

BEGIN AND SADAT- The beginning of Peace

1. WHAT HAS REALLY HAPPENED?

*after the UN - Legalized - the state of Is - a Palestinian state + a Palestinian state in the West Bank*

- a) in 1948 Egypt joined forces w/ other Arab nations " to drive the Israelis into the sea".
- b) in 1967, Egypt closed the Tiran straits in the Gulf of Aqaba and marshalled her troops in the Sinai in what was clearly an act of war, in which the other Arab nations joined. The purpose of this war said Nassar, then the leader of Egypt, was " to Destroy Israel" .
- c) in 1973 Egypt joined with Arab neighbors on Yom Kippur Day in a surprise attack on Israel , with Sadat at the head of Egypt.

? / In THE LIGHT OF EGYPT'S MANIFESTED DESIRE TO DESTROY ISRAEL WHAT DOES THE PEACE TREATY MEAN?

*we might well ask ourselves*

*1/6* Most people say- Sadat has gotten everything back, without firing a shot, but what has Israel received in return. ? ON THE FACE OF IT, IT LOOKS LIKE SADAT IS THE CRAFTIEST MAN WHO EVER LIVED. Who ever heard of a nation gaining through the stroke of a pen what it failed to gain in three bloody wars?

2. SADAT HAS GIVEN UP SOMETHING. What?

a) We must go back to the prophet Muchammad and the rise of Islam in the 7<sup>th</sup> century. Then the prophet urged his people to holy war against all non-Arabs and the Arabic peoples <sup>eventually</sup> captured the entire mid-east from Egypt to ~~India~~/India. It was then that the Arabs established the policy that those conquered by them must accept one of three alternatives 1) death 2) conversion 3) submission. For the Jews who were present at that time in large numbers from Egypt to Iran, the alternative was submission. That is to say they were not forced to convert, since it was from them that M. admittedly learned to believe in the one God. They were not killed. But they were forced to submit to a specific tax to be paid annually to the ruling Arab state. In short, they were tolerated but not accepted as equals.  
for a price

b) Ever since the prospect of a modern Jew. nation in the mid-east loomed, the Arabs have said one thing- THERE CAN BE NO NON ARAB STATE IN THE MIDDLE EAST. The Arabs were not so much concerned about Jews living in Israel as they were concerned about an independent Jew. state, for such a state defied what M. had taught, namely that non-Arabs in ~~lands once ruled by the Arabs~~ living in lands once ruled by the Arabs can live there only *on* submission, *as wards of Arab rulers*.

It was this policy that resulted in the war of 1948 after the UN legalized the tiny Jew. state. The UN, you will remember, created at the same time a Palestinian state on the West Bank, ~~out of land which once belonged to the Jews, and then in the middle ages to the Turks.~~ In 1948 Jordan captured the land assigned to the Palestinian state and absorbed it into Jordan. Strange- that ~~no~~ nation complained that the Palestinian state had been conquered by Jordan, but when Israel seized this same land in driving the Jordanians back when they attacked Jerusalem in 1967, cries of outrage came from every corner of the globe.

Part of the problem you see was this- it was all right for Arabs to conquer Arabs. It was not tolerable that a non-Arab people should conquer Arabs.

He has given up the universal Arab claim that a non-Arab nation cannot exist on what ~~once~~ <sup>presumed to be</sup> was Arab soil. It does not matter that Palestine was never an Arab nation. It has been part of the Turkish empire, but it has never been an Arab nation. What has mattered to the Arabs is that they had considered Palestine their own, even if for centuries <sup>few</sup> no Arabs lived there and the <sup>new</sup> empty land beckoned to any people with the courage to ~~try to~~ make a home along with the sand and stones.

In signing the peace treaty, Sadat has separated himself fr his Arab brethern . He has dared to ~~say~~ run counter to what M. has taught and what 12 centuries of Arabs have believed, that no non-Arab nation could co-exist with the Arab nations.

It is possible, in the long run that what Sadat has given up will be very imp. to the Jew. people. I must admit that at one time, I could not und. what Sadat was offering. I looked at the situation in purely military terms, and in military terms, Sadat has ~~engineered~~ a cunning triumph, but there are other forces at play in the middle east besides military position.

4. To und. the Arab mind in this regard, we have only to look at what Khomeni of Iran has been saying in recent months.

K. has said that the Jews of Iran are safe so long as they are not guilty of treason. It is treasonous, he has said for any one in Iran to be a Zionist, that is to think and act in terms of an independent Jew. state.

Here is the leader <sup>of an Islamic state</sup> of an Islamic state far distant from the land of Israel mouthing the policy of M. K. is a religious leader, and he speaks from the heart of Islamic doctrine. There can be no non-Arabic, no non-Islamic state in the middle east.

Place Sadat against K. and you can see the diff. between the 2 men.

4. AND WHAT HAS BEGIN GIVEN UP-? Begin has taken a great risk.

He is giving up a tremendous military advantage on the gamble that Egypt will be true to its pledge of peace.

Begin has ~~given up~~ <sup>oil fields & air fields</sup> the entire Sinai with its import. air fields built at tremendous cost. He has given up El Arish, an imp. port and naval base on the Gulf of Aqaba. He has agreed to withdraw Israeli settlements from the Sinai, at great political cost to his party. He has agreed to give Gaza and West Bank Arabs a time table to determine how they will govern themselves in the near ~~future~~ future.

Israel is to be commended for doing what no nation in human history has ever done before, give back to its traditional enemy lands conquered in a defensive war. America has never done this. The S.U. has never done this. <sup>removed Cong. lead</sup> Egypt has never done this, but Israel has had the courage to do ~~it~~ in a great gamble for peace- in exchange for the ~~assertion by one Arab leader, the leader of the largest Arab nation that a non-Arab nation may indeed co-exist in the near east.~~

*It has not given Poland or Czech. back to their own people.*  
*We have never given Texas back to Mexico.*

5. THE QUESTION MIGHT WELL BE ASKED- how could Sadat have had the audacity to think that Israelw would trade all of this territory for mere recognition?

The answer is that S<sub>a</sub>dat knew that the U.S. would support him to the hilt and that the US would use all of its leverage to get Is. to agree.

How did Sadat know this? He knew that Brzezinski, Pres. Carter's middle east advisor had written an article in the 1975 Summer issue of the publication Foreign Policy which put Brzezinski on record as favoring:

- a) Israel's surrender of all territories captured after 1948
- b) the crdation of a PLO dominated state on the West Bk and the Gaza Strip
- c) a resolution of the entire Arab-Israel problem in one treaty and one package
- d) the active participation of the US to obtain these agreements
- e) the bringing of the Soviet Union into the negotiations.

Sadat agreed with the Brzezinski-Carter position except for one part- the detail dealing with the Soviet Union. Sadat had broken with the SU and did not want that power to have any further influence in the middle east.

In pursuit of the Brzezinski policy, Pres. Carter came out in March of 1977 in favor of a Palestinian homeland. American overtures were actually made to the PLO to cooperate in the American policy. In october of 1977 the US issued a joint statement with the S. U. calling for the same things that B. <sup>Brzezinski</sup> had outlined in 1975 and a Geneva cpmferemce was called fpr/ In other words the US and the SU had every intion of forcing upon Israel their idea of what a settlement should be in the Mid-East.

To the great shock of the SU and the US, Begin and Sadat arranged their own meeting, for neither of these leaders wanted the SU involved in the settlement. Sadat has admitted that his visit to Jereusalem was not entirely his own idea. The visit came as a result of a series of private meetings betwn. Israelis and Egyptians actually instituted by the Israelis. When Sadat came to Jereusalem, his demands in behalf of the Arab nations differed in only one respect from what all other Arab leaders demanded. Sadat too demanded the return of all Arab land, but he was willing to admit the existence of the Jew. state. He was willing, in exchange, to recog. Israel's right to exist alongside the Arab nations.

This then is the extent of Sadat's liberality. He is no less demanding than any other Arab leader, but he is ready to call an end to hijad- the holy war. He is willing to temper M.'s teaching that all who live in an area inhabited by Arabs must submit to their government and ~~rule~~ rule.

In Jer<sup>u</sup>salem today there is cautious optimism. Israel has taken a great risk with some support from the US and with some pushing from the US. If the other Arab nations now realize that they can't defeat Israel without the aid of Egypt, then there will be peace in the middle east, and this may well come to pass. For the present the PLO is more active than it has been in recent years, and its aim is to demonstrate that Israel has won nothing. It is my feeling that we should share Israel's mood.

We too should be optimistic but cautious. Meanwhile we have to see that Israel is strong. We have to assure her of our support. You will have your chance to do that in a practical way a week from this Sunday nite when we hold our annual bond rally. You might want to come and buy a bond, in such denomination as yo can afford.

*a peace bond,*