University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

10-18-1973

Congressional Record S. 19300 - The Middle East Conflict

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Congressional Record S. 19300 - The Middle East Conflict" (1973). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 1128. https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/1128

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

THE MIDDLE EAST CONFLICT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Middle East, the conflict grows sharper, more devastating, more bloody. The Israells and the Arabs bear directly and immediately the heavy human burdens of war, but repercussions of the most serious kind are also beginning to spread beyond the battlegrounds.

First, all nations importing Mideast petroleum face a 17-percent increase in the price of crude and, on top of that, the Arab nations announced that they will cut production 5 percent at once and announced, in addition, a 5 percent reduction each month thereafter.

Second, the United States and U.S.S.R. are now engaged in the competitive resupply of weapons to the two sides in the war.

Third, the United States and the U.S.S.R. have stepped up the reinforcement of their respective fleets in the Mediteranean, a sea already seething with a surfeit of naval power.

Where is the end of this chain of interrelated development? Is it to be found in a "military solution" in the Middle East? How long will it take to run that course? A week? A month? A year? Not how many days. Mr. President, but how many generations. Even if a military solution were "just around the corner" and, apparently that is not the case, it is not a permissive course for any responsible government.

It is impermissible in terms of the future well being of Israel and the Arab countries. How many corpses must be counted on both sides before a military solution is achieved? How much destruction? Must Cairo be flattened and Tel Aviv? Damascus? Jerusalem? Has nothing at all been learned from the tragedy of Vietnam and others before it?

To await a military solution is also impermissible on economic grounds. What will happen to the ecomonies of the Arab countries when, 20 months from now, on their own announced schedule, the last drop of crude flows through the pipelines of the Mideast and the last well is capped or the price of petroleum is upped and upped until there are no more buyers? In the meantime, what will happen to the economies of the great importers of Arab oil—notably Western Europe and Japan?

Finally, the course of military solution is impermissible as an intolerable risk not only to the security but the survival of the Soviet Union and the United States which, together, hold a great share—perhaps too great a share—of responsibility for the entire world's destiny in this situation.

In these circumstances, I would call the attention of the Senate to a statement by French Foreign Minister Michel Jobert in the French National Assembly on yesterday. Mr. Jobert exhorted the United States and the Soviet Union to stop the resupply of arms to the Mideast and to seek to end the war "before it is too late and the consequences become intolerable." He pledged that France, with the support of the Common Market powers, would make contributions to finding a solution to the conflict.

The initiative of Foreign Minister Jobert comes at a most opportune time. I would urge the administration to give it every attention and I would again express the hope that both the Soviet Union and the United States would seek, in addition to that of France, the immediate diplomatic cooperation of Western Germany, the United Kingdom, and Japan in finding an acceptable cease-fire and negotiations among the parties.

The economic stake of these nations in a restoration of peace is no less than our own. So, too, is their stake along with that of all other nations in human survival.

Mr. President, I repeat the remarks which I made on Tuesday last relative to the Mideast situation:

Mr. President, I have given some thought to the situation which has been developing in the Middle East. It becomes more dangerous by the day, it spreads far beyond the area of the Middle East itself. At the present time, it seems that it stretches from the Atlantic coast clear across the Magreb and the rest of northern Africa, over into Syria, Jordan, Iraq, possibly Saudi Arabia, and the Lord or Allah only knows where it is going to end. It is a most serious situation in that area, which we cannot avoid paying attention to.

With that in mind, Mr. President, I would like to state to the Senate some of my feelings on this subject as they were put down this morning.

First, my feeling is that we should operate on a policy that tries to achieve a balance of sorts in the Middle East.

Second, insofar as the shipment of United States arms is concerned, it must be said that Secretary Kissinger first tried to find a diplomatic solution based on no arms shipments to either side. Finding that impossible because of continuing and increased Soviet shipments to Syria and Egypt, on Sunday last, 9 days after the war started, he—Secretary Kissinger—announced that the United States would replenish the losses of Israel in certain categories. This was done, in my opinion, to achieve a semblance of an arms balance in the area.

Third, I do not believe that we should become involved with American forces anywhere except as our national interest and security are at a vital stake. One Vietnam is one Vietnam too many.

Fourth, the United States and the Soviet Union, the two major outside powers, obviously have been unable to prevent the conflict or to bring about its termination. In view of the increasingly dangerous situation which has been developing, therefore, I would suggest that the President of the United States issue an urgent invitation to Chairman Brezhnev of the U.S.S.R., President Pompidou of France, Prime Minister Heath of the United Kingdom, Chancellor Willy Brandt of West Germany, and Brime Minister Tanaka of Japan for an immediate summit conference for the purpose of bringing about a cease fire and using their collective efforts toward the Middle East to have the parties enter

into negotiations as expeditiously as possible.

Fifth, if a summit cannot be accomplished expeditiously, then I would suggest as an alternative that the Foreign Ministers of the countries mentioned convene in conference at a mutually convenient place and as rapidly as possible. The time, Mr. President, is short.

Mobile Mous, the empiries acress stratters, more that distance more backets. The laresult and the Araba bitst directly and transmission the depression of the anoth entromy hard are also begin that a second beyond the backberningen.

Thes all radiant laterating Mideast paintheast tage a tV-perpent increase in the price of words and, on her of task the Arab national atternation that they will out production is proceed at mice will out production is proceed at mice reduction were month them.

Bound, the Philad Sharos and U.S.B.W. are now exampled in the connectative rasupply of weapons to the two rides in the year.

Third, the Cathed states and the U.S.R.R. have alstand up the webtonce matrix of East respective theats in the Modificances, a set already teodilary with a scatted of mered powers.

Where is the end of this chain of hiinvestigates the should call this th to be between the a "military solution" in the bildine there? However, song will be have be that contrast? However, a monthin? A year's how how many generations liver if a military how more generations liver if a military addition wave "ford account his contrast". In and, again only that is not the ones. If is and, again only that is not the ones. If is not a promitently that is not the ones. If is not a promitently that is not the ones. If is not a promitently that is not the ones. If is

It is unique mitablic in terms of the fubore woll being of larger and the free countries. Now mean depend rout he counted on bolk offer isfore a guillary wohalten is activeword How and Tel along Managers Jerenheim is a prostor. Namagers Jerenheim is a postlage all been learned from the frequer of Wildram and others before 12

To awalk a minitary totation is the injurralisability an economic grounds, What will imagen to the componies of the same constries when, 30 membra from the state outstries when, 30 membra from the picelines of the Minerak and the last will is cooped on the prior al relattion to opped and upon dufili there are instributed in a press and press and the press in append in the meanitude of in great will imprive and Arab all-autable Westing theory and Jagond

Finite and the second of a submitted and the interval of the second s

In States direction and the set of the defension of a statement attraction of the Backstein Mindeel Johern by Francis Progles Minister Mindeel Johern (1) the Prophy Valuena, Assessmin on pretender, and Jake Stovies Union to shop the statics and the Stovies Union is also the security of antra he [36 Mideals and inde and the contemporter Mathema he in inde and the contemporter because in-

Mr. Frendenk, T. rozenk för remnenn valab T. staris och Phresider Last relastrig to the Midwart selandard

Not rescalents I have given sent deviations to use situation without man been deviationed in the Mildele Shall II between the bernead the sent of the Mildele Kall for bernead the same of the Mildele Kall and Albert for a sent of the Shall in the sent Albert over into Sevie, for the sent over the Mildele over the Sevie, for the Source over Albert over into Sevie, for the Source and II is a most archae signation in 1000 and II is a most archae signation in 1000

With that in mind, Mr. Fredderst, I. scale like to state to the drashe some of any isolings on this subject as they are put down this morelage.

North my farting is that use allowing obviate on a policy that uses to schulow a balance of some in the Mildita Last

Becond, insolar as the interret, of United Station prize is concerned, it much be acid that Berretary Xineinger Met in a state thereasy to estimate the on no areas anternantic besides of ordeninger, and Expert, on Station 100deninger, announced for the Station of Nation and Expert, on Station 100deninger, announced the Station of the Station result replaced the Station of the Station result replaced the Station of the station and states and the Station of the Station and Station of the Station of the Station result replaced the Station of the station and the replaced the Station of the station and the station of the Station of the station and the station of the Station of the station and the station of the Station of the station of the station of the stations of the station of the station of the stations of the station of the station of the stations of the station of the station of the stations of the station of the station of the station of the stations of the station of the

White, I do not britere the we double bookness (angined with Anorizon (speen anywhite dates) as new rathered interest and acquaity are at a visit date. Une

Neuroffs the Follow finites and the action workers are action to a second to the first second of the following the second of the following the second of the first second first second the first second first second