

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

---

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

---

**Collection:** Reagan, Ronald: 1980 Campaign Papers,  
1965-1980

**Series:** XV: Speech Files (Robert Garrick and Bill Gavin)

**Subseries:** B: Bill Gavin File

**Folder Title:** Drafts and Back-up Documents –  
09/03/1980, B'nai B'rith (3 of 4)

**Box:** 437

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: [reagan.library@nara.gov](mailto:reagan.library@nara.gov)

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

THEODORE E. CUMMINGS  
9864 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
BEVERLY HILLS, CALIFORNIA 90210

August 19, 1980

Mr. Ed Meese  
Deputy Director, Issues  
Reagan-Bush Committee  
901 South Highland  
Arlington, Virginia 22204

Re: Enclosure

Dear Ed:

In response to your mailgram, enclosed please find recommendations regarding vital issues of concern to the Jewish community in connection with Governor Reagan's major address on September 3, 1980 in Washington, D.C.

ISRAEL

Reinforce positive statements supporting Israel already made; e.g. those in speech accepting nomination, and those in the platform which forcefully speak of Israel's moral and strategic importance.

(Note Carter indicated he would not fully support the Democratic Party plank on Jerusalem.)

Restate support as noted in the Republican platform, "Republicans believe that Jerusalem should remain an undivided city with continued free access to all holy places..."

Emphasize theme of Israel as a democratic pro U.S. ally.

Point to the shortsightedness of Administration policies in considering additional military sales of (a) 100 M60 tanks to Jordan, (b) components to increase the range and capability of the F15 fighters already sold to Saudi Arabia and (c) proposed sale of jets to Iraq.

THEODORE E. CUMMINGS  
9864 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
BEVERLY HILLS, CALIFORNIA 90210

Ed Meese  
August 19, 1980  
Page Two

SOVIET JEWRY

Acknowledge the dramatic decrease in Soviet Jewish emigration -- January - July, 50-60%, August and September, 70-80%.

Need to emphasize the seriousness of discussions at the upcoming Madrid Conference convened to monitor the progress in Soviet compliance with the Helsinki Accords.

Call attention to continuing Soviet violation of human rights conventions and own Constitution re: freedom of all its citizens - restrictions on Jews.

IRAN

Expressions against the Ayatollah Khomeini and the anti-Semitism of the Khomeini regime which has brought severe restrictions on the lives of Jews and all non-Moslems. Verified reports of mock trials and the hanging of at least four Jews.

KKK

A clear statement condemning individuals associated with or the leaders of the Klan and the Nazi party who are currently running for congressional seats, e.g. Tom Metzger, Grand Dragon of California Klan who is running against Congressman Claire Burgener (R-San Diego).

THEODORE E. CUMMINGS  
9864 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
BEVERLY HILLS, CALIFORNIA 90210

Ed Meese  
August 19, 1980  
Page Three

Condemnation of the KKK and any other organizations formed to perpetuate anti-Semitism and bigotry.

Continued Aid to Israel

It is important that Governor Reagan clearly enunciate his view on U.S. aid to Israel.

Sincerely,



THEODORE E. CUMMINGS

TEC n7b

Draft: #2

August 29, 1980

5:15 p.m. (N.K., R.V.A., W.F.G.)

Tonight I want to speak to you about the state of Israel, of its importance to our own nation and its importance to world peace.

But in a sense when I speak of Israel, I speak as well of other concerns of B'Nai Brith and of the entire Jewish community in the United States. Israel is not only a nation--it is a symbol. During my campaign I have spoken of the values of family, work, neighborhood, peace and freedom. I made a commitment to see to it that those values are at the heart of policy-making in the Reagan administration. Israel symbolizes those values. What is Israel if not the creation of families, working together to build a place to live and work and prosper in peace and freedom?

Thus, in defending Israel's right to exist, we defend something more than a nation--we defend the very values upon which our own nation is built.

The long agony of Jews in the Soviet Union is, of course, never far from our minds and hearts. Once again, those ancient, simple, yet essential values come to mind: all these suffering people ask for is that their families get the chance to work where they choose, in freedom and peace. They will not be forgotten by a Reagan Administration.

But I must tell you this:

No policy, no matter how heartfelt, no matter how deeply rooted in the humanitarian vision we share, can succeed if

the United States of America continues its descent into economic impotence and despair.

The survival of Israel and the ability of the United States to bring all the pressures it can to bear on the situation of dissidents against tyranny: neither of these can be expected to become realistic policy choices if our American economy continues to deteriorate under the Carter policies of **HIGH** unemployment, taxes and inflation.

The rhetoric of compassion and concern becomes mere words if not support by the vision--and reality--of economic growth. And the present administration does not seem to realize this. It seems to believe that if the right kind of words are chosen and repeated often enough, all will be well. Can those who share your humanitarian concerns--as I do--ignore the connection between economic policy, national strength and the ability to do the work of friendship and justice and peace in our own nation and world?

The theme of this convention, "A Covenant with Tomorrow" is one which speaks directly to the question of American interests and the well-being of Israel. There is no covenant with the future which is not firmly rooted in our covenant with the past. Since the rebirth of the State of Israel, there has been an iron-clad bond between that democracy and this one.

We insist that this bond is a moral imperative. I agree. But the history of relations between states demonstrates that while morality is most frequently given as a motive for

actions, the true and abiding motive is self-interest. And the touchstone of our relationship with Israel is that a secure, strong Israel is in America's self-interest. Israel is a major strategic asset to America.

Israel is not a client, but a friend--and a very reliable friend, which is not something that can be said of the United States today.

While we have since 1948 clung to the argument of a moral imperative to explain our commitment to Israel, no Administration has ever deluded itself that Israel was not of permanent strategic importance to America. Until, that is, the Carter Administration, which has violated this covenant with the past. I submit to you that it cannot and will not honor a covenant with tomorrow.

The interests of all the world are served by peace in the Middle East. Short of that ultimate goal, our interests are served by stability. To weaken Israel is to destabilize the Middle East. To destabilize the Middle East today is to risk the peace of the world. And at the same time, today the road to peace in the world runs through the Middle East.

How do we travel that road?

First, we cannot positively influence events at the perimeters of our power if power--including economic power--at the center is diminished, and policy in disarray.

The conduct of this nation's foreign policy in the last four years has been marked by inconsistency, incompetence, and inconstancy.

We require and will have a foreign policy which our allies understand and our adversaries understand. Our policies will be based upon consultation with our allies.

We require and will have the defensive capability necessary to ensure the credibility of our foreign policy, and the security of our allies and ourselves: for there can be no security for one without the other.

Today our defensive capacity has been so seriously eroded as to constitute not a deterrent but a temptation.

This is not a campaign issue, it is a matter of grave national concern; so grave, indeed, that the President considers it a liability to his personal political fortunes and, on that account, tries to give the appearance of responding to it. But the half-hearted measures he proposes are clearly inadequate to the task.

We must restore the vital margin of safety which this administration has allowed to erode. We must maintain a defensive capability that our adversaries will respect and that our allies can rely upon.

We must have Presidential leadership that our adversaries will respect, and that our allies can rely upon.

In 1976 Candidate Jimmy Carter came before this convention and said: "I have called for closer ties with our traditional allies, and stronger ties with the State of Israel. I have stressed," he said, "the necessity for a strong defense--tough and muscular, and adequate to maintain freedom under any conceivable circumstances."



Apparently, the candidate didn't listen to his own call. Today we have fewer real allies and, among those remaining, we speak with diminished authority. Our relations with Israel are marked by doubt and distrust. Israel today is in grave danger, and so is freedom itself.

In 1976, Jimmy Carter declared that they would seek what they called a "comprehensive settlement" in the Middle East. What this might mean for Israel and how this might be achieved were questions neither asked nor answered. When the answers became apparent, it was too late.

The comprehensive agreement which Mr. Carter sought required first a reconvening of the Geneva Conference. Israel was amenable to it. Her adversaries agreed conditionally. The conditions were that the Palestine Liberation Organization be represented and that Israel effectively agree in advance of negotiation to withdraw to the pre-1967 borders, which borders were in fact armistice lines resulting from the first effort to destroy the State of Israel. Israel rightly refused these conditions and was promptly accused of intransigence.

Mr. Carter invited the Soviet Union to join him in his effort to force Israel to accept the mockery of negotiations in Geneva. It had taken a major effort to keep Russia out of the Middle East peace process. In October, 1977, Mr. Carter invited them back in free of charge, and they graciously accepted. The Carter Administration presented as a major

achievement the conclusion of a joint Soviet-American accord which would have given the Russians a strong-hold over negotiations, as well as a convenient calling card for inserting themselves more deeply into the Middle East.

None of this impressed Israel particularly, but it seriously disturbed President Sadat. The President of Egypt did not share Mr. Carter's appreciation of the Soviets, and he apparently came to the conclusion which other world leaders, including Mr. Brezhnev, have reached: Mr. Carter is incapable of distinguishing between his own short-term political interests, and the nation's long-term foreign policy interests. Mr. Carter professed not to understand what all the fuss was about and said he was "proud of the Russians."

The result was that the United States government, for the first time in the history of the rebirth of Israel, found itself on the outside looking in. President Sadat made his courageous trip to Jerusalem at the invitation of Prime Minister Begin, and a bi-lateral peace process began. Without, let me re-emphasize, the participation of Mr. Carter. The quick foreign policy success that Carter had hoped to achieve had turned into the first major foreign policy embarrassment of his Administration.

We must not have any illusions about precisely what is at stake in the Middle East. The overriding issue is neither refugees, or oil. These are grave and momentous problems. But the overriding issue which impedes every

productive attempt at solutions to those problems is the effort of the Soviet Union to maintain turmoil there and under the cover of that turmoil to project itself further and further into the area.

For thirty years the Soviet Union has been exploiting every possible conflict in this region--and awakening a number which have been slumbering--in order to advance its power, taking foothold after foothold, and country after country, until today we find its outposts stretched from Afghanistan to Algeria, from Syria to Libya to Ethiopia and Angola. Throughout this period, the Soviet leaders have stirred up Arab hostility to Israel as a cruel weapon for provoking and prolonging war after war, and have abetted an endless cycle of terrorism, in order to bring Arab states under its own influence. The Arab-Israeli conflict could have ended in a just and lasting peace a long time ago--in the early 1950's--had not the Soviet Union tempted Arab leaders to imagine that Soviet arms and Soviet political support would permit them to destroy Israel. This is the source of the single most important obstacle to peace between Israel and her neighbors: the fact that continuing hostility there is fundamental to Soviet expansionism.

Thus, what we do or fail to do in the Middle East is of vital importance not only to the peoples of the region, but to the security of our country, our Atlantic and Pacific allies, Africa, China and the Asian subcontinent.

Because of the weak and confused leadership of Jimmy Carter, we are approaching a flashpoint in this tragic process, with Soviet power now deployed in a manner which directly threatens Iran, the Persian Gulf and Arabian Sea; with Soviet forces and proxy forces building up again in the region; with Soviet fleets and air bases emplaced along the sea lanes on which we and our Allies and the entire free world depend. We must act decisively while there is still time to protect our interest in peace.

In spite of this I am confident that if we act with vigor, vision and practical good sense we can peacefully blunt the Soviet thrust. We can rely upon other responsible Arab leaders in time to learn what Anwar Sadat learned, which is that no people can long endure the cost of Soviet patronage.

How we deal with Israel and her neighbors in this period will determine whether we rebuild the peace process or whether we continue to drift. But let it be clear that the cornerstone of our effort and of our interest is a secure Israel, and our mutual objective is peace.

First, while we can help the nations of that area move toward peace, we cannot and should not try to force a settlement upon them. A dictated peace will not be a lasting peace.

Second, our diplomacy must be sensitive to the legitimate concerns of all in the area. Before a negotiated peace can ever hope to command the loyalty of the whole region, it must first be acceptable to Israelis and Arabs alike.

Third, and most important, we must rebuild our reputation for trustworthiness. We must again become a nation that can be trusted to live up to its commitments.

In 1976 candidate Carter said: "I am concerned with the way in which our country, as well as the Soviet Union, Britain and France have poured arms into certain Arab countries-- five or six times more than Israel receives."

But it was Mr. Carter who agreed to sell 60 F-15 fighters to Saudi Arabia. To get the Congress to go along, he assured these aircraft would not have certain offensive capabilities. Today the Secretary of Defense tells us he cannot say whether this commitment to Congress will be honored until after November 4.

It was Mr. Carter who agreed to sell 100 main battle tanks to Jordan.

It was Mr. Carter who agreed to provide U.S. licensed turbine engines for Iraqi warships.

In 1976 candidate Carter said: "I do not believe that the road to peace (in the Middle East) can be found by U.S. Soviet imposition of a settlement."

We know how long he held that opinion after he was elected.

In 1976 candidate Carter said of the Palestinians: "We must make it clear to the world that there can be no reward for terrorism."

Then, in 1977, President Carter said there must be a Palestinian "homeland."

In 1976 candidate Carter said: "We have all been deeply disturbed by the drift of the United Nations and by the acrimony and cliquishness that seems to have taken hold."

Today what is happening in the U.N. is undermining the peace process and the United States is noted there not for its leadership but for its followership.

I was appalled to see the Carter Administration abstain, rather than veto, the Resolution passed by the United Nations Security Council two weeks ago. As I stated then, the Resolution not only undermines progress toward peace by putting the United Nations on record against Israel and on one side of the sensitive issue of the status of Jerusalem; it also presumes to order other nations--including our Dutch ally--to move their embassies from Jerusalem.

When I learned that Jimmy Carter had failed to instruct his Secretary of State to veto this Resolution, I went back and read the Democratic Platform adopted only a week earlier in New York City. It said, and I quote: ". . .The Democratic Party recognizes and supports 'the established status of Jerusalem as the Capital of Israel, with free access to all its holy places provided to all faiths. As a symbol of this stand, the U.S. Embassy should be moved from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.'"

Within one short week of agreeing to run on this platform, Jimmy Carter acted precisely opposite to its clear provisions.

I believe this sorry episode sheds some new light on an earlier action by Jimmy Carter concerning another U.N. resolution, voted on in March this year. March 1, the Carter Administration failed to veto a most mischievous U.N. Resolution that condemned Israel's presence in Jerusalem, calling it an "occupation." That was the position of the Carter Administration on Saturday. Two days later, on Monday, reacting to the public outcry, Jimmy Carter put the blame for this outrage on his Secretary of State and reversed the position of his Administration.

The Carter pattern emerges with appalling clarity. The man who asks "trust me," zigzags and flip-flops in ever more rapid gyrations, trying to court favor with everyone: Israel and the PLO, the voting bloc in the United Nations and the voters at home. On March 1st it took the Carter Administration three days to switch positions. On August 20th it took them only three minutes. Secretary of State Muskie condemned the U.N. Resolution on Jerusalem in a long speech, no doubt courting favor with the voters at home; then, minutes later, he failed to veto this resolution, courting favor with the PLO and their friends.

This is the Carter record on the Middle East. Arab leaders are persuaded that we don't say what we mean. Israel is persuaded that we don't mean what we say. We cannot build productive relations with either side on such a basis.

Before we can act with authority abroad, we have to demonstrate our ability to make domestic policy without getting the permission of other governments.

It was Mr. Carter who sent an emissary to Saudi Arabia to ask for permission to store petroleum in our own country-- a strategic reserve vital to our national security and a measure long demanded by Congress. The Saudis, predictably, said no. So the Carter Administration caved in and halted the stockpiling.

We cannot have relations with our friends in the Arab world <sup>BUILT</sup> upon their contempt for us.

If we clear away the debris of the past four years, the following issues remain to test the good faith of the Arab nations and of Israel, and to challenge our national will and our diplomatic skills in helping them to shape a peace.

There is the unresolved question of territorial rights resulting from the 1967 war.

There is the status of Jerusalem which is a part of the first question.

There is the matter of refugees.

There is the matter of the PLO, which I consider distinct from the matter of refugees.

Let me address these in order.

The question of territory, putting aside Jerusalem for the moment, must still be decided in accordance with Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. We will tolerate no effort to supersede those Resolutions. We must weigh the



future utility of the Camp David accords against that position.

As Camp David recedes, we must recognize that there are basic ambiguities in the Camp David documents, both in the links between the Israeli-Egyptian peace, and in the provisions for an autonomous regime in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. These ambiguities have now brought negotiations to a dangerous impasse.

It should be recalled that the idea of an autonomous Palestinian Arab regime for the West Bank and the Gaza Strip was an Israeli proposal--a major concession on Israel's part in the interest of progress toward peace.

We can understand the importance of that concession by going back to the first principles governing the situation in those areas. Under Security Council Resolution 242, Israel has the right to administer the West Bank and the Gaza Strip until Jordan, and Syria at least, have made peace with her. Moreover, Resolution 242 provides that when peace comes, Israel should withdraw her armed forces, not necessarily to her 1967 borders, but to "secure and recognized boundaries" which can be protected by special security arrangements.

These provisions reflect the disappointment and false hopes of many earlier efforts in the quest for peace as well as the special legal status of these territories. They are not, like Sinai and the Golan Heights, internationally recognized

parts of Egypt, Jordan, Syria or any other state. Instead, they are unallocated territories of a British mandate for Palestine, still subject under international law to the principles of the mandate as a trust. Israel is in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip not merely as an occupying power, but as a claimant. Both Israel and Jordan have legitimate interests in the West Bank.

Negotiations between Israel and Jordan could take a long and creative step towards resolving these problems. Israel and Jordan are the two Palestinian states envisioned and authorized by the United Nations. Jordan is now recognized as sovereign in some 80 percent of the old territory of Palestine. Israel and Jordan are the parties primarily authorized to settle the future of the unallocated territories, in accordance with the principles of the mandate and the provisions of Resolutions 242 and 338.

Thus the autonomy plan called for in the Camp David Agreements must be interpreted in accordance with the two Security Council Resolutions, which remain the decisive and authoritative rules governing the situation. The Camp David Agreements cannot and should not lead to fundamental changes in the security position, or to the withdrawals of Israeli troops, until Jordan and Syria at least make peace.

Jerusalem has been a source of man's spiritual inspiration since King David founded it, and the target of various national aspirations for many centuries.

Now it exists as a shared trust. The holy places of all faiths are protected. They are open to all. More than this, each is under the care and control of representatives of the respective faiths.

By contrast, under Jordanian control, the Jews were expelled and given no access to their holy places. The consequence of this control within the Islamic world was not one of universal satisfaction, however. King Faisal used to say he wished he might visit Jerusalem, but would not while it was held by the Jews. It is worth noting, however, that he would not go while it was held by the Jordanians either.

So we confront this aspect of an experience quite different from our ~~own~~, in which religion and nationalism combine. It is reasonable conclusion that even were Israel to abandon her capital, the result would not be a permanent and peaceful resolution of the question of Jerusalem.

Then there are the holy places themselves, and the fervor these generate. The Islamic people say Jerusalem is our ~~the~~ holiest city, we should have it. The Jewish people say Hebron is our second holiest city, we belong there.

Just as we will advance suggestions for a settlement within the framework of 242, so we will advance suggestions for the specific resolution of the question of Jerusalem which, as any policy proposal must be, will be in accordance with reality. And the reality is that Israel is not going to relinquish her position in Jerusalem, nor her claim to Jerusalem as her capital city. I intend to accommodate to that reality, but

I will not go beyond that today. To do so would serve no purpose. I do not promise miracles in this regard, although, given the situs, we can agree there are precedents. I do promise a sensitive effort.

I believe the problem can be solved by men of good will. The immediate problem is to make it easier for men of good will to come to the table.

Which brings me to the PLO. President Carter refuses to brand the PLO as a terrorist organization.

I do not hesitate.

We live in a world in which any band of thugs clever enough to get the word "liberation" into their name can thereupon murder school children and have the deeds considered glamorous and glorious. Terrorists are terrorists, not guerillas, not commandos or freedom-fighters or anything else, and they should be identified as such. If others must deal with them, establish diplomatic relations with them, allow them to open embassies, let it be on their heads. They should know that the cost of appeasement has always proved to be exorbitant.

What needs to be understood about the PLO, which is said to represent the Palestinian refugees, is that it represents no one but the leaders who established it as a means of organizing aggression against Israel. The PLO is kept under tight control in every state in the area except Lebanon which it has effectively destroyed. As for those it purports to represent, when any Palestinian breathes a word about peace with Israel,

he is immediately a target for assassination. The PLO has murdered more Palestinians than it has Israelis.

This nation made an agreement with Israel in 1975 concerning its relations with the PLO.

This Administration has violated it.

We are concerned not only with whether the PLO renounces its charter calling for the destruction of Israel. We are equally concerned with whether it is truly representative of the Palestinian people. If we can be satisfied on both counts, then we will not be dealing with the PLO as we know it, but an organization quite different: one truly representative of those Arab Palestinians dedicated to peace and not to the establishment of a Soviet satellite in the heart of the Middle East.

Finally, the question of Arab Palestinian refugees.

My analysis of this tragic situation begins with the Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel, May 14, 1948. For those of you who don't remember it, I will read the relevant paragraph:

"We appeal--in the very midst of the onslaught launched against us now for months--to the Arab inhabitants of the State of Israel to preserve peace and to participate with us in the upbuilding of the State on the basis of full and equal citizenship and due representation in all its provisional and

permanent institutions."

Tragically, this appeal was rejected. People left their land and their homes confident Israel would be destroyed in a matter of days and they could return. It didn't happen. So when we measure the tragedy we measure culpability, and Israel shares no part of it.

The answer to the refugee problem is assimilation. Even if there were to be a West Bank state, there would not be sufficient room on the West Bank to accommodate them. So the answer is assimilation, and the most logical place for them to be assimilated is Jordan, designated by the U.N. as the Arab Palestinian state.

Let me conclude with words from the Psalms. They speak to our concerns tonight, for they encompass all that we strive for. They are a vision of our ideals, of the goal to which we strive with constancy, dedication and faith. They embrace our hopes for a just, lasting peace in the Middle East and our

hopes that the works of justice and mercy be done at home:

...May our garnerers be full,

affording every kind of store;...

May there be no breach in the walls,

no exile, no outcry in our streets.

Happy the people for whom things are thus;

It is given to us to work to see that this vision is never lost, that its message is never forgotten, that the work of peace and justice and freedom goes on, inspired by our values, guided by our faith and made permanent by our commitment.

~~B'NAI BRITH SPEECH~~

DRAFT  
DATE: (Koch/1981/1/10)  
TIME: NK RHH WFG

Tonight I want to speak to you about the state of Isreal, of its importance to our own nation and its importance to world peace.

But in a sense when I speak of Isreal, I speak as well of other concerns of B'Nai Brith and of the entire Jewish community in the United States. Isreal is not only a nation--it is a symbol. <sup>During my Campaign</sup> ~~When, in my~~ ~~acceptance speech,~~ <sup>I have spoken</sup> I spoke of the values of family, work, neighborhood, peace and freedom, I made a committment to see to it that those values are at the heart of policy-making in the Reagan administration. Isreal symbolizes those values. What is Isreal if not the creation of families, working together to build a place to live and work and prosper in peace and freedom?

Thus, in defending Isreal's right to exist, we defend something more than a nation--we defend the very values upon which our own nation is built. ~~The humanitarian concerns that have long inspired B'Nai Brith are at the heart of my own views on foreign policy.~~

The long agony of Jews in the Soviet Union is, of course, never far from our minds and hearts. Once again, those ancient, simple, yet essential values come to mind: all these suffering people ask for is that their families get the chance to work where they choose, in freedom and peace. They will not be forgotten by a Reagan administration.

But I must tell you this:

No policy, no matter how heartfelt, no matter how deeply rooted in the humanitarian vision we share, can succeed if the United States of America continues its descent into economic impotence and despair.

The survival of Isreal and the ability of the United States to bring all the pressures it can to bear on the situation of dissidents against tyrrany: neither of these can be expected to become realistic policy choices if <sup>our American</sup> the economy continues to deteriorate <sup>under the Carter policies of</sup> unemployment, taxes and inflation.



The rhetoric of compassion and concern becomes mere words if not support by the vision--and reality--of economic growth. And the present administration does not seem to realize this. It seems to believe that if the right kind of words are chosen and repeated often enough, all will be well.

Can those who share your humanitarian concerns--as I do--ignore the connection between economic policy, <sup>national strength</sup> and the ability to do the work of friendship and justice and <sup>PEACE</sup> ~~love~~ in our own nation and world?

Koch 393-2111  
299-7297 (H)

Bna's Birth  
Draft -  
Revises and incorporates  
8/28/draft  
Koch effort

It is the tradition that when a Presidential candidate comes before an audience of Jewish Americans, he speaks of Israel. It is not a tradition that I approve of, for it forces the view that this is a single issue constituency. It ignores your natural and active concern for a broad range of issues which trouble all Americans, from the state of our economy to the health of our cities, the quality of our schools, the adequacy of our defense establishment and so forth.

The obverse of that truth, as you know, is that you are not the only Americans concerned with the survival and success of the State of Israel. It is a matter of broad and abiding concern to all Americans. And so I address the question today not as a narrow, parochial issue, but as an issue which profoundly engages the national interests.

The theme of this convention, "A Covenant with Tomorrow" is one which speaks directly to the question of American interests and the well-being of Israel. There is no covenant with the future which is not firmly rooted in our covenant with the past. Since the ~~recreation~~ <sup>rebirth</sup> of the State of Israel, there has been an iron-clad bond between that democracy and this one.

We insist that this bond is a moral imperative. I agree. But the history of relations between states demonstrates that while morality is most frequently given as a motive for actions, the true and abiding motive is self-interest. And the touchstone of our relationship with Israel is that a secure, strong Israel is in America's self-interest. Israel is a major strategic asset to America.

Israel is not a client, but ~~an ally~~ <sup>a friend</sup> -- and a very reliable ~~ally~~ <sup>friend</sup>, which is not something that can be said of the United States today.

I do not see our relationship with Israel as one-sided, I do not see it as a luxury, I do not see it as detrimental to any other interest we may have in the world; I do not see it as a problematical impediment to some hypothetical world order, as espoused by the incumbent Administration.

While we have since 1948 clung to the argument of a moral imperative to explain our commitment to Israel, no Administration has ever deluded itself that Israel was not of permanent strategic importance to America. <sup>that is, the Carter Administration, which</sup> Until <sup>this</sup> ~~this one~~. This one has violated the covenant with the past, ~~and~~ I submit to you that it cannot and will not honor a covenant with tomorrow.

~~The western democracies have a community of interest with Israel in the Middle East.~~ <sup>the world</sup> The interests of all <sup>in the Middle East</sup> are served by peace. Short of that ultimate goal, our interests are served by stability. To weaken Israel is to destabilize the Middle East. To destabilize the Middle East today is to risk the peace of the world. And at the same time, today the road to peace in the world runs through the Middle East.

How do we travel that road?

First, we cannot positively influence events at the perimeters of our power <sup>-- include economic power --</sup> if power <sup>at the center</sup> is diminished, and policy in disarray. ~~include the economy~~

The conduct of this nation's foreign policy in the last four years has been marked by inconsistency, incompetence, and inconstancy.

We require and will have a foreign policy which our allies understand and our adversaries understand. Our policies will be based upon consultation with our allies, and more than this, I intend to depart from the current trend by assuring you that our policies will even be developed in consultation with the Secretary of State.

We require and will have the defensive capability necessary to ensure the credibility of our foreign policy, and the security of our allies and ourselves; for there can be no security for one without the other.

Today our defensive capacity has been so seriously eroded as to constitute not a deterrent but a temptation.

This is not a campaign issue, it is a matter of grave national concern; so grave, indeed, that the President considers it a liability to his personal political fortunes and, on that account, ~~has failed to respond~~ *and tries to give the appearance of* to it.

*responding to the But the half-hearted measure he proposes are clearly inadequate to the task.*  
His response has been to have the Pentagon dribble out the contention that we have an invisible airplane. This airplane, according to Secretary Brown, alters the balance of power in our favor.

An invisible airplane.

I hope we can find it when we need it. But I can think of no more appropriate symbol for the Carter Administration. It *accords* with Mr. Carter's transparent proposals for increased defense spending. It fits with Presidential statements you can see through.

Mr. Carter has wrapped the nation's defense establishment in the Emperor's new clothes, and in the days and weeks ahead I expect to learn that we have invisible battleships and invisible tanks.

*the vital margin of safety which this administration has allowed to erode. We must*  
We must restore and maintain a defensive capability that our adversaries will respect and that our allies can rely upon.

~~Finally~~ We must have Presidential leadership that our adversaries will respect, and that our allies can rely upon.

In 1976 Candidate Jimmy Carter came before this convention and said: "I have called for closer ties with our traditional allies, and stronger ties with the State

of Israel. I have stressed," he said, "the necessity for a strong defense -- tough and muscular, and adequate to maintain freedom under any conceivable circumstances."

Apparently, the candidate didn't listen to his own call. Today we have fewer real allies and, among those remaining, we speak with diminished authority. Our relations with Israel are marked by doubt and distrust. Israel today is in grave danger, and so is freedom itself.

~~And yet . . . and yet, Mr. Carter calls himself "Peacemaker," and wishes to make the conduct of our foreign affairs the centerpiece of his campaign for re-election.~~

~~When a man marches his nation to the brink of international confrontation while calling himself a Peacemaker, when he pursues a course which produces bloodshed while calling himself a Peacemaker, I think it is worth the ~~event~~ <sup>effort</sup> to recall those events upon which he bases his claims. I think it is worth going back over the road to Camp David.~~

<sup>JIMMY</sup>  
In 1976, ~~Mr.~~ <sup>Mr.</sup> Carter and ~~Mr. Begin~~ <sup>Mr. Begin</sup> declared that they would seek what they called a "comprehensive settlement" in the Middle East. What this might mean for Israel and how this might be achieved were questions neither asked nor answered. When the answers became apparent, it was too late.

The comprehensive agreement which <sup>Mr.</sup> Carter sought required first a reconvening of the Geneva Conference. ~~Israel was amenable to it.~~ <sup>AMENABLE</sup> ~~Her~~ <sup>arguably</sup> adversaries agreed conditionally. The conditions were that the Palestine Liberation Organization be represented and that Israel effectively agree in advance of negotiation to withdraw to the pre-1967 borders, which borders were in fact armistice lines resulting from the first effort to destroy the State of Israel. Israel rightly refused <sup>sad</sup> these conditions and was promptly accused of intransigence.

~~That refusal led to consternation, frustration and, finally, misce~~

STANDING TO BEAR  
 within the Carter White House as ~~great~~ pressure was brought on Israel. In the  
 midst of this, the ~~Labor~~ government in Israel fell and the  ~~Likud Coalition~~ came  
 into office with  ~~Begin~~ <sup>a new one.</sup> at its head. It was a development that horrified  
 the Carter Administration ~~Bryzanski~~ <sup>surprised</sup>; as you may recall Bryzanski seemed to have a notion, contrary to the  
 evidence, that a Labor government would be easier to push around.

So the effort to force Israel to Geneva continued with the same results as  
 had attended the dealings with the Rabin government. And the frustration grew until  
 there came an even greater ~~miscalculation~~. Mr. Carter invited the Soviet Union to  
 join him in his effort to force Israel to accept the mockery of negotiations in  
 Geneva.

STEP

HAD TAKEN EFFORT  
 You may recall that ~~it took~~ <sup>planned process</sup> a major ~~confrontation~~ <sup>EFFORT</sup> in 1975 to keep Russia out  
 of the middle East. In October ~~of~~, 1977, Mr. Carter invited them back in free of  
 charge, and they graciously accepted. The Carter Administration presented as a  
 major achievement the conclusion of a joint Soviet-American accord which would have  
 given the Russians a ~~stronger~~ <sup>stronger-hold</sup> hand over negotiations, as well as a convenient  
 calling card for inserting themselves more deeply into the Middle East.

None of this impressed Israel particularly, but it ~~was~~ <sup>seriously disturbed</sup> President Sadat's  
 socks. The President of Egypt did not share Mr. Carter's appreciation of the  
 Soviets, and he ~~rapidly~~ <sup>APPARENTLY</sup> came to the conclusion which other world leaders, including  
 Mr. Brezhnev, have reached: ~~It was that~~ Mr. Carter is incapable of distinguishing  
 between his own short-term political interests, and the nation's long-term foreign  
 policy interests. Mr. Carter professed not to understand what all the fuss was  
 about and ~~said~~ <sup>?</sup> he was "proud of the Russians."

And so it was that Sadat discovered what the rest of the world's leaders were  
 beginning to suspect, which was that Jimmy Carter was not a serious man. An American  
 President who is not a serious man is a dangerous man.

X

The result of ~~this discovery~~ was that the United States government, for the first time in the history of the rebirth of Israel, found itself on the outside looking in. President Sadat made his courageous trip to Jerusalem at the invitation of Prime Minister Begin, and a bi-lateral peace process began. Without, let me re-emphasize, the participation of Mr. Carter. The quick ~~to~~ foreign policy success that Carter had hoped to achieve had turned into the first major foreign policy embarrassment of his Administration.

Then what happened?

Relations between Israel and Egypt developed, preliminary discussions were held, Israelis and Egyptians came together at <sup>SP.?</sup> (Ismalia) and President Sadat began to condition public opinion in Egypt to accept a new relationship with Israel. The media in Egypt was full of Sadat's assurances about Begin, of confidence in Begin's intentions, even of praise for <sup>Prime Minister</sup> Begin.

All of a sudden it all stopped. Everything.

The discussions stopped, the peace process halted, and the Egyptian media began to vilify ~~Menaachem~~ <sup>ISRAEL.</sup> Begin. The cause for this reversal was a puzzle. It was not possible to attribute it to a failure in negotiations because the negotiations were only just beginning. So there had to be some cause extrinsic to the bi-lateral link. And indeed there was.

For it was in this same period -- the last days of 1977 and the early days of 1978 -- that Mr. Carter made a trip to Saudi Arabia. Why he went there has never been clear to anybody, although on July 10 of this year, Jack Anderson wrote a column pointing out that while Carter was in Saudi Arabia he made an agreement to sell the Saudi's F-15's and the very next day his banker, Bert Lance, received a loan of \$3.5 million from a Saudi financier. Hopefully, we'll have an opportunity to explore these matters in the days to come.

When Mr. Carter left Saudi Arabia he made what was called an "unscheduled" stop in Egypt where, on January 4, he met with President Sadat at Aswan. It was immediately following that visit that the peace process stopped, and the campaign against Begin began.

You may accept this as coincidence. You may also accept as a coincidence the fact that the long-promised Libyan "loan" to Billy Carter came through only after a Libyan envoy was permitted to meet with Jimmy Carter. You may accept as coincidence the fact that Mr. Carter's embarrassing expulsion from the Middle East ended only after the Administration pushed for massive arms sales to Israel's adversaries. It was just a coincidence, we were told last August, that our Ambassador to the United Nations happened to be in a New York apartment with the PLO representative to the U.N. You must determine how many "coincidences" one Administration is entitled to.

At any rate, with Israel and Egypt separated once again, Palestinian terrorists acted to keep them separated with attacks out of Lebanon to which Israel naturally and justifiably reacted.

Eight months later, with much blood shed, things back to the boiling point in the Middle East, we were treated to the public relations extravaganza at Camp David which restored Mr. Carter's standing in the polls.

If this is a misapprehension of what occurred, I would like to hear the parties involved deny it. If it is not, and I am confident it is not, then Mr. Carter has no claim to the title of peacemaker.

I do not question the value of Camp David. Both President Sadat and Prime Minister Begin displayed enormous courage to reach out for peace. We must build on that effort. But let no one have any illusions about the events which led up to it.



~~Not~~ <sup>we must not</sup> we have any illusions about precisely what is at stake in the Middle East. The overriding issue is <sup>neither</sup> ~~not~~ refugees, or oil, ~~or who has sovereignty over~~ ~~what~~. These are grave and momentous problems. But the overriding issue which impedes every productive attempt at solutions to those problems is the effort of the Soviet Union to maintain turmoil there and under the cover of that turmoil to project itself further and further into the area.

For thirty years the Soviet Union has been exploiting every possible conflict in this region -- and awakening a number which have been slumbering -- in order to advance its power, taking foothold after foothold, and country after country, until today we find its outposts stretched from Afghanistan to Algeria, from Syria to Libya to Ethiopia and Angola. Throughout this period, the Soviet leaders have stirred up Arab hostility to Israel as a cruel weapon for provoking and prolonging war after war, and have abetted an endless cycle of terrorism, in order to bring Arab states under its own influence. The Arab-Israeli conflict ~~could~~ have ended in a just and lasting peace a long time ago -- in the early 1950's -- had not the Soviet Union ~~certainly~~ tempted Arab leaders to imagine that Soviet arms and Soviet political support would permit them to destroy Israel. This is the source of the single most important obstacle to peace between Israel and her neighbors: the fact that continuing hostility there is fundamental to Soviet expansionism.

The strategic consequences of Soviet success in this endeavor would be cataclysmic.

Soviet mastery of this region would out-flank Europe, carry with it Soviet control of Africa, large parts of Asia, and would directly threaten the United States.

Thus, what we do or fail to do in the Middle-East is of vital importance not only to the peoples of the region, but to the security of our country, our Atlantic

and Pacific allies, Africa, China and the Asian sub-continent.

JIMMY CARTER

Because of the weak and confused leadership of ~~the man who calls himself a~~  
~~peacemaker~~, we are approaching a flashpoint in this ~~ruthless and~~ tragic process,  
with Soviet power now deployed in a manner which directly threatens Iran, the  
Persian Gulf and Arabian Sea; with Soviet forces and proxy forces building up again  
in ~~Syria and Libya~~; with Soviet fleets and air bases enplaced along the sea lanes  
on which we and our Allies and the entire free world depend. We must act decisively  
while there is still time to protect our interest in peace.

In spite of this, I believe that our choices are limited to conflict or  
capitulation. I am confident that if we act with vigor, with vision and with  
practical good sense we can peacefully blunt the Soviet thrust, and we can rely upon  
other Arab leaders in time to learn what Anwar Sadat learned, which is that no  
people can long endure the cost of Soviet patronage.

How we deal with Israel and her neighbors in this period will determine whether  
we shall continue to inch toward the flashpoint in this area, or whether we shall  
pull back from it. But let it be clear that the cornerstone of our effort and of  
our interest is a secure Israel, and our mutual objective is peace.

First, while we can help the nations of that area move toward peace, we  
cannot and should not try to force a settlement upon them. A dictated peace will  
not be a lasting peace. Second, our diplomacy must be sensitive to the legitimate  
concerns of all in the area. Before a negotiated peace can ever hope to command  
the loyalty of the whole region, it must first be acceptable to Israelis and Arabs  
alike.

Third, and most important, we must have the strength and the steadiness of  
purpose to maintain the trust of those nations which rely upon us.

commitments.

In 1977, Zbigniew Brzezinski, frustrated by Israel's refusal to do as she was

~~told, warned that "the United States is not a benevolent mediator (in the Middle East)."~~

I can assure you that wherever U.S. mediation is required and can be useful in the Middle East, it will be deployed benevolently. And may I say patiently and honorably.

*For this rep policy*

(The first task will be to undo the damage that has been done. This will require that we persuade Israel and her neighbors that our commitments to Israel will be kept. Both sides today have reason to doubt this.)

In 1976 ~~we have~~ <sup>CANDIDATE</sup> Mr. Carter ~~saying:~~ <sup>SAID:</sup> "I am concerned with the way in which our country, as well as the Soviet Union, Britain and France have poured arms into certain Arab countries -- five or six times more than Israel receives."

But it was Mr. Carter who agreed to sell <sup>60</sup> F-15 fighters to Saudi Arabia. To get the Congress to ~~agree,~~ <sup>go along,</sup> he assured these aircraft would not have certain offensive capabilities. Today the Secretary of Defense tells us he cannot say whether this commitment <sup>to Congress</sup> will be honored until after November 4.

It was Mr. Carter who agreed to sell <sup>100</sup> ~~200~~ main battle tanks to Jordan.

It was Mr. Carter who agreed to provide U.S.-licensed turbine engines for Iraqi warships.

In 1976 <sup>CANDIDATE</sup> Mr. Carter said: "I do not believe that the road to peace (in the Middle East) can be found by U.S.-Soviet imposition of a settlement."

We know how long he held that opinion after he was elected.

In 1976 <sup>CANDIDATE</sup> Mr. Carter said of the Palestinians: "We must make it clear to the world that there can be no reward for terrorism."

~~In Clinton, Massachusetts~~ <sup>of I hon</sup> In 1977, President Carter said there must be a Palestinian "homeland."

**CANDIDATE**  
In 1976, Mr. Carter said: "The people of other nations have learned, in recent years, that they can sometimes neither trust what our government says nor predict what it will do."

~~Today, the Saudis say that President Carter has already agreed to configure their F-15's. Mr. Carter says he hasn't.~~

~~Today, Mr. Quadaffi says he has received assurances from the Carter Administration that U.S. policies will change to his liking after the November election. Mr. Carter says there is no reason for Quadaffi to think that.~~

**CANDIDATE**  
In 1976 Mr. Carter said: "We have all been deeply disturbed by the drift of the United Nations and by the acrimony and cliquishness that seems to have taken hold."

**what is happening in**  
**IS DESTROYING THE PEACE PROCESS**  
~~Today, the U.N. continues racing toward irrelevancy~~ and the United States is noted there not for its leadership but for its followership.

I was appalled to see the Carter Administration abstain, rather than veto, the Resolution passed by the United Nations Security Council two weeks ago. As I stated then, the Resolution not only undermines progress toward peace by putting the United Nations on record against Israel and on one side of the sensitive issue of the status of Jerusalem; it also presumes to order other nations -- including our Dutch ally -- to move their embassies from Jerusalem.

When I learned that Jimmy Carter had failed to instruct his Secretary of State to veto this Resolution, I went back and read the Democratic Platform adopted only a week earlier in New York City. It said, and I quote: ". . .The Democratic Party recognizes and supports 'the established status of Jerusalem as the Capital of Israel, with free access to all its holy places provided to all faiths. As a symbol of this stand, the U.S. Embassy should be moved from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.'"

Within one short week of agreeing to run on this platform, Jimmy Carter acted

precisely opposite to its clear provisions.

I believe this sorry episode sheds some new light on an earlier action by Jimmy Carter concerning another U.N. resolution, voted on in March this year. March 1, the Carter Administration failed to veto a most mischievous U.N. Resolution that condemned Israel's presence in Jerusalem, calling it an "occupation." That was the position of the Carter Administration on Saturday. Two days later, on Monday, reacting to the public outcry, Jimmy Carter put the blame for this outrage on his Secretary of State and reversed the position of his Administration.

The Carter pattern emerges with appalling clarity. The man who asks "trust me," zigzags and flip-flops in ever more rapid gyrations, trying to court favor with everyone: Israel and the PLO, the voting bloc in the United Nations and the voters <sup>at home.</sup> ~~in New York.~~ On March 1st it took the Carter Administration three days to switch positions. On August 20th it took them <sup>only</sup> three minutes, ~~only~~. Secretary of State Muskie condemned the U.N. Resolution on Jerusalem in a long speech, no doubt courting favor with the voters at home; then, minutes later, he failed to veto this resolution, courting favor with the PLO and their friends.

<sup>Critic</sup> This is the <sup>on the Middle East.</sup> record, ~~we confront in the region.~~ Arab leaders are persuaded that we don't say what we mean. Israel is persuaded that we don't mean what we say. We cannot build productive relations with either side on such a basis.

~~We cannot act with authority abroad until we demonstrate that we intend to be the masters of our own house.~~ <sup>Before we can act ~~abroad~~ with authority</sup> ~~abroad, we have to demonstrate our ability to make domestic policy without getting the permission of other governments.~~

It was Mr. Carter who sent an emissary to Saudi Arabia to ask for permission to store petroleum in our own country -- a strategic reserve vital to our national security and a measure long demanded by Congress. The Saudis, predictably, said no. So the Carter Administration caved in and halted the stockpiling.

<sup>build here</sup> We cannot ~~produce~~ relations with our friends in the Arab world upon their

contempt for us.

If we clear away the debris of the past four years, the following issues remain to test the good faith of the Arab nations and of Israel, and to challenge our national will and our diplomatic skills in helping them to shape a peace.

There is the unresolved question of territorial rights resulting from the 1967 war.

There is the status of Jerusalem which is a part of the first question.

There is the matter of refugees.

There is the matter of the PLO, which I consider distinct from the matter of refugees.

Let me address these in order.

The question of territory, putting aside Jerusalem for the moment, must still be decided in accordance with Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. We will tolerate no effort to supersede those Resolutions. We must weigh the future utility of the Camp David accords against that position.

As Camp David recedes, we must recognize that there are basic ambiguities in the Camp David documents, both in the links between the Israeli-Egyptian peace, and in the provisions for an autonomous regime in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. These ambiguities have now brought negotiations to a dangerous impasse.

It should be recalled that the idea of an autonomous Palestinian Arab regime for the West Bank and the Gaza Strip was an Israeli proposal -- a major concession on Israel's part in the interest of progress toward peace.

We can understand the importance of that concession by going back to the first principles governing the situation in those areas. Under Security Council Resolution 242, Israel has the right to administer the West Bank and the Gaza Strip

until Jordan, and Syria at least, have made peace with her. Moreover, Resolution 242 provides that when peace comes, Israel should withdraw her armed forces, not **NECESSARILY** to her 1967 borders, but to "secure and recognized boundaries" which can be protected by special security arrangements.

These provisions reflect the disappointment and false hopes of many earlier efforts in the quest for peace as well as the special legal status of these territories. They are not, like Sinai and the Golan Heights, internationally recognized parts of Egypt, Jordan, Syria or any other state. Instead, they are unallocated territories of a British mandate for Palestine, still subject under international law to the principles of the mandate as a trust. Israel is in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip not merely as an occupying power, but as a claimant. Both Israel and Jordan have legitimate interests in the West Bank. ¶ Negotiations between Israel and Jordan could take a long and creative step towards resolving these problems. Israel and Jordan are the two Palestinian states envisioned and authorized by the United Nations. Jordan is now recognized as sovereign in some 80 percent of the old territory of Palestine. Israel and Jordan are the parties primarily authorized to settle the future of the unallocated territories, in accordance with the principles of the mandate and the provisions of Resolutions 242 and 338.

Thus the autonomy plan called for in the Camp David Agreements must be interpreted in accordance with the two Security Council Resolutions, which remain the decisive and authoritative rules governing the situation. The Camp David Agreements cannot and should not lead to fundamental changes in the security position, or to the withdrawals of Israeli troops, until Jordan and Syria at least make peace.

Jerusalem. Let me use the subject to introduce one brief aside. I believe the U.S. State Department is a policy arm of the White House, and not the reverse. And I can tell you that the first order of business of a Reagan Presidency is going to be a thorough house cleaning and fumigation of the U.S. Consulates in Jerusalem.

Reeb  
in  
N.K.

It's bad enough when we have the State Department running its own little Middle East policy on the side, but when our Consulates start doing it, then it's time we reminded those fellows and girls who pays their salaries.

Jerusalem is ~~the Gordian knot of Middle East diplomacy.~~ It has been a source of man's spiritual inspiration since King David founded it, and the target of various national aspirations for many centuries. ~~From a far distance, we see it through the mask of propaganda and journalistic sensation.~~ ~~But there, on the ground, it is a shared trust.~~ **NOW IT EXISTS AS A SHARED TRUST.** The holy places of all faiths ~~centered there~~ are protected. They are open to all. More than this, each is under the care and control of representatives of the <sup>respective</sup> ~~relevant~~ faiths. ~~There exists, at least, a ~~beginning~~ ~~modus vivendi.~~~~ ~~That is not the same as a solution, but it is something: a beginning.~~

We must recognize certain realities. We must recognize that from the beginning until 1948 there was a Jewish presence in the Old City -- which is the heart of the issue. For most of this period, that presence <sup>constituted</sup> ~~represented~~ a majority.

**By contrast** Under Jordanian control, the Jews were expelled and given no access to their holy places. The consequence of this control within the Islamic world was not one of universal satisfaction, however. King Faisal used to say he wished he might visit Jerusalem, but would not while it was held by the Jews. It is worth noting, however, that he would not go while it was held by the Jordanians either.

So we confront this aspect of an experience quite different <sup>FROM</sup> ~~from~~ our own, in which religion and nationalism combine. It is a reasonable conclusion that even were Israel to abandon her capital, the result would not be a permanent and peaceful resolution of the question of Jerusalem.

**Then there are** We have, too, ~~the fact of~~ the holy places themselves, and the fervor these generate. The Islamic people say Jerusalem is our third holiest city, we should have it. The Jewish people say Hebron is our second holiest city, we belong there.



I know I would please you mightily, or cause you great suspicion, if I promised unequivocally to move the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem. I will leave that promise to the Democratic platform.

I begin from the position that Jerusalem must never again be a divided City, as it was for nineteen years.

2. As to the question of where embassies are located, I do not want to seem insensitive on a highly sensitive issue, but I am convinced that we have done a disservice to the prospect of a peaceful outcome by overloading the political significance of where an Embassy is placed. There are precedents for having two capitals. There are countries that have three. I do not propose that as a solution, but say rather that we should diminish for the time being the significance of moving embassies into or out of Jerusalem. And I might say further that in doing so we <sup>would</sup> ~~make~~ the apparent significance of what occurred at the U.N. and what has transpired as a result of it.

Next, it is clear that the disposition of this question falls squarely within the providence of those negotiations and arrangements contemplated by 242. And so there can be no progress on one front without progress on the other.

Just as we will advance suggestions for a settlement with <sup>in</sup> the framework <sup>of</sup> 242, we will advance suggestions for the specific resolution of the question of Jerusalem which, as any policy proposal must be, will be in accordance with reality. And the reality <sup>is</sup> that Israel is not going to relinquish her position in Jerusalem, nor her claim to Jerusalem as her capital city. I intend to accommodate to that reality, but I will not go beyond that <sup>today</sup>. To do so would serve no purpose. I do not promise miracles in this regard, although, given the situs, we can agree there are precedents. I do promise a sensitive effort.

**THE PROBLEM CAN BE SOLVED**

I believe the ~~knot~~ can be unraveled by men of good will. The immediate

problem is to ~~pave the way~~ <sup>MAKE IT EASIER</sup> for men of good will to come to the table.

Which brings me to the PLO. President Carter refuses to brand the PLO as a terrorist organization.

I do not hesitate.

We live in a world in which any band of thugs clever enough to get the word "liberation" into their name can thereupon murder school children and have the deeds considered glamorous and glorious. Thus, ~~the National Liberation Front~~ in Vietnam. Thus, ~~the Palestine Liberation Organization~~. Terrorists are terrorists, not guerillas, <sup>NOT</sup> ~~or~~ <sup>LIBERATION</sup> ~~or~~ <sup>OR FREEDOM-FIGHTERS</sup> ~~commandos, or freedom fighters~~ or anything else, and they should be identified as such. If others must deal with them, establish diplomatic relations with them, allow them to open embassies, let it be on their heads. They should know that the cost of appeasement has always proved to be exorbitant.

What needs to be understood about the PLO, which is said to represent the Palestinian refugees, is that it represents no one but the leaders who established it as a means of organizing aggression against Israel. The PLO is kept under tight control in every state in the area except Lebanon which it has effectively destroyed. As for those it purports to represent, when any Palestinian breathes a word about peace with Israel, he is immediately a target for assassination. The PLO has murdered more Palestinians than it has Israelis.

This nation made an agreement with Israel in 1975 concerning its relations with the PLO.

This Administration has violated it.

Today the PLO has a propaganda arm in our nation's capital, and we have had PLO representatives traveling the country propagandizing and raising money.

I agree with Candidate Carter rather than President Carter. Terrorism should not be rewarded.

~~I am not~~ <sup>we are</sup> concerned <sup>NOT</sup> only with whether the PLO renounces its charter calling for the destruction of Israel. ~~I am~~ <sup>we are</sup> equally concerned with whether it is truly representative of the Palestinian people. ~~And I intend to be satisfied on both counts and not just on one before I give any consideration to any future dealings with the PLO.~~ If ~~I~~ <sup>we</sup> can be satisfied on both counts, then we will not be dealing with the PLO as we know it, but an organization quite different: one truly representative of ~~the Arab Palestinians, whom I do not believe are murderers; and, are~~ <sup>types</sup> dedicated to peace and not to the establishment of a Soviet satellite in the heart of the Middle East.

Finally, the question of Arab Palestinian refugees.

My analysis of this tragic situation begins with the Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel, May 14, 1948. For those of you who don't remember it, I will read the relevant paragraph:

"We appeal -- in the very midst of the onslaught launched against us now for months -- to the Arab inhabitants of the State of Israel to preserve peace and to participate with us in the upbuilding of the State on the basis of full and equal citizenship and due representation in all its provisional and permanent institutions."

Tragically, this appeal was rejected. People left their land and their homes confident Israel would be destroyed in a matter of days and they could return. It didn't happen. So when we measure the tragedy we measure culpability, and Israel shares no part of it.

The world, unhappily, is full of refugees. I hear little being said these days about the latest refugees, those from Afghanistan. I hear nothing being said about the more than 4 million black African refugees resulting from the upheavals on that continent -- most of them "liberation movements." I know too that the number

of Arab Palestinian refugees is equalled by the number of Jews from Arab lands expelled, dispossessed of their land, their businesses and their wealth. Israel has taken them in. That is part of the purpose of Israel; to eliminate the term "Jewish refugee" from the lexicon of the history of human tragedy. Once we heard it all the time. We don't hear it anymore. And so with all the talk about human rights, it seems to me that Israel sets a better example than ~~their~~ adversaries, regardless of what the State Department thinks. I don't believe we contribute to the betterment of the world by rewarding those who exploit refugees. And, finally, I cannot reconcile the image of poor homeless refugees in squalid camps supported by U.N. funds with terrorists living like kings in the finest hotels and traveling all over the world.

~~We cannot turn back the clock.~~ The answer to the refugee problem is assimilation. Even if there were to be a West Bank state, there would not be sufficient room on the West Bank to accommodate them. So the answer is assimilation, and the most logical place for them to be assimilated is Jordan, designated by the U.N. as the Arab Palestinian state.

My friends, I do not despair of the future of the Middle East. Nor do I see as the best possible outcome of Arab-Israeli relations a grim, grudging and tenuous peace. I see in the fullness of time the world's next renaissance. While there is no way to over-value the contributions to the world of Jewish brains, creativity and courage, I think we do undervalue the contributions and the capabilities of the Arab world. Israel does not, but I think we very often do.

I do believe that the children of Sara and the children of Hagar will not forever live in hostility, but will find a common place to stand, will find a common road to walk in peace, will find the means for the redemption of our commonly-rooted faith and will not lead ~~them~~<sup>us</sup> back toward darkness and despair, but upward into the light.

words from the PSALMS

Let me conclude with a ~~vision first disclosed in the Psalms.~~

It is a ~~vision~~ <sup>T. Han</sup> that speaks to our concerns tonight, for ~~it~~ <sup>it</sup> encompasses all that we strive for. ~~It~~ <sup>T. Han</sup> is a vision of our ideals, of the goal to which we strive with constancy, dedication and faith. ~~It~~ <sup>T. Han</sup> embraces our hopes for a just, lasting peace in the Middle East and our hopes that the works of justice and mercy be done at home;

~~Security and peace and the dream of peace as a field with images of the laborer, struggle~~  
~~of the vision lives today~~

May our sons be like plants  
well nurtured in their youth,  
Our daughters like wrought columns  
such as stand at the corners of the temple  
May our garner be full,  
affording every kind of store;  
May our sheep be in the thousands, and  
increase to myriads in our meadows;  
May our oxen be well laden.  
May there be no breach in the walls,  
no exile, no outcry in our streets.  
Happy the people for whom things are thus;

~~SECRET~~

It is given to us to work to see that this vision is never lost, that its message is never forgotten, that the work of peace and justice and freedom goes on, inspired by our values, guided by our faith and made permanent by our commitment.

~~I am <sup>not</sup> concerned only with whether the PLO renounces its charter calling for the destruction of Israel. <sup>We be</sup> I am equally concerned with whether it is truly representative of the Palestinian people. And I intend to be satisfied on both counts and not just on one before I give any consideration to any future dealings with the PLO. If I can be satisfied on both counts, then we will not be dealing with the PLO as we know it, but an organization quite different: one truly representative of the Arab Palestinians, whom I do not believe are murderers; and, are dedicated to peace and not to the establishment of a Soviet satellite in the heart of the Middle East.~~

Finally, the question of Arab Palestinian refugees.

My analysis of this tragic situation begins with the Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel, May 14, 1948. For those of you who don't remember it, I will read the relevant paragraph:

"We appeal -- in the very midst of the onslaught launched against us now for months -- to the Arab inhabitants of the State of Israel to preserve peace and to participate with us in the upbuilding of the State on the basis of full and equal citizenship and due representation in all its provisional and permanent institutions."

Tragically, this appeal was rejected. People left their land and their homes confident Israel would be destroyed in a matter of days and they could return. It didn't happen. So when we measure the tragedy we measure culpability, and Israel shares no part of it.

The world, unhappily, is full of refugees. I hear little being said these days about the latest refugees, those from Afghanistan. I hear nothing being said about the more than 4 million black African refugees resulting from the upheavals on that continent -- most of them "liberation movements." I know too that the number