ATLAS VEGAS	
THE INLY COLLEGE AND PO	14096
Published every Friday Price per copy 13c - Pe	r year \$7 - 2 years \$12
PHONE 87	6-1255
Editor Business Manager	Bea Tell, 876-1255 Jack Tell, 876-1255 Bea Tell, 876-1255 Helene Stadler, 384-3685
PUBLICATION N PUBLICATION N 2nd Class Postage Paid Member of Wo Member American Je	I at Las Vegas, Nevada rtd-Union Press wish Press Association wide News Service nuous Weskty Publication

U.S. Foreign Policy? It may be, as some State Department officials have claimed, that Israelis and American Jews over - reacted" to the joint statement on the Middle East issued by the United States and the Soviet Union October 1. President Carter cer-tainly sought to reassure Israel three days later when he addressed the United Nations General Assembly and declared that "the commitment of the U.S. to Israel's security is unquestionable" and pledged that the U.S. would not impose a settlement on the Mideast.

This was followed by a statement worked out during a seven hour meeting between Carter and Secretary of State Cyrus Vance and Israel Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan in which it was agreed that acceptance of the U.S. - Soviet statement was not a prerequisite for reconvening the Geneva conference.

But the Carter Administration once more demonstrated a naivete in again -- as on several past occasions -- failing to realize that certain words or the lack of words can have a dangezous effect on the Israeli public during this important time of delicate negotiations to get a Geneva conference started.

It is true that there was little new in the joint $U_{\rm s}$, - Soviet declaration but its announcement a surprise to all concerned and it was cerwas tainly a shock to Israel. The President has said before that a settlement must include Israeli tainly speaking of the "legitimate withdrawal and rights" of Palestinians was seen as going beyond all past American statements.

Behind The Scenes At The United Nations By DAVID HOROWITZ A World-Union Press Feature

State Dept.-USSR Deal UNITED NATIONS (WUP) -- Judging by the shocking Vance - Gromyko communique, there no doubt that the State Department . can be apparently without the willing approval of the President -- had made some deal with the Soviet Union, a deal which carries with it all the earmarks of appeasement.

That Jimmy Carter himself is not over-happy with the communique -- acceptable to the Arabs and Moscow since it deliberately omitted re-ferences to Resolutions 242 and 338 -- may be deduced from his General Assembly speech in which he made it a point to stress those resolutions as constituting the main basis for the re-convening of the Geneva Conference. He also insisted that "Israel must have borders that are recognized and secure" and that there could be no imposition for a settlement from the outside.

Thus, the Carter UN address, although it did not refer to "Palestinian rights," could be inter-preted as a sort of 'diplomatic renunciation' of the ambiguous Vance-Gromyko document.

But it was the lengthy meetings Moshe Dayan had with the President, during which Menachem Begin's Foreign Minister had reminded Carter of the many previous U.S. commitments and especially of his own solemn commitments -more particularly his pledge that any "Pales-tinian entity will have to be tied to Jordan, LAS VEGAS ISRAELITE



FLOODLIGHTING REVEALS THE STUNNING BEAUTY OF THE TOMB OF AVSHALOM IN JERUSALEM.

and not be independent" and not be independent" -- that cleared the air for a much - disturbed Israel and set at ease the tempers of American Jewish leaders as well - that cleared the air as a number of Senators and Congressmen who

as a number of Senators and Congressment who had voiced their strong protests. " It was this Dayan - Carter 'confrontation' on the evening of the day of the President's speech, that a U.S. - Israeli 'showdown' was averted. Mr. Dayan himself was seen leaving his late night meeting with Carter a smiling, satisfied man.

But as your correspondent stated at the outset, the Vance - Gromyko statement could not be interpreted in any other way than as a Stafe Department deal with Moscow, a sort of 'trade' on a number of global issues including disarmament. Gromyko must have told Vance, in effect; "Give us what we want on the Middle East and we'll come to terms with you on the SALT talks."

All indications point to the fact that Jimmy Carter was 'taken in' by the maneuverings of the known anti - Jewish clique within the State Department and by some of his close advisers including his National Security adviser Zbigniew Brazezinski.

The crux of the problem, of course, was and remains the question of PLO representation at Geneva and the omission of Resolution 242 and 338 in the Vance - Gromyko communique, apparently, was deliberate. It opened the door for the PLO. The Dayan - Carter talks closed this door with this joint U.S. - Israeli statement: "The U.S. and Israel agree that Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 remain the agreed basis for the resumption of the Canava

agreed basis for the resumption of the Geneva peace Conference and that all the understandings and agreements between them on this subject remain in force.

That we are correct in noting that the State Department had made a deal with the Soviets was borne out by Rita E. Hauser, a former member of the U.S. delegation to the UN in the Nikon Administration, In a N.Y. Times' article she charged that "the State Department is doing everything in its power to get the PLO to the table, in one guise or another. Almost any gesture will suffice to prove a change of heart on the part of the PLO, as far as the Administration is concerned, and once it is found to exist, Israel inevitably will be asked to alter its stand and abandon its opposition to treating the PLO at Geneva.

Miss Hauser came to the conclusion that "satisfying the PLO would promote an era of conflict and destruction, and any peace con-ference premised on that result would be a hollow achievement for President Carter."

No doubt Jimmy Carter himself is genuinely sincere in his quest for a Middle East peace. But of all leaders espousing human rights, he must surely know that the PLO represents a murderous element in the Arab world sworn to the destruction of Israel. He is not unaware of the fact that the PLO record is written in blood. In his UN speech, he must have had the PLO in mind when he declared: "Negotiations be successful if any of the parties cannot harbor the deceitful view that peace is simply

an interlude in which to prepare for war." Mr. President, there is but one way to Geneva and you yourself have defined it: "Any Palestinian entity will have to be tied to Jordan, and not be independent." 22.22

.....

"One Man Plus The Truth Constitutes A Majority

BY JACK TELL



FRIDAY, OCT. 14, 1977

(Continued from Page 1)

meeting in London between former U.S. delegate to the U.N., William Scranton, and Basil Akl, a UN delegate of the PLO. This was the first recent step to appease the Arabs because Carter has promised over and over again he would not recognize the PLO, at least until the PLO announced it would accept Israel's right to exist. Then on September 12 the State Department

blasted an unexpected announcement on the eve of the High Holy Days. The syndicated news report was: "The State Department says a lasting Middle Eastern peace will be impossible without Palestinian involvement in Arab - Israeli negotiations..." Newspapers splashed this all over their front pages claiming: U.S. SAYS PALESTINIANS MUST BE IN PEACE TALKS. Conference of Presidents of Major Ameri-

can Jewish Organizations told President Carter of "deep apprehension" of what appeared to be a weakening of our country's commitment to Israel regarding the PLO. President Carter on the same day responded by letter: "I can assure you that our position regarding the PLO is consistent with commitments previously made to the Israeli government."

There was no question, that despite Carter's reassurance, the State Department was maneuvering to undermine Israel's position and to escalate Arab power before the start of the Geneva Conference.

What the administration is doing is making the U.S. a party to a campaign of intimidation against Israel. When the State Department infers that unless Israel accepts the Palestinians (Arafat-PLO) there will be a war, it encourages the Arabs to take hostile action. It also intimates that should the Arabs be bold enough to start a war, the U.S. would be sympathetic to their right to do so.

That is all we need at this stage. A State Department playing a highly dangerous and volatile political game. The cause of peace would be served better if the U.S. made it clear that war is unacceptable, instead of making it inevitable and if it happens, even understandable.

It is the State Department that consistently introduces phrases tailored to put Israel in the role of the villian. Stories released to the American public state Israel must face "hard decisions," and must change her "hard-line" and assume a more "forthcoming" posture and be more "flexible."

If Arafat should suddenly change his position the world and the American public would believe that it was Arafat who was understanding and moderate, and Israel was the intransigent party. All because the State Department has been directing pressures against Israel, never against the Arab states or the PLO. It should have been the other way around.

Everyone reading this column should make it a personal responsibility to reverse the tide. Israel is, and always has been America's best friend. Israel is not to be sacrificed, nor pressured.

Write, call, wire the newspapers the radio and TV news desks, your congressman and senators and our President. Remind everyone about the PLO covenant to extinguish the Jewish State. Underline every expression with "No to PLO." Another Arab state so close to the heart of Israel is dangerous, a hazard, a risk, a pitfall and thrusts Mideast peace into jeopardy.

Ask anyone even only slightly familiar with the situation, if you were Israel would you accept a PLO state on your borders?

There is only one answer. The U.S. must state firmly and without qualification that the Arab nations must negotiate directly with Israel and be ready for compromise in all directions, just as Israel is ready to so comply.

Let's get it on and stop all this nonsense.

ISRAELI FOREIGN MINISTER MOSHE DAYAN STATED IN A NEWS BROADCAST OCTOBER 10, THAT ISRAEL FLATLY REFUSES TO NE-GOTIATE WITH THE PLO UNDER ANY CIR-CUMSTANCES.