

represented by former General Matti Peled and the Progressive List for Peace, by left-Labor, most of Mapam, and a scattering of others on the Left. It has never enjoyed more than 9 percent support within the Jewish electorate.

Center losing favor

Supporters of the "center" position have cause for growing concern that they may be marginalized by electoral victories by the basically anti-democratic, expansionist majority. Some in the center are beginning to have serious concerns that they, like a handful of Jews promoting the third image, may suffer prosecution and persecution. That explains Peres's efforts to get some settlement, but it also explains his rejection of an independent Palestinian entity. Such an entity is overwhelmingly rejected by the Jewish electorate. It would be an ideological "dagger pointed at the heart of Israel."

US interests

For its part, present US strategy appears to require an Israel threatened by and threatening its neighbors. Such an Israel sustains the type of insecurity and instability which permits the US to win and hold the "friendship" of powerful Arab military elites in poor and rich countries alike. In the poor countries, a combination of military sales and aid insures dependence on the US for security and for the regime's survival against its domestic revolution. The nature and scope of economic aid which is not aimed at significant economic development, coupled with the burdens of maintaining large military establishments, also help to sustain economic dependence on the US.

This strategy requires external threats where there are no serious domestic threats. It is a strategy which favors military and commercial elites in the Arab countries and military-industrial elites in Israel. A similar strategy where economic aid is replaced by sales of US technology and expertise applies to the relatively few oil-rich Arab states. Economic dependence is bolstered by sales of technology and services, and by encouraging enormous capital investment in the US. Those investments tie their owners closer to the US economy and therefore to US interests. Israel's dependence is underscored by the fact that its economy would collapse without the yearly US subsidies, now reaching the equivalent of US \$1400 for every man, woman and child there. Unlike

dependent Arab states, however, Israel has a powerful lobby in the US which it relies on to insulate it from American pressures when Israeli and American interests or objectives conflict.

The US government's strategy of control is aimed at securing well-known American economic and strategic objectives in the region: access to oil and to Arab markets, and containing Soviet influence. It is also aimed at containing Western European influence and subordinating European policies there to American interests.

Peace in the Middle East requires a major rethinking in Washington and in Israel of the character of their respective states, the one as world and the other as regional superpower. It requires a reevaluation of the means by which influence can be exercised and sustained without dominion and dependence. It would require each, no doubt, to settle for less, economically and politically, than it presently enjoys.

And where is Canada?

Canada deserves at least a footnote in this discussion, partly because that is precisely where our government has placed us. Only in early June did Joe Clark align Canada with the call for an international peace conference under United Nations auspices, stating that Canada "strongly supports" the efforts of Hussein and other Middle East leaders (i.e., Peres, Mubarak and King Hassan of Morocco) to convene such a conference. His language was vague enough to permit Canada to support the EEC's versions of outcome and conference, or to support the Peres/US line. In the circumstances, the intent was probably to support the latter, although it is not really clear that Hussein and Mubarak are seeking that conference with its unique outcome. Nevertheless, the statement advanced Canada's official position in the direction of peace, as did Canada's switch last November from a negative vote to an abstention on General Assembly Resolution 41/43D, the latest annual successor to 38/58C. The Liberals, however, officially hold to the Camp David model and have not yet managed to inch as far forward as Peres or the US. The NDP endorses an international peace conference under UN auspices, probably the one Peres has in mind. Canada really could do much more to promote the causes of genuine peace and of human decency in the Middle East. But will it? □