

around Lazard Brothers in London aspire to establish its system of fascist world rule.

If the Geneva summit is successful, in the sense anticipated by the meeting between Begin and Sadat, the City of London and Tory traitors such as Henry Kissinger are finished. The Carter Administration would in due course abandon the foolish Schlesinger "energy policy"

— as France, Germany, and Japan push ahead with massive nuclear exports — and the wheels would get into motion for general world economic recovery. For such reasons, Begin's success, provided this means also a viable Palestinian Arab state, is a keystone of real U.S. strategic interests. And Begin must be supported to that specific effect by all the means at our disposal.

First Reactions To Sadat-Begin Meet

From European Leaders . . .

France

Raymond Barre, Prime Minister, speaking on television Nov. 20, in response to a question concerning France's refusal to back a joint EEC statement to have been issued Nov. 19 in support of President Sadat:

"We have always affirmed that Israel has the right to safe and recognized borders, and that some of the Arab countries' demands should also be recognized, France, contrary to what some claim, does not have a partisan policy... In the present state of affairs, in response to this personal initiative by the Egyptian president, such a declaration could have been premature before the situation could be appreciated in all its complexity. This declaration was requested (by the U.S. State Department—ed.) on Friday at 14 o'clock, for Saturday at 10 o'clock. France estimated that it should not associate itself with this initiative. It is true that President Sadat made a step toward the recognition of Israel, and we rejoice over this... No matter how important the event, there can be no durable settlement if the fundamental problems are not dealt with."

West Germany

Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, in an interview in the Nov. 22 daily Westphälische Rundschau:

"That is an astounding development, which can only be welcomed with all of our best wishes, for the Egyptian people as well as for the Israeli people. One can only be amazed at the boldness of President Sadat when one recognizes the severe criticism against the trip that will arise from several Arab countries. I know Mr. Sadat well and I am convinced that this man wants nothing more than peace in the Middle East and to stabilize this peace. Surely this also holds for the Israelis. On the other hand, everyone of us knows that peace in the Middle East depends not merely on Egypt and Israel..."

Hans-Dietrich Genscher, Foreign Minister, speaking in Tunis, Tunisia in a Nov. 19 West German radio news broadcast:

"Sadat's trip ushers in an important development, and the Federal Republic of Germany welcomes it.

On Nov. 22, before attending the European Economic Community Foreign Ministers meeting, Foreign Minister Genscher said:

"I will urge a formal European Economic Community welcome for the Sadat-Begin visit... France's reservations should not prevent the European Economic Community from once again expressing its fundamental interest in a Middle East peace, to which Begin and Sadat have made a very important initiative..."

Great Britain

David Owen, Foreign Secretary, on Nov. 18 termed the Sadat visit to Israel "a bold and imaginative gesture," and said he hoped it would pave the way for a resumption of the Geneva peace conference.

. . . And From Europe's Press

France

Le Figaro, "The Spirit of November 20," by Paul-Marie de la Gorce:

The formidable mobilization of world public opinion, the real moral shock which was produced in Israel, make it almost impossible for things to remain as they are. This is what the Egyptian President is counting on. In fact, he has presented a peace plan which will have the support of the great majority of states. And to use the usual formula, the ball which was thrown into the Israeli court remains there. Only with great difficulty will Mr. Begin be able to refuse to engage negotiations, even if among his future interlocutors are the Palestinians, whom he doesn't like; only with difficulty can he not respond more precisely to the Egyptian border proposals.

Le Figaro, "Portrait of Begin," Nov. 21:

"The British regime has shamelessly tricked the Israeli people," states the call launched by the Irgun, "and there is no longer any moral basis to justify its presence in Eretz Israel... We will fight." Placed in the reality of the period, this text, signed by Menachem Begin, seemed just as crazy as the June 18, 1940 call signed by a temporary Brigadier General named Charles de Gaulle.

Le Figaro, "Passion and Reason," editorial by Paul-Marie de La Gorce, Nov. 19-20:

... It remains to be seen whether a process has not been set in motion the effects of which Begin could fear in the end.

The Israeli population, which will be greeting Anwar Sadat with Egyptian flags in hand, are evidently demonstrating their will for peace. It will not be possible to tell them later that the same man they are cheering is an enemy whom it is necessary to fight by all means. Some profound changes could result from this meeting in the public spirit of Israel. A large proportion of the country consists of former residents of Arab countries: some of them are the most violent in their hostility toward the traditional adversaries of Israel. But others hold a secret attachment to the countries where they were born; they could henceforth express it.

Likewise, the partisans of an entente with the Arab camp, of an accord with the Palestinians and the restitution of the occupied territories, have long been part of a negligible minority and have sometimes had difficulty in speaking out: no doubt they will now speak with much more assurance and will, in Israeli opinion, find much more of an echo.

France Soir, "No Sadat Did Not Return Empty-Handed — Peace Is In Gear," by Benoit Rayski, Nov. 22:

...Both leaders spoke together of their position, without concessions, and thus launched the process of peace ... Neither of them expected on the spot concessions from the other because it is not a bilateral accord they were after, but Geneva where "everything is open for discussion" (Begin).

West Germany

Bavarian Broadcasting Network, Nov. 21:

In a one-hour Mideast special report broadcast on Bavarian and national television, the network interviewed Palestinians on the West Bank who said:

The Jews are not our enemies. Finally the right men have to sit down and negotiate peace. We're fed up with war.

The TV commentator ended the report by saying:

I don't know what the official necessary qualifications are for the Nobel Peace Prize, but I know whom I would award it to.

Die Welt, "A Beginning," front-page lead editorial by publisher Axel Springer, Nov. 21:

If we recognize the historic power of this meeting we will see its poignancy for the future ... But we do not know how this future will turn out, what forces will step in behind the doors which have just been opened... When history is made, it is made by extraordinary men... Begin and Sadat have, in the power of their hearts and understanding, accomplished something without precedent in recent history.

Sadat indeed broke from the Soviets, but the trip to Israel was much more courageous, and more dangerous for him. The Soviet Union did block the transmission of the Knesset speeches... The populations and govern-

ments of the world have much to learn. Their policy was previously oriented to the hostility between Israelis and Arabs ... fear of terror dictated political decisions and worries about oil made them into collaborators of injustice ... But the fears of the West were not Begin's and Sadat's. These two men were more courageous than a dozen European cabinets and even wiser than the man in the White House ... But other attempts will follow, attempts whose goal will be destruction, war ... America and Free Europe must be vigilant ...

Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, Nov. 22:

If Palestinians, Syrians and Moscow would pull together, peace could be negotiated in the first week of January...

Italy

L'Unita, daily of the Italian Communist Party, Nov. 21:

The meeting is without precedent for humanity ... Someone has said that no real issues were discussed, but these people don't understand that even the formal meeting itself is an exceptional occurrence. Both Sadat and Begin stressed not only the necessity for peace, but also for cooperation to ensure the tranquility of the region... Behind the meeting there may be an economic cooperation plan.

Corriere della Sera, Nov. 21:

The positive, encouraging fact is that between the two sides there are efforts to create the psychological climate adapted to fostering the movement toward and enlargement of the dialogue.

Il Tempo, Nov. 21:

If the objective of Sadat and Begin was to pull down the psychological wall that divides Arabs and Israelis, and to make possible direct negotiations ... one can say they have succeeded ... the statements of the two leaders has confirmed that good will exists to begin negotiations for a solution to extremely complex problems.

Sadat has recognized, without half measures and hesitations, the existence of the State of Israel and its right to exist behind secure borders, internationally recognized and respected by neighboring countries, which would put an end to a state of belligerency ... Begin has replied that everything is negotiable ...

Britain

Financial Times, "Sadat and Begin Speeches Disappoint," Nov. 21:

(After downplaying the significance of the meeting, the *Financial Times* questions whether Sadat can muster the support of the Arab world behind him.)

The two speeches in the Knesset would not have been remarkable had they not been the centrepiece of an occasion broadcast live throughout the world, since neither leader said anything which departed in any radical way from their publicly known positions ... So far, of his (Begin's—ed.) private conversations with

President Sadat, nothing has emerged. Nothing indeed may emerge until it becomes clearer whether President Sadat can restore relations with Syria and Saudi Arabia, or whether Israel is facing a new era in which the Arab world is profoundly and perhaps permanently divided ...

Daily Telegraph, Nov. 22:

By sticking to the basic Arab demands, Sadat has refuted the accusation of treachery made against him by much, but by no means all of the rest of the Arab world. Yet when the Egyptian people and others in the Arab world begin to reflect, they will notice more than perhaps at present the paucity of the Israeli response—notwithstanding the general jollity of the occasion. Mr. Begin really had nothing to put into the scales, not even, for the present at least, a return visit to Cairo. He specifically rejected international guarantees, and was completely unforthcoming on withdrawal and the Palestinians. Both leaders looked forward to Geneva—but how can the other Arab states now attend? Perhaps there is more than we know about. Let us hope so.

Soviets Hedge Bets On Mideast Developments

While the Soviet Union has not endorsed the Sadat-Begin talks as a move toward general peace, and indeed the Soviet party daily *Pravda* headlined its Nov. 21 issue, "The Arab World Protests," some signs of moderation in the Soviets' reaction have appeared. Significantly, the major Soviet press have carried no commentary of their own on the summit, but rather have limited their coverage to reprinting criticism of the Sadat-Begin meeting from the major Arab press.

This manner of coverage could indicate that the Soviets are leaving open an option to support the Sadat-Begin diplomacy if it continues to lead toward a Geneva peace conference. East European press coverage has likewise reflected this flexibility in their reports on the meeting.

Stimme der DDR, official East German radio, gave coverage on Nov. 20 to the Israeli Communist Party's call for a special Knesset session to work toward a "comprehensive peace."

The Romanians have covered the Sadat trip very positively, while reports abound that Romania played a major role in the events leading up to it. On Nov. 19, Prime Minister Begin telephoned Romanian President Ceaucescu to thank him for his assistance in arranging the visit.

The Hungarian press has given only "neutral" coverage, more close-lipped than some Soviet reports.

Informed sources report that Soviet circles close to Anglo-American intelligence networks, such as Georgii Arbatov of USA Institute, are peddling the same line as Henry Kissinger, namely that Geneva is out of the question in the near future.

Are Soviets Softening on Israel?

The most outstanding, although still indirect, reflection of Soviet thinking on the Sadat-Begin meeting was reported in the Nov. 19-20 issue of the conservative French daily, *Le Figaro*, excerpts of which follow:

Since the rupture of relations, in 1967, things hardly seem to have evolved. Moscow has made itself the champion of the Arab cause and feigns to believe that the leaders in Tel Aviv are marionettes manipulated by Washington.

On paper, things are clear and plain. The situation is viewed by Moscow only in large black and white terms, with no intervening shades of gray. Nevertheless, things are not as simple or abrupt in reality. Here and there, the Soviet Union seems to give evidence of unexpected leanings toward Israel. The bridges are certainly burned, but other ways have been found to maintain some bits of dialogue at long intervals.

The Soviet-Israeli thaw, accompanied by the reestablishment or not of diplomatic relations, is a rumor that runs periodically around Moscow. Always denied up until now by the facts, it is, however, not without foundation: evidence of mutual interest emerges from time to time noisily shattering the silence of the chancellories.

Despite the shower of nasty editorials by *Pravda* or *Tass*, the Soviet Union appears to have softened its attitude toward Israel these last months. Certain proof has been noticed at international meetings.

Last September, the U.N. Commission for Europe sponsored a chemistry colloquium in Moscow. Israel let it be known that it would like to send observers (as a trial balloon?). At first, the visa demands of the Israeli officials were rejected, but the Soviet Union eventually changed its decision; the visas were granted.

Also in September the international book fair took place in Moscow. The incident was hardly noticed, but Israel had a stand there and there were not only communist publications. Naturally, all the Israeli books were the object of a more detailed censorship examination than those from other countries. But, they were there.

Last spring, after the election victory of the Likud, the anti-Israel press campaign experienced a strange relaxation. For the first two months of his government, Menachem Begin was not the object of any criticism. That, of course, did not last, but it is proof of the surprising good-will that Moscow is ready to demonstrate when Israel is concerned.

Contacts Maintained

In addition to these breaks in the routine hostility, there is constant proof that the USSR thinks that a thaw is possible at any moment. There hasn't been a diplomatic delegation in Moscow for ten years. But the buildings in (the Israeli) embassy have not been touched. Practically, if it were agreed upon, an Israeli ambassador could be installed in Moscow at any time.

Official contacts are not lacking either. Soviet emissaries have travelled discreetly to Israel on several occasions. The Soviet journalist Victor Louis often acts as an intermediary and expresses his opinion in the Italian press with an authority recognized as that of the Kremlin.

In official Soviet circles, there is a current that believes the reestablishment of diplomatic relations is presently conditioned by the convening of the Geneva conference. Nevertheless, there are voices that say this would be an excellent precondition, susceptible of facilitating the convocation of the conference.

At the time of the birth of the Hebrew state, the Soviet Union, the first country to recognize the young nation,

looked with sympathy on this young nation with its socialist orientation, which was created against the English. This inclination was all the more strong in that Israel was at that time surrounded by conservative Arab regimes. Today the situation is reversed: Moscow sees Israel as an American platform and declares itself to be the ideological parent of the Arabs. But traces of affection in a disappointed love still remain....

Will Israel Make Breakthrough On Palestinian Arab Question?

The consensus view of informed observers in Jerusalem and in the U.S. is that Israel is readying itself for acceptance of the creation of an independent Palestinian Arab state on the now-occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip territories.

While this possibility seems to have been rejected by Prime Minister Menachem Begin in his Nov. 24 press conference reiterating Israel's refusal to consider talks at Geneva or elsewhere with known members of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the reality is much more complex, involving a delicate interplay of proposals, concessions, and hard bargaining lines from the three primary parties to the negotiating process — Israel, Egypt, and the Palestinian Arabs.

Within Israel, the mood of the population and of much of the Israeli cabinet favors rapid concessions in favor of achieving a viable solution to the Palestinian Arab problem. According to a former correspondent for the leading Israeli daily *Ha'aretz*, "the drift in Israel has shifted after the Sadat visit — from the feeling of anger and intransigence which helped usher Begin into power

in the first place to a more 'leftist' direction in favor of compromise and an overall peace. This drift will undoubtedly affect the cabinet's policy-making decisions."

A government voice in favor of West Bank concessions has been that of Deputy Prime Minister Yigal Yadin, whose entrance into the cabinet last month clearly strengthened Begin's coalition, giving the government the basis for heading off the extreme nationalist right in the event that bold foreign policy moves had to be made.

In a Nov. 22 interview with Radio Jerusalem, Yadin insisted that Israel "shouldn't underestimate the visit" of Sadat. "It was a great visit; we have always talked of direct negotiations, but no one thought it would happen in such a bold, dramatic way, to bring peace with Egypt to be consummated at the Geneva conference." The Israeli public, Yadin continued, "is not satisfied with the usual events in the Mideast."

The next day, Yadin speculated on a possible Israeli West Bank proposal which was, however, not much more than a reiteration of the so-called Allon Plan: the return, for the most part, of the West Bank to Jordan, but with

Israeli Writer Calls Upon Begin To Compromise On Palestinian Issue

Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin is coming under increasing pressure within Israel to make serious concessions on the question of Palestinian self-determination. Here, Jerusalem Post columnist Meir Merhav calls upon Begin to make such concessions in his Post column Nov. 22; Merhav recently authored a New York Times editorial page feature calling upon Israel to consider negotiations with the Palestine Liberation Organization.

President Sadat has demonstrated his will to make a bold break with the past and take a leap into the future. He has invited Israel to join him in the making of history, here and now, although this may, as he took pains to warm repeatedly, call for hard and difficult decisions.

Mr. Begin unfortunately did not rise to the occasion All he had to offer for Sadat's offer of peace was — peace

There is still some hope. Mr. Begin repeated that everything, including the permanent boundaries between Israel and her neighbors, is open to negotiation. And, in language as guarded as possible, he warned our guest against excluding any subject from negotiations

If this is an indication that Mr. Begin may come to recognize that there can be no peace in our area without a solution to the Palestinian problem — a problem that cannot be imposed on them by either Sadat, Assad, Hussein, or Begin, but must be acceptable to *them*; if it means that the way has been opened to territorial compromise; if it means that what has been said in public together with what may have been said in private is enough to induce the other Arab leaders to negotiate in the manner now opened up by President Assad — there is still hope.