

termed "too dumb."

couldn't everybody summit it up for a change someplace where the seafood was good? So it was Baltimore.

That's why I dreaded the summit. Now I have to confess. The campaign biography they published said I was from California, where I'd been a fanatic surfer with beautiful sun-bleached hair when I was young. This was not true. It was written to help Beulah win the vote of the aging Californians who, of course, have been just about the only voters left in California ever since families went out of style out there.

The truth is, I come from Baltimore. Southwest Baltimore in a neighborhood which used to be called "Pigtown." There are still people who remember me there from the days we met at the saloons while buying a bucket of beer for grandparents too stiff to get out of the house.

Speaking of a bucket of beer, that's exactly what I wished I had to dump on that cookie pusher Beulah calls a secretary of state when he said I'd have to invite Grushenka to tea in Druid Hill Park.

That's when I really blew my stack. If my old Baltimore friends saw me serving tea, they'd never stop sneering. We used to have a word for tea drinkers in my part of town, but it would be beneath the dignity of a former first gentleman to mention it.

What's worse was Grushenka being Russian, because a lot of my old friends were of Polish and Lithuanian extraction and didn't like Russians. Even a Russian like Grushenka, the perennial winner of the Women's Wear Daily award for the most beautiful expensively dressed woman ever to provide light feature copy in the continuing story of the terrifying East-West struggle.

Well, everybody knows the upshot. The papers at the time made it sound pretty sensational. I just want to get the real story on the record. I also want to answer the three question everybody has asked me since that summit.

First of all, no, Grushenka did not like baseball, even after I told her that Russians said they invented the game. "Russians could never invent anything so dull as this contest between birds and socks," she said. "It is capitalist calumny."

Second, no, Grushenka did not refuse to accompany me into a Baltimore Street club because the KGB told her a strip-tease dancer was performing inside. What they told her was that the price of beer was outrageous.

Finally, yes, Grushenka loved the crab cakes on the waterfront. "So much better than that monotonous tea, you vulgar, paunchy, capitalist hedonist," she said. "Did you know crabs were invented in Russia?" ■

Russell Baker is a Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist for the New York Times.

nation, the limited contingent dispatched to Afghanistan has not been able to crush the mujahideen.

Moscow's strategy is not aimed at winning a military victory per se but at cutting off the mujahideen from their base of support by terrorizing the Afghan people. The systematic bombardment of villages drives thousands of "internal refugees" into the cities, where presumably Soviet forces can exercise greater control over them. Concurrently, the

Orin G. Hatch is a Republican senator from Utah.

ghans in the country in 1980, an estimated 1 million have been executed or starved to death since the Soviet invasion. According to a report by Afghan Aid, a charitable organization, about half a million Afghans are in danger of starvation. Some 4 million refugees — more than one-quarter of the population — have fled to neighboring Pakistan and Iran.

But the Afghan horror story has not penetrated our consciousness. It has not entered our lives. This is the key difference between Afghanistan and Vietnam. As one recent study has stated: "Vietnam was a high-tech television war; Afghani-

efforts. The newly established Radio Free Afghanistan, which broadcasts into Afghanistan for a half an hour a day, should be upgraded and expanded. Mujahideen liaison offices should be established in cities such as New York, Paris and Tokyo to help raise money for the resistance fighters and to tell their story to the world.

Vietnam was fought in our living rooms on the evening news. Afghanistan is largely out of sight, out of mind. Soviet objectives in the region have not changed. Arrests, torture and executions continue unabated. To ignore all this is to do a grave injustice to the Afghan people. ■

constancy behind the space shield, he'd have hit the point more heavily than he did. As things now stand, whenever Gorbachev feels like doing so he can say that he devoted hours during their private talks to try to dissuade Reagan from proceeding with the Strategic Defense Initiative. But the public point is the most important: As far as the world knows, nothing of strategic importance was accomplished, and we do not know whether anything of strategic importance was even accosted. That is, if we remove from scrutiny the obvious clichés about the universal desire for peace.

One hundred years ago, meetings between chiefs of state might be justified on grounds other than those stressed today. Before the age of the telephone or of electronic pictures, those chiefs of state who were not cousins or second cousins really did not know each other. At the funeral of Queen Victoria, and again at the funeral of Edward VII, chiefs of government actually met with one another. It is in point that the First World War came only four years after the death of Edward VII, suggesting that familiarity continues to breed contempt. The First World War was an internecine quarrel between grandchildren of Queen Victoria.

But it can hardly hurt to continue to have summit conferences. There is the single weakness in them that is irremediable as the loss of virginity is irremediable: And that, of course, is the suggestion that a summit is a meeting between moral equals. Everyone stands for the Bolshevik national anthem, even as they do for "The Star-Spangled Banner." The egalitarianization of ideology that is a part of the rituals of summit diplomacy cannot ever be undone, save by war, an alternative we rule out. When Richard Nixon spent time with Mao Tse-tung, the greatest man killer since Stalin and Hitler, he was ipso facto baptized. To undo Munich, it required a declaration of war. We can in that sense never undo Geneva, Vienna, Paris and Geneva again, and it is always just a little harder, psychologically, to describe as the head of an evil empire a man with whom you have broken bread, never mind that he continues as exactly that, the head of an evil empire.

Except that the Soviet Union, by its acts, will never permit it, we could look forward to a description of the results of an East-West summit using the language of the Punch cartoon depicting the results of the summit in 1956 between Prime Minister Anthony Eden of England and President Eisenhower. They are seated on a park bench, two oldsters, one dressed in a very British tweed overcoat, the other in matronly attire. The caption: "Darling!" "Yes, darling?" "Nothing, darling. Only darling, darling!" ■

William F. Buckley Jr. is a columnist, author and editor of the National Review.

Why Reagan should visit Israel

By Mitchell Bard

I ran across an interesting fact recently while reading through some old State Department bulletins. There have only been two American presidents who have made official visits to Israel. Richard Nixon met with Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin in June 1974, and nearly five years later Jimmy Carter met with Menachem Begin to iron out the remaining difficulties holding up the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty. That's it, two presidential visits to a country that re-

that Israel does not have the same status as an ally that other U.S. friends enjoy. While Israeli leaders have not expressed any particular concern, it can't help but perpetuate a feeling of subordination. Israeli prime ministers have come here, year after year, asking, often pleading for economic and military aid much like a child pleads with a parent for a raise in allowance. It would be much better if a U.S. president were to go to Israel to offer aid and demonstrate that the relationship is indeed a reciprocal one.

The second reason why President Reagan should visit Israel is more practical. It

belligerency with Israel. Sen. Helms said he wished "that all 100 Senators would go up to the Golan Heights and see what I saw and hear what I heard."

If the president were to go to the West Bank, he might be more sympathetic to Arab complaints about Jewish settlements, especially after seeing those in large Arab population centers like Hebron, but he would also see that Jerusalem, Tel Aviv and the industrial and demographic heart of Israel are within range of missiles obtainable by the Palestine Liberation Organization.

The president might also want to travel north to the border of Lebanon and towns like Kiryat Shmona and visit a bomb shelter where the city's inhabitants were forced to live for extended periods prior to Israel's invasion of Lebanon. He could also travel south to the beautiful Red Sea and look across at the land on the other side. Perhaps, when informed that the land he was looking at is Saudi Arabia, the president might be more sympathetic to Israeli concerns about the sale of advanced weapons to the Saudis.

The president should also visit Arab lands, but they are not the subject of dispute. Moreover, with U.S. ambassadors in most of the 22 Arab countries, there is no shortage of input about Arab concerns. The primary Israeli concern, security, cannot be adequately expressed verbally. It can only be fully understood after traveling through the territories that some are anxious to have Israel give up. It may be that American proposals will not change dramatically afterwards. Conceivably, they may be less favorable to Israel, but they will undoubtedly change. Rather than blindly put forward unacceptable peace plans as Reagan did in 1982, it behooves the president to see first-hand the land and talk to the people directly affected by the dispute. Perhaps then the United States can begin to play a useful role in moving the peace process forward. ■

When you stand on the Golan Heights and look down at the farms and kibbutzim that used to be the targets of Syrian artillery, it is easier to support Israel's unwillingness to return the area to the Syrians.

ceives more U.S. aid than any other and is repeatedly said to be a U.S. ally and strategic asset.

Does it matter that Ronald Reagan and five of his seven predecessors failed to visit Israel? After all, Israeli prime ministers regularly come to Washington for meetings with the president (actually, it was over a decade before Israel's head of state paid an official visit to the president). Yes, it does matter. For two reasons: one symbolic, the other practical.

Symbolically, the unwillingness of presidents to visit Israel creates the impression

is impossible to appreciate Israeli concerns about security until you stand on the Golan Heights or travel through Judea and Samaria. No one who has gone to those places has returned without a greater understanding of the term "secure and defensible borders." Jesse Helms, never considered a supporter of Israel, recently returned from his first visit to Israel and was so impressed by what he saw that he expressed the belief that the United States should sign a formal defense treaty with Israel.

When you stand on the Golan Heights and look down at the Galilee, with its farms and kibbutzim that used to be the targets of Syrian artillery, it is far easier to support Israel's unwillingness to return the area to the Syrians who still maintain a state of

Mitchell Bard is a foreign policy analyst at UCLA specializing in the study of U.S. policy on the Middle East.