

REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

to

JEWISH WAR VETERANS' CONVENTION

Minneapolis, Minnesota

August 11, 1971

It is time for a frank and realistic evaluation of America's position in the world. No issue is more important to each and every one of us as human beings than the issue of war and peace, the need to avoid the senseless brutality and killing that is war. That goal is the one that unites people and crosses political differences, geographical boundaries, color, economic status. That goal is also one that dominates those leaders and governments that aspire to represent the best interests of the human beings they have the responsibility and privilege of governing.

We in the United States are coming through a period of self-appraisal -- and this is as it should be. If we are indeed to become worthy of being known as children of God -- if, indeed, we believe in the principles of human brotherhood -- if there is any meaning at all to the term "civilized man", then it is the responsibility of leaders constantly to probe, explore, study, analyze ways by which men and nations can resolve their disputes short of war. I believe it to be healthy that so many of our youth seek constantly to remind us of our obligations to achieve that goal of peace, for it is the young that fight and die.

But to possess the goal of peace does not produce its realization. The differences between those in the world who believe in political democracy and those forces in the world who are committed to one or another form of totalitarianism -- these differences are profound. We lose sight of them at our peril. We may hope to resolve those differences through intelligence, negotiation, perseverance, and sometimes even through the passage of time alone, but it would be a serious mistake to permit that hope to blind us to the reality that there are forces in society prepared to achieve their objectives through aggression, the use of force and violence, or the frightening threat of force and violence.

We in the United States have a tremendous stake in this question of war and peace. We have more to lose from war than most other nations and, possessing in greater abundance the horrible instruments of destruction, we know the potential end of civilization that can come from such a war. But if the world is to move into a new dimension which is to know war no more, it is essential that the United States, as the strongest and wealthiest nation in the world, assumes the obligations of leadership in that movement. This is not just a duty that befalls us by virtue of our strength and wealth. It is a matter of our deepest self-interest.

We are this year coming to the end of the war in Vietnam. Only history will proclaim the verdict as to whether our military involvement in Southeast Asia was a costly, tragic, and incredible mistake, or whether it brought about great regional security in Southeast Asia.

Certainly the latter was the objective of the four consecutive Presidents of both parties who were intimately involved with our participation in Vietnam. But my purpose is not to discuss Vietnam. It is rather to discuss a much more vital threat to the peace of the world and to our national self-interest. I refer to the tensions of the Middle East.

The Middle East is a powder keg with a very short fuse, ready to explode if any one of the participants strikes the match of revived hostility. It is in the Middle East that the two powerful nuclear Goliaths of the earth, the United States and the Soviet Union, face each other.

It is with a sense of deep regret that I must state to you my belief that our policies today are inadequate to meet our responsibilities in the Middle East. The consequences of that inadequacy are to our danger.

The Administration today is relying on the Soviet Union to help us establish peace in the Middle East. That reliance might make sense were it not for the overwhelming evidence that the Soviet Union does not want a settlement of the issues in the Middle East, nor does Soviet leadership want an all-out war. But it is clear they do not want an all-out peace; and they stand to gain from continued restlessness and tension in that crucial area of the world.

We have witnessed a massive build-up of Soviet military strength in Egypt and Syria. And we have witnessed an increased Soviet presence in the Mediterranean, which has helped make the Soviet Union a major power in the Middle East. The recent 15-year treaty between the Soviet Union and Egypt, on the heels of our own naive bumbling and immediately following the over-eager presence of our Secretary of State in Egypt -- that treaty is a dramatic illustration of our dreadful lack of awareness of the realities of international politics.

The Soviet Union has poured immense quantities of sophisticated weapons and aircraft into Egypt. While achieving a most welcome cease-fire, the Administration permitted the Soviet Union in Egypt to trick us at the very moment of our self-congratulations by implanting guided missiles close to the Suez Canal, thus escalating the level of weaponry and finances required to achieve a balance.

It is reported that there are today nearly 100 Russian officers of the rank of General or Admiral in Egypt and that there are now more than 300 supersonic military Russian planes stationed on Egyptian airfields. There are a total of about 600 Russian aircraft if we include squadrons based in Syria and Iraq. In addition, I am informed that there are about 200 fully trained Russian combat pilots permanently based in Egypt.

The danger stemming from this imbalance is most serious.

The Middle East is the field on which both U.S. and Soviet forces face each other. We obviously welcomed all efforts designed to reduce the tensions between these two countries, but the tensions are there and until they are eliminated, it is the height of irresponsibility and folly to blind ourselves to the dangers to us that come from increased Soviet strength and penetration.

Within recent days the new edition of the authoritative "Jane's Fighting Ships" has been released. It concludes that American naval strength is in serious decline while the Soviet fleet has expanded into a "super navy" with a greatly increased sphere of influence. "The situation for the U.S. Navy is serious," concludes the British military expert who edits that publication.

The USSR now maintains a standing naval force in the Mediterranean designed to counter the American Sixth Fleet which is five times stronger than what it had been five years ago; and it is a missile carrying fleet.

In spite of this strength and the drastic change in the parity between our two nations, the Administration continues to build the presence of the Soviet Union in the Middle East. And we do so at the expense of the one nation in the Middle East that stands as our safeguard against further Soviet penetration.

In recent days the message was again repeated to Israel that we are withholding the planes it needs to defend itself while we pressure Israel to accept a proposal designed to strengthen further the Soviet Union and give its navy even further areas for future domination. I refer to the pressure we are placing on Israel to reopen the Suez Canal prior to the establishment of peace and stability in the area.

The opening of the Suez and the restoration of its ability to function fully and freely as an instrument of international trade is a desirable goal, but the hard facts are that the United States, Israel and the West do not need the Suez, not nearly as much as Egypt needs it for revenue and as the Soviet Union needs it to accomplish its military and economic goals. We must never lose the perspective of that reality.

The Soviet fleet supplies North Vietnam today with most of its war material and weapons. A limited amount comes from Vladivostok and Nakhodka, but most supplies arrive by water from the Black Sea ports to Haiphong. By 1967, the outbreak of the Six Day War in the Middle East, more than two Soviet ships were arriving in Haiphong every three days. But with the end of the Six Day War, the Suez Canal was closed and no longer available to Soviet ships. Today the canal remains blocked and the distance by ship from the Soviet Union to North Vietnam has been doubled in mileage, in effort and in time.

The distance from Odessa to Haiphong using the Suez Canal was 7,212 sea miles. Today, using the southern Africa route it is 14,126 sea miles. Before the Six Day War, it would take a Soviet cargo ship an average of 40 days of easy crossing on the turnabout. Today it takes about 72 days at top speed plus the unloading time of one or two weeks.

With the Suez Canal closed, the double time and distance presented the Soviets with a serious dilemma. They either had to double the number of ships committed to Hanoi's support or reduce their aid drastically. Published figures indicate that the aid to Hanoi was cut.

It is clear to me that thanks to Israel's presence on the east bank of the Suez, North Vietnam's capacity to conduct war was seriously damaged, perhaps even more than the damage inflicted by our bombings of North Vietnam or the invasion of Cambodia -- and at far less risk to ourselves and with none of the hideous costs of lives and property.

Not only is that a fact in examining the realities of the Suez Canal, but it is also a fact that the closing of the Canal hinders the ambition of the Soviet Union to establish an overwhelming presence with its navy in the Indian Ocean. The Red Sea is today dominated by Russia as it was formerly by the United Kingdom. The opening of the Suez Canal would permit the domination of the Red Sea to lead to the domination in the Indian Ocean and thus accelerate that ambition and its realization.

The British withdrawal from the Indian Ocean has left a hole in western global defenses. Five years ago the USSR had no warships in the Indian Ocean. Today it has a score of surface ships alone and, according to Janes's, "there is no telling how many Soviet submarines there are in the area."

Why then is the Department of State actively urging Israel to permit the reopening of the Suez Canal before peace and stability is achieved and before Israel can be assured of her security, when the consequences of this urging obviously serves the best interests of the Soviet Union and thereby damages our own?

If, for the sake of peace in the Middle East, we are to help reopen the Suez Canal and thus accelerate the extension of Soviet power to the Indian Ocean, why should that not be done as part of an over-all agreement that insures peace and stability in the Middle East and in the world? Why do we play the Soviet game by pursuing Israel to make a unilateral withdrawal of its forces along the Canal? Why do we turn the clock back to 1956, when our country insisted on reopening the Canal before establishing peace between Egypt and Israel? Don't we remember that when we did that, we left the door wide open to Russian penetration of the Middle East, Africa, and Asia, which now threatens peace and stability in the world?

What Catherine the Great failed to do, Brezhnev is now succeeding in doing -- and with our help. What we are doing with our shortsighted diplomacy is legitimizing Soviet presence in Egypt, in the Mediterranean, in the Red Sea and in the Indian Ocean.

Yes, we give arms to Israel -- more than ever in the history of our relationship -- to balance the foolish error of our naive euphoria when we were taken by the USSR and Egypt at the time of the cease fire. Yes, President Nixon talks forcefully, effectively, and I believe sincerely of our support for Israel. But that rhetoric is not enough because it is undermined by the actual foreign policy pursued by the Administration.

It is now that I must speak with particular emphasis and out of intense personal experience as a former member of the Executive Branch of our Government.

American policy is too often made by the Department of State and not the President. Harry Truman knew that -- and had he not exerted himself personally, Israel's recognition as a State might not have come. Lyndon Johnson came to know that -- and Israel was able to survive the attacks against it that culminated in the Six Day War. Richard Nixon has yet to learn that lesson.

The original policy of the Department of State 25 years ago was that our country needed to protect the sources of the oil that we imported from the Middle East and to secure its delivery to Europe and our shores. Until 1956, this meant the need for a close relationship with Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Bahrein, Kuwait and Iran, with Egypt, because of the Suez Canal, playing the central role. We were committed to the kingdoms of Iraq and Jordan, the stability of feudal Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf shiekdoms and we had an impatient tolerance of Israel. We looked upon the various Arab states as one, ignoring the wide diversity of peoples, languages, and religions in that area. The Department of State considered itself to be a friend and advocate of the Arabs in order to keep them loyal to the west and as safe as possible from the temptations of the Soviet.

But the situation is no longer what it was 25 years ago. The basic issue of the Middle East is not primarily an Arab-Israel conflict. The area has become a pawn in international politics.

The appearance of the Soviet Union as a power in the Mediterranean, Indian Ocean and Red Sea has completely altered the complexion of this region. Iraq and Syria today are vassals of the Soviet Union. Egypt is in danger of being dominated by the Soviets. Algeria serves as a haven and a base for anti-American subversives. The British have disappeared from the Sudan, Kuwait, Bahrein, Aden and Libya. A Soviet fleet based in Egypt challenges the U.S. Sixth Fleet. Western-oriented Jordan and Lebanon are unstable. NATO is today impotent in the Middle East. Only Israel stands in the path of Communist control in the Middle East and the realization of Russia's old dream of dominating the Indian Ocean.

But in spite of these dramatic changes -- in spite of the emergence of Israel as the strongest military and economic force in the Middle East, State Department policy remains the same.

It is time for a long overdue drastic change of Middle East policy in the light of 1971 conditions and realities. This change in policy cannot be done short of a complete reorganization and reorientation of our Middle Eastern State Department diplomatic corps.

Our new policy must be based on the fact that (1) Egypt is today dependent upon the Soviet Union, and will in all likelihood continue in that position for some time to come. (2) It must be based on the fact that without Israel the United States could not hold the sources of oil and security the delivery of that oil for very long. (3) It must be based on the fact that without Israel, both Libya and Jordan would fall and Saudi Arabia could be paralyzed by Egyptian threats and subversion.

It must be based on the fact that the best assurance of Arab-state independence and security is a negotiated peace between Israel and her neighbors.

Peace in the Middle East can prevent or arrest Soviet penetration and dominance of the Middle East. Continued tension and limited hostilities provide the opportunity for the Soviet Union to move into this area under the cloak of expansive military and economic assistance that carries with it Soviet technicians and other personnel.

(4) It must be based on the fact that Iran, Turkey and NATO would be outflanked without Israel and that the Russian sweep throughout Algeria and the Persian Gulf would be absolute.

(5) Our new Middle Eastern policy in summary must be based on the fact that today Israel and not Egypt is the major power in the Middle East and we must shape our policy accordingly.

This new policy requires in our State Department new personnel and a policy that accepts Israel as a major force and friendly power in that vital area. It requires personnel who are not wedded to the past, where State Department considerations were primarily influenced by the fact of the oil-rich Arab lands.

It requires the recognition that Israel and the Arab states can live in peace, combining their resources and talents for the revitalization of the entire Mid East.

The peoples of the Arab countries and Israel need each other. The Middle East can be developed into a modern, productive, and prosperous area of the world. But it desperately needs peace. And the thrust of our policy must be to help achieve that peace. But the hope of peace will not be achieved by a settlement forced by the super-powers -- a settlement that leaves Israel with insecure borders or under the threat of new attack.

Israel has committed men, arms and material in a struggle for self-preservation against Egypt. In doing so it has incurred the wrath of the Soviet Union whose imperialistic ambitions have been temporarily thwarted. We must be thankful that Israel has stood firm.

We can have peace in the Middle East but only when we make the Soviets realize that we will not appease them at the expense of Israel or anyone else.

And, once the Arab world realizes the U.S. will never permit the destruction of Israel, they also will realize they do not need the Soviets telling them how to run their countries -- how to fight their wars -- how to identify their national goals and plan for their achievement.

We wish the destruction of no nation or people but desire only that Israeli and Arab work together to re-create the "Fertile Crescent" -- I tell you that the measure of our commitment to Israel is also the measure of the chance for Arab world freedom.

- freedom from outside domination -- political and economic;
- freedom to build their own nations and national character;
- freedom to enhance the quality of life for all Arabs;
- freedom to welcome their Jewish brothers to the joint task of regional growth and prosperity.
- freedom to be themselves and set their own pace.

Israel today is in urgent need of Phantom and Sky Hawk (F4 and A4) jets. The last delivery of jets to Israel ended in June 1971. Since that time there has been a suspension of delivery and the policy has presumably been "under review."

Yet, since March, 1971, the Soviet force in Egypt has been strengthened by the addition of Mig 23 (Fox bat) and Sukhoi II (Flagon) aircraft. The Soviet Union has also introduced SA-4 and SA-6 missiles. The combined total strength of Soviet forces in Egypt today is close to 20,000.

There must be no further hesitation in our delivery of the essential Phantoms and Sky Hawks to Israel. The Russians must not be misled to miscalculate the degree of our commitment of Israel.

But the aircraft needs are not enough. The high cost of defense confronting Israel as a result of increased Soviet military support in Egypt has imposed upon that small country an economic burden beyond its means. We were a party to that increased burden as a result of permitting the Soviets to trick us at the time of the cease-fire by placing SAM missiles close to the Suez. Israel has been spending 30 percent of its gross national product on defense. Those expenditures are increasing. Those expenditures are responsible for its serious dollar balance of payment current deficit, a deficit that is in fact approaching 1.5 billion dollars.

Israel today has a foreign exchange debt of 3 billion dollars. The mere servicing of that debt requires a half billion dollars in the current year.

We have a responsibility and a duty to supply Israel with direct economic relief so as to permit it to maintain its defense posture, a posture which is defending our national self-interest as well. Once again, Israel's request for assistance meets with silence or with a statement that the request is "under review". Since April the Administration has been considering an application from Israel for \$200 million for supporting assistance. That request must be granted immediately. We extend supporting assistance to other countries that are far less important to our security interests. And let me add, Israel does not ask for American pilots or other military personnel. She seeks no American advisors or forces. She asks only to be treated with the same considerations as our other allies.

Surely an Administration that can give weapons and economic assistance to the Greek Junta can be equally considerate of Israel -- a country with free political institutions. Israel asks only that she have the weapons and the means for her security.

Again, the Administration permits the Department of State to make policy, to hesitate.

The distinguishing characteristics of policy formulation in a democratic society is that it must represent, as close as the mechanics of decision-making can arrange, the viewpoints of the citizens in that society. The Presidency and the Congress are the institutions through which that kind of decision-making can be achieved. There is no room in a democratic society for basic and consistent policy-making by a career civil service which never faces the electorate.

This means that foreign policy must be formulated by the Congress and President and not the the Department of State which has the responsibility only to execute a policy arrived at by the elected representatives. Where the President doesn't have either the vision or the courage to withstand usurpation by the Department of State, it is time for the Congress to step in.

Recent months have witnessed an intensive government debate aimed at increasing the powers of Congress in foreign policy decision-making. My own experience, however, as a Senator and as a Vice-President, persuade me that desirable as it is for the Congress to play a more significant and major role in foreign policy, that objective cannot be obtained unless the mechanism in the Congress is adequate to assume that increased responsibility.

It is a fact that the Congress is today unprepared for that task. Decisions on foreign policy are discussed in both Houses of Congress and in three, four, or even five committees in each House. With this multiplicity and lack of coordination, it is impossible for the Congress to assert itself in a meaningful way and with an impact on the basic decisions.

The Presidency modernized itself by creating a National Security Council some years ago so as to help the President act with clarity, decisiveness and full information; if he only chose to do so. It is time for the Congress to do the same. I, therefore, recently submitted to the Senate a proposal to create a Joint Congressional Committee on National Security with the leading members of Congress of both parties represented. The major interested Committees of the Congress would then act together on the same facts, at the same time, and with the same perspective.

It is clear that the Department of State does not represent the views of the Congress on Middle Eastern policy. Congress has passed endless resolutions and amendments over the years designed to strengthen the hand of Israel. One of my objectives in urging the creation of a Joint Committee was to help produce the unity and strength of Congress behind a more intelligent self-interested Middle Eastern policy by this country.

The Middle East is not just a problem. It is an opportunity. It is an opportunity to help resolve some of the basic issues that divide the United States and the Soviet Union and that threaten the safety and security of the world.

The Suez Canal should be opened even though that is of primary benefit to Soviet aspirations. But what do we want in return? Rather than to persuade Israel to withdraw its troops from the banks of the Suez unilaterally, we should insist that in exchange for that withdrawal we want Egypt and Israel to negotiate directly as two sovereign nations should in a community of nations.

We should demand the renewal and instigation of a permanent cease-fire, with Israel's neighbors recognizing her integrity as a nation, her sovereignty and her need for well-defined secure borders.

There should be assurances of free access to a reopened Suez and free access to all international waters, such as the Gulf of Aquaba and the Persian Gulf, for Israel and all nations.

And we should recognize that more than the conflict between Egypt and Israel is involved in this dispute. We should insist that the Soviet Union demonstrate its desire for peace by requiring a phased withdrawal of Soviet military manpower from Egypt at the same time as we request Israel to withdraw its troops from the East banks of the Suez.

Finally, we should say to the Soviet Union loudly and clearly: "If you are genuine in your desire for peace and harmony in the Middle East, do something about the thousands of Jews in Russia who are imprisoned in your society by not being able to migrate to Israel." The President of the United States should exert America's diplomatic and moral resources in support of that courageous Russian Jewish community that, at great sacrifice, refuses to submit to the destruction of its identity.

The United Nation's Declaration of Human Rights provides that citizens should have the right to immigrate to the countries of their choice. This a fundamental human liberty. A nation which denies that right to the peoples within it, is imprisoning its citizens. This should be a key ingredient of the efforts we are making to establish that stability in the Middle East.

Our nation has a stake in this vital human crisis, not merely because it is a measure by which we can judge Soviet sincerity in these current Middle Eastern negotiations, but also because we know from bitter experience that those totalitarian societies which deny freedom to their own citizens are uncomfortable and unhappy at the existence of freedom in other societies.

This uneasiness and unhappiness and fear that they breed is a threat to all of us.

In conclusion, it is essential that the American people be reminded that goals can never be achieved by anything short of dedication, effort and sacrifice. The greater the goal, the greater must be the effort, dedication and sacrifice. There is no greater goal than that of peace and security for the world.

For our nation, the strongest, wealthiest, and most fortunate in the world, to fulfill its responsibilities as a world leader, and for those of us who live in this nation to fulfill our responsibility to the future generations of Americans, it is essential that we recognize that among the sacrifices we must make and as part of the dedication that we must bring to bear for our efforts, America must be strong.

That strength, if it is to be effective, must be indivisible. It must be a spiritual strength; it must be a strength and a unity that comes from the elimination of poverty, racism, inhumanity; and it must be a strength that comes from a growing economy -- a strength not only based on a higher standard of living, but a better quality of life.

It must be a strength that recognizes the reality of the world we live in. And this means the strength of military self-defense and mutual security.

I, therefor, pledge myself and I ask you as interested citizens to pledge yourselves to help this country achieve that military, economic, social and political strength that is so necessary for peace and for our stability as a free society.

#

Tom Green
Romanya

REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

TO

JEWISH WAR VETERANS' CONVENTION

76th

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

AUGUST 11, 1971

Nat. Commander -
Albert Schlossberg

Felix Putterman

Francis Forman
auxiliary

Samuel Daniels

IT IS TIME FOR A FRANK AND REALISTIC EVALUATION OF
AMERICA'S POSITION IN THE WORLD. NO ISSUE IS MORE IMPORTANT
TO EACH AND EVERY ONE OF US AS HUMAN BEINGS THAN THE ISSUE OF
WAR AND PEACE. THE NEED TO AVOID THE SENSELESS BRUTALITY AND
KILLING THAT IS WAR. THAT GOAL IS THE ONE THAT UNITES PEOPLE AND
CROSSES POLITICAL DIFFERENCES, GEOGRAPHICAL BOUNDARIES,
COLOR, ECONOMIC STATUS. THAT GOAL IS ALSO ONE THAT DOMINATES
THOSE LEADERS AND GOVERNMENTS THAT ASPIRE TO REPRESENT
THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE HUMAN BEINGS. THEY HAVE THE
RESPONSIBILITY AND PRIVILEGE OF GOVERNING.

↳ WE IN THE UNITED STATES ARE COMING THROUGH A PERIOD
OF SELF-APPRAISAL -- AND THIS IS AS IT SHOULD BE. ↳ IF WE
ARE INDEED TO BECOME WORTHY OF BEING KNOWN AS CHILDREN OF
GOD -- IF, INDEED, WE BELIEVE IN THE PRINCIPLES OF HUMAN
BROTHERHOOD -- IF THERE IS ANY MEANING AT ALL TO THE
TERM "CIVILIZED MAN", THEN IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF
LEADERS CONSTANTLY TO PROBE, EXPLORE, STUDY, ANALYZE WAYS
BY WHICH MEN AND NATIONS CAN RESOLVE THEIR DISPUTES SHORT
OF WAR. ↳ I BELIEVE IT TO BE HEALTHY THAT SO MANY OF OUR
YOUTH SEEK CONSTANTLY TO REMIND US OF OUR OBLIGATIONS TO
ACHIEVE THAT GOAL OF PEACE, FOR IT IS THE YOUNG THAT FIGHT
AND DIE.

↳ BUT, TO POSSESS THE GOAL OF PEACE DOES NOT PRODUCE ITS
REALIZATION. ↳ THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THOSE IN THE WORLD WHO
BELIEVE IN POLITICAL DEMOCRACY AND THOSE FORCES IN THE
WORLD WHO ARE COMMITTED TO ONE OR ANOTHER FORM OF
TOTALITARIANISM -- THESE DIFFERENCES ARE PROFOUND. ↳ WE LOSE
SIGHT OF THEM AT OUR PERIL. ↳ WE MAY HOPE TO RESOLVE THOSE
DIFFERENCES THROUGH INTELLIGENCE, NEGOTIATION, PERSEVERENCE,
AND SOMETIMES EVEN THROUGH THE PASSAGE OF TIME ALONE. ↳ BUT
IT WOULD BE A SERIOUS MISTAKE TO PERMIT THAT HOPE TO BLIND
US TO THE REALITY THAT THERE ARE FORCES IN SOCIETY PREPARED
TO ACHIEVE THEIR OBJECTIVES THROUGH ~~ANOTHER~~ THE USE OF
FORCE AND VIOLENCE, OR THE FRIGHTENING THREAT OF FORCE AND
VIOLENCE.

WE IN THE UNITED STATES HAVE A TREMENDOUS STAKE IN THIS QUESTION OF WAR AND PEACE. WE HAVE MORE TO LOSE FROM

WAR THAN MOST OTHER NATIONS, AND, POSSESSING IN GREATER

ABUNDANCE THE HORRIBLE INSTRUMENTS OF DESTRUCTION, WE KNOW ~~THIS~~

~~THE POTENTIAL END OF CIVILIZATION~~ *what catastrophe* CAN COME FROM SUCH

A WAR, BUT IF THE WORLD IS TO MOVE INTO A NEW DIMENSION

WHICH IS TO KNOW WAR NO MORE, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE UNITED

STATES, ~~AS THE STRONGEST AND MOST ADVANCED NATION IN THE WORLD,~~

ASSUMES THE OBLIGATIONS OF LEADERSHIP IN THAT MOVEMENT. THIS

IS NOT JUST A DUTY THAT BEFALLS US BY VIRTUE OF OUR STRENGTH

AND WEALTH. IT IS A MATTER OF OUR DEEPEST SELF-INTEREST.

In fact, we have and must redefine our role in the world, but we can withdraw from a constructive role except at our peril.

~~discharge~~

-5-
hopefully

WE ARE THIS YEAR, COMING TO THE END OF THE WAR IN

VIETNAM. ONLY HISTORY WILL PROCLAIM THE VERDICT AS TO

WHETHER OUR MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA WAS A

COSTLY, TRAGIC, AND INCREDIBLE MISTAKE, OR WHETHER IT

BROUGHT ABOUT ^{greater} GREAT REGIONAL SECURITY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA ^{and the}

prospects for a more orderly and peaceful development.
CERTAINLY THE LATTER WAS THE OBJECTIVE OF THE FOUR CONSECUTIVE

PRESIDENTS OF BOTH PARTIES WHO WERE INTIMATELY INVOLVED

WITH OUR PARTICIPATION IN VIETNAM. BUT MY PURPOSE IS NOT

TO DISCUSS VIETNAM. IT IS RATHER TO DISCUSS A MUCH MORE

VITAL THREAT TO THE PEACE OF THE WORLD AND TO OUR NATIONAL

SELF-INTEREST. I REFER TO THE TENSIONS OF THE MIDDLE EAST.

↳ THE MIDDLE EAST IS A POWDER KEG WITH A VERY SHORT
FUSE ^{and} READY TO EXPLODE IF ANY ONE OF THE PARTICIPANTS
STRIKES THE MATCH OF REVIVED HOSTILITY. ↳ IT IS IN THE MIDDLE
EAST THAT THE TWO POWERFUL NUCLEAR GOLIATHS OF THE EARTH,
THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION, FACE EACH OTHER,

↳ IT IS WITH A SENSE OF DEEP REGRET THAT I MUST
STATE TO YOU MY BELIEF THAT OUR POLICIES TODAY ARE INADEQUATE
TO MEET OUR RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE MIDDLE EAST. ↳ THE
CONSEQUENCES OF THAT INADEQUACY ARE TO OUR DANGER.

↳ THE ADMINISTRATION TODAY IS RELYING ON THE SOVIET
UNION TO HELP US ESTABLISH PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST,

↳ THAT RELIANCE MIGHT MAKE SENSE WERE IT NOT FOR THE OVERWHELMING EVIDENCE THAT THE SOVIET UNION DOES NOT WANT A SETTLEMENT OF THE ISSUES IN THE MIDDLE EAST, NOR DOES SOVIET LEADERSHIP WANT AN ALL-OUT WAR. ↳ BUT, IT IS CLEAR THEY DO NOT WANT AN ALL-OUT PEACE; AND THEY STAND TO GAIN FROM CONTINUED RESTLESSNESS AND TENSION IN THAT CRUCIAL AREA OF THE WORLD.

↳ WE HAVE WITNESSED A MASSIVE BUILD-UP OF SOVIET MILITARY STRENGTH IN EGYPT AND SYRIA, ↳ AND, WE HAVE WITNESSED AN INCREASED SOVIET PRESENCE IN THE MEDITERRANEAN, WHICH HAS HELPED MAKE THE SOVIET UNION A MAJOR POWER IN THE MIDDLE EAST.

↳ THE RECENT **15**-YEAR TREATY BETWEEN THE SOVIET UNION AND EGYPT, ON THE HEELS OF OUR OWN NAIVE BUMBLING AND IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE OVER-EAGER PRESENCE OF OUR SECRETARY OF STATE IN EGYPT -- ~~THE TREATY~~ IS A DRAMATIC ILLUSTRATION OF OUR DREADFUL LACK OF AWARENESS OF THE REALITIES OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS.

↳ THE SOVIET UNION HAS POURED ^{immense} ~~IN~~ QUANTITIES OF SOPHISTICATED WEAPONS AND AIRCRAFT INTO EGYPT. ↳ WHILE ACHIEVING A MOST WELCOME CEASE-FIRE, THE ADMINISTRATION PERMITTED THE SOVIET UNION IN EGYPT TO TRICK US AT THE VERY MOMENT OF OUR SELF-CONGRATULATIONS BY IMPLANTING GUIDED MISSILES CLOSE TO THE SUEZ CANAL, ↳ THUS ESCALATING THE LEVEL OF WEAPONRY AND FINANCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE A BALANCE.

↳ IT IS REPORTED THAT THERE ARE TODAY NEARLY 100
RUSSIAN OFFICERS OF THE RANK OF GENERAL OR ADMIRAL IN
EGYPT AND THAT THERE ARE NOW MORE THAN 300 SUPERSONIC
MILITARY RUSSIAN PLANES STATIONED ON EGYPTIAN AIRFIELDS,

↳ THERE ARE A TOTAL OF ABOUT 600 RUSSIAN AIRCRAFT IF WE INCLUDE
SQUADRONS BASED IN SYRIA AND IRAQ. ↳ IN ADDITION, I AM
INFORMED THAT THERE ARE ABOUT 200 FULLY TRAINED RUSSIAN
COMBAT PILOTS PERMANENTLY BASED IN EGYPT.

↳ THE DANGER STEMMING FROM THIS IMBALANCE IS MOST
SERIOUS.

↳ THE MIDDLE EAST IS THE FIELD ON WHICH BOTH U.S. AND SOVIET FORCES FACE EACH OTHER. WE OBVIOUSLY WELCOME ALL EFFORTS DESIGNED TO REDUCE THE TENSIONS BETWEEN THESE TWO COUNTRIES, BUT THE TENSIONS ARE THERE AND UNTIL THEY ARE ELIMINATED, IT IS THE HEIGHT OF IRRESPONSIBILITY AND FOLLY TO BLIND OURSELVES TO THE DANGERS ~~THAT~~ THAT COME FROM INCREASED SOVIET STRENGTH AND PENETRATION.

↳ WITHIN RECENT DAYS THE NEW EDITION OF THE AUTHORITATIVE "JANE'S FIGHTING SHIPS" HAS BEEN RELEASED. ↳ IT CONCLUDES THAT AMERICAN NAVAL STRENGTH IS IN SERIOUS DECLINE WHILE THE SOVIET FLEET HAS EXPANDED INTO A "SUPER NAVY" WITH A GREATLY INCREASED SPHERE OF INFLUENCE.

"THE SITUATION FOR THE U.S. NAVY IS SERIOUS," CONCLUDES THE
BRITISH MILITARY EXPERT WHO EDITS THAT PUBLICATION.

↳ THE USSR NOW MAINTAINS A STANDING NAVAL FORCE IN THE

MEDITERRANEAN DESIGNED TO COUNTER THE AMERICAN SIXTH FLEET, *that*

Soviet Fleet

~~IS~~ IS FIVE TIMES STRONGER THAN WHAT IT HAD BEEN FIVE

YEARS AGO; AND IT IS A MISSILE CARRYING FLEET.

↳ IN SPITE OF THIS STRENGTH AND THE DRASTIC CHANGE IN

THE PARITY BETWEEN OUR TWO NATIONS, THE ADMINISTRATION

by policy & inaction

CONTINUES TO BUILD THE PRESENCE OF THE SOVIET UNION IN

THE MIDDLE EAST; AND WE DO SO AT THE EXPENSE OF THE ONE

NATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST THAT STANDS AS ~~OUR~~ ^{the} SAFEGUARD

AGAINST FURTHER SOVIET PENETRATION.

12

But

ISRAEL TODAY IS IN URGENT NEED OF PHANTOM AND SKY

HAWK (F4 AND A4) JETS. THE LAST DELIVERY OF JETS TO ISRAEL

ENDED IN JUNE 1971.

13
~~31~~

SINCE THAT TIME THERE HAS BEEN A SUSPENSION OF DELIVERY AND THE POLICY HAS PRESUMABLY BEEN "UNDER REVIEW."

↳ YET, SINCE MARCH, 1971, THE SOVIET FORCE IN EGYPT HAS

BEEN STRENGTHENED BY THE ADDITION OF MIG 23 (FOX BAT) AND

SUKHOI II (FLAGON) AIRCRAFT; THE SOVIET UNION HAS ALSO

INTRODUCED SA-4 AND SA-6 MISSILES. ↳ THE COMBINED TOTAL

STRENGTH OF SOVIET FORCES IN EGYPT TODAY IS CLOSE TO 20,000.

↳ THERE MUST BE NO FURTHER HESITATION IN OUR DELIVERY

OF THE ESSENTIAL PHANTOMS AND SKY HAWKS TO ISRAEL. ↳ THE

RUSSIANS MUST NOT BE MISLED TO MISCALCULATE THE DEGREE OF

OUR COMMITMENT OF ISRAEL.

↳ BUT THE AIRCRAFT NEEDS ARE NOT ENOUGH ↳ THE HIGH COST

OF DEFENSE CONFRONTING ISRAEL AS A RESULT OF INCREASED
SOVIET MILITARY SUPPORT IN EGYPT HAS IMPOSED UPON THAT SMALL
COUNTRY AN ECONOMIC BURDEN BEYOND ITS MEANS

~~WE WERE A~~
~~PARTY TO THAT INCREASED BURDEN AS A RESULT OF PERMITTING~~
~~THE SOVIETS TO TRICK US AT THE TIME OF THE CEASE-FIRE~~
~~BY PLACING SAM MISSILES CLOSE TO THE SUEZ.~~

ISRAEL HAS BEEN
SPENDING 30 PERCENT OF ITS GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT ON
DEFENSE. THOSE EXPENDITURES ARE INCREASING. THOSE EXPENDITURES
ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR ITS SERIOUS DOLLAR BALANCE OF PAYMENT
CURRENT DEFICIT, A DEFICIT THAT IS IN FACT APPROACHING
1.5 BILLION DOLLARS.

ISRAEL TODAY HAS A FOREIGN EXCHANGE DEBT OF 3 BILLION DOLLARS. THE ^{MILL}~~IDEA~~ SERVICING OF THAT DEBT REQUIRES A HALF BILLION DOLLARS IN THE CURRENT YEAR.

~~WE HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY AND A DUTY TO SUPPLY ISRAEL WITH DIRECT ECONOMIC RELIEF SO AS TO PERMIT IT TO MAINTAIN ITS DEFENSE POSTURE - A POSTURE WHICH IS DEPENDING ON OUR NATIONAL SELF INTEREST AS WELL.~~

^{But,} ^{Economic} ONCE AGAIN, ISRAEL'S REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE MEETS WITH SILENCE OR WITH A

STATEMENT THAT THE REQUEST IS "UNDER REVIEW" SINCE APRIL

THE ADMINISTRATION HAS BEEN CONSIDERING AN APPLICATION FROM ISRAEL FOR \$200 MILLION FOR SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE.

16

~~34-~~

THAT REQUEST MUST BE GRANTED. ~~WE EXTEND~~ WE EXTEND

SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE TO OTHER COUNTRIES THAT ARE FAR

LESS IMPORTANT TO OUR SECURITY INTERESTS. AND LET ME ADD,

ISRAEL DOES NOT ASK FOR AMERICAN PILOTS OR OTHER MILITARY

PERSONNEL. SHE SEEKS NO AMERICAN ADVISORS OR FORCES. SHE

ASKS ONLY TO BE TREATED WITH THE SAME CONSIDERATIONS AS

OUR OTHER ALLIES

SURELY AN ADMINISTRATION THAT CAN GIVE WEAPONS AND

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO THE GREEK JUNTA CAN BE EQUALLY

CONSIDERATE OF ISRAEL -- A COUNTRY WITH FREE POLITICAL

INSTITUTIONS. ISRAEL ASKS ONLY THAT SHE HAVE THE WEAPONS AND

THE MEANS FOR HER SECURITY.

17

But, as I've noted -

~~IN RECENT DAYS THE MESSAGE WAS AGAIN REPEATED TO~~

~~ISRAEL~~ ^{Israel} THAT WE ARE WITHHOLDING THE PLANES ~~IT~~ NEEDS TO DEFEND

ITSELF WHILE WE PRESSURE ISRAEL TO ACCEPT A PROPOSAL DESIGNED

TO STRENGTHEN FURTHER THE SOVIET UNION AND GIVE ITS NAVY

EVEN FURTHER AREAS FOR FUTURE DOMINATION. I REFER TO THE

PRESSURE WE ARE PLACING ON ISRAEL TO REOPEN THE SUEZ CANAL

PRIOR TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE

AREA — ~~present to us~~

18
15-

THE OPENING OF THE SUEZ AND THE RESTORATION OF ITS
ABILITY TO FUNCTION FULLY AND FREELY AS AN INSTRUMENT OF
INTERNATIONAL TRADE IS A DESIRABLE GOAL. BUT, THE HARD FACTS
ARE THAT THE UNITED STATES, ISRAEL AND THE WEST DO NOT NEED
THE SUEZ, ~~IT~~ NEARLY AS MUCH AS EGYPT NEEDS IT FOR REVENUE
AND AS THE SOVIET UNION NEEDS IT TO ACCOMPLISH ITS MILITARY
AND ECONOMIC GOALS. WE MUST NEVER LOSE THE PERSPECTIVE OF
THAT REALITY.

THE SOVIET FLEET SUPPLIES NORTH VIETNAM TODAY WITH
MOST OF ITS WAR MATERIAL AND WEAPONS. A LIMITED AMOUNT COMES
FROM VLADIVOSTOK AND NAKHODKA, BUT MOST SUPPLIES ARRIVE BY
WATER FROM THE BLACK SEA PORTS TO HAIPHONG.

By 1967, the outbreak of the Six Day War in the Middle East,

more than two Soviet ships were arriving in Haiphong every three

days. But with the end of the Six Day War, the Suez Canal

was closed and no longer available to Soviet ships. Today

the canal remains blocked, and the distance by ship from the

Soviet Union to North Vietnam has been doubled in mileage,

in effort and in time.

The distance from Odessa to Haiphong using the

Suez Canal was 7,212 sea miles. Today, using the southern

Africa route it is 14,126 sea miles. Before the Six Day

war, it would take a Soviet cargo ship an average of 40

days of easy crossing on the turnabout. Today, it takes about

72 days at top speed plus the unloading time of one or two

weeks.

20
~~15~~

↳ WITH THE SUEZ CANAL CLOSED, THE DOUBLE TIME AND
DISTANCE PRESENTED THE SOVIETS WITH A SERIOUS DILEMMA. ↳ THEY
EITHER HAD TO DOUBLE THE NUMBER OF SHIPS COMMITTED TO
HANOI'S SUPPORT OR REDUCE THEIR AID DRASTICALLY. ↳ PUBLISHED
FIGURES INDICATE THAT THE AID TO HANOI WAS CUT.

↳ IT IS CLEAR TO ME THAT THANKS TO ISRAEL'S PRESENCE
ON THE EAST BANK OF THE SUEZ, NORTH VIETNAM'S CAPACITY TO
CONDUCT WAR WAS SERIOUSLY DAMAGED. ^{yes,} PERHAPS EVEN MORE THAN
THE DAMAGE INFLICTED BY OUR BOMBINGS OF NORTH VIETNAM OR
THE INVASION OF CAMBODIA -- AND AT FAR LESS RISK TO
OURSELVES AND WITH NONE OF THE HIDEOUS COSTS OF LIVES AND
PROPERTY.

↳ NOT ONLY IS THAT A FACT IN EXAMINING THE REALITIES OF THE SUEZ CANAL, BUT IT IS ALSO A FACT THAT THE CLOSING OF THE CANAL HINDERS THE AMBITION OF THE SOVIET UNION TO ESTABLISH AN OVERWHELMING PRESENCE WITH ITS NAVY IN THE INDIAN OCEAN. THE RED SEA IS TODAY DOMINATED BY RUSSIA AS IT WAS FORMERLY BY THE UNITED KINGDOM. THE OPENING OF THE SUEZ CANAL WOULD PERMIT THE DOMINATION OF THE RED SEA TO LEAD TO THE DOMINATION IN THE INDIAN OCEAN AND THUS ACCELERATE THAT AMBITION AND ITS REALIZATION.

↳ THE BRITISH WITHDRAWAL FROM THE INDIAN OCEAN HAS LEFT A HOLE IN WESTERN GLOBAL DEFENSES. FIVE YEARS AGO THE USSR HAD NO WARSHIPS IN THE INDIAN OCEAN.

32
~~17~~

TODAY IT HAS A SCORE OF SURFACE SHIPS ALONE AND, ACCORDING TO JANES'S, "THERE IS NO TELLING HOW MANY SOVIET SUBMARINES THERE ARE IN THE AREA."

L WHY THEN IS THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE ACTIVELY URGING ISRAEL TO PERMIT THE REOPENING OF THE SUEZ CANAL BEFORE PEACE AND STABILITY IS ACHIEVED AND BEFORE ISRAEL CAN BE ASSURED OF HER SECURITY, WHEN THE CONSEQUENCES OF THIS URGING OBVIOUSLY SERVES THE ~~THE~~ INTERESTS OF THE SOVIET UNION AND THEREBY DAMAGES OUR OWN?

4 IF, FOR THE SAKE OF PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST, WE ARE
 TO HELP REOPEN THE SUEZ CANAL AND THUS ACCELERATE THE EXTENSION
 OF SOVIET POWER TO THE INDIAN OCEAN, WHY SHOULD THAT NOT BE
 DONE AS PART OF AN OVER-ALL AGREEMENT THAT INSURES PEACE
 AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST, ~~AND IN THE WORLD?~~ WHY DO
 WE PLAY THE SOVIET GAME BY ~~pressuring~~ ^{urging} ISRAEL TO MAKE A
UNILATERAL WITHDRAWAL OF ITS FORCES ALONG THE CANAL? WHY
 DO WE TURN THE CLOCK BACK TO 1956, WHEN OUR COUNTRY INSISTED
 ON REOPENING THE CANAL BEFORE ESTABLISHING PEACE BETWEEN
 EGYPT AND ISRAEL? DON'T WE REMEMBER, ~~WHEN WE DID THAT,~~
 WE LEFT THE DOOR WIDE OPEN TO RUSSIAN PENETRATION OF THE
 MIDDLE EAST, AFRICA, AND ASIA, ~~WHICH NOW THREATENS THE SE~~
~~AND STABILITY IN THE WORLD?~~

24
~~19~~

↳ WHAT CATHERINE THE GREAT FAILED TO DO, BREZHNEV IS
NOW SUCCEEDING IN DOING -- AND WITH OUR HELP! WHAT WE ARE
DOING WITH OUR SHORTSIGHTED DIPLOMACY IS LEGITIMITIZING SOVIET
PRESENCE IN EGYPT, IN THE MEDITERRANEAN, IN THE RED SEA
AND IN THE INDIAN OCEAN.

↳ YES, WE GIVE ARMS TO ISRAEL -- MORE THAN EVER IN THE
HISTORY OF OUR RELATIONSHIP -- TO BALANCE THE FOOLISH
ERROR OF OUR NAIVE EUPHORIA WHEN WE WERE TAKEN ^{+ deceived} BY THE
USSR AND EGYPT AT THE TIME OF THE CEASE FIRE. YES, PRESIDENT
NIXON TALKS FORCEFULLY, EFFECTIVELY, AND I BELIEVE SINCERELY
OF OUR SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL. BUT THAT RHETORIC IS NOT
ENOUGH BECAUSE IT IS UNDERMINED BY THE ACTUAL FOREIGN
POLICY PURSUED BY THE ADMINISTRATION.

↳ IT IS NOW THAT I MUST SPEAK WITH PARTICULAR EMPHASIS
AND OUT OF INTENSE PERSONAL EXPERIENCE AS A FORMER MEMBER
OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF OUR GOVERNMENT,

↳ AMERICAN POLICY IS TOO OFTEN MADE BY THE DEPARTMENT
OF STATE AND NOT THE PRESIDENT! HARRY TRUMAN KNEW THAT -- AND
HAD HE NOT EXERTED HIMSELF PERSONALLY, ~~ISRAEL'S~~ ^{the} RECOGNITION *of Israel*
AS A STATE MIGHT NOT HAVE COME. ↳ LYNDON JOHNSON CAME TO KNOW
THAT -- AND ISRAEL WAS ABLE TO SURVIVE THE ATTACKS AGAINST
IT THAT CULMINATED IN THE SIX DAY WAR. ↳ RICHARD NIXON HAS YET
TO LEARN THAT LESSON.

26
~~21-~~

THE ORIGINAL POLICY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE 25 YEARS
AGO WAS THAT OUR COUNTRY NEEDED TO PROTECT THE SOURCES
OF THE OIL THAT WE IMPORTED FROM THE MIDDLE EAST AND TO
SECURE ITS DELIVERY TO EUROPE AND OUR SHORES. UNTIL 1956, THIS
MEANT THE NEED FOR A CLOSE RELATIONSHIP WITH SAUDI ARABIA,
IRAQ, BAHREIN, KUWAIT AND IRAN ^{and} WITH EGYPT BECAUSE OF THE
SUEZ CANAL) PLAYING THE CENTRAL ROLE! WE WERE COMMITTED TO
THE KINGDOMS OF IRAQ AND JORDAN, THE STABILITY OF FEUDAL
SAUDI ARABIA AND THE PERSIAN GULF SHIEKDOMS AND WE HAD
AN IMPATIENT TOLERANCE OF ISRAEL. WE LOOKED UPON THE
VARIOUS ARAB STATES AS ONE, IGNORING THE WIDE DIVERSITY OF
PEOPLES, LANGUAGES, AND RELIGIONS IN THAT AREA.

↳ THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE CONSIDERED ITSELF TO BE A FRIEND
AND ADVOCATE OF THE ARABS IN ORDER TO KEEP THEM LOYAL TO
THE WEST AND AS SAFE AS POSSIBLE FROM THE TEMPTATIONS OF
THE SOVIET

↳ BUT THE SITUATION IS NO LONGER WHAT IT WAS 25 YEARS
AGO ↳ THE BASIC ISSUE OF THE MIDDLE EAST IS NOT PRIMARILY
AN ARAB-ISRAEL CONFLICT, ↳ THE AREA HAS BECOME A PAWN IN
INTERNATIONAL POLITICS.

↳ THE APPEARANCE OF THE SOVIET UNION AS A POWER IN THE
MEDITERRANEAN, INDIAN OCEAN AND RED SEA HAS COMPLETELY
ALTERED THE COMPLEXION OF THIS REGION ↳ IRAQ AND SYRIA TODAY
ARE VASSALS OF THE SOVIET UNION.

EGYPT IS IN DANGER OF BEING DOMINATED BY THE SOVIETS, ALGERIA

SERVES AS A HAVEN AND A BASE FOR ANTI-AMERICAN SUBVERSIVES,

THE BRITISH HAVE DISAPPEARED FROM THE SUDAN, KUWAIT, BAHREIN,

ADEN AND LIBYA. A SOVIET FLEET BASED IN EGYPT CHALLENGES THE

U.S. SIXTH FLEET, WESTERN-ORIENTED JORDAN AND LEBANON ARE

UNSTABLE. NATO IS TODAY IMPOTENT IN THE MIDDLE EAST, ONLY

ISRAEL STANDS IN THE PATH OF COMMUNIST CONTROL IN THE MIDDLE

EAST AND THE REALIZATION OF RUSSIA'S OLD DREAM OF DOMINATING THE

INDIAN OCEAN

BUT IN SPITE OF THESE DRAMATIC CHANGES -- IN SPITE OF

THE EMERGENCE OF ISRAEL AS THE STRONGEST MILITARY AND

ECONOMIC FORCE IN THE MIDDLE EAST, STATE DEPARTMENT POLICY

REMAINS THE SAME. !

AGAIN, THE ADMINISTRATION PERMITS THE DEPARTMENT OF
STATE TO MAKE POLICY; TO HESITATE.

↳ THE DISTINGUISHING CHARACTERISTICS OF POLICY FORMULATION
IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY IS THAT IT MUST REPRESENT, AS CLOSE
AS THE MECHANICS OF DECISION-MAKING CAN ARRANGE, THE
VIEWPOINTS OF THE CITIZENS IN THAT SOCIETY. ↳ THE PRESIDENCY
AND THE CONGRESS ARE THE INSTITUTIONS THROUGH WHICH THAT
KIND OF DECISION-MAKING CAN BE ACHIEVED. THERE IS NO ROOM
IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY FOR BASIC AND CONSISTENT POLICY-
MAKING BY A CAREER CIVIL SERVICE WHICH NEVER FACES THE
ELECTORATE.

30
30-

THIS MEANS THAT FOREIGN POLICY MUST BE FORMULATED BY
THE CONGRESS AND PRESIDENT AND NOT THE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE
WHICH HAS THE RESPONSIBILITY ONLY TO EXECUTE A POLICY ARRIVED
AT BY THE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES. ^{and} WHERE THE PRESIDENT DOESN'T
HAVE EITHER THE VISION OR THE COURAGE TO WITHSTAND USURPATION
BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, IT IS TIME FOR THE CONGRESS TO
STEP IN.

RECENT MONTHS HAVE WITNESSED AN INTENSIVE GOVERNMENT
DEBATE AIMED AT INCREASING THE POWERS OF CONGRESS IN FOREIGN
POLICY DECISION-MAKING.

and,

31
~~24~~

↳ IT IS TIME FOR A LONG OVERDUE DRASTIC CHANGE OF MIDDLE
EAST POLICY IN THE LIGHT OF 1971 CONDITIONS AND REALITIES.

↳ THIS CHANGE IN POLICY CANNOT BE DONE SHORT OF A COMPLETE
REORGANIZATION AND REORIENTATION OF OUR MIDDLE EASTERN
STATE DEPARTMENT DIPLOMATIC CORPS.

↳ OUR NEW POLICY MUST BE BASED ON THE FACT THAT (1) EGYPT
IS TODAY DEPENDENT UPON THE SOVIET UNION, AND WILL IN ALL
LIKELIHOOD CONTINUE IN THAT POSITION FOR SOME TIME TO COME.

(2) IT MUST BE BASED ON THE FACT THAT WITHOUT ISRAEL THE
UNITED STATES COULD NOT HOLD THE SOURCES OF OIL AND ~~SECURE~~ secure
THE DELIVERY OF THAT OIL FOR VERY LONG.

(3) IT MUST BE BASED ON THE FACT THAT WITHOUT ISRAEL, BOTH LIBYA AND JORDAN WOULD FALL AND SAUDI ARABIA COULD BE PARALYZED BY EGYPTIAN THREATS AND SUBVERSION. *and,*

(4) *L* IT MUST BE BASED ON THE FACT THAT THE BEST ASSURANCE OF ARAB-STATE INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY IS A NEGOTIATED PEACE BETWEEN ISRAEL AND HER NEIGHBORS.

L PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST CAN PREVENT OR ARREST SOVIET PENETRATION AND DOMINANCE OF THE MIDDLE EAST. *L* CONTINUED TENSION AND LIMITED HOSTILITIES PROVIDE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR THE SOVIET UNION TO MOVE INTO THIS AREA UNDER THE CLOAK OF EXPANSIVE MILITARY AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE THAT CARRIES WITH IT SOVIET TECHNICIANS AND OTHER PERSONNEL.

(6) IT MUST BE BASED ON THE FACT THAT IRAN, TURKEY
AND NATO WOULD BE OUTFLANKED WITHOUT ISRAEL AND THAT THE
RUSSIAN SWEEP THROUGHOUT ALGERIA AND THE PERSIAN GULF WOULD
BE ABSOLUTE.

(6) OUR NEW MIDDLE EASTERN POLICY, IN SUMMARY MUST BE
BASED ON THE FACT THAT TODAY ISRAEL AND NOT EGYPT IS THE
MAJOR POWER IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND WE MUST SHAPE OUR POLICY
ACCORDINGLY.

↳ THIS NEW POLICY REQUIRES IN OUR STATE DEPARTMENT NEW
PERSONNEL AND A POLICY THAT ACCEPTS ISRAEL AS A MAJOR FORCE
AND FRIENDLY POWER IN THAT VITAL AREA.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ 34
-27-

IT REQUIRES PERSONNEL WHO ARE NOT WEDDED TO THE PAST, WHERE STATE DEPARTMENT CONSIDERATIONS WERE PRIMARILY INFLUENCED BY THE FACT OF THE OIL-RICH ARAB LANDS,

IT REQUIRES THE RECOGNITION THAT ISRAEL AND THE ARAB STATES CAN LIVE IN PEACE, COMBINING THEIR RESOURCES AND TALENTS FOR THE REVITALIZATION OF THE ENTIRE MID EAST,

THE PEOPLES OF THE ARAB COUNTRIES AND ISRAEL NEED EACH OTHER. THE MIDDLE EAST CAN BE DEVELOPED INTO A MODERN, PRODUCTIVE, AND PROSPEROUS AREA OF THE WORLD. BUT, IT DESPERATELY NEEDS PEACE. AND THE THRUST OF OUR POLICY MUST BE TO HELP ACHIEVE THAT PEACE.

L BUT THE HOPE OF PEACE WILL NOT BE ACHIEVED BY A SETTLEMENT

FORCED BY THE SUPER-POWERS -- A SETTLEMENT THAT LEAVES ISRAEL

WITH INSECURE BORDERS OR UNDER THE THREAT OF NEW ATTACK.

L ISRAEL HAS COMMITTED MEN, ARMS AND MATERIAL IN A
STRUGGLE FOR SELF-PRESERVATION, ~~AND IN THE MIDDLE EAST~~ L IN DOING

SO, IT HAS INCURRED THE WRATH OF THE SOVIET UNION WHOSE
IMPERIALISTIC AMBITIONS HAVE BEEN TEMPORARILY THWARTED,

WE MUST BE THANKFUL THAT ISRAEL HAS STOOD FIRM.

L WE CAN HAVE PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST BUT ONLY
WHEN WE MAKE THE SOVIETS REALIZE THAT WE WILL NOT APPEASE
THEM AT THE EXPENSE OF ISRAEL OR ANYONE ELSE.

~~that is,~~
AND, ONCE THE ARAB WORLD REALIZES THE U.S. WILL

NEVER PERMIT THE DESTRUCTION OF ISRAEL, THEY ALSO WILL

REALIZE THEY DO NOT NEED THE SOVIETS TELLING THEM HOW

TO RUN THEIR COUNTRIES -- HOW TO FIGHT THEIR WARS -- HOW

TO IDENTIFY THEIR NATIONAL GOALS AND PLAN FOR THEIR

ACHIEVEMENT.

↳ WE WISH THE DESTRUCTION OF NO NATION OR PEOPLE BUT
DESIRE ONLY THAT ISRAELI AND ARAB WORK TOGETHER TO RE-CREATE
THE "FERTILE CRESCENT" -- I TELL YOU THAT THE MEASURE OF
OUR COMMITMENT TO ISRAEL IS ALSO THE MEASURE OF THE CHANCE
FOR ARAB WORLD FREEDOM.

-- FREEDOM FROM OUTSIDE DOMINATION -- POLITICAL AND

ECONOMIC;

-- FREEDOM TO BUILD THEIR OWN NATIONS AND NATIONAL

CHARACTER;

-- FREEDOM TO ENHANCE THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR ALL ARABS;

-- FREEDOM TO WELCOME THEIR JEWISH BROTHERS TO THE

JOINT TASK OF REGIONAL GROWTH AND PROSPERITY,

-- FREEDOM TO BE THEMSELVES AND SET THEIR OWN PACE.

yes THE MIDDLE EAST IS NOT JUST A PROBLEM. IT IS AN OPPORTUNITY.

IT IS AN OPPORTUNITY TO HELP RESOLVE SOME OF THE BASIC

ISSUES THAT DIVIDE THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION AND

THAT THREATEN THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF THE WORLD.

THE SUEZ CANAL SHOULD BE OPENED EVEN THOUGH THAT IS OF PRIMARY BENEFIT TO SOVIET ASPIRATIONS. BUT WHAT DO WE WANT IN RETURN? RATHER THAN TO PERSUADE ISRAEL TO WITHDRAW ITS TROOPS FROM THE BANKS OF THE SUEZ UNILATERALLY, WE SHOULD INSIST THAT IN EXCHANGE FOR THAT WITHDRAWAL, WE WANT EGYPT AND ISRAEL TO NEGOTIATE DIRECTLY AS TWO SOVEREIGN NATIONS SHOULD IN A COMMUNITY OF NATIONS.

WE SHOULD DEMAND THE RENEWAL AND INSTIGATION OF A PERMANENT CEASE-FIRE, WITH ISRAEL'S NEIGHBORS RECOGNIZING HER INTEGRITY AS A NATION, HER SOVEREIGNTY AND HER NEED FOR WELL-DEFINED SECURE BORDERS.

↳ THERE SHOULD BE ASSURANCES OF FREE ACCESS TO A REOPENED SUEZ AND FREE ACCESS TO ALL INTERNATIONAL WATERS, SUCH AS THE GULF OF AQUABA AND THE PERSIAN GULF, FOR ISRAEL AND ALL NATIONS.

↳ AND WE SHOULD RECOGNIZE THAT MORE THAN THE CONFLICT BETWEEN EGYPT AND ISRAEL IS INVOLVED IN THIS DISPUTE. ↳ WE SHOULD INSIST THAT THE SOVIET UNION DEMONSTRATE ITS DESIRE FOR PEACE BY REQUIRING A PHASED WITHDRAWAL OF SOVIET MILITARY MANPOWER FROM EGYPT AT THE SAME TIME AS WE REQUEST ISRAEL TO WITHDRAW ITS TROOPS FROM THE EAST BANKS OF THE SUEZ.

↳ We should seek an international arms control agreement for the middle East - internationally supervised + subject to inspection

40

FINALLY, WE SHOULD SAY TO THE SOVIET UNION LOUDLY AND
CLEARLY: "IF YOU ARE GENUINE IN YOUR DESIRE FOR PEACE AND
HARMONY IN THE MIDDLE EAST, DO SOMETHING ABOUT THE THOUSANDS
OF JEWS IN RUSSIA WHO ARE IMPRISONED IN YOUR SOCIETY BY NOT
BEING ABLE TO MIGRATE TO ISRAEL." THE PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES SHOULD EXERT AMERICA'S DIPLOMATIC AND MORAL
RESOURCES IN SUPPORT OF THAT COURAGEOUS RUSSIAN JEWISH
COMMUNITY THAT, AT GREAT SACRIFICE, REFUSES TO SUBMIT TO
THE DESTRUCTION OF ITS IDENTITY,

THE UNITED NATION'S DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS
PROVIDES THAT CITIZENS SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO IMMIGRATE
TO THE COUNTRIES OF THEIR CHOICE.

44

THIS A FUNDAMENTAL HUMAN LIBERTY. A NATION WHICH DENIES
THAT RIGHT TO THE PEOPLES WITHIN IT, IS IMPRISONING ITS
CITIZENS. THIS SHOULD BE A KEY INGREDIENT OF THE EFFORTS WE
ARE MAKING TO ESTABLISH THAT STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST.

IN CONCLUSION, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE
BE REMINDED THAT ^{great} GOALS CAN NEVER BE ACHIEVED BY ANYTHING
SHORT OF DEDICATION, EFFORT AND SACRIFICE. THE GREATER THE
GOAL, THE GREATER MUST BE THE EFFORT, DEDICATION AND
SACRIFICE. THERE IS NO GREATER GOAL THAN THAT OF PEACE
AND SECURITY FOR THE WORLD.

FOR OUR NATION, THE STRONGEST, WEALTHIEST, AND MOST
FORTUNATE IN THE WORLD, TO FULFILL ITS RESPONSIBILITIES
AS A WORLD LEADER, ~~AND FOR THOSE OF US WHO LIVE IN THE NATION~~
it must be strong.

42

THAT STRENGTH, IF IT IS TO BE EFFECTIVE, MUST BE
INDIVISIBLE. IT MUST BE A SPIRITUAL STRENGTH; IT MUST BE
A STRENGTH AND A UNITY THAT COMES FROM THE ELIMINATION OF
POVERTY, RACISM, INHUMANITY; AND IT MUST BE A STRENGTH THAT
COMES FROM A GROWING ECONOMY -- A STRENGTH NOT ONLY BASED
ON A HIGHER STANDARD OF LIVING, BUT A BETTER QUALITY OF LIFE.

IT MUST BE A STRENGTH THAT RECOGNIZES THE REALITY OF
THE WORLD WE LIVE IN. AND THIS MEANS THE STRENGTH OF ~~MILITARY~~ *military*
~~SELF~~-DEFENSE AND MUTUAL SECURITY -



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org