

## CAMP DAVID, NOT MUNICH

### WHY SO MUCH EXCITEMENT ABOUT THE RECENT U.N. RESOLUTION ON THE MIDDLE EAST?

The California State Assembly has unanimously called on the U.S. administration to officially repudiate it. So have Congressmen to the North of us and to the South of us. On the national scene, Ted Kennedy, Ronald Reagan and John Anderson have all attacked the Resolution as a threat to America. President Carter himself has publicly agreed that U.S. support of that Resolution was a mistake.

WHY? Why is there such near-unanimity among public figures on this idea?

Why is this issue so important?

There is, on the one hand, the image of Camp David, where Egypt and Israel agreed to meet face to face to negotiate their differences. There is, on the other hand, the image of Munich, where athletes were slaughtered by PLO forces which did not want to negotiate anything with Israel (and where, a generation before, Western diplomats had capitulated to similar military threats, setting the stage for World War II).

*That UN Resolution touched the nerve of America's foreign policy weakness throughout the Middle East ... In Iran, Afghanistan, the Persian Gulf.*

*It was not just the literal substance of the Resolution which bothered these Americans; it was that American support of this Resolution seemed to shift America from the Egyptian-Israeli focus on peace-by-negotiations to the more rigid PLO focus; from the spirit of Camp David to the spirit of Munich.*

### WHY DID THE TILT IN THIS RESOLUTION, FROM THE SPIRIT OF CAMP DAVID TO THE SPIRIT OF MUNICH, BOTHER SO MANY AMERICANS?

BECAUSE peace is important for America. Camp David has been the only bilateral initiative for peace in the Middle East; Egypt willing to foreswear war against Israel, Israel giving up enormous sections of land which it has held. The hard-line countries continue to hold the Munich focus of PLO leader Arafat, who continues to maintain, as he did again in February, that "we shall not rest until we destroy Israel."

That is a threat not only against peace -- but against America's most stable ally in the Middle East.

BECAUSE resistance to Soviet imperialism is important for America. The PLO is anti-American by ideology, and is trained and supported by the Soviet Union. Robert Moss of the London Economist explained recently that the PLO "is the Soviets' favorite, and its leaders make regular visits to the capitals of the Soviet bloc and maintain close contact with Russian embassies and KGB."

*A Palestinian state created tomorrow under PLO terms would be a PLO state, and a Soviet frontier. The Egyptian-Israeli attempt is to find and establish an autonomy which will possibly develop independent Palestinian leadership, and find a non-Soviet solution for important Palestinian aspirations.*

BECAUSE access to Middle East oil is important for America. The thrust of the PLO ideology and attachments is to topple regimes such as Saudi Arabia, and definitively cut the U.S. off from its oil supplies.

THESE ARE THE ISSUES.

U.S. foreign policy is at a crossroad. We need to focus on American national interest:

THESE ARE THE ISSUES.

There are continuing disputes about such subjects as the exact nature of developing autonomy on the West Bank, or the wisdom of new Israeli settlements on the West Bank at this time. These are legitimate and difficult disputes to be worked out through negotiation.

*But we should allow none of these legitimate disputes to divert us from the framework of American national interest. And that framework must be Camp David, not Munich.*