

## Re Fulbright on the Sinai Agreement

To the Editors: J.W. Fulbright's article "Beyond the Sinai Agreement" (*Worldview*, December, 1975) continues his astigmatic approach to the political situation in the Middle East in general and of Israel's position there in particular.

A study of American foreign policy throughout our entire history makes eminently clear that we typically act out of broad national interests. We do not act because we desire any given nation, including Israel, to survive. We may wish such a nation to survive, but we have never sacrificed strong national interests toward such a goal.

Mr. Fulbright assumes in his article that the Arab oil producers perceive Israel as their feared enemy. He seems to have forgotten that it was Egypt that has in the past threatened Kuwait, that it was Iran that threatened Iraq, that it has been Libya that has challenged various Arab regimes. While one may state that on the rhetorical level Israel is the most feared enemy of all Arab states, this is not true in geopolitical terms. Therefore, when the United States supports Israel, it does so in order to protect our interests in the Mediterranean Basin and to have Israel serve as a buffer against the aggression of some Arab nations against others. Has Mr. Fulbright forgotten that upon the establishment of the State of Israel the armies of Syria, Transjordan, and Egypt marched not in the interest of the Palestinians but in their own interests, and that as a conclusion of that war in 1948 these three nations, as well as Israel, had succeeded in dividing up Palestine?

It is intriguing that Mr. Fulbright can ignore the social, religious, and economic complexities of Lebanon when he implies that the strife in that embattled nation will be settled with peace between Israel and her neighbors.

The simplistic approach of Fulbright's comments reaches its peak when he writes "that the key to peace in the Middle East is in the internal politics of the United States." Is it possible that he doesn't know or understand the dramatic social, economic, and political problems that are not only a part of the internal situation of every Middle East state but of the varied interests among them? The reductionist approach of Mr. Fulbright, particularly coming from an individual who has held positions of such great importance in the centers of American power, is appalling.

Joseph R. Rosenbloom

Department of Classics  
Washington University  
St. Louis, Mo.

## "Thinking Canada"

To the Editors: The summer reverie of R.J. Neuhaus has produced an Excursion on Canada (*Worldview*, October, 1975). I used to be a great admirer of his writing. But that obviously was true only as long as he was writing about "them." When he writes about us, his piece strikes me as silly and unnecessarily insulting. So I take pen in hand. Does he touch a sensitive nerve, or is he just talking foolishly?

The article contains inaccuracies. Four are particularly gross.

1. There is no talk in Canada of "excluding" *Time* and *Newsweek* from magazine racks. The bill before Parliament would abolish a previous legislation that grants tax privileges to advertisements placed in the Canadian editions of *Time* and *Reader's Digest*, the only two U.S.-owned magazines that produce

(continued on p. 56)

## WORLDVIEW

### Statement of Purpose

The unique purpose of *Worldview* is to place public policies, particularly in international affairs, under close ethical scrutiny. The Council on Religion and International Affairs, which sponsors the journal, was founded in 1914 by religious and civic leaders brought together by Andrew Carnegie. It was mandated to work toward ending the barbarity of war, to encourage international cooperation, and to promote justice within all societies. The Council is independent and nonsectarian. *Worldview* is an important part of the Council's wide-ranging program in pursuit of these above goals.

*Worldview* is open to diverse viewpoints and encourages dialogue and debate on issues of public significance. It is edited in the belief that large political questions cannot be considered adequately apart from ethical reflection. The opinions expressed in *Worldview* do not necessarily reflect the positions of the Council. Through *Worldview* the Council aims to advance the national and international exchange without which our understanding will be dangerously limited.

Philip A. Johnson, *Publisher*

### Editorial Board:

Hans Morgenthau, *Chairman*  
William J. Barnds  
Eugene B. Borowitz  
Noel J. Brown  
Jorge Dominguez  
J. Bryan Hehir  
Donald F. McHenry  
Paul Ramsey  
Seymour Siegel  
Paul Sigmund  
Kenneth W. Thompson  
Howard Wriggins

