

**ISRAEL NOT ENTIRELY SURPRISED  
BY REAGAN'S DECISION TO WITHDRAW  
THE MARINES FROM BEIRUT**  
By Gil Sedan

JERUSALEM, Feb. 8 (JTA) — Israel had no official reaction today to President Reagan's decision to withdraw the U.S. marines from Beirut. The Cabinet met this morning in what was described as an informal session to discuss the latest developments. It is expected to devote its next regular session on Sunday to the issue.

Reagan's move did not take the Israelis entirely by surprise. U.S. Ambassador Samuel Lewis reportedly informed Premier Yitzhak Shamir and Defense Minister Moshe Arens of the President's intentions yesterday. Reagan issued a statement in California yesterday announcing that he has ordered the 1,400 marines dug in for the last 18 months around Beirut airport, to retire to ships of the U.S. Sixth Fleet off the Lebanese coast, in a phased redeployment.

At the same time, the President authorized intensified naval and air action against Lebanese elements firing into Beirut, including those in Syrian-occupied areas of the country. Until now, U.S. naval and air power was restricted to opening fire only when American positions came under fire.

Reagan's announcement represented a major departure from the policy Administration spokesmen said only yesterday morning would undergo "no change." It is expected to hasten the withdrawal of the British, Italian and French contingents of the multinational force from Beirut.

**Mood Is Pessimistic**

While there was no official comment here today, unofficially the mood was pessimistic, especially as regards the prospects for a quick resolution of the problems in south Lebanon. These now concern Israel the most and the view here is that any settlement depends on Shiite Moslems.

The tougher the Shiite leadership stands in Beirut, the less likely it seems that the large Shiite population in south Lebanon — about 400,000 — will show the necessary flexibility to allow for a further withdrawal of Israeli forces in the area.

A scenario suggested only a few days ago had the Israel Defense Force pull back to artillery range of Israel's northern border. It would thereby end its policing role in urban centers such as Sidon and reduce the risk of casualties among Israeli soldiers which has been an almost daily occurrence.

A pullback by the IDF would be contingent on arrangements with local armed forces, mainly the Shiites, to assume responsibility for security in the south. Israel has been working toward such an arrangement in recent weeks but events of the past 24 hours may have reduced the chances for agreement.

There is mounting public and political pressure on the government to withdraw the IDF from Lebanon entirely. Minister of Science Yuval Neeman, leader of the ultra-nationalist Tehiya Party, is opposed to this. He said today that the de facto partition of Lebanon now seems inevitable and suggested that the IDF would have to stay in south Lebanon indefinitely and possibly permanently.

But former Premier Yitzhak Rabin of the Labor Party sharply criticized the government today for keeping the IDF in Lebanon. He urged a complete pullout in a matter of weeks.

Israeli sources, meanwhile, reiterated that Israel would not intervene to save the government of President Amin Gemayel. Gemayel reportedly sent an emissary to Jerusalem appealing for help. The Israelis say the U.S. has not asked Israel to take any action in Lebanon.

Chief of Staff Gen. Moshe Levy told the Knesset's Foreign Affairs and Security Committee yesterday that Shiite power in Beirut was growing stronger "from day to day" since they joined other Lebanese factions bent on the overthrow of Gemayel's regime.

**STATE DEPT. SAYS REAGAN'S ORDER  
TO MOVE MARINES OUT OF BEIRUT WAS  
NOT A PULLOUT BUT A REDEPLOYMENT**  
By David Friedman

WASHINGTON, Feb. 8 (JTA) — The State Department maintained today that President Reagan's order last night that the U.S. marines be moved from Beirut airport to ships of the U.S. Sixth Fleet offshore, was not a pullout but a redeployment aimed at strengthening U.S. participation in the multinational force.

"The objective is to make the MNF more effective," State Department deputy spokesman Alan Romberg said. He also stressed that the U.S. continues to support the government of Lebanon headed by President Amin Gemayel and believes it still can bring about a reconciliation of the various factions in that country.

Despite Romberg's statement, Reagan's surprise announcement as he began a brief vacation at his California ranch, was seen as a pullout by most members of Congress, particularly those who had been urging that he withdraw the marines from Lebanon, and including most of the candidates for the Democratic Presidential nomination who want to challenge Reagan next November.

As late as yesterday afternoon, the Administration was still maintaining that it planned to keep U.S. forces on the ground in Lebanon.

In his announcement last night, Reagan said he had asked Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger to draw up a plan for the redeployment which he said would be in stages. Romberg said today that some 500 of the 1,600 marines would be moved to the ships within a month. He said that in addition to the marines, there would still be 107 American soldiers who are training the Lebanese army as well as the marines who guard the U.S. Embassy, remaining in Beirut.

**Describes MNF As A 'Presence'**

Romberg stressed that the marines and other members of the MNF were not in Lebanon as a "fighting force". He said instead, the MNF was there as a "presence" in order to "facilitate" achieving the goals the U.S. has pursued in Lebanon.

Those goals, as have been outlined since September, 1982, when the marines took up their positions at Beirut airport, are the reconstitution of

the Lebanese government with the reconciliation of all factions and government sovereignty over all of Lebanon; the withdrawal of Israeli, Syrian and Palestine Liberation Organization forces; and the security of Israel's northern borders.

Romberg noted today that the marines at Beirut airport have not only become a "target" but have been used as an "excuse" by some groups which said they would not negotiate with the Gemayel government until the marines left Lebanon. The major demand by the Syrian-backed groups in Lebanon has been that Gemayel abrogate the May 17, 1983 withdrawal and security agreement with Israel. Romberg reiterated U.S. support for that agreement.

The State Department spokesman denied that last night's announcement was a sudden decision. Romberg said there had been an ongoing review of the situation for weeks and President Reagan decided on the redeployment last week.

The Lebanese government gave its go-ahead two days ago, according to Romberg. He maintained that all members of the MNF had been consulted although there were reports that they were surprised by the announcement. Richard Murphy, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, was in Rome yesterday and was on his way to Paris and London today.

#### Series Of Rapid-Fire Developments

In related developments, it was reported from Paris today that France is anxious to replace its MNF contingents in Beirut with a United Nations force. British government sources said in London today that Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and her senior ministers had decided yesterday to pull out the 115-man British contingent—the smallest component of the MNF—even before Reagan announced his decision. In Rome, Italy's Defense Minister Giovanni Spadolini said his country, which has 1,500 troops in the MNF, was "preparing the same measures as the U.S. and Britain."

In another development, Tass, the official Soviet news agency, announced that the Soviet Union was sending a senior member of its ruling Politburo, Geidar Aliyev, to Damascus next week on what Tass described as a "brief working visit" but gave no details.

The announcement seemed to indicate an expansion of the Soviet role in the Middle East. Moscow has consistently attacked the presence of the MNF in Beirut and has intimated that its strategy calls for the Lebanese crisis to be dealt with as part of an overall Middle East peace settlement with the participation of the major powers, including the USSR.

A United Nations spokesman said today that the UN would be willing to replace the MNF with a multinational force of its own, if the Lebanese government so requested and the Security Council approved. Soviet acquiescence would be required in the Security Council.

In his statement last night, Reagan said: "To enhance the safety of American and other MNF personnel in Lebanon, I have authorized U.S. Naval forces, under the existing mandate of the MNF, to provide naval gunfire and air support against any units firing into greater Beirut from parts of Lebanon controlled by Syria as well as against any units directly attacking American and MNF personnel and facilities."

Romberg said the U.S. policy is not to support any faction or religious group in Lebanon but to

fire back only when fired upon. He noted, however, that the U.S. now considers that any firing on Beirut endangers Americans, as it did today when the American Ambassador's residence in Beirut was shelled.

The battleship New Jersey fired its 16 inch guns today — for the first time in two months — at Syrian controlled positions from which the envoy's home was shelled. Damascus radio charged today that the shelling caused heavy casualties among civilians, including women and children and extensive damage.

Romberg noted that the U.S. has evacuated 90 American Embassy personnel and dependents from Beirut yesterday and today. There are still 196 U.S. government employes in Beirut and 1,350 private American citizens. In addition, he said, there were 900 civilians in Beirut who hold dual U.S.-Lebanese citizenship and 174 Lebanese who have resident alien status in the U.S. Romberg said there has been no general evacuation of Americans from Beirut although the State Department has issued an advisory against travelling there.

#### LABOR PARTY THINK TANK PROPOSES SOLUTIONS TO WEST BANK'S FUTURE

By Gil Sedan

JERUSALEM, Feb. 8 (JTA) — A Labor Party "think tank" has come up with far-reaching solutions to the problem of the future of the West Bank. The report, prepared by a team headed by Dr. Yair Hirschfeld, is intended to be the center of discussion on policy in the occupied territories by the Labor Party's Central Committee. It would be the first comprehensive discussion of its kind by the Labor Party since 1972, if held which is by no means sure.

The proposals outlined by Hirschfeld at a press conference yesterday seem to be a combination of long-standing Labor policy that would limit Israel's presence in the territory to areas vital to its security; autonomy for local Arabs as envisioned in the Camp David accords; and President Reagan's September 1, 1982 peace initiative calling for an ultimate association of the West Bank Palestinians with Jordan.

Hirschfeld maintained that the time is ripe now to create a new political reality in the territories before American pressure begins, "probably after the Presidential elections, or perhaps even before." He is trying to convince the Labor Party Center of the need to discuss it.

According to Hirschfeld, there is considerable support among the population in the territories for some kind of political settlement. He said the group which prepared the report talked to dozens of Israelis responsible in the past, or at present, for administration in the territories and with Palestinian leaders in the West Bank and Gaza.

As a preliminary gesture toward the population, the report recommends abolition of the Israeli civil administration and a policy which would allow maximum economic development to stop the radicalization of the local population. "We are convinced that such steps could help make King Hussein of Jordan join the peace process," Hirschfeld said.

He said negotiations with Hussein should be based on the premise that the preferred permanent solution in the territories is one in which most of the area would become part of a federation with Jordan, demilitarized and with continued Israeli control over security areas.

## ISRAEL ARMY PATROL IN THE GAZA STRIP INADVERTENTLY KILLS ISRAELI CIVILIAN AND WOUNDS ANOTHER

By Hugh Orgel

TEL AVIV, Feb. 8 (JTA) -- An Israel army patrol inadvertently killed one Israeli civilian and wounded another in the Gaza Strip today, apparently having mistaken them for terrorists. A soldier was also wounded, reportedly by a ricocheting bullet.

The shooting occurred near Beth Lahiya in the northern end of the Gaza Strip. The two civilians were inspectors of the Israel Nature Preserves Authority who were riding in a jeep carrying arms to shoot stray dogs to prevent rabies.

One inspector was killed instantly when the patrol opened fire and the other suffered a shoulder wound. It was uncertain who fired the bullet that struck the soldier. The names of the victims were not immediately released.

The army and the Nature Preserves Authority are investigating the incident to determine whether the civilians had received advance warning. The nature authority is responsible to the civilian administration in the territory and its activities are reported to the civilian government, not the military.

## FORMER CHIEF RABBI ORGANIZING A NEW POLITICAL PARTY

By Hugh Orgel

TEL AVIV, Feb. 8 (JTA) -- Rabbi Ovadia Yosef, the former Sephardic Chief Rabbi of Israel, is organizing a new political party to participate in the next Knesset elections. Aguda Israel party circles have expressed concern that the new faction may cut deeply into their own ultra-Orthodox constituency.

Yosef has accused the Aguda of failing to give Sephardim fair representation. The Aguda holds four Knesset seats and those four MKs who head its list and may be reasonably confident of re-election, are all Ashkenazim. The fifth man on the list, Rabbi Yosef Melamed, a Yemenite, was supposed to have replaced one of the other Aguda MKs in the present Knesset under a rotation agreement. But the agreement was never implemented.

Aguda does not deny that most of its constituents are Ashkenazic as are most of the members of its Council of Sages who govern the party and decide how its members vote. The Council of Sages conducts its deliberations in Yiddish, a language few Sephardim understand.

Political observers say the threat posed by Yosef's new party may be one of the reasons the Aguda opposes early elections.

## 3 CANADIAN LAWMAKERS SAY SOVIET JEWS SEEKING EMIGRATION ARE BEING USED AS 'PAWNS IN THE COLD WAR'

By Michael Solomon

MONTREAL, Feb. 8 (JTA) -- Three members of Parliament, just back from a trip to the Soviet Union, charged today that Jews seeking emigration are being used as "pawns in the cold war," that the Soviet authorities blatantly disregard international human rights agreements they have signed and foster and circulate virulent anti-Semitism in the government-controlled media.

Those conditions were reported by James Peterson, Liberal MP, Fred King, a Conservative, and Lynn McDonald, of the New Democratic Party. They were accompanied on their tour by Barbara Stern, chair-

person of the Canadian Committee for Soviet Jewry and Alan Rose, executive vice president of the Canadian Jewish Congress. While in the USSR the group met with 70 refuseniks in Moscow and Leningrad.

Peterson, who heads the Parliamentary Group on Soviet Jewry, comprising more than half the members of the federal Parliament, said he felt that Soviet Jews who want to emigrate to Israel are "being used as pawns in the cold war." King said, "We went to learn the truth and we found that the Soviets are denying Jews permission to leave in disregard of the human rights agreements the Soviet Union has signed."

## Anti-Semitic Activity Cited

McDonald said she and her colleagues heard "first hand" of the discrimination faced by Soviet Jewry. "There are posters that are very anti-Semitic and available in book stores." Peter Roberts, the Canadian Ambassador to Moscow, showed the visitors a recent article in the Communist Party newspaper Pravda charging that Zionism and fascism stem from the same roots.

Stern said he met people who have been applying for exit visas for a decade only to be repeatedly refused. Now their children are applying and constitute a second generation of refuseniks. Rose said: "It's difficult to estimate the number of refuseniks, but 20,000 would not be a great exaggeration. When the cold war is at its fiercest, the doors are hardest to open."

## KOHL AND HIS GOVERNMENT DENOUNCED BY FORMER ISRAELI ENVOY TO GERMANY

By David Kantor

BONN, Feb. 8 (JTA) -- Chancellor Helmut Kohl and his government were fiercely attacked by Israel's former Ambassador to West Germany, Asher Ben Nathan, who declared yesterday that he would resign as president of the Israel-German Friendship Association the moment the Bonn government signs an arms sales deal with Saudi Arabia.

He accused the government of hypocrisy when it justified the arms deal on strategic and political grounds. "A reference to economic interests would at least be the truth. Everybody knows how much Arab money was invested in West Germany and how much more is still expected," Ben Nathan said in an interview with Die Welt.

He took issue with the Chancellor's apparent view that the past plays no part in Germany's present or future policies and denounced him for failing to repudiate a remark by one of his spokesmen, Peter Boenisch, that "one cannot make policy with Auschwitz."

Ben Nathan also rejected the West German argument that if the U.S., Britain and France can sell arms to the Arab states, it cannot be taboo for Germany to do the same. If that is true, why doesn't Bonn offer troops to the multinational force in Lebanon, the former envoy asked.

He sharply attacked what he considers unconscionable behavior by Kohl during his recent visit to Israel. According to Ben Nathan, the Chancellor failed to praise the Camp David accords but vigorously supported the 1980 Venice declaration by the European Economic Community (EEC) heads of state which he had previously rejected when he was leader of the opposition. Kohl's statements in Jerusalem on the Arab-Israeli conflict were aimed at Arab capitals, not Israel, Ben Nathan charged.

## BEHIND THE HEADLINES RECENT TRENDS IN CANADIAN JEWRY By Arnold Ages

(Part Three Of A Three Part Series)

TORONTO, Feb. 8 (JTA) — Canadian Jewry's support for Israel has been one of the community's characteristic elements. During the 1947-48 War of Independence the number of Canadian Jews who volunteered to fight for the nascent Jewish State was higher on a percentage basis than the American contingent.

Leonard Slater, in his book, "The Pledge," and David Bercusson, in his book on the "Machal" (Mitsnadvei Hutz Le'Aretz - Israel's Foreign Volunteers), confirm that the Canadian Jewish commitment to the Zionist enterprise was expressed both in terms of the Canadian participants and the clandestine shipment of arms to Israel.

Since 1948 and up to the early 1970's Canadian Jews enjoyed a more or less uninterrupted period of support from the Canadian government. This was due in part because of the role played by two outstanding Canadians in the formative years of the United Nations.

### Role Played By The Canadians

Justice Ivan Rand was the Canadian member of the UN Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP), which brought forth the 1947 partition resolution. Rand's pro-Zionist sensitivities are said to have influenced the committee in issuing the majority decision to advocate partition.

The other great Canadian who supported Israel throughout his career was Lester Pearson. In 1956, while serving as Canada's delegate to the UN, Pearson offered the famous resolution which helped create the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF), which was interposed between Egyptian and Israeli troops. Pearson eventually won the Nobel Prize for his political work as a peacemaker.

It is instructive to note that during the ferocious debates at the UN in the wake of the Sinai campaign, Pearson was (after Abba Eban) one of the most eloquent defenders of Israel and it was he who argued against the immediate, forcible evacuation of Israeli troops from Sinai. Pearson advocated a slow withdrawal but only after the reasons which precipitated the 1956 war had been addressed by the UN.

### Shift In Canada-Israel Entente

The halcyon days of the Canada-Israel entente, however, seem to be a thing of the past. During a recent farewell interview with the media, Israel's Ambassador to Canada, Yeshiyahu Anug, parried questions about the relationship between the two states by stressing the excellent economic and trade activities existing between the two countries. Anug was reticent to deal with the following development.

Since late 1983, both Canada's Minister of External Affairs, Alan MacEachern, and Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau have been making policy statements about Canada's Mideast position which indicate a departure from traditional Canadian views on the subject. Both MacEachern and Trudeau chose to make their policy statements during trips to Arab countries, designed to strengthen Canadian ties with the latter.

The Prime Minister was particularly provocative during his sojourn in Arab capitals (He did not visit Israel during the Mideast trip). In public statements to the press, Trudeau insisted that Israel should with-

draw immediately and unilaterally from Lebanon, remove itself from Judaea and Samaria and permit the PLO to establish a state there.

An editorial writer in Vancouver's Jewish Western Bulletin (January 12) commented: "About the only thing that the Prime Minister refrained from asking Israel to do was to surrender all its currency reserves to the PLO and name Yasir Arafat B'nai B'rith's Man of the Year."

The positions taken by Trudeau and his external affairs minister will not have surprised those who have been following the conduct of the Canadian government in the last half decade during which Canada's formerly pro-Israel posture has undergone a precipitous tilt towards the Arab rejectionist states.

At the UN, Canadian representatives have on several occasions supported resolutions condemnatory of Israel. It should be noted at the same time Canada has voted against other more blatant anti-Israel resolutions, including the infamous Zionism-racism declaration.

### Strident Opposition To Israel

That sort of even-handed approach gave way to strident opposition to Israel during the 1982 invasion of Lebanon. While the American Administration was cautiously assessing all aspects of the situation, the Canadian Parliament, led by the Prime Minister, passed resolutions denouncing Israel for its incursion and demanding immediate withdrawal.

Trudeau was the first commonwealth minister to speak out against Israel. British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, having emerged shortly before from the Falkland's imbroglio, was more circumspect.

### Inflammatory Remarks By Envoy

Canadian Jews winced even more when, a short while after the Parliament's one-sided vote, Canada's Ambassador to Lebanon, Theodor Arcand (in a gesture unparalleled among ambassadorial personnel from democratic countries) publicly rebuked the Israelis for their "barbaric" invasion of Lebanon.

Arcand's intervention was widely covered by the Canadian media (although largely unreported in the U.S.), especially his sanctimonious pronouncements on the way in which the "good" Israel he had always thought of, had been transformed into this new militaristic monster.

Arcand's views could not be passed off simply as the incautious remarks of a man given to indiscretions: the Parliament in Ottawa commended Arcand on two counts: for staying behind in war-torn Beirut (when most of the other diplomats had left) and, for speaking so forthrightly about the indecency of the Israeli attack.

It is important to note that in late 1983 members of the Parliament's liberal caucus, having been apprised of the reaction of Canada's large Jewish liberal constituency, urged the Prime Minister to adopt a more judicious approach in foreign policy statements on the Mideast.

In early 1984, Canadians are talking about the prospects of an election. Whether the Conservatives under Brian Mulroney (who has advertised his warm feelings for Israel) will be able to return Canada to the status quo ante with regard to Israel is a moot point, assuming of course that his party defeats the liberals in the forthcoming vote.

No matter who wins the election, it is hardly likely that Canada will ever return to the kind of pro-Israel sentiment that was incarnated in the Pearson era.