

## REAGAN'S OFFER TO ACT IN LEBANON GENERATES OPTIMISM IN ISRAEL

By David Landau

JERUSALEM, July 7 (JTA) -- The optimism generated here by President Reagan's agreement in principle to "contribute a small contingent" of American troops to assist in the withdrawal of Palestine Liberation Organization forces from west Beirut was not dissipated today by the resurfacing of obstacles still holding up a final agreement.

Israel's Cabinet held a long session in the morning and ministers emerged saying they were hopeful of a peaceable solution to the problem of the beleaguered PLO forces trapped by the Israel Defense Force in west Beirut. There was no substantive official statement issued and a top Israeli aide, Foreign Ministry Director General David Kimche, was reported to have gone to Beirut to report to U.S. envoy Philip Habib on the Israeli Cabinet stance.

As reported earlier in the week, the two obstacles that still seem to impede a settlement are: the PLO's demand that it keep a political office in Beirut, and the PLO's demand that two small Palestinian army units stay in Lebanon, in the areas under Syrian control, and withdraw only at a later stage, together with the Syrian and IDF forces.

The Prime Minister's spokesman, Uri Porat, reiterated today the Cabinet's Sunday decision rejecting both of these demands. Nevertheless observers here continue to believe that if these are the sole remaining problems to be resolved, solutions will somehow be found.

Labor Alignment leaders made it clear at a session of the Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee today that their party would not support IDF military action against west Beirut if these two PLO demands were the only remaining obstacles and the main body of the PLO agreed to leave the city without a fight.

### Ideas And Problems

One idea that has been aired during the week was for the PLO to set up its desired political office in the north Lebanon town of Tripoli, thus remaining on Lebanese soil but not in the much more sensitive spot, Beirut.

The situation of another problematic issue -- the PLO's demand for a partial IDF pullback from Beirut in the first stage -- was not known. Israel has said it will not pull back until the PLO withdrawal from Beirut has been accomplished.

Conceivably the entry of U.S. forces into west Beirut and also of French troops -- with the commitment implied U.S.-French guarantee of the PLO's exit -- would enable Israel to soften its stand on this point and agree to a partial withdrawal earlier than it otherwise intended.

Israeli officials do not conceal their reluctance to approve a direct French role in the proposed Beirut withdrawal. Jerusalem has been deeply disappointed by Paris' stand during the war in Lebanon, and its efforts to save the PLO.

But the Israeli officials recognize that the U.S. is extremely reluctant to send its troops into Beirut without a broader "multinational" framework. Since

France, with its own strong and traditional interests in Lebanon is apparently eager to play a role, Washington plans on a French battalion alongside the U.S. forces, giving the venture its "multinational" character.

Israel Radio reported after today's Cabinet meeting that the French are seeking a UN aegis for their proposed role in Beirut. This no doubt would make Israel even more dubious about the French participation.

Meanwhile, it has become clear that the exiting PLO men would head firstly to Syria -- to the port of Latakia if they are taken off by ship -- and from there would presumably spread out among the Arab states. Israeli officials note wryly that most Arab states have expressed outright reluctance to receive the ousted PLO men.

## 'MANY COMPLEX' PROBLEMS CITED BEFORE REAGAN'S OFFER TO SEND U.S. TROOPS TO BEIRUT CAN BE IMPLEMENTED

By David Friedman

WASHINGTON, July 7 (JTA) -- The Reagan Administration stressed today that "many complex" problems had to be solved in the negotiations in Lebanon before President Reagan's offer to send a contingent of United States troops into west Beirut can be carried out. (Related Story, P.2.)

But State Department spokesman Dean Fischer stressed there was no time limit on Reagan's agreement in principle to send up to 1,000 troops to help the Palestine Liberation Organization evacuate west Beirut. However, he said the U.S. wanted the negotiations to reach a successful conclusion "as soon as possible."

Fischer, at the same time, refused to comment on any aspect of the negotiations being conducted by Philip Habib, the President's special envoy in Beirut, or on PLO chief Yasir Arafat's rejection yesterday of the Reagan offer. "We are at a very delicate and sensitive stage with the parties involved and there cannot be any comments on the negotiations or on public statements by any of those involved," Fischer explained.

This is essentially what Reagan said yesterday when he revealed in a Los Angeles speech that Habib had informed him that a U.S. contribution to a multi-national peacekeeping force might be essential to securing a peaceful resolution for the beleaguered section of the Lebanese capital. However, the President said the offer was subject to a formal request from the Lebanese government, something which the State Department said today has not yet been made.

### Many Unanswered Questions

However, a State Department source said that the negotiations being conducted by Habib now revolve around the possibility of the U.S. force, probably a contingent of marines from the Sixth Fleet. But the source urged reporters not to give "undue weight" to Arafat's public rejection of the U.S. troops or to consider it a stumbling block.

The source said the negotiations going on were "much more complex" with many unanswered questions such as how the evacuation would be

carried out, where the PLO would go, and what the Israelis would do. The source stressed that all the negotiations that have been going on in Beirut have only involved west Beirut which Israel has surrounded.

The source denied that Arafat is demanding U.S. recognition of the PLO before he agrees to accept the help of American troops in evacuating. "He knows our position," the source said. Habib is not having any direct negotiations with the PLO, only through a third party. The State Department denied that if the U.S. conducts the evacuation, it would be de facto recognition of the PLO.

In another development, Fischer announced that M. Peter McPherson, Administrator for the Agency for International Development (AID) and Reagan's personal representative for disaster aid to Lebanon, and Arthur Dewey, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State in the Bureau for Refugee Programs, left last night for the Middle East and will go to Lebanon where they will assess the needs there and report back to the President. Fischer said they will meet with Lebanese government officials, representatives of the United Nations and of other international organizations, providing relief for the war-torn country.

#### REAGAN TO COMPLY WITH WAR POWERS ACT IF U.S. TROOPS ARE SENT TO LEBANON

WASHINGTON, July 7 (JTA) -- The White House said today that President Reagan would comply with the War Powers Resolution if U.S. troops are sent to Lebanon to assist in the withdrawal of Palestine Liberation Organization forces from west Beirut.

The resolution, passed by Congress in November, 1973 over President Nixon's veto, requires the President to consult with Congress before sending American military forces abroad to any area where hostilities are underway or likely to develop. It would be the legal basis for the deployment of American troops in Lebanon and the duration of their stay there.

Reagan said in Los Angeles yesterday that he had "agreed in principle to contribute a small contingent" of U.S. troops as part of a multinational force for "temporary peacekeeping" in Beirut provided agreement was reached by all parties concerned in the crisis there. The parties are Lebanon, Israel, Syria and the PLO. Reagan noted that he was responding to a request relayed to him by his special envoy for the Lebanese crisis, Philip Habib.

Habib has been in Beirut for nearly a month attempting to negotiate a settlement that would ensure the departure of the PLO from Lebanon, the withdrawal of Israeli forces and the establishment of a strong, independent Lebanese government.

Reagan, saying yesterday that "The situation is too sensitive for detailed discussion," disclosed that "This weekend in discussions with Mr. Habib, the government of Lebanon told us that a multinational force might be essential for a temporary peacekeeping in Beirut and informally proposed that the United States consider making a contribution to that force."

Reagan stressed that the Lebanese government "has not made a formal proposal but I have agreed in principle to contribute a small contingent of U.S. personnel subject to certain conditions." He did not say what those conditions are.

This morning, White House deputy press secretary Larry Speakes spelled out the War Powers Resolution which was adopted originally in reaction to the war in Viet Nam. The law states that the President "In every possible instance shall consult with Congress before introducing United States armed forces into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances."

When there is no declaration of war, the President also must send a written report to Congress within 48 hours of the dispatch of troops or after the number of troops already in a country is substantially enlarged.

The law requires the President to end the use of American forces after 60 days unless Congress has extended the period. Congress has the right, by vote of the Senate and House, to order the President to withdraw the troops if they are engaged in hostilities not related to a declaration of war or not otherwise specifically authorized by Congress.

Administration officials said today with respect to the situation in Lebanon that there would have to be a commitment from all parties to the conflict to a settlement before the President would agree to send U.S. troops to Beirut. Vice President George Bush said in San Francisco today that he did not believe American troops would be sent to Lebanon unless all parties involved agreed such a step was essential to establishing and guaranteeing peace in the area.

Speakes told reporters today that if U.S. troops were sent to Lebanon they would be equipped for combat. The last time American troops were involved in Lebanon was in 1958 when President Eisenhower ordered U.S. marines to land on the beaches near Beirut in a show of support for the government of the then President of Lebanon, Camille Chamoun. Chamoun had requested American aid against what he feared was an imminent coup masterminded by President Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt who was believed to be acting under the influence of the Soviet Union.

#### Cautious Reaction From Congress

Reagan's announcement that he had agreed in principle to send an American military contingent to Lebanon drew a mixed, largely cautionary reaction from Congress. Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker (R. Tenn.) said he wanted more details before deciding on the matter. "I have previously expressed my opposition to the use of American troops in Lebanon, and I've expressed that directly to the President," Baker said.

Sen. Charles Percy (R. Ill.) chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said "The action should not be taken unless requested by the Lebanese government with the consent of Israel and the Palestinians ... and it should be for a limited time such as 30 days." Percy added that the plan "would be considered if this is the only way" to get the PLO out of Beirut and avoid further bloodshed.

Rep. Clement Zablocki (D. Wisc.), chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee was "less than satisfied by reports that while the U.S. troops are supposed to be part of a multinational force, the other participants are not yet known." He observed: "Should this deployment take place, it is imperative that American troops not become involved in hostilities, not one American life must be lost, not one American soldier must be wounded."

Senate Minority Whip Alan Cranston (D. Calif.) acknowledged that the dispatch of U.S. forces to Lebanon would be a delicate and possibly dangerous mission but he hoped it might result in peace and

stability in the region. Cranston, a strong backer of Israel, said: "Just as we have been urging the Israelis and Arabs to take risks for peace, we too must shoulder our share of the risk."

Sen. Larry Pressler (R. S.D.) said he would support the participation of U.S. forces in Lebanon if they were part of an international force and restricted to the Beirut area. "This force should not be viewed as a substitute for United Nations forces in Lebanon," he said.

Sen. Charles Mathias (R.Md.) urged that Congress and the Administration carefully weigh the many potential dangers before making a commitment. He also said the U.S. should use the opportunity to reach a new understanding with Israel on the future use of American-supplied weapons and for greater Israeli flexibility in the autonomy negotiations.

#### MERIDOR SAYS UNITS OF U.S. SIXTH FLEET ARE ON WAY TO LEBANON

By Hugh Orgel

TEL AVIV, July 7 (JTA) -- Cabinet Minister Yaacov Meridor, who is in charge of Israeli aid to south Lebanon civilians, told an Israeli Radio press conference today units of the Sixth Fleet with American marines on board were already on their way to Lebanon and could be off the shore within two or three days.

He said one of the problems of making any arrangement with the PLO was the number of varied and opposing bodies which made up that organization, with which Israel refuses to talk. He appeared to doubt whether any hard and fast arrangement could be made with Yasser Arafat or any other PLO leader without contradiction by a rival group within the organization.

Meridor said that 331 Lebanese civilians had been killed in the fighting and the Israel Defense Force had told him that another 1,200 PLO terrorists and Palestinian civilians had been killed during stiff fighting within the refugee camps which the PLO had turned to strongpoints and fortifications.

He said the Red Cross and other international bodies now agreed with Israel's figures, based on local Lebanese sources. They could not explain their earlier for larger estimates of casualties but said the Israeli figures were "correct as of now," suggesting the earlier figures might also have been correct. But Meridor said that in conversations with their representatives they could give no explanation of the difference in the estimates.

Meridor said much of the international aid offered was not needed, as it was based on the earlier exaggerated figures. Most of the ambulances sent by Israel to aid the wounded had now been brought back to Israel, as they and the equipment and tools they carried were not required.

#### UN CHIEF SAYS ISRAEL COOPERATING TO PROVIDE AID TO CIVILIANS AFFECTED BY FIGHTING IN LEBANON

GENEVA, July 7 (JTA) -- Israel has been cooperating with UN relief agencies in ongoing discussions on how to provide aid to civilians affected by the fighting in Lebanon, United Nations Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar said today. He said he hoped that Israel would continue to cooperate with international relief agencies when it came to implementing the distribution of relief supplies.

The UN official said that contrary to reports from heads of international agencies that Israel was impeding distribution efforts, these agencies were

in fact receiving "the cooperation of all parties" in discussing relief measures. Perez de Cuellar also reported that he might meet with Palestine Liberation Organization official Farouk Kaddoumi, who is expected here tomorrow.

Perez de Cuellar said that the UN must "rethink the whole concept" of peacekeeping forces, noting that this is not the first time military forces have bypassed UN forces. But he said that Israel did not shoot at UN forces. "They tried to bypass UN forces."

#### LEBANESE ENVOY ON U.S. TROOPS

By Judith Kohn

NEW YORK, July 7 (JTA) -- Ambassador Ghassan Tuani, Lebanon's Ambassador to the United Nations, said today that a Lebanese request for the dispatch of U.S. troops to his country would come only in the context of a comprehensive plan leading to the restoration of Lebanese sovereignty.

In an interview on CBS-TV Morning News program, Tuani said his country would not accept such American intervention merely to remove the PLO forces from west Beirut, but he suggested that a multinational force sent as part of a plan to remove all foreign elements from Lebanon would be welcomed.

When President Reagan announced yesterday that he had "agreed in principle" to send U.S. forces as part of a multinational force for "temporary peacekeeping," he said the proposal would be implemented only upon request from Lebanon and would depend on further agreement between Lebanon, Israel and the Palestinian leaders.

#### MITTERRAND DECLINES TO MEET WITH A PLO OFFICIAL

By Edwin Eytan

PARIS, July 7 (JTA) -- President Francois Mitterrand turned down a request by a Palestine Liberation Organization official for an audience. The President avoided meeting with Farouk Kaddoumi, head of the PLO's political department, by claiming that he had no time because he was leaving today for Budapest.

Kaddoumi arrived here yesterday as a member of an Arab League delegation which includes the Foreign Ministers of Kuwait and Algeria. The delegation is touring the capitals of all the countries that are permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. The group is scheduled to visit London next and then possible will go to Washington.

Mitterrand's refusal to meet with Kaddoumi is not unprecedented. No PLO leader has yet been received at the Elysee Palace although PLO officials regularly confer with the Foreign Minister and other top Administration officials.

Kaddoumi met this morning with Foreign Minister Claude Cheysson to report that no decision has been taken by the PLO concerning French and American efforts to obtain its evacuation from west Beirut. Cheysson later told reporters that the PLO leadership trapped in west Beirut has apparently taken no final decision as yet.

According to reports from Beirut today, PLO leader Yasser Arafat rejected suggestions that the PLO evacuate Beirut under protection of American military forces but did not reject the involvement of U.S. troops in a multinational peacekeeping force to separate Israeli and Palestinian forces.

## BEHIND THE HEADLINES ARGENTINA AND ISRAEL

By Sheldon Kirshner

(Editor's note: Sheldon Kirshner, a reporter with the Canadian Jewish News of Toronto, visited Argentina last May before the war in the South Atlantic broke out. An earlier report by Kirshner in the May 7 Bulletin dealt with the Argentine Jewish community.)

BUENOS AIRES, July 7 (JTA) -- At the United Nations, Argentina's position on Arab-Israeli issues is practically a foregone conclusion. Studied neutrality is the driving force of Argentine foreign policy, notwithstanding its obvious Western orientation, and neither Israel nor the Arab states are particularly pleased by its stance.

Pragmatic even-handedness has been the leit-motif of Argentina's policy for many years. Membership in the non-aligned movement underlines its propensity for neutrality. In Latin America, Buenos Aires has one of the most independent foreign policies, despite the fervent anti-Communism of its leaders. And this tendency to play both sides of the fence is clearly reflected in Argentina's position vis-a-vis the Arab-Israeli conflict at the UN.

### Playing Both Sides Of The Fence

\* In 1947, Argentina abstained on the Palestine partition plan. Yet the Argentines quickly recognized Israel and opened an embassy in Tel Aviv.

\* Immediately after the Six Day War, Argentina opposed Arab and Soviet efforts to force Israel from the occupied territories. Yet the Argentines favor resolution 242, which calls for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied lands.

\* Argentina did not support Israel's annexation of the Golan Heights, but it was against a related motion endorsing voluntary sanctions against Israel.

\* Argentina, which abstained on the 1975 resolution equating Zionism with racism, does not recognize the PLO. But Argentina, one high-level Foreign Ministry spokesman told me, regards the PLO as the legitimate representative of the Palestinians. Argentina has not expressed an opinion on the merits of a Palestinian state, he said, but it thinks the Palestinians are entitled to self-determination.

### Supports Camp David Process

The Palestinian problem, he added, constitutes the core of the Arab-Israeli dispute. "If you solve it, you solve everything." He went on to say that Argentina fully supports the Camp David process as "the only game in town" at the present. He disagreed with the assessment that it is a spent force.

Asked why Argentina choose to remain in the non-aligned movement, the official replied: "We have an affinity with the problems of the less developed countries, though we're pro-Western. We're south, not north."

Juan Peron, the late President, brought Argentina into the movement after the Yom Kippur War, ostensibly to gain votes for Argentina's dispute with Britain over the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands, and to attract Arab petrodollars.

Israelis in Buenos Aires contend that Argentine membership in the movement has somewhat diminished Argentina's support of Israel at the UN. But a senior Argentine diplomat, a former Ambassador to Israel, disagreed with that notion.

As he put it: "We have maintained our balanced position toward the Middle East. Two principles guide our policy: The first is Israel's inviolate right to exist as a free and independent nation. The second is the right of the Palestinians to live in their own homeland."

Jewish community leaders here are not happy about Argentina's relationship with the non-aligned movement.

Elias Zivklich, president of B'nai B'rith, called it "an instrument of Soviet policy and penetration," and he urged Argentina to leave it. Mario Gorenstein, president of DAJA -- the representative body of Argentine Jewry -- said he doubted this would happen. Emilio Perina, a Jewish lawyer who has good contacts in government, said Argentina would retain its membership as long as its economy was in a shambles.

### Cordial Bilateral Relations

Argentine non-alignment notwithstanding, Israel and Argentina have cordial bilateral relations. Israel's main supplier of meat, Argentina also sells Israel cereal products and leather goods. Israel exports electronic and medical equipment, textiles, chemicals -- and weaponry.

Although Israeli trade with Argentina is not significant, Argentina is one of Israel's best customers for military equipment. In the late 1970s, when the U.S. imposed an arms embargo against the junta, Israel stepped in and sold the generals an estimated 26 Dagger jets (a modified version of the Mirage), four Dabur patrol boats, Gabriel ship-to-ship missiles and Shafrir air-to-air missiles.

"Argentina was looking for suppliers after President Carter slapped the embargo on us," explained a businessman well versed in the field. "Israel had always tried to penetrate the Argentine market, and the government gave it a chance." Israeli sources in Buenos Aires are loath to discuss the matter.

Apparently, Argentina is satisfied with Israeli equipment. "I've heard many officers say beautiful things about Israel," one authoritative source said. "The pilots are impressed with the Dagger, and they have admiration for Israeli flyers."

Despite such sentiment, Israel has to work hard to maintain its fairly positive image in Argentina. "There is not general or automatic approval of our policies," an Israeli source said.

### Friends And Enemies

Israel has friends in Argentina, but enemies as well. Argentina is home to one or two million Arabs, mainly of Lebanese Christian descent. And while they are not as valuably committed to the Arab cause as Jews are to Israel, they remain a potential reservoir of anti-Israel sentiment. In the armed forces, officers who received combat training in Nazi Germany are resolutely anti-Israel.

Some politicians, notably on the extreme left and right, have no love for Israel. The landed gentry, and elements within the Catholic church, generally don't like Israel. Sectors of the ethnic German community are anti-Semitic and anti-Zionist.

Argentina, which is self-sufficient in oil, has good relations with the Arab world. "We don't have a very big trade with the Arabs, but we're trying to improve it," said an Argentine diplomat. In the mid-1970s, Argentina began a drive to increase trade with the Arabs and to induce them to invest money in Argentina industry and commerce. According to an Israeli source, the drive has yet to pay dividends.