

# THE MIDDLE EAST NEWSLETTER

VOL. IV, Nos. 1 & 2  
MARCH 1970

AMERICANS FOR JUSTICE IN THE MIDDLE EAST — P. O. B. 4841 — BEIRUT, LEBANON



# U.S. MIDDLE EAST POLICIES DISCUSSED

## American Ambassador Addresses Beirut Lions Club

Mr. Dwight Porter, the United States envoy to Lebanon recently addressed a meeting of the Beirut Lions Club. Following the Ambassador's remarks, Mr. Rashid Karami, the Prime Minister of Lebanon, who attended in his capacity as Honorary President of the Lions Club, commented on the speech.

Mr. Porter prefaced his remarks with the statement that he spoke as a friend on the subject of the United States and the Middle East. He stated that recent propaganda attacks had tended to obscure American objectives and motives relative to the Arab-Israeli conflict and noted that such propaganda charges had a harmful effect on relations between the American and Arab peoples, "a relationship which should be based on mutual understanding and self-interest."

The Ambassador stated that most citizens in the American democracy are not well informed about the Middle East, but that they increasingly wish to better inform themselves as they become aware of the threat to world peace which the area has come to be. "I am firmly convinced in my own mind that the American people want to understand the issues of the Middle East and to judge the matter with a fair and impartial attitude. But such an attitude does not come unless they are exposed to fact and not propaganda."

Emphasizing that the American objective is the achievement of a durable peace in the Middle East, Mr. Porter pointed out that the United States cannot impose a peaceful solution, "nor could even the United Nations." He ruled out a military solution as being "empty and meaningless to both victor and loser." "Time and again," he said, "the United States has reiterated its support for Resolution 242, unanimously adopted by the United Nations Security Council on November 22, 1967," and he enumerated the key elements contained therein as:

- withdrawal of Israeli forces from territories occupied in the June war;
- termination of all claims of belligerency;
- acknowledgement of the sovereignty of every state in the area within secure and recognized boundaries;
- guaranteed freedom of navigation through international waterways;
- and, finally, a just settlement for Palestine refugees.

The Ambassador then spoke of the principles fundamental to America's search for a peaceful solution in the Middle East as outlined by Secretary of State William P. Rogers on December 9th last. He remarked that these had been "subject to distortion from the moment they were enunciated" and they still "are not clearly understood." (See following story for excerpts from and editorial comment on the Rogers statement.)

## Lebanese Prime Minister Replies in Person

In replying to the Ambassador's speech, Prime Minister Karami pointed out that the conflict in the area arose from the expulsion of the Palestinian Christians and Muslims from their land in 1948 as the result of an international conspiracy based on the Balfour Declaration. "Ever since that time," the Premier said, "the Arabs have been seeking to arrive at a just solution to the problem of the Palestine people, only to be met by the repeated aggressions of Israel and its continued expansion until it now occupies the land of three independent Arab nations which are members of the United Nations and signatories to the Human Rights charter."

Continuing, the Premier said: "What kind of talks could take place when territories are occupied and sovereignty is violated? Such talks, in fact, would be surrender and submission to the will and conditions of the occupier. We cannot, under such circumstances, discard our sovereignty over our land. No doubt America, the powerful nation, and the permanent member of the Security Council is able to impose this peace based on justice in harmony with the principles that it proclaims in the world."

The Premier declared that he agrees with the opinion of the American Ambassador on what can be accomplished by false propaganda in terms of twisting truth, such as is the case with relation to the reality of the Palestine issue in America itself, where the American people are not completely informed of the tragedy of the Palestine people. He expressed hope that the Ambassador and the State Department would convey the true picture of the tragedy of this people which have been expelled from their homes and whose land has been usurped in violation of the principles of justice and the Human Rights Charter.

"How does the Ambassador explain the position of his government," Premier Karami asked "when it announces that it is extending further military assistance to Israel, as contained in the message of President Nixon to the World Zionist Conference, on the heels of statements by Israeli authorities that they will not give up Jerusalem, Gaza, the Golan Heights, the West Bank or Sharm Al-Sheikh?"

---

*Dwight Porter fought in the Pacific as an officer of the Marine Corps from 1942 through 1945. He entered the Department of State in 1948 and served in Frankfurt, Bonn, London and Vienna prior to being appointed Ambassador to Lebanon in 1965.*

# AJME CONTRIBUTION TO THE DISCOURSE

*Ambassador Porter's public remark that the principles enunciated by Secretary of State Rogers in his statement on "U.S. Policy in the Middle East" had been subject to distortion and "still are not clearly understood" prompts reproduction here of certain principal points made by Secretary Rogers and editorial comment thereon.*

The American Secretary of State made clear on December 9 that the U.S. Government supports withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the 1967 war. He said, "We believe that while recognized political boundaries must be established, and agreed upon by the parties, any changes in the pre-existing lines (i.e. those established by the 1949 armistice agreements) should not reflect the weight of conquest and should be confined to insubstantial alterations required for mutual security. We do not support expansionism . . . We support Israel's security and the security of the Arab states as well."

## NO LASTING PEACE

On the question of the refugees, Mr. Rogers said, "There can be no lasting peace without a just settlement of the problem of those Palestinians whom the wars of 1948 and 1967 have made homeless. The United States has contributed about 500 million dollars for the support and education of the Palestine refugees . . . The problem posed by the refugees will become increasingly serious if their future is not resolved. There is a new consciousness among the young Palestinians who have grown up since 1948 which needs to be channeled away from bitterness and frustration towards hope and peace."

## STATUS OF JERUSALEM

In regard to the future status of Jerusalem, the Secretary of State emphasized that the U.S. Government "cannot accept unilateral actions by any party to decide the final status of the city . . . Arrangements for the administration of the unified city should take into account the interests of all its inhabitants and of the Jewish, Islamic and Christian communities. And there should be roles for both Israel and Jordan in the civic, economic and religious life of the city."

## INDIRECT NEGOTIATIONS SUGGESTED

Americans in the Middle East were particularly interested in Mr. Rogers remarks about the mode of negotiations. He said, "the detailed provisions of peace relating to security safeguards . . . should be worked out between the parties, under Ambassador Jarring's auspices, utilizing the procedures followed in negotiating the armistice agreements under Ralph Bunche in 1949 at Rhodes. His formula has been previously used with success in negotiations between the parties on Middle Eastern problems." In these past negotiations there was no direct confrontation between Arab and Israeli negotiators.

*Editorial Comment. The main strength of Secretary of State Rogers' statement of U.S. policy towards the Middle East is its departure from stated Israeli policy on three items. The Israelis have declared that Jerusalem has been irrevocably annexed as part of Israel. Rogers says that "there should be roles for both Israel and Jordan in the civic, economic and religious life of the city." The Israelis have refused to accept any responsibility for the Palestinian refugees and some Israeli leaders have even tried to deny that the Palestinians exist. Secretary of State Rogers states that "there can be no lasting peace without a just settlement of the problem of those Palestinians whom the wars of 1948 and 1967 have made homeless." The Israelis continue to insist upon direct bi-lateral negotiations between themselves and the Arabs. Rogers urges the use of an intermediary such as was used in 1949 at Rhodes when Dr. Ralph Bunche negotiated an armistice between the Arabs and the Israelis.*

## ROGERS STATEMENTS APPLAUDED

*While we applaud Mr. Rogers' statements on these matters, we believe that the U.S. Government must challenge Israeli policy more directly and forthrightly. The language of diplomats (at least in public) is invariably soft and relatively formless. This is the case with Mr. Rogers' December 9th statement. But eventually American leaders must respond precisely and clearly to Israeli claims to the permanent annexation of Jerusalem, to their open disclaimers of responsibility for the refugee problem, and to their unrealistic insistence upon direct bi-lateral talks.*

## U.S. CAN INFLUENCE ISRAEL

*The U.S. has the strength to force these points, by refusing to sell arms to Israel or by blocking financial support, or merely by threatening to do this. The question is whether Mr. Nixon and his policy-makers have the courage. Since the creation of Israel during Truman's administration, American Middle Eastern policy has been intimidated by pro-Israeli groups in the U.S. Even Eisenhower, while successfully opposing the Israeli occupation of Suez in 1956, could not shift American policy away from its commitment to Israel. At the same time America has never been able to influence basic Israeli policies, especially those involving territorial claims and the refugees. England and France meanwhile have managed to develop Middle East policies which are largely independent of domestic Zionist pressures.*

*President Nixon, through such measures as Mr. Rogers' policy statement, is probably trying to move towards an independent U.S. policy in the Middle East, a policy which combines self-interest with justice. But will he manage to do this before another major war breaks out in the Middle East, a war which could escalate to the nuclear level?*

# ARABS SUPPORT BEIRUT JEWISH COMMUNITY

## JEWS IN BEIRUT

On January 19, a small dynamite bomb exploded on the premises of a school in the Jewish quarter of Beirut. No one was hurt and damage was minimal. The Israeli press, quick to distort any incident involving Jews, repeated again the Israeli allegations that Jews are mistreated in all Arab countries. There were the usual hints at "reprisal" and the pointed threat that Israel must "protect" Jewish communities in Lebanon. Characteristically, much of the western press followed the lead of Jerusalem, reporting only the incident itself.

The immediate and strong Arab reaction to the incident was not generally publicized. It is of interest to note that the Arab condemnation of this bombing was even stronger than that from Israel.

### *Minister and Officials Visit Jewish Community*

Within hours after the incident, the Lebanese Minister of the Interior, Mr. Kamal Jumblatt, and other high government officials met with leaders of the Jewish community. During this visit, Mr. Jumblatt stated:

I feel it is my duty to make this visit to show my complete denunciation of the attack which occurred on one of the schools. I would like to emphasize that I differentiate between a Jew and a Zionist. Jews in Lebanon are Lebanese and have all the rights and privileges of every Lebanese. We are doing our best to find the perpetrators of this ugly act. We have already denounced it and we denounce it again today, because we do not believe in any form of violence, particularly when this is directed toward schools, hospitals, and the homes of peaceful citizens. (*Al-Nabhar*, January 21).

### *Fateh Denounces the Explosion at the Jewish School in Beirut*

Equally emphatic was the statement of Al-Fateh, the leading Palestinian commando group which published the following statement the day after the incident:

The Palestinian Liberation Organization—Al-Fateh—denounces the ugly attack which took place on the Jewish community school in Beirut and condemns it in the name of the Palestinian armed revolution. This armed revolution was

started in order to fight sectarianism, and aims at establishing a democratic state in Palestine, where Moslems, Christians and Jews can live together on an equal basis. ... We stand side by side with our Arab citizens that are of Jewish faith and extend our arms to protect them as well as condemn any attempt to scare them whether it is in Lebanon or anywhere else. (*Al-Nabhar*, January 20).

### *It Will Not Fool Anyone*

The attitude of the Lebanese toward this incident is best summed up in an editorial which appeared in the Arabic daily *Al-Jarida*, on January 20:

Lebanon has remained in the eyes of the world the ideal country where all religions, including the Jewish one, can live within the framework of the law on an equal basis. Christians, Moslems and Jews are alike in relation to their rights and freedoms.

This unique character of Lebanon has made the world desire its safety and continuity, and is the very reason which causes the Zionists to hate Lebanon and conspire to make its citizens rise up against each other. Israel is also trying to show that Lebanon is a sectarian state which persecutes the Jews, so that it can justify additional unwarranted attacks on it.

This last conspiracy (the explosion at the school) will not succeed. Israel may find a thousand and one unwarranted reasons for executing its planned attacks on Lebanon, but it will not change the character of Lebanon as a free country that has its doors wide open for the entire world and where its citizens of all creeds can live together on an equal basis.

The statements emphasize that at least in Lebanon Jews are accorded the same privileges and protection as are all other citizens, regardless of race, position or creed. Leaders of the Palestinian Liberation Movement have repeatedly stated that their aims is to reestablish a secular state in Palestine where people of any religion may live in complete freedom and equality. Observers generally agree that Lebanon, with its groupings of religious minorities, is the model for Palestinian hopes in this homeland.



# Bertrand Russell's Last Reflections On The Middle East

"The latest phase of the undeclared war in the Middle East is based upon a profound miscalculation. The bombing raids deep into Egyptian territory will not persuade the civilian population to surrender, but will stiffen their resolve to resist. This is the lesson of all aerial bombardment. The Vietnamese, who have endured years of American heavy bombing, have responded not by capitulation, but by shooting down more enemy aircraft. In 1940 my own fellow-countrymen resisted Hitler's bombing raids with an unprecedented unity and determination. For this reason the present Israeli attacks will fail in their essential purpose, but at the same time they must be condemned vigorously throughout the world.

"The development of the crisis in the Middle East is both dangerous and instructive. For over 20 years Israel has expanded by force of arms. After every stage in this expansion Israel has appealed to 'reason' and has suggested 'negotiations.' This is the traditional role of the imperial power, because it wishes to consolidate with the least difficulty what it has taken already by violence. Every new conquest becomes the new basis of the proposed negotiation from strength which ignores the injustice of the previous aggression. The aggression committed by Israel

must be condemned not only because no state has the right to annex foreign territory, but because every expansion is also an experiment to discover how much more aggression the world will tolerate.

"The refugees who surround Palestine in their hundreds of thousands were described recently by the Washington journalist I. F. Stone as 'the moral millstone around the neck of world Jewry'. Many of the refugees are now well into the third decade of their precarious existence in temporary settlements. The tragedy of the people of Palestine is that their country was 'given' by a foreign power to another people for the creation of a new state. The result was that many hundreds of thousands of innocent people were made permanently homeless. With every new conflict their numbers have increased. How much longer is the world willing to endure this spectacle of wanton cruelty? It is abundantly clear that the refugees have every right to the homeland from which they were driven, and the denial of this right is at the heart of the continuing conflict. No people anywhere in the world would accept being expelled en masse from their own country; how can anyone require the people of Palestine to accept a punishment which nobody

else would tolerate? A permanent just settlement of the refugees in their homelands is an essential ingredient of any genuine settlement in the Middle East.

"We are frequently told that we must sympathize with Israel because of the suffering of the Jews in Europe at the hands of the Nazis. I see in this suggestion no reason to perpetuate any suffering. What Israel is doing today can not be condoned; and to invoke the horrors of the past to justify those of the present is gross hypocrisy. Not only does Israel condemn a vast number of refugees to misery; not only are many Arabs under occupation condemned to military rule; but also Israel condemns the Arab nations, only recently emerging from colonial status, to continuing impoverishment as military demands take precedence over national development.

"All who want to see an end to bloodshed in the Middle East must ensure that any settlement does not contain the seeds of future conflict. Justice requires that the first step towards a settlement must be an Israeli withdrawal from all the territories occupied in June 1967. A new world campaign is needed to help bring justice to the long-suffering people of the Middle East."

*As his final message Bertrand Russell addressed the above to the delegates at the International Conference of Parliamentarians on the Middle East Crisis, meeting in Cairo on February 2, 1970. The man who devoted his life to the search for peace with justice died on February 3rd.*

## "THEY ARE PRAYING ON OTHER PEOPLE'S HOUSES"

Anyone who has had experience with military occupation will find much that is familiar in what I saw of life on the West Bank last summer. There are attitudes, actions, and conditions which generally follow from occupation, both for the occupied and the occupiers. Uncertainty, suspicion, the suspension of civil rights, affect the public and private lives of everyone under foreign occupation. And the corresponding distrust, the power, and the estrangement from the population they are governing can do damage of equal magnitude to the occupiers themselves. The colonial administrator or the military governor, to be "effective," is forced into insensitiveness to the human problems around him. He is aware always of being hated, and his overriding goal is the peace of inertia and inactivity, not the energy and ferment which might lead to aspirations of independence.

The Israelis obviously do not relish the position in which they find themselves on the West Bank, and the Israeli man-in-the-street is frank in admitting that he would rather have the land without the people. But despite the exodus of a half million Arabs during and after the June War, of whom very few have been able to return permanently, Israel is governing a half million Arabs on the West Bank, in addition to those in Gaza and, of course, the 350,000 in Israel itself.

The Israelis pride themselves on having left as much administration as possible in the hands of local Arab leaders—so long as these leaders remain sufficiently docile. Many do not: the mayor of Arab Jerusalem was deported last year; recently the mayors of Hebron and of Ramallah were arrested and subsequently banished to the East Bank. Thus real power—to imprison or to free, to let a man travel or to restrict him to his village, to blow up a house or to leave it standing—remains with the military authority, and is exercised according to the orders and abilities of the local military commander. Each has his own reputation with the populace. The governor in Bethlehem last summer was regarded as a hard but consistent man; the governor in Ramallah on the other hand was held in contempt by the educated population of the area who considered him arbitrary and inefficient.

I had been on the West Bank twice before last summer, once three years ago and again just before the June War. On the surface little had changed. The late summer countryside was peaceful and quiet. The harvest of figs and olives was in progress and crops this year were good. As in pre-war days, one was invariably served a plate of melon sometime during a visit, often along with quantities of *bmadi* figs, specialties of the Nablus region, figs the size of lemons with sweet pale flesh and a purple tartness at the heart.

Normal social patterns of visits, weddings, funerals go on as before. Women still spend the late afternoon

hours visiting one another, a time-honored custom which is one of the principal avenues of information exchange in the society.

In towns and villages, road work and building repairs go on with an appearance of normality. Without any central government in charge, each town takes responsibility for its own maintenance, so that, for purposes of local taxation, a city-state administration has developed, which predictably works more efficiently in some areas than in others. Little new building is undertaken. The sources of income from sons employed outside the West Bank, especially in Kuwait, have dried up. But the visitor still enjoys the beautiful hand-hewn stone houses which were built in such numbers up to June 1967. These are family endeavors, two and three stories high, with spacious rooms, wide verandas, and walled gardens. Their floors are of tile or marble and are kept immaculately clean by a people in love with water. These are the houses that the Israelis are blowing up—almost as though in vengeance for their own grey cement mass-housing developments which scar the hillsides around Safed above Galilee and the coastal plain from Haifa to Tel Aviv.

Like the landscape and customs, the people themselves have not changed in appearance. There are a few veils and a few mini-skirts. But for the most part, all extremes are avoided. Men wear white shirts and dark trousers and are clean-shaven with close-cropped hair; women, blouses and skirts with head scarves for street wear. In the villages about half the men wear the *kufiya* and their wives the long embroidered dresses of the *fellabin*, dresses which are now prized for evening wear on the cocktail circuits of Beirut and California. West Bank residents are still up at dawn, which comes early in the bright, unsmogged air of the West Bank hill country; they work until dinner at about 1:00 and then rest during the heat of the afternoon. As a coolness settles over the land, shops re-open and almost everyone goes out to visit friends or to stroll along the streets.

### EVERYWHERE IS "ISRAEL"

This is the life that the tourist glimpses as he is taken through the West Bank on an Egged Bus tour under the watchful care of a skilled Israeli guide, or goes on his own, led by Israeli tourist pamphlets. These pamphlets neither mention Palestine nor show any boundary separation between the West Bank and Israel proper. So unless a tourist is quite observant, has friends or relatives there, or speaks enough Arabic to gain the trust of the people, he may very well leave convinced that conditions are as "normal" as might be expected, that people are living happily and prosperously, enjoying all the "western freedoms" imported by the "liberation" forces.

Closer observation shows how deceptive one's casual impressions are. First, there is simply the size and pervasiveness of the military presence—the trucks passing by full of young, serious-faced soldiers, the heavily guarded military camps at intervals along the roads,

*The author of this article is from California. She is a graduate of the University of California at Berkeley. She has asked that her name be withheld to avoid any possible difficulties for her hosts on the Jordanian West Bank.*



the number of jeeps, their passengers armed and watchful. The headquarters of the military governor has become a new town center. It is the place where one must go and stand in line for hours, sometimes days, to obtain any sort of permit. In Nablus, at eight in the morning, the two lines—one for men and the other for women—already stretched for a block in opposite directions along the street, and there was no shade to protect the petitioners as they waited their turns.

One sees repairs being made to roads and buildings, but no new ones being built. History is repeating itself—dealing with the West Bank as it did to the Arabs in Israel after 1949. Here it is worth digressing a bit to see what is in store for the newly occupied areas.

#### THE EXAMPLE OF ACRE

If one has been to the Old City of Acre as I had been the week before I went to the West Bank, he has seen the future of the West Bank, if it remains occupied, foretold in the stagnation, hopelessness, and bitterness of the Arab citizens of that ancient seaside city. Twenty years ago, when Israel was created, most of the educated middle and upper class of Acre emigrated. During the years after 1949, the people who stayed became increasingly frustrated by their inability to improve housing and jobs, by the unavailability of good education for their children, and by the general alienation of their environment as they became foreigners in their own land. They therefore continued to leave as they became economically able to do so. Now Old Acre is a Rip Van Winkle of a city. In the New City outside the walls, extensive housing has been built for Jewish im-

migrants; there are good schools, parks, efficient sanitation. The Old City, whose residents say they pay the same taxes and are under the same city administration as are residents of the New City, has slept for twenty years.

#### SECOND CLASS CITIZENS IN ISRAEL

The population, caught in poverty's vicious circle, has increased to the point where every corner of the ancient buildings is occupied. Until three years ago it was difficult for an Arab to obtain a permit to move to another part of Israel. Now people can move, but finding inexpensive, decent housing that is not earmarked for Jewish immigrants is almost impossible. So they stay, and dream of going to the U.S., to Canada, to Australia. In the meantime, in return for their high taxes, garbage is collected sporadically, street lights are replaced six months after they burn out, schools are overcrowded and are in dark, dank buildings more appropriate as the medieval prisons some of them once were than as a child's first glimpse of education.

Tourists are brought to the Old City to see the ancient sea walls, the Crypt of St. John, the museum, and on their guided tours pick their way through the littered, dusty, narrow streets, seeing a bit of "local color"—the red men on the reservation. They carry with them one of the ubiquitous Israeli tourist pamphlets with its subtle propaganda:

When the British entered the city in 1918, it was little more than a sleepy Turkish village . . . . Since 1948, Acre has resumed

*(Continued on page 10)*

## POINTS TO PONDER

"As I shall have to speak frequently of the 'Arabs' in this book—thus lumping together one hundred million human beings—I might as well say a few words about my attitude towards them.

The Arabs are attractive and likeable people. They ooze charm and I do not mean this in a derogatory sense; it comes naturally to them, it is not at all affected. There is a great deal we can learn from them, Israelis and Europeans alike. Family ties are sacred for the Arabs; they bow to their elders and treat them with respect—not an unattractive quality in an age which has developed a silly veneration of youth. Arab hospitality is also a noble and civilized trait in a world growing more and more mercenary every day.

Israelis do not know the Arabs. Most of them have never exchanged a single word with a single Arab. 'Arabs' are a distant—sometimes not so distant—threat to them, having to do with abstract politics and not with everyday life. In spite of this, many Israelis tend to despise them as a backward people. Those who know them have more respect for them. The Arabs are as intelligent as the Jews. In fact, these two Semitic peoples resemble each other as closely as the Scots resemble the English, and resent just as much having this similarity pointed out. The Arabs spent long centuries under Turkish oppression—which is not too good for any nation—and subsequently their own feudal rulers oppressed, exploited and fooled them in the most cynical way. So the Jews, no doubt, are a few generations ahead of them, at the moment. But a few generations means nothing in history. The two peoples must learn to know each other because—whether they like it or not—they will have to live together.

The Arabs are a very proud people; the Jews are not proud. The Jews are practical, logical and insist on their rights; they are often arrogant but they are not proud. They are sober, self-assertive realists. The Arabs are proud dreamers. In a way they are both right as, indeed, both sides often are right in this tragic conflict; for the Arabs dreams are reality; but the Jews know that present-day reality is not a dream." pp. 28-29.

"Israeli manners were just as bad as ever before. Israelis still keep teaching you your own business. God knows everything but the Israelis know everything better; they cannot bear to be wrong in anything." p. 39.

From *The Prophet Motive: Israel Today and Tomorrow*, by George Mikes, Andre Deutsh, London, 1969.

\* \* \*

"No Jordanian flag will ever fly over Jerusalem again . . . And there are some territories which for our security we can never give back."

Golda Meir, as quoted in *Le Monde*, 25/11/69

"The coup [The theft of French ships from the port of Cherbourg by the Israelis late in December] points to Israel's emerging status as a power in the world with which major powers must deal. The new status will become official when, as American intelligence confidently predicts, Israel announces that it has a nuclear capability. At that point, the major powers will no longer be making arrangements for Israel, but will deal with it one to one."

*Israel's CIA,*

by Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden,  
*New York Post*, Jan. 3, 1970.

\* \* \*

"Israel wants to hold its [atomic] card as a last resort in its conflict with the Arab world."

Chalmers M. Roberts, News Analysis,  
*International Herald Tribune*,  
March 6, 1970.

\* \* \*

I am an Arab. Has not an Arab eyes? Has not an Arab hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? Fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warned and cooled by the same winter and summer as a Jew is? If you stab us do we not bleed? If you tickle us do we not laugh? If you poison us do we not die? And if you wrong us shall we not revenge? If we are like you in the rest, we will resemble you in that. If an Arab wrong a Jew, what is the Jew's humility? Revenge! If a Jew wrong an Arab, what should his sufferance be by Jewish example? Revenge, of course.

I am an Arab.

*The Merchant of Venice* (adapted)

Members are urged to share *The Newsletter* with friends, local newspapers and representatives in government. It is published in Beirut, Lebanon, and edited by the Editorial Board of AJME.

Interested persons may join AJME by air-mailing name, address and check for at least \$10 or the equivalent to AJME, P.O. Box 4841, Beirut, Lebanon. The annual dues of \$10 include subscription to *The Middle East Newsletter* and cover mailing of other AJME publications.

Members NOTE: Please do not forget or delay your RENEWAL check!



## EDITORIAL:

# FAIL SAFE IN THE MIDDLE EAST — THE MOST SERIOUS OF GAMES —

Since the 1967 war, world leaders—Johnson, U Thant, President Nixon and others—have maintained a steady lament to the effect that the Middle East is potentially the most dangerous area in the world today.

Why? Is it the daily loss of life in the Middle East? I rather doubt it. Since 1948, many thousands of human beings have died violently in the Arab-Israeli struggle. But the killing in the Middle East is insignificant on the strategic, global scale. It cannot yet match the slaughter of human life in Korea, Vietnam or Indonesia. So why do our statesmen speak so fearfully, so ominously?

The answer, briefly, is the BOMB. It seems likely that by this time the Israelis either have secretly assembled some atomic bombs, or at least possess the theoretical knowledge, technical skills and raw materials necessary to do this. Last May 8 Israel denied having any "operational" nuclear weapons, but this adjective is frightening, not reassuring. Let me quote at length from a military historian, J. Bowyer Bell:

"The prospect of an independent nuclear capacity in the Middle East is the result of Israeli talent and French sympathy. The French ties, stretching back to 1949, led Shimon Peres in 1955 to push the construction of a nuclear program with French support. Work soon began secretly on a 24,000-kilowatt Dimona reactor in [the] Negev and continued covertly in French and Israeli laboratories and testing sites. The United States, unaware of the secret projects, openly cooperated with the Israelis in the construction of a smaller 1,000-kilowatt reactor near Tel Aviv. In 1960 United States intelligence sources discovered the existence and size of the Dimona reactor. Neither the Israelis nor the French were particularly informative about their joint nuclear projects, although it was known that sophisticated experiments were being carried out in the Negev. The twenty-four megawatt reactor has the capacity to produce sufficient plutonium for two atomic bombs annually."

(*The Long War*, Prentice-Hall, 1969, p. 389)

This explains, I think, why world leaders are so concerned about the situation here. Another major offensive like the 1967 war (assuming the Israelis won it) would merely mean thousands of additional deaths, Arab and Israeli.

It is not this warfare which disturbs the world's leaders. After all, 90 American and 2000 Vietnamese bodies in the month of January, 1970, do not move these men to decisive action to end that struggle.

What troubles the dreams of our strategic specialists and diplomats, Messrs. Nixon, Laird, Rogers and Kissinger, is the dread that Israel might be "forced" to unveil its atomic "capability."

What would happen then?

The Russians would probably not arm the Arabs with nuclear arms, but would they be "forced" to give Cairo a nuclear guarantee?

Failing this, would the Egyptians attempt some massive "preventive war"? Or would they try to gather enough Uranium-235 to construct their own bomb? Even a nation such as Egypt might have the technological skills sufficient to put together a simple "Hiroshima" bomb.

If the reader thinks this an absurd and far-fetched fantasy, let him explain to himself why Israel has refused to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Pact banning the spread of atomic weapons. And let him explain the Israelis' tight-lipped secrecy concerning their nuclear "Research and Development." And let him note that the Phantoms which the U.S. is now supplying to Israel are, among other things, nuclear bombers.

Many people explain the U.S. support for Israel as a result of domestic political pressures by American Zionists. This is important, of course. But if Israel is in fact a nuclear power, then it is in a strong bargaining position by itself to influence our Middle East policy. Israel can quite simply force us into supplying her with the conventional arms necessary to ensure her military dominance in the Middle East, for the last thing we want is for Israel to reveal her nuclear capability. This would lead to the most serious of games in the Middle East, a show of ultimate force by both the U.S. and Russia.

M. S.

(Continued from page 7)

its character as a city of immigration. The modern housing estates are the homes of 23,000 new immigrants who have created here a population at least as diverse as any the city ever enjoyed in by-gone ages . . . . Acre's 5,000 Arab citizens, still largely resident in the Old City, play a full and active part in all aspects of the city's new life, adding their own colour and customs to the present-day scene.

#### PUNITIVE DESTRUCTION OF HOMES

Housing and education are paramount values of Arab family life. If a man cannot educate his children or if he loses his house, his life loses much of its meaning and purpose. The Israeli occupation forces in the West Bank seem aware of this fact. As well as noting the absence of new building activity on the West Bank, the observant tourist sees fresh piles of rubble about. In fact, if he happens to pass through Ramallah or Nablus or Hebron at the right time he may see a house being dismantled for blowing up. He will be told that the house "belongs to terrorists," but if he asks for evidence, for access to court proceedings—for any evidence of due process being exercised against the family which is about to be deprived of its shelter—he will receive no satisfactory answer. Houses are frequently blown up when their residents are merely suspected of having given shelter to a commando. Houses are also demolished as a deterrent—as a means to force parents to curb the resistance activities of their sons and daughters.

There is an idealistic fervor among Arab middle-class teen-agers. Their country is occupied, they are not free to come and go, to be educated, to take jobs where they please. Moreover, they feel an enormous sympathy for their opposite numbers among Palestinians in exile. They have formed numerous resistance groups—some effective, some not. The occupation authorities will not tolerate the activities of these groups, and they attempt to crush them by punishing the entire family of an involved adolescent. The most immediate way to accomplish this is to blow up the family's home. Here "family" is not the western "nuclear" family of four to six persons, but the eastern "extended" family of grandparents, unmarried aunts, orphaned cousins, younger brothers, often extending to fifteen or more persons under one roof.

#### DESTRUCTION HARDENS RESISTANCE

It is difficult to determine reliably how many homes have been destroyed or how many people made homeless under Israeli policy. But it is certain that demolishing homes, like most such repressive measures, only hardens resistance and makes the subject population more determined to re-establish itself in its own land. The destruction of homes in Jerusalem in June and July of 1967 to clear a large open square in front of the Wailing Wall is well-known and was described in U.S. newsmagazines *Time* and *Newsweek* at the time. But the tourist who has been in Jerusalem "before" and "after" is still unprepared for its actuality—and even less prepared for the several acres of rubble just outside the

walls on the Jericho Road where the remains of the houses in front of the Wailing Wall were dumped. As the Arab boy who led me to the Wailing Wall my first evening back in Jerusalem commented quietly, "They are praying on other people's houses."

Along with differences in his physical surroundings, the observant tourist sees some changes in the people themselves. Families still greet a guest with gentleness and hospitality, and a solicitousness over one's comfort and well-being which can seem stifling to an individualistic westerner. But it now takes longer to become friends. There is a guardedness and distrust which, combined with traditional politeness, hinders frank conversation. But once communication begins, hatred towards Israel and resentment towards the U.S. are expressed with an articulate eloquence. In the Old City of Jerusalem I had the odd experience of having difficulty buying souvenirs because the shopkeepers were so eager to talk once they found a sympathetic ear.

#### ENDLESS RESTRICTIONS

But, if one is really to find out what life is like under occupation, one must live awhile, as I did, in a West Bank home and participate in the daily life of the people there—the visits to brothers in prison, the fears for daughters whose friends have been arrested, the sudden release from jail of a neighbor's daughter, the 10:00 p.m. arrest of another's son, the hours in line for a permit to go to Amman on business. For many of its residents, the West Bank has become a prison. There are restrictions wherever one turns. Some people obtain permits to go to Israel or the East Bank for business or even pleasure; others cannot even go to Jerusalem; still others cannot leave their immediate area. Some get permits to visit relatives outside the West Bank; others stand in line for hours only to be told to "come back tomorrow." One father, worried about his son who is studying in Beirut, tried for weeks to get permission to visit him. He was finally told that, since the boy's mother had been to Beirut some time before, "one member of the family was enough."

#### FOR STUDENTS ALSO

Some students are given permission to leave the West Bank to study at outside universities; others are not. (The only college on the West Bank is at Bir Zeit. It is a two-year junior college, and is already stretched to its financial limits.) In Jerusalem, for instance, there is a large educated Arab population who wish to educate their children, and many others who are just getting a first generation of sons through high school and are prepared to make any sacrifice to put them in a university somewhere. The brother of the boy who took me to the Wailing Wall is from such a family. He finished first in his class with high grades in all his examinations. He wants to study physics or mathematics. His father, with ten children and only the income from his small vegetable stall, had saved enough to send his son to Beirut to school. But he was unable to get him a permit to leave.

Very few Arabs go to Hebrew University, and there are severe restrictions on what Arab students who go there can study. They are largely restricted to the

social sciences; the pure and applied sciences like physics, math, and engineering are almost completely closed to them. In addition, there is the language difficulty. Few West Bank students know enough Hebrew to study in the language. Thus for many, studying abroad is their only chance at a higher education. But petitioning for permits absorbs vast amounts of time and energy and the frustration incurred are a principal source of resentment and indignity; the military officials are not noted for their respect for people who must petition them for the favor of leaving and re-entering their own land.

If one leaves without a permit, as he is of course free and welcome to do, he becomes both homeless and stateless, dependent on foreigners for a job, a home, everything. For the economically well-off, leaving is a great temptation, and there are hundreds of unsung heroes among those who choose to stay because to leave would be in their eyes the final defeat. A few of the people who left during and after the war have come back under the family reunion plan. But in spite of the publicity which the plan received, in actuality only a few immediate relatives have received permission to return, sometimes a year and more after their families on the West Bank began applying for their return. For many more the permission never comes.

#### IMPRISONMENT FOR MANY

There are problems even more urgent than those of education for many of the families whose sons and daughters are still at home. Of the dozen or so families visited on the West Bank, nearly every one of them has a son, a daughter, or some other close relative, in prison. If the experience I had was at all representative, every middle-class family is being affected by the round-ups of dissident teen-agers. In its treatment of dissidents the Israeli occupation—like all occupations—is at its worse. The authorities feel themselves in the midst of a hostile population; they are compelled to try to eliminate all active opposition, to encourage or enforce passivity and acceptance of their presence. West Bank residents are fond of saying that on the West Bank, one can say anything, but can do nothing—and it is widely assumed that the reason for the show of freedom of speech is to keep the authorities aware of which people they should watch for overt resistance.

When a teen-ager is arrested, he or she is held for a period of investigation. During investigation the prisoner is allowed to see neither his parents nor a lawyer. I visited one family whose daughter had been suddenly arrested one evening five days before my arrival. Her parents had not been able to see her since or even to get a change of clothing to her. A week later, when I again heard of the family, she was still being kept incommunicado, and her family had only heard of her whereabouts and condition through second and third hand reports filtering out of prison.

The methods used by a military occupation to get information from prisoners are inevitably harsh. Other than the occasional informer, available for a price, no one has any incentive to cooperate willingly. I spent an afternoon with a girl the day after she was released from prison. She had been in jail five months, never



*Imad Shebadeh in Daily Star, Beirut.*

appearing before a judge, or receiving any sort of trial or sentence. She had studied for and passed her high school exams in prison. While studying, she had been taken for questioning almost daily. To force her cooperation she claimed her interrogators frequently stripped her to her underclothing, beat her, and forced her to watch friends being beaten.

When first arrested, the suspects are kept in small, cramped cells with bright lights turned on them twenty-four hours a day. They are questioned at odd hours around the clock. There are countless stories current among the population of beatings and other forms of torture in prisons. In the absence of an investigative body with the authority to track down the truth—and Israel so far has refused such a body access to its prisons—these stories can be neither proved nor disproved. Some beatings however have resulted in permanent injuries attested to by doctors who have treated prisoners, and in one widely-reported case, by a family in Ramallah which buried its son. Some may argue that these conditions are unavoidable under any military rule. They probably are, but it goes badly with the Israelis' continual reminding of their tourist-visitors of what they



themselves have suffered, and how their State is designed to prevent such things from ever happening again to Jews.

#### WHAT TOURISTS DON'T SEE

Few tourists see the agonies of the average West Bank middle-class family. Still fewer ever see the most completely dispossessed people there—the people of the destroyed villages of Beit Nuba and Yalu. (See Michael Adams' report in the *Newsletter*, Vol. II, No. 7). These villages, which were the homes of some three thousand people, were completely destroyed in June 1967. The houses were demolished and plowed over, although in the 1967 war the villagers had surrendered without resistance to the Israeli occupiers. This was done ostensibly in retaliation for shelling from the area during the period from 1948 to 1967. Now the area, which overlooks the Tel Aviv-Jerusalem highway, has been planted to cotton and irrigated with water from the well at Beit Nuba, the only plentiful supply of water anywhere near. The people went to relatives and friends in surrounding villages, and to caves, or other makeshift shelters. From that time to this, despite continuing pressure from the Israeli military government, they have refused to leave the vicinity. Twice they were offered resettlement—once in the now-vacant refugee camps of Jericho and again in Auji, a desert area north of Jericho. They refused both offers. They refuse for several reasons: they point out that the camps in Jericho are the homes of others and those others should be allowed to return; they are high country farmers and cannot readily adapt to the Jericho or Auji area, which, being below sea level, has a completely different agriculture, and normal summer temperatures of 110° to 115°; above all, they believe that they have the right to return to their own lands and to rebuild their own villages.

The Israelis have cut off all their pensions and other social security which they would normally be entitled to under the Jordanian laws still in force on the West Bank; Israeli soldiers patrol the area to keep them from returning, even to draw water from the Beit Nuba well. They make do with the trickle of water from the well at Beit Seir. Food is so short that, for some children, a glass of sweet tea constitutes a meal. The Israeli authorities have publicized a warning that no group is to give these people organized forms of assistance. But despite a near-starvation diet, unbelievably difficult living conditions, and an uncertain future, ninety percent of the people of the destroyed villages stay on, convinced that they must make a stand now in this place and at this time.

#### STRONG WILL TO RESIST

The people's will to resist is strong, and it sometimes is demonstrated unexpectedly in a way which must unnerve the occupation soldiers. While we were in Nablus two large stone houses were blown up one bright blue skied morning. My young daughter watched from the veranda of the house where we were visiting. I was away at the time, but when I returned an hour later, the children of the household eagerly pulled me to the roof so I would have a good view of what "the Jews had done." Parts of the walls were still standing, a bit

of smoke and dust hung in the air, a few soldiers strolled casually around the area. The people had gone, no one was quite sure where—to relatives most likely, with whatever belongings they had been able to carry with them. The stones remained—what had that morning been someone's home was now as much a ruin as any of the other historical remains everywhere in the Middle East.

The previous week, three houses had been blown up in Ramallah. One of them belonged to the family of a teenage girl who had been in prison in Jerusalem for several weeks under questioning. She had been defiant, refusing to cooperate with her questioners, and stories of her courage had been filtering out daily. The Israelis brought her to Ramallah to watch the blowing up of her home. Perhaps they hoped she would break down, and that her defeat would in turn discourage her friends from further resistance. But instead she became an instant folk-heroine by making the traditional Arab trill of joy as the house crumbled.

#### ISRAELI TRIUMPHS ERODED

Israel's occupation of the West Bank is not the first instance of a people corrupted by its own military triumphs. But it is one of the least known or understood, and one that needs telling both in the west and in Israel itself. Israelis I met were both proud of their conduct on the West Bank and utterly unaware of the reasons for what they regard as the Arab's unreasoning hostility towards them. It is all too easy to chalk up all resistance to some sort of diabolical anti-Jewishness, and never have to think of the humiliation of a people, educated and socially advanced, subjugated to military occupation, and worse, to arbitrary expulsion and dispossession. Perhaps if they realize why they are resisted on the West Bank, they will also recognize the same motives in the determination of Palestinians in exile to regain a place in their own land.

---

#### RECENT AJME ACTIVITIES

The "flu" epidemic in Lebanon early this year was hard on the volunteer staff of AJME and resulted in postponement of the first issue of Volume IV of the *NEWSLETTER*, but other activities continued. These included numerous letters to highly placed Americans on the matter of additional Phantoms to Israel and on the overall issue of the American Government's policies in regard to the Middle East.

Believing them to be of interest to AJME readers several recent letters and cables are reproduced on the following page.

DO YOU EXPRESS VIEWS TO YOUR  
SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN?



*The following letter was mailed February 12 to several of President Nixon's advisors, various officials in the upper echelons of the Department of State and each member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. The response was impressive, including letters from a number of Congressmen, several Senators and a two page letter from Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs.*

President Nixon's recent statement in respect to a decision whether to supply additional armaments to Israel prompts this letter.

Americans for Justice in the Middle East (AJME) is, as the name implies, a group of Americans, some of whom live in the Middle East and others in the United States. We come from many walks of life, pursue a variety of professions, and represent a wide spectrum of US political persuasion. In fact, we have only one thing in common, that is, an overriding concern for America and its position in the Middle East.

The President's statement implied that the decision regarding further arms shipments to Israel would reflect an assessment as to the relative balance of military strength existing between Israel and the Arab countries. It is to this question and related aspects of the problem that we ask you to direct your attention and consider the following points:

1. The fact is Israel now enjoys overwhelming superiority in military capability. Ample evidence of this is its proven ability to carry out air and ground operations in virtually any part of neighboring Arab countries with impunity. Visualize, if you will, the reaction among Americans, were an enemy of the US to bomb locations in the suburbs of Washington, D.C., and carry off a radar station from Key West, Florida, without the loss of a single man. Would US public opinion be persuaded that this enemy was militarily inferior and therefore required greater armaments?

2. At this critical juncture, were the US to provide further arms it would lose all remaining vestiges of its position as an arbitrator. Notwithstanding press statements emanating from this region, the US still has influence upon Arab opinion, based largely upon their conviction that the principles of fairness and equity which America represents will ultimately emerge in its policy toward the Arab countries.

President Nixon has given us—all of us, not just those who reside in the Middle East—a grace period of thirty days. May we plead that this time be used to reach a sound conclusion, based upon the courage to do what is right for our country and uninfluenced by political expediencies which propose that we redress an imbalance in arms which obviously does not exist.

Very truly yours,  
William A. Ward, President

*Members of the Dhahran (Saudi Arabia) Chapter of AJME despatched the following cable to President Nixon on March 2 and AJME headquarters in Beirut followed up with a cable to the President expressing support for the sentiments voiced therein:*

As a large group of Americans residing in the Middle East we are deeply concerned over recent US actions and statements which appear to retreat from the peace proposals of the Secretary of State's speech of 9 December and from your administration's earlier promises of a more even-handed policy. The steady deterioration of conditions in the Middle East and increasing ceasefire violations demand more decisive US action. Your foreign policy report recognizes the danger of increasing Soviet dominance in the Middle East but apparently ignores the following important factors:

1. The growth of Soviet influence is the result of unswerving US support for Israel which drives Arab states and individuals to seek help wherever available.

2. Israel already enjoys vast technological military superiority over the combined Arab states. Its US provided planes have three times the range and double the bombload of any existing Arab planes. More war planes for Israel would only aggravate the imbalance.

3. We believe that the power of the US to control the situation is not being fully exercised. Israel is dependent on public and private American aid. Her rejection of four power endeavors and of the Rogers' proposals could be countered by US action. Her unilateral insistence on direct negotiations is a procedural barrier which US should not support as US goal is peace however negotiated.

4. Despite Zionist pressure in the US, the Nixon Administration is in a position to pursue a policy in the Middle East on the basis of justice and longrun American interests rather than domestic political considerations.

Americans for Justice in the  
Middle East, Dhahran.

*The following cable was despatched to President Nixon on March 3:*

We wish to thank you for the personal warmth and courtesy of your reception of the President of France, Mr. Pompidou. We are particularly gratified that our President made the extraordinary gesture of flying to New York to reassure Mr. Pompidou of Franco-American friendship inspite of some unpleasant demonstrations. Thank you.

Americans for Justice in the Middle East

## BOOK REVIEW

In *THE GAME OF NATIONS*, which deals with United States policy in the Middle East, Miles Copeland has written his answer to the view of American decision making that Bobby Kennedy presented in *THIRTEEN DAYS*, an account of the Cuban missile crisis. Kennedy talks about "dedicated, intelligent men," and "the future of our country and of mankind"; Copeland, who was with the State Department from 1955 to 1957, subtitles his book: "The Amoralities of Power Politics."

He states his aim clearly. The book is a case history, "intended to reveal general truths about the relations between great powers and those small powers which, by techniques such as those of Egypt's President Nasser, are able to gain international influence out of all proportion to their inherent strengths." In discussing these techniques, he tries to show that our government's mistakes in dealing with leaders like Nasser stem not so much from wrong decisions at the top as from a misunderstanding and misuse of our "system for dealing with problems which are insoluble by ordinary means." His is a personal account, not cleared by the governments he writes about. He writes that one diplomat to whom he showed the manuscript told him he was wrong to disillusion the public that some information is best forgotten and that some illusions are best left alone. Copeland disagreed. Contrary to Bobby Kennedy, Copeland sees decision makers as seasoned bureaucrats and decision-making as very clearly defined and organized. It has two feed-ins: one is foreign intelligence which identifies problems and possible solutions, and the other is domestic intelligence which indicates what solutions are acceptable to American citizens. "The job of our top decision-makers, essentially, is to match the two."

Copeland's claim that the book is a case study suggests that he's telling it like it is, but he often contradicts himself. For example, on the one hand he writes that intelligent men in the State Department with very efficient means for gathering information, analyse this information impersonally, objectively, and effectively; yet, his descriptions of how the State Department handled President Nasser shows anything but intelligence and efficiency. He offers "The Games Center" as one element in the efficient system that effects American foreign policy, then goes on to say, almost patronizingly: "Findings of the Game were not infallible, of course." Leaders of Afro-Asian countries had "human sensitivities and instincts which we hadn't yet worked out how to program into a computer." Hence, The Games Center failed to predict Qasim's coup in Iraq, the fall of Nkrumah, or the durability of the Vietcong. Isn't it possible that if our efficient system could have predicted these three events, our foreign policy in the Middle East, in Africa, and in Southeast Asia might be drastically different now, and perhaps even effective? If Copeland is right, then, about his account's being a case study, he's contradicting himself about the efficiency of the system. Another example of contradiction is his assertion that the book is not really about Nasser,

but instead about how to deal with Nasser-type leaders. At the end of the book he says about Nasser: "I like him personally; I know of no one with whom I would rather spend a long evening of conversation and joking. He is one of the most courageous, most incorruptible, most unprincipled [How can any person without principles be corrupted?] and, in his way, most humanitarian national leaders I have ever had the pleasure to meet." This reflects the attitude Copeland shows toward Nasser throughout the book, an attitude which does, to a considerable extent, make it more a book about Nasser than a case study.

Whether Copeland intends it or not, there is considerable humor in his book. His account of American attempts to influence the 1947 elections in Syria is very funny, especially to anyone who has been in the Middle East. Businessmen, missionaries, diplomats, money, and American-type voting machines would make the election "as American as apple pie." Anyone who has eaten in the Middle East knows that when you order apple pie you get something that isn't quite the same as what mom used to bake. The election turned out to be as Syrian as stuffed squash.

Copeland tries to deal with events in the Middle East from that election up to the June war in 1967. That is probably too much for any man in a single book, and it is obviously too much for Copeland who has trouble organizing his material. He is often hard to follow as he skips forward and backward several years, almost at random. The major events in the Middle East that he deals with are the Zaim coup in Syria in 1949, the revolution in Egypt in 1952, the Suez war in 1956, the Lebanese and Jordanian crises and the Iraqi Revolution in 1958.

His book is particularly interesting when he discusses the American government's attempts to deal with Nasser in 1955. The United States was much closer to providing Egypt with vast amounts of foreign aid than I had ever realized. Nor did I realize when I was in Cairo that the Tower of Cairo is the result of a 2,999,990 dollar (ten dollars were missing) personal gift from the United States government to Nasser, a gift that Copeland personally delivered in cash, in a suitcase, to the head of Nasser's body-guard. If that's crypto-diplomacy, what's blatant diplomacy?

Copeland's book is full of interesting vignettes about the Middle East and about American efforts to deal with the area. He probably takes himself too seriously when he considers the book a case-study, but it does reveal that at least some, and perhaps many, of the United States' efforts in foreign policy are amoral, at best. If they were amoral and effective, they would be easier to accept than they are being amoral and ineffective. Copeland suggests that United States' efforts are pragmatic, but what is pragmatic about failure? For him to say, in the end, that America's guiding thought will now be solving the world's problems and exploring space, and that anyone who wants to join may, is to miss the point: Who is going to define the world's problems and how to solve them, and, if Copeland's portrait of our foreign policy is accurate, who will want to join us?

A.L. Miller



*THE DESPAIR OF AN OCCUPIED LAND*



## ZIONIST ECONOMIC INTIMIDATION IN AMERICA SETS DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

*The letter reproduced below was published in The New York Times on March 7. The writer is a prominent American businessman with about twenty years experience in the Middle East. He is exceptionally well-versed in the affairs of the area. This letter was, however, written entirely in a private capacity.*

To the Editor:

In the *Times* of January 8, Jay Monroe, president of Tensor Corporation, made a public display of withdrawing his company's account from Chase Manhattan and urged the public to do the same, not for any business reasons, but because a Chase officer, David Rockefeller, expressed a political view Mr. Monroe did not share. This act of economic intimidation introduces into American business a dangerous precedent difficult to confine to political issues.

Mr. Monroe sets out to "punish" the bank's shareholders because Mr. Rockefeller reportedly warned President Nixon that "US policies in the Middle East are resulting in a loss of political influence in the Arab world." Mr. Rockefeller's statement can hardly be contested by anyone familiar with the area. American educators and businessmen working there have witnessed with growing alarm the senseless erosion of American position and the resulting growth of Soviet influence in this important region.

No thoughtful American looking at the Middle East from the point of view of American national interest can fail to be concerned about the real possibility of losing 107 million Arabs to Communist domination.

Quite apart from oil economics (and the Arabs do control 65 per cent of the free world's reserves), the Arab world is an essential communications link with Asia and Africa. It is the religious center of the entire Moslem world. It contributes a net credit of over \$2 billion annually to the US balance of payments, and with a G.N.P. of over \$23 billion, represents an important market for American products.

Thousands of Americans work in the Arab countries. Above all, we have a moral obligation to see that justice is done to the millions of Palestinians for whose plight we bear heavy responsibility.

Mr. Monroe impugned the motives of leading citizens because their views did not conform to policies advocated by the Israeli Government. "It is shocking," as Senator Fulbright puts it, "to find that the subject of peace in the Middle East is one upon which American citizens are not viewed as either patriotic or unbiased unless they endorse and even embrace the policies of a single foreign government."

R.I. Brougham  
Dhahran, Saudi Arabia  
Feb. 21, 1970

P. O. B. 4841

Beirut, Lebanon

RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED

AIR MAIL