

# There is a peaceful solution for the Mideast



“When Sadat says that it is impossible to overcome the hatred during this generation, this actually means that he is not prepared to do so.”

By ROBERT FRIEDMANN

Arab spokesmen—as well as “respectable” magazines like *Time*—try to impress the world with moderate statements made by their leaders. They are always unclear (to the Western world) about what they mean by “peace” and about their future aims. They said Israel represents an obstacle on their road to peace by not accepting the conditions dictated by them. The Arabs rely on being a strong people with economic power, wanting to determine the future of the world.

If Arabs speak about peace they never define its contents. Hitler spoke about European peace. European leaders were impressed by it until the invasion of Poland. Sadat, in his interviews, stresses that normal relations and peace are for the next generation. Israel's position is to achieve peace in our generation. Peace for Israelis means peaceful relations with our Arab neighbors. Israel does not only strive for recognition and defensible borders, but for borders which are agreed upon by both sides and open to each other. Peace without peaceful relations is like a wagon without wheels. The one who sits in the wagon is stuck.

Sadat is convinced that peace can be achieved only by the next generation; if this is so, why does he urgently demand Israel's withdrawal within the next three months? If Europe, after World War II, would have had to be rebuilt according to the proposed Egyptian design, there would be an iron curtain between France and Germany, the borders hermetically sealed, both armies on constant alert opposite each other. Nothing would bring about the Common Market, and the next generation would have to decide Europe's fate.

Why does Sadat threaten war now, if in his opinion a whole generation is necessary to achieve peace? For Israelis and Arabs, peace is an urgent requirement of this generation. I believe peace is vital for both nations (though not necessarily for the Arab autocrats). When Sadat says that it is impossible to overcome the hatred during this generation, this actually means that he is not prepared to do so. The Israeli's have no difficulty in overcoming obstacles of this kind.

There is hardly any hatred of Arabs in Israel. Israelis and their

Robert Friedmann is an Israeli graduate student in the Department of Sociology.

leaders expressed a willingness and desire to meet Sadat and other Arab leaders, in direct face-to-face negotiations, at any time; that in spite of Sadat's former direct contact with the German Nazi party and the flattering articles he wrote about Hitler.

Arab propaganda likes to present Israel to the world as being too stubborn—not flexible enough to return territories. Israel would not find it difficult to exchange places for peace. But where would the unilateral withdrawal by Israel lead? Is it toward improvement of Egypt's option to go to war against Israel? Or is it for the option of a mutual agreement leading toward peace? There cannot be any peace based only on territorial rearrangements.

What is important is the rearrangement of attitudes. If it is true, as Sadat says, that a generation is needed to forget Egypt's hatred of Israel, Israel has to ask itself if it is logical and advisable to withdraw from territories and, by this, bring nearer to our large centers of population those who are still full of hatred. What brought Israel into the “occupied areas” is not a desire for expansion, but the outcome of the hatred of the Arabs (and unlike *Time*'s shameful “innuendo,” the Suez Canal was not closed because the Israelis reached the east bank of the canal but because the Egyptians wanted it that way; see *Time*, April 7, 1975).

What will make Israel withdraw from these places will be Arab readiness to put an end to hatred and prejudice. Israelis have no intention to again become a minority among Arabs anywhere, and it is high time that even the Arabs recognize the right of national freedom applies even to the Jewish people. The disagreement between Israel and the Arabs is a very simple one. They want to have Israel disappear among the millions of Arabs, transformed again into a minority which lives at the mercy of the Arabs. To this an agreement means suicide.

Recognizing the existence of a Palestinian problem, the Arabs will have to understand that no solution can be found by replacing the state of Israel with a so-called Palestinian democratic, secular state. Those places which the Arabs call Arabic have been a Jewish homeland for the last 3,000 years. Included in the 20 existing Arab states, there is a Palestinian homeland—the State of Jordan—which is 60 percent of the original

Palestine and 60 percent of its population is Palestinian. With the exception of Lebanon, there are no Arab states which are secular or democratic; and no Israeli is prepared to learn a lesson in democracy from any Arab country. Israel will not permit itself to be transformed into another ghetto within the framework of a Palestinian state in which the Arabs discriminate socially, politically, culturally and economically against Jews as is the case today in all Arab countries—and in regard to Jews in the Western world.

For Israeli's, peace means open borders, tourists, economic relations, cultural and scientific exchange, no hostile propaganda. One has yet to hear one of these ideas mentioned by any of the “responsible, moderate” Arab leaders. True peace for the Middle East has two important ingredients: the true intention of nations to live together, and because of past experience (witness the surprise war of 1973, the history of Arabs not honoring agreements), it seems advisable to have an interim period during which each nation will be able to test the other's attitude.

The most unfortunate part about Arab-Israeli relations is the fact that Arab leaders keep all information about Israel, about Israel's desire for peace, from their constituents. No offer whatsoever has been made to bring about a change in the attitude of their people toward Israel. Why is it that over 150,000 Arabs from neighboring countries can come and visit Israel every year and not one single Israeli is allowed to visit any Arab country? The Arabs speak two languages; one for the Arab world and one for the Western world. Peace will come nearer when Sadat and Assad will talk to their people as they do to the Western world.

The suspension of the negotiations are a direct outcome of the above described attitudes of the Arabs leaders. Israel has shown an immense flexibility—even to the extent of offering to withdraw from the vitally important strategic Giddi and Mitla passes in exchange for Egypt's renunciation of a state of war, and this in spite of Israel's unfortunate experience with agreements in the past. What more could Israel have offered? Israelis are not prepared to jeopardize their very survival, and paradoxical as it may seem, the survival of small Israel is the survival of the great Western hemisphere.

## Agencies spurn President's order

By SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER  
Los Angeles Times Syndicate

The quasi-official government bureaus struck a blow for complete independence recently when they told President Ford that executive orders issued for departments of the executive branch do not apply to them.

The agencies, which for many years have gone their own way and written their own rules, told the President, in effect, that he exercises no authority over their activities. This was the ultimate in confrontations. It presented a spectacle of groups of men named by the President informing him he had no right to tell them what to do—even when the President was acting in the best interest of the country.

President Ford did not ask the agencies for a file of their deepest and darkest secrets. All he did was ask for an idea of what various programs proposed in Congress and in the departments might cost the taxpayers. He asked for “economic impact statements,” showing what various new standards for air, water, noise, meat, poultry, fabrics, land sales, boats, paints and similar items might cost the government in the years ahead. But the way the regulatory agencies, especially those having to do with the economy, reacted, you would have thought the President had asked for something far more important.

The independent economic regulatory agencies unanimously informed the

White House that the President's order requiring inflation impact statements does not apply to them. They seem to think such statements would be equal to agency opinions, and in economic terms this cannot be done.

Of all the stupid arguments going on in Washington at present, this is among the first two or three. President Ford requested information upon which he could base economic decisions. The agencies are in existence for that very purpose. However, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Maritime Commission, to name a few, seem to think a reply to the President would compromise their positions in the government.