

This unofficial public service transcript was prepared while the live program was in progress. "The Advocates" is not responsible for errors of omission or commission.

THE ADVOCATES

7:00 - 8:00 PM, PDT

June 14, 1970

Topic: "The Middle-East: Where Do We Go From Here?"  
Part I: The Case Against U.S. Support For Israel

Participants:

Advocate Roger Fisher (against support)

Dr. George Habash, leader of Popular Front for  
the Liberation of Palestine

President Nasser of Egypt

Abu Omar, code name for Al Fatah leader (live)

King Hussein, Jordan, President of U.A.R.

Arnaud De Borchgrave, senior editor, Newsweek

Advocate Alan Dershowitz (for support)

Abu Omar (live)

Abba Eban, Israeli Foreign Minister

Golda Meir, Prime Minister of Israel

Maj. Gen. Y. Harkabi (Ret.) former Chief of  
Intelligence, Israeli Defense Forces (live)

Gen. Yitzhak Rabin, Israeli Ambassador to the U.S.

Filmed Statement of May 24th Guest

Honorable Kevin White announcing his decision on  
the proposal: "Should your city provide methadone  
to heroin addicts?"

Moderator:

Victor Palmieri

Origination:

Los Angeles, KCET

"The Advocates" is a public television network presentation of KCET, Los Angeles and WGBH, Boston made possible by grants from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the Ford Foundation.

ANNOUNCER: Tonight from Los Angeles, live, coast-to-coast, "The Advocates." Roger Fisher; guest advocate, Alan Dershowitz and the moderator, Victor Palmieri.

VICTOR PALMIERI: Good evening. Every Sunday at this time "The Advocates" looks at an important public problem. Tonight the problem is the Middle East. The practical choice is this: "Should the United States give less or more military support to the state of Israel?" Advocate Roger Fisher, our executive editor and a professor of law at the Harvard Law School, says the United States should give less military support to Israel.

ROGER FISHER: For the United States to send bombers now to Israel would be putting a match to the explosive Middle East. We should try to settle this war, not take sides. We should withhold our military support as leverage to persuade Israel to use political means, not war. To help you understand that Israel is not the only one that feels threatened in the Middle East, we went there to bring you these witnesses: Arnaud De Borchegra~~e~~, Middle East expert of Newsweek magazine; George Habash, leader of the Palestine guerilla group that this week held Americans hostage in Amman; King Hussein of the strife-torn kingdom of Jordan; President Nasser~~e~~ of the United Arab Republic, and here in the studio the first official representative of Al Fatah to come to this country, Abu Omar.

PALMIERI: Our guest advocate Alan Dershowitz is also a professor of law at the Harvard Law School -- a great many people are these days -- and a member of the national board of the American Civil Liberties Union. He says the United States should give more military support to the state of Israel.

ALAN DERSHOWITZ: The United States should supply more military supports to Israel, a country that merely wants to live in peace. The Arab belligerents, armed to the teeth by Soviet weapons and now even pilots are determined to destroy Israel as soon as they are strong enough to do so. They reject the UN cease-fire which Israel accepts. The interests of world peace and of the United States are best served by keeping the peace-seeking country -- Israel -- strong enough to discourage miscalculations by those who want war. The United States now to impose a one-sided arms embargo against Israel would be for it to take sides against a small democracy threatened by external force.

Next week you will see a filmed interview with Prime Minister Golda Meir of Israel and Foreign Minister Abba Eban. With us in the studio will be Israel's leading expert on the Arab ideology, Gen. Harkabi, chief -- former chief -- of Israel's military intelligence and now a professor at Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

PALMIERI: Thank you, Mr. Dershowitz. Well, the conflict in the Middle East is the produce of a very complicated past.

FILM: VOICE: The Holy Land -- for thousands of years the home of both Arabs and Jews. When the Turkish Ottoman Empire dissolved after World War I, Palestine comes under British rule as a mandate of the League of Nations. Britain declares it looks with favor upon the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. As Jewish immigration increases, the Arabs in Palestine feel increasingly threatened.

1939. World War II brings Hitler's vicious campaign of genocide. Six million Jews are murdered. For most Jews fleeing Europe, there is no refuge except Palestine. But as immigration increases so does political friction with the Arabs and with the British over immigration controls.

## MIDDLE EAST/2

1947. The British turn the problem over to the newly formed United Nations. The UN over Arab protests decides to partition Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states with Jerusalem as an international city.

May 14, 1948. Israel proclaims its independence within the partitioned boundaries. In a matter of hours it is attacked by Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria. The Israeli's defeat the Arab forces. More than half a million Arab Palestinians leave their homes, most settle in refugee camps in Jordan and in the Gaza Strip. Jordan takes over the heart of what was to have been the Arab Palestinian state, an area known as the West Bank.

1949. Under the auspices of the UN, an armistice is signed. Israel winds up with one-third more of Palestine than it was given under the partition plan. Contrary to agreement, Jordan occupies parts of Jerusalem denying Jews access to their Holy places.

1956. President Nasser of Egypt nationalizes the Suez Canal blocking Israel's shipping through the canal and the Gulf of Aqaba. Israel with British and French support launches a surprise attack sweeping across the Sinai Peninsula to the canal and the Gulf. After a truce Israel is persuaded to withdraw from the Sinai under assurances that she will have access to the Suez and the Gulf of Aqaba, and that a UN peace-keeping force will be moved into the Sinai.

May, 1967. As Arab terrorist activities from Syria become more vicious, Israel threatens drastic reprisals. Egypt mobilizes troops in the Sinai. Nasser orders the UN peace-keeping force out and once again moves to block Israel's shipping.

June 5, 1967. Diplomacy fails to open the Gulf of Aqaba. Israel again strikes at Egypt in the Sinai. Jordan and Syria attack Israel. In a 6-day war, Israel defeats all Arab forces. Israel occupies the Sinai, the Gaza Strip, Syria's Golan Heights, all of Jordan's West Bank and all of Jerusalem.

MIDDLE EAST, PART I/3

November 22, 1967. The UN Security Council unanimously adopts a resolution setting out the following principles for peace in the Middle East: Israeli withdrawal from territories occupied by the Six-Day-War; recognition of the right of all states to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries; a just settlement of the refugee problem, and freedom of navigation through international waters.

For three years no mutually acceptable method is found to implement this resolution. And while the states of Egypt, Jordan and Israel all say they accept the Security Council's Resolution, the organized Palestinian refugees say they do not. Palestinian guerilla groups launch terrorist attacks. The Israelis counter with military force against guerilla strongholds in Jordan and Lebanon. On the western front, Egypt and Israel exchange heavy artillery fire across the still blocked Suez Canal. With increasing Soviet support of Egyptian air defense, Israel's Foreign Minister calls on the United States for more jets. (END OF FILM)

PALMIERI: "The Advocates" and their teams spent almost a month in the Middle East preparing for this program. They left Amman, Jordan only days before the current outbreak of fighting between Jordanian troops and the Arab commandos. Now, let's begin. Mr. Fisher, will you proceed?

ROGER FISHER: The case I want to put to you tonight is the United States should give less military support to Israel. As I put this case, I ask your tolerance. I ask you to listen to what I'm saying with an open mind. Many Americans, particularly American Jews, naturally feel a deep, emotional commitment to Israel and the defense of that place. In this state of mind you're likely to hear criticism of present policies of Israel as justification of all past Arab actions. The American Friends Service Committee has just produced a report on the Middle East. I agree with two phrases particularly: "There is blame enough for all," and "There are no devils and no angels in the Middle East."

The real question is not the past but where do we go from here. During this hour I will present four things which Israel ought to do and which I believe the United States ought to urge Israel to do and use such military leverage as we have in that direction.

With respect to the Palestinian refugees, Israel should begin admitting them to the West Bank and to Israel itself. With respect to the neighboring Arab states, Israel should make a firm commitment of its willingness to withdraw its forces as part of a package settlement. With respect to military matters, Israel should abandon the policy of escalatory retaliation -- two eyes for an eye. With respect to negotiations, Israel should be prepared to sit down with indirect talks, not insisting that the first talks be face-to-face.

The first point is with respect to the Palestinians. Let's go to the map and look at the Middle East. For hundreds of years Palestinians lived in this area of Palestine. For a quarter of a century before Israel was formed, the mandate of Palestine included Israel, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Today there are 2.4 million Palestinians -- people who claim that as their home. 400,000 are in Israel itself; 600,000 are in the West Bank now under Israeli military occupation; 350,000 are packed into the Gaza Strip here on the Mediterranean; about a million are outside of whom 700,000 are in Jordan. We went to Jordan to get a better idea of what is happening among the Palestinian people.

MIDDLE EAST, PART I/ 4

FILM: VOICE: This is a refugee camp in Jordan (sounds of wind blowing). Camps like this have existed for 20 years since the war first drove Palestinians from their homes. For 20 years these camps have limped along as charity as a temporary solution. The people subsist in part on a ten-cent a day allowance from the United Nations. From the beginning, the United Nations has recognized the right of the refugee to return home or to be compensated for their losses. But after 20 years, neither has happened. A whole new generation has been born in the limbo of these camps. They have learned about Palestine from their parents. As they have come of age, they have joined the struggle to return to their homeland.

We talked to a woman whose son was killed a few days before in a guerilla raid across the Jordan River.

INTERPRETER: I asked her what she would like to say to the American people. She said she wants to say that the Israelis expelled us from our homeland and American supplies Israel with arms and weapons.

VOICE: What would she like America to do?

INTERPRETER: (Question asked and woman's response.) She said to do something good rather than evil. I said, what for example, what could be something good? She said to stop supplying Israel with arms to kill our children.

VOICE: Many organizations work for liberation. The Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine is led by George Habash.

DR. GEORGE HABASH: Well, let me be frank. The Americans do not know the facts about the Palestinian problem and about the Middle East. And they should actually try hard to know the scientific facts about our problem. All the American people -- especially before a few years -- were actually looking at the Palestinian problem from one window only, from the Zionist window. Do you Americans know, for example, that before 30 years we were living -- we Palestinians -- were living in Palestine, as you are living in America, as Syrians are living in Syria, as any other people living in his own country? This was actually the fact in Palestine. And, after that, as I have established, our people out of their country living in tents for 20 years. Nobody in the world stood with them. Do you know these facts?

VOICE: Isn't there a danger that children who never knew your homeland will lose interest in the struggle?

HABASH: No because these new children are also living in tents. And therefore they will not forget their country. Not only this, Israel actually is consisting a continuous danger to all the other worlds. It's a foreign state, aggressive state. Everybody here feels this. We feel it daily. No matter what you hear in America, no matter what you read in your magazines, our people here daily feel the aggressiveness of Israel -- during air raids, during aggression, during their being in tents. Therefore nobody here will forget what Israel means, and what it's existence means.

MID EAST PART I/ 5

VOICE: This year what is celebrated is independence day in Israel. The Palestinians here in Jordan celebrated with a massive armed demonstration for national liberation.  
(Voice in background giving speech)

Militant organizations are growing. The biggest is a commando group -- Al Fatah -- which Palestinians are volunteering more rapidly than they can be trained or armed.  
(Voices clapping and chanting)

There are twice as many Palestinians as Jordanians living in Jordan. Although only a small number of Palestinians are active guerillas, the guerilla is a soldier-hero of all Palestinians. Denied repatriation, denied compensation, denied equality in the land of their birth, the Palestinians are taking justice into their own hands.  
(END OF FILM)

FISHER: While in Amman we met one of the active full-time leaders of Al Fatah. To join us tonight we have brought from Jordan, the first representative of Al Fatah to come officially to this country, Abu Omar.

PALMIERI: Abu Omar, welcome to "The Advocates."

FISHER: Abu Omar, where were you born?

ABU OMAR: Palestine.

FISHER: What's the background of this conflict?

ABU OMAR: The conflict is not between Israel and the Arab states as it is often depicted. It is primarily a conflict between the Zionists who have occupied Palestine, and colonized Palestine and expelled the inhabitants -- the majority of the inhabitants -- and the Palestinians people, ourselves, who reject this occupation, who reject this colonization, who reject this expulsion and are engaged in a struggle for liberation.

FISHER: How did the conflict begin?

ABU OMAR: The conflict began with the birth of Zionism as a political movement in Europe towards the end of the last century. Zionism aimed at making of Arab Palestine a Jewish state. The only problem with that was that Palestine -- even as late as 1917 -- had more than 90 per cent who are not Jews, but Christians and Moslems. Therefore, the Zionists could make -- try to change the democracy only by allying themselves with the British who controlled Palestine after the First World War. Only through that alliance, they were able to colonize Palestine. By the time British colonial rule ended in Palestine in 1948, the minority of less than 10 per cent of Jews had increased about 30 per cent and the Zionists were able to occupy the majority of Palestine and to expel the Moslem and the Christian inhabitants from the territory that they occupied.

FISHER: During the War of 1948, how many Palestinians fled the war?

ABU OMAR: There is controversy about the exact figures, the magnitude is less than a million.

FISHER: Somewhere between half a million and a million.

MID EAST PART I/6

And where did they go? Did they choose to abandon their country for good?

ABU OMAR: No, I think one doesn't have to ask when there is conflict has broken out '47 to '48, and when there is conflict, it is quite natural that people who are unarmed as the Palestinians were mostly would seek refuge in safer places.

FISHER: And again in 1967.

ABU OMAR: In 1967 the same, more of the same happened. The rest of Palestine was occupied, more refugees which all this has given an impetus to the resistance of the Palestinian people.

FISHER: What is the goal of Al Fatah?

ABU OMAR: The goal of the Palestine National Liberation Movement -- Al Fatah -- is first to liberate Palestine through arms struggle and to restore the human and political rights of the Palestinian people -- our right to return to our homes and to be able to determine our own destiny. Second to create a non-sectarian democratic state in Palestine where Jews, Christians and Moslems would live as equals without a discrimination on the basis of race, color or creed.

PALMIERI: Let's hear from Mr. Dershowitz now. Your cross-examination.

ALAN DERSHOWITZ: Abu Omar, you say you want to control and determine your own destiny, but you can determine your own destiny. You can live in a Palestinian state if you want to. Isn't that true?

ABU OMAR: No. It is not true. We can only do it through our liberation struggle.

DERSHOWITZ: Why is that so? Didn't Jordan annex the Palestinian state? If not for Jordan's invasion against Israel, couldn't you have been living in Palestine today?

ABU OMAR: We are, most of the Palestinians who were thrown out of Palestine, it was occupied by the Zionists ...

DERSHOWITZ: ...thrown out into where?

ABU OMAR: ...were thrown out of Palestine...

DERSHOWITZ: ...into where?...

ABU OMAR: ... all parts of the area...

DERSHOWITZ: ...into Palestine where they could establish their own state...

ABU OMAR: ...no, in Lebanon, in Syria and in parts of Palestine that were not occupied...

DERSHOWITZ: ...could they not have all gone to Palestine which was set aside by the United Nations, established a state and lived there?

MID EAST PART I/7

ABU OMAR: Mr. Dershowitz, by shouting you do not change reality.

DERSHOWITZ: Let's hear reality.

ABU OMAR: The reality is that the Palestinians thrown out in part of Palestine might have been able to form a state in the part that was left...

DERSHOWITZ: ...why didn't they do so...

ABU OMAR: ...but that was not their intention because...

DERSHOWITZ: ...why didn't they do so?...

ABU OMAR: ...because they want to create a state in all... (many voices speaking at the same time)...

PALMIERI: Just a moment, gentlemen, just a moment. Let me ask you to proceed with Mr. Omar, Abu Omar, I should say and say it all at once, in the spirit of the program. Let's go slowly enough, let him answer so that we can hear...

ABU OMAR: I would appreciate that. I don't think noise can ...

PALMIERI: ...go right ahead, go right ahead...

ABU OMAR: ...satisfy the problem. I had, I think answered your question. We could have Palestinians, we could have lumped themselves in the part which was left to them which was less than half and created a state but Palestinians consider all Palestine their country and they want...

DERSHOWITZ: ...so what you're doing is you're fighting now, you're killing people simply to get land. You talk about liberation...

ABU OMAR: ...we are fighting, there is war. The Zionists are the ones who impose this war on us by coming and colonizing our country, by using weapons of mass destruction and to say we are...

DERSHOWITZ: ...and in 1947 they were using weapons of mass destruction?...

ABU OMAR: ...they are using weapons of this mass destruction now and before...

DERSHOWITZ: ...they used the United Nations, is that a weapon of mass destruction?

ABU OMAR: ...they had not used the United Nations...

DERSHOWITZ: ...the United Nations established the state of Israel, did it not?...

ABU OMAR: ...the United Nations has made a number of resolutions, most of which have been gathering dust on the shelves of the UN. The only reasons that the Zionists are occupying the nation of Palestine is because they won in a fight, not because the United Nations...

DERSHOWITZ: ...who started the fight in 1948?...

ABU OMAR: ...has decided. The fight began with the Zionists who insisted on coming under the imperialist guise umbrella into Palestine, colonizing Palestine, arming themselves and fighting and expelling the native population of Christians and Moslems so they could have this racist, exclusive Jewish state in part of our country.

MID EAST PART I/8

DERSHOWITZ: And you want to have a state that is not racist and exclusive. You want to have ...

ABU OMAR: ...I want to have a state for all those who want to live in Palestine, the Palestinians without any discrimination on the basis of who their mother was, whether she was Jewish or not ...

DERSHOWITZ: ...could every ...

ABU OMAR: ... as you could as a Jew have a right to go to Palestine and live there, not only you have the right, but you are begged to go there from America because you're ethnologically advanced and soon while the Palestinian people -- whether they happen to be Christians or Moslems -- are not allowed to go back to their own country to their own homes, to their own farms, to their own villages.

DERSHOWITZ: Of course they are allowed. Many -- as you'll see next week in our show -- many Moslems and many Christians have been admitted to Israel ...

ABU OMAR: ...there have been 50,000 out of a million and a half that are not. 50,000 is not many.

DERSHOWITZ: Could I live in an Arab state today? I mean live, not be changed in a public spectacle in Bagdad.

ABU OMAR: There are immigration laws which if you want to come and live in our country you would have to apply, immigration laws ...

DERSHOWITZ: ...immigration laws? They wouldn't even let me in to visit to interview King Hussein or Nasser...

ABU OMAR: ...we would be glad to allow you to come and visit at an area that's under control any time that you would like ...

PALMIERI: ... let me ask you a question ...

ABU OMAR: ... in fact I have had many people who have come to visit with us and who support our movement who are of the Jewish faith and have not had your hang-ups.

PALMIERI: Let me interrupt to ask a question. Palestine as such was never a national state ...

ABU OMAR: ... it was a state ...

PALMIERI: ... isn't it true, it was never a Palestinian state. Why isn't it true than that is just as much a movement of the National Liberation for Israelis as it is for Palestinians?

ABU OMAR: The Palestinians have been living in Palestine since time immemorial. And they have a right like other people of the Third World to decide the political framework and system that they want to live under. This is to liberate themselves from the British who were ruling the National Liberation, there is no parallelism for people in the Ukraine, in Russia, in Poland, and Germany and France and South Africa and America to decide they want to liberate themselves by coming to occupy our country. I think there is no ...

MIDDLE EAST, PART I/10

PALMIERI: Mr. Dershowitz, will you proceed with one more question?

ABU OMAR: . . . whatsoever.

DERSHOWITZ: Jews, then, have no right whatsoever to national liberation. Even if a Jewish state were to be established in a five-mile radius near Tel Aviv, you would still kill people, throw bombs and destroy airplanes.

ABU OMAR: . . . I think you have no understanding whatsoever what national liberation means. National liberation means a people exist in a society and they choose to determine the political system that they have.

DERSHOWITZ: . . . Only people can be liberated.

ABU OMAR: Not that they . . .

DERSHOWITZ: . . . Land can't be liberated . . . free can't be liberated.

ABU OMAR: Not that they can be liberated by killing from Europe and all over the world by force with the help of British colonial power to impose their existence on Palestinians and throw people who are not Jewish out.

PALMIERI: Abu Omar, next week, we're going to ask you back to continue this friendly chat. I appreciate your being here. Thank you so much. Mr. Fisher? Go right ahead.

FISHER: Palestinians cannot now go back into the West Bank, the area to which Mr. Dershowitz was requesting they go is now again barred. Some of them are there and a million cannot get back to there. While Palestinians become more desperate and violent, the states involved have become more reconciled to the existence of Israel. Egypt and Jordan have accepted the Security Council Resolution we heard discussed. That Resolution in addition to requiring justice be done to the refugees, calls for withdrawal of Israeli forces from territories occupied in 1967, acknowledge the right of all states to live in peace behind secure and recognized boundaries and guaranteed freedom of navigation for Israel through the Suez and the Strait of Teheran. That has been accepted. The United States is committed to supporting it and has called for withdrawal. I'm not suggesting that Israel withdraw first, but that it commit itself to withdrawal and work out a package. That's the commitment that both Nasser and King Hussein have made. Israel can have peace with her neighbors or conquered territory. They cannot expect to have both. King Hussein and President Nasser are now prepared to take a reasonable approach. Let us hear what King Hussein thinks stands between his people and peace.

FISHER: FILM: Let me start with the intergovernmental problem. What do you want the United States to do in the Middle East?

KING HUSSEIN: What we have wanted most throughout this very difficult period -- affecting not only the area and its people but the world as a whole -- all we have wanted was that the United States should live up to its pronounced policy, announced policy of even-handedness. Nothing more than that and certainly nothing less.

FISHER: You want the United States now to cut off aid to Israel?

HUSSEIN: I believe that the United States can certainly help to a very large extent -- moreso than any other power in this world -- to bring about a just and honorable and lasting peace to this area and to its people. I think the United States ought to do everything it can to achieve that end. And if it means pressuring Israel, certainly.

FISHER: You mean we should stop giving them Phantoms at the present time.

HUSSEIN: Well, if they are defying the Security Council and its Resolution of the 22, November, 1967, and the principles that Resolution contains, and the worlds wish that peace be established on the basis of justice. If they continue to occupy the territory they have occupied since June of 1967; if they continue to attack the Arab homeland giving them more Phantoms certainly it's not going to help the move towards resolution at all and, in fact, is encouraging the further deterioration of the situation towards a climax that could jeopardize world peace. (Music and singing)

FISHER: This was the city of Suez. Despite the cease-fire three years ago Israel has bombed and shelled the city almost daily and the sounds you hear in the background are American-made planes attacking again while I was there. Homes, schools, hospitals, mosques, churches -- nothing has been spared. 250,000 people have had to be evacuated. To date 434 civilians -- men, women and children -- have been killed here and over 1500 wounded. Now, soldiers remain firing back across the Canal and defending the road to Cairo.

In the rest of Egypt, the ancient patterns of life repeat. Industrialization had come slowly, but the Egyptians are proud of the progress they have made. Denied aid by the United States, Egypt was forced to turn to the Soviet Union and Soviet influence is growing. Continued war with Israel and a fast increase in population have stunted planned economic growth. A social revolution has been achieved throughout Egypt but even in Cairo where the struggle to catch up with the 20th century is most nearly successful, the economic revolution remaind only half delivered. This is the reality that confronts the most important leader in the Arab world -- Egypt's President Nasser.

FISHER: Well, Mr. President, I want to thank you for giving us this chance to discuss your position. Despite everything you've said there are still many Americans who do not understand clearly your views. On May 1st you made an appeal to President Nixon. Will you like to tell the American people just what you want President Nixon to do?

PRESIDENT NASSER: Well, mainly the appeal to President Nixon was directed for the implementation of the Security Council Resolution of November, 1967. From our point of view, a big part of the Arab territories either in Egypt or Jordan or Syria -- these parts were occupied by the Israeli forces. So our objective is the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the occupied territory. The second question, the second main point for the Arabs is the rights of the Arabs of Palestine, the rights of the refugees who were deprived of their country, of their land, of everything, in their homeland and then their land.

FISHER: But what do you want Preisent Nixon to do? What should he do? Should he ...

NASSER: ...we agreed about arrangements for peace -- all arrangements for peace which were included in the Security Council we agreed about. There was no agreement from Israel in principle about the word "withdrawal" from the Arab occupied territories. So we are sure that Israel doesn't want peace but wants exparsions. So we want President Nixon to use his influence with Israel and get from them a promise or a word that they are ready to withdraw from all the occupied territories and they are ready to solve the problem of the refugees according to the United Nations resolution.

FISHER: Many Americans are still uncertain on your position toward Israel. Do you unequivocally accept the existence of the state of Israel?

NASSER: Well, according to the United Nations resolution -- we agreed about this resolution -- we accepted the right of each country to live, including Israel, but when they speak about recognized and secure boundaries this is the big question. What are the recognized and secure boundaries?

FISHER: We'll come to boundaries in a minute. But do you, in accepting the resolution, you're now prepared to accept the existence of the state of Israel as a state entitled to live under some boundary?

NASSER: Yes, but ...

FISHER: ...now we'll come to the ...

NASSER: ... under two conditions. I want, because if I say that I accept the state of Israel while they occupy our territory really I will be encouraging the Israel for expansion.

FISHER: No, but will you accept the demarcation lines as of June 1st or June 4th 1967...

NASSER: ...yes...

FISHER: ...as final boundaries?

NASSER: Yes.

FISHER: These temporary armistice lines as of June 4th, I guess, 1967 you are now prepared to accept those boundaries as final boundary line of Israel?

NASSER: Yes.

FISHER: Israel as a state inside those boundary lines.

NASSER: Yes, but is Israel ready to accept these boundaries ad demarcation lines?

FISHER: I do not know and I will ask those questions when I get a chance. From your statements I take it that your position has changed from 1966 to today. Is that correct?

NASSER: Well, of course, there was confusion. We're always stressing about the rights of the peoples of Palestine. So now if the withdrawal will insure the rights of the people of palestine are fulfilled it would be a different situation.

FISHER: Let's turn to the question of talks. You objected to bilateral talks between the UAR and Israel. Why?

NASSER: Because they occupy 20 per cent of our territory, of our country.

FISHER: But might not talks be the way to deal with that problem?

NASSER: Well, if I go and sit on the table it would be a table of capitulation.

FISHER: Well, you do not want to sit in two party talks with Israel.

NASSER: Yes.

FISHER: Now you do meet in the Security Council with Israel. You do not object to the Security Council discussing this question.

NASSER: No, we don't object.

FISHER: What one step could Israel take that would be the best step forward toward peace in the Middle East?

NASSER: To agree about the implementation of the Security Council Resolution and to declare that they are not willing to expand and they are willing to, they are ready, to withdraw from all occupied territory as long as there is peace arrangements.

FISHER: You do not ask them to withdraw first?

NASSER: No, no. There must be a package deal about everything.

FISHER: A package deal and you want them to promise now to work out that package deal.

NASSER: Yes, because if they agree, this means a promise but was said last week by Mrs. Meir, Prime Minister of Israel, that they are not ready to mention the word "withdrawal" at all.

FISHER: If Israel promised to accept the Security Resolution and to withdraw within one year to work out the package deal, would you accept a cease-fire for one year?

NASSER: I think one year is a very long time, because if we have to make arrangements for...

FISHER: ...six months?...

NASSER: I'll be ready to accept.

FISHER: A six month cease-fire if, to work out the package deal if they would accept an agreement to the resolution.

NASSER: Well, I'll be ready to accept but I think it needs less than six months.

FISHER: Once Israeli forces have withdrawn to those boundary lines, would you be willing to see to it that no Egyptian territory was used as a basis for armed attacks by anybody against Israel?

NASSER: Yes. Yes, this really is clear in the Security Council Resolution.

FISHER: Once Israel withdraws, Egypt will promise that its territory will not be used by anybody for attacks on Israel.

NASSER: Yes. (END OF FILM)

PALMIERI: Well, Mr. Dershowitz, we can't offer you President Nasser for cross-examination, but I'll give you Mr. Fisher.

DERSHOWITZ: Mr. Fisher, aren't you aware that President Nasser and King Hussein speak in one language to their people and say one thing and speak very differently to the American public as they've been doing for years? For example, as recently as March 27, 1969, Nasser reiterated the Khartoum Resolution. We have declared our principles. No negotiations, no peace, no relinquishing of one inch of Arab land and no bargaining over Palestinian rights. These are our principles. We shall never give them up.

MIDDLE EAST PART I/15

HUSSEIN: "Kill the Jews wherever you find them. Kill them with your hands, with your nails with your teeth.

FISHER: I am aware that inconsistent statements were made by both governments -- that's a loaded question, Mr. Dershowitz. Are you aware of the fact that the government of Israel last year said, "Israel accepts the resolution." Are you aware that on the 4th of June of this year, La Mond quoting General Dayan speaking to Israelis at home in Israel sayd, "I hereby declare in the name of the government that there exists no decision of the government which considers the resolution of the 22 November as a basis for talks with the Arabs."

Now, the ability of both governments to talk war and to talk peace is quite important and I'm not defending everything that's been said by the Arabs. I'm saying you heard him there say, I commit myself to implement the Resolution if Israel will commit itself, implement the resolution, he'll accept a six-month cease-fire to try to work out the package deal. Instead we're greeted by bombs.

DERSHOWITZ: Speaking about the cease-fire, is it not perfectly clear to you that all the fighting between Egypt and Israel will stop if the Egyptians comply with the cease-fire that Israel has repeatedly indicated a willingness to comply with the cease fire?

FISHER: Sure, Israel has gone here and taken over the West Bank, all of Sinai, the Golan Heights and sit for three years and we'll take a cease-fire.

DERSHOWITZ: But Israel will take the cease-fire. How then can you explain your use of the following language in the film: despite the cease-fire three years ago, Israel has bombed and shelled the city almost daily. Now soldiers remain fighting back in fact across the canal -- Egyptian soldiers -- and defending the road to Cairo when it is clear to you that the fighting can stop -- forget about the territories they can be negotiated -- but the fighting can stop if Nasser simply says, yes, I accept the cease-fire.

THE MIDDLE EAST, PART I/16

FISHER: President Nasser's accepted the resolution. For three years -- two and half years -- he's accepted the resolution. Israel has insisted on territory and peace. They've insisted on keeping the territory and saying, we're going to sit on it indefinitely and we want peace. They cannot expect both.

PALMIERI: Let me ask a question...

FISHER: ... I believe they must take peace or the occupied territory.

PALMIERI: Mr. Fisher, if Egypt loses she survives. If Israel loses she is destroyed. Wouldn't it be an unreasonable first step for the Arabs to pledge control over the Palestinian commando terrorist acts and then seek the pledge that you assert from Israel, pledge of withdrawal?

FISHER: I believe not. I believe that to have a million people being deprived of their country for 20 years and expect President Nasser not only to accept occupation of 20 per cent of his country but to accept the exclusion of them from the places they were born while Jews are being invited in and then without a single commitment from Israel, a firm commitment, that they will try to work out withdrawal.

DERSHOWITZ: You really do then justify Egypt's use of force to break the cease-fire to try to recapture the territories to try to get Israel to move away from the cease-fire...

FISHER: I understand how Egyptian patience tried for three years ... What I'm criticizing ...

DERSHOWITZ: ...Patience? If they don't just sit down and negotiate, how do you justify the refusal to walk into the same room and say hello to Israel and negotiate and work this thing out.

FISHER: Because they...

PALMIERI: ... let's proceed with your case, Mr. Fisher. Let's answer this and turn to the case you've prepared.

FISHER: In terms of the military situation the war is escalating. Israel is bombing 10 times over for every shot that is fired. During the first ten days of this June Israel dropped more tons of explosives on Egypt than all the combatants used in the June War of 1967. That is not a policy we should support with more bombers, heavy bomber aircraft. To discuss the dangerous military situation is Arnaud de Borchgrave of Newsweek and again President Nasser.

Film: ARNAUD DE BORCHEGRAVE: Well, to understand the present balance of power, I think is for us to go back to what the balance of power was immediately prior to the Six-Day War in 1967. And in those days there was no question the balance of power was in favor of the Arab countries -- the Arab armies and air forces. They had the numerical superiority and this was one reason why the Israelis decided to launch their preemptive strike on June 5th, 1967. But since then the situation has changed completely. And today, there is no real balance of power in this part of the world because Israel enjoys unchallenged supremacy especially where it counts -- in the air. And this is one reason why we now see a much deeper Soviet involvement in Egypt in terms of taking on the commitment of defending Egyptian skies which is the most recent and perhaps alarming development in the situation. Brought upon, I think, by the Israelis themselves. Whether they deliberately overplayed their hand or not nobody really knows but they humiliated Egypt last January and February, and indirectly their Russian friends, to such an extent that the Russians have no choice. They had to come in here and help President Nasser defend his own country. This was as a result of President Nasser's trip to Moscow last January when he demanded immediate action. The Israelis were bombing within ten miles of Cairo.

FISHER: Do you feel the United States is taking sides? Your speech criticized the United States?

NASSER: Yes, we are sure the United States is taking the side of Israel. Well, before the war we got words from the United States government that they guaranteed the integrity of all countries in this area. We were getting these guarantees from the United States government but when the Israeli forces attacked us suddenly and destroyed our air force and as a result of that we were defeated. Now we realized that Israel was able to get all the modern equipment for electronic warfare from the United States. Then after that we tried, of course, to rebuild our armed forces. But Israel received from the United States "Phantoms" and "Sky Hawks" -- airplanes. For what purpose? To attack us; to attack our cities; to kill our children and to kill our workers. Why? To impose a settlement on us.

FISHER: Let me turn to the Russians. How many Russians were here that helped build the Aswan Dam?

NASSER: About 5,000 were here.

FISHER: And where are they now?

NASSER: We have now about 70.

FISHER: . . . 70?

NASSER: . . . in Aswan and the rest left to . . .

FISHER: . . . the rest have gone back.

NASSER: Yes.

FISHER: Now how many Russians are here to help with the defense?

NASSER: Well, this is a secret. (laughter)

FISHER: It's a secret? Why?

NASSER: Because it is a military question.

FISHER: Well, about how many? Is it a big number or a small number? Is it like Aswan Dam? Is it comparable?

NASSER: Less.

FISHER: Less than there at the present time. Now, how much equipment are you receiving from the Soviet Union?

NASSER: We received equipment to rebuild our armed forces. You know we lost all.

FISHER: . . . in 1967 . . .

NASSER: . . . our equipment in '67 because of the surprise which destroyed our air force.

FISHER: But you're getting airplanes?

NASSER: I'm getting airplanes.

FISHER: Tanks?

NASSER: Tanks.

FISHER: And electronic equipment?

NASSER: Some electronic equipment, yes, but not as "Phantom" airplanes. We get MIG 21s. MIG 21 in intercept, defense airplane, but the "Phantom" is for strike. The Phantom could carry seven tons of explosives.

FISHER: And the MIG 21 is just an interceptor?

NASSER: Interceptor.

FISHER: Now, does the Russian commitment to help defend Egypt, does it extend to the Sinai?

NASSER: Well, they are not having a commitment to defend Egypt. We have the Egyptian armed forces and we have Russian advisors.

FISHER: Are you using Russian pilots?

NASSER: No, we have advisors.

FISHER: Do they fly around?

NASSER: Yes, of course. They train our people. They train our pilots and these squadrons and all over the units so they have to fly.

FISHER: I take it you really don't want to settle this problem with military means though.

NASSER: Well, of course, one doesn't go for war just for war. But there must be a just solution.

FISHER: Is there any other point you would like to make to Americans ...

NASSER: There are some things. The Americans look to me as a military man who thinks that military people like wars. And so on. Well, military men always know what happens in war so really we are for peace. We don't like to go just for war just to fight. We want to have a good relations between the United States and people in the Egyptian country. Why do we quarrel? Why do we conflict. There are no dire problems between us. People think that as it was really published in some newspapers that we wanted to kill the Jews, want to kill the Irealis, want to destroy them. All that we want is justice to the Arabs, to the Moslems, the Christians and the Jews -- the rights of the Arabs of Palestine. Rights for everybody.

FISHER: Fine, Well, I want to thank you very much for being so generous with your time and for talking with us here. Thank you.

DEBORCHEGRAVE: Where does the initiative lie for a peaceful settlement? I think by process of elimination it lies clearly in Israel today. President Nasser as long as he's constantly humiliated by the Israelis and in his present weakened condition clearly cannot afford to make any concessions. Hussein, King Hussein, of Jordan sits on a throne that is virtually paralyzed by the presence, the overbearing presence, of the Palestinian commandos who virtually run his country. The Palestinian commandos are also -- at least the Palestinian Liberation Movement -- has grown to such a point now since the six-day War that it is in a position to effectively veto any kind of peaceful settlement it does not agree with. And this is a very powerful force, I think, the most important political force in the Middle East today. You just can't ignore them in any kind of political settlement. (END OF FILM)

PALMIERI: Well, Mr. Dershowitz, I think that was a very unusual interview with President Nasser. It deserves at least two or three questions from you.

DERSHOWITZ: If Mr. De Borchgrave is correct, if the Fatah can in fact veto any peace overtures or any peace negotiations by Nasser, do you think there really is any chance for peace?

FISHER: Yes, I think there is. I think if one is betting on the odds, one says more war because both sides are talking peace and preparing for war. Israel is preparing...

DERSHOWITZ: ... If there is more chance for more war wouldn't it be suicidal for Israle to return to its pre-1967 situatiinn where almost 70 per cent of its population was exposed to shot range, cannon range, of the Arabs unless there was a negotiated peace?

MIDDLE EAST PART I/20

FISHER: No one is pressing Israel to withdraw now. They're pressing Israel to make a commitment to accept the principles unanimous Security Council Resolution, supported by the ...

DERSHOWITZ: ... suppose Israel accepts them too. You mentioned Moshe Dayan's statement, every newspaper that I saw in Israel when I was there indicated acceptance by the government of the Security Council Resolution. It was reiterated in the UN by Mr. (inaudible) recently. They do accept it. You will see next week on film.

PALMIERI: Why do you say they don't accept it?

FISHER: I say they don't accept it because the UN officials say they cannot get a commitment out of Israel that it will withdraw pursuant to that resolution. When Israel accepts it they say its an agenda for discussion. We will mention those items but with the resolution unanimously said withdraw from territories occupied in 1967, you can read every day in the paper there's a consensus in the government they will not give up and go through Jerusalem, West Bank modifications...

PALMIERI: ... Okay, next question.

DERSHOWITZ: When you hear Nasser on this filmed interview that he wants justice for the Palestinians, does he mean, do you suppose, that the Palestinians should be allowed to return so as to eliminate the Jewish state or does he have in mind Palestinians returning individually to live as Israeli citizens as a minority in Jewish state?

FISHER: The latter.

DERSHOWITZ: You think he means the latter.

FISHER: But not as a second class citizen. A minority, perhaps, or majority depending on how their rights to return come, but not to be treated by as second class citizens..

DERSHOWITZ: But Mr. Nasser repeated over and over again, if the refugees return to Israel, Israel will cease to exist. If the refugees return to Israel, they will be able to impose their will on the Jews and expel them from Palestine. He reiterated this most recently in an interview with the New York Times...

PALMEIRI: Gentlemen, aren't you proving something that we've seen in the United States, namely that national leaders stick to two constituencies? In our case Hanoi, and the American people, they say somewhat different things, or try to convey different meanings? Isn't that the problem that you're now discussing?

DERSHOWITZ: No, but Israel is an open society. It's leaders cannot speak with two tongues. It's leaders speak to the Americans and that's read in the press every day. There is no press censorship. In the Arab countries it is inherent...

FISHER: Are you questioning me?

DERSHOWITZ: ... and traditional to speak with a forked tongue.

FISHER: One reason it sounds so ambiguous what your statements because they do make different statements. I do believe that each audience has a domestic problem. I know that Golda Meir with members of her government committed publicly not to withdraw one inch, has a domestic in saying she promises to withdraw and I know that...

MIDDLE EAST PART I/21

DERSHOWITZ: ...you know the government represents one or two per cent of the population. You know the way the Israeli cabinet...

FISHER: ...and this still happens in the government...

PALMIERI: All right, let me bring this down to the question really at issue here. Isn't it a fact that the U.S. failure to respond to the Israeli request for more war planes encourages not only the Palestinian organizations but Russian participation, Mr. Fisher?

FISHER: Russian participation is limited to defense. The Russians as General Barleff himself has quoted ...

DERSHOWITZ: In other words, you don't believe Nasser. Nasser denied that it was defense. You said you think it's defense. He said it was just training, no defense.

FISHER: No, they're helping the defense as the Russians did in North Vietnam...

DERSHOWITZ: Nasser (jumble of voices)...

PALMIERI: All right, Mr. Fisher, I'm going to give you your time to wrap up your case. Can you do that?

FISHER: Thank you. Israel is asking the United States to join them in dealing with the Middle East the way the United States tried to settle Vietnam, by escalating the bombing against someone who does not yield. And, as I began, there are no devils and no angels in the Middle East. I will not defend every statement they made and I'm surprised Mr. Dershowitz sought to defend everything Israel officials have made.

There are essentially two disputes. The Palestinian one, the people who have been driven from their land, fled from their land and not allowed back. The only reason they're not allowed back today -- where their fathers and their grandfathers, where they were born -- is because they're not Jews. That offends them; they become organized. Israel alone can take the initiative to do justice to them by letting them back at least to the West Bank and letting some back into Israel, starting that process. There is some risk. The risk is less than pursuing the perusing course.

The intergovernmental dispute needs to be settled by a firm commitment from Israel that it will implement the Security Council Resolution, a firm commitment to withdraw.

I referred at the beginning of this talk to a Quaker Report, produced by the American Friends Service Committee after two years, 18 drafts and 9 people talking with all sides. There's no report with which everyone will agree. This report will certainly be criticized by Arabs and by Israeli. I have criticisms of it. Mr. Dershowitz has more extensive criticisms of it. But in my judgment it's the best document available. The American Friends Service Committee has kindly undertaken to provide free copies of this report which normally sell for 75 cents to the first 5,000 viewers of "The Advocates" who write in requesting it. I'd like to urge those of you interested in obtaining it to write, "The Advocates" Box 1970, Boston, 02134. Ask for a copy of the Quaker Report.

PALMIERI: Thank you, Mr. Fisher, I'm delighted to hear someone else give that address. I recognize the sound.

Well, Mr. Dershowitz you have an opportunity next week to present your case for increasing U.S. support to Israel. But I think our audience would be interested now in a preview of that presentation.

DERSHOWITZ: I think first that the audience -- especially the television audience -- ought to know that an Arab lobby front group has offered to pay for the mailing of the Quaker Bulletin that Mr. Fisher proposes. So when you read it, bear that in mind when you evaluate its objectivity. Mr. Fisher...

FISHER: ...Mr. Dershowitz, may I just correct the report? The report is being paid for by the American Friends Service Committee. We did not accept the offer of other groups who are pleased that neutrals discovered how wrong the set-up is...

PALMIERI: ...let me clear that up. There was an offer made and not accepted. Will you proceed, sir?

DERSHOWITZ: Right, I only mention that to indicate the offer was made so that it is evidence of what at least some people think the report and its biases are all about.

Mr. Fisher asks the United States to impose a one-sided arms embargo against Israel in order to blackmail her into accepting the Fisher formula. Now what is this formula? One, Israel must take back the 1967 refugees into the West Bank -- and it's a substantial number of the 1948 refugees -- into Israel. But when Israel issued 27,000 reentry permits to the West Bank, the majority of them went unused and as we will show next week through the words of Mr. Fisher's witness, Abu Omar, that for Israel to take in a million refugees educated in hate and terror for the last twenty years, would be like the United States to take in 80,000,000 terrorists dedicated to its overthrow by violence. Fisher asks Israel to stop its air attacks against defensive targets. If Israel is willing to stop all attacks, if only the Arabs will comply with the cease-fire. Moreover Israeli air attacks are the only effective way to defend against Egypt's superior artillery. Since Israel began responding by air, its casualties have been reduced by two-thirds and Mr. Fisher's witness -- Abu Omar -- concedes in an interview in today's New York Times that the Israeli attacks have succeeded in intensifying pressure on Hussein to control the commandos. Mr. Fisher asks Israel to promise to return territory and to begin direct negotiations. We will see next week that Israel has offered to begin direct negotiations if they will lead to peace and an agreement between parties; that Israel has no interest in territories, and that its willingness to return the territories will depend on the willingness and ability of the Arab states to make and enforce a real peace. But if Mr. Fisher's witnesses are correct it seems questionable whether the Arabs can really make peace. Mr. Omar tells us that the Al Fatah are implacably opposed to negotiations and...

PALMIERI: ...I'm going to interrupt you now...

DERSHOWITZ: ...that Fatah terrorists can veto any effective...

PALMIERI: Mr. Dershowitz, we'll hear some more next week. We'll be looking forward to it.

Ladies and gentlemen, before writing in on the question: "Should the United States give less or more military support to Israel?", we ask that you wait until you've heard next week's broadcast on Sunday, June 21st. And in the meantime if you'd like a copy of the report Mr. Fisher mentioned, or if you'd like to hear from other organizations working on this problem, or you'd like to comment on tonight's broadcast, please write, "The Advocates," Box 1970, Boston, 02134. On May 24th

"The Advocates" argued the proposal: "Should your city provide methadone to heroin addicts?" Our guest that evening was the Honorable Kevin White, the Mayor of Boston. He's considered his questions. He's now prepared to announce his decision.

FILM: KEVIN WHITE: Within the next month, the city of Boston will open two new clinics. In both, methadone treatment along with other therapy will be available. People who are knowledgeable, that is, ex-drug addicts and professionals, agree that an individual's motivation is akin to successful treatment. Simply stated, an addict must want to break his habit if he's going to be cured. The opponents of methadone treatment as they presented their arguments on "The Advocates" seemed to overlook this important point. They would offer methadone only to those persons who had failed previously in other forms of therapy. At a time of rapidly increasing drug use in every city including my own I don't think as mayor I can afford to deny any addict a reasonable chance to assist on the road to a cure. And for this reason I have decided to make methadone available to those addicts upon request.  
(END OF FILM)

PALMIERI: Well, thank you very much, Mayor White. Thanks also to our witnesses who are here tonight; to our advocates, Mr. Fisher and Mr. Dershowitz. We'll all look forward to your presentation next week when you favor increased U.S. military support of Israel and we'll have our same studio audience voting that evening. I'm Victor Palmieri. Until next Sunday evening, thank you and good night.

ANNOUNCER: "The Advocates" as a program takes no position on the issue debated tonight. We ask each advocate to present responsible arguments, not necessarily his own personal views. Our job is to help you understand both sides more clearly.

This program has been made possible by grants from the Ford Foundation and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.