

WASHINGTON — The State Department last week sought to distance itself from an officially distributed document proposing the creation of an independent Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza.

U.S. officials were clearly embarrassed by a report in last Tuesday's *Jerusalem Post* on the detailed plan, published in the spring 1982 issue of the State Department's *Open Forum Journal*.

That publication is widely distributed throughout the State Department and its overseas posts. Its editor, Eileen Heaphy, last week pointed out that while the report on the Palestinian state was unclassified, it was supposed to have been an "inhouse publication, closely held and restricted" to officials in the department.

State Department spokesman Dean Fischer also called the report an "internal document," adding: "I think you should take my statements, hopefully, as the administration's position on that issue."

Official U.S. policy has never supported the creation of an independent Palestinian state. That's why the decision to officially circulate the alternate approach on an unclassified basis raised eyebrows among veteran diplomatic observers.

The *Open Forum Journal* was created in 1967 to bring "new or alternative foreign policy views to the secretary of state and other senior officials."

According to its charter, it also "stimulates foreign affairs professionals to think, discuss, and write on foreign policy questions, including those falling outside their assigned responsibilities."

An editorial note in the current

publication acknowledged that the proposal for a Palestinian state on the West Bank and Gaza Strip — with Jerusalem becoming the joint capital of Israel and Palestine — "goes beyond current U.S. policy. But that is the purpose of the open forum — to provide a context in which new or alternative policy options can be freely and creatively expressed."

The editorial note pointed out that more detailed versions of the papers justifying a Palestinian state "have been distributed to policymakers working on Middle East issues... The *Open Forum* hopes that the proposals of the Palestinian-Israeli working group contribute to the in-house dialogue on this crucial issue."

U.S. officials have stressed that the proposal reflects only the personal views of the authors and not the State Department.

But knowledgeable insiders acknowledged that there is widespread sympathy among State Department specialists on the Middle East for the position outlined in the *Open Forum*.

The Palestinian-Israeli working group consisted of Larry Roeder, Jr., who was born in Beirut and who currently serves in the office of East-West trade of the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs; Franklin C. Marcus, who studied at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem before joining the State Department's foreign service; Henry Sizer, who has spent most of his diplomatic career in the Arab world and is presently in the United Nations political affairs office of the Bureau of International Organization Affairs; and Melinda Kimble,

'Palestine' plan causes stir

By WOLF BLITZER
Jerusalem Post Correspondent

an economics officer whose assignments have included Cairo and who is currently the energy and technology officer in the Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs.

They concluded that the Palestinians "will be satisfied with nothing less than true independence from both Israel and Jordan for the territories occupied by Israel since 1967. Just as other 'peoples' have done before them, the Palestinians today are struggling for one thing above all else: the powerful idea of 'self-determination' or 'sovereignty'. In the 20th century, that means an independent state."

The authors of the paper said Israel's security concerns "could be met by a wide spectrum of practical arrangements which would not violate Palestinian sovereignty as long as the essential attributes of a state (territory, a flag, a government, exchanging ambassadors, etc.) were left intact."

Among these arrangements, they said, would be an Israeli right to station security forces on the West Bank "in return for the intangible but precious concession of 'sovereignty,' which the Palestinians value above all else."

Regarding the future status of Jerusalem, they insisted that the city cannot be redivided. Instead, an undivided Jerusalem should serve as a dual capital for both Israel and the new Palestinian state."

In the proposal, the authors put forward a detailed formula for joint

Israel-Palestinian administration of Jerusalem to the point of suggesting that "it may be advisable to have a city manager selected from the International Association of City Managers. Such a person, especially if neither Israeli nor Palestinian, could be more effective than an elected mayor."

It is also argued that a new Palestinian state could become moderate and pro-Western if the U.S. "should support early on" its creation.

"Its eventual emergence is nearly inevitable, given the power of the concept of national self-determination and the passionate support for such a state throughout the 'Third World,'" they said.

"If we and the Israelis continue to frustrate this tide, the result may in fact live up to our worst fears — an uncomprising, anti-American Palestine tied to the Soviets and committed to promoting terrorism in the midst of an Arab world that is increasingly leftist and bitter toward the United States.

"But if we seize the moment, we can capitalize on the evident desire of the relatively moderate Palestinians to deal with the U.S. and the obvious desire of the Saudis, Kuwaitis, Egyptians and other moderate Arabs to insure a responsible and stable Palestine."

The question of Israeli settlement is discussed.

"To encourage Israeli acceptance of the peace agreement and to provide another measure of security for Israel, the Palestinians should allow Jewish settlers to remain on the West Bank. All settlers would be guaranteed internationally

recognized human rights, including the right to travel anywhere in Palestine and the right to travel to and from Israel.

"Such an initiative on the part of the Palestinians would be an extraordinary show of good faith to the Israelis and thus would make Israeli acceptance of the treaty of peace easier. It would also provide an excellent means for Israeli intelligence within the Palestinian state. The settlements would be allowed only defensive weapons, such as rifles and machine-guns."

The proposal continued: "In recognition of the unique character of the Jewish settlements, the Palestinian constitution would allow issues of family status, religious affairs, or family disputes to be adjudicated by the appropriate religious courts. However, as residents of Palestine, the settlers would be expected to obey Palestinian civil and criminal law in all other matters."

The authors of the paper say that if a Palestinian state brought peace to the region, "the Western donor community and the Gulf Arab states would have great incentive to provide the necessary capital" to maintain its viability.

Israel itself, they added, would benefit economically because the need to maintain "massive military expenditures... would decline." In addition, they said, Israel would no longer be burdened with the cost of administering the West Bank and Gaza.

"In sum," it concluded, "establishing a Palestinian state makes the soundest economic sense for all the parties involved. Only with peace can Palestine, Israel and the rest of the region maximize their economic potential. Peace and statehood are essential elements of prosperity."

Voters drift to the right

By MARK SEGAL
Eighty per cent of the voters still prefer the two big blocs.

78% דתן ארץ ישראל
全地にイスラエルの火を!
JERUSALEM POST
MARCH 12-19