

Nixon Trip: Risks at Home and Abroad

By Carroll Kilpatrick
Washington Post Staff Writer

President Nixon, a man who likes what he calls "historic firsts," will chalk up two more this week: he will be the first American President to visit Israel and several Arab countries and he will be the first American President to leave the country while under an impeachment investigation.

Despite Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger's assertion that foreign policy is not conducted in relation to Watergate, they are related in the minds of the American people, in the minds of the leaders with whom the President will confer and, probably most important of all, in the mind of the President himself. Foreign policy could be his last line of defense.

Twice this month the President will try to disengage himself from the impeachment process while undertaking journeys overseas. The Middle East trip is being squeezed in before the trip to the Soviet Union later in the month for the

ostensible purpose of maintaining the momentum achieved by the Israeli-Syrian disengagement agreement.

Critics are asking, however, what is to be accomplished, why the President insists upon making two arduous and potentially dangerous trips in one month and whether he is not using foreign policy for partisan political ends.

Any foreign travel by a President involves high risks and requires extensive planning. Yet the trip to the Middle East was not an-

nounced until last Tuesday and it was not definite until the Syrian-Israeli agreement was hammered out a few days before.

The advance teams of Secret Service agents, communications experts and others that must precede a presidential visit did not leave Washington until a week ago. Normally, they would have been dispatched at least two or three weeks in advance.

When the advance teams finish their preparations in Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Syria (where the United States

has no diplomatic representation), Israel and Jordan, they probably will go directly on to the Soviet Union to prepare for the Summit conference to begin June 27 in Moscow.

After the Middle East tour, Mr. Nixon will return to the United States—for all of five or six days to rest, devote himself to other duties, and to prepare for the Soviet trip.

Official spokesmen argue that the Middle East tour can be of direct tangible benefit to the United States and that it can promote the cause of peace in an area where fighting has broken out four times since World War II.

The officials insist that since the United States at last has gained the confidence of both sides, the President should do all in his power to promote the move toward a solid agreement.

As the President said in his Annapolis speech Wednesday, the trip will afford

See NIXON, A10, Col. 1

Little Current Repeats

Little Current, which won the Preakness with a brilliant stretch drive on the rail, yesterday won the Belmont Stakes in New York with a charge through the middle for a seven-length victory. Jolly Johu was second, beating Kentucky Derby winner Cannonade in a photo finish.

Details on Page D1

NIXON, From A1

an opportunity to explore "ways in which we can continue our progress toward permanent peace in that area."

A respected Middle East expert not connected with the Nixon administration said last week that "of course, the trip is a political one, but it could be worthwhile."

This expert said that the trip will "underline the commitments" of this country in the area, which he regards as essential to a peace agreement.

He supported the President's comment in the Annapolis speech that "a positive American role was in-

dispensable to achieving a permanent settlement in the Middle East."

"The danger is that the President will act as though he has made peace in the Middle East," the expert said. "He hasn't."

In his Annapolis speech, Mr. Nixon did not claim peace, but he did say that it became clear after the October war to moderate Arab leaders and to Washington "that a positive American role was indispensable to achieving a permanent settlement in the Middle East."

The trip will reassert the "positive American role" and further commit the United States to a continuing leadership role in trying

to bring about a permanent settlement.

In the effort, the President runs political risks at home. So far, he has been able to bring about rapprochement with Arab leaders without a crisis in relations with Israel or extreme disaffection in the Jewish community in the United States.

But the danger signs are everywhere. The President's Annapolis speech declaring that "we cannot gear our foreign policy to transformation of other societies"—in other words, to requiring the Soviet Union to permit the emigration of Jews—aroused deep resentments in some parts of the country.

Kissinger's Middle East

diplomacy was criticized most of all in Israel, and Mr. Nixon could find the coolest welcome of all in Jerusalem.

Egyptian President Anwar Sadat was the chief promoter of the President's trip, and Sadat has warmly embraced the United States. He, like Soviet Communist Party leader Leonid I. Brezhnev, now is among the President's most ardent boosters and regards the impeachment drive with grave concern.

The President is assured of an enthusiastic welcome in Egypt, but the enthusiasm in Israel will be much more controlled and will put to a severe test the President's skill in diplomacy.