

And the hardliners, sometimes with religious overtones, influence Israeli policy and create events, most conspicuously in the occupied territories, which cause Arabs to say, "You see they seek **lebensraum** (the German term for "living space" used by the Nazis), not peace."

This circular process has created gulfs of fear and hate which can only be bridged by outside powers.

The task, as I see it, is to put communications on the more moderate, realistic plane and seek an overall settlement on the basis of simultaneity. The trade offs are basically, occupied territory for recognition and security guarantees.

All sides recognize that another war is a war no one can win — except possibly the Soviet Union. And the Arabs relish dependence on the Soviet Union no more than Israelis welcome dependence on the U.S. They are all nationalists. They all seek independence. And now the Arabs have a chance to build stability and nationhood not on war, but with their new found oil wealth. They all seek development — and development is not consistent with a continued state of belligerency. All the warring parties have a common interest in peace.

With some exceptions, Arab leaders are prepared to accept the right of an Israeli state to exist — and for good reason. It is a reality. And the American commitment is, and must remain, unequivocal. But now America is not being tested; Israel is. A long-term occupation of Arab territory is not consistent with American interests, nor with UN Security Council Resolution 242 — nor the Fourth Geneva Convention. It is not consistent with Israel's security — which will only be assured by demilitarized zones and unequivocal guarantees. Boundaries are all indefensible in the nuclear age — and boundaries which trap the aggrieved adversary within are imprudent in the extreme as recent events in the West Bank make evident to many Israelis and American Jews.

Continued stalemate can only lead to another outbreak of the war. Its consequences would be serious — not alone for the direct participants — not alone for the victims of another

oil embargo in the non-Communist world — but for the nuclear superpowers confronting each other.

The Soviet Union is not paralyzed by an election. It is moving to establish a new relationship with Jordan, even to repair its relationship with Egypt. Syria is moving to expand its authority in Lebanon and to form a common front with Jordan.

The U.S. dare not wait. Next year will be an Israeli election year. It is past time we faced the obvious — and put aside the wishful thinking and the myths which have obscured reality in the U.S. and Israel. Judging from my own experience, Americans are ready for the truth, more so than their representatives in Congress and the executive branch.

The most charitable thing that can be said about step-by-step diplomacy is that it has run its course. Now is the moment, perhaps the last, to seek an overall settlement without war.

The principles for an overall settlement should be established and with some specificity by the U.S. and, if possible, the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union must be made to understand that if it seeks to enjoy the economic benefits of detente it must accept the responsibilities of detente. Those principles, including the territorial concessions by Israel, Arab recognition, guarantees and demilitarized zones should be made the basis for negotiation in a process involving all the parties prepared to accept the existence of all the others. These principles could be accepted by all the parties simultaneously through the good offices of outside powers. Other questions, including the status of Jerusalem and Palestinian rights could be resolved in negotiations once the momentum was reversed. The Palestinian question is after all as thorny an issue for the Arabs as for the Israelis. Its resolution is no one's pre-condition for serious negotiations.

It did not take another trip to the Middle East to bring me to these conclusions. This trip gave me a sense of greater urgency and a belief that it is still not too late. That is a view which is not shared by all authorities. It is, however, not too late to try.

Excerpts From Hearings Of Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee On Neareast Affairs

May 22 (IPS) — The Neareast Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held the first of a series of scheduled hearings on the Mideast situation on May 29. The Subcommittee, chaired by Senator George McGovern (D-SD), took testimony from four senators who recently visited

the area. James Abourezk (D-SD), Adlai Stevenson (D-Ill), Floyd Haskell (D-Colo) and Jacob Javits (R-NY). The four were questioned by Senators McGovern, Charles Percy (R-Ill), and Clifford Case (R-NJ). Following are excerpts from the testimony.

Opening Remarks by Senator Abourezk

I want to comment on how the United States is acting in the Middle East — something I have never been able to understand. The U.S. continues to act as if it is presuming that it is our interest to maintain the status quo of constant turmoil, with the Palestinians having no homeland. ...But more and more the Administration and congressmen and especially senators see that to maintain that status quo is not in U.S. interest.

Because of the special U.S. relation to Israel, if we wanted to we could bring Israel to negotiations.

We have not done that because we have not adopted a U.S.

Mideast policy, but an Israeli Mideast policy.

This is what we can accomplish: (1) Guarantee of Israel's security would help matters and is in reach. (2) A return of occupied territories. (3) The establishment of Palestinian national identity and (4) A demilitarization of the area.

Regarding the new (Israeli West Bank) settlements, there have been some mild rebukes from the press and Congress, but these were not strong enough. The settlements will create many problems in a year or two — guerrilla war and terrorism, if you want to call it that. We will regret very much that we were so mild in rebuking Israel in allowing them.

Opening Remarks by Senator Haskell

Every Arab government recognizes that Israel is here to stay. This is very encouraging, also because the solution to the Palestinian problem is crucial and the Arabs say they will accept the establishment of a Palestinian state outside of Israel. The Arabs are very anxious for a permanent solution.

In Israel I found a less flexible attitude....

There should be negotiations, leading to establishment of a Palestinian state, recognition of Israel, Israeli withdrawal (from occupied territories).

At this conference (Geneva) the PLO obviously should be called. When you get to that table, maybe nothing will happen. If so, we'd not be any worse off. But not to ask people to come to that table would be a bad mistake.

Excerpts From the Question and Answer Period

Sen. Stevenson: Privately the Arab leaders are willing to accept Israel. Their precondition for this is Israeli acceptance of 242 (United Nations resolution 242, passed in November 1967, which calls for Israeli withdrawal from occupied territories — ed)...As Senator Haskell says, it's important to get them all to the table, but it is necessary to prepare very carefully....

Sen. Abourezk: It would not be good to simply return the West Bank to Jordan because this would upset delicate Arab politics. I want to ask if this committee would be willing to report out a denunciation of (Israeli West Bank) settlements and calling on Israel to withdraw? I think the senators wouldn't pass such a resolution, but I think they should.

Sen. McGovern: Israeli settlements on the West Bank is a crucial problem, partly responsible for these hearings. I want to refer to Terence Smith's New York Times article last week which says that '68 settlements form a border that Israel wants as final. Do you agree?

Sen. Haskell: As a practical matter, if you want things to blow up, just continue those settlements.

Sen. Abourezk: The installation of paramilitary people in those settlements shows that the government intends to make them borders — and the so-called "terrorist" attacks like in Kiryat Shomo have all been against the paramilitary in those settlements, albeit some were very young soldiers.

Sen. Percy: ...But Arafat (head of the Palestine Liberation Organization - ed.) doesn't accept 242...

Sen. Haskell: Arafat couldn't stick by that. I hope such a statement wouldn't deter us...

Sen. McGovern: I spoke with Arafat last year. When he's asked directly if it would be satisfactory to have the West Bank and Gaza as the Palestinian state, he gives an un-

qualified yes. When I reported this in my Jerusalem press conference, which was widely covered, I was asked if I thought Arafat would accept this, and I said yes, that's his position. U.S. embassy personnel then told me he'd repudiate it, but he didn't. Isn't that significant?

Sen. Javits: No — unless the West Bank Palestinian state would be final, and not just a staging ground for terrorism, and I don't think the PLO under the present set-up could accept this ...

Sen. Stevenson: These people are at war, so public rhetoric is different from private statements. The PLO represents the Palestinians. Who else is there? What alternative do we have? I did not say publicly — but only to the State Department — what Arafat told me, because I knew it would be repudiated. But a report on what I told State was leaked to the Washington Post which indicated a much more flexible position on the part of the present PLO leadership (Arafat was asking for a few inches. He had to have something for the Palestinian people) but he's not asking for total implementation of 242. It is time to face realityNo one is suggesting anything unilateral (concessions from the Israelis) and I don't find any Arabs asking for such. And I believe them because it is in their interest. We must recognize reality and speak to common interests of all in the area, and appeal to outside powers to help ...

Sen. McGovern: Last year when I got back from the Middle East I wrote an article on the emerging consensus, but no one would publish it because all the editors said everyone already knows all this. What I wrote was that there is a new consensus that: Israel must return to 242 boundaries, the Arabs must guarantee Israel existence, Israel must recognize Palestinian rights. Is this a practical basis for settlement?

Sen. Abourezk: Yes. And on (the question) if the Arabs will recognize Israel, Hussein last year in the U.S. said this, Assad said this in the Newsweek interview, Sadat said this in the U.S. They all said they are prepared to recognize Israel provided there are some adjustments by Israel. So demanding that the Arabs and the PLO recognize Israel prior to the conference is unrealistic. So let's sit down and begin to talk.

Sen. Stevenson: Defensible boundaries are not the Trojan horse West Bank settlements for Israel, but internationally guaranteed borders.

Sen. Javits: The key is the guarantee of borders by the U.S. and others: maybe we should make Israel some kind of member of NATO.

Sen. McGovern: (Disagreeing with Javits) Since we are approaching the nuclear threshold in the Middle East, we must work for this solution (proposed by Abourezk and Stevenson).