New Chapter in US-Zionist Strategic Cooperation

While reading the following article, one must bear in mind the attempt of the western media and officials to portray the US-Israeli strategic alliance agreement as something new. True, the US and 'Israel' will escalate their joint involvement in the Middle East more openly, but the idea itself is old. This agreement is the result of over three decades of close political, economic and military cooperation. It is, moreover, a continuation of the ongoing Camp David conspiracy which is enacted in successive phases, each emphasizing different methods and points of attack. While the Memorandum of Understanding signed in Nov. 1981, set out the principles of US-Zionist strategic cooperation, the new agreement is a concrete working program based on these principles.

Overview of the agreement

The strategic alliance agreement was announced on Nov. 30th, after the conclusion of high level talks in Washington D.C., between Israeli Prime Minister Shamir and Defense Minister Arens and their counterparts in the US administration, Reagan and Weinberger. It was agreed to set up a joint political-military committee, which is scheduled to meet in early January, to discuss joint military exercises, stockpiling US military equipment in 'Israel', US purchase of Israeli supplies and services, etc.

This was the first time Reagan had received an Israeli Prime Minister in 18 months, and their meeting was billed as signalling renewed friendship. Shamir's having replaced Begin offered the chance for the US and Zionist leaderships to take qualitative steps to coordinate their strategy more closely, while at the same time trying to disassociate their new plans and moves from the atrocities and failures of the Begin-Sharon era.

The agreement comes at a time when both the US and Israeli political and military strategies are bogged down in the quagmire that they have created in Lebanon. This is due to the heroic resistance of the Lebanese National Resistance Front, the Syrian forces and the Palestinian revolution, especially against the capitulationist May 17th Israeli-Lebanese accord. Having previously underestimated the obstacles they would encounter, Shamir and Reagan centered their talks on, in Shamir's words, "confronting the Soviet-supplied military build-up in Syria".

The idea of the political-military agreement between Washington and Tel Aviv is to send a clear signal to Syria and the Soviet Union that there is no gap between the US and Israeli strategy in the Middle East, and that US and Israeli interests are one and the same. This dispelled any illusions that the US was intending to depend less on 'Israel'. On the contrary, the role of the Zionist state as US imperialism's watchdog in the Middle East is broadened and given more strategic significance. In view of Reagan's intention to run for the US Presidency in 1984, reinforced cooperation with 'Israel' might give him the option of withdrawing the Marines, if this was needed to enhance his chance of reelection, without jeopardizing implementation of US policy in Lebanon. Already, there are discussions in US military circles to deploy some of the Marines closer to the Israeli occupation troops, while securing the rest on the 6th Fleet vessels.

The US decision to stockpile military equipment in 'Israel' and hold joint military maneuvers makes the Zionist state a forward base for the Rapid Deployment Force on its way to the Gulf. This is further proof that the organic link between Zionism and imperialism, and especially its military aspect, does not diminish over time, but grows stronger. The very existence of the Zionist state is rooted in this link, while at the same time the US needs a reliable fortress in an area as vital as the Middle East. Without lessening its dependence on 'Israel', current US imperialist policy dictates the presence of its own forces, as seen in Lebanon and the efforts to set up permanent military bases in the region. The 1983 strategic alliance agreement is an attempt to coordinate the historical Israeli role with US imperialism's increased emphasis on military intervention. At the same time, increased US military presence in the area increases the likelihood that a local conflict can explode into a regional one, threatening world peace. Simply stated, the US-Israeli agreement is a new declaration of war against the Arab masses, and a challenge to the forces of peace and progress all over the world.

US-Israeli declaration of war

While directed against all nationalist and progressive forces in the area, the current focus of increased US-Zionist cooperation is to break Syria's nationalist stand. During his visit to Washington, Arens was quoted as saying, "the possibility of a joint US-Israeli military action against Syria is a function of the extent of the challenge. If there were to be a military challenge, I suppose all options are open." Thus, it came as no surprise when US warplanes, on December 4th, for the first time in the Middle East conflict, staged a direct military attack on the armed forces of an Arab country (Syria). According to the *International Herald Tribune*, Dec. 5, a Pentagon spokesman confirmed that the raid was discussed with the NATO allies beforehand. This, coupled with Arens remarks, proves that the attack was premeditated. The timing of the US aggression against Syria is proof that it is directly applying its part of the agreement.

'Israel' - new NATO member?

While petitioning for more US aid, Shamir compared US aid to 'Israel' with greater expenditures for NATO. The comparison is also apt in terms of US-Israeli cooperation in Lebanon, for in reality the US is promoting an unofficial NATO venture under the cover of the Multinational Forces' mandate.

With the strategic alliance agreement, the Zionist state is overtly accentuating the role it has always occupied in imperialism's anti-communist strategy, globally and regionally. Accordingly, 'Israel' is given carte blanche to attack liberation movements in defense of US interests, on the pretext that they are the advance contingent of the 'Soviet invasion to come'. In reality, the strategic alliance agreement is directed against all the anti-imperialist forces indigenous to the area, and against the support they receive from the socialist community. It is a new litmus test for all the US 'peace' initiatives in the area, showing once again that these are primarily designed to keep the Zionist state as the strongest in the area, as the chosen way of insuring imperialist dominance.