

# United States Policy and Dr. Kissinger's

*The following is part of an interview granted by President Carter Sunday, Nov. 20 on the Begin-Sadat meetings.*

**Carter:**

## Biggest Breakthrough In 30 Years

**Q:** Do you think things are going well so far?

**A:** I think so. The fact that President Sadat would be courageous enough to go to Israel will transform, I think, the Middle Eastern peace prospects regardless of the outcome of this particular visit. It's a breakdown in 30 years, perhaps even centuries, of hatred. And I was particularly touched yesterday when President Sadat walked down the red welcoming carpet and shook hands with Mr. Dayan, and he and Mrs. Meir exchanged friendship, and he then kissed her on the cheek. I thought that was a great occasion.

I think it will be a major step forward.

**Q:** What do you mean that leaders have been an obstacle to peace in the Middle East?

**A:** Well I think it's obvious that the people of the world want peace, and pray for peace. And I think that this action by President Sadat to break down all the barriers that have been created by leaders in the past and go directly to the heart of Israel, in Jerusalem, has been feared by many as a possible action that would arouse the animosity of his own people and also there was doubt about how Israel would receive him.

But the overwhelming gratitude and excitement that now exists in Egypt and in Israel show that the people were ready for it and it was just the reluctance of leaders to take this momentous step that was an obstacle. And I have talked to all of the leaders in the Middle East — both the presidents, the kings, the prime ministers and the foreign ministers — and I know from personal experience that they genuinely want peace.

Some of them, I think, have underestimated the willingness of their own people to accept strong moves toward a new understanding. And I think that Mr. Sadat and Mr. Begin will show today that the two nations that have constantly been at war, with tremendous suffering, whose leaders have only been separated by a 30-minute plane ride, have responded well. I think this is proof in itself that had we leaders of the world been more aggressive in taking bold steps that the people would have responded well.

**Christopher:**

## Soviet Role Essential

*The following is part of a speech delivered by Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher Nov. 22 at the convention of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.*

President Anwar el-Sadat of Egypt and Prime Minister Menachem Begin of Israel have taken action to

prove their determination to work for an overall settlement.

The want to get to the forum which already exists for that purpose — the Geneva Middle East peace conference — where all the parties can be represented and peace treaties can be negotiated dealing with all the issues that separate Arabs and Israelis.

What we know from the events of the past few days gives up hopes that the momentum for reconvening that conference can continue to build.

It would be wrong and shortsighted in these weeks of intense diplomacy to pretend that the Soviet Union, as co-chairman of the Geneva conference, does not have an interest in the Middle East, or to pretend it does not have a role to play in the outcome of negotiations — a constructive role or a troublesome role.

That is why, through our recent joint statement, we sought to engage the Soviets on the most constructive basis at this most critical moment. We do not take lightly the Soviet commitments implied in that statement.

**Kissinger:**

## Neither Geneva Nor The Soviets

*The following are comments made by Henry Kissinger Nov. 22 on NBC-TV's "Today" show.*

With respect to Geneva, it's important to know whether we want to negotiate something or to ratify something.

I think Geneva as a ratification forum can be very useful. As much as possible, it should be negotiated ahead of time.

Now that the parties are directly in contact with each other, our role should be more facilitating than intrusive...

If the Soviet Union genuinely wants peace, it should welcome it. The Soviet Union has been responsible for most of the crises in the area.

It opposed the trip of President Sadat, it has discouraged other Arabs from welcoming it.

If there is a solution, the Soviet Union can participate in endorsing it. But I do not think the Soviet Union is necessary to bring matters beyond this point. I would certainly not enhance the position of the Soviet Union at this point. It isn't necessary.

**Kissinger:**

## Geneva Will Fail

*The following is part of James Reston's account of an interview he had with Henry Kissinger just prior to the Begin-Sadat meeting, and carried in the Nov. 20 New York Times.*

Mr. Kissinger said he thought it would be a mistake to keep talking about a "comprehensive Middle East settlement" at a Geneva conference as a preferable alter-

native to the Begin-Sadat meeting. If the two could not agree on a philosophic basis for compromise, Mr. Kissinger observed, the bureaucrats at Geneva could certainly not agree on boundaries or any other points of difference, and "Geneva would become irrelevant."

"For the first time," Mr. Kissinger said, "these

leaders are talking together and in Jerusalem, with Sadat going to the most sacred religious and historical shrines of Israel. Let them decide what the requirements for the future are. A Geneva conference is not an end in itself. If this mission doesn't succeed, how can Geneva succeed when you're dealing with bureaucrats?"

## Harriman Prepares 'Grassroots' Drive To Support Panama Treaty

### *Exclusive to the Executive Intelligence Review*

Twelve hundred professional lobbyists from around the United States met Nov. 18 in Washington, D.C.'s International Inn for a full day conference preparing them to "Go out and get the Panama Canal treaty passed."

The event was organized by Averell Harriman's newly formed Committee of Americans for a Panama Canal Treaty (COACT), while the Carter Administration supplied the big guns to get a protreaty machine rolling. Community speeches, television specials, articles in local newspapers, slide-talks, and so forth, can be expected to begin a "grassroots" swell across the country in answer to the vigorous publicity blitz of the largely "conservative" opposition to Senate passage of the treaties.

Unfortunately — if not surprisingly — COACT's organizing promises the American electorate a barrage of canned arguments for the Panama agreement which are no more than the flip side of the equally canned points made by the treaty's opponents. The so-called Panama Canal issue thus continues to be merely a fight for political leverage in internal United States politicking, leaving the needed open debate around full redefinition of U.S. foreign policy along the humanist, progrowth outlines on which it first began largely unaddressed.

The lobbyists gathered at the International Inn, all there by special invitation, were greeted by Vice President Walter Mondale, then addressed by an impressive series of speakers, including former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, treaty negotiator Sol Linowitz, and the Secretary of the Navy Graham Clayton. Linowitz was so overawed by his companions on the podium that he began his speech with the confession that he felt like a "brownie" in comparison with such figures as Henry the K.

The speeches were directed to answering "everything you always wanted to know about the Panama Canal treaty," preparing those present to see their con-

stituencies on passage of the treaty. Sol Linowitz tried to couch his arguments in favor of being "fair" to Panama, and ending the U.S. colonialist image abroad. Henry Kissinger provided hardline bluster, assuring the gathering that he would be more than willing to send in U.S. troops to keep the Canal open if there was no alternative, but that the treaty fortunately provides that alternative.

Kissinger also stressed the bipartisan nature of treaty support — and not incidentally playing up his own importance in passing. If "we" had won last November, and the "lamentable events" of last Jan. 20 thus avoided, Henry quipped, "we" would have negotiated the treaty also.

In addition to such speeches, every lobbyist was provided with a packet of materials by COACT, including sample speeches to "Hosttown", sample op-eds, and other "grassroots" organizing equipment, including a "How-to Kit." Even new slogans were put forward: "America: Speak Softly but Carry a Big Stick," and "Bully for America? or America, the Bully?"

The event was capped by a reception at the White House where Jimmy Carter personally appeared to give a pep talk to the group. A Harris Poll conscious Carter seemed to feel more energized himself at the sight of the 1,200 organizers. (An attendance of 400 had originally been projected.) Carter told the gathering he was glad to see so many people, and was sure they would all go out to insure the treaty was passed first of all "for me," and, of course, in the "long run, for national interests." A more politically astute member of the Committee must have corrected the President on this, for shortly thereafter Carter jumped back on the podium to remind people that indeed this was a bipartisan effort, and not just a personal matter for Jimmy Carter!

Whether or not the Harriman machine can get the treaty passed — and its efforts will probably aid that end — one thing was clear from the day's proceedings: Averell Harriman gained some solid brownie points with the Carter Administration by successfully demonstrating his ability to deliver his machine.