



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS  
JOURNALS + DIGITAL PUBLISHING



---

### The Madrid Peace Conference

Source: *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (Winter, 1992), pp. 117-149

Published by: University of California Press on behalf of the Institute for Palestine Studies

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2537235>

Accessed: 10-03-2015 19:32 UTC

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of California Press and Institute for Palestine Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Palestine Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

SPECIAL DOCUMENT FILE

# THE MADRID PEACE CONFERENCE

- I. U.S. Letters of Assurances on the Terms of the Peace Conference, Washington, D.C., mid-October 1991 (main points).
  - A. U.S. Letter of Assurances to the Palestinians
  - B. U.S. Letter of Assurances to Syria
  - C. U.S. Letter of Assurances to Lebanon
  - D. U.S. Letter of Assurances to Israel
- II. U.S.-Soviet Letter of Invitation to Peace Talks in Madrid, 18 October 1991.
- III. Delegations to Madrid
  - A. Palestinian-Jordanian Delegation
    - 1. Palestinian Delegation and Steering Committee
    - 2. Jordanian Delegation
  - B. Syrian Delegation
  - C. Lebanese Delegation
  - D. Egyptian Delegation
  - E. Israeli Delegation
- IV. Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir's Letter to Secretary of State Baker, Jerusalem, 28 October 1991 (main points).
- V. Opening Addresses in Madrid
  - A. U.S. President George Bush, 30 October 1991 (excerpts).
  - B. Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, 30 October 1991 (excerpts).
  - C. EC Representative, Dutch Foreign Minister Hans van den Broek, 30 October 1991 (excerpts).
  - D. Head of the Egyptian Delegation, Foreign Minister 'Amr Musa, 30 October 1991 (excerpts).
  - E. Head of the Israeli Delegation, Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, 31 October 1991 (excerpts).

*Journal of Palestine Studies* XXI, no. 2 (Winter 1992), pp. 117-149.

- F. Head of the Jordanian Delegation, Foreign Minister Kamil Abu Jaber, 31 October 1991 (excerpts).
- G. Head of the Palestinian Delegation, Haydar Abd al-Shafi, 31 October 1991.
- H. Head of the Lebanese Delegation, Foreign Minister Faris Bouez, 1 November 1991 (excerpts).
- I. Head of the Syrian Delegation, Foreign Minister Faruk al-Sharaa, 31 October 1991 (excerpts).
- J. U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, 1 November 1991 (excerpts).

## **VI. Closing Remarks in Madrid**

- A. Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, 1 November 1991.
- B. Head of the Palestinian Delegation, Haydar Abd al-Shafi, 1 November 1991.
- C. Syrian Foreign Minister Faruk al-Sharaa, 1 November 1991 (excerpts).

## **VII. U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's Press Conference, Madrid, 3 November 1991 (excerpts).**

---

### **I. U.S. Letters of Assurances on the Terms of the Peace Conference, Washington, D.C., mid-October 1991 (main points).**

*[The final versions of the Letters of Assurances (LOAs), in lieu of the more binding, bilateral "memoranda of understanding" that had originally been planned, were conveyed, after a number of drafts, to the various negotiating parties by the United States in mid-October. No authoritative texts of any of the LOAs have been officially released, but the main clauses have been reported in various regional press organs.]*

### **A. U.S. Letter of Assurances to the Palestinians**

*[Mideast Mirror carried the following points, obtained from its own sources, on 24 October 1991.]*

- Palestinians and Israel must respect each other's security, identity, and political rights.

- Bilateral talks will begin four days after the opening of the conference.

- Multilateral talks will open two weeks after the opening of the peace conference.

- We believe that Palestinians should gain control over political, economic, and other decisions that affect them and their fate.

- The U.S. will seek to avoid prolongation and stalling by any party. All negotiations should proceed as quickly as possible

toward agreement.

- The U.S. doesn't seek to determine who speaks for Palestinians in this process. We are seeking to launch a political negotiating process that directly involves Palestinians and offers a pathway for achieving the legitimate political rights of the Palestinian people and for participation in the determination of their future. We believe that a joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation offers the most promising pathway toward this end.

- Palestinians will be free to announce the component of the joint delegation and to make a statement during the opening of the conference. They may also raise any issue pertaining to the substance of the negotiations during the negotiations.

- The U.S. understands how much importance Palestinians attach to the question of East Jerusalem. Thus we want to assure you that nothing Palestinians do in choosing their delegation members in this phase of the process will affect their claim to East Jerusalem or be prejudicial or precedental to the outcome of the negotiations.

- The U.S. is opposed to the Israeli annexation of East Jerusalem and extension of Israeli law on it and the extension of Jerusalem's municipal boundaries. We encourage all sides to avoid unilateral acts that would exasperate local tensions or make negotiations more difficult or preempt their final outcome.

- The U.S. believes that Palestinians of

East Jerusalem should be able to participate by voting in elections of an interim governing authority. The U.S. further believes that Palestinians from East Jerusalem and Palestinians outside the occupied territories who meet the three criteria should be able to participate in the negotiations on final status. The U.S. supports the right of Palestinians to bring any issue including East Jerusalem to the table.

- The purpose of negotiations on transitional arrangements is to effect the peaceful and orderly transfer of authority from Israel to Palestinians. Palestinians need to achieve rapid control over political, economic, and other decisions that affect their lives and to adjust to a new situation in which Palestinians exercise authority in the West Bank and Gaza. For its part the U.S. will strive from the outset and encourage all the parties to adopt steps that can create an environment of confidence and mutual trust, including respect for human rights.

- Negotiations between Israel and Palestinians will be conducted in phases beginning with talks on interim self-governing arrangements. These talks will be conducted with the objective of reaching agreements within one year. Once agreed the interim self-governing arrangements will last for a period of five years. Beginning the third year of the period of self-governing arrangements, negotiations will take place on permanent status. It is the aim of the U.S. government that permanent status negotiations will be concluded by the end of the transitional period.

- Palestinians are free to argue for whatever outcome they believe best meets their requirements. The U.S. will accept any outcome agreed by the parties. In this regard and consistent with long-standing U.S. policies, confederation is not excluded as a possible outcome of negotiations on final status.

- The U.S. believes that no party should take unilateral actions that seek to predetermine issues that can only be reached through negotiations. In this regard the U.S. has opposed and will continue to oppose settlement activity in territories occupied in 1967 which remain an obstacle to peace.

- Any party will have access to the sponsors at any time.

- We are prepared to work hard with you in the period ahead.

#### B. U.S. Letter of Assurances to Syria

*[The points below, taken from the letter as published on 15 October in the Saudi daily Asharq al-Awsat, were reproduced in Mideast Mirror]*

*the same day.]*

1. The peace conference and the talks that follow must be based on Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338.

2. The object of the conference is to prepare for direct bilateral Arab-Israeli talks within two days and also for multilateral talks within two weeks. The bilateral talks will run on two parallel tracks: direct talks between Israel and the neighboring states, and direct talks between Israel and "the Palestinians."

3. The U.S. intends to work actively towards a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and do everything it can to keep the two-track process going in that direction. The U.S. is not an advocate of linkage between the "various forms of negotiations," but believes that speedy action in all negotiations to arrive at an agreement is needed and would serve the interests of a comprehensive settlement.

4. The conference will convene under U.S.-Soviet auspices and can reconvene with the approval of all parties.

5. The role of the UN consists in the dispatch by the UN secretary-general of a representative to attend the conference as an observer.

The U.S. and the USSR will keep the secretary-general informed of the progress of the negotiations. Any agreements reached by the parties will be registered at the UN secretariat and communicated to the Security Council, whose endorsement will be sought by the participating parties. The U.S., cognizant of all parties' interests in the success of this process, will not, as long as the process is actively under way, support any parallel or conflicting action by the Security Council.

6. The final settlement can be reached only on the basis of mutual concessions during the negotiations. The U.S. will throughout these negotiations continue to be committed to the fact that Security Council Resolution 242 and the land-for-peace principle are applicable to all fronts, including the Golan Heights.

7. The U.S. does not intend to recognize or accept any unilateral action on the part of Israel vis-à-vis the extension of its laws, sovereignty or administration to the territory of the Golan Heights.

8. The U.S. will continue to oppose Israeli settlement activity in the territories occupied in 1967, which remains an obstacle to peace.

9. The U.S. is prepared to serve as guarantor of the security of whatever borders Israel and Syria agree on.

10. The U.S. will continue to act as a mediator that genuinely seeks a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict on the basis of recognition of all the parties' "needs and requirements." The U.S. and the USSR will remain the "moving force" in this process to help the parties make progress towards a comprehensive peaceful settlement.

The U.S. and USSR are ready to remain in constant touch with any of the parties at any time, and the U.S. is also ready to participate in the negotiations in any of their stages with the approval of the parties involved.

### C. U.S. Letter of Assurances to Lebanon

[The following summary, reported in the London-based Lebanese daily al-Hayat, was translated in Mideast Mirror on 16 October.]

- An assurance that Security Council Resolution 425, which calls for an Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon, has nothing to do with resolution 242 and will be treated as a separate issue.
- An assurance that the withdrawal of Israeli troops and the withdrawal of Syrian troops from Lebanon are two separate issues, the former addressed by resolution 425 and the latter by the Taef agreement, which also calls for the withdrawal of all non-Lebanese forces from Lebanon.

### D. U.S. Letter of Assurances to Israel

[The Jerusalem Post on 16 October listed what it reported to be all the clauses of the 17-point Letter of Assurances to Israel. The list was reproduced in Mideast Mirror the same day.]

1. The U.S. sees the objective of the Middle East negotiations as the attainment of genuine peace and reconciliation between the peoples of the region, accompanied by peace treaties and full diplomatic relations.

2. The opening conference will have no power to make decisions, hold votes or impose positions.

3. Negotiations will be direct only.

4. The U.S. will not support linkage between the various bilateral negotiations.

5. No party need sit with another party against its wishes.

6. The U.S. has no intention of bringing about a dialogue between Israel and the PLO or negotiations between them.

7. Palestinians taking part in negotiations must be resident of the West Bank or the Gaza Strip who accept phased direct negotiations in two tracks and are ready to live at peace with Israel.

8. The U.S. will not support the creation of an independent Palestinian state.

9. Israel holds its own interpretation of Security Council Resolution 242, alongside other interpretations.

10. Israel is entitled to secure and defensible borders.

11. The U.S. will take steps to enlarge the circle of peace in the Middle East.

12. The U.S. will take steps to bring the Arab economic boycott to an end and to have UN Resolution 3379 equating Zionism and racism annulled.

13. The U.S. will consult closely with Israel and show due consideration for Israel's positions in the peace process.

14. The U.S. reconfirms ex-president Gerald Ford's written commitment to ex-premier Yitzhak Rabin of September 1975 regarding the importance of the Golan Heights to Israel's security.

15. The U.S. would be ready to give its own guarantees to any border agreed upon between Israel and Syria.

16. Israel is entitled to a secure border with Lebanon and Security Council Resolution 425 on Lebanon must be implemented in a manner assuring the stability and security of the border.

17. The U.S. is committed to Israel's security and to the maintenance of Israel's qualitative edge.

---

### II. U.S.-Soviet Letter of Invitation to Peace Talks in Madrid, 18 October 1991.

[The following is the full text of the invitation to the Madrid peace conference jointly issued by U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin to Israel, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, and the Palestinians. A text of the invitation was made available by al-Hayat to the Mideast Mirror, which published it on 21 October 1991.]

18 October 1991

Your Excellency:

On behalf of President Gorbachev and President Bush, we are very pleased to convey the attached invitation. After extensive consultations with Israel, Arab states, and the Palestinians, we have concluded that an historic opportunity exists to advance the prospects for genuine peace throughout the region. The United States and the Soviet Union are deeply committed to helping the parties realize this opportunity.

We look forward to working with you closely in this historic endeavor, and count on your continuing support and active participation.

To facilitate preparations for the confer-

ence and ensuring negotiations, we urgently request your positive response as soon as possible, but no later than 6:00 P.M. Washington time, 23 October.

*Sincerely,*

*James A. Baker, III  
Boris Dmitriyevich Pankin*

### Invitation

After extensive consultations with Arab states, Israel, and the Palestinians, the United States and the Soviet Union believe that an historic opportunity exists to advance the prospects for genuine peace throughout the region. The United States and the Soviet Union are prepared to assist the parties to achieve a just, lasting and comprehensive peace settlement, through direct negotiations along two tracks, between Israel and the Arab states, and between Israel and the Palestinians, based on United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. The objective of this process is real peace.

Toward that end, the president of the U.S. and the president of the USSR invite you to a peace conference, which their countries will co-sponsor, followed immediately by direct negotiations. The conference will be convened in Madrid on 30 October 1991.

President Bush and President Gorbachev request your acceptance of this invitation no later than 6 P.M. Washington time, 23 October 1991, in order to ensure proper organization and preparation of the conference.

Direct bilateral negotiations will begin four days after the opening of the conference. Those parties who wish to attend multilateral negotiations will convene two weeks after the opening of the conference to organize those negotiations. The co-sponsors believe that those negotiations should focus on region-wide issues such as arms control and regional security, water, refugee issues, environment, economic development, and other subjects of mutual interest.

The co-sponsors will chair the conference which will be held at ministerial level. Governments to be invited include Israel, Syria, Lebanon and Jordan. Palestinians will be invited and attend as part of a joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation. Egypt will be invited to the conference as a participant. The European Community will be a participant in the conference, alongside the United States and the Soviet Union and will be represented by its presidency. The Gulf Cooperation Council will be invited to send its secretary-general to

the conference as an observer, and GCC member states will be invited to participate in organizing the negotiations on multilateral issues. The United Nations will be invited to send an observer, representing the secretary-general.

The conference will have no power to impose solutions on the parties or veto agreements reached by them. It will have no authority to make decisions for the parties and no ability to vote on issues or results. The conference can reconvene only with the consent of all the parties.

With respect to negotiations between Israel and Palestinians who are part of the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation, negotiations will be conducted in phases, beginning with talks on interim self-government arrangements. These talks will be conducted with the objective of reaching agreement within one year. Once agreed the interim self-government arrangements will last for a period of five years. Beginning the third year of the period of interim self-government arrangements, negotiations will take place on permanent status. These permanent status negotiations, and the negotiations between Israel and the Arab states, will take place on the basis of resolutions 242 and 338.

It is understood that the co-sponsors are committed to making this process succeed. It is their intention to convene the conference and negotiations with those parties who agree to attend.

The co-sponsors believe that this process offers the promise of ending decades of confrontation and conflict and the hope of a lasting peace. Thus, the co-sponsors hope that the parties will approach these negotiations in a spirit of good will and mutual respect. In this way, the peace process can begin to break down the mutual suspicions and mistrust that perpetuate the conflict and allow the parties to begin to resolve their differences. Indeed, only through such a process can real peace and reconciliation among the Arab states, Israel and the Palestinians be achieved. And only through this process can the peoples of the Middle East attain the peace and security they richly deserve.

---

### III. Delegations to Madrid

[The biographical information about the various participants was taken from FBIS and Mideast Mirror.]

#### A. Palestinian-Jordanian Delegation

[Israel's refusal to talk with Palestinians ex-

cept within the framework of a Jordanian delegation resulted in the formation of a joint Jordanian-Palestinian negotiating team. Although the joint delegation, like the others, was to have fourteen members, a formula was devised whereby the Jordanians and the Palestinians would each appoint fourteen delegates, seven of whom would sit at the negotiating table at one time.]

#### *A.1. Palestinian Delegation and Steering Committee*

[Israel posed as a further condition to its participation in the talks that the Palestinians had to be residents of the West Bank (excluding East Jerusalem) or Gaza Strip and have no formal links with the PLO, and that the PLO would have no role in the selection process. While Israel closed its eyes to the fact that this latter condition was ignored, the former was complied with in the delegation's composition.

In order to give a formal role to categories of Palestinians whose presence on the delegation was rejected by Israel—and notably to some of the leading figures that had been meeting over the past months with Secretary of State James Baker—a steering committee was set up of seven members, four from Jerusalem and three from the diaspora; Israel expressed unhappiness that the steering committee members also received formal invitations to attend the conference. The members of the delegation and steering committee are as follows:]

*Haydar Abd al-Shafi*, 72, head of the delegation. A leading nationalist from Gaza; a physician by training and head of the Palestinian Red Crescent Society in Gaza; a founding member of the Palestine National Congress and its first deputy speaker in May 1964. Twice deported for three months each (in 1967 and 1970); long associated with the Palestinian left.

*Samir Abdallah*, 41, economics professor at Najah University; close to the Palestine Communist Party.

*Fraih Abu-Meddain*, 47, head of Gaza Bar Association; pro-Fateh.

*Zakariya al-Agha*, 49, an internist and head of the Arab Medical Association in Gaza; a principal member of the Palestinian delegation meeting with Secretary Baker. Has been in prison, under town arrest, travel ban, and administrative detention; pro-Fateh.

*Mamduh al-Aker*, 48, a surgeon and urologist from Nablus but practicing in Ramallah; an independent activist with close ties to

Faisal Husseini and Hanan Ashrawi. *Saeb Erekat*, 36, a professor of political science at Najah University in Nablus; pro-Fateh.

*Elias Freij*, 71, mayor of Bethlehem since 1972—the only remaining elected mayor in the occupied territories who has not been deposed. Considered close to Jordan.

*Abderrahman Hamad*, 45, originally from Gaza; dean of the Faculty of Engineering at Bir Zeit University in the West Bank; pro-Fateh.

*Nabil Ja'bri*, 45, a dental surgeon and chairman of the Board of Trustees of Hebron University; imprisoned for two months in 1988.

*Sameh Kanaan*, 38, employee of Nablus Chamber of Commerce; spent thirteen years in Israeli prison until 1985 prisoner exchange between Israel and PFLP-GC; pro-Fateh.

*Nabil Kassis*, 44, physics professor at Bir Zeit University and the university's vice-president for academic affairs.

*Ghassan Khatib*, 36, a professor of economic development at Bir Zeit University; founder of Jerusalem Media Communications Center in Jerusalem; spent four years in prison; close to the Palestine Communist Party.

*Sami Kilani*, 42, a physics professor at Najah University in Nablus; a poet and writer and board member of the Palestinian Writers' Union; spent three years in prison; close to the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DFLP) (Abd Rabbuh faction).

*Mustafa Natsheh*, 52, an engineer, elected as deputy mayor of Hebron in 1976; succeeded the elected mayor, Fahd Kawasme, when the latter was deported in 1980; himself deposed by Israeli authorities in 1983; pro-Fateh.

#### *Steering Committee*

*Faisal Husseini*, 51, head of the steering committee and preeminent Palestinian leader in the occupied territories; headed the Palestinian delegations meeting with Secretary Baker over the last months (barred from the delegation as an East Jerusalemite). Founder and head of Arab Studies Society, Jerusalem; served a year in Israeli prison and numerous administrative detention terms; pro-Fateh.

*Hanan Ashrawi*, 45, spokesperson for the delegation; one of the leading members of the Palestinian delegation meeting with Secre-

tary Baker (barred from the Madrid delegation because she holds a Jerusalem I.D.); professor of English literature at Bir Zeit University.

*Zahira Kamal*, 45, an East Jerusalem teacher and head of Women's Action Committees; close to DFLP (Abd Rabuh faction).

*Anis Kassem*, 52, an expert in international law living in Amman; chief editor of the *Palestine Yearbook of International Law*.

*Rashid Khalidi*, 42, professor of Middle East history at the University of Chicago, formerly taught at Columbia University and American University of Beirut; author of several books and many articles on the Middle East.

*Camille Mansour*, 46, professor of political science at the Sorbonne (Paris I); author of a number of books; former director of research at the Institute for Palestine Studies, Beirut.

*Sari Nusseibeh*, 42, professor of philosophy at Bir Zeit University and resident of East Jerusalem; a leading pro-PLO moderate; author; co-founder of several public affairs bodies in the occupied territories.

#### A.2. Jordanian Delegation

[The inclusion on the Jordanian delegation of two diaspora Palestinians from Jerusalem, Walid Khalidi and Anwar Khatib, was widely reported as a means of circumventing Israel's veto of these categories in the Palestinian delegation.]

*Kamil Abu Jaber*, foreign minister and head of delegation; former professor of political science.

*Abdel Salam Majali*, head of delegation for the bilateral talks; former advisor to King Hussein and former minister of health and education.

*Muhammad al-Adwan*, ambassador to the Soviet Union.

*Fuad Ayyoub*, King Hussein's press secretary, ambassador to Great Britain.

*Adnan al-Bakhit*, historian and vice president of Jordan University, head of its center for maps and documents and former head of its strategic studies center.

*Muhammad Bani-Hani*, head of the Jordan Valley Authority and an expert on water issues.

*Musa Breizat*, a strategist and political researcher at the Royal Court.

*Talal al-Hassan*, ambassador to Belgium and the European Community.

*Ghassan al-Jundi*, international law expert.

*Awwad Khalidi*, ambassador to France.

*Walid Khalidi*, research fellow at Harvard Uni-

versity's Center for Middle East Studies and historian of the Palestine question; co-founder of Institute for Palestine Studies in Beirut and the Royal Scientific Society in Amman; born in Jerusalem with Jordanian and U.S. passports.

*Aoun Khasawneh*, legal advisor to Crown Prince Hassan and an expert on international law.

*Anwar Khatib*, governor of East Jerusalem from 1966 until Jordan relinquished its ties with the West Bank in 1988.

*Abdelhafez Mar'eи*, army general and head of the military intelligence department.

#### B. Syrian Delegation

*Faruk al-Sharaa*, foreign minister and head of delegation.

*Muwaaffah al-Allaf*, chief negotiator; former ambassador (retired).

*Zuheir Akkad*, ambassador to Spain.

*Ahman Arnous*, head of the foreign minister's office.

*Brigadier Rizkallah Elias*, university professor.

*Saber Falhout*, head of the Syrian Journalists' Union.

*Dia'eddin Fattal*, ambassador to the United Nations.

*Nasrat Mulla Haidar*, member of the Supreme Court.

*Zakariya Ismail*, former ambassador (retired).

*Najdi al-Jazzar*, head of the international organizations department of the Foreign Ministry.

*Muhammad Khadr*, ambassador to Great Britain.

*Ahmad Fat'hi al-Masri*, ambassador to the UN in Geneva.

*Maj. General Adnan Tayyara*, head of the Syrian delegation to the Mixed Armistice Commission.

*Walid al-Mu'allim*, ambassador to the United States.

#### C. Lebanese Delegation

*Faris Bouez*, foreign minister and head of delegation.

*Naji Abu-Assi*, ambassador to Senegal.

*Isabella Edde*, information advisor.

*Elias Haddad*, foreign ministry advisor.

*Abbas Hamiyeh*, former ambassador to Spain.

*Mahmoud Hammoud*, ambassador to Great Britain.

*Zafer al-Hassan*, director of political affairs at the Foreign Ministry.

*Yusuf Istanyus*, counselor.

*Judge Antoine Khair*, State Consultative Council.

*Ja'far Ma'awi*, head of economic affairs at the

Foreign Ministry.  
*Ambassador Samir Mubarak*, attached to the Central Administration in Beirut.  
*Ambassador Jihad Murtada*, head of the Center for Legal Research and Studies at the Foreign Ministry.  
*Ghassan Salameh*, a writer on Middle East affairs.  
*Suhail Shammas*, secretary general of the Foreign Ministry.

#### D. Egyptian Delegation

[The presence on the Egyptian delegation of a number of members known for their anti-Israel, pro-PLO sentiments was much remarked upon.]

*'Amr Musa*, foreign minister and head of delegation.

*Ahmad Abul-Gheit*, served at the embassy in Washington and was a member of the Camp David negotiating team.

*Mahmud Abu Nasr*, former permanent representative to the Arab League.

*Salah Amer*, professor of international law at Cairo University and member of Egypt's legal team during the Taba dispute.

*Ali Eddin Hilal Dessouki*, head of Cairo University's Center for Political Research and Studies; associated with the al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies; has written extensively on the Palestine question and the Arab-Israeli conflict.

*Nabil Fahmi*, member of foreign minister's cabinet; son of Ismail Fahmi.

*Ahmad Fakhr*, retired general and former chief of Egypt's military intelligence.

*Waguil Hamdi*, director of the Arab East department at the Foreign Ministry.

*Qadri Hefni*, a psychology professor at Ain al-Shams University and author of several studies on the Arab-Israeli conflict.

*Lotfi al-Kholi*, a leading political writer, former chief editor of *al-Tali'a* and weekly columnist in *al-Ahram*.

*Yunan Labib Rizk*, professor of modern history at Ain al-Shams; has written extensively on Israel, Zionism, and the Palestine problem.

*Reda Shehata*, director of the Foreign Minister's Bureau.

*Ramzi al-Shaer*, a prominent jurist and president of Zaqqaziq University.

#### E. Israeli Delegation

*Yitzhak Shamir*, prime minister and head of delegation.

*Yossi Ben-Aharon*, Prime Minister Shamir's chief of staff, expected to lead bilateral negotiations with Syria.

*Elyakim Rubinstein*, cabinet secretary, expected to lead bilateral negotiations with the Jordanian-Palestinian delegation.

*Asad Asad*, special advisor to the prime minister on Druze affairs.

*Shlomo Ben-Ami*, deputy director-general of the Foreign Ministry in charge of North American affairs.

*Eliahu Ben-Elissar*, head of Knesset's Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee; first Israeli ambassador to Egypt.

*Eytan Ben Tsur*, ambassador to Spain.

*Sarah Doron*, chairwoman of the Likud faction in the Knesset.

*Joseph Hadass*, acting director-general of the Foreign Ministry.

*Uzi Landau*, Likud MK.

*Salai Meridor*, advisor to Defense Minister Moshe Arens.

*Yekutiel Mor*, brigadier general; a senior official in Defense Ministry.

*Benyamin Netanyahu*, former deputy foreign minister and former Israeli ambassador to the UN.

*Zalman Shoval*, ambassador to the United States.

#### IV. Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir's Letter to Secretary of State Baker, Jerusalem, 28 October 1991 (main points).

[Two days before leaving for the Madrid conference, Prime Minister Shamir sent Secretary Baker a two-page letter explaining Israel's basic positions on a Palestinian state, Jerusalem, interim arrangements, and the border issue. Excerpts from the letter were first published in *Yedi'ot Aharonot* on 30 October; the following day *Hadashot* published an account of what it claimed to be a more complete version, involving nine clauses. FBIS translated the *Hadashot* report on 31 October.]

1. Israel calls on the United States to voice its opposition to a Jordanian-Palestinian confederation because there is no difference between such a confederation and an independent Palestinian state. (In other words, the Americans are expected to renege on a promise they gave on that issue to the Palestinians).

2. Jerusalem is not up for discussion. No East Jerusalem inhabitant can participate in the discussions on the future of Jerusalem. (In other words, this is a new demand that the two East Jerusalem delegates in the Jordanian delegation not participate in the negotiations).

3. Israel is not bound by promises the United States made in its letters of assurances to the Arab sides in the negotiations.

4. Israel adopts the Camp David Accords in toto and whoever does not adopt them in toto cannot make use of isolated components of the accords.

5. Progress in the bilateral and multilateral talks will be simultaneous, and any progress within one framework will be linked to progress in the other.

6. The goal of the peace talks is a peace treaty.

7. Israel disqualifies anybody appointed or authorized by the PLO or anybody who presents himself as a representative of that organization.

8. The United States will ensure that the Palestinian delegation does not operate as an independent delegation.

9. Israel demands that an effort be made to adopt most of the components of the 1983 peace treaty between Israel and Lebanon.

## V. Opening Addresses in Madrid

### A. U.S. President George Bush, 30 October 1991 (excerpts).

[President Bush's address was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary at the White House.]

... Peace will only come as the result of direct negotiations, compromise, give-and-take. Peace cannot be imposed from the outside by the United States or anyone else. While we will continue to do everything possible to help the parties overcome obstacles, peace must come from within.

We come here to Madrid as realists. We do not expect peace to be negotiated in a day, or a week, or a month, or even a year. It will take time; indeed, it should take time—time for parties so long at war to learn to talk to one another, to listen to one another. Time to heal old wounds and build trust. In this quest, time need not be the enemy of progress.

What we envision is a process of direct negotiations proceeding along two tracks, one between Israel and the Arab states; the other between Israel and the Palestinians. Negotiations are to be conducted on the basis of UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338.

The real work will not happen here in the plenary session, but in direct bilateral negotiations. This conference cannot impose a settlement on the participants or veto agreements; and just as important, the conference

can only be reconvened with the consent of every participant. Progress is in the hands of the parties who must live with the consequences.

Soon after the bilateral talks commence, parties will convene as well to organize multilateral negotiations. These will focus on issues that cross national boundaries and are common to the region: arms control, water, refugee concerns, economic development. Progress in these fora is not intended as a substitute for what must be decided in the bilateral talks; to the contrary, progress in the multilateral issues can help create an atmosphere in which long-standing bilateral disputes can more easily be settled.

For Israel and the Palestinians, a framework already exists for diplomacy. Negotiations will be conducted in phases, beginning with talks on interim self-government arrangements. We aim to reach agreement within one year. And once agreed, interim self-government arrangements will last for five years; beginning the third year, negotiations will commence on permanent status. No one can say with any precision what the end result will be; in our view, something must be developed, something acceptable to Israel, the Palestinians, and Jordan, that gives the Palestinian people meaningful control over their own lives and fate and provides for the acceptance and security of Israel.

We can all appreciate that both Israelis and Palestinians are worried about compromise, worried about compromising even the smallest point for fear it becomes a precedent for what really matters. But no one should avoid compromise on interim arrangements for a simple reason: nothing agreed to now will prejudice permanent status negotiations. To the contrary, these subsequent negotiations will be determined on their own merits.

Peace cannot depend upon promises alone. Real peace—lasting peace—must be based upon security for all states and peoples, including Israel. For too long the Israeli people have lived in fear, surrounded by an unaccepting Arab world. Now is the ideal moment for the Arab world to demonstrate that attitudes have changed, that the Arab world is willing to live in peace with Israel and make allowances for Israel's reasonable security needs.

We know that peace must also be based on fairness. In the absence of fairness, there will be no legitimacy—no stability. This applies above all to the Palestinian people, many of whom have known turmoil and frustration above all else. Israel now has an opportunity to demonstrate that it is willing to

enter into a new relationship with its Palestinian neighbors; one predicated upon mutual respect and cooperation.

Throughout the Middle East, we seek a stable and enduring settlement. We've not defined what this means; indeed I make these points with no map showing where the final borders are to be drawn. Nevertheless, we believe territorial compromise is essential for peace. Boundaries should reflect the quality of both security and political arrangements. The United States is prepared to accept whatever the parties themselves find acceptable. What we seek, as I said on 6 March, is a solution that meets the twin tests of fairness and security. . . .

To succeed, we must recognize that peace is in the interest of all parties—war, absolute advantage of none. The alternative to peace in the Middle East is a future of violence and waste and tragedy. . . .

Today, we can decide to take a different path to the future—to avoid conflict. I call upon all parties to avoid unilateral acts, be they words or deeds, that would invite retaliation or, worse yet, prejudice or even threaten this process itself. I call upon all parties to consider taking measures that will bolster mutual confidence and trust—steps that signal a sincere commitment to reconciliation.

I want to say something about the role of the United States of America. We played an active role in making this conference possible; both the secretary of state, Jim Baker, and I will play an active role in helping the process succeed. Toward this end, we've provided written assurances to Israel, to Syria, to Jordan, Lebanon, and the Palestinians. In the spirit of openness and honesty, we will brief all parties on the assurances that we have provided to the other. We're prepared to extend guarantees, provide technology and support, if that is what peace requires. And we will call upon our friends and allies in Europe and in Asia to join with us in providing resources so that peace and prosperity go hand in hand.

Outsiders can assist, but in the end, it is up to the peoples and governments of the Middle East to shape the future of the Middle East. It is their opportunity and it is their responsibility to do all that they can to take advantage of this gathering, this historic gathering, and what it symbolizes and what it promises.

No one should assume that the opportunity before us to make peace will remain if we fail to seize the moment. Ironically, this is an opportunity born of war—the destruction of past wars, the fear of future wars. The time

has come to put an end to war—the time has come to choose peace. . . .

#### B. Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, 30 October 1991 (excerpts).

*[The following excerpts, taken from the full text of President Gorbachev's speech translated in FBIS on 30 October, relate to the Middle East. The bulk of the address was taken up with the situation of the Soviet Union.]*

. . . Let me say a few words about the role of the two powers whose presidents are now before you as cochairmen of the conference. It was the will of history that unless there had been an improvement and then a radical change in Soviet relations we would not have witnessed the profound qualitative transformations in the world that now make it possible to speak of an entirely new period, a period of peace in world history. Movement in that direction has begun.

The fact that a realistic hope has emerged for an Arab-Israeli settlement can only be understood in this context.

Cooperation between the two powers and other members of the UN Security Council was indispensable to stop the aggression against Kuwait and to reaffirm the effectiveness of the new criteria in international relations. Right after that, just as was agreed between President Bush and me early in September 1990 at our Helsinki meeting on the subject of the Gulf war, vigorous joint efforts began, aimed at achieving a Middle East settlement.

All that we and the Americans have done to that end signifies that proper conclusions have been drawn from the Gulf war. Our joint participation in the process of settlement was prompted by a desire to offer our good offices, not to impose solutions from outside that would run counter to the national interests of states in the region.

Thus, as a result of major bilateral and multilateral efforts, a signal was sent to the parties involved in the conflict that they need to negotiate, to work together toward finding a realistic balance of interests which alone may form the foundation of a durable peace.

Today we have a unique chance. It would be unforgivable to miss this opportunity. Success is in everybody's interest not only because the rights of the peoples and nations and of individuals are increasingly recognized today as a universal foundation of the world order, but also for another reason of particular urgency and gravity. The Middle East has become one of the most heavily armed regions of the world, where lethal weapons and

nuclear technologies are spreading and where other weapons of mass destruction are also present.

This is a justified cause for alarm. The international community is entitled to expect that this conference will come up with decisions that will put to rest this concern. In my view, the conference can only succeed if no one seeks a victory over the other side but all seek a common victory over the cruel past. I am speaking of peace, rather than a cessation of the state of war. A durable peace implies the realization of and respect for the rights of the Palestinian people.

We have restored diplomatic relations with Israel. Now that profound democratic changes are taking place in our country and in the world and that a real process of settlement of the Middle East crisis is getting underway, the absence of such relations was becoming a nonsense. We hope and will try to make sure that this would benefit the peoples of our two countries, and the entire Arab world.

Peace in the Middle and Near East would benefit all. The region has a vast potential. Turned to constructive pursuits, it will help not only to resolve the problems of the nations that live there but will also become an important pillar of global international progress and prosperity.

We must break the fetters of the past and do away with animosity, militarism, terrorism, hostage-taking, and actions that turn people into refugees.

Our country, as a participant in the Middle East [peace] process and a neighbor that has maintained long-standing and extensive ties with the nations of the region, has a special interest in the success of this conference.

The pace and methods of resolving problems that have emerged at the present stage of world development will have a strong bearing on the settlement of conflicts in the Middle East and elsewhere. . . .

### C. EC Representative, Dutch Foreign Minister Hans van den Broek, 30 October 1991 (excerpts).

[Foreign Minister van den Broek, whose country holds the revolving six-month EC presidency, addressed the conference in the EC's capacity as observer. His speech, in English, was carried in its entirety in FBIS on 31 October.]

. . . The Twelve consider that it is of the greatest importance that the sides have committed themselves to accepting the timetable outlined for this conference—direct negotiations on the basis of UN Resolutions 242 and 338

in two ways, between Israel and the Palestinians on one side and between Israel and her Arab neighbors on the other. Political negotiations should be consolidated by multilateral talks on the basis of regional cooperation in different spheres of mutual interest.

We hope and intend to work closely with all sides to guarantee progress, according to these criteria. Taking into account geographical proximity, a greatly shared historic patrimony, and the intense political, cultural, economic, and humanitarian relations with the people of the Middle East, the Community and its member states cannot but have a great interest in the region's future, with which it shares so many things. Furthermore, we want to share in this building of peace. The Twelve's guiding principles throughout all negotiations are those which, for so long, have guided our position. They continue to be the same. These principles are: UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338; the principle of land for peace; the right of all states of the region, including Israel, to live within secure and recognized borders; and the correct expression of the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people. Our positions on matters related to the occupied territories, including East Jerusalem, are also well known.

In our view, a global solution should include these very principles, but we do not pretend to give a recipe as to how they should be applied. What is essential now, at the beginning of this conference, is that the way should be open for substantial progress. That is why it is essential for measures to be approved to build confidence. They will contribute to the creation of a stable environment, which is what progress in these negotiations requires. A halt to Israel's settlement activity in the occupied territories is an essential contribution of this type. A rejection of the Arab trade boycott of Israel is another prerequisite.

Regarding the situation in the occupied territories, it is important for both sides now to show a certain self-control and that Israel should respect the articles of the fourth Geneva Convention. We hope that there will be a tangible improvement in the situation in the occupied territories, even before the application of provisional or other agreements. . . .

### D. Head of the Egyptian Delegation, Foreign Minister 'Amr Musa, 30 October 1991 (excerpts).

[The Egyptian foreign minister's speech, much commented upon in Israel for what was perceived

*as its hardline tone, was broadcast live in Arabic on Cairo Egyptian Space Channel and translated in FBIS on 31 October.]*

. . . The peace which we strive to establish, consolidate, and guarantee must accord with the land-for-peace formula in Security Council Resolution 242, which has unambiguously confirmed the UN Charter's firmly established principle stipulating that seizing land by force is inadmissible, and which guarantees all states' right to live in peace and security.

This peace has its own components, pillars, and elements. It means right for right, commitment for commitment, and security for security. This alone, we are confident, would achieve the dictum: Peace for peace.

It is inconceivable that principles the world has endorsed and approved can be subject to negotiation, interpretation, or one-upmanship. Withdrawal from the territories that have been occupied since 1967—the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, Gaza, and the Syrian Golan Heights in implementation of Security Council Resolution 242; and from southern Lebanon in implementation of Security Council Resolution 425—is the right approach to establish a genuine peace based on justice and dignity. Recognition of the Palestinian people's right is the primary guarantee to peaceful coexistence between Israel and Palestinians and all Arabs everywhere.

The Arabs have not come to concede rights that enjoy recognition and support under international law, the principles of justice, and the UN Charter and resolutions. Nor have they come to relinquish obligations they must implement in accordance with the same laws and principles. They have come in good faith and mutual confidence to search for common ground and acceptable formulas that respond to concerns, reconcile the various demands, and achieve agreement on arrangements and methods that will secure justly and equitably the legitimate needs of all parties without infringing on the rights of any party. We call on Israel to take the same approach.

The launching of the historic peace process must not stumble through hurdles that may obstruct its progress toward a comprehensive and permanent settlement. A number of basic requirements must be secured and respected:

1. The Palestinian people's legal status cannot be contested. The Palestinian people are not merely inhabitants or residents in conquered land (*aradi maftuhah*), but they have their own distinguished national

character with the same characteristics as all other peoples.

2. The West Bank, Gaza, and the Syrian Golan Heights are occupied territory subject to full implementation of Security Council Resolution 242 and the Geneva agreements. These are not conquered land or promised land. The territories have their legal owners. Claims that are not based on principles of legitimacy and international law have no place in today's world.

3. The settlements being established in the occupied territories since 1967 are illegal, and further settlements will prevent any possible progress toward genuine peace and will cast doubt on the credibility of the process itself. They must be stopped so that they will not obstruct the peace process or destroy the foundations of the negotiations.

4. Jerusalem has its own situation. It must remain free, open, and holy to all Muslims, Christians, Jews, and other peoples. The force of occupation must not exercise any illegal exploitation of or sovereignty over the holy city. The unilateral decisions made by the occupation authority to annex the city are decisions we consider without any credibility; the situation of the city must thus be subject to negotiations and be decided through agreement within the framework of legitimacy formulated by the resolutions on which the international community concurred.

The Arab-Israeli conflict is essentially based on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, with any movement or progress in it depending on a settlement of the Palestinian problem—land and rights. But it also requires Israel's ending its 1967 occupation of Syrian territory and withdrawing to Syria's international border.

Our march toward this must be reasoned and wise, aiming for justice and fairness. It must accommodate equal rights and obligations and be based on international legality and a correct, conscientious understanding of history.

The peace conference marks a new watershed in Middle East history, gathering yesterday's enemies and foes at one meeting, seeking to cement the wide cracks between them. It embodies the people's aspiration and desire for peace, and we are hopeful that the conference, and the peace process it will create, will settle the historic Arab-Israeli struggle.

#### E. Head of the Israeli Delegation, Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, 31 October

**1991 (excerpts).**

[Prime Minister Shamir's address, carried live in English over Jerusalem Israel Television Network, was reproduced in FBIS on 31 October.]

. . . Ladies and gentlemen, to appreciate the meaning of peace for the people of Israel, one has to view today's Jewish sovereignty in the Land of Israel against the background of our history. Jews have been persecuted throughout the ages in almost every continent. Some countries barely tolerated us; others oppressed, tortured, slaughtered, and exiled us. This century saw the Nazi regime set out to exterminate us. The Shoah—the Holocaust, the catastrophic genocide of unprecedented proportions which destroyed a third of our people—became possible because no one defended us. Being homeless, we were also defenseless. But it was not the Holocaust which made the world community recognize our rightful claim to the Land of Israel. In fact, the rebirth of the State of Israel so soon after the Holocaust has made the world forget that our claim is immemorial. We are the only people who have lived in the Land of Israel without interruption for nearly 4,000 years. We are the only people, except for a short Crusader kingdom, who have had an independent sovereignty in this land. We are the only people for whom Jerusalem has been a capital. We are the only people whose sacred places are only in the Land of Israel. No nation has expressed its bond with its land with as much intensity and consistency as we have. For millennia, our people repeated at every occasion the cry of the psalmist: If I forget thee, Jerusalem, may my right hand lose its cunning. For millennia, we have encouraged each other with the greeting: Next year in Jerusalem. For millennia, our prayers, literature, and folklore have expressed powerful longing to return to our land. Only Eretz Yisra'el, the Land of Israel, is our true homeland.

Any other country, no matter how hospitable, is still a diaspora, a temporary station on the way home. To others, it was not an attractive land; no one wanted it. Mark Twain described it only 100 years ago as a desolate country which sits in sackcloth and ashes—a silent, mournful expanse which not even imagination can grace with the pomp of life.

The Zionist movement gave political expression to our claim to the Land of Israel, and in 1922, the League of Nations recognized the justice of this claim. They understood the compelling historic imperative of establishing a Jewish homeland in the Land

of Israel. The United Nations organization reaffirmed this recognition after World War II.

Regrettably, the Arab leaders, whose friendship we wanted most, opposed a Jewish state in the region. With a few distinguished exceptions, they claimed that the Land of Israel is part of the Arab domain that stretches from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf. In defiance of international will and legality, the Arab regimes attempted to overrun and destroy the Jewish state even before it was born. The Arab spokesmen at the United Nations declared that the establishment of a Jewish state would cause a bloodbath which would make the slaughters of Genghis Khan pale into insignificance. In its declaration of independence on 15 May 1948, Israel stretched out its hand in peace to its Arab neighbors, calling for an end to war and bloodshed. In response, seven Arab states invaded Israel. The UN resolution that participated the country was thus violated and effectively annulled.

The United Nations did not create Israel. The Jewish state came into being because the tiny Jewish community in what was Mandatory Palestine rebelled against foreign imperialist rule. We did not conquer a foreign land; we repulsed the Arab onslaught, prevented Israel's annihilation, declared its independence, and established a viable state and government institutions within a very short time.

After their attack on Israel failed, the Arab regimes continued their fight against Israel with boycott, blockade, terrorism, and outright war. Soon after the establishment of Israel, they turned against the Jewish communities in Arab countries. A wave of oppression, expropriation, and expulsion caused a mass exodus of some 800,000 Jews from lands they had inhabited from before the rise of the Islam. Most of the Jewish refugees, stripped of their considerable possessions, came to Israel. They were welcomed by the Jewish state, they were given shelter and support, and they were integrated into Israeli society, together with half a million survivors of the European Holocaust.

The Arab regimes' rejection of Israel's existence in the Middle East and the continuous war they have waged against it are part of history. There have been attempts to rewrite this history, which depicts the Arabs as victims and Israel as the aggressor. Like attempts to deny the Holocaust, they will fail. With the demise of totalitarian regimes in most of the world, this perversion of history will disappear.

In their war against Israel's existence, the Arab governments took advantage of the cold war. They enlisted the military, economic, and political support of the communist world against Israel, and they turned a local regional conflict into an international powder keg. This caused the Middle East to be flooded with arms, which fueled wars and turned the area into a dangerous battleground and a testing arena for sophisticated weapons.

At the UN, the Arab states mustered the support of other Muslim countries and the Soviet bloc. Together, they had an automatic majority for countless resolutions that perverted history, paraded fiction as fact, and made a travesty of the UN and its charter.

Arab hostility to Israel has also brought tragic human suffering to the Arab people. Tens of thousands have been killed and wounded; hundreds of thousands of Arabs who lived in Mandatory Palestine were encouraged by their own leaders to flee from their homes. Their suffering is a blot on humanity. No decent person—least of all a Jew of this era—can be oblivious to this suffering. Several hundreds of thousands of Palestinian Arabs live in slums known as refugee camps in Gaza, Judaea, and Samaria. Attempts by Israel to rehabilitate and house them have been defeated by Arab objections. Nor has their fate been any better in Arab states. Unlike the Jewish refugees who came to Israel from Arab countries, most Arab refugees were neither welcomed nor integrated by their hosts. Only the Kingdom of Jordan awarded them citizenship. Their plight has been used as a political weapon against Israel. The Arabs who have chosen to remain in Israel—Christian and Muslim—have become full-fledged citizens, enjoying equal rights and representation in the legislature, in the judiciary, and in all walks of life.

We, who over the centuries were denied access to our holy places, respect the religion of all faiths in our country. Our law guarantees freedom of worship and protects the holy places of every religion.

Distinguished cochairmen, ladies, and gentlemen. I stand before you today in yet another quest for peace—not only on behalf of the State of Israel, but in the name of the entire Jewish people that has maintained an unbreakable bond with the Land of Israel for almost 4,000 years. Our pursuit of accommodation and peace has been relentless. For us, the ingathering of Jews into their ancient homeland, their integration into our society, and the creation of the necessary infrastructure are at the very top of our national agenda.

A nation that faces such a gigantic chal-

lenge would most naturally desire peace with all its neighbors. Since the beginning of Zionism, we formulated innumerable peace proposals and plans. All of them were rejected. The first crack in the wall of hostility occurred in 1977, when the late President Anwar al-Sadat of Egypt decided to break the taboo and come to Jerusalem. His gesture was reciprocated with enthusiasm by the people and government of Israel, headed by Menahem Begin. This development led to the Camp David Accords and a treaty of peace between Egypt and Israel. Four years later, in May 1983, an agreement was signed with the lawful government of Lebanon. Unfortunately, this agreement was not fulfilled because of outside intervention. But a precedent was set, and we look forward to courageous steps, similar to those of Anwar al-Sadat. Regrettably, not one Arab leader has seen fit to come forward and respond to our call for peace.

Today's gathering is a result of a sustained American effort based on our own peace plan of May 1989, which in turn was founded on the Camp David Accords. According to the American initiative, the purpose of this meeting is to launch direct peace negotiations between Israel and each of its neighbors and multilateral negotiations on regional issues among all the countries of the region. We have always believed that only direct bilateral talks can bring peace. We have agreed to precede such talks with this ceremonial conference, but we hope that Arab consent to direct bilateral talks indicates an understanding that there is no other way to peace. In the Middle East, this has special meaning, because such talks imply mutual acceptance, and the root cause of the conflict is the Arab refusal to recognize the legitimacy of the State of Israel.

The multilateral talks that would accompany the bilateral negotiations are a vital component in the process. In these talks, the essential ingredients of coexistence and regional cooperation will be discussed. There cannot be genuine peace in our region unless these regional issues are addressed and resolved.

We believe the goal of the bilateral negotiations is to sign peace treaties between Israel and its neighbors and to reach an agreement on interim self-government arrangements with the Palestinian Arabs. But nothing can be achieved without goodwill. I appeal to the Arab leaders—those who are here and those who have not yet joined the process: Show us and the world that you accept Israel's existence. Demonstrate your readiness to accept

Israel as a permanent entity in the region. Let the people in our region hear you speak in the language of reconciliation, coexistence, and peace with Israel. In Israel, there is an almost total consensus for the need for peace. We only differ on the best ways to achieve it. In most Arab countries, the opposite seems to be true. The only differences are over the ways to push Israel into a defenseless position and, ultimately, to destruction. We would like to see in your countries an end to poisonous preachings against Israel. We would like to see an indication of the kind of hunger for peace which characterizes Israeli society.

We appeal to you to renounce the jihad against Israel; we appeal to you to denounce the PLO Covenant which calls for Israel's destruction; we appeal to you to condemn declarations that call for Israel's annihilation, like the one issued by the rejectionist conference in Tehran last week; we appeal to you to let Jews who wish to leave your countries go. And we address a call to the Palestinian Arabs: Renounce violence and terrorism. Use the universities in the administered territories, whose existence was made possible only by Israel, for learning and development, not agitation and violence. Stop exposing your children to danger by sending them to throw bombs and stones at soldiers and civilians.

Just two days ago, we were reminded that Palestinian terrorism is still rampant, when the mother of seven children and the father of four were slaughtered in cold blood. We cannot remain indifferent and be expected to talk with people involved in such repulsive activities.

We appeal to you to shun dictators like Saddam Hussein who aim to destroy Israel. Stop the brutal torture and murder of those who do not agree with you. Allow us and the world community to build decent housing for the people who now live in refugee camps. Above all, we hope you finally realize that you could have been at this table long ago, soon after the Camp David Accords were first concluded, had you chosen dialogue instead of violence, coexistence instead of terrorism.

Ladies and gentlemen, we come to this process with an open heart, sincere intentions, and great expectations. We are committed to negotiating without interruption, until an agreement is reached. There will be problems, obstacles, crises, and conflicting claims, but it is better to talk than to shed blood. Wars have not solved anything in our region; they have only caused misery, suffering bereavement, and hatred.

We know our partners to the negotiations

will make territorial demands on Israel but, as an examination of the conflict's long history makes clear, its nature is not territorial. It raged well before Israel acquired Judaea, Samaria, Gaza, and the Golan in a defensive war. There was no hint at recognition of Israel before the war in 1967, when the territories in question were not under Israel's control.

We are a nation of 4 million. The Arab nations from the Atlantic to the Gulf number 170 million. We control only 28,000 square km. The Arabs possess a land mass of 14 million square km. The issue is not territory, but our existence. It will be regrettable if the talks focus primarily and exclusively on territory. It is the quickest way to an impasse.

What we need, first and foremost, is the building of confidence, the removal of the danger of confrontation, and the development of relations in as many spheres as possible. The issues are complex, and the negotiations will be lengthy and difficult. We submit that the best venue for the talks is in our region, in close proximity to the decisionmakers, not in a foreign land. We invite our partners to this process to come to Israel for the first round of talks. On our part, we are ready to go to Jordan, to Lebanon, and to Syria for the same purpose. There is no better way to make peace than to talk in each other's home. Avoiding such talks is a denial of the purpose of the negotiations. I would welcome a positive answer from the representatives of these states here and now. We must learn to live together. We must learn to live without war, without hatred. . . .

#### F. Head of the Jordanian Delegation, Foreign Minister Kamil Abu Jaber, 31 October 1991 (excerpts).

[Dr. Abu Jaber's address, carried live in English over Amman Jordan Television, was reproduced in FBIS on 31 October.]

. . . Today we have an historic opportunity for peace in a land that has not tasted it for a long time. We must remember that the extremists and the rejectionists who speak in absolute terms are still lurking in the wings. It is from there that they issue their often repeated clichés and venomous threats. Inasmuch as peace is a good in itself and inherent value, it is also a battle against the absolutist ideologues invoking ancient hatreds. Many think that the situation should not be resolved, but left to future generations to deal with.

Those of vision, however, see it differently, considering the immediacy of the need to reach a peaceful settlement at this particu-

lar moment of world history, with its interdependence between peoples and nations. King Hussein said: "We must be involved in the drive for peace, because it concerns our present and our future. Otherwise, the outcome, God forbid, will be ominous dangers. . . ."

We take to heart and respect the words of President Bush in his 6 March 1991 address before the American Congress when he said: "I expressed my hope that out of the horrors of war might come new momentum for peace. We have learned in the modern age geography cannot guarantee security, and security does not come from military power alone. By now, it should be plain," the president said, to all parties that the peacemaking in the Middle East requires compromise.

Peace cannot, indeed must not, reflect the military balance of the belligerents now. It should essentially reflect the hope of a better future that will end once and for all our living in the midst of conflicting tragedies. It should bring us all in step with a new world that will shatter the shadows, the misery, and the fog that engulfs our lives. . . .

More land is not more security. Occupation is against every legal principle. And the shape it has taken in the Arab occupied territories contravenes the United Nations Charter and the Fourth Geneva Convention. The building of settlements and the expropriation of land are both in clear contravention of the rules of international law. The justice that Jordan seeks requires resort to law—law that governs the actions of men, freeing them to live secure in a stable order and institutionalized universe. That, and that alone, can assure the proper division of labor and resources. And that alone can guarantee not only survival, but freedom and security. The technology of war has far outdistanced our appreciation of its destructiveness and danger. Otherwise, how can we continue to contemplate our security in missiles, nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons?

Our cause, his majesty said, is not only between us and Israel, but also between the world and Israel; between the supremacy of international law and the flouting of it. The whole world rejects what Israel's leadership is saying, because it contravenes international legitimacy. Indeed, a relatively growing segment of the Israelis themselves are not far from this world view. The king added that our world today is peace-oriented, and that the Arabs and the rest of the world will come together in their mutual desire and interest to find a peaceful solution. That is one of the bases of the Jordanian position: a search for peace, secure in the support of the entire

Arab world, indeed the whole world community and in particular the Palestinians. We and the Palestinians have a just cause, which must be addressed and resolved with equity and with fairness. Our second basis for entering this peace process is our expectation that there will be no asymmetry or double standards.

The third basis of the Jordanian approach is that our cause and that of our Palestinian brethren is intricately linked by ties of history, culture, religion, language, demography, geography, as well as human suffering and human aspirations and national aspirations. The king said: We would have preferred an independent Palestinian delegation, though we have no objection to providing an umbrella for our Palestinian brethren, since we are keenly aware that both Jordanians and Palestinians are besieged as the parties directly and adversely affected by the continuation of the status quo of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Fourth, the peace we seek must be based on United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. The objective is real peace. We must emphasize that our understanding of resolution 242 is that it is based on the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war, and the exchange of land for peace. The deliberations preceding its adoption, and in which Jordan participated, were based on that principle. Our position is firmly based on United Nations resolutions and international law.

We are aware that Israel's creation was the result of UN Resolution 181 of 29 November 1947. It is in accordance with the strength of these resolutions, as well as the general principles of international law, that Jordan demands the total withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied Jordanian, Palestinian, Syrian, and Lebanese lands.

The three dimensions of the Jordanian position—the Jordanian, the Palestinian, and the regional—are founded on international law. Resolution 242 is a valid international instrument unanimously agreed upon by the international community. It is binding on all member states of the United Nations in accordance with Article 25 of the UN Charter.

Arab sovereignty must be restored in Arab Jerusalem. In the context of peace, Jerusalem will represent the essence and symbol of peace between the followers of the three great monotheistic religions. It is God's will that has made the historic city important to them all.

The illegal settlements should be removed, not augmented. The issue of Pales-

tinian refugees and that of the displaced must be solved in accordance with relevant UN resolutions. The Palestinian people must be allowed to exercise their right of self-determination in their ancestral homeland. The fulfillment of these demands is a question of the credibility of the UN resolutions. Let me speak plainly, let me speak plainly that Jordan has never been Palestine and will not be so.

Withdrawal from Lebanon and the application of UN Security Council Resolution 425 is also an essential prerequisite for the establishment of regional peace.

Fifth, the peace we seek as a result of negotiations is a permanent one, a just one, a comprehensive peace; peace that will focus on region-wide issues, such as arms control and regional security, water, the environment, the fate of the Palestinian refugees and the displaced, and the economic balance among the peoples of the area through joint development programs.

Peace must mean security for all, protected by all in their hearts and their souls, because it is founded on justice and honor.

Sixth, our position is also predicated on the vision of a better future that will replace the present bitterness and frustration. And, in the words of King Hussein, enable us to transform these realities into positive forces that will take us from despair to hope, from confrontation and the four decades of suffering, anxiety, and pain that accompanied it, and which left an imprint on our lives, to peace and its promise of security, stability, opportunities, and prosperity for all; from the no-war, no-peace situation and its real dangers, to a condition of certainty and ease which will enhance the creativity and the hopes of the younger generation. . . .

#### G. Head of the Palestinian Delegation, Haydar Abd al-Shafi, 31 October 1991.

[The speech was carried over Amman Jordan Television in English (*italicized passages in Arabic*) and reproduced in full in FBIS on 1 November 1991. The Israeli government expressed surprise and displeasure over the fact that the Jordanians and the Palestinians, officially part of the same delegation, were each allotted 45 minutes for their addresses instead of having to share the time between them.]

In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate. O esteemed audience. Allow me first to extend greetings of thanks and appreciation to the State of Spain, king, government, and people, for hosting this historic conference. I would also like to extend greet-

ings of pride and appreciation for the sons of the Palestinian people who are still struggling for freedom and independence. I will now speak on their behalf to you and the various democratic powers in the world in English.

Mr. Baker, Mr. Pankin, ladies and gentlemen: On behalf of the Palestinian delegation, we meet in Madrid, a city with a rich texture of history, to weave together the fabric which joins our past with future, to reaffirm a wholeness of vision which once brought about a reverse of civilization and a world order based on harmony in diversity. Once again, Christian, Muslim, and Jew face the challenge of heralding a new era enshrined in global values of democracy, human rights, freedom, justice, and security. From Madrid, we launch this quest for peace, a quest to place the sanctity of human life at the center of our world, and to redirect our energies and resources from the pursuit of mutual destruction to the pursuit of joint prosperity, progress, and happiness.

We, the people of Palestine, stand before you in the fullness of our pain, our pride, and our anticipation, for we long harbored a yearning for peace and a dream of justice and freedom. For too long, the Palestinian people have gone unheeded, silenced and denied. Our identity negated by political expediency; our right for struggle against injustice maligned; and our present existence subdued by the past tragedy of another people. For the greater part of this century we have been victimized by the myth of a land without a people and described with impunity as the invisible Palestinians. Before such willful blindness, we refused to disappear or to accept a distorted identity. Our intifada is a testimony to our perseverance and resilience waged in a just struggle to regain our rights. It is time for us to narrate our own story, to stand witness as advocates of truth which has long lain buried in the consciousness and conscience of the world. We do not stand before you as supplicants, but rather as the torch-bearers who know that, in our world of today, ignorance can never be an excuse. We seek neither an admission of guilt after the fact, nor vengeance for past inequities, but rather an act of will that would make a just peace a reality.

We speak out, ladies and gentlemen, from the full conviction of the rightness of our cause, the verity of our history, and the depth of our commitment. Therein lies the strength of the Palestinian people today, for we have scaled walls of fear and reticence, and we wish to speak out with the courage and integrity that our narrative and history deserve.

The cosponsors have invited us here today to present our case and to reach out to the other with whom we have had to face a mutually exclusive reality on the land of Palestine. But even in the invitation to this peace conference, our narrative was distorted and our truth only partially acknowledged.

The Palestinian people are one, fused by centuries of history in Palestine, bound together by a collective memory of shared sorrows and joys, and sharing a unity of purpose and vision. Our songs and ballads, full of tales and children's stories, the dialect of our jokes, the image of our poems, that hint of melancholy which colors even our happiest moments, are as important to us as the blood ties which link our families and clans. Yet, an invitation to discuss peace, the peace we all desire and need, comes to only a portion of our people. It ignores our national, historical, and organic unity. We come here wrenched from our sisters and brothers in exile to stand before you as the Palestinians under occupation, although we maintain that each of us represents the rights and interests of the whole.

We have been denied the right to publicly acknowledge our loyalty to our leadership and system of government. But allegiance and loyalty cannot be censored or severed. Our acknowledged leadership is more than [the] justly democratically chosen leadership of all the Palestinian people. It is the symbol of our national unity and identity, the guardian of our past, the protector of our present, and the hope of our future. Our people have chosen to entrust it with their history and the preservation of our precious legacy. This leadership has been clearly and unequivocally recognized by the community of nations, with only a few exceptions who had chosen for so many years shadow over substance. Regardless of the nature and conditions of our oppression, whether the disposition and dispersion of exile or the brutality and repression of the occupation, the Palestinian people cannot be torn asunder. They remain united—a nation wherever they are, or are forced to be.

And Jerusalem, ladies and gentlemen, that city which is not only the soul of Palestine, but the cradle of three world religions, is tangible even in its claimed absence from our midst at this stage. It is apparent, through artificial exclusion from this conference, that this is a denial of its right to seek peace and redemption. For it, too, has suffered from war and occupation. Jerusalem, the city of peace, has been barred from a peace conference and deprived of its calling. Palestinian Jerusalem, the capital of our homeland and

future state, defines Palestinian existence, past, present, and future, but itself has been denied a voice and an identity. Jerusalem defies exclusive possessiveness or bondage. Israel's annexation of Arab Jerusalem remains both clearly illegal in the eyes of the world community, and an affront to the peace that this city deserves.

We come to you from a tortured land and a proud, though captive people, having been asked to negotiate with our occupiers, but leaving behind the children of the intifada, and a people under occupation and under curfew who enjoined us not to surrender or forget. As we speak, thousands of our brothers and sisters are languishing in Israeli prisons and detention camps, most detained without evidence, charge, or trial, many cruelly mistreated and tortured in interrogation, guilty only of seeking freedom or daring to defy the occupation. We speak in their name and we say: Set them free. As we speak, the tens of thousands who have been wounded or permanently disabled are in pain. Let peace heal their wounds. As we speak, the eyes of thousands of Palestinian refugees, deportees, and displaced persons since 1967 are haunting us, for exile is a cruel fate. Bring them home. They have the right to return. As we speak, the silence of demolished homes echoes through the halls and in our minds. We must rebuild our homes in our free state.

And what do we tell the loved ones of those killed by army bullets? How do we answer the questions and the fear in our children's eyes? For one out of three Palestinian children under occupation has been killed, injured, or detained in the past four years. How can we explain to our children that they are denied education, for schools are so often closed by the army? Or why their life is in danger for raising a flag in a land where even children are killed or jailed? What requiem can be sung for trees uprooted by army bulldozers? And most of all, who can explain to those whose lands are confiscated and clear waters stolen, a message of peace? Remove the barbed wire. Restore the land and its life-giving water. The settlements must stop now. Peace cannot be waged while Palestinian land confiscated in myriad ways and the status of the occupied territories is being decided each day by Israeli bulldozers and barbed wire. This is not simply a position. It is an irrefutable reality. Territory for peace is a travesty when territory for illegal settlement is official Israeli policy and practice. The settlements must stop now.

In the name of the Palestinian people, we wish to directly address the Israeli people

with whom we have had a prolonged exchange of pain: Let us share hope, instead. We are willing to live side by side on the land and the promise of the future. Sharing, however, requires two partners, willing to share as equals. Mutuality and reciprocity must replace domination and hostility for genuine reconciliation and coexistence under international legality. Your security and ours are mutually dependent, as entwined as the fears and nightmares of our children. We have seen some of you at your best and at your worst. For the occupier can hide no secrets from the occupied, and we are witness to the toll that occupation has exacted from you and yours.

We have seen you agonize over the transformation of your sons and daughters into instruments of a blind and violent occupation. And we are sure that at no time did you envisage such a role for the children whom you thought would forge your future. We have seen you look back in deepest sorrow at the tragedy of your past, and look on in horror at the disfigurement of the victim-turned-oppressor. Not for this have you nurtured your hopes, dreams, and your offspring. This is why we have responded with solemn appreciation to those of you who came to offer consolation to our bereaved, to give support to those whose homes were being demolished, and to extend encouragement and counsel to those detained behind barbed wire and iron bars. And we have marched together, often choking together in the nondiscriminatory tear gas or crying out in pain as the clubs descended on both Palestinian and Israeli alike, for pain knows no national boundaries, and no one can claim a monopoly on suffering. We once formed a human chain around Jerusalem, joining hands and calling for peace. Let us today form a moral chain around Madrid and continue that noble effort for peace and a promise of freedom for our sons and daughters. Break through the barriers of mistrust and manipulated fears. Let us look forward in magnanimity and in hope.

To our Arab brothers and sisters, most of whom are represented here in this historic occasion, we express our loyalty and gratitude for their life-long support and solidarity. We are here together seeking a just and lasting peace, whose cornerstone is freedom for Palestine, justice for the Palestinians, and an end to the occupation of all Palestinian and Arab lands. Only then can we really enjoy together the fruits of peace, prosperity, security, and human dignity and freedom.

In particular, we address our Jordanian colleagues in our joint delegation: Our two

peoples have a very special historic and geographic relationship. Together, we shall strive to achieve peace. We will continue to strive for our sovereignty, while proceeding freely and willingly to prepare the grounds for a confederation between the two states of Palestine and Jordan, which can be a cornerstone for our security and prosperity.

To the community of nations on our fragile planet, to the nations of Africa and Asia, to the Muslim world, and particularly to Europe, on whose southern and neighborly shores we meet today, from the heart of our collective struggle for peace, we greet you and acknowledge your support and recognition. You have recognized our rights and our government, and have given us real support and protection. You have penetrated the distorting mist of racism, stereotyping, and ignorance, and committed the act of seeing the invisible and listening to the voice of the silenced. Palestinians under occupation and in exile have become a reality in your eyes, and with courage and determination, you have affirmed the truth of our narrative. You have taken up our cause and our case, and we have brought you into our hearts. We thank you for caring and daring to know the truth, the truth which must set us all free.

To the cosponsors and participants in this occasion of awe and challenge, we pledge our commitment to the principle of justice, peace, and reconciliation based on international legitimacy and uniform standards. We shall persist in our quest for peace to place before you the substance and determination of our people, often victimized but never defeated. We shall pursue our people's right to self-determination to the exhilaration of freedom and to the warmth of the sun as a nation among equals.

This is the moment of truth. You must have the courage to recognize it and the will to implement it, for our truth can no longer be hidden away in the dark recesses of inadvertency or neglect. People of Palestine look at you with a straightforward, direct gaze, seeking to touch your heart, for you have dared to stir up hopes that cannot be abandoned. You cannot afford to let us down, for we have lived up to the values you espouse, and we have remained true to our cause.

We, the Palestinian people, made the imaginative leap in the Palestine National Council of November 1988, during which the Palestine Liberation Organization launched its peace initiative based on Security Council Resolution 242 and 338, and declared Palestinian independence based on Resolution 181 of the United Nations, which gave birth to

two states in 1948, Israel and Palestine. December 1988, a historic speech before the United Nations in Geneva led directly to the launching of the Palestinian-American dialogue. Ever since then, our people have responded positively to every serious peace initiative and have done the utmost to ensure the success of this process. Israel, on the other hand, has placed many obstacles and barriers in the path of peace to negate the very validity of the process. Its illegal and frenzied settlement activity is the most glaring evidence of its rejectionism, the latest settlement being erected just two days ago. These historic decisions of the Palestine National Council wrench the course of history from inevitable confrontation and conflict towards peace and mutual recognition. With our own hands and in an act of sheer will, we have molded the shape of the future of our people. Our parliament has articulated the message of the people, with the courage to say "yes" to the challenge of history, just as it provided the reference in its resolutions last month in Algiers and in the Central Council meeting this month in Tunis to go forward to this historic conference. We cannot be made to bear the brunt of other people's "no's." We must have reciprocity. We must have peace.

Ladies and gentlemen: In the Middle East, there is no superfluous people outside time and place, but rather a state sorely missed by time and place. The state of Palestine must be born on the land of Palestine to redeem the injustice of the destruction of its historical reality and to free the people of Palestine from the shackles of their victimization.

Our homeland has never ceased to exist in our minds and hearts, but it has to exist as a state on all the territories occupied by Israel in the war of 1967 with Arab Jerusalem as its capital in the context of that city's special status and its nonexclusive character.

This state, in a condition of emergence, has already been a subject of anticipation for too long, should take place today rather than tomorrow. However, we are willing to accept the proposal for a transitional stage provided interim arrangements are not transformed into permanent status. The time frame must be condensed to respond to the dispossessed Palestinians' urgent need for sanctuary and to the occupied Palestinians' right to gain relief from oppression and to win recognition of their authentic will.

During this phase, international protection for our people is most urgently needed. And the *de jure* application of the Fourth Geneva Convention is a necessary condition. The phases must not prejudice the outcome.

Rather, they require an internal momentum and motivation to lead sequentially to sovereignty. Bilateral negotiations on the withdrawal of Israeli forces, the dissolution of Israeli administration, and the transfer of authority to the Palestinian people cannot proceed under coercion or threat in the current asymmetry of power. Israel must demonstrate its willingness to negotiate in good faith by immediately halting all settlement activity and land confiscation while implementing meaningful confidence-building measures.

Without genuine progress, tangible constructive changes and just agreements during the bilateral talks, multilateral negotiations will be meaningless. Regional stability, security, and development are the logical outcome of an equitable and just solution to the Palestinian question, which remains the key to the resolution of wider conflicts and concerns.

In its confrontation of wills between the legitimacy of the people and the illegality of the occupation, the intifada's message has been consistent: to embody the Palestinian state and to build its institutions and infrastructure. We seek recognition for this creative impulse which nurtures within it the potential nascent state.

We have paid a heavy price for daring to substantiate our authenticity and to practice popular democracy in spite of the cruelty of occupation. It was a sheer act of will that brought us here; the same will which asserted itself in the essence of the intifada as the cry for freedom, an act of civil resistance and people's participation and empowerment.

The intifada is our drive towards nation-building and social transformation. We are here today with the support of our people, who have given itself the right to hope and to make a stand for peace. We must recognize as well that some of our people harbor serious doubts and skepticism about this process. Within our democratic, social, and political structures, we have evolved a respect for pluralism and diversity and we shall guard the opposition's right to differ within the parameters of mutual respect and national unity.

The process launched here must lead us to the light at the end of the tunnel. And this light is the promise of a new Palestine—free, democratic, and respectful of human rights and the integrity of nature.

Self-determination, ladies and gentlemen, can neither be granted nor withheld at the will of the political self-interest of others. For it is enshrined in all international charters and humanitarian law. We claim this right;

we firmly assert it here before you and in the eyes of the rest of the world. For it is a sacred and inviolable right which we shall relentlessly pursue and exercise with dedication and self-confidence and pride.

Let's end the Palestinian-Israeli fatal proximity in this unnatural condition of occupation, which has already claimed too many lives. No dream of expansion or glory can justify the taking of a single life. Set us free to reengage as neighbors and as equals on our holy land.

To our people in exile and under occupation, who have sent us to this appointment, laden with their trust, love, and aspirations, we say that the load is heavy and the task is great, but we shall be true. In the words of our great national poet Mahmud Darwish: *My homeland is not a suitcase, and I am no traveler.*

To the exiled and the occupied we say you shall return and you shall remain and we will prevail, for our cause is just. We will put on our embroidered robes and *kafiyehs* in the sight of the world and celebrate together on the day of liberation.

Refugee camps are not fit for people who were raised on the land of Palestine in the warmth of the sun and freedom. The hail of Israeli bombs almost daily pouring down on our defenseless civilian population in the refugee camps of Lebanon is no substitute for the healing rain of the homeland. Yet, the international will had ensured their return in United Nations Resolution 194—a fact willfully ignored and unenacted. Similarly, all other resolutions pertinent to the Palestinian question beginning with resolution 181, through resolutions 242 and 338, and ending with Security Council Resolution 681, have until now been relegated to the domain of public debate rather than real implementation. They formed a larger body of legality, including all relevant provisions of international law within which any peaceful settlement must proceed. If international legitimacy and the rule of law are to prevail and govern relations among nations, they must be respected and impartially and uniformly implemented. We as Palestinians require nothing less than justice.

Palestinians everywhere: Today we bear in our hands the precious gift of your love and your pain, and we shall set it down gently here before the eyes of the world and say there is a right here which must be acknowledged—the right to self-determination and statehood. There is strength and there is the scent of sacred incense in the air. Jerusalem, the heart of our homeland and the cradle of

the soul, is shimmering through the barriers of occupation and deceit.

The deliberate violation of its sanctities is also an act of violence against the collective human, cultural, and spiritual memory and an aggression against its enduring symbols of tolerance, magnanimity, and respect for cultural and religious authenticity.

The cobbled streets of the old city must not echo with the discordant beat of Israeli military boots. We must restore to them the chant of the *muezzin*, the chimes of the church, the call of the ram, and the prayers of all the faithful calling for peace in the city of peace.

From Madrid let's light the candle of peace and let the olive branch blossom. Let's celebrate the rituals of justice and rejoice in the hymns of truth, for the awe of the moment is a promise to the future, which we all must redeem.

Palestinians will be free and will stand tall among the community of nations in the fullness of the pride and dignity which, by right, belongs to all people. Today, our people under occupation are holding high the olive branch of peace. In the words of Chairman Arafat in 1974 before the UN General Assembly: *Let not the olive branch of peace fall from my hands. Let not the olive branch of peace fall from the hands of the Palestinian people.* May God's mercy, peace, and blessings be upon you.

#### H. Head of the Lebanese Delegation, Foreign Minister Faris Bouez, 1 November 1991 (excerpts).

*[The Lebanese foreign minister's speech, delivered in Arabic, was carried over Beirut Radio and translated in FBIS on 1 November.]*

. . . Gentlemen: Lebanon has been and continues to be a peace-loving country that participated in establishing the United Nations, chaired one of its General Assembly's sessions, contributed toward the foundation of other international organizations, particularly the International Court of Justice—of which Lebanon is a member—and participated in charting human rights laws. Lebanon is committed to international legitimacy and to all resolutions adopted by the UN Security Council and General Assembly, as well as the provisions of international law. Lebanon urges setting up a new world order in which the principles of law, the rejection of aggression, and the solving of disputes by peaceful means prevail.

Lebanon attaches a basic importance to implementing resolution 425 because the

1949 armistice continues to govern the situation between Lebanon and Israel. The eighth article of the armistice stipulates that this agreement should remain in force until the two sides achieve a peaceful solution. For all these reasons, Lebanon has endeavored and continues to endeavor to implement resolution 425, adopted by the UN Security Council on 19 March 1976. This resolution calls for full respect of the territorial integrity, sovereignty, and political independence of Lebanon within its recognized international borders, and calls on Israel to halt its military operations against Lebanon's territorial integrity and immediately withdraw its forces from all Lebanese territory.

The resolution established a UN interim force in southern Lebanon to ensure the Israeli forces' withdrawal, consolidate world peace and security, and help the Lebanese government restore its immediate authority in the region. Resolution 425 met obstacles which prevented its immediate, full, and unconditional implementation—Israel's constant refusal to implement it. These obstacles will only make Lebanon more insistent that it be fully implemented.

Lebanon sees in the resolution a challenge to the international community to prove it is seriously committed to its resolutions. Implementing this resolution will prove that the international community does not have double standards, and that its commitment to international law and independent countries' sovereignty over their territories is not limited to one specific area or case.

I remind you that Lebanon was the first Arab country to denounce the aggression against Kuwait. Lebanon did not prevaricate for a moment, basing its stand on the principle of sovereignty and independence but finding it hard to see international law forcibly applied to a fraternal Arab country, albeit an aggressor.

I stress to you: The Lebanese government, while wishing this conference full success, will spare no efforts in the endeavor to implement resolution 425, regardless of the course of this conference and regardless of its final outcome. We informed the countries calling for this conference, the United States and the Soviet Union, that our acceptance is based on this stand.

I praise many friendly countries for supporting our stand, particularly the United States, which told us that resolution 425 does not depend on a comprehensive solution in the region and is not linked to it, although such a solution would enhance peace and stability in Lebanon.

Resolution 425 is an independent and integral resolution that has a detailed mechanism for its implementation. It is not linked in any way whatsoever to the existing efforts to implement international resolutions on the Arab territories occupied in 1967, particularly resolutions 242 and 338.

While wishing these endeavors quick and complete success, we stress that Lebanon is primarily concerned with liberating all its territory. Lebanon, which does not accept any alternative to resolution 425, expects the peace efforts and the signs of the new world order to contribute to eliminating the obstacles to implementing this resolution and even end all procrastination in implementing it.

When this resolution is implemented, Lebanon will be fully committed to controlling security on its recognized borders and will not allow any security violations. The justification for resistance to the occupation will then disappear.

As for the borders themselves, they are taken into account by resolution 425, which is based on the 1949 armistice agreement. They are internationally recognized borders and are in no way subject to negotiation.

Gentlemen: Lebanon is in the Middle East. It has embraced its ideas, ideologies, religions, and philosophies. It has suffered from the conflicts afflicting it. Hence, the Lebanese are probably more aware than others—since their country is the meeting point between East and West and borders the sea—that there can be no real peace in the region except a comprehensive peace for all its regions and countries. None of this region's peoples will enjoy peace when raging volcanoes, oppressed peoples, and violated rights abut their borders.

Lebanon, a constituent and active member of the Arab League, is committed to the Arab cause—especially the Palestinian people's issue and their right to self-determination and to return to their lands—to the liberation of the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem, and the achievement of a just peace in the region.

Lebanon wants to stress its solidarity with the Arab stand that aims to implement Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, the two resolutions that constitute the principal basis for convening this conference—that is, land for peace. Continuing the settlement policy will inevitably have a negative effect on all efforts to achieve peace in the region.

The Palestinian issue is the core of the Middle East conflict. A just and comprehensive solution to it is bound to allow the region to enjoy the stability, security, and confidence

it deserves. This applies particularly to our homeland, Lebanon, which paid the highest price for the Palestinian people's expulsion from their land. Lebanon was the target of two major Israeli military incursions in 1978 and 1982, causing immense loss of life and destroying property. I regret to remind you that the Israeli attacks have not stopped.

Lebanon, with its small area—10,452 sq km—it's own social, political, and economic makeup, and modest natural resources, has succeeded with difficulty in hosting Palestinian evacuees awaiting a solution to their problem. Lebanon cannot provide these people with a dignified life or permanently absorb them without harming its own domestic situation, provoking struggles and conflicts on its territory over social, economic, employment, and political matters. Lebanon warns against resolving the Palestinian people's problem by settling this fraternal people's sons on a small, densely populated territory, demographically delicate and sensitive. This might turn the struggle for survival into a dangerous affair, and instead of restoring Palestine to its people it might cause Lebanon to be lost.

Resettlement plans disregard people's natural affiliation and attachment to their land, where land is the source of identity, love of homeland akin to religious faith, and a person's origin bound to the soil. Land, according to the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples' belief and philosophy, like that of their Arab brothers, is closely bound to identity, heritage, and ancient origin. Abandoning this origin justifies hate, frustration, and revolt in the minds of these peoples.

Making things worse is uprooting citizens from their homelands and birthplace on various impractical pretexts, separating them from their land, their culture, the soil they tilled, and their achievements, and forcing them, in their hundreds of thousands, to emigrate from a far continent's vast territories to a small, disputed land they have not seen before and with which they have no bond. By this I mean encouraging Soviet citizens to emigrate, uprooting them from their natural society. . . .

It is high time for this region to become a base of international law and not an exception to it; it is time for this region to again become a crossing point for the continents rather than a barrier to rapprochement. It is time for the people of this region, who are known for their heritage and noble origins, to resume their historic position in exploring the horizons of humanity and charting its future. . . .

### I. Head of the Syrian Delegation, Foreign Minister Faruk al-Sharaa, 31 October 1991 (excerpts).

[*Mr. Sharaa's address was recorded from Amman Jordan Television and translated from the Arabic by FBIS on 1 November.* ]

. . . Mr. President: We have never been warmongers and advocates of destruction. Syria has always called for the attainment of a just and comprehensive peace on the basis of UN resolutions, and it has stressed a true intention and serious desire for peace. At the height of the October war, His Excellency President Hafiz al-Assad said: We have no fondness for killing or destruction; we are only defending ourselves against killing and destruction. We are not and have never been aggressors. We have been and still are defending ourselves against aggression. We want death for no one; we are protecting our people against death. We cherish freedom and want it for ourselves and others.

Peace and the theft of others' territory do not go together. For peace to be permanent and stable, it must encompass all the parties to the conflict on all fronts. Developments in our region have borne out the validity of this truth. Israel used its peace treaty with Egypt to annex Jerusalem in 1980 and the Golan Heights in 1981, and to invade Lebanon in 1982. Obviously, Israel committed this series of aggressive acts at a quicker pace than its withdrawal from Egyptian Sinai. Following each aggression, the UN Security Council convened and issued unanimous resolutions: Resolution 476, which declared the annexation of Jerusalem to be null and void; resolution 497, which declared the imposition of Israeli laws in the Golan Heights to be null and void and without any basis in international legal authority; and resolution 425, which demanded an unconditional Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon. But, like resolutions 242 and 338, these resolutions have failed to be implemented thanks to Israel's rejection and stubbornness and the cold war climate between East and West. As for now, with the cold war over and confrontation and competition between the United States and the USSR giving way to a new era of détente and cooperation, and with the peace conference getting underway, the peoples of the region and the world are waiting for these resolutions to be enforced as soon as possible through serious and productive talks.

In this context, it is worth noting that Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, which form the foundations of the peace conference, were passed as a compromise among

the permanent Security Council members, the majority of which, as is known, have been sympathetic to Israel since its inception. Hence, the implementation of these two resolutions must not be subject to fresh compromises at the bilateral talks. They must be implemented fully and on all fronts. The preamble to resolution 242 clearly states the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war. This means that every inch of Arab territory occupied by the Israelis through war and force—the Golan Heights, the West Bank and Jerusalem, and the Gaza Strip—must revert to their rightful owners in full.

World public opinion now realizes more than ever before, especially in the aftermath of the Gulf crisis, that double standards are no longer acceptable in this age; that the principles of international law, not the law of the jungle, must be respected; and that the UN resolutions, not brute force, must be put in force. The world states have also recently realized that only Israel resists the peace efforts with all the power at its disposal and continues its occupation of others' territory by force. Today, all states realize that Israel adopts a sterile and worn-out ideology based on expansion, the building of settlements, and the displacement of Arabs from their territories, on which they have lived for centuries, to replace them with new immigrants who have never lived in our region at any time in history.

In this regard, Syria would like to remind the cosponsors of the conference, and through them the international community, that the Israeli occupation of the Syrian and Palestinian territories has led to the displacement of approximately half a million Syrian citizens from the Golan Heights. Those citizens, to date, have not been able to return to their homes. Moreover, there are over a quarter of a million Palestinian refugees in Syria who are deprived of their right to the homeland of their fathers and forefathers in Palestine.

Israel's allegations for bringing world Jewry to it at the expense of the indigenous Arab inhabitants are supported neither by legal nor humanitarian principles. Had the world adopted these allegations, all Christians should have been urged to emigrate to the Vatican and all Muslims to holy Mecca. It is an amazing paradox that Israel rejects the implementation of UN Resolution 194 issued in 1948 stipulating the repatriation of Palestinian refugees and compensating those unwilling to return, on the pretext that there is not enough territory, at a time Israel continues to urge hundreds of thousands of new Jewish

immigrants to settle in the same territory and to abandon their original homelands, such as the Soviet Union, which has an area estimated at one-sixth of the world.

We believe that the time of fallacies and meaningless pretexts that are only aimed to justify the continued occupation and annexation is over. All parties, aggressors and victims alike, are now before an historic opportunity, which may not recur, to end long decades of destructive conflict, and to establish a just, comprehensive, and durable peace which would extricate the region from the whirlpool of wars, and signal the beginning of a new epoch in which peoples of the region would devote their efforts to achieve prosperity and development.

A just peace necessitates that no Arab territories remain under Israeli occupation and that the Palestinian people must not remain deprived of their right to self-determination. If the objective, indeed, is for the peoples and states of the region to coexist and to enjoy security, peace, and prosperity, and to place their potential and abundant resources in the service of their economies and development, would it be feasible to achieve this aspired objective without the termination of the occupation and return of rights?

The Arabs have offered much for the sake of peace. They have explicitly announced that they aspire for peace, asking only to enjoy the basic rights that the UN Charter guarantees to all peoples and which the international community and the world at large have acknowledged for any people. As for Israel, it alone of all world states insists on keeping the Arab territories that it occupied by force under the pretext of security, as if geographic expansion can guarantee security in the age of scientific and technological progress. If the world adopts this Israeli logic, how many wars and conflicts would erupt among neighbor countries under this pretext? . . .

The Syrian Arab delegation has come to this conference in spite of Syria's many reservations on its form and prerogatives to seek a just and honorable peace that comprehensively covers all the aspects and fronts of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Our delegation has come equipped with an inexhaustible reserve of goodwill and a real and serious desire for a just peace, and with a determination to contribute in rendering the peace process a success and having it attain its noble objective. This is balanced by a determination to reject any exploitation of the current peace process to legalize what is not legitimate and what is unacceptable in the eyes of the United Nations, its charter, and its resolutions, or to

achieve any gains, no matter how minimal, that will reflect the weight of the aggression or be a reward to the aggressor.

This is Syria's firm stand based on the principles of international legitimacy and the UN resolutions. This stand mandates Israel's withdrawal from every inch of the occupied Syrian Golan, the West Bank, Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip, and southern Lebanon. It also mandates securing the Palestinian people's legitimate national and political rights, foremost being their right to self-determination.

The establishment of settlements in the occupied Arab territories is an illegal act and is considered null and void. It is a major obstacle on the road to peace. This dictates their elimination. The continued settlement activity in the occupied Arab territories after the peace process has started is tangible proof that Israel does not want to attain real peace. . . .

Our eagerness to make the peace process succeed, however, requires that multilateral talks—which are not in the context of resolution 242—not begin except after gaining a substantial, concrete achievement in bilateral talks that confirms the removal of the major obstacles to peace. This is because Israel, as everyone knows, is not concerned with implementing resolutions 242 and 338 on the basis of land for peace, but is concerned only with engaging itself, along with the region's states, in negotiations on regional cooperation while continuing to consolidate its occupation of Arab territories. This contradicts the objective on whose basis this conference has been convened.

Mr. President: We have come for a just and honorable peace that rests on right and international legitimacy, not for a fake peace that reflects the conditions of the aggressor and the weight of the occupation. We have come for a real peace that includes all the fronts of the Arab-Israeli conflict, not for a peace that deals with one aspect of the conflict and creates new conflicts and tensions in the region. . . .

#### J. U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, 1 November 1991 (excerpts).

[Secretary Baker's address was made available by the U.S. Department of State.]

. . . Our work—making peace through negotiations—has just begun. As we look at the challenges ahead, it is worth noting and learning from what we have already accomplished.

- For decades, agreement on whether to negotiate eluded the parties. This

weekend, direct, bilateral negotiations aimed at comprehensive, genuine peace will start.

- For decades, agreement on what to negotiate eluded the parties. This weekend, negotiations should begin on the accepted basis of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338.
- For decades, agreement on how to negotiate eluded the parties. This weekend, negotiations will begin on two tracks and in phases; and in a few weeks, those parties who wish to participate will convene to organize multilateral negotiations on a wide range of issues that affect the well-being of all peoples in the region.

These are not mere platitudes. During these eight months of diplomacy, though the parties sometimes fell back on old slogans and outmoded code words, they also came to understand the need to engage concretely and pragmatically to resolve problems. I said often that the parties would probably stake out maximum positions, especially as they got closer to negotiations.

This is not surprising, especially in a public forum. The key, however, is to get beyond the rhetoric and into the direct negotiations.

A basic tenet of American thinking is that negotiations are the best way to resolve disputes and achieve peace. Negotiations do not guarantee peace. But without negotiations, there is no way to produce genuine peace and no mechanism to develop understandings that can endure.

The United States is willing to be a catalytic force, an energizing force, and a driving force in the negotiating process. Our involvement in this process will be rooted solidly in the core principles enunciated by President Bush last March. They will remain the cornerstone that guides our participation in the negotiating process.

The U.S. is and will be an honest broker. We have our own positions and views on the peace process, and we will not forego our right to state these. But, as an honest broker with experience—successful experience—in Middle East negotiations, we also know that our critical contribution will often be to exert quiet, behind-the-scenes influence and persuasion.

Let no one mistake our role as an honest broker to mean that we will change long-standing U.S. policy positions; and let no one mistake our policy positions as undercutting our determination to help the parties reach

fair and mutually acceptable solutions to problems. As President Bush and I have both said this week, it is not our policies that matter; it is those of the parties. They are the ones that must negotiate peace.

This week, the parties provided insight into their thinking about a negotiated settlement. They outlined three broad requirements in the search for peace:

- First, we heard a yearning for peace—the wish of peoples in the region to live in a mutually satisfying relationship with neighbors, a relationship characterized by peace treaties, economic relations, cultural ties, and political dialogue.
- Second, we heard an emphasis on land—the desire of peoples in the region to exercise authority and political governance over territory they consider part of their national, political, historical or religious patrimony.
- Third, we heard a need for security—the requirement of people to live free of fear, and the obligation of governments to do their best to protect their citizens.

What the parties in fact said this week is that these core issues—land, peace, and security—are inseparable elements in the search for a comprehensive settlement.

The parties have made clear that peace by itself is unachievable without a territorial solution and security; that a territorial solution by itself will not resolve the conflict without there also being peace and security; and that security by itself is impossible to achieve without a territorial solution and peace. The process on which we are embarked can work only if all issues are put on the table, and if all issues are satisfactorily resolved.

One key issue is the style of negotiations. Today, the Soviet Union and the United States are on the same side of the table—literally and figuratively—in striving for global peace and the resolution of regional conflicts. Today, and in the future, we will work together in pursuit of a Middle East settlement.

The United States, at the highest levels, will remain intimately engaged in this process. We expect to be available to the parties throughout this process. The United States and the Soviet Union are prepared to participate directly in the negotiations themselves, with the consent of all parties.

We will do our part. But we cannot do your part as well. The United States and the Soviet Union will provide encouragement, advice, recommendations, proposals, and views

to help the peace process. Sometimes, you will be satisfied with our views, sometimes frustrated. Sometimes, we will support your positions, and sometimes not. Sometimes we will act quietly and behind the scenes, and sometimes we will make known our views and positions in public. None of this, however, will relieve you—the parties—of the obligation of making peace. If you won't do it, we certainly can't. As I have said from the beginning of this effort, we cannot want peace more than you, the parties most directly affected by its absence.

Parties in this process cannot reasonably be expected to operate outside their political environment; but they should be expected to educate, shape, guide, and lead politics and opinion. Leaders in the region have taken difficult and courageous decisions to get to this conference and to negotiations. More difficult and more courageous decisions will be required to settle this conflict. . . .

This week, many have focused on the need for steps that would build confidence and trust. The United States continues to believe that confidence-building measures are important for the process and for the parties themselves.

I want to be perfectly honest, standing here as I am before colleagues with whom I have spent many, many hours since last March. The unwillingness of the parties to take confidence-building steps has been disappointing. You have dealt successfully with formulas and positions. You have agreed on terms of reference that are fair and equitable. You have launched a process of negotiations that can succeed. But you have failed to deal adequately with the human dimension of the conflict.

As I traveled through the region, I witnessed terrible scenes of human tragedy, suffering and despair. Innocent civilians caught in the crossfire of a conflict they wish would end. Refugees and displaced persons wandering across the vast expanses of time. Mothers and fathers, afraid of the future that awaits their children. And children, being schooled in the lessons of animosity and conflict, rather than friendship and accommodation.

Formulas, terms of reference and negotiations are not enough. Support for a negotiating process will not be sustainable unless the human dimension is addressed by all parties. A way must be found to send signals of peace and reconciliation that affect the peoples of the region. Don't wait for the other side to start; each of you needs to get off the mark quickly. You should know best what is

needed.

Through negotiations and through these and other steps, you can demonstrate respect for the rights of others. You can express understanding of the fears of others. You can touch the people—the women, men, and children—who are the victims of the Arab-Israeli conflict. We can only succeed at the table, if we find ways of reaching out to one another away from the table.

The challenges have been great, and the obstacles have been many, on the road to peace. Your decisions over these eight months of intensive diplomacy have created a new baseline of realism and commitment to peace. This conference has been vital in breaking down the barriers of communication, and in establishing for all to see that Arab and Israeli leaders can meet face to face.

In closing, let me speak to each of you personally and directly.

For over four decades, the world waited for this week. Peace-loving peoples everywhere tried time and again to get you—the makers of this intractable conflict—to join together to discuss your differences. This week, here in Madrid, you finally have met and held such a meeting.

This has been a start—a good start—an historic start that has broken old taboos—an important start that opens further opportunities.

But it is only a start—and that's not enough. You must not let this start become an end.

When you walk out these doors, you carry with you great responsibilities. You carry with you the responsibility to your peoples to seek peace. You carry with you the responsibility to the world to build a comprehensive and just peace. You carry with you the responsibility to yourselves to break with the past and pursue a new future.

For if you do not seize this historic opportunity, no one will blame anyone outside your region.

You now shoulder the destiny and challenge of making peace, as you enter direct negotiations with your neighbors. The continuation and success of this process is in your hands. The world still looks to each of you to make the choice for peace.

## VI. Closing Remarks in Madrid

### A. Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, 1 November 1991. [The speech was carried live in English over Jeru-

*salem Qol Yisra'el and reproduced in FBIS the same day.]*

Distinguished cochairs, ladies, and gentlemen: Let me first apologize as I have to leave this hall immediately after my statement, together with some of my colleagues, in order to return to Israel before sunset, in time for the advent of our holy day of rest. I trust no one will see in this a sign of disrespect.

Let me also express again our thanks and appreciation to our Spanish hosts and to the cosponsors for putting so much effort in making this conference possible.

For two days, we have sat in this hall, armed with a lot of patience, to listen to what our Arab neighbors have to say. We have heard much criticism and many charges. We can respond to each and every charge, to every misrepresentation of history and fact—and there were quite a few—and we can refute every contention. We, too, can cite morality, justice, and international legality in our favor. But is this what we have come here for? Such futile exchanges and rebuttals have been taking place for the last forty-three years at the United Nations and in countless international gatherings. They have not brought us one inch closer to mutual understanding and peace. This is precisely why we have persistently called for direct face-to-face talks. Nevertheless, we came here out of goodwill, hoping there might be change, a turn for the better in tone and content that would lead us to a new and more promising chapter, and we have not given up this hope.

Let me, therefore, make just a few remarks—not for the sake of polemics, but to shed light on a few facts. Syria's representative wants us and the world to believe that this country is a model of freedom and protection of human rights, including those of the Jews. Such a statement stretches incredulity to infinite proportions. The ancient Jewish community in Syria has been exposed to cruel expression, torture, and discrimination of the worst kind. Most of the Jews fled the country over the years, and the few thousands left are living in perpetual terror. Anyone who tries to cross the border is incarcerated in prison, beaten and tortured, and his family exposed to punishment and constant fear.

But not only are the Jews the victims of the Syrian regime. To this day, Syria is the home of a host of terrorist organizations that spread violence and death to all kinds of innocent targets, including civil aviation and women and children of many nations. I could go on and recite a litany of facts that demonstrate the extent to which Syria merits

the dubious honor of being one of the most oppressive, tyrannical regimes in the world, but this is not what we have come here for.

To the Lebanese people, our neighbors to the north, we send a message of sympathy and understanding. They are suffering under the yoke of Syrian occupation and oppression and are denied even the capacity to cry out in protest. We bear no ill will to the courageous and suffering Lebanese, and we join them in the hope that they will soon regain their independence and freedom. We have no designs on Lebanese territory, and in the context of a peace treaty and the removal of the Syrian presence, we can restore stability and security on the borders between our two countries.

In many respects, we have a situation of *de facto* nonbelligerency with the Kingdom of Jordan. We sincerely believe that a peace treaty with Jordan is achievable. In the context of such a treaty, we will determine together the secure and recognized boundaries and lay the foundation for a relationship of mutual cooperation and neighborly relations. Both countries stand to gain from a relationship of peace, and we hope to achieve it through direct, bilateral negotiations.

I listened attentively to the statement of the Palestinian Arab spokesman in the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation. The Palestinian Arabs are our closest neighbors and in many respects their lives are intertwined with ours. This is one more reason for the importance we attach to an accommodation with this community. The Palestinian Arab spokesman made a valiant effort at recounting the sufferings of his people. But let me say that listing history and perversion of facts will not earn them the sympathy which they strive to acquire. Was it not Palestinians who slaughtered a major part of the Jewish community of Hebron without any provocation? Was it not Palestinians who rejected every peace proposal since the beginning of the century and responded by violence? Was it not Palestinians who produced a leader who collaborated with the Nazis in the extermination of Jews during the Holocaust? Was it not the Palestinians who called their Arab brethren in 1948 to come and help them destroy the Jewish state? Was it not the Palestinians who rejoiced and danced on the roofs when Iraqi Scud missiles were falling on Tel Aviv? Have they forgotten that more Palestinians were killed by their own brethren in a few recent years than in clashes with Israeli security forces? Even to this very day, under conditions which you describe as occupation, is it not a fact that any Jew who strays into an Arab village risks his life, but tens of

thousands of Palestinian Arabs work freely in every town and village in Israel and no one molests them?

We have presented the Palestinians a fair proposal, one that offers them a chance to improve their lot immensely. I appeal to them to accept our proposal and join us in negotiations.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have come here to seek together the road that would lead us to peace and accommodation rather [than] to engage in a match of charges and counter-charges. Peace is not just words or a signature on a piece of paper. Peace is a frame of mind and a set of actions that are the opposite of hostility and create a climate of mutual trust, tolerance, and respect.

With an open heart, we call on the Arab leaders to take the courageous step and respond to our outstretched hand in peace. Yesterday I extended an invitation to come to Israel for the first round of peace negotiations and begin a sincere exchange that would lead to agreement. We hope you will accept our invitation. We will readily reciprocate. I am sure I speak for every man, woman and child in Israel who join me in the hope that, after all, this gathering will be registered in history as a turning point away from hostility, and forward to coexistence and peace. Thank you.

#### B. Head of the Palestinian Delegation, Haydar Abd al-Shafi, 1 November 1991.

[Dr. Abd al-Shafi's remarks, carried live in English over Amman Jordan Television, were reproduced in FBIS the same day.]

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. It is indeed regrettable and disheartening that Mr. Shamir didn't find anything worthy of response in our statement of yesterday except to deal what was there to present the hardships and difficulties that our people are living under occupation. Now, it seems to me very obvious that Mr. Shamir wants to draw us back into the situational polemics and recriminations for which we have decided not to subscribe any more. That Mr. Shamir has left the audience today on the pretext of the Sabbath, also in my opinion, is not warranted. I think our deliberations here are as important as any religious rite. Friday is a holy day for us, and we choose to stay in this audience, rather than to go for our religious rites.

Mr. Pankin, Mr. Baker, ladies and gentlemen: We wish first to congratulate the cosponsors for succeeding where so many have failed before. The fact of the conference itself convening is no negligible feat, but a tribute to

sheer persistence, tenacity, and hard work. For this we extend our appreciation.

For this historic conference to succeed, it requires—to borrow a literary phrase—a willing suspension of disbelief, the predisposition and ability to enter alien terrain where the signals and signposts are often unfamiliar and the topography uncharted. This solemn endeavor on which we are embarking here in Madrid demands of us a minimal level of sympathetic understanding in order to begin the process of engagement and communication. For this interdependent age demands the rapid evolution of a shared discourse that is capable of generating new and appropriate perceptions, on the basis of which forward-looking attitudes may be formed and accurate road maps drawn.

Failing this, time will not spare us and our peoples will hold us accountable. Thus, we have the task—rather, the duty—of rising above static and hard-set concepts of discarding teleological arguments and regressive ideology, and of abandoning rigid and constricting positions. Such attitudes barricade the speaker behind obdurate and defensive stances, while antagonizing or locking out the audience. Eliciting instant responses through provocation and antagonism would, admittedly, generate energy, but such energy can only be short-lived and, ultimately, destructive. Energy with direction—real momentum emerges from a responsible and responsive engagement between equals, using recognizable terms of reference regardless of the degree of disagreement.

In all honesty, we the Palestinian delegation came here to present you with a challenge, to lay our humanity before you and to recognize yours, to transcend the confines of the past, and to set the tone for a peace process within the framework of mutuality, expansiveness, and acknowledgement. We deliberately refused to limit the options before us to one, or to fall into the trap of reductive entrenchment with a rigid either-or argument.

Ladies and gentlemen, peace requires courage to make and perseverance to forge. In his opening speech, President Bush sent a strong message, not just to the participants, but to the world as a whole, a peace pledge with the dual signs of fairness and legitimacy as necessary components. We were gratified, for the Palestinian initiative is firmly grounded in these two principles. Most speeches which followed reaffirmed them and sought to demonstrate seriousness of intent. The Israeli statement, however, remains the exception, imprisoned in its own anachronistic and antagonistic rhetoric, incapable of re-

sponding to the tone and implications of the occasion. But the days of domination, of manipulative politics, are over. And the emergent realities of our contemporary world are consecrating the principles of moral politics and global harmony as the criteria and measures of value. We further find it incomprehensible how Israel can violate with impunity the integrity of the process and the consensus of the participants. UN Security Council Resolution 242 and the principle of territory for peace constitute the terms of reference and the source of legal authority for the conference and negotiations as stated in the letters of invitation. The positive response of the Palestinian people was primarily in recognition and appreciation of this commitment. The essence of 242, as formulated in its own preamble, is the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by war, thus containing within it an internal and binding definition which renders it incapable of being variously and subjectively interpreted or applied.

We came here to realize its implementation, not to indulge in exegesis or semantics, or to be party to its negation or extraction from the peace agenda. This is not only an Arab and Palestinian requirement; it is also a demand of the international community and a test of validation for the new era in global politics. The same terms articulated in 242 apply to East Jerusalem, which is not only occupied territory, but also a universal symbol and a repository of cultural creativity, spiritual enrichment, and religious tolerance. That today an apartheid-like pass system bars many Palestinians from entering our holy city is both painful and provocative. The gates of Jerusalem must be open. Palestinian Jerusalem is the vehicle of our self-definition and the affirmation of our uninterrupted existence on our land.

Ladies and gentlemen, the issue is land. And what is at stake here is the survival of the Palestinian people on what is left of our olive groves and orchards, our terraced hills and peaceful valleys, our ancestral homes, villages, and cities. International legitimacy demands the restoration of the illegally occupied Arab and Palestinian lands to their rightful owners. Israel must recognize the concept of limits—political, legal, moral, and territorial—and must decide to join the community of nations by accepting the terms of international law and the will of the international community.

No amount of circumlocution or self-deception can alter that fact. Security can never be obtained through the acquisition of other people's territory, and geography is not the

criterion for security. The opposite is actually true. Retaining or expanding occupied territory is one sure way of perpetuating hostility and resentment. We are offering the Israeli people a unique chance for genuine security through peace. Only by solving the real grievances and underlying causes of instability and conflict can genuine and long-standing stability and security be obtained.

We the people of Palestine hereby offer the Israelis an alternative path to peace and security: Abandon mutual fear and mistrust; approach us as equals, within a two-state solution; and let us work for the development and prosperity of our region based on mutual benefit and well-being. We have already wasted enough time, energy, and resources locked in this violent embrace of mutual destruction and defensiveness. We urge you to take this opportunity and rise to meet the challenge of peace.

Settlements on confiscated Palestinian land and the expropriation of our resources will surely sabotage the process launched by this conference, for they are major obstacles to peace. They constitute a flagrant violation of Palestinian rights and the Fourth Geneva Convention. All settlement activity and confiscation of Palestinian land must stop, for these measures constitute the institutionalized plunder of our people's heritage and future.

Palestinians are a people with legitimate national rights. We are not the inhabitants of territories, or an accident of history, or an obstacle to Israeli expansionist plans, or an abstract demographic problem. You may wish to close your eyes to this fact, but we are here in the sight of the world, before your very eyes. And we shall not be denied. In exile or under occupation, we are one people, united despite adversity, determined to exercise our right to self-determination and to establish an independent state, led by our own legitimate and acknowledged leadership. The question of all our refugees will be dealt with during the permanent-status negotiations under the terms of UN Resolution 194.

We have already declared our acceptance of transitional phases as part of this process, provided they had the logic of internal coherence and interconnection within a specified, limited time frame and without prejudging the permanent status.

During the transitional phase, Palestinians must have meaningful control over decisions affecting their lives and fate. During this phase, the immediate repatriation of the 1967 displaced persons and the reunion of separated families can be carried out.

We have also expressed the need for pro-

tection and third-party intervention in the course of bringing about a settlement under such conditions of disequilibrium between occupier and occupied. For peace as a state of civilizations between societies, real peace between peoples cannot precede the solution of the problems which are the core of the conflict. It is the solution which opens the door to peace and not the other way around.

On these grounds, we hereby publicly and solemnly call upon the cosponsors of the conference, directly or through the United Nations, to place the whole of the occupied Palestinian territories under their trusteeship, pending a final settlement. Palestinian people are willing to entrust you with the protection of their lives and lands, until a fair and legitimate peace is achieved. They are the same people, our Palestinian people, who have celebrated the occasion of this conference by offering olive branches to the Israeli occupation soldiers. Palestinian children were decorating army tanks with this symbol of peace. Our Palestinian people under occupation and in exile were here with us during the past three days, in our minds and hearts, and it is their voice that you have heard.

To the cosponsors and to the international community that seeks the achievement of a just peace in the Middle East, you have given us a fair hearing. You cared enough to listen, and for that we thank you. Thank you.

### C. Syrian Foreign Minister Faruk al-Sharaa, 1 November 1991 (excerpts).

[The following excerpts of the Syrian foreign minister's speech were published in the New York Times on 2 November 1991.]

. . . Distinguished co-chairmen, an important point which must be raised as long as the conference has its objective as peace: the head of the Israeli delegation, in his statement yesterday recognized that he will not return not one inch of land, particularly when he mentioned the surface area. He spoke of a surface area that surpasses the surface area of Palestine under mandate. That shows, indeed, that confirms and proves that he wishes to maintain occupation on the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, the Golan and Jerusalem. Who-ever wants to look at the facts will discover that truth.

The Arabs are the only people who have lived in Palestine for thousands of years, even when the Jews came from the south through Sinai, the Palestinians were there, in Palestine. And they have been there since.

Let's not get into that. But let me just wonder about one thing. The head of the Is-

raeli government, if he says that it is a Jew's right to return to Palestine following an absence of more than 2,000 years, how can it not be the right of a Palestinian, a Palestinian who left Palestine not 40 years ago?

I really had wanted to focus on peace for which we have come. Before that I shall just show you if I may a photograph, an old photography of Mr. Shamir at the age of thirty-two.

The information was widely distributed in Europe at the time. The caption says he is thirty-two years old, he is 165 centimeters tall. And then the other descriptions we all know. However, why was this picture distributed? It was distributed because he was wanted. He himself recognized that he was a terrorist. That he practices terrorism. And that he helped in the assassination of Count Bernadotte, the UN mediator in Palestine, as I recall, in 1948. He kills peace mediators. And then he talks of Syria, Lebanon, and terrorism.

Let me give you another example on this subject. Israel shot down in 1954 a Syrian; it kidnapped, hijacked a Syrian aircraft in 1954, a civilian aircraft.

He also says, no, he did not say that Israel occupied; he does not recognize occupation. He said that 1967, the war in '67 was a defensive war. The media tells us that the Arabs attacked Israel in 1967. They are really holding in contempt all historians, and history itself. Just the last word.

Regardless of who occupied who, regardless of who initiated the war in 1967, the resolution, distinguished cochairmen, is clear. It states, it provides that it is inadmissible to acquire the territory of others by war. Those territories must be returned.

Very briefly, in conclusion, distinguished cochairmen, we have come for peace, and we shall continue to work for peace proceeding from our faith in such a peace. We declare with determination and resolution that we shall work to achieve a comprehensive and just peace, which would liberate the land and guarantee the rights and securities of all. We shall find it very strange indeed where this Israeli side attempted to create pretexts to prevent the continuation of this process in Madrid. . . .

## VII. U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's Press Conference, Madrid, 3 November 1991 (excerpts).

[The text of the secretary of state's press conference was made available by the State Department's Office of the Assistant Secretary/Spokesman.]

. . . Let me begin by saying that the Madrid conference was a beginning. I think it was a good beginning. Today the parties have taken another critical step beginning direct bilateral negotiations between Israel and the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation, Israel and Lebanon, and Israel and Syria. There have been, and as I have said before, there will be obstacles in this process to be overcome, but they have not deterred us until now, and they do not, in my view, diminish the importance of what has happened this week.

Let me emphasize another point that I made in my address to the peace conference on Friday. The parties have not agreed on venue and, in fact, as you know, the major issue that we had to work over the weekend was where to hold the bilateral negotiations. This is still an open question, and it is one that will need to be resolved as the negotiations proceed. The United States and the Soviet Union expressed the hope that the parties themselves will continue to negotiate in order to reach an understanding. In the absence of agreement, we will work together with the parties. And we will make proposals as necessary.

The United States and the Soviet Union intend to maintain our position that bilateral negotiations should be face-to-face and take place separately between an Israeli delegation and each of the other delegations.

On behalf of the cosponsors I want all to know that the arrangements that have been so laboriously worked out for these initial bilateral meetings will not be considered precedential for future rounds of talks.

Amidst all of the procedural wrangling, it is important, I think, not to lose sight of the breakthrough represented by the start of direct bilateral negotiations. As I have stressed all along, direct negotiations are the only way in which real progress is going to be made, and the only way in which real progress—real peace—is ever going to be achieved.

I want to take special note of the steadfast commitment of the Jordanian-Palestinian delegation to beginning bilateral negotiations. And I want to express appreciation to all those who have gone the extra mile to make these opening meetings possible today, particularly the government of Israel.

From the initial reports I have received from the delegations themselves, I am especially pleased with the quality of the first negotiating session between the Israeli and joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegations. As they

told me, and as their public statement made clear, they surely intend to proceed in a serious and constructive fashion, and that gives us reason to believe that we really are entering a new phase in the Middle East. . . .

*Q:* If there's no solution to the venue problem, how long will the Syrians, or how long are the Syrians committed to remain in the process if they're committed at all? And secondly, apart from the fact that the Israelis and the Palestinians held historic first talks, what specifically did they accomplish that causes you to use the word "breakthrough?"

SECRETARY BAKER: First of all, let me say with respect to the question about any country staying in the process or not staying in the process, I think we ought to look at the actions of all of the countries so far. They have all entered the process, and many of them against the predictions of a lot of people that they would not enter the process. They have all entered the first two phases of the process. We of course have a third phase—the multilateral negotiations—and Syria has made clear its reservations about those multilateral negotiations. But I have no reason to think that any country is on the verge of pulling out of the process just because we have a continuing discussion or difference of opinion with respect to what the venue should be for the bilateral negotiations. I think if that was going to be the case, I think we might have seen it before now.

With respect to the second part of your question, I can only tell you that I had a personal briefing from the representatives of the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation, and from the representatives of the Israeli delegation who participated in those talks. They both used the same types of terms. In fact, the terms that they used in their public statements—constructive, forthcoming. Are there lots of questions and lots of differences? You bet. . . .

*Q:* Mr. Secretary, when you started this whole process, you talked about confidence-building measures, and I remember asking you a question about that in the King David. Now, we've come a long way. The Palestinians have made a lot of sacrifices as far as the delegation is concerned. The Palestinians in the occupied territories have changed their—instead of throwing stones, they're throwing olive branches. Now when will the Israelis stop building settlements, release the prisoners, and get the process—give the hope to the Palestinians?

SECRETARY BAKER: You know I said

night before last, I think, when I was here that the question of settlements and the question of a suspension of the intifada, these are all issues that should be put on the table in the negotiations.

We did have some discussions with the delegation members tonight about the importance of steps being taken that will permit the Palestinian delegation representatives to freely move in terms of carrying out their responsibilities as negotiators. I don't know whether that falls under the heading of confidence-building measures or not, but I have to tell you that I think a lot of what the Palestinian representatives had to say at the conference was well received in many places around the world.

I think that the talks between Israelis and Palestinians have really gotten off to a better start, frankly, than I would have expected, and I think that confidence-building measures ought to, at some point in the process, be put on the table and be negotiated. I think they will be.

*Q:* Mr. Secretary, what are the modalities and framework that you propose the system and negotiation for interim government agreement which was agreed among the Palestinians, the Jordanians and the Israelis? And, could you elaborate on this idea of self-government—interim self-government—for the Palestinians?

SECRETARY BAKER: I can't answer the first part of your question because we have not made specific suggestions and I don't know where you—if you have the idea that we have, I don't know where you have gotten that idea.

*Q:* (Inaudible)

SECRETARY BAKER: Well, let me say what the concept generally is, is that there should be for a transitional period, interim self-government arrangements for Palestinians. Those can take many, many different forms and variations. I should interject here that it's our hope, as it indicated in our notice of invitation, that we could conclude those negotiations within a year, we hope. We have, at least, begun the negotiations with the objective of trying to conclude them in one year. But, there are many, many things that Palestinians can and should do to govern themselves—that fall under the heading of interim self-government arrangements, transitional arrangements.

If you go back and look at the—some of the talks that followed Camp David, you will see many of the ideas suggested there. There

are a whole host of them and I won't run down the full list.

*Q:* Mr. Secretary, is it your understanding that the various Israeli delegations have accepted the principle of having a Bush administration representative on hand, on call, in case the talks should run—you know, should run into trouble? And, such a person would be consulted in the event of an impasse?

SECRETARY BAKER: I think you ought to direct that question to the Israeli government representative who, I understand, will be doing a briefing here later tonight. Let me tell you what the position of the United States has been and continues to be. We want to see—first we wanted to see a process develop. I think one has developed. I hope one has developed. Now, we want to see it move forward. We want to serve as a catalyst to produce that movement in any way that we can. If the best way for us to do that is to not be involved at all, that's what we want. If the best way for us and our cosponsor, the Soviet Union, to do that is to be in the room and intimately involved, then that's what we would like. However, the ground rules are that the parties will negotiate bilaterally without anybody else in the room unless the parties themselves invite others in the room. We have said we expect to—we and the Soviets—would expect to be the driving force behind this process and we would be available, if wanted.

*Q:* Thank you, Mr. Secretary, but I'm afraid I'm going to put my question in Arabic, if you don't mind. (No translation)

SECRETARY BAKER: I can't answer the last part of your question. I think that's directed more properly to the media in the West. Let me say, with respect to the intentions of the United States and my own intentions, we intend to stay fully engaged—as fully engaged as we can and for as long as we think that the parties are serious about peace. And, right now, we are convinced that the parties are serious. If they weren't, I don't think they would have come to Madrid, notwithstanding some suggestions to the contrary. And, if they weren't, I certainly don't think they would be sitting down together face-to-face, but my own view is we should

stay engaged, fully engaged for as long as the parties themselves are serious about peace.

*Q:* Mr. Secretary, following up a little bit on Saul's question, in July I think it was, when President Asad said yes to your three-layer proposal, that really broke the logjam and made all this possible. Yet, now in the last three or four days, not only were they dithering over the venue, but putting heavy, heavy pressure on the Palestinians and Jordanians not to go forward. One, do you feel President Asad broke his word to you, or at the very least stretched it? And, two, does it give you any doubts about the willingness of the Syrian government to follow through on this commitment?

SECRETARY BAKER: The answer to your question is that I absolutely do not think that President Asad, in any way or to any extent, broke any commitment.

I take note of the fact that Syrians and Israelis are sitting down face-to-face beginning at 10:20 Sunday night, which is four days after the opening of the conference. And, my view about the role of Syria in this process remains what I said in my speech to the conference, that I do believe their earlier commitment was very, very important and that until given some reason to think to the contrary, I believe, that when they tell us that this represents a historical change in their policy approach, we have no reason to disbelieve that.

They are at the table. They attended the conference and, yes, it was difficult to arrange all of this, and—but, let me go back to what I said a couple of nights ago, I think. Well, no I guess I said it today on the television program.

What looks to us, perhaps, like insignificant little issues of procedure or modalities, can be very, very large issues to the parties who are involving themselves in this process. And, I am not speaking now just about Syria. I am speaking about all of the parties. It took a great deal of courage, I think, for a lot of the parties to make the commitment to come to Madrid, to engage in bilateral negotiations and to engage, some of them, in multilateral negotiations.

Thank you very much.