



NEWS from U.S. Senator Bob Dole

(R.—Kans.)

New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510 (202) 224-6521

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1978

CONTACT: BILL KATS
202-224-8947

DOLE SAYS NO TO U.S. TROOPS IN THE MIDEAST

PITTSBURGH -- Sen. Bob Dole (R-Kan.) said tonight that the United States should not place troops in the Middle East as a peace-keeping or "buffer" force, in conjunction with any proposed settlement between Israel and Egypt.

Dole said that American troops "would be subject to terrorism and we would be drawn into confrontation now, and eventually Americans would decide that this was too great a price to pay and insist upon withdrawing our forces.

"We have seen how Israel was threatened by the withdrawal of military forces in 1948. We have seen how Israel was threatened by the withdrawal of U.N. forces in 1967. We don't need, and Israel doesn't need or want, more buffer forces in the Middle East.

"The road to peace runs from Cairo to Jerusalem. Let those two capitals decide there will be no more war in the military and political realities of that area, and there will be peace."

Of the current Camp David summit, Dole said, "We hope for word of peace from Camp David. We shall be content with word of progress toward peace. It is more important than partisan advantage. It is more important than politics. We do all share the same prayer, not just for the people of Israel and their generations, but for all the people of the Middle East and all their generations.

"There are issues to be discussed, and there are non-issues -- certain impediments to peace. These include the questions of a Palestinian state and of autonomy for the Palestinian people."



NEWS from U.S. Senator Bob Dole

(R.—Kans.)

New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510 (202) 224-6521

REMARKS OF SENATOR BOB DOLE

ISRAEL BOND MAN OF THE YEAR DINNER

PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA

SEPTEMBER 12, 1978

It's a pleasure to join with you this evening in paying tribute to our friend, Lester Hamburg. Few of us are singled out for an honor so prestigious as that for humanitarian service. I know that the full extent of his assistance to the Jewish people, and to the nation of Israel, can never be known by any of us. But his efforts are nevertheless an inspiration to all of us who yearn for peace and security in a troubled world. Those who are willing to give of their time and resources for the benefit of mankind, and for the cause of peace, are due the admiration and high respect which they have earned.

I know that Lester, like the rest of us, shares an abiding concern about the future of Israel, and about the cause of world peace itself. That's why I want to talk with you a little this evening about the Camp David Summit now underway, and about international human rights.

CAMP DAVID SUMMIT

This is a time of crucial importance to Israel, and that makes it a time of crucial importance to Jews all over the world, as well as to those of us who are concerned with the well-being of Eretz Israel. Bu using the term Eretz Israel, I mean what Menachem Begin means when he speaks of Israel's borders. I made that clear last year in Jerusalem when I said I agreed with the distinctions he has drawn between liberated territory and occupied territory. Perhaps a better term for "liberated territory" would be "redeemed territory.

Today we are waiting, along with the rest of the world, to know what will issue forth from Camp David. I believe that the desire for peace in the Middle East is strong among the participants, and the opportunity for progress in reaching a settlement is at hand. Certainly we all share a prayerful hope that the talks will accomplish the ambitious goals for which the summit was intended.

The leaders sit today on top of the mountain where Camp David is located, and peer out in search of peace. But I have stood, as many of you have, and as only Menachem Begin among those leaders involved has stood, at the bottom of other mountains and hills. I have stood in the Huleh valley and at places like Gonen and looked up the same hills where Syrian guns once commanded the heights of the Golan. And I know, as you know, that the questions which flow from those territories do not involve anything of expansionist ambitions nor even, ultimately, of historical, legal or moral right. They involve life or death for the people of Israel.

They cannot and must not be sacrificed to the political needs of Anwar Sadat or of Jimmy Carter, or of anyone else who advocates a peace which might lead to another attempt at a war of annihilation.

A SECURE PEACE

We hope for word of peace from Camp David. We shall be content with word of progress toward peace. It is more important than partisan advantage. It is more important than politics. We do all share the same prayer, not just for the people of Israel and their generations, but for all the people of the Middle East and all their generations. Lo T'Dah Milchamah. Let Isaiah's dream be fulfilled, and Menachem Begin's and our own. Lo T'Dah Milchamah. They shall not know war.

Let the day come.

Let the dream come true.

That is our hope and our wish and our prayer.

But peace must come like Lincoln's peace, with healing in its wings. It cannot come on the heels of political expedience. It cannot come bearing the seeds of future war. For this would be no peace at all.

There are issues to be discussed, and there are non-issues--certain impediments to peace. These include the questions of a Palestinian state, and of autonomy for the Palestinian people.

Historically, both Jews and Arabs have lived in Eretz Israel, and a name of convenience was applied to them and the land, by the mandatory powers. The name was Palestine. Some Arabs sold their land legally and profitably to the Jews. Some left willingly, and hopefully, to await the destruction of Israel in 1948. They were disappointed. For thirty years, while we have been a staunch friend of Israel, we have also been in the business of trying to alleviate Arab disappointments. When they attack Israel and are defeated, we are concerned to mitigate the disappointment of their intention. When they attack Israel and lose land to which they had no legal or historical claim in the first place, we are concerned to see that land restored.

NO AMERICAN TROOPS IN MIDDLE EAST

Today it is proposed that we should put American troops to guard Israel's security. Yet Israel's security requires only that we not undermine her cause. American troops would be subject to terrorism and we would be drawn into confrontation now, and eventually Americans would decide that this was too great a price to pay and insist upon withdrawing our forces. We have seen how Israel was threatened by the withdrawal of military forces in 1948. We have seen how Israel was threatened by the withdrawal of U.N. forces in 1967. We don't need, and Israel doesn't need or want, more buffer forces in the Middle East.

The road to peace runs from Cairo to Jerusalem. Let those two capitals decide there will be no more war in the military and political realities of the area, and there will be peace. There can be no war without Egypt. And the issue which affects Egypt is the Sinai. Not the West Bank, not the Golan, not the Gaza, not the Palestinians, but the Sinai. The others attack Sadat's personal interest and Egypt's national interest. In settling the Sinai question, we force the other Arab nations to settle themselves the tragic refugee problem which they themselves created. It is not Israel's problem, and it should not be visited upon Israel.

THE BACKDROP

Now, as we look to Camp David, there are some facts of recent history which must be considered. Throughout the entire first year of the present administration, enormous pressure was placed upon Israel to attend a reconvening of the Geneva Conference. Israel agreed to this. But it was not that simple. The Arab nations would not go to Geneva unless Israel agreed to a number of pre-concessions, which would have made any further negotiations unnecessary. They would have given the Arabs everything they wanted, and laid the groundwork for future war against Israel. To this, Israel would not agree.

You will recall how great was the pressure placed upon Israel at that time. But she would not succumb to pressure. Then the administration overplayed its hand. It threatened to bring Russia back into the picture and this disturbed not only Israel, but Egypt also. At that point, and not until then, Sadat made clear that he was prepared to go ahead independently to deal with Israel. The meeting in Jerusalem was arranged, and the United States was out of the picture. It was a humiliating development for President Carter.

It is interesting to consider what happened next. President Sadat went to Jerusalem in November. Arrangements were made to hold substantive peace talks.

On January 1, Sadat gave an interview to one of the semi-official organs which reflect government thinking in Egypt. The first substantive meeting was held in Egypt, at Ismailya. Sadat described it in these terms: "Begin came and brought a complete plan on withdrawal for the occupied territories ... The first time since the establishment of Israel that the Jews presented something specific ... They went further than we could imagine. They came to argue with us. I would state my views and they would state theirs. This in itself was a positive step. We both agreed to discuss everything. Begin had declared that everything was negotiable."

Sadat said that he once considered Begin "the hawk of hawks," but that in fact Begin "had changed his opinion and wants peace, not war. He wants discussion ..."

"It is not true," Sadat told the Egyptian people, "that we did not agree on anything, or that I did not obtain any specific thing. To the contrary, Sadat said of Begin, "He was a man with whom understanding can be reached."

January 1st. This was after preliminary bi-lateral meetings between the two leaders. And Prime Minister Begin's recollection about the tone and progress of these preliminary meetings coincides with Sadat's recollections in his interview. This process was to be carried forward in meetings scheduled to begin on January 14th. But suddenly Sadat called his negotiators home, called Begin intransigent, and a terrorist and so forth. There was consternation in Israel. Begin was amazed. The world wondered what happened. And all we could deduce here at home was what we had been conditioned over the previous year to believe, which was that Begin was at fault. He was inflexible. And he had derailed the peace talks.

But something else happened in that period. And it was the only thing of interest to have happened, because there were no substantive talks between Israel and Egypt in that period. But on January 5, four days after Sadat's interview praising Begin's peaceful intentions, President Carter took an unscheduled trip to Egypt returning from his scheduled trip to Saudi Arabia. He met in private with Sadat, and there was no indication what went on in their talks. But immediately afterward, Sadat scuttled the peace talks, insisted that only U.S. participation could provide a solution, and began to talk about his "good friend, Jimmy Carter." From that point forward, President Sadat has held President Carter's feet to the fire and between the two they have managed to make Menachem Begin appear to be the only impediment to peace in the Middle East.

HOPE FOR A BEGINNING

Since that time we have had a renewal of the war in Lebanon and more lives lost. Whether these lives would have been lost if the peace talks had gone forward last January is something about which we can only speculate. But these facts do form the backdrop to the talks at Camp David, and we must be prepared to examine the outcome of the Camp David talks against that backdrop.

Realistically, we cannot look for a conclusion. Hopefully, we can look for a process, for long-term talks to Begin, and not to be curtailed. If that happens, the summit must be rated a success. And if there is no progress, then the blame for this must not fall on Menachem Begin who, in Sadat's own words, is "a man who truly wants peace."

Now, let me say a word about Soviet Jewry.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN RUSSIA

Orlov, Slepak, Nudel, Petkus, Scharansky, Ginzburg, Lukyanenko--each has become a symbol of the struggle for human rights, the Maccabees of our time, figures larger than life, men of whom little is known, except their enormous courage. We can sympathize with their suffering, admire their bravery, support their struggle.

But sympathy alone is not sufficient for a nation whose commitment to human rights was a hallmark for two centuries before the term became a political slogan. Can we not take concrete actions to protest the suffocation of liberty in the Soviet Union today?

I believe we can.

In May, I warned my colleagues of the impending disaster in store for Scharansky and Ginzburg. I suggested that we respond to the Soviets in decisive terms they could understand. A few weeks later, I proposed an amendment linking the use of Federal funds for trips sponsored by the National Science Foundation to violations of human rights by a host nation, a resolution which explicitly stated that if a nation did not conduct its international scientific affairs in accord with the principles laid down in the Helsinki Final Act, the United States should not participate.

There is little doubt that in these exchanges the United States gives more than it receives. It is unthinkable that taxpayers' money should be used to subsidize exchanges that are of benefit only to the Soviets, in light of the denial of human rights to some of the very participants in those exchanges.

Unfortunately, my proposition received little support from the administration and I withdrew it out of respect for the views of Senators Javits and Ribicoff, staunch supporters of human liberty who preferred to trust in the good intentions of the Soviets and felt such a move might be counterproductive.

Only now, in the shadow of the horror of the Scharansky and Ginzburg trials, has the administration begun to take a position. It is now implementing the very policies many of us advocated months ago. Some scientific visits have been cancelled by the Secretary of State. And the administration is undertaking a review of all bilateral agreements with the Soviet Union.

History has taught us the futility of failing to deal directly with oppression. In the past, we have been reluctant to become involved with events that, at first sight, appeared not to affect us directly. But I say to you tonight that, so long as such blatant disregard of human rights is demonstrated, none of us can hide behind national borders.

Finally, however, this much must be understood when we address the question of human rights. In pursuing the goal our concern must be the maximization of human rights, and not of political benefit. Events have shown that we can frequently do more to advance human rights when we act quietly. We are not in the business of overthrowing sovereign governments, so we don't have that option available as a means of advancing human rights. Accepting this, we know further that sovereign governments do not react well to being pressured in the international arena. In recent years we have seen the results of these tactics in dealing with the Soviets. Immigration has declined and show trials have increased.

And in our general advocacy of human rights, we must treat all nations alike, and not approach the question selectively. On that account, I say let us proceed with respect to the rights of the people of Israel, for the human rights of Jewish refugees and refugees from Arab lands and let us be truly even-handed instead of trying to mollify Israel with empty words and gestures while we try to ingratiate ourselves with Israel's adversaries by way of actions that threaten Israel's security and her very survival.

FAITHFUL ADHERENCE TO PRINCIPLE

In our domestic decisions, as well as in our dealings with other nations, we must be firm but not intransigent, committed to freedom and self-rule, dedicated to the preservation of fundamental human rights around the globe. We don't want to return to the day-to-day tensions of the Cold War. But we must insist on faithful adherence to basic principles of democracy and decency, in an unswerving commitment to the notion that freedom is the birthright of all men, that the destiny of all the peoples of the world--those living and to be born--is to be free.

With staunch support from men like Lester Hamburg, and with continuing Congressional commitment to our friends in the Middle East, I'm optimistic about the future of the state of Israel, about the prospects for peace in the Middle East.

And I'm deeply honored to have been a part of this wonderful evening in Pittsburgh.