

that a subject to be discussed at Camp David will be the stationing of U.S. troops in the Middle East to "guarantee" an Egypt-Israel peace. This possibility has been bitterly attacked by the Soviets, who have identified National Security Council chief Zbigniew Brzezinski as its architect.

Despite the publicity given to the separate peace dynamic, Egyptian President Anwar Sadat stressed Aug. 14 that he "would not sign a separate peace," but was committed to a "global accord. . . . I could have signed a separate peace a long time ago but I didn't, so why do these reports persist?" Sadat stressed.

Lebanon: Precedent For American Pressure?

The one sign that emerged this week that the U.S. would take Israel to task for obstructing Middle East talks was the evidence of U.S. pressure to force Israel

to stop arming the Lebanese Falangists. According to *Newsweek* magazine, shipments have in fact stopped to the Falange because of U.S. pressure.

Whether this is just a "put-out-the-fire-that-Israel-sets" operation, or is part of a wider operation to bring Israel into line, is as yet unclear.

In Lebanon, meanwhile, the Israelis continue to play with fire despite U.S. involvement. Israeli puppets in the South refuse to allow Lebanese Army forces to penetrate southward, jeopardizing United Nations peacekeeping efforts in the region. In Beirut, Israeli agents blew up a nine-story building in western Beirut in an attempt to initiate a new wave of terrorism in the Middle East. But the fact of Israeli intelligence's involvement has begun to emerge into the international press (see below).

— Mark Burdman

Views Of The Summit From Around The World

The Sept. 5 Camp David summit has drawn a great deal of commentary and evaluation from the international press and diplomatic community. The following is a representative sample, from the U.S., Europe, the Soviet bloc, and the Arab world.

A U.S. insider in the negotiations stressed that:

Camp David is a delicate balance, as we search for an umbrella to further the talks. The crux is for Israel to give back the West Bank: we need a commitment from Israel *in principle* that the West Bank and Sinai are Arab territory. That's the key: in return for it, the Arabs can make some concessions in terms of the Israeli security question. This won't be detailed to the point at Camp David, but will be discussed in follow-up working groups. . . .

For the West Bank, we need the principle of eventual self-determination. This may not seem like stated U.S. policy, but that is what is meant by 'legitimate rights of the Palestinians,' and the Israelis are fully aware of it. . . .

As for the Soviets, they'll buy the package if it doesn't include American troops being sent to the area, and that idea is not coming from the Administration, but from some people in Congress.

Other sources took a less sanguine tone. The Saudis have made clear that their support for the Camp David initiative is *conditional* on Israel making territorial and related concessions. On Aug. 9, the Saudi paper *Al-Bilad* stated that Camp David:

will be more or less Israel's last chance to make responsive steps to any reasonable initiative or to hinder it, which would make it yet another failure like the other meetings that have taken place. . . . (We) hope that Israel will not use the Camp David meeting to propagate again disunity in the Arab ranks when healthy signs of solidarity and the start of unified strategy have appeared on the horizon.

On Aug. 11, the *Riyadh Domestic Service* stressed that the Camp David meeting:

represents the last chance for Israel to abandon its arrogance and its insistence on its rigid position and to show greater flexibility. . . . Nobody expects the summit meeting to succeed unless the United States puts forward a plan of its own in line with the UN resolutions and forces Israel to accept. . . . The failure of this conference is fraught with great danger. . . . It will. . . mean the squandering of the last chance open to Israel to return to the right path and realize that it cannot gain peace and territory at one and the same time.

Jordan's *Amman Domestic Service* Aug. 9 worried about the consequences for Camp David if Carter held back from pressuring Israel:

As the United States clings to its stands of not exerting pressure on Israel, not submitting definite proposals and not turning into a full partner in the negotiations, except in the sense of arranging another meeting here or there; and as Israel is more persistent than ever on sticking to the two matters of territories and sovereignty, with constant denial of the firm, legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arab people, it is difficult to make progress toward a comprehensive peace in the region. . . . In order for us to have hope in the possibility of making progress toward a true and comprehensive peace, the United States should have called for a summit conference that comprises all the parties concerned with the Middle East dispute, including the Soviet Union and the EEC, in addition to the principal Arab parties.

The Dangers of War

A writer close to Egyptian President Sadat, Anis Mansour of the weekly *October* magazine, warned on Cairo's *Middle East News Agency* Aug. 13 that:

the U.S. has a definite and direct interest in peace, that this opportunity which it provided to the two sides of the Middle East dispute might be the last, and that if it does not lead to peace there will be no peace for Israel or for the U.S. . . . The U.S. and Israel are aware that the possibility of war exists, that military operations could begin at any moment, that Washington and Tel Aviv exchanged messages regarding the Egyptian military movements, and that Egypt sometimes raises the degree of military preparedness among its forces.

The threat of war is cited by leading French commentator Paul Marie de la Gorce of *Le Figaro* Aug. 9 as a prime motivation behind Carter's Camp David decision. In an article supportive of Carter, de la Gorce writes:

Short of being blind, it was impossible not to see that the almost spectacular failure of the Egyptian President's initiative last November would lead to a catastrophe of unpredictable dimensions President (Carter) is putting himself on the front line: if he succeeds, he will come out with enormous prestige; if he fails, he will inevitably bear the consequences....What powerful motives pushed him to act?

First of all, the obvious certainty that, short of a settlement or the beginning of a settlement, a war (in the Mideast) would have formidable consequences on the world equilibrium. But in addition, the American government is, it seems, convinced that the Israeli refusal to accept Resolution 242 of the United Nations ... is not insurmountable

From a much more critical standpoint, the Soviets this week warned of negative consequences developing out of Camp David, in commentaries in various Soviet publications. An Aug. 10 *Tass* release reports:

Leaders of the present Israeli Government have made it clear on many occasions that they are interested in reducing the role of the United States to organizing the process of bilateral talks with some Arab countries and in forcing the Carter administration not to assume the role of the umpire between Israel and the Arabs. After

the United States itself has actually torpedoed the resumption of the Geneva peace conference on the Middle East, American diplomacy has had nothing left to do, as a matter of fact, but to follow the mainstream of Israeli policy. Of course, the United States has big levers of pressure on Israel, whose dependence on the American military and economic aid has increased particularly since the October war in 1973. At the moment, Israel accounts for one-third of all foreign aid by the United States. Nevertheless, the Carter administration has made repeated assurances during the past year that it will in no case resort to pressure on Israel.

The likelihood of such pressure has become minimal during the year of mid-term elections when the influence of the Zionist lobby forced the President to display especially and sometimes in a form even humiliating for the White House, the common American and Israeli positions on issues of a Middle East settlement. . . .

Pravda further stressed the danger of Israeli manipulation of the U.S. in an Aug. 12 *Tass* release entitled "Dangerous Undertaking."

According to reports received from Washington, the President's aide for National Security Z. Brzezinski told correspondents that the U.S. government is preparing, as he said, 'constructive proposals' which will be presented to the participants in the Camp David meeting at the beginning of September, Egyptian President Sadat and Israeli Prime Minister Begin. Informed American circles affirm that among these so-called "constructive initiatives" is a proposal for the deployment of contingents of American troops to the Middle East as a "guarantee" marking the separate deal between Egypt and Israel.

...Moreover, it should be clear that the proposed introduction of American troops will bring a new element into the Middle East situation, fraught with far-reaching dangerous consequences. . . .

It goes without saying that if these interventionist plans are actually intended to be realized, as has come out in the American press, they will be met with decisive resistance by the independent Arab states and all who are for a universal political settlement in the Middle East, including the Soviet Union.

Israeli Terror Aimed At Saudis, Arabs And Israelis

Faced with an unprecedented terror wave directed against their offices in the Mideast and elsewhere, Arab government and Palestinian officials have begun to lay blame for the incidents on Israel, exposing Israel's role in international and, in particular, in "inter-Arab" terror acts.

The vigorous Arab exposure of the Israeli connection to international terrorism promises to effectively contain a major Israeli deployment capability not only against Arab unity but also against the Bonn-Bremen economic plans and a Middle East peace settlement. Fearful that the upcoming Camp

David summit may become the venue for the U.S. to pressure Israel into a comprehensive settlement, the Israelis are brandishing terrorism to blackmail the U.S. into submission.

Triggering this development was the Aug. 13 explosion in Beirut that demolished a nine-story apartment complex housing the offices of the pro-Iraqi Palestine Liberation Front (PLF) and Fatah, the core group of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). The leaders of both groups, who were in the process of reconciling their differences as part of a larger inter-Arab reconciliation effort,