

# Israel's Dayan Is Main Threat To Geneva Accord

The Israeli Cabinet voted unanimously yesterday to accept the U.S.-Israeli "working paper" on a Middle East peace settlement hammered out between President Carter and Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan of Israel in an all-night meeting two weeks ago in New York.

The Cabinet decision, announced after a reportedly stormy five-hour session chaired by Prime Minister Menachem Begin, signals an important Israeli willingness to continue to explore the possibility of a reconvened Geneva conference later this year chaired by the United States and the Soviet Union.

The "working paper" itself is not the central issue in the ongoing Middle East negotiations, however. According to published reports, the key concept embodied in the paper is a proposal to set up, at a reconvened Geneva meeting, a multilateral Arab-Israel working committee that would include representatives of Israel, the Arab states, and the Palestinians to discuss the issue of the Palestinians. Previously, Israel had refused categorically to negotiate the Palestinian question.

But sharp disagreement — even head-to-head confrontation — prevails over who should represent the Palestinians, and to what end. The hawkish Dayan faction in Israel, and its British and American "Israel Lobby" allies, intends to use the deadlock over the Palestine question to destroy chances for a peace settlement and provoke a Middle East war and an oil crisis.

## *U.S.-Soviet Accord*

The underlying issue in the Middle East negotiations is the continued furor over the Oct. 1 announcement of a joint U.S.-Soviet statement endorsing the "rights of the Palestinian people." That statement not only signaled Washington's shift in the Middle East — previously, the U.S. had spoken only of the "legitimate interests of the Palestinians" — but was a significant part of a much broader U.S.-Soviet rapprochement that included the Middle East, the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks (SALT), and the downplaying of Carter's "human rights" provocations.

## U.S.-Soviet Global Deal In The Works

*The following is an interview with a spokesman close to the American Jewish Congress:*

**Q:** What is your view of the recent U.S.-Soviet communiqué?

**A:** My position is a moderate one that rejects annexation of the West Bank despite protests from the Gush Emunim and Agriculture Minister Sharon, but that opposes Israel's simply giving up the West Bank, because surrendering it would undercut Israel's security. Therefore, one has to *begin* with proposals to make Israel as secure as possible.

There are 14 different ways to maximize Israel's security. The least attractive is to have American troops or joint U.S.-Soviet policing of the area. The best is to have a set of arrangements whereby Israel is defensible.

I have been told by absolutely top-level reliable people that there is a global deal between the U.S. and the Soviets in the making. It involves SALT, a dropping of Carter's human rights, and some kind of settlement in the Mideast. This was the basis of and reason for Brzezinski's secret doings and dealings in Europe recently.

Both sides are being flexible. However, Carter was pretty badly beaten down (by the Israel Lobby — ed.) in a matter of days. The U.S.-Soviet deal

might even be destroyed — there are forces in the U.S. who don't want such a deal, they want a confrontation. *This is against my view.*

I believe that the Russians are like us, despite what you may hear in public. They don't want adventurers running around the Mideast. They want to cool it. They'll support a neutralized West Bank and Jordan. Their position and ours are not as far apart as some may think.

I am searching for a non-confrontationist middle option. I want to reduce the U.S.-Soviet conflict. I support the idea wholeheartedly. I want to increase mutual accommodation. And I also don't want to wake up one morning and have to make painful decisions: the U.S. or Israel.

**Q:** Where is the impetus for the U.S.-Soviet rapprochement coming from within the U.S.?

**A:** It's the Trilateral-Brookings foreign policy establishment, with the profoundly important element of American big business. American business, although this is not always played up front publicly, *wants* to do business with the Arabs and with the Soviets. They are the profoundest prodétente elements in the United States, despite the public appearances of some of their representatives.

It is that package that Dayan, Secretary of Energy James Schlesinger, Vice-President Walter Mondale, and the so-called Israel Lobby have mobilized to upset, in coordination with British royal intelligence and the latter's Second International apparatus. A domestic political crisis is brewing in the United States over this issue, and an aide to pro-Israeli Senator Daniel Moynihan (D-NY) said of the White House: "The lunatics have taken over the asylum."

Since the Oct. 1 joint statement, Carter has carefully tried to line up a domestic political consensus behind the move. But important signals from Israel itself have indicated some Israeli support for the Carter initiative, including from Prime Minister Begin himself.

Most important was the result of a visit to Israel by former French Prime Minister Jacques Chaban-Delmas, who met with Begin in Jerusalem, and invited the Israeli leader to make an official visit to France. Begin's reported acceptance of the French invitation drew a storm of hysterical protest from the opposition Labor Party and "liberal" press in Israel, including the trade union daily Davar, which said in an editorial that the "only friend of Israel in France is Francois Mitterrand," the British agent who heads the French Socialist Party.

In addition, in a speech in Atlanta, Georgia, former Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban — a long-time rival of Dayan — told an audience that he welcomed the participation of the Soviet Union in Middle East peace efforts as a necessary component, and added that as long as guarantees of Israeli security are achieved, other issues — like the troublesome issue of the Palestine Liberation Organization — can be resolved.

#### *Dayan's Threats*

Against the prevailing current of peace, General Dayan has carried out a firestorm of provocations, lies, threats, and ultimatums. The Dayan campaign has as its central objective the provocation of the Arab states and the PLO into adopting a hard-line anti-Israeli posture in response, thereby setting up a growing war crisis in which Israel would increasingly receive U.S. backing against the Arabs.

In a television interview, a speech at the United Nations, and a press conference before returning to Israel, Dayan unleashed his venom. He threatened that if Israel were faced with Arab demands to create a West Bank Palestinian state at a reconvened Geneva con-

ference, Israel would walk out of the conference, allowing it to collapse. This threat, especially in the eyes of European observers, is a virtual guarantee of a provoked oil embargo, aiding the Schlesinger forced-conservation drive.

Dayan added that Israel would not negotiate with the PLO even if the PLO changed its covenant and recognized Israel and UN Resolution 242. He said that the PLO must "change its guts." He also stated that Israel would not accept to negotiate even with designated, non-PLO representatives at Geneva if the PLO had a hand in designating other Palestinians.

This latter statement ran directly counter to a groundbreaking gesture last week from the PLO, whose UN representative Zehdi Terzi said that the PLO might not demand to attend Geneva itself provided that it could name non-PLO Palestinians to negotiate in its name. Other Arab reaction to the string of Dayan provocations was immediate, with Syria in particular saying that it would refuse to attend a Geneva conference unless the PLO were represented on an equal basis with all other parties.

But there are growing indications that Dayan's position within Israel is getting shakier and more isolated, and that perhaps Begin is maneuvering to oust Dayan and clear the way for a peace settlement.

According to Washington analysts, there are reports that Begin — a hardline nationalist — may have given private assurances, possibly during his recent visit to Romania, that he would ultimately accept an overall peace agreement, including a West Bank state, in which Israel's security were firmly guaranteed. The reported Begin visit to France, which had so far played a key role in the ongoing U.S.-Soviet moves on the Middle East and SALT, might be another crucial step in that direction.

The overriding strategic issue is the fact that the Soviet-U.S. statement has cleared the path to a UN resolution recognizing Palestinian rights, and thus toward the PLO's acceptance of Resolution 242 in conjunction with this new resolution. This, in turn, would mean effectively that the PLO has accepted the existence of the Israeli state — something that the PLO has so far refused to do — thus ensuring an official dialogue between the U.S. and the PLO. Under these circumstances, it is expected that Begin — provided that he can free himself from Dayan — will respond in kind.

— Bob Dreyfuss

## U.S.-Soviet Communique — A Sellout

*The following excerpt from the Oct. 9 Jerusalem Post editorial demonstrates the attitude of some Israeli factions to the joint U.S.-Soviet communiqué recognizing Palestinian rights:*

The U.S.-Soviet statement — which many American critics justly termed an about-face in American policy and a sell-out of Israel — rather than the working paper, reflects the Carter Administration's intentions, if it could have its way.

One of the lessons to be learned... is that the Administration can no longer be viewed... as a neutral third party offering its unbiased good offices for the purposes of arriving at a settlement acceptable to both Arabs and Israel.

The U.S. has its own clear-cut interests in the area and evidence has been mounting that the Carter Administration would not hesitate to impose a settlement — on Israel, not on the Arabs — commensurate with its reading of America's interests if it could get away with it.

The second lesson to be learned is that there is a potentially powerful opposition within the U.S. to such a policy.

One of the most urgent tasks confronting Israel is to harness this potential now.

### “Ominous Mutterings” Against Dayan

*Jerusalem Post, Oct. 10*

One local motif accompanying Mr. Dayan's recent talks in Washington and New York has been ominous mutterings in the Herut camp (of the ruling Likud Party —ed.) against the Foreign Minister for allegedly having surrendered too much to the Americans.

It is no secret that Mr. Dayan's appointment as Foreign Minister was opposed by the majority of the Prime Minister's party...

## Jerusalem Post

### It Was Mondale vs. Brezezinski on U.S.-Soviet Statement

*The article excerpted here appeared in the Oct. 14 Jerusalem Post, under the byline of Wolf Blitzer.*

It can now be revealed that the Oct. 1 U.S.-Soviet statement on the Middle East, which recognized “the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people,” brought to a

head the already tense relationship in the White House between National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski and top political aide Hamilton Jordan.

Jordan was furious that Brzezinski had cleared the joint statement with the President without bothering to inform anyone else on Carter's staff. In fact, even Vice-President Walter Mondale is reliably reported to have been unaware of the statement until after it was released.

Mondale, moreover, was already angry at Brzezinski for talking about U.S. “leverage” on the Middle East parties during an interview with Canadian Television — despite the Vice-President's solemn pledge in his June address in San Francisco that the U.S. would never use its military or economic assistance programme to Israel as a means of political pressure.

Although Secretary of State Cyrus Vance is taking “credit” for the concept of a joint communiqué with the Soviets, Brzezinski, who supported the idea, was charged with winning the President's approval. Brzezinski, who meets with Carter daily to brief him on overnight developments affecting national security, is said to have given the President an overly optimistic assessment of the reaction the statement was likely to evoke in Israel...

Hamilton Jordan, who today is probably closer to Carter than anyone else in the top White House echelon now that Bert Lance has returned to Georgia, was irate when, on Saturday evening, Oct. 1, he learned about the joint statement from the radio.

Here he was, responsible for maintaining the President's popularity among the public, the Congress, and the Democratic Party, without having had any input whatsoever on a statement which was obviously going to affect support for the President.

Jordan invited Israeli Ambassador Simcha Dinitz to a meeting on Monday, at which Stuart Eizenstadt and Robert Lipshutz were also present...

Carter was genuinely stung by the uproar generated by the communiqué. He immediately knew that Brzezinski and Vance had not prepared him well for these developments. No expert in the diplomatic nuances of code words like “rights” or “interests,” Carter could hardly be blamed for accepting their view that the statement was not that offensive to Israel.

Meanwhile, there were other meetings among the top White House staff involving Mondale, Jordan, Lipshutz, Eizenstadt and others — Brzezinski was conspicuously absent. They were determining how best to repair the damage.

Their message to the President was clear: the rift with Israel and its many American supporters must be removed. And the best way to do that was for the President to reach agreement with Dayan on Wednesday evening on a draft working paper for reconvening the Geneva conference...