

Rep. Paul Findley (R.-Ill.) has already demanded in a written communication to the State Department that the Administration investigate whether or not Israel's Lebanon invasion violated the U.S. Foreign Military Sales Act which forbids use of U.S. arms supplies except for defensive purposes.

The Carter Administration is expected to take advantage of the backlash on this particular question to mobilize support for its plan for a "package deal," of military aircraft sales to Israel, Saudi Arabia and Egypt, a package which the Israel Lobby, in the person of Sen. Henry Jackson, has already vowed to block. Israel Lobby threats to unveil a years-old letter from former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, purporting to guarantee Israel its aircraft with "no strings attached," do not appear to have intimidated the White House so far.

Press Criticizes Genocide

Leading U.S. press have begun a campaign of open criticism against the Israeli invasion. The *Chicago Tribune* today concluded in an editorial entitled "Has Retaliation Helped?" that Israeli military operations in Lebanon had not contributed substantial benefits for Israeli security. Yesterday's *Baltimore Sun* criticized Begin for attempting to block swift UN peacekeeping

action in the Security Council, characterizing the UN resolution as "a large American favor" preventing a war of attrition between the Palestinians and Israel which would "complicate Israel's relations with an increasingly unsympathetic world." The *Sun* added, "It is Mr. Begin's style, unfortunately, to respond ungenerously to large favors."

The brutal atrocities suffered by the Palestinian and Lebanese population under Israeli attacks have contributed to the depth of the backlash against the Israel Lobby. Blasting "the propagandists for Israel," in the U.S. press Abourezk accused them of "dehumanizing Arabs because such dehumanization enable Israelis to engage with impunity in the savagery of killing. That is a tragic lesson in racism committed by people who have suffered the most throughout history from racism."

Syndicated columnist Nicholas von Hoffman has directly compared Israeli actions in Lebanon to the treatment of the Jewish population under Hitler. Although few have spoken out so bluntly, there is a dawning realization in the U.S. that exactly this Israeli "Bettelheim syndrome" — identification with one's own Nazi persecutors — is dangerous to Israel, and indeed, to the whole world.

—Don Baier

U.S. Press Opposes Israeli 'Retaliation'

Amid the justifications provided by the Washington Post and the Boston Globe for Israel's "retaliation" raid of southern Lebanon, a clear pattern of U.S. press criticism of that action emerged. Both the East Coast and regional press joined in questioning the motives of the Israeli government in taking action that is so definitively damaging to recent peace initiatives.

We excerpt here portions of U.S. press criticism of the Begin government.

The *Chicago Tribune*, "Has Retaliation Helped?" (editorial), March 22:

Israel's willingness to accept an immediate ceasefire in Southern Lebanon is welcome news...

That force (United Nations — ed.) may not succeed in bringing peace but inaction would have been morally repugnant and irresponsible. It would only have confirmed the notion in some quarters that the United States is committed to an "Israel right or wrong" position...

Once again we hear about secure and defensible borders. Where are they? ... Israel's real security lies only in genuine peace with the established Arab governments and removing the cause of conflict: the homelessness of millions of displaced Palestinians. Staying in occupied Arab territories on the other hand breeds resentment on the part of the very governments which have the power to contain the Palestinian liberationists ... (the Begin government) has been insisting on expand-

ing rather than removing their settlements ... (Israel's) best course now is to withdraw its troops and get on with the peace talks.

The *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, "Sparks in a Tinder Box," (editorial), March 16:

...The takeover of southern Lebanon by the Israeli armed forces, no matter how understandable from the viewpoint of a beleaguered Israeli government, is also deplorable ... It is a dangerous business ... It involves an invasion across international boundaries ... The invasion risks involving Lebanese forces in the conflict, but most importantly, it risks conflict with the Syrian forces which are keeping the peace in Lebanon.

Talk about tossing matches about in a dynamite warehouse!

Suppose the surgical operation did not work out as planned... (and) there was escalation and the world had a Sarajevo on its hands?

The *Seattle Times*, "Critical Juncture in Mideast Peace Efforts," (editorial) March 22:

...Begin says the resolution does not require Israel to withdraw from the occupied West Bank of the Jordan River.

That view is at odds not only with the position of every other government involved, but also with that of the

Israeli government in power at the time the resolution was adopted.

Yigal Allon, foreign minister in the Labor Party government that was succeeded by Begin's government last spring, charges the Begin Administration with impeding peace negotiations by its position on resolution 242.

If the peace initiative ... is now allowed to die for want of sufficient flexibility and reasonableness in either Jerusalem or Cairo, those responsible will encounter a world-wide sense of disappointment and disillusionment...

The Israeli incursion into Lebanon was one answer to that terrorist outrage. An even more necessary response is to take steps to keep the peace initiative alive.

The Gary Post-Tribune, "*Does an Eye for an Eye Pay Off Internationally?*" (editorial), March 16, 1978:

We were braced for Israeli retaliation to last weekend's brutally tragic raid by Palestinian guerrillas, yet we were surprised by its intensity.

At this writing, with the Israeli incursion into Palestine Liberation Organization camps in Southern Lebanon confused, we remain unconvinced of its effectiveness from the long term viewpoint...

Massive raids into Lebanon may well forestall immediate Palestinian counterterror, but might they not also serve to heighten the resistance movement from other bases?

The New York Daily News, "*Women and Children Pawns in a Deadly Game,*" by Jimmy Breslin, March 19:

...It is chilling to be in New York and see people automatically arise and laud the Israelis for their counter-attack. No mention was made that the counterattack included the bombing of women and children.

Apparently, a dead woman in Lebanon is not worth as much as a dead woman in Israel...

When Begin arrives at Kennedy Airport today on his way to see President Carter, he is at best a questionable talent, a killer turned bureaucrat.

On the night Begin was elected Prime Minister of Israel, there was such unanimous concern about him in the American foreign policy establishment that I had to like him right away. And when hopes for peace in the Middle East broke out so dramatically with the visit of Egypt's Anwar Sadat to Jerusalem, Begin seemed to have an opportunity given to few men: a clean, clear shot at greatness...

So as he arrives today, Menachem Begin no longer is a hero of oppression. He appears to have lost his chance for greatness. He has become just a stubborn old bureaucrat

who has no difficulty in having expensive tools used to kill back some women and children living in huts...

The New York Times, "*The Triumph of Hate?*" by Anthony Lewis, March 20:

Prime Minister Begin comes to Washington this week with an emotional mantle of approval for his response to Palestinian terrorists...

But it does not follow that Israel was wise to occupy a big strip of southern Lebanon, or to carry out heavy bombing raids there and elsewhere. Still less does it follow that retaliation of that kind is in Israel's true long-term interest: in peace and security. I think the action, with its inevitable political and human implications, courts disaster for Israel...

Then think about the scale of this retaliation in human terms. What message does it send to those Arabs who have been coming around to the idea of peace with Israel?

At least 700 people were killed by the Israeli military operation, according to United Nations officials, and 160,000 made homeless. Is that a "justified" reprisal for 35 deaths? ... Are there true friends of Israel here — Senators Ribicoff or Moynihan or Jackson, say — who will speak the truth to Menachim Begin? Unless someone does, and persuades him, I think history will see this as a fateful moment for Israel.

Money Manager, "*News Briefs*" column, March 20:

State Department and Pentagon officials are three-quarters persuaded that the Israeli incursion into Lebanon last week was scheduled whether or not Palestinian terrorists had staged their murderous raid on Israeli civilians. So far as the State Department experts are concerned the retaliatory raid, the biggest ever, was "too pat."

Pentagon officials, more specific than their diplomatic peers, claim that an operation as large as the attack on southern Lebanon — involving the largest number of troops ever, a wide range of mechanized equipment and armament, and continuous coordinated air strikes — could not have been planned and executed in the 17 hours the Israeli leaders claim.

President Carter will probably let the issue slide when he meets this week with Prime Minister Begin since to raise it deliberately would serve only to exacerbate relations that are tenuous now at best, between Israel and the United States, and accomplish nothing that United Nations and other condemnations haven't already. But it's better than a safe bet, aides say, "the President will not forget the episode."