



**ONE WEEK REVIEW  
OF THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS  
IN THE NATIONS CAPITOL**

Cover:

Dr. Peter S. Tanous, President of the National Association of Arab Americans, with the Secretary of State William P. Rogers

This material has been compiled and distributed by the National Association of Arab Americans, extra copies may be obtained by writing to:

**National Association of Arab Americans**  
1834 K Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20006  
(202) 347-2429

*EDITORIAL*

*THE SUNDAY STAR*  
*and*  
*THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS*

*WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 15, 1973*

**Letters to the Editor**  
**Non-Emigrant Rights**

**SIR:** Much has been written about Sen. Jackson's amendment to the East-West Trade Bill. In his speech on the Senate floor March 15, he said he and the other senators (and representatives also) were in favor of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as espoused by the U.N. more than 25 years ago. It states in part that "everyone has the right to leave any country including his own, and to return to his country." One could not argue with this statement. The amendment will deny to Russia the favored-nation status unless it changes its unjust policies regarding the emigration of its citizens (particularly Jews emigrating from Russia to Israel). A change in this policy would be commendable as it is a grave injustice as it now stands.

One wonders, however, why Sen. Jackson and his colleagues are so selective in their concern for human rights. He tries by sophistry and rationalization to explain why he isn't trying to coerce Russia to grant certain rights to others enslaved by them. He feels that the right

of emigration is the first among equals in the field of human rights. It seems to me that the Ukrainians, Hungarians, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, etc., would rather live in peace and freedom in their own countries than to emigrate. Would the American Indian and Black rather emigrate or receive justice and his rights in this country? When will Sen. Jackson have an amendment to deny aid to Israel unless they let the displaced Palestinian Arabs return to their country? I think he will never make any amendments regarding the above, as who ever heard of a person getting elected to Congress or the presidency by the power and money of the Ukrainians, Hungarians, Estonians, Wounded Knee Indians, etc.

To obviate being charged with hypocrisy and self-serving actions, one should remember that hearts should not bleed selectively, no matter how commendable the selective bleeding is.

**W.T. Driebe, M.D.**

Arlington, Va.

EXCERPTS FROM THE BROADCAST ON  
CBS TELEVISION NETWORK  
FACE THE NATION

Sunday, April 15, 1973  
11:30 A.M. - 12:00 Noon EST

GUEST: SENATOR J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT  
Democrat of Arkansas

REPORTERS: George Herman - CBS News  
Jerrold L. Schecter,  
Time Magazine  
Marvin Kalb - CBS News

**KALB:** Senator, I'd like to ask you about the Middle East. There's been a lot of news there this week, particularly starting with the Israeli raid against Beirut. Since that time, the State Department has taken a hard line on the Palestinian extremists, and it appears as though the United States has adopted an almost Israeli line as to how you deal with the Palestinians. Do you feel that's the best way of handling the problem?

**SEN. FULBRIGHT:** No; if you recall, I made, I thought, a very - my most thoughtful effort on this area, thinking the only hope in that area is for a political settlement between Israel and Egypt and the - her neighbors, and it has to be a political settlement that is acceptable to both. I think if we don't have that, this type of development that has recently occurred - that is retaliation, the shooting down of an airplane and then the killing of some people, and now the raid into Beirut - is a very dangerous development. There's only one way I can see to stop it - is for the United States to take a very strong stand that this has to be settled - politically settled.

The Israelis object to an imposed settlement. I don't know what they mean by an imposed settlement. It's quite obvious, without the all-out support by the United States in money and weapons and so on, the Israelis couldn't do what they've been doing. So we bear a very great share of the responsibility for the continuation of this - of this state of warfare.

**KALB:** Should we be cutting back in our aid to Israel:

**SEN. FULBRIGHT:** Well, it isn't - that's too simplistic a way to do it. We should use our - every influence we have to persuade a political settlement. This administration said in the beginning it should be along the lines of the '67 resolution - I think it's 242-of the United Nations, with some adjustments in such places as the Golan Heights, Sharm El Sheikh and Gaza Strip, which I have supported, made a speech in connection, supporting that approach. And I think it was correct. I only regret that the-that the government didn't follow through with it.

Now I must say, I think they received very great objections to that from the Senate, and the great majority of the Senate of the U.S.-somewhere around 80 per cent-are completely in support of Israel, anything Israel wants. This has been demonstrated time and again, and this has made it difficult for our government. In this instance I have thought the President and the Secretary had the right approach, as evidence by what was called the Rogers Doctrine.

**KALB:** They've just about given up on that.

**SEN. FULBRIGHT:** Well, I hope they haven't. I think this is a very dangerous area in which the interests of this country-because of the energy resources in the Persian Gulf, it's very important; there's no more interest-no more important area-it's far more interesting, more important to the welfare of this

government than is anything in South-east Asia. And this is the area where our attention should be focused, and a reasonable settlement should be brought about by-for-well, it's the highest priority, in my opinion.

*HERMAN:* For awhile there, everybody was talking optimism-things looked good-there was an atmosphere tending towards peace in the Middle East. Now we've had all these recent raids, attacks, terrorism . . .

*SEN. FULBRIGHT:* I never was optimistic. The one thing I-not in this area.

*HERMAN:* Do you feel now that peace is easily possible at all after these recent incidents?

*SEN. FULBRIGHT:* It's not easy, but I think with our influence-

*HERMAN:* Has it receded some?

*SEN. FULBRIGHT:* Now after all, the Russians withdrew their troops and whatever they had, as far as I know, in Egypt. They made their gesture. Why shouldn't we respond and make a gesture--

*HERMAN:* They were kicked out, as I remember.

*SEN. FULBRIGHT:* All right, any way you like it, they're out, and that's the significant part-they're not still there. And I think it-that should have been a sign in which we should have-we should have responded with our influence to bring about a political settlement. Now I don't think-I think that would be in the interest of Israel, frankly. Here is a difference of opinion. I think Mr. Nahrum Goldman and Mr. Ben Gurion-they did share my views at the time I'm speaking of. There is a difference, of course, among the Israelis as to what is in their interest, just as there is here. I think a political settlement, approximating, at least, the United Nations resolution, is in the interest of Israel-as well as ourselves and the world.

*SCHECTER:* Senator, you talked about the energy crisis in relation to the Middle East, but aren't we now involved with the Soviet Union in really dealing with that crisis in terms of our trade pattern with them-this whole development of natural gas? And don't you see that as-as-a

*SEN. FULBRIGHT:* That is a very minor, minor side issue. It's like saying, well, we can look to Alaska for our resources. That's a very small matter. The real resources-three-fourths of all the resources we know of outside of the Soviet Union are in the Persian Gulf. This is where, for the next ten or 15 years especially, our attention should be focused; and every effort of our diplomacy should be brought to bear to bring about a settlement, and then long-term agreements as to the access to those resources.

*SCHECTER:* But doesn't a settlement in the Middle East depend on our relations with the Soviet Union, and now--

*SEN. FULBRIGHT:* Well, it's certainly influenced-and as I've already said, the Soviet Union has done, I think, a very significant thing when they withdrew from Egypt.

*KALB:* Senator, to go back to your point about what we might do to get a political solution in the Middle East, I gather that what you're saying is that the U.S. has great leverage with Israel, and it ought to use that leverage to press Israel into concessions to make the peace possible.

*SEN. FULBRIGHT:* Well, we have the leverage in the sense that we supply all the wherewithal-or a major part of the wherewithal-to finance or to pay for everything that Israel does. We don't have any leverage in the sense that Israel controls the Senate. The Senate is at her-a subservient, in my opinion, much to much. We should be more concerned about the United States' interest, rather than doing the bidding of Israel. This is a most unusual development.

*HERMAN:* There's a place where you have what some people think is a direct clash, and that is the trade bill and the Jackson amendment, where the United States wants certain trade agreements with the Soviet Union, wants to make certain changes in our trade policy; and the Jackson amendment, which would forbid that unless Russians let the Jews out.

*SEN. FULBRIGHT:* Well, I don't think the Jackson amendment is a proper amendment. The administration, if I'm

properly informed, is strongly against the Jackson amendment. This is simply a demonstration—a further one, a recent one—of what I say about the Senate having been the obstacle, the obstruction, to the administration doing what I believe they wish to do in the Middle East.

*HERMAN:* Will the Senate approve or disapprove the Jackson amendment?

*SEN. FULBRIGHT:* The current attitude is that the Senate will approve the Jackson amendment; and it will, unless the administration is persuasive on a very large number of their followers. I don't approve the Jackson amendment. I think that policy is what has encouraged and is largely responsible for the present government of Israel following what I believe to be a dangerous policy—for Israel as well as all of us.

*KALB:* Should the United States be in

the position, in your opinion, in the United Nations debate, of vetoing a resolution that would condemn Israel?

*SEN. FULBRIGHT:* Well, I don't particularly like these confrontations of condemnation. I—my view is that persuasion and argument and diplomacy is called for. The—just the outright condemnation is not the right way to approach it. However, our influence, if the administration could keep the Senate from intervening from time to time under the leadership of some of the members, then I think they'd be disposed to bring about a settlement. And I think it could be brought about, and would be in the interest of Israel and ourselves and certainly the peace of the world. It's a very important issue. I put it at the—right at the top of the—what's important to us.

*This statement was presented to The Honorable William P. Rogers, Secretary of State by Dr. Peter S. Tanous, President of the National Association of Arab Americans.*

April 16, 1973

The Honorable William P. Rogers  
Secretary of State  
Department of State  
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Secretary:

The United States has reached a crossroads in the Middle East. At this very moment the eyes and ears of the whole world are focused on the proceedings before the United Nations Security Council. We have come here today, as concerned American citizens. My organization is the National Association of Arab Americans; Mr. Woodrow W. Woody of Detroit, Michigan, represents the Greater Detroit Arab American Community and the World Lebanese Cultural Union; Mr. Minor George of Cleveland, Ohio, Chairman of the International Relations Committee of the Midwest Federation of American Syrian-Lebanese Clubs, with a combined representation of over One Million concerned Americans of Arabic Heritage. We are all deeply concerned with the drift of American policy away from the traditional ties of friendship between our country, the U.S., and the Arab nations. Many, other than Arab Americans, in this country, are expressing their concern over the explosive nature of the present American policy in the Middle East. The Arabs have begun to despair of United States integrity, and the validity of the U.S. mediation.

The latest terrorist raids into Beirut, Lebanon by Israeli invaders, disguised as civilians, using arms supplied by our government, were members of the Israeli Armed Forces. Unfortunately for Israel, and the whole world, the three Palestinians who were murdered, were those intellectual, moderate voices loved and respected by freedom loving people all over the world. It is unfortunate that our news media continues to take a biased view on the Middle East . . . . I will not term the role of the Palestinian as guerrilla, nor as freedom fighters, but rather Patriots fighting for the right to return to their country. This right to return is upheld in Article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and unanimously upheld by every United Nations General Assembly since 1949. Ironically, the U.S. has consistently sponsored the U.N. resolutions on repatriation, but it has, regretfully, remained an inimplemented principle of U.S. policy in the Middle East.

Joseph C. Green, former Ambassador to Jordan, in the April 11, 1971 edition of the Washington Post, stated, "United Nations Human Rights Commission condemned the Israeli government for its grave violations of human rights as well as its violations of the Geneva Convention in the occupied territories." These points were cited by Ambassador Green:

1. A policy of collective punishment of Arabs
2. Evacuation and transfer of sections of the Arab population in the occupied countries
3. Transfer of part of its own civilian population into the occupied territories.

The sympathies of the world were with the Jews after World War II, and they warranted the human compassion. As Dean Sayre has so clearly state, "The oppressed

have become the oppressors." But as Americans, we must realize it is not right to accommodate the Jews by inflicting the suffering on those Arabs who, in no way wronged the Jews, nor were they a party to the Jewish problem which developed during and after World War II; this was created by the Western powers. It is evident to Christians, Moslems and Jews alike, that sympathy for the Jew has resulted in the Arabs being made the scape goat for the crimes of the Western World.

Zionist political pressures and financial contributions to elected American officials should not be the determining factor in foreign policy. Surely the basic interests of the U.S. should be placed above and before the international and well financed interests of domestic pressure groups. We not only give unlimited and continued military and economic aid to Israel to the deterioration of American/Arab friendship, but the weapons we supply them with are the most sophisticated. In addition, the Zionists have had an unprecedented effect on our foreign policy by involving their foreign problems in our domestic affairs, as evidenced by the Jackson Amendment to the Soviet Trade Agreement. They have put pressure on every branch of our government. Not only do we support them through the Legislative arms of our government, but we are now financing many of their proposed programs, to the detriment of our own domestic programs and policies.

The acts of terrorism and aggression against the country of Lebanon are a violation of the United Nations Resolutions and decisions and also of the Lebanese/Israeli Armistice Agreement of 1949. Israel has unilaterally denounced this Armistice Agreement, and the United Nations maintains that the Agreement remains valid and in force.

Further, we are deeply concerned over the recent statement by General Dayan in which he stated, "The next time, we will hit the Nation of Lebanon." This statement must not be permitted to stand without some restraining action by the United States. Such statements are only further proof of the National Policy of Military Aggression and Assassination, which Israel has adopted. When a nation becomes so arrogant and secure in the knowledge that it has the complete support of a "super-power", that it can adopt such a policy, we question the logic of the United States supporting such a government. If this is our policy, we have come here today to protest and to demand that the policy be changed. Ask yourself, Mr. Secretary, who created the Palestinian Resistance Movement? It was Israel. Does this mean, however, that we must stand idly by and allow the situation to continue to remain unresolved.

Where do we stop Israel? We did not stop them at the Beirut Airport; we did not stop them when they invaded the north of Lebanon; we did not stop them following the downing of the Libyan airliners; we did not stop them when they destroyed the south of Lebanon, and now they have struck at the very heart of Lebanon — in a residential section of Beirut. Where do we, the U.S. draw the line. The aggressions must be stopped NOW.

The basic problem is the Palestinian. In the last two years, the United States has given to Israel, in Military and Economic Aid, approximately One Billion Dollars. Why not force Israel to come to a political settlement; With half of what we are giving to the Israeli's in aid, allocate One Half a Billion Dollars, and work out a formula whereby the Israeli's will allow the Palestinians to return to their homes. The money allocated for the Palestinians could go to building homes for them, and for educational and other facilities. We have just given Israel Fifty Million Dollars for the resettlement of Soviet Jews who have no claim to the land of Palestine.

*The United States does have leverage with Israel and we should be ready to use it now.* We can delay or refuse any further shipment of phantoms, other military armament, and economic assistance, including private tax free funds. For indeed, with the Soviet exit from Egypt there is no military threat to Israel.

In view of the crisis we are now facing with the energy problem, it could only benefit the United States to have a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East. A just settlement in the Middle East will be to the advantage of all parties to the conflict

in the Middle East; the United States, Israel and all the Arab people.

What can we do to resolve these problems, Mr. Secretary? We want the United States to live up to its own commitments, further we want:

1. Restraint on the part of the United States in the use of the Veto in the United Nations.
2. The Implementation of United Nations Resolution 194 (III), and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
3. Forceful action on the part of this Administration to restrain Israel from any further acts of military aggression against Lebanon and other Arab countries.
4. A final settlement based on peace with justice involving withdrawal from occupied territories, including Jerusalem, and self-determination for the Palestinians.
5. Implementation of the United Nations Resolution 242 and the Rogers Plan, (which, Israel, not the Arab Countries, have rejected).

Mr. Secretary, the stakes are far too great to leave relations, between the Arabs and the Americans, to Zionists and Israeli Generals. This is 1973, not 1948. Tomorrow may be too late. You may ask, what is at stake? We say to you, Mr. Secretary, only the security of the United States and its economic stability. History will not forgive — even a powerful nation like the United States of America, the luxury of ignorance and innocence, any longer.

---

Dr. Peter S. Tanous — President  
National Association of Arab Americans

---

Woodrow W. Woody — Past President-National  
World Lebanese Cultural Union  
Greater Detroit Arab American Community

---

Minor George — Chairman International Relations  
Committee — Midwest Federal of American  
Syrian-Lebanese Clubs

*AIDE TO ISRAEL FROM PUBLIC FUNDS:*

*Approximately \$300 MILLION FOR MILITARY AID (Credit for Arms Ceiling \$500 Million)*

*CUT FROM THE DOMESTIC BUDGET*

1. Hill-Burton Program	To construct public or other non-profit hospital and clinical facilities	\$90 Million
2. Regional Medical Program	To improve and regionalize research on and delivery of health services especially "for persons residing in areas with limited health services	60 Million
3. Training Grants & Fellowships	Promotes long term categorical training for selected professional disciplines, like social workers health aides, and psychiatrists.	58 Million
4. <i>UNDER CORPORATE WELFARE Air Carrier Payments</i>	To cover any operating losses by Air carriers for specific transportation services	<u>66 Million</u>
		\$274 Million

THESE ITEMS TOTAL ONLY \$274 MILLION DOLLARS AS OPPOSED TO THE \$300 MILLIONS FOR ARMS.

*AID TO ISRAEL FROM PUBLIC FUNDS*

Approximately \$200 Million for Economic Aid

*CUT FROM THE DOMESTIC BUDGET FOR LACK OF FUNDS*

EDUCATION:	Includes all education programs in HEW the largest component of cutback is for reduction in Library Construction and Services	\$138 Million
	EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT	<u>53 Million</u>
		\$191 Million

THESE ITEMS TOTAL ONLY \$191 MILLION AS OPPOSED TO THE \$200 MILLION FOR ECONOMIC AID TO ISRAEL WHICH IS NOT NEEDED BY THEM.

**AID TO ISRAEL – UNITED ISRAELI APPEAL FOR THE RESETTLEMENT OF SOVIET JEWS**

\$50 Million

**CUT FROM THE DOMESTIC BUDGET FOR LACK OF FUNDS:**

**FOR COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS** as an alternative to ineffective and costly State Mental Institutions, especially to provide the facilities to those unable to pay \$50 Million

Besides the public funds there is an estimated \$500 Million which will go to Israel thru Private TAX FREE Contributions.

*WHAT does \$500 Million mean to the Domestic Budget: It could be \$390 Million cut from the budget for the OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY., an agency to research and reduce incidents of poverty. THIS AGENCY HAS BEEN ABOLISHED.*

*WHAT does \$500 Million mean to the Domestic Budget: It could be the \$305 Million for HOUSING SUBSIDIES CUT. To help fulfill the 1949 Housing Act's pledge of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family. The new budget suspends new committments under the Housing Subsidy Act.*

*What does \$500 Million mean to the Domestic Budget: It could be the MAN POWER PROGRAM to encourage on the job and class froom training, summer jobs for youth, vocational rehabilitation, subsidies for those hiring the hard core unemployed, and public service employment. HOW MUCH WAS CUT . . . \$499 MILLION.*

The United States today faces inflation, a possible raise in taxes, unrest among the minority groups . . . in the face of all this this country continues to give aid to Israel. Ironically, last week, the government of Israel announced a reduction in Income Taxes for her citizens. The Foreign Currency Reserve in Israel has increased by three times since the beginning of 1970.

Beginning of 1970 – Foreign Currency Reserve \$ 400 Million

Beginning of 1973 – Foreign Currency Reserve \$ 1 Billion 200 Million

This is an amazing fact in view of what the Israeli government spends on Arms. The \$800 Million increase is due to the funds the U.S. Government so generously supplies Israel with to the detrement of our own Country.

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, today's New York Times contains an article from the Reuters News Service concerning statements made by Premier Golda Meir of Israel in an interview with an Israeli newspaper.

According to the news reports, Mrs. Meir stated that I have never said a good word about Israel.

The Times reports:

Mrs. Meir said: "Can you remember when Senator Fulbright has said anything positive" about Israel?

I greatly regret that Mrs. Meir has made such a statement and I do not believe her claim can be borne out by the record. I am afraid that Mrs. Meir confuses a lack of complete and total support for every action taken by the Israeli Government or every request that it makes with a lack of respect or friendship for Israel.

I will state once more, as I have on many previous occasions, that I have a profound regard for the State of Israel and for its people. The nation and many of its citizens have an outstanding record of accomplishments and the 25th anniversary of the Republic of Israel is an appropriate occasion to note this.

Although I differ with some of the policies of the Government of Israel and, indeed, with some of the actions taken by this body with regard to Israel, I do not believe it is fair or accurate to categorize my position as anti-Israel. What I have advocated is what I see as a more balanced policy in the Middle East, aimed at achieving lasting peace in the area. I do not believe that it is in our best interest or in the best interest of Israel for the United States to give unquestioned support to every action and every desire of the Government of Israel.

I have gone to great lengths to spell out my position in detail, in speeches in

the Senate and elsewhere, in articles and books. I am convinced that an objective reading of my views will not support the view that I have no concern for Israel. In fact, my position does not differ greatly from that of some leading Israelis, including the Nation's first Prime Minister, David Ben-Gurion.

In the New York Times article about Mrs. Meir's statement, she refers to a recent appearance before the Committee on Foreign Relations by Mr. Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs.

Since Mrs. Meir has referred to Mr. Sisco's testimony before the committee and my comments on that occasion, I think it is appropriate to refer to certain of my remarks that she apparently overlooked. I would like to quote from my remarks to Mr. Sisco from the transcript of the hearing on April 3, just 2 weeks ago:

But the Israelis are among the most energetic, brightest, most capable people in the world. They have proved it for two millenia, I do not deny it, and they are very great people, but when you give them that kind of military power they tend to use it just like other people do, and I think you create a dangerous situation. They are almost tempted to attack their neighbors because they know they can beat them all. They have got more arms than all their neighbors put together as you know, and there is not a one of them that they could not run over tomorrow if they wished to do it. Now they are restrained in the situation, I agree, but we contribute to a dangerous situation . . . That is the way it looks to me.

Mr. President, I would like to submit for the RECORD, just a few more of the many examples I could cite where I have made comments which I do not believe could be fairly construed as "anti-Israel." I cite these remarks from some of my appearances on network interview programs, because these are spontaneous answers to questions posed to me.

From "Face The Nation," CBS, July 6, 1970:

Mr. MacNeil. Senator, back in the Middle East, do you think the United States has a commitment or should have a commitment to Israel—to its territorial integrity?

Senator FULBRIGHT. We have no formal commitment—no treaty or otherwise. The commitment is the tremendous respect that the people of this country have for the Israeli and the Jewish people in general . . . if you say, will we go to great lengths to assist and protect Israel, we will but without any formal commitment.

That's in the nature of our country and the people who live in it and the respect that they have for the Israelis.

From "Face the Nation," CBS, October 31, 1971:

Mr. KALB. Will you support a continuing resolution to make sure that money gets to Israel?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, Israel is a very special case, and I have acknowledged that we should support it.

Ms. BERGER. Senator, may I catch you on another point? Do you still favor a mutual security treaty with Israel, and do you think that in the given mood of the United States today Israel could put any faith in it?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I don't know about Israel but I still favor that. I think when I reflect on the speech or proposal I made a year ago August (1970), I think it was a good one. I still think it is a good one. I still think it would be very wise. I agreed, as I did then and now with Mr. Ben-Gurion, that this is the safest way for Israel's future.

From "Meet the Press," NBC, August 23, 1970:

Senator FULBRIGHT. Now, the Middle East, I have stated that we have very long association with the Israelis . . . This country played a major role in the creation of the State of Israel . . . it so happens the Russians did too. The Russians agreed, approved, or voted for the resolution of partition, back in 1947, I believe it was, and this was very much on the conscience of the West because of what happened in Western Europe, in Germany. I don't know that

you want to recall all of those instances, but there has been a long history of association, of sharing of cultural background, and I would say, a political background, with Israel.

Mr. President, I could cite other examples, but I hope these few will have made my point. I do not expect Mrs. Meir to agree with everything I say, nor do I believe she should expect me to agree with everything she says. If she wants to view me and my views as misguided then that is certainly understandable. However, if she construes my position as one of a lack of concern and respect for Israel, then I believe she is being unfair to me and not seriously trying to understand my position. I ask unanimous consent to print the statement of Prime Minister Meir as reported in the New York Times in the RECORD.

Further, Mr. President, I wish to state once again that I believe a political settlement in the Middle East, consistent with the proposals made by Secretary Rogers in 1969, is in the interest of the United States of Israel and of peace. I urge President Nixon to insist upon such a settlement in order that we may proceed to make arrangements with the countries of the Persian Gulf for an adequate supply of oil for our country. A political settlement is essential to the establishment of stability in the area and to the economic health of the United States during the next 10 years.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### MRS. MEIR SAYS THAT FULBRIGHT HAS NEVER SHOWN FRIENDSHIP

TEL AVIV, April 16 (Reuters).—Premier Golda Meir said in an interview published here today that Senator J. W. Fulbright, Chairman of the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee, had never said a good word about Israel.

In an interview with the left-wing Mapam party newspaper, Al Hamishmar, Mrs. Meir said that Senator Fulbright should not be quoted as an example of

American thinking toward Israel.

Mr. Fulbright, in an interview on the Columbia Broadcasting System program "Face the Nation" in the United States yesterday, asserted that the Nixon Administration was unable to put pressure on Israel for a Middle Eastern peace settlement because the Senate was "subservient" to Israel.

Mrs. Meir said, "Can you remember when Senator Fulbright has said anything positive" about Israel?

"This is a man who hasn't slept nights for years," she said, because under American law part of the United Jewish Appeal funds are free of income tax. "Charity contributions are free of tax. Fulbright knows the law. He has been searching for years. Maybe one day he'll find something."

The Premier said that when Joseph J. Sisco, the Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian affairs gave evidence before the Senator's committee, Mr. Fulbright asked, " 'It doesn't worry you that so much money flows to Israel?' Money is flowing in, but it is mainly from Jewish contributors, apart from Government loans under American law. So why is he so worried."

In his appearance yesterday, Mr. Fulbright said that the United States possessed leverage over Israel because "we supply all the wherewithal—or a major part of the wherewithal—to finance or pay for everything Israel does." But he said that this leverage could not be used because "Israel controls the Senate."

FROM THE  
CONGRESSIONAL  
RECORD

WED. APRIL 18, 1973

STATEMENT OF  
SEN. JAMES ABOUREZK

(D) SOUTH DAKOTA

VIOLENCE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, the degenerating cycle of violence in the Middle East reminds one of nothing so much as a picture of two high-speed freight trains plunging toward each other, a head-on collision inevitable, with those looking on immobilized by the horror of the spectacle.

Mr. President, something must be done to avoid the Middle East collision. No matter how difficult the job, or how seemingly hopeless the prospects for peace, the United States must do everything in its power to stop the bloodshed and to break the cycle of violence.

How many more Munichs, civilian airliners, invasions of Lebanon, killings of diplomats, and retaliatory destruction of American property do we need before that point is driven home?

Will we continue to watch as mindless terrorism threatens American lives in the Middle East?

Will we continue to stand by until one day we find ourselves listening to an American President explaining to the Nation on TV that he has ordered American troops and air support into the Middle East to save American lives?

The bloodshed we now witness would be nothing compared to what would occur if that condition became reality.

And if there are those who doubt the possibility of the United States being pulled, step by step, into a war in the Middle East, I would remind them only that we became entrapped in the war in

Southeast Asia by a commitment that amounted to nothing as compared to our commitments and interests in the Middle East.

Mr. President, the paramount interest of the United States in the Middle East must be peace. If the policies of this Nation are to accurately reflect those interests, then these policies must be re-examined and asserted far more vigorously than they have been in the past.

S 7666

By taking a basically passive role in which we respond to requests for more and more arms, and periodically issue expressions of outrage over terrorist attacks, we do less than nothing to avert the impending disaster.

I do not pretend to have an exclusive blueprint. But I do believe that there are two vital steps we must take if we are to even get within hailing distance of a peaceful settlement.

First, we must be scrupulously evenhanded in our reactions to the misguided terrorism that is sure to occur again in the region. Whether it is at Munich or at Khartoum, over Sinai or in Beirut, violence is the enemy of peace. There is no "best" or "worst" kind of violence, as one American newspaper has claimed. There is only one kind of violence, the "worst" kind, the kind that kills and maims. The United States must demonstrate an understanding that violence is certain to continue so long as the refugee and border problems continue. And we must express our outrage over all violent acts by both sides.

And if our policy continues to be that of simply responding to demands for more and more arms and increasingly militant statements and declarations, then we only contribute to the impending disaster. We should instead take the lead in reducing both tensions and arms shipments to insure that the

Middle East focus is on the conference table rather than on the battlefield.

As a compassionate people we can no more tolerate the inhumanity and the continuation of the Palestinian refugee camps than we could the mistreatment and genocide practices against the Jews by Hitler. Until the refugee matter is dealt with, we must realistically face the fact that even the most brilliantly drawn border agreements will fail in the face of continued terrorism.

We cannot stop by showing compassion only for homeless Jews. Our compassion must extend to the Palestinians who have found themselves without a homeland.

Mr. President, the job of this body and of this Nation is to do everything within our power to bring peace to the Middle East. Let us forgo the easy posturing for our constituents. Let us put aside partisan divisions that have nothing to do with the Middle East. Let us demonstrate in our actions the kind of evenhanded restraint which is the only way to change the course of disaster.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABOUREZK) on the very fine statement he has just rendered on the floor of the Senate. I hope that Senators who are not present today will avail themselves of the RECORD to read the comments made by the Senator from South Dakota.

The Senator has put his finger on one of the most important and timely subjects concerning world peace. The present cycle of tragedy in the Middle East underscores the necessity for immediate political solution—one act of violence follows another.

It is very easy to place blame on one side or the other; but the important point is that the cycle continues, and we have the highest responsibility as a peacemaker to see to it that tensions are eased on both sides.

I agree with the Senator from South Dakota that it is certainly in the best interests of the United States, it is in the best interests of Israel, and it is in

the best interests of the Arab States to avoid the continued escalation of this tension. Certainly things are out of hand now, when governments will officially assign people to assassinate, and when terrorist organizations are able to function in any part of the world. These are crimes; these are contributions to escalating the tensions.

I think the United States has a commitment to gain a peaceful settlement now. But whatever settlement is reached—I think the Senator from South Dakota brings up this point that is almost forgotten—it must involve the Palestinian refugee camps. The words “Palestine” and “Palestinian” have been almost forgotten in our vocabulary; yet this point is terribly important when we consider the larger number of refugees in Palestinian refugee camps.

So I feel that the Senator has made a great contribution this morning to a better understanding of this very complex issue, which should not put us into a position of being pro-Arab or pro-Israel but, rather, pro-peace and pro-humanitarian. We want to help to settle something that is affecting our national interests, for we face fuel shortages related to our economic requirements that can be met out of Middle Eastern oil; but more important is the humanitarian responsibility we have to exercise this peacemaker role.

I commend the Senator from South Dakota for his forthrightness, for his evenhandedness, for his objectivity, and for his fairness in handling this complex issue, which is more often characterized by emotion than by fact or logic or reason. It has been a great contribution this morning.

Mr. ABOUREZK. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I especially appreciate his remarks because everyone in Congress and in the country knows the dedication of the Senator from Oregon to the cause of nonviolence and peace, whether it is in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, or any other part of the world.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

# NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ARAB AMERICANS

1834 K STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

April 19, 1973

Telephone: (202) 347-2429

## NEWS RELEASE

Dr. Peter Tanous, President of the National Association of Arab Americans, on April 16, 1973 led a delegation which met with the Secretary of State, Mr. William P. Rogers. Accompanying Dr. Tanous was Mr. Woodrow W. Woody of Detroit, Michigan and Mr. Minor George of Cleveland, Ohio. The meeting took place in the office of the Secretary at 3:30 P.M.

A prepared formal statement, outlining the strong feelings of the Arab American Community was presented to Secretary Rogers.

Secretary Rogers thanked the delegation for coming and expressed his pleasure at having an opportunity to talk with them.

Dr. Tanous, in a very frank and open discussion asked the Secretary when and where the U.S. planned to draw the line and take some action to halt future incursions into Lebanon and other Arab countries by Israel; and, was the U.S. prepared to prevent Israel from occupying any of Lebanon's territory. Mr. Rogers' answer to this was, "The United States has always and continues to guarantee the territorial integrity of Lebanon." In answer to a question raised regarding the use of the veto by the U.S. in the United Nations Security Council meeting, Mr. Rogers indicated that the U.S. would support a balanced resolution referring to both Israeli aggression and Arab terrorism. However, it would not support a unilateral condemnation of either side; to which Dr. Tanous responded; "Our government is equating the actions of two entirely different entities—one an isolated group of frustrated individuals, and the other is an accepted Nation recognized by the world

## NEWS RELEASE

community. To condemn all Arab Nations because of the actions of a few frustrated individuals, would approximate condemning all Blacks in the U.S. for the Black Panthers actions at San Jose, California when Judge Hoyle was murdered."

In response to a question as to what the U.S. policy was toward the Palestinian refugees, Mr. Rogers stated that this was a great problem, and "the rights of the Palestinian must be considered in any Middle East settlement, if the settlement is to be a lasting one." Question by Dr. Tanous: "The Arab Nations had, in general, accepted the 'Rogers Plan', Israel has not. Why not apply pressure to Israel to accept?"

Secretary Rogers Answered: "A forced settlement will not produce a lasting peace. We are striving for an agreement that is acceptable to both parties." To which Dr. Tanous responded, "This concept is good, but it never works, for neither side will relinquish what it believes to be valid points. The U.S. could apply pressure on Israel by restricting shipments of phantoms and other sophisticated weaponry. But the important thing is that action must be taken to start negotiations moving at the earliest possible date."

The Secretary apologized for the fact that he could not spend more time with the delegation, since he had been called to a meeting with the President at the White House. He did, however, assure Dr. Tanous that he would take the statement home with him and read it carefully.

The delegates were encouraged by their meeting with the Secretary of State and intend to continue to maintain a dialogue with the Department of State and other agencies of the government.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Page E 2313

THE HONORABLE RICHARD T. HANNA  
of  
California

"BALANCING ISRAELI AND ARABIC RELATIONS"

MR. HANNA: Mr. Speaker, there is no more sobering aspect of the present world scene at this moment than the condition of confrontation between Israel and the Arabic countries. What is increasingly disturbing is the absence of candid and constructive expression of a relationship with Egypt and the other Arab countries that reflects our obvious national interest.

It seems to me if we can maintain assurances of firm support for Nationalist China while we are pursuing aggressively an improved and normalized relationship with the Peoples Republic of China, we certainly ought to be able to make more meaningful progress with the countries and principalities of the Arabian peninsula without diminishing our commitment to support the integrity of Israel.

I am not unaware that certain overtures have been made to the Arabs by this Administration. But reports lead to the conclusion that Mr. Sisco was about as adroit as a bull in a China shop and not impressive in overall accomplishment. In spite of protestation predictably elicited

by this criticism from both the White House and the Secretary of State, what they are now doing and have done is not getting the appropriate results.

What is needed, Mr. Speaker, is a firm statement from our President that we intend an even-handed and fair policy in Arab countries as well as standing firmly to protect the integrity of the new nation of Israel. The State Department actions should be geared as much toward normalizing relations with the Arabs as in assisting and urging an acceptable truce between the Middle East conflicting parties. We should decry any violence by either of the parties of their agents and should also express our opposition to injustices visited upon the nonmilitary civilians of all national origins.

We hope to see some meaningful expressions of policy demonstrating equality of treatment in the whole of the Middle East and feel such expressions are very much in the true national interest of the United States.

NEW YORK TIMES

April 11, 1973

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Fanning Mideast Flames

To the Editor:

I am appalled at your April 11 editorial "Strike Against Terror." You characterize the action as daring and brilliant, but fail to inform your readers of the facts in this action.

Israel set itself up as accuser, judge, jury and executer of three alleged Palestinian commandos. In carrying out this "strike" nine innocent civilians were killed including two policemen of Lebanon and 29 innocent people, including nine Lebanese policemen, were

injured. Destruction and havoc were wrought by this daring and brilliant strike, which I would rather classify as a barbaric act of terror.

Escalation by irresponsible action of a very dangerous world situation serves no useful purpose. Your editorial merely fans the flames of the fire and incites the terrorists to continue in their activity, on both sides. It would appear more useful and beneficial to mankind if terrorism, in all forms, were condemned.

**RICHARD C. SHADYAC**  
Arlington, Va., April 11, 1973