

In a barrage of statements these days, U.S. officials are trying not only to support the position of Egyptian President Anwar Sadat . . . but also to cast doubt on the Syrian Arab Republic's stand so as to support the Egyptian President's allegations that those who reject his capitulatory line will ultimately join this line. . . .

Following all that has happened under U.S. sponsorship and with its participation and encouragement — in terms of torpedoing peace efforts and conspiring against the work of the Geneva conference, and against some of the parties to the conference, and preparing the way for separate solutions and for tripartite Egyptian-U.S.-Israeli

this that Vance should speak about the Geneva conference as if nothing has happened and as if Washington is guiltless in the massacre of the conference and the massacre of real peace efforts. . . .

President Assad . . . has said that Syria will not kneel . . . All of the talk about international efforts for Geneva is a kind of cover for the current conspiracy and for the regime's fall into the abyss of surrender.

The road to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East is not through pushing the Sadat regime to surrender to Israel, nor through excluding the Soviet Union, the co-chairman of the Geneva conference, from the peace efforts, nor through colluding against the PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization—ed.), nor through trying to

push Syria into a corner.

Tishrin, "The Difference Between Nasser and Sadat," Dec. 8:

Egyptian President Anwar Sadat has won international fame. People all over the world know him or at least have heard his name mentioned in the news. This fame reminds us of the widespread fame won by the late Jamal Nasser, with, however, one difference between the two: Nasser won international fame for his role as one of the prominent leaders of the Arab national liberation movement and for having been a leading representative of the nonaligned movement and ~~talks in Cairo~~ — people's struggle against imperialist and racist regimes. Sadat's fame results from his going against the interests of his country and the Arab nation and for his going against the forces opposed to imperialism and racism in the world. It also emanates from his capitulation before the Israeli aggressors and occupiers.

Nasser was a symbol of the people's liberation, their struggle and their hopes for progress, liberation and peace, while President Sadat has become the symbol of spinelessness and capitulation and is considered a symbol of leaders who have placed themselves at the service of imperialism and racism. He has become a substitute for the late Chiang Kai-shek, Nguyen Van Thieu, Lon Nol and Nguyen Cao Ky. . . .

Israeli Press: Begin And Dayan Disagree 'Over Everything'

The Israeli press last week had the first substantial discussion by the Israeli media of the rift between Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin and his renegade Foreign Minister, Moshe Dayan. Begin favors an overall Middle East peace settlement, while Dayan, backed by British intelligence networks, is out to secure a partial peace with Egypt alone, a "solution" that would keep the Middle East dangerously unstable.

ISRAEL

Yedioth Aharonot, "Tensions With Dayan," Dec. 11:

There has recently been tension in the government between the Foreign Minister and several other ministers. At the same time it is believed in the coalition that these tensions are marginal and it is natural that these be felt among people with strong personalities such as the leaders of the present government.

The tensions that have recently been in evidence:

- The relations between the Foreign Minister and the

Minister of Defense. Defense Minister Ezer Weizman is very active in the political deliberations within the government and is in on the inner consultations. Dayan would prefer the issue (of peace negotiations — ed.) to revolve more around him as the person responsible for the Foreign Ministry. In view of this, there is a certain tension between Weizman and Dayan.

- The appointment of the Director General of the Prime Minister's office Dr. Eliahu Ben Elissar, to head the Israeli delegation to the Cairo conference. This has caused dissatisfaction in the Foreign Ministry. Even though Dayan agreed to the appointment, there is a feeling in the ministry that this appointment reduces the role of the Foreign Ministry in these contacts.

- The appointment of Maj. Gen. Avraham Tamir as the Israeli Defense Force representative on the delegation to the Cairo conference. Dayan did not agree with this appointment. On the other hand, it is Ezer Weizman's opinion that this appointment is the best that the IDF could make for the Israeli delegation. The Defense Minister stresses that Tamir heads the Planning Department in General Headquarters and has just headed the team that prepared the alternative military plans for the border problem on all fronts with a view toward the negotiations with the Arabs.

• Criticism in the government of the way the Foreign Ministry is running the overseas information campaign in the wake of the Sadat visit. The critics maintain that the Israeli information effort has created the impression on the world that Israel is following Egypt while, in fact, Israel initiated several political moves that made the Sadat visit possible.

The "black cat" apparently walked between Dayan and the Director General of his ministry, Ephraim Evron. Begin had proposed to Dayan that the Israeli delegation to the Cairo conference consist of the director generals of the Prime Minister's office and of the Foreign Ministry, but Dayan opposed Evron's appointment.

One of the reasons for the tension in relations between Dayan and Evron is the fact that the Director General of the Foreign Ministry has taken positions differing from Dayan's on certain issues.

Despite all this, coalition circles maintain that these tensions will not be able to undermine government cooperation in the determination of political moves.

Daver, "Dayan and Begin At Odds Over Everything," by Daniel Block, Dec. 13:

Coalition and cabinet sources were informed yesterday of a dispute between Prime Minister Menachem Begin and Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan over everything connected with the treatment of the Cairo conference.

The Foreign Minister is angry because the Prime Minister is reserving for himself the treatment of the matter and the Foreign Minister is not in the center of the picture. These sources also report that Foreign Minister Dayan was angry that Prime Minister Begin appeared at the joint press conference with U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance contrary to custom and protocol, according to which, in such a case, the Israeli Foreign Minister should appear together with his American counterpart. In the past it was the custom that the Israeli Foreign Minister was the one to appear at the joint press conference with any guest foreign minister. This was done on previous visits by the U.S. Secretary of State.

Observers point out that, in various statements made recently, expression was given to differences in shading in statements made by Begin and Dayan, with Dayan belittling the value of Sadat's statement about "no more war" while Begin attributed historic importance to it, and also when Dayan hurried to affirm the possibility of a separate peace with Egypt, while Begin, in his statements, was scrupulous in declaring Israel's desire for a comprehensive settlement with all the Arab countries. There is also a difference between the great optimism Begin is making heard and Dayan's reservations and doubts. Dayan spoke yesterday about a short conference and about the framework for the continuation as something unclear.

Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan yesterday denied, at a

gathering of foreign correspondents, the reports of a dispute between him and the Prime Minister. Foreign Ministry sources also tried to reduce the importance of the dispute, pointing out that it could be that Dayan was feeling a certain dissatisfaction over matters of secondary importance, but there was no difference between him and the Prime Minister with regard to the principal approach and to the aims of the negotiations and debates with Egypt at the Cairo conference.

Peres Declares He's Open To Palestinian State

The following are excerpts from an interview with Israeli Labor Party and opposition leader Shimon Peres that was published in the Christian Science Monitor Dec. 13. The interview and comment is significant in that Peres indicates that he would not oppose the formation of a government in exile by the Palestine Liberation Organization:

Q: You accept the idea of a Palestinian national existence?

A: That's right.... Every nation can decide about its identity. If there are Arabs who consider themselves Palestinians it is their decision, not mine. And they don't have to have my approval, and my disapproval is meaningless. The question is if the PLO is a representative or a terrorist organization.... If people want to discuss ... let them keep their guns under government control. Because the moment they come with guns they don't represent, they threaten. That's No. 1.

No. 2: Their (PLO) charter is not for Palestinian nationhood.... They claim Israel is Palestine.... The PLO doesn't say: we are Palestinian people and for that recognize our people. That would be OK.

Q: In principle do you not oppose the opening position of a demand for a Palestinian state?

A: I can't oppose anything. I say this is a negotiation without prior conditions....

Q: If the PLO accepts Resolution 242 and if the PLO agrees to the idea of reaching a coexistence arrangement with Israel, what would be your attitude toward the PLO?

A: Then they would stop being the PLO. Then we wouldn't have a problem....

Peres characterized his party's willingness to compromise on the West Bank and to negotiate for the fulfillment of Palestinian national identity as "quite a major difference" from the attitude of the Begin government.