

### ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)				
FROM:			EXTENSION	NO.
			DATE	
TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)		DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS
		RECEIVED	FORWARDED	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
1.	<i>John -</i>	<i>JA</i>		<p><i>These are the news public Affairs (State) news releases from State. If they fit into a file ok, if not you can destroy.</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Ad</i></p>
2.				
3.	<i>Linda - please set</i>			
4.	<i>up a State Dept Public</i>			
5.	<i>Affairs release file. We'll</i>			
6.	<i>decide as we go along</i>			
7.	<i>when to purge file.</i>			
8.		<i>Thanks</i>		
9.		<i>John</i>		
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

Current  
Policy No. 418

Secretary Shultz

# President Reagan's Middle East Peace Initiative

September 10, 1982



United States Department of State  
*Bureau of Public Affairs*  
Washington, D.C.

*Following is a statement by Secretary Shultz before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, September 10, 1982.*

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to discuss with you the Administration's recent policy steps in the Middle East. We have begun actions of a wide range and of immense importance. The positive bipartisan support for President Reagan's peace initiative has been evident to us and is deeply appreciated. That support is essential to the conduct of a vigorous and creative foreign policy and, accordingly, I deeply appreciate your willingness to meet with me on short notice.

A little over 2 months ago, I came before you as a nominee for Secretary of State. In those hearings, we were all clearly concerned about the problems presented by the Middle East and the Palestinian issues in particular. I emphasized then our efforts to secure a cease-fire in Lebanon, as the first step toward our goal of a united, sovereign Lebanon, freed from foreign forces. I also emphasized the importance of Israeli security and overall peace, while recognizing the legitimate rights of the Palestinians and their just requirements.

Since then, not just your attention but the world's attention was focused on the Middle East and particularly on our diplomatic efforts there to end the bloodshed and to bring a deeper and lasting peace to the area. With the successful evacuation of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) from Beirut, we have turned to the next steps necessary for peace: the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon and the restoration

of central authority in that country and, of prime importance, the reinvigoration of the Camp David peace process in an effort to resolve fairly the underlying Arab-Israeli dispute.

Lebanon, of course, has suffered grievously over the last several months, let alone the last several years. Phil Habib's [President's special emissary to the Middle East] and Morris Draper's [Deputy Assistant Secretary for Near East and South Asian Affairs] successful negotiation of the withdrawal of the PLO from Beirut established the first phase of our approach to the problem of Lebanon. The U.S. Marine contingent in the multinational force completed its withdrawal from Beirut at 2:00 this morning, well within the 30-day period the President specified in his notification to you. The French and Italian contingents will begin their withdrawal soon. The Government of Lebanon, meanwhile, is working carefully but surely to reestablish authority over all parts of Beirut, with the Lebanese Army and police increasingly assuming security responsibilities in the city.

A second phase in our Lebanon diplomacy is now before us. As all of you know, the President is sending Ambassador Draper to Lebanon to begin negotiations on withdrawal of foreign forces from that country. The President has made it clear that he personally intends to stay fully engaged in efforts to bring about a strong, free, united, and healthy Lebanon, sovereign throughout all its territories within internationally recognized borders. The withdrawal of all foreign military forces from Lebanon

must be accompanied by the creation of conditions in southern Lebanon to preserve Israeli security. In the immediate future, we will seek a further stabilization in the situation in Beirut. We must create an environment in Lebanon that will allow the newly elected Lebanese Government—free of outside pressure or imposed solutions—to carry on with its task of national reconciliation. The desperate need for economic reconstruction can be well served through such reconciliation and the withdrawal of foreign forces.

The United States is a staunch friend of the Lebanese people and will be a good partner in Lebanon's courageous effort to rebuild its economy and to strengthen its national institutions. We will exercise our responsibility and duty to give every opportunity to the Lebanese themselves to recreate a united but pluralistic society behind strong leadership from their newly elected president. We also look forward to cooperating with appropriate international institutions in the effort to ameliorate the destruction caused by the long and most unfortunate fighting.

These efforts to rebuild Lebanon and strengthen its institutions can only be helped by progress in the overall search for a Middle East peace. The problems of Lebanon are distinct and must be addressed whenever possible separately from our Middle East peace initiative, but both tasks must be carried on without delay. The President will, therefore, dispatch Ambassador Draper to Lebanon this weekend, while we also continue to work on the overall peace initiative.

When I was before you in the confirmation hearings, I noted our commitment to solving the Palestinian problem within the Camp David framework. Right after your vote to report my nomination favorably to the full Senate, the President instructed me that he wished high priority be placed on addressing the underlying Arab-Israeli dispute, especially the Palestinian issues.

The President's statement last week began a fresh start on the Arab-Israeli dispute. The fundamental problems involved are of universal concern not just to the people of the region but to the United States and other countries as well. The events of the last month have demonstrated that we Americans have a special responsibility in the efforts to bring peace to the area. No one else has the credibility—and therefore the ability—to provide the crucial link to all sides.

The President's Middle East peace initiative is based on an intensive and detailed review of the problem. We have

discussed the issues in detail with members of this committee and others in the Congress, with former government officials, and many other knowledgeable people. The paramount conclusions of that review are that (1) it is time to address, forcefully and directly, the underlying Palestinian issues, and (2) genuine success depends upon broadening participation in the negotiations to include, as envisaged in the Camp David accords, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and the representatives of the Palestinian people.

In taking this initiative, the President established two conditions—we will remain fully committed to both the principles of the Camp David accords and to the security of Israel. The Camp David framework has one key element that all other peace plans lack: It has been successful. It produced the only treaty of peace between Israel and an Arab country and the completion of the disengagement and return of the Sinai. Moreover, the Camp David framework has the necessary room for negotiations to fulfill the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and to reach peace treaties between Israel and her neighbors. As President Carter said a week ago, "There is absolutely nothing in the President's speech . . . nor in the information he sent to the Israelis which is contrary to either the letter or the spirit of Camp David. It is absolutely compatible with the Camp David agreement." Our initiative will give the provisions of Camp David their full meaning and a new dynamism.

This renewed dynamism for the Camp David negotiations will insure Israeli security, and we emphatically will require the product of the negotiations to do so. As the President's speech noted, this country, this Administration, and the President personally are committed to Israel's security. This same renewed dynamism also will provide appropriate regard to the "legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and their just requirements." Camp David itself calls for the residents of the West Bank and Gaza and other Palestinians as agreed to participate in negotiating the two primary means of achieving those rights—a 5-year transitional period of autonomous self-government and final status after the 5-year transitional period. By renewing the process, we seek to fulfill the hope of Camp David: Israel and her neighbors, Jordan, Egypt, and the Palestinians, engaged in fair, direct, and successful negotiations on how they will all live together.

The Camp David accords provide that these negotiated arrangements on final status must be "just, comprehensive, . . . durable," and "based on Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 in all their parts." Security Council Resolution 242 sets forth the two key principles:

- (i) Withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied. . . .
- (ii) Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force.

As it has often been summarized, peace for territory.

We believe these principles apply on all fronts, but our position on the extent of withdrawal will be significantly influenced by the extent and nature of the peace and security arrangements being offered in return. Israel, Jordan, Egypt, and the elected representatives of the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza will negotiate the final boundaries, recognizing Palestinian legitimate rights, and securing what Resolution 338 calls a "just and durable peace." We will support positions in those negotiations which we believe are fair. Those positions include:

**Israeli Sovereignty/Palestinian State.** It is the President's belief that the Palestinian problem cannot be resolved through Israeli sovereignty or control over the West Bank and Gaza. Accordingly, we will not support such a solution. We will also not support the formation of a Palestinian state in those negotiations. There is no foundation of political support in Israel or in the United States for such a solution and peace cannot be achieved by that route. The preference we will pursue in the final status negotiations is some form of association of the West Bank and Gaza with Jordan.

**Self-determination.** In the Middle East context, the term "self-determination" has been identified exclusively with the formation of a Palestinian state. We will not support this definition of self-determination. We do believe that the Palestinians must take a leading role in determining their own future and fully support the provision in the Camp David agreement providing for the elected representatives of the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza to decide how they shall govern themselves consistent with the provisions of their agreement in the final status negotiations.

**Jerusalem.** We will fully support the position that Jerusalem must be undivided and that its status must be determined through negotiations. We do not recognize unilateral acts with respect to final status issues.

**Settlements.** The status of Israeli settlements must be determined in the course of the final status negotiations. We will not support their continuation as extraterritorial outposts, but neither will we support efforts to deny Jews the opportunity to live in the West Bank and Gaza under the duly constituted governmental authority there, as Arabs live in Israel.

Negotiations on the final status of the area will not start until a self-governing authority for the territories is firmly in place. Negotiations about the transitional phase have been in progress for the last 3 years. In those negotiations we have consistently expressed our views to our negotiating partners, Israel and Egypt, as issues arose. Most recently, we informed our partners of how these separate expressions fit into our overall view of Palestinian self-government during a transitional period.

In our view, the objective of the transitional period is the peaceful and orderly transfer of authority from Israel to the Palestinian inhabitants, while insuring that all necessary measures are taken to assure Israeli security.

We have emphasized that this period is transitional, not final, and that, therefore, the provisions relating to it should not prejudice the final status. In light of those views, we have told our partners that we have supported and will continue to support:

- The definition of full autonomy giving the Palestinian inhabitants real authority over themselves, the land, and its resources subject to fair safeguards on water;
- The inclusion of economic, commercial, social, and cultural ties between the West Bank, Gaza, and Jordan;
- Participation by the Palestinian inhabitants of east Jerusalem in the election for the West Bank/Gaza authority; and
- Progressive Palestinian responsibility for internal security based on capability and performance.

Using those same standards, we have opposed and will continue to oppose:

- Dismantlement of existing settlements; and
- Provisions which represent a threat to Israel's security.

As the President noted in his speech, we are attempting to reinvigorate the autonomy negotiations. That effort would be assisted to a great extent by a freeze of the Israeli settlements in the occupied territories, which was requested during the Camp David negotiations. Our concern is not with their legality or illegality but with their effects on the peace process.

The President's initiative follows over 3 years of active negotiations, continuous discussions of the issues involved over the same period, and, most recently, two trips to the Middle East by the Secretary of State this year and additional trips by Ambassador Fairbanks [Special Negotiator for the Middle East Peace Process] and by others working on the negotiations. We have put these ideas in some detail to the Israelis and the key Arab states, including Jordan and Egypt. They are now examining the proposals. It would be surprising if they liked or disliked all of them. We have received reactions from some of our interlocutors. We are studying those reactions. We confidently expect to continue our discussions, with the Israelis, with the Arab countries, and with other friendly governments.

The President has now articulated a reasonable basis for a negotiated compromise among the parties. We emphasize that any agreement must be based on the free give-and-take of the negotiating process. We do not guarantee to any party the outcome of the negotiations on any issue. The President has now stated publicly some U.S. positions on key issues. We now call for the parties contemplated by the Camp David agreement to join us in seeking peace.

Mr. Chairman [Senator Charles H. Percy], I am very grateful for the words of support and encouragement that you and the members of this committee have given. Your emphasis in several interviews on the deep yearning for peace in the countries and peoples of this area; Senator Cranston's and Senator Boschwitz's support for the effort to broaden the process and involve the Jordanians and representatives of the Palestinians; and Senator Mathias' emphasis on the need for all to address this problem objectively are indications that the Congress and the Administration are together, focused on this essential task. As you put it, "There just isn't an alternative for finding a basis for lasting

peace. . . . Think what could happen to this area in the Middle East if peace is found, and a basis for working together with its Arab neighbors is found by Israel and its Arab neighbors."

We now have the initial formal reactions from the Israeli Government and the Arab League summit. The Israeli Government, supported by a vote of the Knesset, has opposed the President's proposals. While not directly addressing the President's proposals, the Arab League summit has put forward its own proposals, key elements of which are at variance with our proposals. The President stands firmly behind his proposals. The reactions of the Israeli Government and of the Arab League are clear and graphic evidence that the position of both sides must be negotiated if we are to bring genuine peace and security to this troubled region.

The opening positions have been announced. Now is the time for quiet diplomacy to pursue the President's initiative and bring it to fruition.

In launching this initiative, the President determined that he would stay fully involved and fully committed to the principles he enunciated. We will be working hard over the next weeks in light of the new dynamic the initiative introduces to bring the peace process forward. I pledge to you that we will be exercising the creativity, the persistence, and the dogged determination to succeed which marked the successful effort in Beirut. I also emphasize to you that we recognize that our effort is to bring a lasting, effective, and just peace to this area. That goal can hardly be accomplished in a few short weeks. We ask you to stay with the President in his determination to sustain this effort and to look for the long-term, just solution. We believe, deeply and purposefully, that peace can come between Arabs and Jews. No greater purpose can be placed before us all than a just and lasting peace. ■

Published by the United States Department of State • Bureau of Public Affairs • Office of Public Communication • Editorial Division • Washington, D.C. • September 1982  
Editor: Colleen Sussman • This material is in the public domain and may be reproduced without permission; citation of this source is appreciated.

---

Bureau of Public Affairs  
United States Department of State  
Washington, D.C. 20520

Postage and Fees Paid  
Department of State  
STA-501



---

Official Business

---

Third Class Bulk Rate

If address is incorrect  
please indicate change.  
Do not cover or destroy  
this address label. ▶

Current  
Policy No. 419

*Secretary Shultz*

# The Quest for Peace

September 12, 1982



United States Department of State  
*Bureau of Public Affairs*  
Washington, D.C.

*Following is an address by Secretary Shultz before the United Jewish Appeal, New York City, September 12, 1982.*

No theme is more appropriate for my first speech as Secretary of State than the theme of peace. No objective we share is more worthy or more elusive: to attain it requires realism, strength, the capacity to run risks, and the ability to gather trust. It takes sustained goodwill to build up that trust. And it takes serious, fair, and direct bargaining at the negotiating table to hammer out workable and durable agreements.

If we needed any reminder, events of this year make it clear that we do not live in a world of peace. Scarcely a region of the developing world—where peace is crucial for social and economic growth—has been spared. From Indochina to the Horn of Africa, from the Persian Gulf and Afghanistan to the tip of South America, wars raged with frightening intensity and tragic results. Some cases, such as the Soviets' imperialistic war in Afghanistan, are new conflicts where one nation is seeking to extend its power and control. But much of the violence we witnessed this year, including the war over the Falklands, represented only the latest outbreak of long-smouldering disputes. Mankind has advanced his capacity to wage war. But his ability to settle disputes peacefully and to prevent violence remains primitive.

We have clear codes of international morality and law. From the words of the prophets to the rhetoric of 20th century statesmen, mankind has set out standards for individual and international behavior. Over the last two centuries, nations have formed international bodies to adjudicate disputes, resolve conflicts, and promote peace. But the ideal of a world at peace has remained, and will remain, a mirage until nations pursue, as a matter of course, policies rooted in mutual respect and aimed at forging and fostering a just international order.

The formula for peace often requires that we convince our adversaries of the strength of our forces and of our will to defend liberty and security. That same formula demands that we stand prepared to meet with our adversaries and work with them to bridge differences. Despite the catalogue of troubles around the world, there are great opportunities and practical possibilities before us today.

The pursuit of peace with freedom, security, and justice is the essence of America's foreign policy. Our country's commitment to peace is beyond doubt, based on our creative, unrelenting efforts in that cause.

The past year has been a year rich in American efforts for peace. At the President's direction, and with the commitment of American peacekeeping forces, Secretary Haig took the lead in creating the multinational force that

helped make good on the historic Israeli move for peace: withdrawal from the Sinai. Deputy Secretary of State Walter Stoessel worked intensively in the crucial final weeks to assure that achievement. Ours was the nation that made a major effort to head off the tragic war in the South Atlantic. We have continued the effort to find peaceful and just settlements to the fighting in Indochina and Afghanistan. With all America behind him—including once again our dedicated men in uniform—Phil Habib [President's special emissary to the Middle East] used every ounce of his legendary skill and stamina to prevent a tragic denouement of the war in Lebanon. We are currently engaged in a major diplomatic effort to achieve Namibian independence and lasting security in southern Africa. We have provided vigorous backing for the international efforts that secured Libya's withdrawal from Chad. And to ease the dangers of nuclear war, the President has proposed major reductions of U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons and has offered new proposals to advance the talks on the reduction of conventional forces.

International institutions and resolutions for peace need practical efforts to give them life. Mankind has made astonishing technological and material leaps in the last 40 years. But we must make equally dramatic gains in the political realm if we are to bequeath a safe and secure world of peace to our children.

I believe we can make those gains. Strength of arms and of will are essential, but no more so than the ability to find that winning mixture of courage and realism. No matter what the obstacles, we must persevere—for there are no more noble nor important goals than peace, freedom, and security.

### The President's Peace Initiative in the Middle East

These principles apply fully to that set of goals foremost in our thoughts today—peace in the Middle East and security and success for Israel and her Arab neighbors. No one who has walked the streets of Jerusalem and Tel Aviv and who has talked at length with as many Israeli people as I have can doubt that they want peace and security, and I am dedicated to helping them achieve both.

Against the backdrop of confrontation, despair, and fear that have characterized the search for peace in the Middle East, three key documents spell out how peace might be made a reality.

- The first is U.N. Security Council Resolution 242, which established the basis for a negotiating process founded on the idea of an exchange of territory for real peace.

- The second is the Camp David accords, which—in the Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty—led directly to the realization of such an exchange of territory for peace. Camp David calls for a “just, comprehensive, and durable” Middle East peace based on Resolution 242, but builds on it as well by calling for a solution that recognizes “the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and their just requirements” and a “resolution of the Palestinian problem in all its aspects.”

- And third, there is the President's speech of September 1. This historic address builds on the earlier documents by stating categorically that our approach to peace will continue to be based on Resolution 242, with its concept of an exchange of territory for peace, and the Camp David accords, which provide for Palestinian self-government with full guarantees for Israel's security.

While I cannot summarize for you the totality of a rich and complex speech, I would like to review four important points made by the President.

**First**, there should be full safeguards for Israeli security, both internal and external, throughout the transitional period and beyond. The President has made this forcefully clear.

**Second**, as stated in Camp David, there should be a transitional period of 5 years during which the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza should be permitted to exercise full autonomy.

**Third**, the United States believes that peace cannot be achieved on the basis of Israeli sovereignty over the West Bank and Gaza but must be based on Resolution 242's formula of an exchange of territory for peace. Our preference is for self-government by the Palestinians in association with Jordan, with the extent of withdrawal determined by the quality of peace offered in return.

**Fourth**, the United States also believes that peace cannot be achieved by the creation of an independent Palestinian state on the West Bank and Gaza. The President has stated clearly and unequivocally that we will not support an independent Palestinian state in the territories.

One section of the President's speech especially deserves reading tonight word for word, because it did not appear in the text printed in the *New York Times*. But don't blame the *Times*. The passage was inserted by the President at the very last minute—after the press had received their copies. It was put in because the President wanted to speak from his heart to the people of Israel. The President said this:

I have personally followed and supported Israel's heroic struggle for survival ever since the founding of the State of Israel 34 years ago. In the pre-1967 borders, Israel was barely 10 miles wide at its narrowest point. The bulk of Israel's population lived within artillery range of hostile Arab armies. I am not about to ask Israel to live that way again.

Those words represent the President's, and America's, fundamental commitment to Israeli security and to genuine peace. Our commitment grows out of a sense of moral obligation but also out of strategic interest. A strong, secure Israel is in our interests and the interests of peace. There will be no peace without Israeli security, but Israel will never be secure without peace. Our vision of the future on the West Bank is one guided by a vision of a secure Israel living with defensible borders and by our abiding belief that it is not in Israel's long-term interests to try to rule over the more than 1 million Palestinians living in the West Bank and Gaza.

Approval for the President's initiative is gathering force and momentum, both here at home and abroad. I believe it will gather more and more support as people read and study that speech carefully. The same is true of the Camp

David accords on which the President's speech is based. Those who do take the time to read those historic documents soon recognize the genius of Camp David. It is an accomplishment that is a tribute to the statesmanship of the leaders of three great nations—Prime Minister Begin, the late President Sadat, and our own President Carter.

### The Opportunity of the Present

Despite the many dark periods of stagnation, setback, and delay since 1967, a look at the long-term trend in the Middle East is encouraging. After a quarter century of sterile conflict and confrontation, the past decade has seen a building momentum toward peace. Three negotiated disengagement agreements have been signed. President Sadat paid his historic and stirring visit to Jerusalem. There was the great achievement of the Camp David framework and the signing in 1979 and fulfillment this past April of the first treaty of peace between Israel and an Arab neighbor—a treaty that is a tribute to the willingness of the people of Israel and of Prime Minister Begin to take risks for peace. I say the first treaty because there must be—and there will be—more to come. For only in the context of true peace, freely negotiated, can there be true security for Israel and her neighbors.

Nothing is more crucial than building on this momentum. But, as has been obvious to all, the stalemate in the autonomy talks over the past 2 or more years, and the outbreak of major military conflict this past summer, pose a grave threat to further progress.

In these circumstances, President Reagan decided that the time had come for renewed American leadership. He acted, as well, because the Middle East today is at a moment of unprecedented opportunity: Israel, the moderate Arab states, the Palestinians, and the United States are all affected, and all now face the choice between hope and frustration, between peace and conflict.

**Israel** has demonstrated once again, at tragic cost, that it will not be defeated militarily. If Israel's adversaries want peace and justice they must recognize, clearly and explicitly, the right of the State of Israel to exist, and they must enter, as President Reagan said, “direct, hard, and fair” negotiations with Israel. When they do, Israel then has the chance to translate military strength into peace, the only long-term security.

**For the moderate Arabs**, there is the opportunity to demonstrate that the course of negotiations can produce results and serve their interests. For Lebanon, there is now a second chance; the chance once again to be free, prosperous, and democratic, posing no threat to its neighbors and serving as a stable bridge between the West and the Arab world.

**The Palestinians** now confront a great decision: whether to continue down the self-destructive road of armed struggle, which has only produced tragedy for the Palestinian people, or to seize the opportunity to affect their destiny by way of the peace process. The Camp David framework upholds the importance of self-government for the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza. And it provides Palestinian representatives the right to participate in the determination of their future at every step in that process.

**For the United States**, the brilliant, dogged diplomatic achievement of Presidential emissary Phil Habib has shown America's determination and ability to promote just and peaceful solutions to the problems of the area. His work is but the latest evidence of how crucial is the help of the United States if the peoples and nations of the region are to stop the fighting, construct solid agreements, and prevent wars between Arabs and Israelis from again threatening to become the focal point of global conflict.

In his historic address to the Israeli Knesset, Anwar Sadat spoke of "moments in the lives of nations and peoples when it is incumbent upon those known for their wisdom and clarity of vision, to penetrate beyond the past, with all its complexities and vain memories, in a bold drive toward new horizons." The present is such a moment for us all.

The President has offered a challenge—the challenge of peace—to Israelis and Arabs alike. Everyone talks so much about peace that it requires some effort to stop and comprehend what it really can mean. Relief from the horrible burden of war can unleash the full development of human potential, promising even greater creativity in the arts and sciences. Peace offers new economic possibilities—when the defense burden is lightened—to build a better life at home and contribute to the prosperity of the region and the world. Peace can mean fruitful economic cooperation between Israel and her neighbors. Imagine how the genius of the Israeli nation could flourish if it were freed from the physical and psychological burdens imposed by the continu-

ing state of conflict. Imagine the enormous contribution that the peoples of this region—so rich in spiritual strength—could make to all mankind.

### **The Challenge to Israel**

The challenge that the President has offered to Israel is to extend its hand to welcome wider participation in the peace process. Israel has demonstrated once more its military strength and bravery. But we all recognize that while true peace requires military strength, strength alone is not enough; true peace can only be achieved through lasting negotiated agreements leading ultimately to friendly cooperation between Israel and its neighbors.

In the 1948 war of independence Israel lost 6,000 dead, out of a population that was much smaller than it is today; it lost nearly 200 dead in 1956, nearly 700 in 1967, and hundreds more in the war of attrition that lasted until 1970; 2,800 young Israelis were killed in the 1973 war and more than 300 in 1982.

That terrible cycle of death and suffering must end. The evacuation of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) from Beirut and the forceful demonstration of Israeli capability make this an altogether unique moment, a moment of opportunity to end this cycle. Triumphs of statecraft are decisions which join opportunity with action. If this opportunity is allowed to pass it may never come again.

The challenge Israel faces now is to combine diplomacy with power to build an enduring political settlement. There is nothing that says that Palestinian self-government in association with Jordan must lead inevitably to a Palestinian state. The President has said that we will not support such an outcome. It is not beyond the reach of diplomacy to create, nor Israeli military power to insure, that agreed arrangements for the West Bank will not erode over time. U.S. determination that concrete, iron-clad arrangements for the security of Israel accompany the ultimate resolution of the Palestinian question is heightened, not diminished, by the fact that we have views on a desirable direction for the negotiations.

The crucial point is that when it comes to safeguarding the long-term security of Israel, the friendship and resolve of the United States are second in importance only to Israel's own resolution and strength. And, in the final analysis, that friendship and resolve deserve, in return, to be reciprocated by a willingness to listen with an open mind

to the views of others. But let me be clear: We have a right to be heard but we have no intention of using our support for Israel's security as a way of imposing our views.

We must not underestimate the dilemmas and risks that Israel faces in opting for negotiations, but they are dwarfed by those created by a continuation of the status quo. The United States recognizes its obligations, as the principal supporter of Israel's security, to be understanding of Israel's specific circumstances in the negotiating process. The President has urged consideration of his proposals in the context of negotiations, to be undertaken without preconditions and with no thought of imposed solutions.

That is why the United States particularly asked that the parties themselves not preclude possible outcomes by concrete and perhaps irreversible actions undertaken before the process of negotiation is completed. While we support the right of Jews to live in peace on the West Bank and Gaza under the duly constituted governmental authority there—just as Arabs live in Israel—we regard the continuation of settlement activity prior to the conclusion of negotiations as detrimental to the peace process.

### **The Challenge to the Arabs**

The President has offered a fundamental challenge to the Arabs as well. It is time for the Arab world to recognize the opportunity provided by Camp David. The path of rejection has achieved nothing but tragedy, particularly for the Palestinians. Surely, the pattern of agonies of this capable and courageous people must not be repeated. Alternatively, the Camp David process and the President's fresh start offers a promise of resolution with honor and justice to those with the wisdom to join the peace process. But it also implies a corollary: Those who fail to join will miss a precious opportunity—an opportunity for peace that may not come again soon.

The absence of Jordan and representatives of the Palestinian inhabitants of the occupied territories from the negotiations has been the crucial missing link in the Camp David process. Success in the peace process depends on Arab support for these vital missing partners to join the negotiations and become partners for peace. We trust that support will be forthcoming soon. Our consultations with the Arab world will be designed to encourage such support. We recognize the risks to all parties, but the risks of failure are even greater. The Arab nations missed one chance for



peace when they rejected the 1947 U.N. partition plan. Then, for nearly two decades, they rejected the legitimacy of the boundaries within which the Israelis lived so insecurely prior to 1967. In 1978 they refused to support Egypt when the Camp David accords were signed. Today, the Arabs again have great opportunities: to move from belligerency to negotiation to peace; and to work realistically and practically for the rights of the Palestinians. But these opportunities, like the previous ones, will not last forever.

#### A "New Realism" for Us All

Thus for the Palestinians and other Arabs, and for Israel, this is indeed the moment, as the President said, for a "new realism." An element in that realism is that the United States has decided to state publicly where it stands on critical questions. There will be, as I have said, no imposed solutions. Any point agreed by Israel and its Arab neighbors will not be opposed by us. But at the same time, the United States is now obligated, by reality and morality alike, to make known its views on what we believe is needed to reach a fair, workable, and lasting solution. This the President did on the first of September. The President's initiative contains firm American principles; we will not depart from them. As we move ahead the United States, as a full partner, will reserve the right to support positions on either side when we feel this is likely to

promote fair agreement. And we will put forward our own proposals when appropriate, to the same end. I reiterate, however, that no specific negotiated result is ruled out: That is the essence of the process.

We must also recognize another reality: The positions now held by the potential partners in negotiations are widely at variance. The point however is this: Any participant in this process—including the United States as a full partner—is free to have and to enunciate its positions. Once views are expressed, the place, indeed the only place, to thrash out differences is at the bargaining table. If there were no differences of opinion, there would be no need for negotiations.

The issues are complex, the emotions deep, the forces in the Middle East contentious, and the stakes so great. The wisdom of the peace process must spring from recognition of these facts. Bitterness dies hard, while trust grows slowly. President Reagan has now set out the lines of a fair and realistic solution; together with the other parties we should all come together to discuss and negotiate these matters.

There is no need now to agree on any principle but one: That is the need to come together at the bargaining table to talk—to talk about differences; to talk about aspirations; to talk about peace; but in all events to talk. We ask for

nothing more of any of the participants at the beginning of the process. And we have the deepest duty and obligation to ask for no less.

If it takes more time, we are prepared for that. But there are limits—this opportunity must not be lost. One hundred and twenty years ago, Abraham Lincoln, speaking to the Congress of the United States, said that "The dogmas of the . . . past are inadequate to the . . . present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew."

In this spirit, and with the vision, self-confidence, and mutual trust that has marked our relationship at its best moments, Israel and America—and our Arab friends, now and in the future—can shape a life of dignity, justice, and true peace. ■

Published by the United States Department of State • Bureau of Public Affairs Office of Public Communication • Editorial Division • Washington, D.C. • September 1982  
Editor: Colleen Sussman • This material is in the public domain and may be reproduced without permission; citation of this source is appreciated.

Bureau of Public Affairs  
United States Department of State  
Washington, D.C. 20520

Official Business

If address is incorrect  
please indicate change. ►  
Do not cover or destroy  
this address label.

Postage and Fees Paid  
Department of State  
STA-501



Third Class Bulk Rate