



NEWS from U.S. Senator Bob Dole

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

FOR RELEASE: 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1977

CONTACT: JANET ANDERSON

DOLE LAUDS SADAT, BEGIN: WARNS AGAINST U.S. AMBITION TO BE KNOWN AS PEACEMAKER

MONTICELLO, N.Y.--"President Sadat's diplomacy suggests a radical and courageous departure from common practice," Senator Bob Dole said Wednesday night. "He is the first leader of stature to relinquish Israel as a valuable whipping boy, and to suggest that his people have more to gain from peace than from war, or from protracted preparation for war. It has been the habit of leadership [in Arab countries] to blame their failings, and the unhappy lot of their people, on Israel."

Dole lauded both Israeli Prime Minister Menahem Begin and Egyptian President Anwar Sadat for the peace initiatives in remarks prepared for delivery to the United Synagogue Biennial Convention meeting in Monticello, New York. "There is no way to refute the fact that Prime Minister Begin's policy of firmness on fundamentals has at last opened the door to peace," Dole told the group.

Criticizing the U.S. - U.S.S.R. push for a Geneva Conference, Dole said the "Carter Administration wants it, as nearly as I can understand, to vindicate the conclusions of a paper Mr. Brzezinski wrote for the Brookings Institute awhile ago."

"The President has been pinned to an imaginary achievement chart with imaginary deadlines, and for some reason it is assumed that he has to produce some startling accomplishments during his first year in office."

The Kansas Senator also warned that the United States "must be careful not to let our ambition to be known as a peacemaker stand in the way of peace itself."

"The Begin-Sadat initiative so far has met with little enthusiasm and less apparent encouragement by the Administration. If successful, it could well demonstrate conclusively that a step-by-step, country-by-country approach to peace is more useful than a spectacular conference that may end in a spectacular failure. It will demonstrate the bankruptcy of the so-called 'comprehensive settlement' approach to the Middle East problem. And it will focus attention not on the White House or the Kremlin as the instruments and guarantors of peace, but on the parties in conflict, which is where the real authority is, where the real responsibility lies, and where success or failure will ultimately be determined."

REMARKS OF SENATOR BOB DOLE
UNITED SYNAGOGUE BIENNIAL CONVENTION
CONCORD HOTEL - KIAMESHA LAKE, NEW YORK
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1977

I appreciate the opportunity to be with you this evening. I know some of us met earlier this year in Jerusalem. Those of you who were delegates to the ZOA Convention, or who attended in some capacity and heard Prime Minister Begin speak, will recall his message directed to Egypt at that time. We were witnessing the cultivating of seeds which had been planted, and which now may bear fruit in a rather miraculous way.

BEGIN IS ARCHITECT OF PEACE

President Carter has been saying for months that now was the most opportune moment for a settlement in the Middle East. He was right ... for the wrong reasons -- for reasons which had little to do with the U.S. initiative aimed at forcing Israel and her adversaries to an untimely meeting at Geneva.

The principal reasons that peace in the Middle East have become a real possibility are because Menahem Begin was elected Prime Minister in the face of U.S. and Arab calculations that he would not be elected; that he was able very quickly to win the broad support of the Israeli people, contrary to press speculation here that he would fail to do so; that he has been able to establish a strong working majority in the Knesset, contrary to official speculation here that he could not; and, that he has adopted a line toward the Arab states which is conciliatory on issues which affect their vital national interests, and which is unyielding insofar as their territorial ambitions are affected.

THE WEST BANK IS ISRAELI

The bellwether issue, which has muddied Middle East diplomacy for ten years, has been the disposition of the West Bank.

After the Six Day War, Israel agreed to give up the West Bank in exchange for a peace agreement. I cannot speak for the wisdom of such a proposal. All nations, Israel not least, have an inherent right to live in peace. From the beginning, Israel has been denied that right. She is the aggrieved party in the dispute. Israel also has both an historical claim and a legal right to the West Bank. The fact that the West Bank was taken by force and held by force for nineteen years in no way diminished Israel's claim. And so it seems to me at least questionable why Israel should have offered then, or should be called upon now, to give up her claim to the West Bank -- in order to be permitted to enjoy the right to live in peace.

It may be that the government of Israel will elect to relinquish its control over some part of the West Bank. As I have said previously, that is her right -- not her obligation. I believe we should support her absolutely in the exercise of that right. That is the answer to the question of settlements on the West Bank.

WEST BANK SETTLEMENTS, NOT AGGRESSION

There have been suggestions that the establishment of settlements are a calculated insult to President Carter. That is either an intentional misreading or a genuine misreading of what is taking place there today. I don't know which is worse. There would be settlements regardless of the quality or content of Prime Minister Begin's relations with President Carter. One has nothing to do with the other. The demonstration of good faith toward President Carter does not, and cannot be construed to, require Israel to forego its sovereign rights -- among them the right of its people to settle on their own land.

The settlements, as anyone who has ever visited the West Bank can confirm, are an act of faith -- not an act of aggression. The history of the redemption of land in Israel is one of Jews paying exorbitant prices for land that nobody else wanted anyway, and then loving the land back to life.

If that is aggression, if that is a calculated insult, then we ought to encourage it. It beats the standard forms of aggression by a country mile.

ISRAEL MUST BE JUDGED AND TREATED AS ALL OTHER NATIONS

Israel, frankly, has suffered from being on the losing end of a long propaganda battle because she has had the temerity to fight back when attacked, and worse than that, she has

had the audacity to win. The argument, pared to its essentials, is that Israel wants too much; not only does she want peace; but, on top of that, she wants to exist, and to exist in safety, and to be able to assure her own safety.

Stated so baldly, that proposition has the ring of a reductio ad absurdum. It happens, unfortunately, to be accurate. It is a curious judgement on Israel.

Every year, nations are admitted to the U.N. whose primary claim to nationhood is a flag and an airline, and you can't even find some of these so-called nations on a map. But no one questions their right to exist. And I certainly do not.

Yet, Israel is the only nation which is called upon again and again to justify her right to exist. The message which Menahem Begin has given, very forcefully, is that the international community will no longer be permitted to use one set of rules, one set of standards, one set of behavioral criteria for itself, and a special, unique set for Israel.

That has come as an unsettling proposition in some quarters. But it is slowly having the effect of finally convincing all parties to this conflict that there is nothing to be gained from using political, diplomatic and economic pressures to force Israel back into an untenable position where she can then be dismembered militarily.

MODERATE VS. RADICAL ARAB LEADERSHIP

This is a very compelling reality to moderate Arab leadership which seeks peace for its people, which seeks prosperity for its people, and which seeks the kind of stability in the area which is required to close the door to Russia's adventurism in that part of the world.

Unfortunately, not all Arab leadership falls in the moderate category. This is what creates the tragic paradox we see today where every step toward long-term peace increases the short-term chance of war.

We should have no illusions about the possibilities of peace. It is certainly no secret that I have very serious, fundamental differences with the Carter Administration's Mid-East Peace Plan. I think it is misnamed. It is not a peace plan. It is a plan which would seriously diminish the prospect of peace. It is based on illusions, and not on the reality of the situation in the Middle East.

ARAB NATIONS COVET OLD BRITISH MANDATE TERRITORY

The fundamental assumption of the plan is that if Israel retreated to the 1949 Armistice lines, and if a Palestinian state was established somewhere -- and you know where they have in mind -- then peace would result from that. The probability is that if the alleged irritant, the speck of sand in the eye of the Middle East -- Israel -- were to disappear tomorrow, in a very short time the area would be engulfed in the flames of war.

Ironically, Israel is the single greatest force for stability in the area. The territory of the old British Mandate -- including Israel and Jordan -- is the cockpit for Arab territorial ambitions which almost certainly could not be reconciled peacefully.

ARAB NATIONS IN CONFLICT

The inability of these nations to resolve their own differences and to co-exist in peace is not just a judgement based on historical experience, it is a reflection of contemporary events and you can follow it every day in the newspapers.

The latest upheaval is a potential war between Morocco and Algeria. Only recently, Egypt had to send troops to her western borders to battle Libya, and that was a bloody exchange. The efforts of President Sadat's predecessor, Abdel Nasser, against Yemen are a matter of record. There is constant friction between Iraq and Syria. The bloody record of assassinations and executions resulting from that conflict is there for all to examine. King Hussein has survived more assassination attempts than Idi Amin.

None of those situations take into account the PLO and other radical Palestinian groups, which increases the amount of past bloodshed and the prospect of future instability exponentially. And finally, none of this takes into account the internal circumstances of many of these nations which, under their own leadership, are insecure and intrinsically incapable of speaking for the course they may take after the next coup or the next assassination.

"COMPREHENSIVE SETTLEMENT" UNDESIRABLE AND UNATTAINABLE

Given all this, my assessment of the term comprehensive settlement, which has been given such currency by the present Administration, is that it would mean Israel would be in dire danger on three or four fronts, instead of one or two.

There are those who seek a settlement that will bring peace, and there are those who want a settlement that will improve their chances of success in another war. I would rather have a piecemeal peace which helps the antagonists get into the habit of getting along together, and which demonstrates the advantages of peace, than to have a comprehensive settlement which turns out to be another public relations gimmick that can't be sustained and that sets the groundwork for another round of war.

ARAB-JEWISH COOPERATION DEMONSTRATED IN SOUTHERN LEBANON

For now, nothing is more certain than the fact that some factions in the Middle East do not want peace, do not favor peace, and will do everything within their power to prevent peace. The experience on Israel's northern border is ample evidence of this. Israel's strong presence along the Good Fence has meant security for the Christian Arabs in Southern Lebanon, it has meant jobs, medical assistance and just plain hope. It has demonstrated that Jews and Arabs can cooperate, can work together in peace and harmony to their mutual benefit. This is the last thing that the PLO rejectionists want or can tolerate. It is an embarrassment to all those who have preached for years that the destruction of Israel is a holy obligation, and the only means of achieving peace.

To end this embarrassment and, ostensibly, to get peace talks going, the Administration pressured Israel to reduce its presence along that border. And when Israel did so, the PLO was permitted by Syria to reinfiltate the area, to attack Israel, and we have seen the tragic results of that for both sides.

The conclusion that must be drawn is that a strong Israeli presence prevented killing, and the withdrawal of Israeli forces permitted killing.

SADAT CAN BREAK THE CYCLE OF WAR

I want to believe, and I hope I am right, that Anwar Sadat is one of those who wants peace now, for its own sake and forever. He has shown that he is a man who is willing to take enormous risks. I believe his initiative toward Israel is the greatest risk of his career. It may produce the beginnings of a process toward a settlement between Jordan and Israel which might then encourage an accommodation between Syria and Israel. Or it may produce another tragic round of assassinations. I pray for his success.

I mean that sincerely. Today's world often suggests to us that cynicism is the better part of wisdom, and even those who are not cynics are at least confirmed sceptics. Where I come from, it is not considered bad manners to look at a horse's teeth before you buy him. It's just common sense. It is common sense to cut the cards when you sit down with the architect of the Yom Kippur War.

SADAT MEETS THE TEST OF SINCERITY

But having said all that, we still have to acknowledge that President Sadat's diplomacy suggests a radical and courageous departure from common practice. He is the first leader of stature to relinquish Israel as a valuable whipping boy, and to suggest that his people have more to gain from peace than from war, or from protracted preparation for war. It has been the habit of leadership there to blame their failings, and the unhappy lot of their people, on Israel.

By his actions, Anwar Sadat is sacrificing the traditional gilt-edged excuse for governmental failures in the Middle East. I think that is a token of sincere intent on which we must rely.

THE BEGINNINGS OF PEACE

It would be nice if the events of the next few days should result in Anwar Sadat and the man who has been unjustly branded a terrorist -- Menahem Begin -- going to Stockholm next year to receive the Nobel Peace Prize. I hope it happens. The beginnings of peace in the Middle East would be a prize in which the whole world could share equally and gratefully.

The beginnings of peace in the Middle East could mark the beginning of the end of a renewed opportunity for aggression by the Soviet Union. The reintroduction of the Soviet Union into the Middle East equation has been the single most troublesome blunder in U.S. international relations in recent memory.

Bringing Russia back into the Middle East has been justified on the grounds that she is co-chairman of the Geneva Conference. That is both true and irrelevant. It is irrelevant because there is no clear justification for the anxious push to reconvene the Geneva Conference. The terms dictated in advance by the U.S. to Israel were not only unacceptable, but deadly. They eliminated any need for a Conference, if, indeed, such a need existed at all.

GENEVA CONFERENCE UNTIMELY, IMPROBABLE

Israel has agreed to a working paper containing the broad procedural outlines for reconvening a Conference, and now the Arab States refuse to accept those procedures. I do not suggest that this is grounds for condemning the Arab States, but rather it is a clear indication of the wrong-headedness of any effort to force the parties back together at Geneva.

Those who are most interested in going to Geneva are not Israel and her adversaries, but Russia and the United States. Russia wants it for the opportunity to secure the role she was closed out of in 1974, and the Carter Administration wants it, as nearly as I can understand, to vindicate the conclusions of a paper Mr. Brzezinski wrote for the Brookings Institute awhile ago. Presumably there are other reasons, but they are unclear to me.

I do find it ominous that the Soviet willingness to move forward on a SALT agreement was contemporaneous with the Carter Administration's sudden move to bring Russia back into the Middle East. Asking Russia to help make peace in the Middle East is like putting a box to guard the chicken coop. All their instincts militate toward mischief.

We can assess their attitude toward the Jews of Israel by considering their policy toward the Jews of Russia. It is a policy of intimidation, repression and spiritual annihilation.

BELGRADE HUMAN RIGHTS CONFERENCE

Let me say, parenthetically, that I will be going to Belgrade for the "Human Rights" Conference on Monday, and I intend to put the case very precisely in just those words. Arthur Goldberg did it last week, and with the uproar that resulted, you would have thought someone asked Russia to give Sakhalin Island back to Japan -- its rightful owner.

That's an interesting example of a double standard, by the way. The Russians took Sakhalin from Japan after World War II and the Atlas shows it belonging to Russia now. It's as though we had stolen Sicily, and refused to return it. Yet Jerusalem, the capital and indisputable possession of Israel, is still considered by some to be disputed territory.

SALT NEGOTIATIONS DISTURBING

Russia is working to discipline the Carter Administration, and it is not clear what will be in the SALT proposal. I hope it has not been purchased at Israel's expense. I hope it is an agreement that the Senate can ratify. But I am not optimistic.

SOVIET POWER LEADS TO SOVIET ADVENTURISM

If recent authoritative news reports are true, our SALT negotiator, Paul Warnke, has agreed to terms that would give the Soviets clear and unquestioned strategic superiority in the mid-80's.

The concessions reportedly agreed to by Warnke include:

- banning any U.S. heavy ICBM and allowing the Soviet 308.
- banning the U.S. M-X and Trident II missiles and allowing the Soviets to deploy their new SS 16, 17, and 18 ICMB's, SSN 17 and 18 submarine missiles and SS 20 mobile medium range missile.
- limiting our air-launched cruise missile to less than fifteen hundred miles, and our submarine cruise missiles to only 360 miles.
- agreeing to limit B-52's with cruise missiles to no more than 120.
- allow the Soviets unlimited numbers of intercontinental Backfire bombers, while the U.S. has given up B-1.

These lopsided concessions are being defended by Warnke supporters with the argument that Soviet superiority would be harmless. Reasonable men, and certainly those of us concerned with Israel's security, cannot accept such naive reasoning.

The memoirs of the great statesmen of this century are drawn together by one common thread. Whether Munich, Berlin or the Cuban Missile Crisis, the outcome of grave crises has always been heavily influenced by what Dean Acheson described as "the shadow that power casts". If we had not enjoyed a clear six-to-one strategic advantage over Russia in 1962 for instance, it is unlikely that the Cuban blockade would have ended happily for the U.S.

Strategic nuclear superiority provides our national leadership with greatly enhanced freedom to take forceful action. Superiority in the hands of Western leaders was used for twenty years vigorously to checkmate Soviet adventurism. Superiority in the hands of Soviet leaders would provide a strong reinforcement to that very Soviet adventurism.

Such a shift in the strategic balance would be of enormous consequences -- most particularly in the Middle East. In a balance of Soviet superiority, the U.S. simply could not provide the security and military support to Israel in a confrontation where the Soviets chose to intervene against Israel.

I am not suggesting that to avoid such catastrophe, the U.S. must seek itself to achieve strategic superiority. But I do say that the fates of Israel, NATO and the U.S. demand that we never permit the Soviets to achieve it.

I raise this troubling issue with you tonight only because I believe that very shift in the balance is at issue in the current SALT negotiations, and I have no more confidence in the conduct of the SALT negotiations than I had in the plan for negotiations at Geneva on the Middle East.

I do not mean to castigate and condemn the President's efforts. I do not defend them, either. I simply suggest that a number of extremely delicate situations are being held hostage to unrealistic expectations that have little to do with the long range prospects for peace in the Middle East or in the world.

CARTER A VICTIM OF EXPECTATIONS

In the aftermath of last year's Presidential elections, there were a number of public presumptions, not just involving peace in the Middle East, but also involving the economy, energy, the cities, and other areas of national and international concern. The President has been pinned to an imaginary achievement chart with imaginary deadlines, and for some reason it is assumed that he has to produce some startling accomplishments during his first year in office.

The news cycle and the natural rhythms of the legislative process or of international affairs don't always coincide. This creates an unhealthy situation. The push to convene a Geneva Conference before the end of the year is just one of a series of desperate undertakings that cannot be explained on their face, but can only be explained as an effort to show a good report card at the end of one year in office.

I think it's time to take the pressure off the President and let him concentrate on establishing a good record over his entire term in office, rather than creating expectations which require him to come up with a flashy public relations triumph in his first year in office. That is a trap which he is falling into, and he's about to take the Congress, the country, and Israel with him.

ADMINISTRATION UNENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT BEGIN-SADAT INITIATIVE

The Begin-Sadat initiative so far has been met with little enthusiasm and less apparent encouragement by the Administration. If successful, it could well demonstrate conclusively that a step-by-step, country-by-country approach to peace is more useful than a spectacular conference that may end in a spectacular failure. It will demonstrate the bankruptcy of the so-called "comprehensive settlement" approach to the Middle East problem. And it will focus attention not on the White House and the Kremlin as the instruments and the guarantors of peace, but on the parties in conflict, which is where the real authority is, where the real responsibility lies, and where success or failure will ultimately be determined.

We must be careful not to let our ambition to be known as a peacemaker stand in the way of peace itself.

BEGIN HAS MADE PEACE POSSIBLE

There is no way to refute the fact that Prime Minister Begin's policy of firmness on fundamentals has at last opened the door to peace. It is apparent to me that the United States can best help to keep the door open by supporting Israel in her policy of firmness and not by sending signals that we may be willing or able to force Israel to retreat from such fundamental positions as no Palestinian state on the West Bank and no retreat from the West Bank, except as Israel itself may choose to withdraw.

WE CANNOT DICTATE PEACE

It is within our reach; indeed, it is within the reach of President Carter himself, to be an instrument of peace. That is an accolade which every President seeks, I believe, as his highest goal. I wish it for him. I say it sincerely. Peace is not a partisan, political plaything. It is too important for that. But let it be recognized that it is enough merely to be an instrument of peace. Let it come as it will, as it may. Let us not seek to dictate it. The effort to do so cannot bring a lasting peace, and it may be destructive in the end.

If things go well, if our prayers are answered, in a matter of days the leaders of two great nations -- of one great people with a common spiritual root -- may come together to redeem 29 years of bitterness and bloodshed, and a history that reaches back to the Torah.

You will soon celebrate Channukah and your children will play with their dreidals on which are marked Nun, Gimel, Hay, Shin -- "Ness Gadol Hayah Shom". It happened in Jerusalem. Such a miracle happened again in 1967. Perhaps another -- the miracle of peace -- will begin there in 1977. Let us be prepared to nurture it.

Shalom.