

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library

Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Speechwriting, Office of: Speech Drafts: Records,
1981-1989

SERIES: I: SPEECH DRAFTS, 1981-1989

Folder Title: Address to the Nation on the Middle East
(Bakshian) 09/01/1982 (1 of 2)

Box: 49

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**

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

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

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Santa Barbara, California)

For Immediate Release

September 1, 1982

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT
TO THE NATION

KNBC-TV Studios

Burbank, California

6:00 PDT

THE PRESIDENT: My fellow Americans, today has been a day that can make us proud. It marks the end of the successful evacuation of the PLO from Beirut, Lebanon. This peaceful step could never have been taken without the good offices of the United States and especially the truly heroic work of a great American diplomat, Ambassador Philip Habib.

Thanks to his efforts I am happy to announce that the U.S. Marine contingent helping supervise the evacuation has accomplished its mission. Our young men should be out of Lebanon within two weeks. They, too, have served the cause of peace with distinction and we can all be very proud of them.

But the situation in Lebanon is only part of the overall problem of conflict in the Middle East. So over the past two weeks while events in Beirut dominated the front page America was engaged in a quiet, behind-the-scenes effort to lay the groundwork for a broader peace in the region. For once there were no premature leaks as U.S. diplomatic missions traveled to Mideast capitals and I met here at home with a wide range of experts to map out an American peace initiative for the long-suffering peoples of the Middle East--Arab and Israeli alike.

It seemed to me that with the agreement in Lebanon we had an opportunity for a more far-reaching peace effort in the region and I was determined to seize that moment.

In the words of the scriptures, the time had come to follow after the things which make for peace. Tonight I want to report to you the steps we have taken and the prospects they can open up for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

America has long been committed to bringing peace to this troubled region. For more than a generation successive United States administrations have endeavored to develop a fair and workable process that could lead to a true and lasting Arab-Israeli peace.

Our involvement in the search for Mideast peace is not a matter of preference, it is a moral imperative. The strategic importance of the region to the United States is well known, but our policy is motivated by more than strategic interests. We also have an irreversible commitment to the survival and territorial integrity of friendly states. Nor can we ignore the fact that the well-being of much of the world's economy is tied to stability in the strife-torn Middle East. Finally, our traditional humanitarian concerns dictated a continuing effort to peacefully resolve the conflict.

When our administration assumed office in January of 1981 I decided that the general framework for our Middle East policy should follow the broad guidelines laid down by my predecessors.

MORE

There were two basic issues we had to address. First, there was a strategic threat to the region posed by the Soviet Union and its surrogates, best demonstrated by the brutal war in Afghanistan, and, second, the peace process between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

With regard to the Soviet threat, we have strengthened our efforts to develop with our friends and allies a joint policy to deter the Soviets and their surrogates from further expansion in the region, and, if necessary, to defend against it.

With respect to the Arab-Israeli conflict, we have embraced the Camp David framework as the only way to proceed. We have also recognized, however, solving the Arab-Israeli conflict in and of itself cannot assure peace throughout a region as vast and troubled as the Middle East.

Our first objective under the Camp David process was to ensure the successful fulfillment of the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty. This was achieved with the peaceful return of the Sinai to Egypt in April, 1982. To accomplish this, we worked hard with our Egyptian and Israeli friends, and, eventually, with other friendly countries to create the multinational force which now operates in the Sinai.

Throughout this period of difficult and time consuming negotiations we never lost sight of the next step of Camp David -- autonomy talks to pave the way for permitting the Palestinian people to exercise their legitimate rights. However, owing to the tragic assassination of President Sadat and other crises in the area, it was not until January, 1982 that we were able to make a major effort to renew these talks.

Secretary of State Haig and Ambassador Fairbanks made three visits to Israel and Egypt early this year to pursue the autonomy talks. Considerable progress was made in developing the basic outline of an American approach which was to be presented to Egypt and Israel after April.

The successful completion of Israel's withdrawal from Sinai and the courage shown on this occasion by Prime Minister Begin and President Mubarak in living up to their agreements convinced me the time had come for a new American policy to try to bridge the remaining differences between Egypt and Israel on the autonomy process.

So, in May, I called for specific measures and a timetable for consultations with the governments of Egypt and Israel on the next step in the peace process. However, before this effort could be launched, the conflict in Lebanon preempted our effort.

The autonomy talks were, basically, put on hold while we sought to untangle the parties in Lebanon and still the guns of war. The Lebanon war, tragic as it was, has left us with a new opportunity for Middle East peace. We must seize it now, and bring peace to this troubled area so vital to world stability while there is still time. It was with this strong conviction that over a month ago, before the present negotiations in Beirut had been completed, I directed Secretary of State Shultz to again review our policy, and to consult a wide range of outstanding Americans on the best ways to strengthen chances for peace in the Middle East.

We have consulted with many of the officials who were historically involved in the process, with members of the Congress, and with individuals from the private sector. And I have held extensive consultations with my own advisors on the principles that I will outline to you tonight.

MORE

The evacuation of the PLO from Beirut is now complete. And we can now help the Lebanese to rebuild their war-torn country. We owe it to ourselves, and to posterity, to move quickly to build upon this achievement. A stable and revived Lebanon is essential to all our hopes for peace in the region. The people of Lebanon deserve the best efforts of the international community to turn the nightmares of the past several years into a new dawn of hope.

But the opportunities for peace in the Middle East do not begin and end in Lebanon. As we help Lebanon rebuild, we must also move to resolve the root causes of conflict between Arabs and Israelis. The war in Lebanon has demonstrated many things, but two consequences are key to the peace process.

First, the military losses of the PLO have not diminished the yearning of the Palestinian people for a just solution of their claims; and, second, while Israel's military successes in Lebanon have demonstrated that its armed forces are second to none in the region, they alone cannot bring just and lasting peace to Israel and her neighbors.

The question now is how to reconcile Israel's legitimate security concerns with the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. And that answer can only come at the negotiating table. Each party must recognize that the outcome must be acceptable to all and that true peace will require compromises by all.

So, tonight I'm calling for a fresh start. This is the moment for all those directly concerned to get involved -- or lend their support -- to a workable basis for peace. The Camp David agreement remains the foundation of our policy. Its language provides all parties with the leeway they need for successful negotiations.

I call on Israel to make clear that the security for which she yearns can only be achieved through genuine peace, a peace requiring magnanimity, vision and courage.

I call on the Palestinian people to recognize that their own political aspirations are inextricably bound to recognition of Israel's right to a secure future.

And I call on the Arab states to accept the reality of Israel -- and the reality that peace and justice are to be gained only through hard, fair, direct negotiation.

In making these calls upon others, I recognize that the United States has a special responsibility. No other nation is in the position to deal with the key parties to the conflict on the basis of trust and reliability.

The time has come for a new realism on the part of all the peoples of the Middle East. The State of Israel is an accomplished fact; it deserves unchallenged legitimacy within the community of nations. But Israel's legitimacy has thus far been recognized by too few countries and has been denied by every Arab state except Egypt. Israel exists; it has a right to exist in peace behind secure and defensible borders; and it has a right to demand of its neighbors that they recognize those facts.

I have personally followed and supported Israel's heroic struggle for survival, ever since the founding of

the State of Israel 34 years ago. In the pre-1967 borders Israel was barely ten miles wide at its narrowest point. The bulk of Israel's population lived within artillery range of hostile Arab armies. I am not about to ask Israel to live that way again.

The war in Lebanon has demonstrated another reality in the region. The departure of the Palestinians from Beirut dramatizes more than ever the homelessness of the Palestinian people. Palestinians feel strongly that their cause is more than a question of refugees. I agree. The Camp David agreements recognized that fact when it spoke of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and their just requirements. For peace to endure it must involve all those who have been most deeply affected by the conflict. Only through broader participation in the peace process, most immediately by Jordan and by the Palestinians, will Israel be able to rest confident in the knowledge that its security and integrity will be respected by its neighbors. Only through the process of negotiation can all the nations of the Middle East achieve a secure peace.

These, then, are our general goals. What are the specific new American positions and why are we taking them? In the Camp David talks thus far both Israel and Egypt have felt free to express openly their views as to what the outcome should be. Understandably their views have differed on many points. The United States has thus far sought to play the role of mediator. We have avoided public comment on the key issues. We have always recognized and continue to recognize that only the voluntary agreement of those parties most directly involved in the conflict can provide an enduring solution.

But it has become evident to me that some clearer sense of America's position on the key issues is necessary to encourage wider support for the peace process. First, as outlined in the Camp David Accords, there must be a period of time during which the Palestinian inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza will have full autonomy over their own affairs. Due consideration must be given to the principle of self-government by the inhabitants of the territory and the legitimate security concerns of the parties involved.

The proof is in the five-year period of transition which would begin after free elections for a self-governing Palestinian authority to prove to the Palestinians that they could run their own affairs, and that such Palestinian autonomy poses no threat to Israel's security. The United States will not support the use of any additional land for the purpose of settlement during the transitional period. Indeed, the immediate adoption of a settlement freeze by Israel, more than any other action, could create the confidence needed for wider participation in these talks.

Further settlement activity is in no way necessary for the security of Israel and only diminishes the confidence of the Arabs that a final outcome can be freely and fairly negotiated.

I want to make the American position well understood. The purpose of this transitional period is the peaceful and orderly transfer of authority from Israel to the Palestinian inhabitants of the West

MORE

Bank and Gaza. At the same time, such a transfer must not interfere with Israel's security requirements.

Beyond the transition period, as we look to the future of the West Bank and Gaza, it is clear to me that peace cannot be achieved by the formation of an independent Palestinian state in those territories, nor is it achievable on the basis of Israeli sovereignty or permanent control over the West Bank and Gaza. So the United States will not support the establishment of an independent Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza. And we will not support annexation or permanent control by Israel.

There is, however, another way to peace. The final status of these lands must, of course, be reached through the give and take of negotiations. But it is the firm view of the United States that self-government by the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza in association with Jordan offers the best chance for a durable, just, and lasting peace. We base our approach squarely on the principle that the Arab-Israeli conflict should be resolved through negotiations involving an exchange of territory for peace.

This exchange is enshrined in United Nations Security Council Resolution 242, which is, in turn, incorporated in all its parts in the Camp David Agreement. U.N. Resolution 242 remains wholly valid as the foundation stone of America's Middle East peace effort. It is the United States' position that, in return for peace, the withdrawal provision of Resolution 242 applies to all fronts, including the West Bank and Gaza.

When the border is negotiated between Jordan and Israel, our view on the extent to which Israel should be asked to give up territory will be heavily affected by the extent of true peace and normalization, and the security arrangement offered in return.

Finally, we remain convinced that Jerusalem must remain undivided. But its final status should be decided through negotiation. In the course of the negotiations to come, the United States will support positions that seem to us fair and reasonable compromises and likely to promote a sound agreement. We will also put forward our own detailed proposals when we believe that they can be helpful. And, make no mistake, the United States will oppose any proposal from any party and at any point in the negotiating process that threatens the security of Israel. America's commitment to the security of Israel is ironclad. And I might add, so is mine.

During the past few days, our Ambassadors in Israel, Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia have presented to their host governments the proposals, in full detail, that I have outlined here today. Now, I am convinced that these proposals can bring justice, bring security, and bring durability to an Arab-Israeli peace. The United States will stand by these principles with total dedication. They are fully consistent with Israel's security requirements and the aspirations of the Palestinians.

MORE

We will work hard to broaden participation at the peace table as envisaged by the Camp David Accords. And I fervently hope that the Palestinians and Jordan, with the support of their Arab colleagues, will accept this opportunity.

Tragic turmoil in the Middle East runs back to the dawn of history. In our modern day, conflict after conflict has taken its brutal toll there. In an age of nuclear challenge and economic interdependence, such conflicts are a threat to all the people of the world, not just the Middle East itself. It's time for us all -- in the Middle East and around the world -- to call a halt to conflict, hatred, and prejudice. It's time for us all to launch a common effort for reconstruction, peace and progress.

It has often been said -- and regrettably too often been true -- that the story of the search for peace and justice in the Middle East is a tragedy of opportunities missed.

In the aftermath of the settlement in Lebanon, we now face an opportunity for a broader peace. This time we must not let it slip from our grasp. We must look beyond the difficulties and obstacles of the present and move with a fairness and resolve toward a brighter future. We owe it to ourselves -- and to posterity -- to do no less. For if we miss this chance to make a fresh start, we may look back on this moment from some later vantage point and realize how much that failure cost us all.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy toward the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawning of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East -- and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future -- I ask you, my fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking. Thank you and God bless you.

END

6:20 P.M. PDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Santa Barbara, California)

FOR RELEASE AT 6:00 p.m. PDT
(9:00 p.m. EDT)

September 1, 1982

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE NATION

KNBC Studios
Burbank, California

Today has been a day that should make all of us proud. It marked the end of the successful evacuation of the PLO from Beirut, Lebanon. This peaceful step could never have been taken without the good offices of the United States and, especially, the truly heroic work of a great American diplomat, Ambassador Philip Habib. Thanks to his efforts, I am happy to announce that the U.S. Marine contingent helping to supervise the evacuation has accomplished its mission. Our young men should be out of Lebanon within two weeks. They, too, have served the cause of peace with distinction and we can all be very proud of them.

But the situation in Lebanon is only part of the overall problem of conflict in the Middle East. So, over the past two weeks, while events in Beirut dominated the front page, America was engaged in a quiet, behind-the-scenes effort to lay the groundwork for a broader peace in the region. For once, there were no premature leaks as U.S. diplomatic missions travelled to Mid-East capitals and I met here at home with a wide range of experts to map out an American peace initiative for the long-suffering peoples of the Middle East, Arab and Israeli alike.

It seemed to me that, with the agreement in Lebanon, we had an opportunity for a more far-reaching peace effort in the region -- and I was determined to seize that moment. In the words of the scripture, the time had come to "follow after the things which make for peace."

Tonight, I want to report to you on the steps we have taken, and the prospects they can open up for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

America has long been committed to bringing peace to this troubled region. For more than a generation, successive U.S. administrations have endeavored to develop a fair and workable process that could lead to a true and lasting Arab-Israeli peace. Our involvement in the search for Mid-East peace is not a matter of preference, it is a moral imperative. The strategic importance of the region to the U.S. is well known.

But our policy is motivated by more than strategic interests. We also have an irreversible commitment to the survival and territorial integrity of friendly states. Nor can we ignore the fact that the well-being of much of the world's economy is tied to stability in the strife-torn Middle East. Finally, our traditional humanitarian concerns dictate a continuing effort to peacefully resolve conflicts.

When our Administration assumed office in January 1981, I decided that the general framework for our Middle East policy should follow the broad guidelines laid down by my predecessors.

There were two basic issues we had to address. First, there was the strategic threat to the region posed by the Soviet Union and its surrogates, best demonstrated by the brutal war in Afghanistan; and, second, the peace process between Israel and its Arab neighbors. With regard to the Soviet threat, we have strengthened our efforts to develop with our friends and allies a joint policy to deter the Soviets and their surrogates from further expansion in the region, and, if necessary, to defend against it. With respect to the Arab-Israeli conflict, we have embraced the Camp David framework as the only way to proceed. We have also recognized, however, that solving the Arab-Israeli conflict, in and of itself, cannot assure peace throughout a region as vast and troubled as the Middle East.

Our first objective under the Camp David process was to ensure the successful fulfillment of the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty. This was achieved with the peaceful return of the Sinai to Egypt in April 1982. To accomplish this, we worked hard with our Egyptian and Israeli friends, and eventually with other friendly countries, to create the multinational force which now operates in the Sinai.

Throughout this period of difficult and time-consuming negotiations, we never lost sight of the next step of Camp David; autonomy talks to pave the way for permitting the Palestinian people to exercise their legitimate rights. However, owing to the tragic assassination of President Sadat and other crises in the area, it was not until January 1982 that we were able to make a major effort to renew these talks. Secretary of State Haig and Ambassador Fairbanks made three visits to Israel and Egypt this year to pursue the autonomy talks. Considerable progress was made in developing the basic outline of an American approach which was to be presented to Egypt and Israel after April.

The successful completion of Israel's withdrawal from Sinai and the courage shown on this occasion by Prime Minister Begin and President Mubarak in living up to their agreements convinced me the time had come for a new American policy to try to bridge the remaining differences between Egypt and Israel on the autonomy process. So, in May, I called for specific measures and a timetable for consultations with the Governments of Egypt and Israel on the next steps in the peace process. However, before this effort could be launched, the conflict in Lebanon preempted our efforts. The autonomy talks were basically put on hold while we sought to untangle the parties in Lebanon and still the guns of war.

The Lebanon war, tragic as it was, has left us with a new opportunity for Middle East peace. We must seize it now and bring peace to this troubled area so vital to world stability while there is still time. It was with this strong conviction that over a month ago, before the present negotiations in Beirut had been completed, I directed Secretary of State Shultz to again review our policy and to consult a wide range of outstanding Americans on the best ways to strengthen chances for peace in the Middle East. We have consulted with many of the officials who were historically involved in the process, with Members of the Congress, and with individuals from the private sector, and I have held extensive consultations with my own advisors on the principles I will outline to you tonight.

The evacuation of the PLO from Beirut is now complete. And we can now help the Lebanese to rebuild their war-torn country. We owe it to ourselves, and to posterity, to move quickly to build upon this achievement. A stable and revived Lebanon is essential to all our hopes for peace in the region. The people of Lebanon deserve the best efforts of the international community to turn the nightmares of the past several years into a new dawn of hope.

But the opportunities for peace in the Middle East do not begin and end in Lebanon. As we help Lebanon rebuild, we must also move to resolve the root causes of conflict between Arabs and Israelis.

The war in Lebanon has demonstrated many things, but two consequences are key to the peace process:

First, the military losses of the PLO have not diminished the yearning of the Palestinian people for a just solution of their claims; and second, while Israel's military successes in Lebanon have demonstrated that its armed forces are second to none in the region, they alone cannot bring just and lasting peace to Israel and her neighbors.

The question now is how to reconcile Israel's legitimate security concerns with the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. And that answer can only come at the negotiating table. Each party must recognize that the outcome must be acceptable to all and that true peace will require compromises by all.

So, tonight I am calling for a fresh start. This is the moment for all those directly concerned to get involved -- or lend their support -- to a workable basis for peace. The Camp David agreement remains the foundation of our policy. Its language provides all parties with the lee-way they need for successful negotiations.

I call on Israel to make clear that the security for which she yearns can only be achieved through genuine peace, a peace requiring magnanimity, vision and courage.

I call on the Palestinian people to recognize that their own political aspirations are inextricably bound to recognition of Israel's right to a secure future.

And I call on the Arab states to accept the reality of Israel -- and the reality that peace and justice are to be gained only through hard, fair, direct negotiation.

In making these calls upon others, I recognize that the United States has a special responsibility. No other nation is in a position to deal with the key parties to the conflict on the basis of trust and reliability.

The time has come for a new realism on the part of all the peoples of the Middle East. The State of Israel is an accomplished fact; it deserves unchallenged legitimacy within the community of nations. But Israel's legitimacy has thus far been recognized by too few countries, and has been denied by every Arab state except Egypt. Israel exists; it has a right to exist in peace behind secure and defensible borders; and it has a right to demand of its neighbors that they recognize those facts.

The war in Lebanon has demonstrated another reality in the region. The departure of the Palestinians from Beirut dramatizes more than ever the homelessness of the Palestinian people. Palestinians feel strongly that their cause is more than a question of refugees. I agree. The Camp David agreement recognized that fact when it spoke of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and their just requirements. For peace to endure, it must involve all those who have been most deeply affected by the conflict. Only through broader participation in the peace process -- most immediately by Jordan and by the Palestinians -- will Israel be able to rest confident in the knowledge that its security and integrity will be respected by its neighbors. Only through the process of negotiation can all the nations of the Middle East achieve a secure peace. <

These then are our general goals. What are the specific new American positions, and why are we taking them?

In the Camp David talks thus far, both Israel and Egypt have felt free to express openly their views as to what the outcome should be. Understandably, their views have differed on many points.

The United States has thus far sought to play the role of mediator; we have avoided public comment on the key issues. We have always recognized -- and continue to recognize -- that only the voluntary agreement of those parties most directly involved in the conflict can provide an enduring solution. But it has become evident to me that some clearer sense of America's position on the key issues is necessary to encourage wider support for the peace process.

First, as outlined in the Camp David Accords, there must be a period of time during which the Palestinian inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza will have full autonomy over their own affairs. Due consideration must be given to the principle of self-government by the inhabitants of the territories and to the legitimate security concerns of the parties involved.

The purpose of the 5-year period of transition which would begin after free elections for a self-governing Palestinian authority is to prove to the Palestinians that they can run their own affairs, and that such Palestinian autonomy poses no threat to Israel's security.

The United States will not support the use of any additional land for the purpose of settlements during the transition period. Indeed, the immediate adoption of a settlement freeze by Israel, more than any other action, could create the confidence needed for wider participation in these talks. Further settlement activity is in no way necessary for the security of Israel and only diminishes the confidence of the Arabs that a final outcome can be freely and fairly negotiated.

I want to make the American position clearly understood: The purpose of this transition period is the peaceful and orderly transfer of domestic authority from Israel to the Palestinian inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza. At the same time, such a transfer must not interfere with Israel's security requirements.

Beyond the transition period, as we look to the future of the West Bank and Gaza, it is clear to me that peace cannot be achieved by the formation of an independent Palestinian state in those territories. Nor is it achievable on the basis of Israeli sovereignty or permanent control over the West Bank and Gaza.

So the United States will not support the establishment of an independent Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza, and we will not support annexation or permanent control by Israel.

There is, however, another way to peace. The final status of these lands must, of course, be reached through the give-and-take of negotiations. But it is the firm view of the United States that self-government by the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza in association with Jordan offers the best chance for a durable, just and lasting peace.

We base our approach squarely on the principle that the Arab-Israeli conflict should be resolved through negotiations involving an exchange of territory for peace. This exchange is enshrined in United Nations Security Council Resolution 242, which is, in turn, incorporated in all its parts in the Camp David agreements. U.N. Resolution 242 remains wholly valid as the foundation stone of America's Middle East peace effort.

It is the United States' position that -- in return for peace -- the withdrawal provision of Resolution 242 applies to all fronts, including the West Bank and Gaza.

When the border is negotiated between Jordan and Israel, our view on the extent to which Israel should be asked to give up territory will

be heavily affected by the extent of true peace and normalization and the security arrangements offered in return.

Finally, we remain convinced that Jerusalem must remain undivided, but its final status should be decided through negotiations.

In the course of the negotiations to come, the United States will support positions that seem to us fair and reasonable compromises, and likely to promote a sound agreement. We will also put forward our own detailed proposals when we believe they can be helpful. And, make no mistake, the United States will oppose any proposal -- from any party and at any point in the negotiating process -- that threatens the security of Israel. America's commitment to the security of Israel is ironclad.

During the past few days, our Ambassadors in Israel, Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia have presented to their host governments the proposals in full detail that I have outlined here tonight.

I am convinced that these proposals can bring justice, bring security, and bring durability to an Arab-Israeli peace.

The United States will stand by these principles with total dedication. They are fully consistent with Israel's security requirements and the aspirations of the Palestinians. We will work hard to broaden participation at the peace table as envisaged by the Camp David Accords. And I fervently hope that the Palestinians and Jordan, with the support of their Arab colleagues, will accept this opportunity.

Tragic turmoil in the Middle East runs back to the dawn of history. In our modern day, conflict after conflict has taken its brutal toll there. In an age of nuclear challenge and economic interdependence, such conflicts are a threat to all the people of the world, not just the Middle East itself. It is time for us all -- in the Middle East and around the world -- to call a halt to conflict, hatred and prejudice; it is time for us all to launch a common effort for reconstruction, peace and progress.

It has often been said -- and regrettably too often been true -- that the story of the search for peace and justice in the Middle East is a tragedy of opportunities missed.

In the aftermath of the settlement in Lebanon we now face an opportunity for a broader peace. This time we must not let it slip from our grasp. We must look beyond the difficulties and obstacles of the present and move with fairness and resolve toward a brighter future. We owe it to ourselves -- and to posterity -- to do no less. For if we miss this chance to make a fresh start, we may look back on this moment from some later vantage point and realize how much that failure cost us all.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawning of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East -- and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future -- I ask you, my fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking.

<

#

But the opportunities for peace in the Middle East do not begin and end in Lebanon. As we help Lebanon rebuild, we must also move to resolve the root causes of conflict between Arabs and Israelis.

The war in Lebanon has demonstrated many things, but two consequences are key to the peace process:

First, the military losses of the PLO have not diminished the yearning of the Palestinian people for a just solution of their claims; and second, while Israel's military successes in Lebanon have demonstrated that its armed forces are second to none in the region, they alone cannot bring just and lasting peace to Israel and her neighbors.

The question now is how to reconcile Israel's legitimate security concerns with the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. And that answer can only come at the negotiating table. Each party must recognize that the outcome must be acceptable to all and that true peace will require compromises by all.

So, tonight I am calling for a fresh start. This is the moment for all those directly concerned to get involved -- or lend their support -- to a workable basis for peace. The Camp David agreement remains the foundation ~~on which we must build~~. Its language provides all parties with the lee-way they need for successful negotiations.

I call on Israel to make clear that the security for which she yearns can only be achieved through genuine peace, a peace requiring magnanimity, vision and courage.

I call on the Palestinian people to recognize that their own political aspirations are inextricably bound to ~~respect for~~ Israel's right to a secure future. *Recognition of*

And I call on the Arab states to accept the reality of Israel -- and the reality that peace and justice are to be gained only through hard, fair, direct negotiation.

In making these calls upon others, I recognize that the United States has a special responsibility. No other nation is in a position to deal with the key parties to the conflict on the basis of trust and reliability.

The time has come for a new realism on the part of all the peoples of the Middle East. The State of Israel is an accomplished fact; it deserves unchallenged legitimacy within the community of nations. But Israel's legitimacy has thus far been recognized by too few countries, and has been denied by every Arab state except Egypt. Israel exists; it has a right to exist in peace, *behind secure & defensible borders.* and it has a right to demand of its neighbors that they recognize those facts.

The war in Lebanon has demonstrated another reality in the region. The departure of the Palestinians from Beirut dramatizes more than ever the homelessness of the Palestinian people. Palestinians feel strongly that their cause is more than a question of refugees. I agree. The Camp David agreement recognized that fact when it spoke of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and their just requirements. For peace to endure, it must involve all those who have been most deeply affected by the conflict. Only through broader participation in the peace process -- most immediately by Jordan and by the Palestinians -- will Israel be able to rest confident in the knowledge that its security and integrity will be respected by its neighbors. Only through the process of negotiation can all the nations of the Middle East achieve a secure peace.

These then are our general goals. What are the specific new American positions, and why are we taking them?

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS ON THE
MIDDLE EAST

SEPTEMBER 1, 1982

TODAY HAS BEEN A DAY
THAT SHOULD MAKE US PROUD.

IT MARKED THE END OF THE
SUCCESSFUL EVACUATION OF *the*
PLO FROM BEIRUT, LEBANON.

THIS PEACEFUL STEP COULD
NEVER HAVE BEEN TAKEN
WITHOUT THE GOOD OFFICES
OF THE UNITED STATES AND,
ESPECIALLY, THE TRULY
HEROIC WORK OF A GREAT
AMERICAN DIPLOMAT,
AMBASSADOR PHILIP HABIB.

THANKS TO HIS EFFORTS, I
AM HAPPY TO ANNOUNCE THAT
THE U.S. MARINE CONTINGENT
HELPING TO SUPERVISE THE
EVACUATION HAS

He ACCOMPLISHED ITS MISSION. *mmf*

OUR YOUNG MEN SHOULD BE OUT
OF LEBANON WITHIN TWO WEEKS.

THEY, TOO, HAVE SERVED THE
CAUSE OF PEACE WITH
DISTINCTION AND WE CAN ALL
BE VERY PROUD OF THEM.

BUT THE SITUATION IN
LEBANON IS ONLY PART OF
THE OVERALL PROBLEM OF
CONFLICT IN THE MIDDLE
EAST. SO, OVER THE PAST
TWO WEEKS, WHILE EVENTS IN
BEIRUT DOMINATED THE FRONT
PAGE, AMERICA WAS
ENGAGED IN A QUIET,
BEHIND-THE-SCENES EFFORT
TO LAY THE GROUNDWORK FOR
A BROADER PEACE IN THE
REGION. FOR ONCE, THERE
WERE NO PREMATURE LEAKS
AS U.S. DIPLOMATIC
MISSIONS TRAVELED TO
MID-EAST CAPITALS AND I
MET HERE AT HOME WITH A
WIDE RANGE OF EXPERTS TO
MAP OUT AN AMERICAN PEACE
INITIATIVE FOR THE LONG-
SUFFERING PEOPLES OF THE
MIDDLE EAST, ARAB AND
ISRAELI ALIKE.

IT SEEMED TO ME THAT,
WITH THE AGREEMENT IN
LEBANON, WE HAD AN
OPPORTUNITY FOR A MORE

FAR-REACHING PEACE EFFORT
IN THE REGION -- AND I WAS
DETERMINED TO SEIZE THAT
MOMENT. IN THE WORDS OF
THE SCRIPTURE, THE TIME HAD
COME TO "FOLLOW AFTER THE
THINGS WHICH MAKE FOR
PEACE."

TONIGHT, I WANT TO
REPORT TO YOU ON THE
STEPS WE HAVE TAKEN, AND
THE PROSPECTS THEY CAN
OPEN UP FOR A JUST AND
LASTING PEACE IN THE
MIDDLE EAST.

AMERICA HAS LONG BEEN
COMMITTED TO BRINGING
PEACE TO THIS TROUBLED
REGION. FOR MORE THAN A
GENERATION, SUCCESSIVE U.S.
ADMINISTRATIONS HAVE
ENDEAVORED TO DEVELOP A
FAIR AND WORKABLE PROCESS
THAT COULD LEAD TO A TRUE
AND LASTING ARAB-ISRAELI
PEACE. OUR INVOLVEMENT
IN THE SEARCH FOR MID-EAST

PEACE IS NOT A MATTER OF
PREFERENCE, IT IS A MORAL
IMPERATIVE. THE STRATEGIC
IMPORTANCE OF THE REGION TO
THE U.S. IS WELL-KNOWN.

BUT OUR POLICY IS
MOTIVATED BY MORE THAN
STRATEGIC INTERESTS. WE
ALSO HAVE AN IRREVERSIBLE
COMMITMENT TO THE SURVIVAL
AND TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY
OF FRIENDLY STATES. NOR
CAN WE IGNORE THE FACT
THAT THE WELL-BEING OF
MUCH OF THE WORLD'S
ECONOMY IS TIED TO
STABILITY IN THE STRIFE-
TORN MIDDLE EAST.

FINALLY, OUR TRADITIONAL
HUMANITARIAN CONCERNS
DICTATE A CONTINUING
EFFORT TO PEACEFULLY
RESOLVE CONFLICTS.

WHEN OUR
ADMINISTRATION ASSUMED
OFFICE IN JANUARY 1981, I
DECIDED THAT THE GENERAL

FRAMEWORK FOR OUR MIDDLE
EAST POLICY SHOULD FOLLOW
THE BROAD GUIDELINES
LAID DOWN BY MY
PREDECESSORS.

THERE WERE TWO BASIC
ISSUES WE HAD TO ADDRESS.

FIRST, THERE WAS THE
STRATEGIC THREAT TO THE
REGION POSED BY THE SOVIET
UNION AND ITS SURROGATES,
BEST DEMONSTRATED BY THE
BRUTAL WAR IN

AFGHANISTAN; AND, SECOND,
THE PEACE PROCESS BETWEEN
ISRAEL AND ITS ARAB

NEIGHBORS. WITH REGARD TO
THE SOVIET THREAT, WE HAVE
STRENGTHENED OUR EFFORTS
TO DEVELOP WITH OUR FRIENDS
AND ALLIES A JOINT POLICY
TO DETER THE SOVIETS AND
THEIR SURROGATES FROM
FURTHER EXPANSION IN THE
REGION, AND, IF NECESSARY,
TO DEFEND AGAINST IT.

WITH RESPECT TO THE ARAB-
ISRAELI CONFLICT, WE HAVE
EMBRACED THE CAMP DAVID

FRAMEWORK AS THE ONLY WAY
TO PROCEED. WE HAVE ALSO
RECOGNIZED, HOWEVER, THAT
SOLVING THE ARAB-ISRAELI
CONFLICT, IN AND OF
ITSELF, CANNOT ASSURE
PEACE THROUGHOUT A REGION
AS VAST AND TROUBLED AS
THE MIDDLE EAST.

OUR FIRST OBJECTIVE
UNDER THE CAMP DAVID
PROCESS WAS TO ENSURE THE
SUCCESSFUL FULFILLMENT OF
THE EGYPTIAN-ISRAELI PEACE
TREATY. THIS WAS
ACHIEVED WITH THE PEACEFUL
RETURN OF THE SINAI TO
EGYPT IN APRIL 1982. TO
ACCOMPLISH THIS, WE WORKED
HARD WITH OUR EGYPTIAN AND
ISRAELI FRIENDS, AND
EVENTUALLY WITH OTHER
FRIENDLY COUNTRIES, TO
CREATE THE MULTINATIONAL
FORCE WHICH NOW OPERATES
IN THE SINAI.

THROUGHOUT THIS PERIOD
OF DIFFICULT AND TIME-

CONSUMING NEGOTIATIONS, WE
NEVER LOST SIGHT OF THE
NEXT STEP OF CAMP DAVID:

AUTONOMY TALKS TO PAVE THE
WAY FOR PERMITTING THE
PALESTINIAN PEOPLE TO
EXERCISE THEIR LEGITIMATE
RIGHTS. HOWEVER, OWING

TO THE TRAGIC
ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT
SADAT AND OTHER CRISES IN
THE AREA, IT WAS NOT UNTIL
JANUARY 1982 THAT WE WERE
ABLE TO MAKE A MAJOR
EFFORT TO RENEW THESE

TALKS. SECRETARY OF STATE
HAIG AND AMBASSADOR
FAIRBANKS MADE THREE VISITS
TO ISRAEL AND EGYPT EARLY
THIS YEAR TO PURSUE THE
AUTONOMY TALKS.

CONSIDERABLE PROGRESS WAS
MADE IN DEVELOPING THE
BASIC OUTLINE OF AN
AMERICAN APPROACH WHICH
WAS TO BE PRESENTED TO
EGYPT AND ISRAEL AFTER
APRIL.

THE SUCCESSFUL
COMPLETION OF ISRAEL'S
WITHDRAWAL FROM SINAI AND
THE COURAGE SHOWN ON THIS
OCCASION BY PRIME MINISTER
BEGIN AND PRESIDENT MUBARAK
IN LIVING UP TO THEIR
AGREEMENTS CONVINCED ME
THE TIME HAD COME FOR A NEW
AMERICAN POLICY TO TRY TO
BRIDGE THE REMAINING
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EGYPT
AND ISRAEL ON THE AUTONOMY
PROCESS. SO, IN MAY, I
CALLED FOR SPECIFIC
MEASURES AND A TIMETABLE
FOR CONSULTATIONS WITH
THE GOVERNMENTS OF EGYPT
AND ISRAEL ON THE NEXT STEPS
IN THE PEACE PROCESS.
HOWEVER, BEFORE THIS EFFORT
COULD BE LAUNCHED, THE
CONFLICT IN LEBANON
PREEMPTED OUR EFFORTS. THE
AUTONOMY TALKS WERE
BASICALLY PUT ON HOLD WHILE
WE SOUGHT TO UNTANGLE THE
PARTIES IN LEBANON AND
STILL THE GUNS OF WAR.

THE LEBANON WAR,
TRAGIC AS IT WAS, HAS LEFT
US WITH A NEW OPPORTUNITY
FOR MIDDLE EAST PEACE. WE
MUST SEIZE IT NOW AND
BRING PEACE TO THIS
TROUBLED AREA SO VITAL TO
WORLD STABILITY WHILE THERE
IS STILL TIME. IT WAS WITH
THIS STRONG CONVICTION THAT
OVER A MONTH AGO, BEFORE
THE PRESENT NEGOTIATIONS
IN BEIRUT HAD BEEN
COMPLETED, I DIRECTED
SECRETARY OF STATE
SHULTZ TO AGAIN REVIEW OUR
POLICY AND TO CONSULT A
WIDE RANGE OF OUTSTANDING
AMERICANS ON THE BEST WAYS
TO STRENGTHEN CHANCES FOR
PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST.
WE HAVE CONSULTED WITH
MANY OF THE OFFICIALS
WHO WERE HISTORICALLY
INVOLVED IN THE PROCESS,
WITH MEMBERS OF THE
CONGRESS, AND WITH
INDIVIDUALS FROM THE
PRIVATE SECTOR, AND I

HAVE HELD EXTENSIVE
CONSULTATIONS WITH MY OWN
ADVISORS ON THE PRINCIPLES
I WILL OUTLINE TO YOU
TONIGHT.

THE EVACUATION OF THE
PLO FROM BEIRUT IS NOW
COMPLETE. AND WE CAN NOW
HELP THE LEBANESE TO
REBUILD THEIR WAR-TORN
COUNTRY. WE OWE IT TO
OURSELVES, AND TO POSTERITY,
TO MOVE QUICKLY TO BUILD
UPON THIS ACHIEVEMENT. A

STABLE AND REVIVED LEBANON
IS ESSENTIAL TO ALL OUR
HOPES FOR PEACE IN THE
REGION. THE PEOPLE OF
LEBANON DESERVE THE BEST
EFFORTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL
COMMUNITY TO TURN THE
NIGHTMARES OF THE PAST
SEVERAL YEARS INTO A NEW
DAWN OF HOPE.

BUT THE OPPORTUNITIES
FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE
EAST DO NOT BEGIN AND END

IN LEBANON. AS WE HELP
LEBANON REBUILD, WE MUST
ALSO MOVE TO RESOLVE THE
ROOT CAUSES OF CONFLICT
BETWEEN ARABS AND ISRAELIS.

THE WAR IN LEBANON
HAS DEMONSTRATED MANY
THINGS, BUT TWO
CONSEQUENCES ARE KEY TO
THE PEACE PROCESS:

FIRST, THE MILITARY
LOSSES OF THE PLO HAVE NOT
DIMINISHED THE YEARNING OF
THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE FOR
A JUST SOLUTION OF THEIR
CLAIMS, AND SECOND, WHILE
ISRAEL'S MILITARY SUCCESSES
IN LEBANON HAVE DEMONSTRATED
THAT ITS ARMED FORCES ARE
SECOND TO NONE IN THE
REGION, THEY ALONE CANNOT
BRING JUST AND LASTING
PEACE TO ISRAEL AND HER
NEIGHBORS.

THE QUESTION NOW IS
HOW TO RECONCILE ISRAEL'S

LEGITIMATE SECURITY
CONCERNS WITH THE
LEGITIMATE RIGHTS OF THE
PALESTINIANS. AND THAT
ANSWER CAN ONLY COME AT THE
NEGOTIATING TABLE. EACH
PARTY MUST RECOGNIZE THAT
THE OUTCOME MUST BE
ACCEPTABLE TO ALL AND THAT
TRUE PEACE WILL REQUIRE
COMPROMISES BY ALL.

SO, TONIGHT I AM
CALLING FOR A FRESH START.
THIS IS THE MOMENT FOR ALL
THOSE DIRECTLY CONCERNED
TO GET INVOLVED -- OR
LEND THEIR SUPPORT -- TO
A WORKABLE BASIS FOR PEACE.
THE CAMP DAVID AGREEMENT
REMAINS THE FOUNDATION ON
WHICH WE MUST BUILD.
IT'S LANGUAGE PROVIDES
ALL PARTIES WITH THE LEE-
WAY THEY NEED FOR SUCCESSFUL
NEGOTIATIONS.

I CALL ON ISRAEL TO
MAKE CLEAR THAT THE

SECURITY FOR WHICH SHE
YEARNs CAN ONLY BE ACHIEVED
THROUGH GENUINE PEACE, A
PEACE REQUIRING
MAGNANIMITY, VISION AND
COURAGE.

I CALL ON THE
PALESTINIAN PEOPLE TO
RECOGNIZE THAT THEIR OWN
POLITICAL ASPIRATIONS ARE
INEXTRICABLY BOUND TO
~~RECOGNITION OF~~
RESPECT FOR ISRAEL'S RIGHT
TO A SECURE FUTURE.

AND I CALL ON THE ARAB
STATES TO ACCEPT THE
REALITY OF ISRAEL --
AND THE REALITY THAT PEACE
AND JUSTICE ARE TO BE
GAINED ONLY THROUGH HARD,
FAIR, DIRECT NEGOTIATION.

IN MAKING THESE CALLS
UPON OTHERS, I RECOGNIZE
THAT THE UNITED STATES
HAS A SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY.

NO OTHER NATION IS IN A
POSITION TO DEAL WITH THE
KEY PARTIES TO THE

CONFLICT ON THE BASIS OF
TRUST AND RELIABILITY.

THE TIME HAS COME FOR
A NEW REALISM ON THE PART
OF ALL THE PEOPLES OF THE
MIDDLE EAST. THE STATE OF

ISRAEL IS AN ACCOMPLISHED
FACT, IT DESERVES

UNCHALLENGED LEGITIMACY
WITHIN THE COMMUNITY OF
NATIONS. BUT, ISRAEL'S

LEGITIMACY HAS THUS FAR
BEEN RECOGNIZED BY TOO
FEW COUNTRIES, AND HAS
BEEN DENIED BY EVERY ARAB
STATE EXCEPT EGYPT.

ISRAEL EXISTS; IT HAS A

RIGHT TO EXIST IN PEACE;

~~BEHIND SECURE AND DEFENSIBLE~~ *BOARDERS;*

AND IT HAS A RIGHT TO
DEMAND OF ITS NEIGHBORS
THAT THEY RECOGNIZE
THOSE FACTS.

THE WAR IN LEBANON
HAS DEMONSTRATED ANOTHER
REALITY IN THE REGION.

THE DEPARTURE OF THE
PALESTINIANS FROM BEIRUT

DRAMATIZES MORE THAN EVER THE
HOMELESSNESS OF THE
PALESTINIAN PEOPLE.

PALESTINIANS FEEL STRONGLY
THAT THEIR CAUSE IS MORE
THAN A QUESTION OF REFUGEES.

I AGREE. THE CAMP DAVID
AGREEMENT RECOGNIZED THAT
FACT WHEN IT SPOKE OF THE
LEGITIMATE RIGHTS OF THE
PALESTINIAN PEOPLE AND
THEIR JUST REQUIREMENTS.

FOR PEACE TO ENDURE, IT
MUST INVOLVE ALL THOSE
WHO HAVE BEEN MOST DEEPLY
AFFECTED BY THE CONFLICT.

ONLY THROUGH BROADER
PARTICIPATION IN THE
PEACE PROCESS-- MOST
IMMEDIATELY BY JORDAN AND
BY THE PALESTINIANS --
WILL ISRAEL BE ABLE TO
REST CONFIDENT IN THE
KNOWLEDGE THAT ITS

SECURITY AND INTEGRITY
WILL BE RESPECTED BY ITS

NEIGHBORS. ONLY THROUGH
THE PROCESS OF NEGOTIATION

CAN ALL THE NATIONS OF THE
MIDDLE EAST ACHIEVE A
SECURE PEACE.

THESE THEN ARE OUR
GENERAL GOALS. WHAT ARE
THE SPECIFIC NEW AMERICAN
POSITIONS, AND WHY ARE WE
~~TALKING~~^{TAKING} THEM?

IN THE CAMP DAVID TALKS
THUS FAR, BOTH ISRAEL AND
EGYPT HAVE FELT FREE TO
EXPRESS OPENLY THEIR VIEWS
AS TO WHAT THE OUTCOME
SHOULD BE. UNDERSTANDABLY.
THEIR VIEWS HAVE DIFFERED
ON MANY POINTS.

THE UNITED STATES HAS
THUS FAR SOUGHT TO PLAY THE
ROLE OF MEDIATOR; WE HAVE
AVOIDED PUBLIC COMMENT ON
THE KEY ISSUES. WE HAVE
ALWAYS RECOGNIZED -- AND
CONTINUE TO RECOGNIZE --
THAT ONLY THE VOLUNTARY
AGREEMENT OF THOSE PARTIES
MOST DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN

THE CONFLICT CAN PROVIDE
AN ENDURING SOLUTION. BUT
IT HAS BECOME EVIDENT TO
ME THAT SOME CLEARER SENSE
OF AMERICA'S POSITION ON
THE KEY ISSUES IS NECESSARY
TO ENCOURAGE WIDER SUPPORT
FOR THE PEACE PROCESS.

FIRST, AS OUTLINED IN
THE CAMP DAVID ACCORDS,
THERE MUST BE A PERIOD OF
TIME DURING WHICH THE
PALESTINIAN INHABITANTS
OF THE WEST BANK AND GAZA
WILL HAVE FULL AUTONOMY
OVER THEIR OWN AFFAIRS.

DUE CONSIDERATION MUST BE
GIVEN TO THE PRINCIPLE
OF SELF-GOVERNMENT BY THE
INHABITANTS OF THE
TERRITORIES AND TO THE
LEGITIMATE SECURITY
CONCERNS OF THE PARTIES
INVOLVED.

THE PURPOSE OF THE 5-
YEAR PERIOD OF TRANSITION
WHICH WOULD BEGIN AFTER
FREE ELECTIONS FOR A

SELF-GOVERNING PALESTINIAN
AUTHORITY IS TO PROVE TO
THE PALESTINIANS THAT THEY
CAN RUN THEIR OWN AFFAIRS,
AND THAT SUCH PALESTINIAN
AUTONOMY POSES NO THREAT
TO ISRAEL'S SECURITY.

THE UNITED STATES WILL
NOT SUPPORT THE USE OF
ANY ADDITIONAL LAND FOR
THE PURPOSE OF SETTLEMENTS
DURING THE TRANSITIONAL
PERIOD. INDEED, THE
IMMEDIATE ADOPTION OF A
SETTLEMENT FREEZE BY
ISRAEL, MORE THAN ANY
OTHER ACTION, COULD CREATE
THE CONFIDENCE NEEDED FOR
WIDER PARTICIPATION IN
THESE TALKS. FURTHER
SETTLEMENT ACTIVITY IS
IN NO WAY NECESSARY FOR
THE SECURITY OF ISRAEL
AND ONLY DIMINISHES THE
CONFIDENCE OF THE ARABS
THAT A FINAL OUTCOME CAN
BE FREELY AND FAIRLY

NEGOTIATED.

I WANT TO MAKE THE
AMERICAN POSITION WELL
UNDERSTOOD: THE PURPOSE OF
THIS TRANSITIONAL PERIOD IS
THE PEACEFUL AND ORDERLY
TRANSFER OF AUTHORITY FROM
ISRAEL TO THE PALESTINIAN
INHABITANTS OF THE WEST BANK
AND GAZA. AT THE SAME
TIME, SUCH A TRANSFER MUST
NOT INTERFERE WITH ISRAEL'S
SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.

BEYOND THE TRANSITION
PERIOD, ^{AS} ~~AT~~ WE LOOK TO THE
FUTURE OF THE WEST BANK
AND GAZA, IT IS CLEAR TO
ME THAT PEACE CANNOT BE
ACHIEVED BY THE FORMATION
OF AN INDEPENDENT
PALESTINIAN STATE IN THOSE
TERRITORIES. NOR IS IT
ACHIEVABLE ON THE BASIS
OF ISRAELI SOVEREIGNTY
OR PERMANENT CONTROL OVER
THE WEST BANK AND GAZA.

SO THE UNITED STATES
WILL NOT SUPPORT THE
ESTABLISHMENT OF AN
INDEPENDENT PALESTINIAN
STATE IN THE WEST BANK AND
GAZA, AND WE WILL NOT
SUPPORT ANNEXATION OR
PERMANENT CONTROL BY
ISRAEL.

THERE IS, HOWEVER,
ANOTHER WAY TO PEACE. THE
FINAL STATUS OF THESE LANDS
MUST, OF COURSE, BE REACHED
THROUGH THE GIVE-AND-TAKE
OF NEGOTIATIONS. BUT IT
IS THE FIRM VIEW OF THE
UNITED STATES THAT SELF-
GOVERNMENT BY THE
PALESTINIANS OF THE WEST
BANK AND GAZA IN
ASSOCIATION WITH JORDAN
OFFERS THE BEST CHANCE
FOR A DURABLE, JUST AND
LASTING PEACE.

WE BASE OUR APPROACH
SQUARELY ON THE PRINCIPLE
THAT THE ARAB-ISRAELI

CONFLICT SHOULD BE RESOLVED
THROUGH NEGOTIATIONS
INVOLVING AN EXCHANGE OF
TERRITORY FOR PEACE. THIS
EXCHANGE IS ENSHRINED IN
UNITED NATIONS SECURITY
COUNCIL RESOLUTION 242,
WHICH IS, IN TURN,
INCORPORATED IN ALL ITS
PARTS IN THE CAMP DAVID
AGREEMENTS. U.N.

RESOLUTION 242 REMAINS
WHOLLY VALID AS THE
FOUNDATION STONE OF
AMERICA'S MIDDLE EAST
PEACE EFFORT.

IT IS THE UNITED
STATES' POSITION THAT --
IN RETURN FOR PEACE --
THE WITHDRAWAL PROVISION
OF RESOLUTION 242 APPLIES
TO ALL FRONTS, INCLUDING
THE WEST BANK AND GAZA.

WHEN THE BORDER IS
NEGOTIATED BETWEEN JORDAN
AND ISRAEL, OUR VIEW ON
THE EXTENT TO WHICH ISRAEL

SHOULD BE ASKED TO GIVE
UP TERRITORY WILL BE
HEAVILY AFFECTED BY THE
EXTENT OF TRUE PEACE AND
NORMALIZATION AND THE
SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS
OFFERED IN RETURN.

FINALLY, WE REMAIN
CONVINCED THAT JERUSALEM
MUST REMAIN UNDIVIDED, BUT
ITS FINAL STATUS SHOULD BE
DECIDED THROUGH NEGOTIATIONS.

IN THE COURSE OF THE
NEGOTIATIONS TO COME, THE
UNITED STATES WILL SUPPORT
POSITIONS THAT SEEM TO
US FAIR AND REASONABLE
COMPROMISES, AND LIKELY TO
PROMOTE A SOUND AGREEMENT.

WE WILL ALSO PUT FORWARD
OUR OWN DETAILED PROPOSALS
WHEN WE BELIEVE THEY CAN
BE HELPFUL. AND, MAKE
NO MISTAKE, THE UNITED
STATES WILL OPPOSE ANY
PROPOSAL -- FROM ANY

AND AT ANY POINT IN

PARTY AND AT ANY POINT IN
THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS --
THAT THREATENS THE SECURITY
OF ISRAEL.) AMERICA'S
COMMITMENT TO THE SECURITY
OF ISRAEL IS IRONCLAD.

DURING THE PAST FEW
DAYS, OUR AMBASSADORS IN
ISRAEL, EGYPT, JORDAN, AND
SAUDI ARABIA HAVE PRESENTED
TO THEIR HOST GOVERNMENTS
THE PROPOSALS IN FULL
DETAIL THAT I HAVE
OUTLINED HERE TODAY.

I AM CONVINCED THAT
THESE PROPOSALS CAN BRING
JUSTICE, BRING SECURITY,
AND BRING DURABILITY TO AN
ARAB-ISRAELI PEACE.

THE UNITED STATES WILL
STAND BY THESE PRINCIPLES
WITH TOTAL DEDICATION.

THEY ARE FULLY CONSISTENT
WITH ISRAEL'S SECURITY
REQUIREMENTS AND THE
ASPIRATIONS OF THE
PALESTINIANS.) WE WILL

WORK HARD TO ^{BROADEN}~~BROADEN~~
PARTICIPATION AT THE PEACE
TABLE AS ENVISAGED BY THE
CAMP DAVID ACCORDS AND I
FERVENTLY HOPE THAT THE
PALESTINIANS AND JORDAN,
WITH THE SUPPORT OF THEIR
ARAB COLLEAGUES, WILL
ACCEPT THIS OPPORTUNITY.

TRAGIC TURMOIL IN
THE MIDDLE EAST RUNS BACK
TO THE DAWN OF HISTORY.
IN OUR MODERN DAY,
CONFLICT AFTER CONFLICT HAS
TAKEN ITS BRUTAL TOLL THERE.

IN AN AGE OF NUCLEAR
CHALLENGE AND ECONOMIC
INTERDEPENDENCE, SUCH
CONFLICTS ARE A THREAT TO
ALL THE PEOPLE OF THE
WORLD, NOT JUST THE
MIDDLE EAST ITSELF. IT
IS TIME FOR US ALL -- IN
THE MIDDLE EAST AND AROUND
THE WORLD -- TO CALL A
HALT TO CONFLICT, HATRED
AND PREJUDICE; IT IS
TIME FOR US ALL TO LAUNCH

A COMMON EFFORT FOR
RECONSTRUCTION, PEACE AND
PROGRESS.

IT HAS OFTEN BEEN SAID -
AND REGRETTABLY TOO OFTEN
BEEN TRUE -- THAT THE STORY
OF THE SEARCH FOR PEACE AND
JUSTICE IN THE MIDDLE EAST
IS A TRAGEDY OF
OPPORTUNITIES MISSED.

IN THE AFTERMATH OF
THE SETTLEMENT IN LEBANON
WE NOW FACE AN OPPORTUNITY
FOR A BROADER PEACE. THIS
TIME WE MUST NOT LET IT
SLIP FROM OUR GRASP. WE
MUST LOOK BEYOND THE
DIFFICULTIES AND
OBSTACLES OF THE PRESENT
AND MOVE WITH FAIRNESS
AND RESOLVE TOWARD A
BRIGHTER FUTURE. WE OWE
IT TO OURSELVES -- AND
TO PROSPERITY -- TO DO NO
LESS. FOR IF WE MISS THIS
CHANCE TO MAKE A FRESH
START, WE MAY LOOK BACK

posterity

ON THIS MOMENT FROM SOME
LATER VANTAGE POINT AND
REALIZE HOW MUCH THAT
FAILURE COST US ALL.

THESE, THEN, ARE
THE PRINCIPLES UPON WHICH
AMERICAN POLICY TOWARDS
THE ARAB-ISRAELI
CONFLICT WILL BE BASED.

I HAVE MADE A PERSONAL
COMMITMENT TO SEE THAT
THEY ENDURE AND, GOD
WILLING, THAT THEY WILL
COME TO BE SEEN BY ALL
REASONABLE, COMPASSIONATE
PEOPLE AS FAIR,
ACHIEVABLE, AND IN THE
INTERESTS OF ALL WHO WISH
TO SEE PEACE IN THE MIDDLE
EAST.

TONIGHT, ON THE EVE
OF WHAT CAN BE A DAWNING
NEW HOPE FOR THE PEOPLE
OF THE TROUBLED MIDDLE
EAST -- AND FOR ALL THE
WORLD'S PEOPLE WHO DREAM
OF A JUST AND PEACEFUL
FUTURE -- I ASK YOU, MY

FELLOW AMERICANS, FOR YOUR
SUPPORT AND YOUR PRAYERS
IN THIS GREAT UNDERTAKING.

THANK YOU AND GOD BLESS
YOU.

I HAVE PERSONALLY
FOLLOWED AND SUPPORTED
ISRAEL'S HEROIC
STRUGGLE FOR SURVIVAL
EVER SINCE THE FOUNDING
OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL
34 YEARS AGO.

~~I HAVE PERSONALLY BEEN
THERE, AND I HAVE
PERSONALLY FELT
THE SMALL SIZE AND
PHYSICAL VULNERABILITY
OF THAT TINY COUNTRY.~~

IN THE PRE--~~1967~~
BORDERS, ISRAEL WAS
BEARLY 10 MILES WIDE
AT ITS NARROWEST POINT.
THE BULK OF ISRAEL'S
POPULATION LIVED WITHIN

I HAVE PERSONALLY

GO

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS ON THE MIDDLE EAST

My Fellow Americans:

Today has been a day that should make us proud. It marked the end of the successful evacuation of ^{the} PLO from Beirut, Lebanon. This peaceful step could never have been taken without the good offices of the United States and, especially, the truly heroic work of a great American diplomat, Ambassador Philip Habib. Thanks to his efforts, I am happy to announce that the U.S. Marine contingent helping to supervise the evacuation has accomplished its mission. Our ^{young men} boys should be out of Lebanon within two weeks. They, too, have served the cause of peace with distinction and we can all be very proud of them.

But the situation in Lebanon is only part of the overall problem of conflict in the Middle East. So, over the past two weeks, while events in Beirut dominated the front page, America was engaged in a quiet, behind-the-scenes effort to lay the groundwork for a broader peace in the region. For once, there were no premature leaks as U.S. diplomatic missions traveled to Middle East capitals and I met here at home with a wide range of experts to map out an American peace initiative for the long-suffering peoples of the Middle East, Arab and Israeli alike.

It seemed to me that, with the agreement in Lebanon, we had an opportunity for a more far-reaching peace effort in the region -- and I was determined to seize that moment.

In the words of the scripture, the time had come to "follow after the things which make for peace."

Tonight, I want to report to you on the steps we have taken, and the prospects they can open up for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

America has long been committed to bringing peace to this troubled region. For more than a generation, successive U.S. administrations have endeavored to develop a fair and workable process that could lead to a true and lasting Arab-Israeli peace. Our involvement in the search for Mid-East peace is not a matter of preference, it is a moral imperative. The strategic importance of the region to the U.S. is well-known.

But our policy is motivated by more than strategic interests. We also have an irreversible commitment to the survival and territorial integrity of friendly states. Nor can we ignore the fact that the well-being of much of the world's economy is tied to stability in the strife-torn Middle East. Finally, our traditional humanitarian concerns dictate a continuing effort to peacefully resolve conflicts.

x When ^{our}my Administration assumed office in January 1981, I decided that the general framework for our Middle East policy should follow the broad guidelines laid down by my predecessors.

There were two basic issues we had to address. First, there was the strategic threat to the region posed by the Soviet Union and its surrogates, best demonstrated by the brutal war in Afghanistan; and, second, the peace process between Israel and its Arab neighbors. With regard to the Soviet threat, we have

strengthened our efforts to develop with our friends and allies a joint policy to deter the Soviets and their surrogates from further expansion in the region, and, if necessary, to defend against it. With respect to the Arab-Israeli conflict, we have embraced the Camp David framework as the only way to proceed. We have also recognized, however, that ^{solving the Arab-Israeli conflict,} ~~the Camp David process,~~ in and of itself, cannot assure peace throughout a region as vast and troubled as the Middle East.

Our first objective under the Camp David process was to ensure the successful fulfillment of the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty. This was achieved with the peaceful return of the Sinai to Egypt in April 1982. To accomplish this, we worked hard with our Egyptian and Israeli friends, and eventually with other friendly countries, to create the multinational force which now operates in the Sinai.

Throughout this period of difficult and time-consuming negotiations, we never lost sight of the next step of Camp David: autonomy talks to pave the way for permitting the Palestinian people to exercise their legitimate rights. However, owing to the tragic assassination of President Sadat and other crises in the area, it was not until January 1982 that we were able to make a major effort to renew these talks. ~~On my instructions,~~ Secretary of State Haig ^{and Ambassador Fairbank made three} ~~made two~~ visits to Israel and Egypt ~~in January and early~~ ^{February of this year} to pursue the autonomy talks. Considerable progress was made in developing the basic outline of an American approach which was to be presented to Egypt and Israel after April.

The successful completion of Israel's withdrawal from Sinai and the courage shown on this occasion by ^{Prime Minister Begin and} both President Mubarak and ~~Prime Minister Begin~~ in living up to their agreements convinced me the time had come for a new American policy to try to bridge the remaining differences between Egypt and Israel on the autonomy process. So, in May, I called for specific measures and a timetable for consultations with the Governments of Egypt and Israel on the next steps in the peace process. However, before this effort could be launched, the conflict in Lebanon preempted our efforts. The autonomy talks were basically put on hold while we sought to untangle the parties in Lebanon and still the guns of war.

The Lebanon war, tragic as it was, has left us with a new ^{and} opportunity for Middle East peace. We must seize it now while ~~there is still time~~. We must bring peace to this troubled area so vital to world stability, ^{while there is still time.} It was with this strong conviction that over a month ago, before the present negotiations in Beirut had been completed, I directed Secretary of State Shultz to again review our policy and to consult a wide range of outstanding Americans on the best ways to strengthen chances for peace in the Middle East. We have consulted with many of the officials who were historically involved in the process, with Members of the

Congress, and with individuals from the private sector, and I have held extensive consultations with my own advisors on the principles I will outline to you tonight.

The evacuation of the PLO from Beirut is now complete. And we can now help the Lebanese to rebuild their war-torn country. We owe it to ourselves, and to posterity, to move quickly to build upon this achievement. A stable and revived Lebanon is essential to all our hopes for peace in the region. The people of Lebanon deserve the best efforts of the international community to turn the nightmares of the past several years into a new dawn of hope.

But the opportunities for peace in the Middle East do not begin and end in Lebanon. As we help Lebanon rebuild, we must also move to resolve the root causes of conflict between Arabs and Israelis.

The war in Lebanon has demonstrated many things, but two consequences are key to the peace process:

First, the military losses of the PLO have not diminished the yearning of the Palestinian people for a just solution of their claims; and second, while Israel's military successes in Lebanon have demonstrated that its armed forces are second to none in the region, they alone cannot bring just and lasting peace to Israel and her neighbors.

The question now is how to reconcile Israel's legitimate security concerns with the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. And that answer can only come at the negotiating table. Each party must recognize that the outcome must be

acceptable to all and that true peace will require compromises by all.

So, tonight I am calling for a fresh start. This is the moment for all those directly concerned to get involved -- or lend their support -- to a workable basis for peace. The Camp David agreement remains the foundation on which we must build. It's language provides all parties with the lee-way they need for successful negotiations.

I call on Israel to make clear that the security for which she yearns can only be achieved through genuine peace, a peace requiring magnanimity, vision and courage.

I call on the Palestinian people to recognize that their own political aspirations are inextricably bound to respect for Israel's right to a secure future.

And I call on the Arab states to accept the reality of Israel -- and the reality that peace and justice are to be gained only through hard, fair, direct negotiation.

In making these calls upon others, I recognize that the United States has a special responsibility. No other nation is in a position to deal with the key parties to the conflict on the basis of trust and reliability.

The time has come for a new realism on the part of all the peoples of the Middle East. The State of Israel is an accomplished fact; it deserves unchallenged legitimacy within the community of nations. But, Israel's legitimacy has thus far been recognized by too few countries, and has been denied by every Arab state except Egypt. Israel exists;

it has a right to exist in peace; and it has a right to demand of its neighbors that they recognize those facts.

The war in Lebanon has demonstrated another reality in the region. The departure of the Palestinians from Beirut dramatizes more than ever the homelessness of the Palestinian people. Palestinians feel strongly that their cause is more than a question of refugees. I agree. The Camp David agreement recognized that fact when it spoke of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and their just requirements. For peace to endure, it must involve all those who have been most deeply affected by the conflict. Only through broader participation in the peace process -- most immediately by Jordan and by the Palestinians -- will Israel be able to rest confident in the knowledge that its security and integrity will be respected by its neighbors. Only through the process of negotiation can all the nations of the Middle East achieve a secure peace.

These then are our general goals. What are the specific new American positions, and why are we taking them?

In the Camp David talks thus far, both Israel and Egypt have felt free to express openly their views as to what the outcome should be. Understandably, their views have differed on many points.

The United States has thus far sought to play the role of mediator; we have avoided public comment on the key issues. We have always recognized -- and continue to recognize -- that only the voluntary agreement of those parties most directly involved in the conflict can provide an enduring solution. But it has

become evident to me that some clearer sense of America's position on the key issues is necessary to encourage wider support for the peace process.

First, as outlined in the Camp David Accords, there must be a period of time during which the Palestinian inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza will have full autonomy over their own affairs. Due consideration must be given to the principle of self-government by the inhabitants of the territories and to the legitimate security concerns of the parties involved.

The purpose of the 5-year period of transition which would begin after free elections for a self-governing Palestinian authority is to prove to the Palestinians that they can run their own affairs, and that such Palestinian autonomy poses no threat to Israel's security.

The United States will ^{not support} oppose the use of any additional land for the purpose of settlements during the transitional period. Indeed, the immediate adoption of a settlement freeze by Israel, more than any other action, could create the confidence needed or wider participation in these talks. Further settlement activity is in no way necessary for the security of Israel and only diminishes the confidence of the Arabs that a final outcome can be freely and fairly negotiated.

I want to make the American position well understood: The purpose of this transitional period is the peaceful and orderly transfer of authority from Israel to the Palestinian inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza. At the same time, such a transfer must not interfere with Israel's security requirements.

Beyond the transition period, as we look to the future of the West Bank and Gaza, it is clear to me that peace cannot be achieved by the formation of an independent Palestinian state in those territories. Nor is it achievable on the basis of Israeli sovereignty or permanent control over the West Bank and Gaza.

So the United States will not support the establishment of an independent Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza, and we will not support annexation or permanent control by Israel.

There is, however, another way to peace. The final status of these lands must, of course, be reached through the give-and-take of negotiations. But it is the firm view of the United States that self-government by the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza in association with Jordan offers the best chance for a durable, just and lasting peace.

We base our approach squarely on the principle that the Arab-Israeli conflict should be resolved through negotiations involving an exchange of territory for peace. This exchange is enshrined in United Nations Security Council Resolution 242, which is, in turn, incorporated in all its parts in the Camp David agreements. U.N. Resolution 242 remains wholly valid as the foundation stone of America's Middle East peace effort.

It is the United States' position that -- in return for peace -- the withdrawal provision of Resolution 242 applies to all fronts, including the West Bank and Gaza.

When the border is negotiated between Jordan and Israel, our view on the extent to which Israel should be asked to give up territory will be heavily affected by the extent of true peace and normalization and the security

arrangements offered in return.

Finally, we remain convinced that Jerusalem must remain undivided, but its final status should be decided through negotiations.

In the course of the negotiations to come, the United States will support positions that seem to us fair and reasonable compromises, and likely to promote a sound agreement. We will also put forward our own detailed proposals when we believe they can be helpful. And, make no mistake, the United States will

oppose any proposal -- from any party and at any point in the

~~commitment to the security of Israel is included.~~

negotiating process -- that threatens the security of Israel. America's

~~Commitment to the security of Israel is included.~~

During the past few days, our Ambassadors in Israel, Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia have presented to their host governments the proposals in full detail that I have outlined here today.

I am convinced that these proposals can bring justice, bring security, and bring durability to an Arab-Israeli peace.

The United States will stand by these principles with total dedication. They are fully consistent with Israel's security requirements and the aspirations of the Palestinians. We will work hard to broaden participation at the peace table as envisaged by the Camp David Accords. And I fervently hope that the Palestinians and Jordan, with the support of their Arab colleagues, will accept this opportunity.

Tragic turmoil in the Middle East runs back to the dawn of history. In our modern day, conflict after conflict has taken

its brutal toll there. In an age of nuclear challenge and economic interdependence, such conflicts are a threat to all the people of the world, not just the Middle East itself. It is time for us all -- in the Middle East and around the world -- to call a halt to conflict; it is time for us all to launch a common effort for reconstruction, peace and progress.

It has often been said -- and regrettably too often been true -- that the story of the search for peace and justice in the Middle East is a tragedy of opportunities missed.

In the aftermath of the settlement in Lebanon we now face an opportunity for a broader peace. This time we must not let it slip from our grasp. We must look beyond the difficulties and obstacles of the present and move with fairness and resolve toward a brighter future. We owe it to ourselves -- and to posterity -- to do no less. For if we miss this chance to make a fresh start, we may look back on this moment from some later vantage point and realize how much that failure cost us all.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawning of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East -- and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future -- I ask you, my

Page 12

fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking.

Thank you and God bless you.