

The original documents are located in Box D27, folder “Zionist Organization of America, Los Angeles, CA, August 28, 1969” of the Ford Congressional Papers: Press Secretary and Speech File at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. The Council donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA, THURSDAY
EVENING, AUGUST 28, 1969, AT THE
CENTURY PLAZA HOTEL, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

*Greetings from
Pres. Nixon
Mixed audiences - welcomed
all wives from who Minority leader of House
all husbands from who speaker of House*

SHALOM! (SHAH-LOAM).

I FIND IT MOST NATURAL TO USE THE
TRADITIONAL HEBREW GREETING, ^① SINCE I HAVE
SPOKEN BEFORE MANY JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS IN
RECENT MONTHS. ALSO, ^② I AM A GREAT BELIEVER
IN PEACE, AS I AM CERTAIN EACH OF YOU ARE.

I HAVE COME TO YOU TONIGHT TO SPEAK
OF ^① PEACE -- OF WAR AND PEACE -- OF THE
MIDDLE EAST AND ^② THE HEART-RENDING PROBLEMS
THAT DISTURB US ALL AS WE LOOK AT THAT
DEEPLY TROUBLED REGION.

I HAVE COME TO YOU TO SPEAK OF THE
NIXON ADMINISTRATION'S VIEW OF THE MIDDLE
EAST AND TO MAKE SOME PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS



OF MY OWN.

THE UNITED STATES HAS, OF COURSE, A TREMENDOUS CONTINUING RESPONSIBILITY TO PROMOTE PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST / WHETHER OR NOT THAT TASK SEEMS IMPROBABLE AND IMPOSSIBLE.

I AM AWARE THAT MANY INDIVIDUALS BELIEVE THE UNITED STATES SHOULD SIMPLY KEEP HANDS OFF THE MIDDLE EAST, MANY WHO BELIEVE THAT OUR COUNTRY IS STANDING IN THE WAY OF AN ISRAELI-ARAB SETTLEMENT BY TRYING TO HELP FIND A SOLUTION. I DO NOT SHARE THAT VIEW.

CERTAINLY THE FACT THAT THE UNITED STATES HAS ENGAGED IN BOTH FOUR-POWER AND TWO-POWER TALKS ON THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION HAS NOT CONTRIBUTED IN ANY MEASURE TO THE STATE OF WAR WHICH CURRENTLY EXISTS



BETWEEN ISRAEL AND THE ARAB STATES. AT THE SAME TIME, HOWEVER, THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR CONFRONTATION HAS BEEN GREATLY REDUCED ^{by such talks} THAT IS PROGRESS FOR ALL MANKIND.

I ASSURE YOU / THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION IS CONVINCED THAT ONLY LOCAL INITIATIVES CAN RESOLVE LOCAL CONFLICTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. IT IS ONLY LOCAL SOLUTIONS THAT CAN PRODUCE A PERMANENT PEACE. BUT THE ADMINISTRATION BELIEVES ^{diligent, careful, broad & specific} IT ¹¹ CAN BE HELPFUL.

~~AND THAT IS ALL THE ADMINISTRATION IS TRYING TO DO.~~

^{for the past 8 months} NOW, EXACTLY WHAT HAS THE ADMINISTRATION BEEN TRYING TO DO AND WHY?

FOR THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION WE MUST GO BACK TO THE MIDDLE EASTERN SITUATION AS IT EXISTED LAST JANUARY.

EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE PEACE HAD SLOWED

ALMOST TO A STANDSTILL. DESPITE THE BEST EFFORTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS REPRESENTATIVE, AMBASSADOR JARRING, ^{of progress at best} DISCUSSIONS WERE ON DEAD CENTER.

IT HAD BECOME APPARENT THAT A NEW INITIATIVE WAS MANDATORY. WITHOUT SOME PROGRESS TOWARD PEACE, THE SITUATION COULD ONLY BECOME MORE DANGEROUS. ^{both regionally & between the major powers,} A NEW INITIATIVE WAS REQUIRED BECAUSE NO RESPONSIBLE AMERICAN PRESIDENT COULD FAIL TO RECOGNIZE THAT THE INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES -- AS WELL AS THE INTERESTS OF THE MIDDLE EASTERN PEOPLES -- WERE DEEPLY INVOLVED.

IN FEBRUARY THE PRESIDENT LAUNCHED A SERIES OF CONSULTATIONS WITH THE FOUR PERMANENT MEMBERS OF THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL, AT FIRST BILATERALLY / AND THEN IN MORE FORMAL

MEETINGS, TO DETERMINE WHAT MIGHT BE DONE TO HELP BREAK THE STALEMATE.

SUBSEQUENTLY, A SERIES OF MEETINGS WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SOVIET UNION DEVELOPED.

IT HAS BEEN SAID THAT THOSE TALKS HAVE BROKEN DOWN. I CAN TELL YOU TONIGHT THAT THOSE TALKS ARE CONTINUING.

THE ADMINISTRATION DOES NOT BELIEVE THAT THE U.S.-SOVIET TALKS ON THE MIDEAST CAN BRING PEACE IN AND OF THEMSELVES. BUT IT DOES BELIEVE THE UNITED STATES WOULD BE DERELICT IF IT DID NOT MAKE EVERY EFFORT TO DETERMINE WHETHER NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND THE ARAB STATES WOULD BE POSSIBLE UNDER AUSPICES OF AMBASSADOR JARRING, *or any other individuals.*

THERE ARE SOUND REASONS FOR THE BILATERAL TALKS WITH THE SOVIET UNION.



realistically

THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION SEES SOVIET INFLUENCE IN THE MIDDLE EAST AS A REGRETTABLE FACT OF LIFE -- A DEMONSTRATION OF SOVIET POWER WHICH MUST BE DEALT WITH THERE JUST AS ANYWHERE ELSE IN THE WORLD.

THE ADMINISTRATION HAS NO ILLUSIONS ABOUT LONGRANGE SOVIET INTENTIONS, BUT IN THE MIDDLE EAST AS IN ALL OTHER AREAS OF THE WORLD THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION IS TRYING TO TURN AN ERA OF CONFRONTATION INTO AN ERA OF NEGOTIATION.

WE KNOW THAT THE RUSSIANS NOW ARE EMPLOYING GUNBOAT DIPLOMACY IN THE MEDITERRANEAN. THEY NOW HAVE 63 TO 65 VESSELS ^{*in that body of water*} THERE, A GREATER NUMBER OF SHIPS THAN OUR SIXTH FLEET. THE SOVIET VESSELS ARE ENGAGED IN NAVAL EXERCISES OFF THE COAST OF SYRIA AND EGYPT, USING BASES IN




THOSE TWO COUNTRIES. THE EXERCISES ARE CENTERED AROUND A SO-CALLED RUSSIAN AIRCRAFT CARRIER, A SHIP WHICH IS EQUIPPED FOR THE TAKEOFF AND LANDING OF TROOP-CARRYING HELICOPTERS.

THE RUSSIANS ALSO HAVE SENT 10 SHIPS INTO THE RED SEA-INDIAN OCEAN AREA SOUTH OF THE SUEZ CANAL.

THE SOVIET DESIGNS IN THE MIDDLE EAST ARE READILY APPARENT TO THE UNITED STATES. WE ARE FULLY AWARE OF THEIR LONGRANGE INTENTIONS, ~~AND~~ WE ARE CAREFULLY WATCHING CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS.

It is my judgment THE RUSSIANS ARE NOT ACHIEVING WHAT THEY WANT IN THE MIDDLE EAST -- AND THAT IS HELPFUL TO US. THE SOVIETS ACQUIRED NAVAL AND AIR BASE RIGHTS IN EGYPT ON AN INFORMAL BASIS, BUT THE RUSSIANS ARE ALMOST



CERTAIN TO FIND THIS A BAD BARGAIN IN THE
END. I DO NOT BELIEVE THE EGYPTIANS WILL
EVER ACCORD THE RUSSIANS FORMAL RIGHTS TO
These military installations,
THE BASES.

THE SOVIETS ^{absolutely} ARE TRYING TO USE ARAB-
ISRAELI TENSIONS TO EXPAND INTO THE MIDDLE
EAST. THEY FAILED IN FRONTAL ASSAULTS ON
TURKEY AND IRAN AND SO THEY ARE TRYING TO
LEAPFROG THEM TO RUSSIA'S LONG-SOUGHT
OBJECTIVE OF BECOMING A MIDDLE EAST POWER.
IT IS IN THE VITAL INTERESTS OF THE UNITED
STATES TO PREVENT SOVIET DOMINATION OF THE
MIDDLE EAST. WORLD PEACE WOULD BE
ENDANGERED IF THE SOVIET UNION GAINS A
DOMINATING POSITION IN THIS AREA OF THE
WORLD THAT HAS SUCH HISTORICAL AND STRATEGIC
IMPORTANCE.

THE MIDDLE EAST HAS ALWAYS BEEN A



POTENTIAL TARGET FOR SOVIET EXPANSION...
EXTENSION OF ITS EUROPEAN SPHERE OF
INFLUENCE.

LET ME TOUCH ON THE SIX-DAY WAR OF
JUNE 1967 FOR A MOMENT AND SAY THAT BOTH THE
SOVIET UNION ^{in a major way} AND THE UNITED STATES ^{to a lesser extent} LOST IN
THAT WAR. THE UNITED STATES LOST SOME OF
ITS OPTIONS FOR THE PROMOTION OF STABILITY
IN THE MIDDLE EAST; / THE SOVIET UNION LOST
PRESTIGE, MANEUVERING ROOM AND A VAST
AMOUNT OF ARMS DONATED TO THE ARABS.

The question is often asked. WHY SHOULD THE UNITED STATES ENGAGE
IN TALKS WITH THE SOVIET UNION ON THE
MIDDLE EAST?

WE MUST DO WHAT WE CAN TO PROBE AND
ASSESS RUSSIAN INTENTIONS, ^{We must be honest, sincere & firm} ~~AND~~ WE MUST KEEP
UP A DIALOGUE IN ORDER TO AVOID A NUCLEAR
CONFRONTATION IN THAT AREA OF THE WORLD.

AS FOR ISRAEL AND THE ARAB STATES, IT MAY BE THAT THE U.S.-SOVIET TALKS WILL PRODUCE THE BROAD FRAMEWORK FOR REALISTIC NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN THE PRINCIPAL PARTIES TO THE DISPUTE. FOR ANY NEGOTIATION TO BEGIN, THE PARTIES MUST COME TO BELIEVE THAT REALISTIC NEGOTIATION IS POSSIBLE AND ACT ACCORDINGLY -- IN GOOD FAITH.

IT IS NOT HARD TO AGREE THAT PEACE IS ESSENTIAL. WHAT IS DIFFICULT TO AGREE ON/IS HOW TO ACHIEVE PEACE.


IT IS NOT ALWAYS ACCURATE TO APPLY STATEMENTS MADE ABOUT ONE PART OF THE WORLD TO ANOTHER. BUT I THINK IT IS WORTH CONSIDERING HERE TONIGHT SOME OF THE STATEMENTS MADE BY PRESIDENT NIXON DURING HIS RECENT TRIP TO ASIA.

HE SPOKE OF LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR



PEACE / AND PROGRESS / AND SECURITY. HE SAID
MAKING AND PRESERVING PEACE IS WORK THAT
MUST CONCERN THE WHOLE WORLD. BUT, HE
EMPHASIZED, PEACE / CAN BE ACHIEVED ONLY
THROUGH THE RESOLUTION OF CONFLICTING
FORCES AT WORK IN EACH PART OF THE WORLD.

THE MAIN OBJECTIVE OF THE NIXON
ADMINISTRATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST IS
PEACE... / PEACE BECAUSE IT IS ESSENTIAL IF
THE MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN OF THE AREA ARE
TO LIVE IN SAFETY AND TO LEAD CREATIVE
LIVES... / PEACE BECAUSE THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE
AREA MUST FIND A WAY TO DIVERT THEIR
RESOURCES FROM WARFARE TO ECONOMIC PROGRESS. /
PEACE BECAUSE THE UNITED STATES CAN BEST
PURSUE ITS VARIED INTERESTS IN THE MIDDLE
EAST WHEN THERE IS PEACE THERE... / PEACE
BECAUSE THE UNITED STATES DOES NOT WISH TO



BECOME INVOLVED IN A MAJOR CONFLICT IN THE MIDDLE EAST OR ANY OTHER AREA.

THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION DOES NOT BELIEVE THE UNITED STATES OR ANY OTHER MAJOR POWER CAN IMPOSE PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST.

A ^{meaningful} REAL PEACE CAN ONLY GROW OUT OF AGREEMENT AMONG THOSE WHO ARE IN CONFLICT.

THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION WILL DILIGENTLY AND WITH ALL ITS RESOURCES HELP WHERE IT CAN. WE WILL HELP IN PROVIDING SECURITY WHERE IT IS NEEDED, AND WE WILL HELP IN WORKING TOWARD AGREEMENT. BUT WE CAN ONLY HELP.

THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION HAS CAREFULLY WEIGHED WHAT IS REQUIRED TO MAKE PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND WHAT IS REQUIRED TO KEEP THE PEACE.



THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION IS KEENLY AWARE THAT AN IMPOSED PEACE, EVEN IF IT WERE POSSIBLE, WOULD NOT LIKELY BE A PERMANENT PEACE.

THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION DOES NOT SEEK TO IMPOSE PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST, BUT IT WILL SPARE NO EFFORT TO HELP FIND THE ROAD TO PEACE.

I MENTIONED EARLIER HELP FROM THE ADMINISTRATION IS PROVIDING SECURITY. IN THAT CONNECTION, I WOULD NOTE THAT THE FIRST OF THE 50 PHANTOM JETS NOW ON ORDER FOR ISRAEL WILL BE DELIVERED NEXT MONTH, AND THE ORIGINAL ORDER OF 44 SKYHAWKS ^{a first military aircraft} HAS BEEN DOUBLED TO 88.

RIGHT HERE IN CALIFORNIA, ISRAELI PILOTS AND MECHANICS HAVE BEEN TRAINED TO FLY AND MAINTAIN U.S. PHANTOM JETS. THE

FIRST CLASS OF ISRAELI PHANTOM JET PILOTS WAS RECENTLY GRADUATED FROM THE U.S. TRAINING PROGRAM.

WHAT BETTER PROOF CAN THERE BE THAT THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION IS FULFILLING U.S. COMMITMENTS TO ISRAEL? *It has & it will.*

IT HAS BEEN SAID THAT THE U.S. SHOULD EMPLOY A MORE BALANCED POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST. IF THERE IS VALIDITY TO THAT STATEMENT, THEN WHAT SHOULD BE SAID OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND ITS ^{questionable} PRACTICE OF CONDEMNING ISRAEL FOR ITS RETALIATORY RAIDS BUT ONLY MILDLY REPROVING ARAB VIOLATORS OF THE UN CEASE-FIRE? AND WHAT TOO SHOULD BE SAID OF THE ARABS WHO CURRENTLY ARE FIRING RUSSIAN-MADE ROCKETS INTO JERUSALEM?

ALTHOUGH THE ANALOGY IS NOT PERFECT,



I CAN READILY UNDERSTAND ISRAEL'S
DETERMINATION NEVER TO BECOME ANOTHER
CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

*When I look
at the frightful ramifications*

I DESPERATELY HOPE THE WAR FEVER
CAN BE COOLED. WE MUST AT LEAST APPLY
A POULTICE.

Many of THE ACADEMIC TYPES DESPAIR AND
DECLARE THAT THERE IS NO SOLUTION TO THE
MIDDLE EAST SITUATION.

WE WHO ARE IN GOVERNMENT CANNOT AFFORD
TO TAKE SUCH A DEFEATIST ATTITUDE. AND I
WOULD NOT / IF WE COULD. I BELIEVE WE SHOULD
PURSU THE IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE OF A MIDDLE
EAST ARMS BALANCE / WHILE TRYING TO CREATE
THE FRAMEWORK FOR DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS
BETWEEN THE PARTIES TO THE CONFLICT.

WE SHOULD NOT DESPAIR IN OUR PURSUIT
OF PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST. *The problems of the
hour should spur us to greater efforts.*

I SAY THIS BECAUSE THE SOVIETS MUST ULTIMATELY CONCLUDE THAT THEY HAVE MADE A BAD INVESTMENT IN THE MIDDLE EAST. HOW MANY TIMES WILL THE RUSSIANS BE WILLING TO GO THROUGH A FIASCO LIKE THE SIX-DAY WAR?²

FOR THE SHORT TERM, THE SITUATION LOOKS GRIM. BUT I REMAIN THE ETERNAL OPTIMIST. *and I believe for good reason.*

NATIONS AS WELL AS INDIVIDUALS -- IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND ELSEWHERE -- SURELY RECOGNIZE THAT PEACE IS ESSENTIAL IF THEY ARE TO MAKE THE EARTH A BETTER PLACE TO LIVE.

THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF A PEACE SETTLEMENT IN THE MIDDLE EAST HAVE BEEN SPELLED OUT IN THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION OF NOVEMBER 22, 1967.

THE PROBLEM LIES IN DIFFERING



INTERPRETATIONS OF THAT RESOLUTION: HOW TO CREATE A STATE OF PEACE, / HOW TO PRESERVE IT / AND HOW, IN PRACTICAL WAYS, TO GUARANTEE IT.

I AM NOT ONE OF THOSE WHO EUPHORICALLY CRY OUT THAT IF AMERICA CAN LAND A MAN ON THE MOON, SHE CAN DO ANYTHING.

I SIMPLY SAY THIS. WE HAVE REACHED THE MOON, AND NOW WE MUST HELP TO MAKE EACH CORNER OF THE PLANET EARTH A PLACE WHERE HUMAN BEINGS CAN LIVE IN PEACE.

SHALOM.

-- END --



Distribution:

*Full
Galleries 10:00 a.m. 8/28/69
Air Mail 10:30 a.m. 8/28/69*

M Office Copy

AN ADDRESS BY REP. GERALD R. FORD, R-MICH.
MINORITY LEADER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
BEFORE THE ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA
AT THE CENTURY PLAZA HOTEL, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY EVENING, AUGUST 28, 1969

FOR RELEASE AT 6 P.M. (E.D.T.) THURSDAY

SHALOM!

I find it most natural to use the traditional Hebrew greeting, since I have spoken before many Jewish organizations in recent months. Also, I am a great believer in peace, as I am certain each of us are.

I have come to you tonight to speak of peace -- of war and peace -- of the Middle East and the heart-rending problems that disturb us all as we look at that deeply troubled region.

I have come to you to speak of the Nixon Administration's view of the Middle East and to make some personal observations of my own.

The United States has, of course, a tremendous continuing responsibility to promote peace and stability in the Middle East whether or not that task seems improbable and impossible.

I am aware that many individuals believe the United States should simply keep hands off the Middle East, many who believe that our country is standing in the way of an Israeli-Arab settlement by trying to help find a solution. I do not share that view.

Certainly the fact that the United States has engaged in both four-power and two-power talks on the Middle East situation has not contributed in any measure to the state of war which currently exists between Israel and the Arab states. At the same time, however, the danger of nuclear confrontation has been greatly reduced. That is progress for all mankind.

I assure you the Nixon Administration is convinced that only local initiatives can resolve local conflicts in the Middle East. It is only local solutions that can produce a permanent peace. But the Administration believes it can be helpful. And that is all the Administration is trying to do.

Now, exactly what has the Administration been trying to do and why?

For the answer to that question we must go back to the Middle Eastern situation as it existed last January.

Efforts to achieve peace had slowed almost to a standstill. Despite the best efforts of the United Nations representative, Ambassador Jarring, discussions were on dead center.

(more)



It had become apparent that a new initiative was mandatory. Without some progress toward peace, the situation could only become more dangerous. A new initiative was required because no responsible American President could fail to recognize that the interests of the United States -- as well as the interests of the Middle Eastern peoples -- were deeply involved.

In February the President launched a series of consultations with the four permanent members of the UN Security Council, at first bilaterally and then in more formal meetings, to determine what might be done to help break the stalemate.

Subsequently, a series of meetings with representatives of the Soviet Union developed.

It has been said that those talks have broken down. I can tell you tonight that those talks are continuing.

The Administration does not believe that the U.S.-Soviet talks on the Mideast can bring peace in and of themselves. But it does believe the United States would be derelict if it did not make every effort to determine whether negotiations between Israel and the Arab states would be possible under auspices of Ambassador Jarring.

There are sound reasons for the bilateral talks with the Soviet Union.

The Nixon Administration sees Soviet influence in the Middle East as a regrettable fact of life -- a demonstration of Soviet power which must be dealt with there just as anywhere else in the world.

The Administration has no illusions about longrange Soviet intentions, but in the Middle East as in all other areas of the world the Nixon Administration is trying to turn an era of confrontation into an era of negotiation.

We know that the Russians now are employing gunboat diplomacy in the Mediterranean. They now have 63 to 65 vessels there, a greater number of ships than our Sixth Fleet. The Soviet vessels are engaged in naval exercises off the coast of Syria and Egypt, using bases in those two countries. The exercises are centered around a so-called Russian aircraft carrier, a ship which is equipped for the takeoff and landing of troop-carrying helicopters.

The Russians also have sent 10 ships into the Red Sea-Indian Ocean area south of the Suez Canal.

The Soviet designs in the Middle East are readily apparent to the United States. We are fully aware of their longrange intentions, and we are carefully watching current developments.

The Russians are not achieving what they want in the Middle East -- and that

(more)

is helpful to us. The Soviets acquired naval and air base rights in Egypt on an informal basis, but the Russians are almost certain to find this a bad bargain in the end. I do not believe the Egyptians will ever accord the Russians formal rights to the bases.

The Soviets are trying to use Arab-Israeli tensions to expand into the Middle East. They failed in frontal assaults on Turkey and Iran and so they are trying to leapfrog them to Russia's long-sought objective of becoming a Middle East power. It is in the vital interests of the United States to prevent Soviet domination of the Middle East. World peace would be endangered if the Soviet Union gains a dominating position in this area of the world that has such historical and strategic importance.

The Middle East has always been a potential target for Soviet expansion... extension of its European sphere of influence.

Let me touch on the Six-Day War of June 1967 for a moment and say that both the Soviet Union and the United States lost in that war. The United States lost some of its options for the promotion of stability in the Middle East; the Soviet Union lost prestige, maneuvering room and a vast amount of arms donated to the Arabs.

Why should the United States engage in talks with the Soviet Union on the Middle East?

We must do what we can to probe and assess Russian intentions, and we must keep up a dialogue in order to avoid a nuclear confrontation in that area of the world.

As for Israel and the Arab states, it may be that the U.S.-Soviet talks will produce the broad framework for realistic negotiations between the principal parties to the dispute. For any negotiation to begin, the parties must come to believe that realistic negotiation is possible and act accordingly -- in good faith.

It is not hard to agree that peace is essential. What is difficult to agree on is how to achieve peace.

It is not always accurate to apply statements made about one part of the world to another. But I think it is worth considering here tonight some of the statements made by President Nixon during his recent trip to Asia.

He spoke of local responsibility for peace and progress and security. He said making and preserving peace is work that must concern the whole world. But, he emphasized, peace can be achieved only through the resolution of conflicting forces at work in each part of the world.

(more)

The main objective of the Nixon Administration in the Middle East is peace... peace because it is essential if the men, women and children of the area are to live in safety and to lead creative lives..peace because the governments of the area must find a way to divert their resources from warfare to economic progress... peace because the United States can best pursue its varied interests in the Middle East when there is peace there...peace because the United States does not wish to become involved in a major conflict in the Middle East or any other area.

The Nixon Administration does not believe the United States or any other major power can impose peace in the Middle East.

A real peace can only grow out of agreement among those who are in conflict.

The Nixon Administration will diligently and with all its resources help where it can. We will help in providing security where it is needed, and we will help in working toward agreement. But we can only help.

The Nixon Administration has carefully weighed what is required to make peace in the Middle East and what is required to keep the peace.

The Nixon Administration is keenly aware that an imposed peace, even if it were possible, would not likely be a permanent peace.

The Nixon Administration does not seek to impose peace in the Middle East, but it will spare no effort to help find the road to peace.

I mentioned earlier help from the Administration is providing security. In that connection, I would note that the first of the 50 Phantom jets now on order for Israel will be delivered next month, and the original order of 44 Skyhawks has been doubled to 88.

Right here in California, Israeli pilots and mechanics have been trained to fly and maintain U.S. Phantom jets. The first class of Israeli Phantom jet pilots was recently graduated from the U.S. training program.

What better proof can there be that the Nixon Administration is fulfilling U.S. commitments to Israel?

It has been said that the U.S. should employ a more balanced policy in the Middle East. If there is validity to that statement, then what should be said of the United Nations and its practice of condemning Israel for its retaliatory raids but only mildly reproofing Arab violators of the UN cease-fire? And what too should be said of the Arabs who currently are firing Russian-made rockets into Jerusalem?

Although the analogy is not perfect, I can readily understand Israel's determination never to become another Czechoslovakia.

I desperately hope the war fever can be cooled. We must at least apply a poultice.

(more)

The academic types despair and declare that there is no solution to the Middle East situation.

We who are in government cannot afford to take such a defeatist attitude. And I would not if we could. I believe we should pursue the immediate objective of a Middle East arms balance while trying to create the framework for direct negotiations between the parties to the conflict.

We should not despair in our pursuit of peace in the Middle East.

I say this because the Soviets must ultimately conclude that they have made a bad investment in the Middle East. How many times will the Russians be willing to go through a fiasco like the Six-Day War?

For the short term, the situation looks grim. But I remain the eternal optimist.

Nations as well as individuals -- in the Middle East and elsewhere -- surely recognize that peace is essential if they are to make the earth a better place to live.

The essential elements of a peace settlement in the Middle East have been spelled out in the UN Security Council Resolution of November 22, 1967.

The problem lies in differing interpretations of that resolution: How to create a state of peace, how to preserve it and how, in practical ways, to guarantee it.

I am not one of those who euphorically cry out that if America can land a man on the moon, she can do anything.

I simply say this. We have reached the moon, and now we must help to make each corner of the planet earth a place where human beings can live in peace.

SHALOM.

#

AN ADDRESS BY REP. GERALD R. FORD, R-MICH.
MINORITY LEADER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
BEFORE THE ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA
AT THE CENTURY PLAZA HOTEL, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY EVENING, AUGUST 28, 1969

FOR RELEASE AT 6 P.M. (E.D.T.) THURSDAY

SHALOM!

I find it most natural to use the traditional Hebrew greeting, since I have spoken before many Jewish organizations in recent months. Also, I am a great believer in peace, as I am certain each of us are.

I have come to you tonight to speak of peace -- of war and peace -- of the Middle East and the heart-rending problems that disturb us all as we look at that deeply troubled region.

I have come to you to speak of the Nixon Administration's view of the Middle East and to make some personal observations of my own.

The United States has, of course, a tremendous continuing responsibility to promote peace and stability in the Middle East whether or not that task seems improbable and impossible.

I am aware that many individuals believe the United States should simply keep hands off the Middle East, many who believe that our country is standing in the way of an Israeli-Arab settlement by trying to help find a solution. I do not share that view.

Certainly the fact that the United States has engaged in both four-power and two-power talks on the Middle East situation has not contributed in any measure to the state of war which currently exists between Israel and the Arab states. At the same time, however, the danger of nuclear confrontation has been greatly reduced. That is progress for all mankind.

I assure you the Nixon Administration is convinced that only local initiatives can resolve local conflicts in the Middle East. It is only local solutions that can produce a permanent peace. But the Administration believes it can be helpful. And that is all the Administration is trying to do.

Now, exactly what has the Administration been trying to do and why?

For the answer to that question we must go back to the Middle Eastern situation as it existed last January.

Efforts to achieve peace had slowed almost to a standstill. Despite the best efforts of the United Nations representative, Ambassador Jarring, discussions were on dead center.

(more)

It had become apparent that a new initiative was mandatory. Without some progress toward peace, the situation could only become more dangerous. A new initiative was required because no responsible American President could fail to recognize that the interests of the United States -- as well as the interests of the Middle Eastern peoples -- were deeply involved.

In February the President launched a series of consultations with the four permanent members of the UN Security Council, at first bilaterally and then in more formal meetings, to determine what might be done to help break the stalemate.

Subsequently, a series of meetings with representatives of the Soviet Union developed.

It has been said that those talks have broken down. I can tell you tonight that those talks are continuing.

The Administration does not believe that the U.S.-Soviet talks on the Mideast can bring peace in and of themselves. But it does believe the United States would be derelict if it did not make every effort to determine whether negotiations between Israel and the Arab states would be possible under auspices of Ambassador Jarring.

There are sound reasons for the bilateral talks with the Soviet Union.

The Nixon Administration sees Soviet influence in the Middle East as a regrettable fact of life -- a demonstration of Soviet power which must be dealt with there just as anywhere else in the world.

The Administration has no illusions about longrange Soviet intentions, but in the Middle East as in all other areas of the world the Nixon Administration is trying to turn an era of confrontation into an era of negotiation.

We know that the Russians now are employing gunboat diplomacy in the Mediterranean. They now have 63 to 65 vessels there, a greater number of ships than our Sixth Fleet. The Soviet vessels are engaged in naval exercises off the coast of Syria and Egypt, using bases in those two countries. The exercises are centered around a so-called Russian aircraft carrier, a ship which is equipped for the takeoff and landing of troop-carrying helicopters.

The Russians also have sent 10 ships into the Red Sea-Indian Ocean area south of the Suez Canal.

The Soviet designs in the Middle East are readily apparent to the United States. We are fully aware of their longrange intentions, and we are carefully watching current developments.

The Russians are not achieving what they want in the Middle East -- and that

(more)

is helpful to us. The Soviets acquired naval and air base rights in Egypt on an informal basis, but the Russians are almost certain to find this a bad bargain in the end. I do not believe the Egyptians will ever accord the Russians formal rights to the bases.

The Soviets are trying to use Arab-Israeli tensions to expand into the Middle East. They failed in frontal assaults on Turkey and Iran and so they are trying to leapfrog them to Russia's long-sought objective of becoming a Middle East power. It is in the vital interests of the United States to prevent Soviet domination of the Middle East. World peace would be endangered if the Soviet Union gains a dominating position in this area of the world that has such historical and strategic importance.

The Middle East has always been a potential target for Soviet expansion... extension of its European sphere of influence.

Let me touch on the Six-Day War of June 1967 for a moment and say that both the Soviet Union and the United States lost in that war. The United States lost some of its options for the promotion of stability in the Middle East; the Soviet Union lost prestige, maneuvering room and a vast amount of arms donated to the Arabs.

Why should the United States engage in talks with the Soviet Union on the Middle East?

We must do what we can to probe and assess Russian intentions, and we must keep up a dialogue in order to avoid a nuclear confrontation in that area of the world.

As for Israel and the Arab states, it may be that the U.S.-Soviet talks will produce the broad framework for realistic negotiations between the principal parties to the dispute. For any negotiation to begin, the parties must come to believe that realistic negotiation is possible and act accordingly -- in good faith.

It is not hard to agree that peace is essential. What is difficult to agree on is how to achieve peace.

It is not always accurate to apply statements made about one part of the world to another. But I think it is worth considering here tonight some of the statements made by President Nixon during his recent trip to Asia.

He spoke of local responsibility for peace and progress and security. He said making and preserving peace is work that must concern the whole world. But, he emphasized, peace can be achieved only through the resolution of conflicting forces at work in each part of the world.

(more)

The main objective of the Nixon Administration in the Middle East is peace... peace because it is essential if the men, women and children of the area are to live in safety and to lead creative lives...peace because the governments of the area must find a way to divert their resources from warfare to economic progress... peace because the United States can best pursue its varied interests in the Middle East when there is peace there...peace because the United States does not wish to become involved in a major conflict in the Middle East or any other area.

The Nixon Administration does not believe the United States or any other major power can impose peace in the Middle East.

A real peace can only grow out of agreement among those who are in conflict.

The Nixon Administration will diligently and with all its resources help where it can. We will help in providing security where it is needed, and we will help in working toward agreement. But we can only help.

The Nixon Administration has carefully weighed what is required to make peace in the Middle East and what is required to keep the peace.

The Nixon Administration is keenly aware that an imposed peace, even if it were possible, would not likely be a permanent peace.

The Nixon Administration does not seek to impose peace in the Middle East, but it will spare no effort to help find the road to peace.

I mentioned earlier help from the Administration is providing security. In that connection, I would note that the first of the 50 Phantom jets now on order for Israel will be delivered next month, and the original order of 44 Skyhawks has been doubled to 88.

Right here in California, Israeli pilots and mechanics have been trained to fly and maintain U.S. Phantom jets. The first class of Israeli Phantom jet pilots was recently graduated from the U.S. training program.

What better proof can there be that the Nixon Administration is fulfilling U.S. commitments to Israel?

It has been said that the U.S. should employ a more balanced policy in the Middle East. If there is validity to that statement, then what should be said of the United Nations and its practice of condemning Israel for its retaliatory raids but only mildly reproofing Arab violators of the UN cease-fire? And what too should be said of the Arabs who currently are firing Russian-made rockets into Jerusalem?

Although the analogy is not perfect, I can readily understand Israel's determination never to become another Czechoslovakia.

I desperately hope the war fever can be cooled. We must at least apply a poultice.

(more)

The academic types despair and declare that there is no solution to the Middle East situation.

We who are in government cannot afford to take such a defeatist attitude. And I would not if we could. I believe we should pursue the immediate objective of a Middle East arms balance while trying to create the framework for direct negotiations between the parties to the conflict.

We should not despair in our pursuit of peace in the Middle East.

I say this because the Soviets must ultimately conclude that they have made a bad investment in the Middle East. How many times will the Russians be willing to go through a fiasco like the Six-Day War?

For the short term, the situation looks grim. But I remain the eternal optimist.

Nations as well as individuals -- in the Middle East and elsewhere -- surely recognize that peace is essential if they are to make the earth a better place to live.

The essential elements of a peace settlement in the Middle East have been spelled out in the UN Security Council Resolution of November 22, 1967.

The problem lies in differing interpretations of that resolution: How to create a state of peace, how to preserve it and how, in practical ways, to guarantee it.

I am not one of those who euphorically cry out that if America can land a man on the moon, she can do anything.

I simply say this. We have reached the moon, and now we must help to make each corner of the planet earth a place where human beings can live in peace.

SHALOM.

#