy in the world at large, and it is to that larger policy that our concerns must be directed."

Not two weeks later, Secretary Vance, about to leave for Moscow to discuss strategic arms, was asked how President Carter and Mr. Brezhnev might fare if they themselves were to discuss these issues. The Secretary said in an interview in *Time:* "When the two men eventually sit down together, they will get along well. Both of them are strong men who have similar dreams and aspirations about the most fundemental issues..."

Similar Dreams And Aspirations?

This seems to me a profound misreading of reality—of American, Soviet and world reality....

... The Soviet state... is the same totalitarian police state that Khruschev, Stalin, and Lenin directed before (Brezhnev). And the "dreams and aspirations" of that state apparatus are wholly contrary to those of the American democracy.

Instead, the normal objective of the Soviet state is the expansion of communism, and it can be ruthless with any small nation which stands in its way at a time when it is expanding....

The Soviet aspirations for Israel are equally plain. Israel is in the way of current Soviet expansion, for beyond pro-western, democratic Israel lies the Persian Gulf, Egypt, a whole continent, an island sea....

Finding that Israel could not be destroyed militarily, the Soviets thereupon set about seeking the *political* destruction of Israel...

Even as Soviet expansionism is made manifest in Africa, it appears once again in an area of historic Russian imperial ambition, central Asia. On April 27, so-called "insurgents in the military" overthrew the government in Afghanistan. Almost immediately, it became apparent that the military coup was in fact a coup by the Communist Party of Afghanistan....

When on April 7, I urged that we look to "our policy in the world at large," I had an hypothesis in mind. Let me restate it: "I believe that what is happening to American policy, not merely in the Middle East but in the world at large, is a gradual accommodation to the fact that the Soviet Union has not only become the equal to the United States in military power, but seems destined to surpass the United States..."

I believe that much of what the administration has done in foreign affairs can be understood in this context. It is a succession of events, large and small, dramatic and simple, but all pointing in one direction: a quiet accommodation to long-sustained Soviet efforts....