Wilson Center | Digital Archive
International History Declassified
digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org

August 30, 1971

Meeting between Soviet academic and envoy to Israel, Yevgeni Primakov and Israeli Prime Minister, Golda Meir, 30 August 1971

Citation:

"Meeting between Soviet academic and envoy to Israel, Yevgeni Primakov and Israeli Prime Minister, Golda Meir, 30 August 1971", August 30, 1971, Wilson Center Digital Archive, Israeli State Archives (ISA), File A-7055\11. Obtained for CWIHP by Guy Laron. https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114295

Summary:

Primakov came to hear a concrete offer from Golda on how to push the peace process forward. The Prime Minister was unwilling to go into specifics. Primakov informed Golda that as far as the Soviet Union was concerned there was a linkage between Israeli concessions and immigration of Jews from the Soviet Union. According to Primakov, as long as the Arab-Israeli conflict remained unsettled, the Soviet Union could not be seen as acting against the interests of its Arab allies by allowing unrestricted Jewish immigration from the Soviet Union to Israel.

Credits:

This document was made possible with support from Leon Levy Foundation

Original Language:

English

Contents:

Original Scan

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

Meeting between

Mrs. Golda Meir and Guest
August 30, 1971

Present:

Mrs. Meir
Mr. Herzog
Mr. Dinitz

Guest ELIEZER
Mr. [redacted] (interpreter)

. . . . .

MRS. MEIR: So you saw us from the other side? Do we look better from the other side or from inside?

GUEST: Excuse me for my English.

MRS. MEIR: Your English is very good. My Russian is worse.

GUEST: In Moscow some people think that you speak Russian quite well.

MRS. MEIR: This is one of the legends. The fact is that I heard a lot of Russian in my life. I have an older sister and she was in the revolutionary movement in Russia in 1904, 1905, 1906, an when we came to the United States, in the city that we came to we found quite a few people, also Russian revolutionaries, and they had no homes. They were all single men, so our home - father, mother and sister - became a center for the refugee Russians. The Russian language was not entirely foreign to me. I understand a bit but I can't speak, but when I was in Mosoow my daughter and son-in-law went with me as code operators. My son-in-law is a Yemenite. They both learned Russian. Mr. Ben Gurion used to say that this is the only Yemenite in the world that knows Russian. They stayed about two years. I only stayed a year and some months.

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

GUEST: Russian is a very difficult language.

MRS. MEIR: So is Hebrew. When I was in Helsinki at the Social International, I found out that Finnish is even worse than Hebrew. They say it is an almost impossible language. But Russian is a very beautiful language. You'd be surprised how many people there are in Israel that know Russian; Russian literature, and some of my very close friends who have been here 30 years, 40, years, 50 years, when they hear Russian literature, Russian poetry, Russian songs, they immediately light up.

GUEST: Before our plane landed here, we listened to Russian songs on the El Al plane.

MRS. MEIR: I think of all of the kinds of people who came here from 70=80 countries in the world, maybe those that remained very much involved in the culture of the country from which they came, maybe those that came from Russia are number one. Once I had a talk in New York at the UN with Foreign Minister Gromyko and I told him, I was brought up in the United States; I know American literature, poetry and so on, but I don't have any such instictive sentiments to it. On the other hand, I have friends; they hear a Russian song, they just melt. It is something that is all together different. Just a year ago, a very close friend of ours died; he was our Minister of Education, Aranne. When he'd hear a Russian song, he'd melt away.

GUEST: Maybe these generations are nearest to the Russian culture because our intelligentia is of Jewish origin.

MRS. MEIR: Well, I want to tell you that I am glad you are here

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

GUEST: Thank you very much. If you will permit me, I will speak Russian.

. . . . Your proposal to establish contact was attentively studied and my. . . . . It is possible to have a contact on a permanent basis if there is such a wish on your side. I myself, or maybe somebody else, can come here from time to time and then there will be a possibility to exchange information and also viewpoints on the situation. Our leadership supports your proposal in connection with the situation which has developed in the Middle East. It will be no secret on my part if I will tell you that we are not very satisfied with the developments. We are not satisfied ? because of several considerations and several momentous considerations.

First of all, it became clear now that it seems there is no ? bridge between the Israeli position and the Arab position at this moment. I don't take upon myself to clarify the ihterpretation of Israel's position. It is not in the scope of my visit and I can't do it.

If this situation as it is now will develop it may, in our view, become dangerous. Mrs. Meir knows probably better than I know the situation, that the situation of neither war nor peace fosters the development of extremist elements. And Mrs. Prime Minister certainly knows, no less than I, that the Soviet Union has made efforts to move the Arabs from their position. If there are no constructive steps in response from the other side, it might, of course, lead to a situation where the extremeist elements in the

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

Arab States might get the upperhand. Some of the Arab leaders told us in all frankness that they see no other way than to go to war, although they know this will mean many victims on their part, but they are prepared to sacrifice. They have even mentioned a kind of a balance, that the Egyptian population is 12 times larger than the Israeli population. They can lose 10 Egyptians when Israel loses one, and it might still be of positive value. The Soviet Union would not like that such a situation should develop. We have here many considerations including our own national efforts.

I can tell you frankly that we have no wish to be ~~involved~~ drawn directly in such a conflict. In these conditions it seems that an exchange of views is imperative. Our view is that a settlement should be achieved which will be lasting and will take into consideration the interests of both sides.

In our view, I must say, the Resolution of the Security Council is being viewed more as in favor of Israel than of the Arabs. I see that you are astonished, so I will explain. I understood yesterday from the Foreign Minister that our position is beir understood as if we work only for one thing and this is the withdrawal of forces, and thus we are regarded as being one-sided. Thi is not so. We are for action on the basis of the Security Council Resolution.

The position of Israel is to have secure borders and to have security on its borders is quite understood by all of us, and therefore in taking into consideration this position and taking also into consideration the legitimate position on the other side.

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

as, for instance, on territorial matters, there is room for an exchange of views on concrete points.

The Foreign Minister yesterday stressed the necessity of direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab countries. This is a problem which may be discussed but, of course, the Soviet Union is unable to decide for the Arabs. We think that there is a necessity for an exchange of views between Israel and the Soviet Union and not only between Israel and the Arabs. If we speak about a lasting settlement, it is clear that without the Soviet Union as well as without the United States, it is difficult to imagine a settlement.

I would like to say immediately that if these contacts will continue, there is no intention on our side to harm in any measure your relations with the United States, because it is clear that you have very close relations with the United States and that this is the result of your national interest. At the same time, the situation which has evolved now is such, and it is my understanding that the Israelis understand it, that it is impossible to avoid the Soviet Union in this situation.

I would like some preliminary remark: first of all, I am very grateful to Mrs. Prime Minister for having received me and giving me the opportunity to tell. .

MRS. MEIR: I want to tell you for the necessary background our talk that my father was a carpenter and not a diplomat. And I am not a carpenter, but my father not being a diplomat, that I hav inherited. I didn't inherit his ability to be a carpenter. This say because I want the understanding between us that I will speak

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

very frankly, and with no desire to say things that can be interpreted in one way or another - directly and frankly. When I was in Helsinki I thought that maybe this is an opportunity to have a messa conveyed to your leaders that we feel that the situation that has be established, created, where we do not talk - when people talk to each other, whether it is in private or on the basis of internation relations, it does not necessarily mean that they agree. At any rate, the condition for a dialogue is not that I will speak to you on the condition that you will agree with me. But the very fact that there is a dialogue is important, and I believe, all my people believe, that the situation as it is between the Soviet Union and us is not natural and, if I may say, not constructive. The very fact that we cannot meet and we cannot talk. We read your opinions and policies, and the policies of your government as far as the Middle East is concerned, in the papers, the radio. We hear speech in the UN and the same holds true for you as far as our position an our ideas are concerned. I mean, we are talking to each other through some media which does not always mean that this media alway brings people closer together. Very often it is the opposite and there was no direct contact where we may disagree, where we may have to argue. There may even be bitter arguments, but at least they are face to face. Because we have an interest in this part of the world and it is a vital interest to our being, just as vital as the Soviet people consider their land to be vital to their being. We may have interests in other places in the world, but our interest whether to be or not to be is whether we are here or not.

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

But we understand, the Soviet Union for reasons of its own have interests in this part of the world and in other parts of the world. It is perfectly all right as far as we are concerned, but we have to talk about it and we have to see: is there a clash of interests or isn't there? Can the Soviet Union, with its interests, whatever they may be and that's none of our business, whatever the interests of the Soviet Union may be in this area, is it essential that it follows the policy that we believe it is following of one hundred percent support to our neighbors and no support to us?

I want to say, and I want you to accept it, no matter what has happened, over and over again, my predecessors, Mr. Ben Gurion, Mr. Sharett, Eshkol, I, when at times we felt very much hurt by the attitude of the Soviet Union, we said, we will never forget the attitude of the Soviet Union during the Second World War and its position in the UN of 1946 and 1947. I am sure that you know the background of our people. Our people has lived for thousands of years and has never forgotten anything, the good and the bad. We remember both. And since our people cannot say that throughout our history we were pampered, the instances throughout our history when other people have understood and have helped us, every one of these instances is underlined several times so that we should not forget and the attitude of the Soviet Union at that time -- I don't know if there are many speeches about the Jewish people and its right to exist and its right for sovereignty, whether there were many speeches in which the expression was so clear as the expression

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

of your representative in the UN after the holocaust, after Hitlerism, after Naziism, after what has happened to our people, and we felt: this is the expression of a people that understands our tragendy and understands our aspirations that we must be in a position in which it will never happen again.

Maybe because of that it even hurt us more the attitude that has been adopted by the Soviet Union in the last few years. I don't think that any people can really understand exactly what the interes of another people are. At any rate, we do not understand why the Soviet Union has come to the conclusion that to safeguard its interests, whatever they may be in this part of the world, it is necessary to take that stand that it has taken.

I will try to tell you some ? . In the first place, I want you to accept and convey that to your government, to your leaders: we are interested in an on-going dialogue between you and Otherwise, I wouldn't have approached the Foreign Minister in Finland. I did not believe - I am not so naive to think that if we were instrumental in arranging a meeting, that in one conversation or one meeting we decide the issue. I am glad that you came. I hope that we will have more meetings with you. I even dare hope - and don't hold it against me - that maybe we can meet level to level with some of your leaders; if it is necessary in secret. We have no reason for secrecy, but if you have we will honor that. And so there should be no doubt in that case. And I want you. whatever the outcome of your present visit is or maybe even more talks that we will have in the future on different level. there is one thing - maybe two, three things - that I want to try to explain and have you

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

take it back to your leaders.

One, there is nothing in the world that is more important to us, that is more vital to us, that is more sincere than the desire of peace by the Israeli people. I want to tell you absolutely: I don't know of one Jew in Israel that wants war. We have differences of opinion about the final peace agreement. There are many parties in this country. I remember one of your ambassadors, the one before the last one, Khodorof, who had a very good sense of humor and we had good friendly relations. He used to say to me: too much democracy in your country. Some times we suffer because of too much democracy, but this is our system. So there are differences of opinion, but there is no difference of opinion, there is no party - I don't know of one single individual that wants war and doesn't want peace. When you say that the Arab extremists figure things out: we can afford to lose one; they can afford to lose many, I want to tell you that there is nothing that shocks us more than the mathematics in the question of human lives. To us - that's true - every single one is a tragedy. That's true. But from that we draw the conclusion that for the life of every one in this country, we are prepared to do everything. We want peace, but we cannot compromise with the possibility of being or not being. That one thing that is absolute. After all that has happened: we have come back here; we have done some work in the country. We have never known peace, real peace we have never had. We want peace. We believe that we will have peace when our neighbors will stop using mathemati

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

in the question of human lives.

When there was the war of attrition, Nasser onces said, Israel can't win, because he said, a people that every morning in the papers carries the photographs and the names of the men that fell the day before, people like that can't win, and I felt if I could only sit with him and explain the terrible mistake that he is making. Our strength is in this fact. Our strength lies in the fact that every single mother that lost her son or a young women that lost her husband and remained with little orphans, when they see that it is not only their loss but it becomes the tragedy of the entire people, from that comes our strength, and that he doesn't understand. He thought if you don't tell about the casualties that's strength and they leave each family with its own sorrow and tragedy. That is the fatal mistake that our neighbors make.

So we want peace.

Number two: everything that anybody says anywhere about our desire for territorial expansion, that we want territory, is pure nonsense. Either people say it because they don't know or they know better and they say something that they know isn't true. Recent history proves it. The UN decided on boundaries in 1947. We accepted. The Arabs attacked us and there was the armistice lines of 1948. We lived with these armistice lines. We didn't have peace. I don't know whether there were six consecutive months I'm not sure - between 1948 and 1967 in which there was absolute quiet.

Wilson Center Digital Archive
Original Scan

I would very much ask you to at least see one place. I don't care even if it is from the air; preferably from the land. See the Golan Heights. The Syrians were on the hill with their guns there; UN Observers were there. Our kibbutzim - you know what a kibbutz is - down below and we didn't realize until after the 67 war that you didn't even need field glasses to see what is happening. You just stand there and you see every single house. You see every child that is running there in the yard, and I have been to the kibbutzim after the shelling, in 1967, when every single house was hit, not once, over and over again. So we didn't have peace.

But we need territory? We have great ambitions. We still have a lot of territory in the Negev that is sand, and we have many rocks. We have enought to do forever and forever. And we can brir in millions of Jews here without taking one inch of territory from any Arab State. I want you to accept that: it has nothing to do with territorial expansion, but we have learned a lesson and that i we must have borders which we can defend. Not somebody else. We. the borders must be sufficient that when any Arab leader decides that he wants to attack us again, he should look at the borders and say, maybe I shouldn't. For example again, the Golan Heights. If the Syrians again are up on the top and we are down below, that's easy, but if we are on the hill, we won't attack the Syrians. Never. But I believe that they also won't attack us. The borders that we think are necessary to us as secure are the best guarantees also for peace in the area. Because we believe that any Arab leader who

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

is in his right mind and who cares a little bit about how many casualties he will have, when the border will not look easy to him to cross, he will think again and he won't do it.

These are two things: peace, no consideration for territoria expansion, but naturally if we speak about borders, and that they cannot be the same as they were before, you don't draw borders in the air. Therefore, there must be changes also on the ground, but only for the purpose of security and not for territory.

And the third thing which we cannot compromise on is Jews. This country makes no sense whatsoever if the people here don't feel that the state has been created and exists and thousands of our young men have given their lives throughout the years for the purpose that every Jew that must or wants to come here should come We have a very, very bitter spot in our hearts about our British friends. We feel that many more Jews could have been saved during the holocaust if the British had not put numbers of how many may co in and how many are illegal and are sent back, but that's past history.

When people ask me, why didn't we agree to the '47 borders, I don't know whether you ever saw the map of 1947, with corridors, internationalized Jerusalem. To Jews Jerusalem means something. I had one answer: when the UN decided on partition, on the '47 borders we had 300,000 Jews in camps. Three years after the war: Germany, Italy, Cyprus , and I said we wanted only one thing: the key to the Haifa port, that it shouldn't be in the hands of the British or in the

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

hands of anybody else. In our hands. That's all we wanted. These are the three things that we want. We want to live here. We want to live in peace. We want to have borders that are defendable. We want the Jews to come; any Jew that wants to. We don't force any Jew to come.

I don't know whether it can serve any purpose if we should go into a discussion, although this is something that we don't understand. Personally, I am bothered less by disagreement than by by my not understanding. I don't understand why there is the difference of assessment what happened in 1967. We can stand befor any tribunal and prove that we did not cause the war, but here it was. And immediately after the war we said, we want to negotiate with our neighbors secure borders and agreed. We didn't draw a map and say to Nasser or to the Syrians or to King Hussein, here i the map, sign. We don't respect the moral principle that the attacked and the attacker are both right or both wrong. There is a difference between the attacker and the attacked. We don't respect the moral principle which, by the way, is not the truth, the inadmissibility of the conqeust of territory by force. I accept it when one nation attacks another nation in order to conquer territory. Was that true for Poland under the Oder Neisse border. No? Israel way back in 1961, we notified the Polish government tha we supported that the Order Neisse border should be the final border. I applauded Willy Brandt that he had the courage as the lea of his people and he was not a Nazi, but the people did to Poland

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

what they did - and he went and signed that this is the border. Thi happened over and over again and rightly so . In the same way as I would never think that the Sudeten Germans should go back to Czechoslovakia. It is ridiculous. They were the source of the tragedy for Czechoslovakia and Czechoslovakia has a right to live. We don't ask for ourselves anything that other people before us haven't done the same thing and which we think was right for other people and right for us.

So when you say you cannot speak for the Arabs, whether they want to sit with us or not, that I understand. What is surprising is why, maybe you do; I don't know, but in public, why the Soviet Union doesn't encourage the Arabs to enter negotiations. After all, you have interests in this area. Maybe Americans have interest in this area. That's also not our busines The people that live here forever. My colleagues told me that last night you said, the eternal existence of Israel. We will be here ar the Arabs will be here. We are the people. We are the neighbors here. We must never meet? We must never talk to each other? Is the only place where we should meet on the battlefield and after the war is over, or before the war, we never meet? We did meet in 1949 on the island of Rhodes and we signed armistice agreements together.

You said that there can be no settlement in this area without the Soviet Union and with the United States. But I say this in all frankness - not instead of the Israelis and the Arabs. The Israelis

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

and the Arabs. They are the vital factors in this area. The United States has interests; the Soviet Union has interests. As far as we are concerned, it is legitimate.

One more thing I would like you to take back to your leaders never have we joined anybody against the Soviet Union, and I can assure you that Israel's policy will never be that. God forbid we should ever be at war with the Soviet Union. Otherwise, any intere that the Soviet Union has in this area, as far as we are concerned, it is legitimate. The United States has interests. The United States has interests in Saudi Arabia and in the oil companies. The oil companies are our worst enemies. I consider them worse than the Arabs. The Arabs are at least here. They may think they don't like us here. What do the oil companies have against us? Only money and for money they are prepared to shed our blood. But we dictate to the Americans what their interest should be here?

but one of the basic elements in Israeli foreign policy from the very beginning is not to join pacts of somebody against somebody. Never. The United States - we are on very good terms with the United States for various reasons. They were together with the Soviet Union in 1947. They helped a lot. They have six million Jews in the United States. They are free. They can help us. You go through the country; it is full of tourists. But the United States knows very, very well they cannot dictate policy to us, and more than once we have had differences of opinion with the United States. We have differences of opinion now on certain aspects.

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

The only difference between our relations with the United States and our relations to the Soviet Union is that with all the differences of opinion that we had with the United States throughout the years, we always talked to them. They always talked to us. The line was never broken. To our sorrow this is not the case with the Soviet Union.

May I tell you that when I was recalled from Moscow to enter the Cabinet here, after our first Parliamentary elections - Mr. Vishinsky was Foreign Minister - I came to say, goodbye. I had come here for a few weeks. I was sworn in as a member of the government. The Parliament then passed a bill which allowed the government to accept a $100 million loan from the US Import Export Bank, and I went back to Moscow to say goodbye and to settle my affairs. I went to see Mr. Vishinsky and to say goodbye and I said, Mr. Vishinsky, I come from Israel now. This bill was passed in the Knesseth, our Parliament. We received a loan for $100 million from the export-import bank for imports, not in cash, agricultural equipment, many other things, extremely important to us. I want to tell you that there is not one single article in that agreement which has any political character. I even said to him, there is one article which is very unpleasant and that is that we have to repay the loan, but besides that, there is nothing.

But I said, we don't want to be dependent only on the United States, and I want to ask something of you. I said, since the State of Israel we have been buying many things in the Soviet Union, much more than the British administration ever did but we cannot pay in cash. We want you to establish a credit for us, not

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

because we can't get it from the United States. We don't want to get it only in the United States. I had the impression that he was sympathetic. He wrote it down, but of course it never happened. This I only tell you to show you that from the beginning we wanted relations, certainly with the Soviet Union.

You point out that there are extremists among the Arabs and there may be more. After what I said, I don't have to tell you that that is not what we want. But why should there be more? Why? Because we don't accept the dictate of the Arabs? I don't want to argue with you that the 242 Resolution is in favor of Israel or not. We have accepted it. The Arabs have accepted it. All right. On the basis of this resolution, let us meet, consult, debate and come to an agreement. And you know very well the resolution does not say that we have to withdraw from all territories, period. First of all, it doesn't say"all territories and in the second place, you yourself say there are many things there. Well, let us sit down and discuss. We and the Arabs. Every point. We did that in 1949 and we came to an agreement. Let's do it again.

But I want to say this: we don't want war. We don't think there is a reason for war. If the Arab leaders have acquiesced to our being here I don't know whether you understand me I am not asking them to love us. I am not asking them to dance in the streets that there is a Jewish state, but if they acquiesce to the reality that we are here and they cannot throw us out, that's all, and that they want to live in peace with us. If they accept these principles, there is no reason why there shouldn't be a peac

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

agreement between us. It may take a long time, but it has taken now four years without their talking to us. It doesn't have to take so long when they talk to us.

But if they will declare war, we will fight for our lives and we will fight as you fought. Maybe military experts would have said to you people, Stalingrad, never; you can't win. Hitler is almost in Moscow. You can't win. Look what happened in Leningrad. Military experts told us in 1948, you are crazy. You are 650,000 people here. You haven't one tank. You don't have one single plane. You have a few rifles. You can't win against six armies. But there are things when a people fight for its existence, there something else in addition to planes and tanks and everything else We will fight for our very lives because this is the only thing we have, and we will do it under any condition. And any plane that stands in our way, we will do our best to bring it down. In 1949, during the war, the British forgot that they already left the country; they forgot that they are not in control of this country and some of their planes came over and we knocked them down. Bevin You think we liked it? No. We don't want to knock down an Arab plane or any other plane. We don't want war. We don't want to kill. We don't want our boys to be killed. We want to live. We have a right to live. And we believe there is no need for war and w believe that peace is possible.

If we would be so fortunate that the Soviet Union would say to itself and to our Arab neighbors, look people, we are convinced that Israel wants peace with you. Israel has a right to live in

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

security. We recommend to you - you can't force them - we recommend to you, meet the Israelis in peace negotiations. We acceptes Sadat's proposal for a special Suez Canal agreement because we felt that would help to carry out peace negotiations in a more relaxed atmosphere. He would begin rebuilding his cities. There would be shipping in the Suez. We would step back a bit from the line. That would help. But he has other ideas. All this in view of trying to gain peace and I aee no clash between these two principles: one, there is nothing that we want more than peace. and, two, if attacked we will use all the power and strength that we will have and we will respond. Maybe we are the only people in the world that cannot afford to lose a war. The only ones. Becau if we lose the war we won't be here any more. Other people lose a war, they remain and they can win some other time. If we lose a wa it will be the last time. That we can't afford. If we have do - believe me, I want you to believe me this, even if you don't agree with one word I say, this you must believe, otherwise there is no s in discussing this: we want peace more than anything else in the world, but we want peace that we should live with it.

Sorry for a long speech.

GUEST: All that the Prime Minister said about the eagerness for peace is definitely true because there is no people in the world which wants war. In spite of that, situations may be created or are created from time to time when war is inevitable. I am very much against supporting any mathematics. But at the same time. let's try and understand some of the motives which exist also on the other side. The other side has lost territory. land. The question

a

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

of the redetermination of the lost land becomes very sharp. This question gets also an internal political character. After the Six Day War I was in Tunisia and I have spent several years in Arab countries, and while then in Tunisia I met an American millionaire of Jewish origin who built villas on one of the picturesque islands.

MRS. MEIR: I just wonder why he couldn't find a place in America.

GUEST: Because maybe of profit. He invited me to lunch and he spoke about Israel. He said, we need 15 or 20 years and then everybody will forget about the previous lines and will accept the new border.

MRS. MEIR:AN American Jew in Tunisia?

GUEST: I absolutely do not identify his point of view with the point of view of the Israeli leadership. I only want to point out that there is such an opinion that if 15 or 20 years will pass the question will disappear. On the Arab side, it seems to me it i not so.

MRS. MEIR: On the Arab side?

GUEST: It is not so that they will accept in 15 or 20 years if 15 or 20 years will lapse -

MRS. MEIR: You didn't hear that from Israel either.

GUEST: I am speaking only about one opinion. The territori question for them has an extraordinary importance. If Hussein entered into such a struggle with the Palestinian movement, he cann acquiesce in giving up territory without the danger of losing his

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

throne. The territorial question is extraordinarily sharp, and we have to recognize that it is so in the eyes of the Arabs, and it fosters a tendency to see for any solution of the question. I explained how we see things, and Mrs. Prime Minister pointed out that in an exchange of views, it is not necessary that people should have the same opinion. There are motivations which are based on what they regard their legitimate stand and which foster certain tendencies. I think an attempt should be made to reconcile both approaches; the approach that there should not be a passing of territory and, on the other hand, the question of security. I would not like to dwell on concrete questions, but talking about the Golan Heights, it is possible, of course, to say that to be several meters high, this is a guarantee for security of the whole state, but it is also possible not to think like that. Because Israel won the Six Day War mainly by hitting the air bases of the Arab countries, as it also happened in 1956. Therefore, it seems that the strategic importance of being at a certain height is not so great. On the other hand, it provokes many difficulties. Mrs. Prime Minister said, why don't you encourage to enter into negotiation? It is difficult to encourage them to enter into negotiations when this means to give up territory. But as far as the negotiations, we understand that the Arabs do not completely negate any negotiations. Anwar Sadat made a statement, a much publicized statement, that they are prepared to sign a peace agreement. He is ready to sign. This statement of his was very well received. I agree with Mrs. Prime Minister that the Arabs

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

before took a completely negative attitude which was an obstacle. Now I do not think that they take the same attitude. I do not speak about public statements because you can find them on both sides, public statements for propaganda purposes. I speak about their attitude as it seems to me exists in reality.

The question of the Oder Neisse and the Sudeten German which the Prime Minister touched upon are very important ones but I don't think there is a full analogy. I will tell you why. You know that Germany destoryed the whole of Poland and a great part of Europe and Soviet Russia, and Germany was very near of achieving its aim of destroying completely Poland. You can say that threats of this kind were expressed on the part of the Arabs, but thank God these threats were never realized and they were realized by the Germans. There is no full analogy because Poland ? after it had liberated these territories from German hands. Here the situation seems to be the opposite. Israel is at the moment occupying foreign territory. I wouldn't like you now to suspect that I make any analogy between the Israeli ? and the Nazis. I would like only to point out the absence of an analogy, because we would like to stress that the territorial question has for the Ar an extraordinary significance and importance.

In regard to a lasting settlement, of course Israel can strive to keep the territories and to maintain the status quo, as it is now. I do not dwell on the motives which might be behind that. I just mention such a possibility. But it seems to me that in the long run in such a case, a clash between Israel and the Arab neighbors is unavoidable.

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

MRS. MEIR: Excuse me, I want to understand, when did Israel speak of keeping all the territories?

GUEST: It is not the question of all the territories. Yesterday, for example, your Minister of Foreign Affairs told me that he would like to remain in some territories which are of great meaning from the point of view of security. He named not all of Sinai. He spoke of the Golan Heights. He spoke about Jerusalem, speaking of the motives not only of security, and he spoke of Sharm el-Sheikh. It means that you fixed all the ones before the negotiation.

MRS. MEIR: Our position - that's our idea. We never said that before we sit down at the table Sadat must say yes. But may I ask you a question: how did the Old City of Jerusalem become Jordanian?

GUEST: You see, I can ask questions too: how many years Jerusalem has become part of the Israeli territory, because it wasn't -

MRS. MEIR: I can answer that. The city of Jerusalem was decided at the UN as internationalized. We accepted.

GUEST: But not now?

MRS. MEIR: We accepted in 1947. What happened in 1948? We attacked Jordan? Or Jordan attacked Jerusalem? Things didn't happen from heaven. The entire city of Jerusalem was decided in 1947 as internationalized. We accepted it. The Arabs didn't. And in 1948 the Arab Legion, the Jordanian army, with British officers, with the head of the Jordanian army, Glubb, attacked Jerusalem, all of Jerusalem. We were weak. All we could do was to defend part of

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

Jerusalem. Where were all of the nations that decided it? What does it mean that Jerusalem is internationalized? What does it mean? It belongs to all the nations? But when the Jordanian army attacked, where were all the nations? Nobody came to help. Not one. And Abdullah took the Old City. Why was he allowed to keep it? Did he conquer territory? He conquered not only Israeli territory. He conquered territory of the entire world. He was allowed to keep it.

But I don't know whether you know the story of June 5, 1967, June 5, 1967, Mr. Eshkol sent a message through General Bull to Hussein. Hussen himself wrote about it afterwards, and in this message he said, if you don't come into the war, nothing will happen to you, and when Mr. Eshkol wrote this message, Egypt and Syria didn't have an airforce any more. Why did Hussein attack after that? The shells were falling all day Monday, right around the Parliament. I was there in the Parliament on the 5th of June, where the shelling were falling all around our building. Why?

GUEST: It is possible to bring up various examples. For instance, in 1956, the Tri-partite attack on Egypt, as an example.

MRS. MEIR: But what happened before that. The main point is: where does history begin? Does history begin on the day of June 5, 1967 or on the 15th of May 1967? And the same thing in 1956, with Fedayeen, with the Sinai and the Gaza Strip as their base, came in as far as Jaffa and Lydda and killed Jewish workers when they were working in the orange groves and they threw bombs in Jewish schools and Jewish children were killed. This went on for years.

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

What would you do if you were in our place?

GUEST: We don't like to elaborate on history because it is possible to make various example of many things. There can be various interpretations. For instance, in 1949 the occupation of Elath. The march on Elath headed by (General Dayan - it was) Yigal Allon, which took place after the Armistice. There are many examples I would not like to elaborate on.

MRS. MEIR: Who started the war in 1948? I have the best witness, which is Mr.Gromyko's speech in the Security Council. wher he said that Article 7 should be imposed not on Israel but on the Arab countries that are attacking Israel. I didn't say that. Gromyko said that.

GUEST: I can bring an example of 24 hours before the 5th of June when there was a stormy debate in the bunker of Cairo, in the presence of Nasser with the General Staff of the Egyptian army And severl people proposed then to give a blow, to attack Israel, and Nasser completely opposed it. And this cost him afterwards a clash with military circles, especially the group in ~~the army~~ of AMER.

MRS. MEIR: Maybe - I wasn't there.

GUEST: He brought several arguments to motivate this step, and one of the most important arguments he brought up was that the Soviet Union will never support us if we start that. It is possibl to bring up a lot of facts and interpretations, which I would not like to do. I would like only to stress one aspect

MRS. MEIR: May I just ask you. In 1957 at the UN I was in the UN -- in the statement that I made, it said that two things

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

I didn't decide it. The powers decided that with Mr. Hammarskjold and it was accepted by Israel, that the Observers, the UN Emergency Force in Sharm el-Sheikh remains there until the situation becomes normal. That in the Gaza Strip, Egyptians will not return to the Gaza Strip. The UN Emergency Force will be there. The Egyptians immediately returned to the Gaza Strip, but why did Nasser drive out the UN Observers from Sharm el-Sheikh when in that statement I said, and it was not opposed, that if our shipping will be interfered with in the Straits of Tiran Israel will look upon that as an attack on its territory and will act in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter. Because when he drove out the Yugoslavs and the Indians and the Canadians from Sharm el-Sheikh, he made a statement now Israel must go to war. But I can give you records. I don't know what Nasser said in the bunker. I wasn't there. But I can give you records of what he said in the Sinai before the war. They were not declarations of peace. We never understood why did Nasser on the 15th of May, for no reason whatsoever, nobody can show us a provocation on the Israel side, why did he begin to send his army across the Canal into the Sinai desert. What happened?

GUEST: I do not justify him at all. I think he was motivated by nationalist Arabs and his image in the Arab world.

MRS. MEIR: But that's our lives.

GUEST: But I personally do not think that he wanted to attack Israel. I may be mistaken, because I am sure that Mrs. Meir has information.

MRS. MEIR: Look, if you make a mistake in whether Nasser

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

did want to attack us or not to attack us, that's more or less theoretical. If we had made a mistake then, you wouldn't have to sit here to talk to me. I just wouldn't be here any more - none of us would be here any more. We waited from the 15th of May until the 4th of June. Mr. Eban went to London; he went to Paris; he went to Washington. What did he go for? He didn't ask for armies. We never asked for one single soldier from anywhere. There was never a foreign pilot in Israel, thank God; there never will be. We won't ask them to come and help us; at any rate, not against the Arabs. What did he go for? He went to all these places asking them to prevent the war. He went to U-Thant; he went to the Security Council. Why didn't the Security Council act between the 15th of May and the 4th of June? Why didn't U Thank send some body to this area? Why didn't he come? But with the first batch of Egyptian soldiers Nasser brought into the Sinai, we went to war We saw the Sinai desert being filled up with men and tanks and planes. We found them afterwards in the Sinai. Why? That's the big question. You know, we have a Jewish joke. A man says, this man wanted to hit me. The other says, how do you know? He says, becau he did.

We waited. You will never understand, nobody will ever unde stand, who wasn't here, what the atmosphere in the country was. There was no panic, nothing of the kind, but everybody went about convinced that the clock is drawing closer and closer to the zero hour. Nobody like your peOple should understand that. You have had it all. There was an agreement with the Germans. You had all that

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

But the difference is the might of the Soviet Union, and who are we? And it was drawing closer and closer and closer. It is like a snake that is growing in the yard, that comes up to the door. Maybe it won't bite, but what do you do when a snake, a dangerous snake, is coming closer and closer? You speculate whether it will sting you or not sting you? For weeks this pepple, listening to all the speeches - I can give you a number of these records with my compliments. I understand ; you know a bit of Arabic, maybe a lot. If you promise that you will put them on your phonograph when you come back to Moscow, I will give you these records.

MR. HERZOG: On the order of the day -

MRS. MEIR: The little innocent king - we have an order of the day. There is a little village near Jerusalem, on the hill. We found afterwards the order of the day. It wasn't an order that they capture the village: kill every man, woman and child. This was the order of the day. We have it. And this would have happened. I want you to understand how we lived those weeks. We knew this would be the order of the day for every many, woman and child - Jewish in this country, to be killed. Theonly place we could run to was in the sea. This was supposed to be our fate, and what do we do? You speak about the Golan Heights. It is not important because our airplanes can attack. Our boys went up with tanks, crawled up the Golan Heights, fought man to man. It cost a lot. You people know better than anybody else the price you pay for winning a war, and we paid a price. There are families in Israel where three

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

generations fell - the father, the son and the grandson in 1967. This has been our life. Why did we go up the Golan Heights? To take territory? The Syrians were up there and our men went up with the tanks like this, and during the day. What was it? A picnic? We sent our planes and boom everything was over? The men that were killed and the men that are without legs and the men without arms and the men that are paralized from here down, they are men: they want to live and they have a right to live. Sons of people, of men and women, who have numbers from the Nazi concentration camp. I know a family in my neighborhood in Tel Aviv, near my home. One son they managed to bring here and he fell in the battle.

GUEST: We are very sensitive to this attitude. Therefore it might be even more important now to prevent the r ? of the situation as it is now.

MRS. MEIR: Excuse me, just a minute, what do you mean by "what the situation is now"? May I read to you you will say this a public statement, but since Sadat doesn't want to sit with us I can only read his public statements, and he said this to his people and that is more important. This was on the 9th of January 1971. "There is no contradiction whatsoever between us and the Palestinian movement. We give the Palestinian movement our total support." What the Palestinian movement asks is the end of the Zionist Movement beca the Zionist movement is based on the creation of the Jewish state and not on a state where there would be Jews, Moslems and Christians. If the Israelis accept the ideas put forward by the Palestinian movement, this would mean that they renounce the Zionist ideology.

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

Never mind Zionist ideology. They have to renounce being a Jewish State. "We hope that the Israelis will finally come to reason and accept to live in peace with the Palestinians who are the owners of the country." Thank you very much. Now our ideal should be to b a Jewish minority in an Arab state. There are Jews who came here from the United States because they didn't want to be a Jewish minority in the United States, or in Poland, or in Paris. This is what we came here for? To become second rate citizens in an Arab state? This is peace, with Israel?

GUEST: This is a public statement and the Soviet Union has never supported this idea, as you know. Never supported any

MRS. MEIR: Thank God we were never at war with the Soviet Union. Therefore we don't have to make peace with the Soviet Union, but the war and peace is a question between us and the Arabs and we can't close our eyes, but we don't say to Sadat, President Sadat, since you make these statements we have nothing to talk to you about. No. We say, okay, we have heard this, now let's sit down and talk.

GUEST: If we dwell on public statements, then we also have to quote statements on your part which are not accepted on the other side?

MRS. MEIR: To destroy Egypt, to destroy Jordan, to destroy Syria?

GUEST: No, I don't say that there were statements of this kind, because there weren't. I say, for instance, the statement that you are the government of the occupied territories.

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

MRS. MEIR: No, not even that. Our position is that as long as we are in these territories, we have to act as though we were the government. For what? We are responsible for work, for employment, for health, for education, because they have no other government. We are the government and as long as there is no other government, that means there is no peace settlement, we have to act as though we were the government. We have to take care of their needs, which is proper. We shouldn't take care of the people?

GUEST: . . . . . statement that Israel is (not) a member of NATO so that it can take part in fighting the Soviet Union. . .

MRS. MEIR: Nobody has ever made a statement in this countr to fight the Soviet Union, to help fight the Soviet Union. Never. But I want to say something to you again, very strongly. What do we see in this area? Only the Arabs? That would be bad enough. W see the Arabs with 500 percent political support by the Soviet Union. But that doesn't end there. We see military support. We see a constant flow of arms. We see planes. We see Russian pilots We see thousands of Russians in there as instructors, advisors. pilots. This is what we see. I said in public, in the Parliament and in other places: I don't believe that the Soviet Union wants war. I don't believe that the Soviet Union, that the leaders of the Soviet Union have ever taken a decision to destroy the State of Israel. But the Soviet Union has given arms to Arab countries when the Arab countries say not the Soviet Union says the Arab countries say they want to destroy Israel. Because what we found i Sinai desert is Soviet arms, Soviet planes, Soviet tanks, Soviet

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

guns. The shells by which and the guns and bullets by which our boys were killed in the Six Day War were Soviet. Again, I said it over and over again, I do not believe that the Soviet leadership decided to destroy Israel, but it gave arms to the Arab countries and is giving arms to the Arab countries where the Arab countries say they want to destroy Israel.

GUEST: Mrs. Prime Minister knows that although we have given arms to Arab countries we have done everything to influence them to change their position. They came now to a position which is not wholly negative, where they even declared that they are ready to sig a peace treaty. It is obvious that the Soviet Union played a part in that. I would like you to take this also into consideration.

MRS MEIR: We do. When I said that the Soviet Union doesn't want war, it doesn't men that the Soviet Union will declare war. What I meant was that the Soviet Union doesn't want that the Arabs should declare war. But, for instance, you said it once or twice that Sadat said he wants to make peace with Israel. Yes. on condition. He said if Israel commits itself to withdraw from all territories and to restore the rights of the Palestinian people, I will be prepared to make peace and then, not only Egyptian territory, then he went on to say that the UAR believes that a just and lasting peace can be only if Israel will draw back from all Arab territory. not through negotiations. This he gives us as a ultimatum. If we will accept this, then he will sign peace with us.

GUEST: This is probably a basis for a possibility

MRS. MEIR: Good - excellent.

Wilson Center Digital Archive

Original Scan

GUEST: It is not an ultimatum.

MRS. MEIR: So what did we say? We said to Dr. Jarring, all right, this is the Egyptian position. Our position is different. Now let us go on with negotiations. But Sadat makes a statement, I don't care what the Israelis say. I am not interested. I want to know what the United States says. The Unit States should force Israel to accept this, and I said, we are very good friends with the United States; we value that friendship very much. We don't take orders from the United States and the U.S. government knows that

GUEST: There have been statements by Mr. Eban after the Six Day War that the only motive is to sign peace with the Arab countries.

MRS. MEIR: Today too. How do you sign a peace treaty?

GUEST: If this is the case then there is some basis for rapprochement, because the Arabs have abandoned their former position. Mrs. Golda Meir knows they went very far away.

MRS. MEIR: It is very difficult for us to be in the position, to hear, we are going further and further, the Arabs, and we don't get anything in response- they haven't made one step. When Sadat said to Jarring that he is prepared to enter into a peace agreement with Israel, the Israel government made a statement very important: we appreciate, but then now let us sit down and discuss what are the terms or do we have to accept the terms before hand, with no negotations? Have we the right? Supposing you think that our position is wrong, that is your opinion, but have we a right to have a position? So we have a position. Sadat has

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

a position which I think is wrong. It is perfectly all right. We don't say, oh no, you must change your position. No. Fine. We have our position; he has his position. Now let's sit down and negotiate. He doesn't want to negotiate even through Dr. Jarring. Let me give you an example. It doesn't make any difference peace or war doesn't depend on that, but it is a sign. We consented. not direct negotiations. First we thought direct we still think direct negotiations are the only way, but all right. We gave in. We went through Dr. Jarring. Dr. Jarring gives us a paper, a position of the Egyptian government. Okay. Then, we answer, and we write on our paper, "The observations of the Israel Government to the Governm of the U AR" on their paper of this and this date through Dr. Jarring. Dr. Jarring says to our Ambassador in the UN, you know that Ambassador A-Zayat refused to accept that paper. He had to cut off this heading. Why? Because it said the Israeli goverment presents its comments to the UAR government through Dr. Jarring. But, look, it means they don't want to talk to us even through Dr. Jarring. They don't want to negotiate. But look, try us out. Okay. We make no conditions whatsoever but we won't accept conditions. We have our ideas. He has his ideas. It is perfectly all right. Now, let us sit down and negotiate and not to tell us every month when he will begin shooting. What is the situation now? 90 days cease fire another 90 days cease fire, 30 days cease fire and after that. Sadat says no more cease fire. I will begin shooting when I want to or when I am ready. We are very happy that he hasn't started yet, but may start tonight, maybe tomorrow. We don't want to negotiate under

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

threats of shooting. And we don't ask for any conditions and we will not give any conditions. He has a right to put on the table everything he wants and we have the same right and then we negotiate.

GUEST: I would like to tell about the arguments which the Arab side has which seems to me are important to know. The Egyptian side considers that when Dr. Jarring came, they answered positively to all the questions. They agreed completely with everything which he put to them as a basis for negotiation.

MRS. MEIR: That isn't true, but it doesn't matter. Because on shipping and some others, that isn't true, but it doesn't matter.

GUEST: They have given us information about and it says there explicitly

MRS. MEIR: According to the Constantinople Convention of 1888 -- they have been saying it all the years when they didn't allow us shipping. And, for instance, in Tiran, they said this should be decided by the International Court. We will give you the paper, but the main thing is that at the end he says, on condition that Israel commits itself to leave all territories. That was the end.

GUEST: Again the territorial question. It must be reconciled.

MRS. MEIR: Should that be decided beforehand or should that be decided in negotiations? You said before that there is a differen between Poland and Germany and us and Egypt. Why? Because Hitler occupied Polish territory? And Nasser brought in his army in 196[illegible] (in order) not to cross the border. The Sinai was his. He did not succeed. He did not succeed in doing it. Do you suggest that we should have waited in Tel Aviv until he comes to Tel Aviv?

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

GUEST: It is very difficult to talk about that because there are different approaches. The question is, is it possible to reconcile this territorial principle, on the one hand, and the security of Israel, even on the long series of conditions which should assure this security? Is it possible to reconcile? This is the practical consideration.

MRS. MEIR: What does it mean, is it possible to assure?

GUEST: What I had in mind is guarantees, is a concretization of the question of guarantees, demilitarization of territories, introduction of UN troops on a new basis and this kind of thing.

MRS. MEIR: And this means peace with our neighbors?

GUEST: But peace doesn't also mean the maintenance of the status quo.

MRS. MEIR: Of course not.

GUEST: Therefore, it is necessary that some approach should be found. I agree with you that permanent negotiations with permanent contacts at a certain stage are necessary, but it is necessary to prepare such negotiations. If there is a possibility of such a preparation, then maybe our contacts can be useful. On this level. The position of Israel is clear. Also by the declarations given by you as well as .

I would like to stress again that your striving for your existence and for security and for a secure life is absolutely well understood and natural. Absolutely natural. The question is whether in this framework there is room for elasticity or there isn't. This

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

is the crux. Or is your position that it is only one way, direct negotiations and nothing else?

MRS. MEIR: We went to Dr. Jarring for negotiations.

GUEST: We support the renewal of Dr. Jarring's activity. And the deadlock of his activity was that he sent a memorandum to both sides and only one side answered.

MRS. MEIR: Because? These are not negotiations. Dr. Jarring sent this document five weeks after he started, four weeks after he started, and he told us to sign, to sign on conditions. Are these negotiations? After that we answered and we said, this is our position; now let's negotiate. We can't accept dictates from the beginning. I want to tell you something else -- two things. We want security. But we don't want to be dependent for our security on outsiders. We want to be exactly like every other people in the world, big peoples, small peoples. We want borders that we can defend if we are attacked, but we want something else. We don't want to live forever with a separation between us and our neighbors. We believe that if we sign peace agreements with our neighbors, we want to begin a new life with them. Peace does not mean only signing a piece of paper. Peace means that there will be intercourse between our neighbors and us. They come to us. We will come to them. There will be development projects in this entire area. Do we all the time want to live in a life where around us are UN soldiers and everything that you have mentioned: guarantees, UN, demilitarized zones -- everything we had. There isn't one new thing. But on principle, we don't want to be a protectorate, not of big powers

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

not of small powers, not of the UN. We gained our independence. We are an independent country. We don't want somebody to protect us. We want peace with our neighbors. Of all the countries of the world - how many are there - 129 countries in the UN - why should we be the only country that is protected by foreign powers? Why? Why can't there be just a simple peace between us and our neighbors?

GUEST: It is a question of the peace agreement ? I am very grateful to you for elucidating your position, which is now much clearer to me.

MRS. MEIR: For instance, on the 26th of February, we wrote to Dr. Jarring, and among other things, "The withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from the UAR cease fire line to secure, recognized and agreed boundaries to be established in the peace agreement." Israel will not withdraw to the pre-June 5th line. That is our position and we ended by saying, "The UAR and Israel should enter into a peace agreement with each other to be expressed in a binding treaty in accordance with normal international law and precedent and take undertakings. The government of Israel believes that now that the UAR has through Ambassador Jarring expressed its willingness to enter into a peace agreement with Israel and both parties have presented their basic pos ition - not ultimatums they should now pursue the negotiations in a detailed and concrete manner without prior conditions so as to cover all the points listed in their respective documents with a view to concluding a peace agreement."

Tell me, what is wrong with this?

GUEST: There is an eternal contradiction in your document.

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

On the one hand, you say you will not withdraw to the previous line. On the other hand, you say you go to negotiations without prior conditions.

MRS. MEIR: This is our position, but we don't say to Sadat, you must accept this. He can come. He can say, we should pull out of all of Sinai, 90 percent. All right. That's his position. This is our position. Now let's sit down and negotiate. It would be ridiculous and we wouldn't be telling the truth if we say we will come to the negotiating table, that we have no ideas whatever. Sure we have our position. He has his. But we don't ask him to accept it beforehand. It is not a condition. It is a position. We have nothing against that, that that is his position and this is our position. Now let's negotiate.

GUEST: I would like for the sake of reporting to Moscow to clarify whether I have understood rightly that your position is that you see no other way out of the situation which has been created than negotiations which should lead to the agreement.

MRS. MEIR: We don't say now direct negotiations from the beginning, although at some time there must be direct negotiations. But under Jarring? Under Jarring. We would prefer direct negotiations. But we want a negotiated peace agreement, not something that is forced upon us, not by Egypt alone and not by the big powers or small powers. It doesn't make any difference. It must be a free negotiated agreement and we make no conditions. We have positions. We make no conditions and we don't accept conditions from any other side. Their position can be whatever they want.

Wilson Center Digital Archive
Original Scan

GUEST: Another question: The Arab side has greatly modified its stand. They now accept the existence of the State of Israel and accept the boundaries not of 1948, but of those which were in existence until the Six Day War. They accept de facto, in fact, all the obligations which the resolution of the Security Council talks about.

MRS. MEIR: No they don't, because 242 resolution does not say all territories and they say all territories.

GUEST: The obligations of the resolution imposed on their side. I have in mind the questions regarding free shipping and so on.

MRS. MEIR: They don't accept that. But that's not important, because we will negotiate. I just want to make this point clear. All the years that they didn't allow our ships to go through the Suez Canal, they said, in accordance with the 1888 convention of Constantinople. The Tiran Straits, we have to go to the Hague. They say it now too. But that's not important, but these should be points of negotiation. This is really a factual thing. They didn't give in. They say now, in the letter they wrote to Dr. Jarring, they say exactly the same thing. Suez Canal according to the 1888 Convention; through the Tiran Straits, according to the International Court. This is what they said all the years, and the result was that no shipping of Israel ships and no cargo for Israel went through the Suez Canal and the Straiqts of Tiran were closed to us.

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

GUEST: These questions can be clarified.

MRS. MEIR: Certainly. That's what I said, in negotiation.

GUEST: That can be clarified preliminarily. I would like to come back to my question. This is exactly what I asked: is it possible to make constructive steps on the Israeli side at this moment or is the only answer negotiations?

MRS. MEIR: For instance, I don't quite understand, sometimes it makes me a bit angry - not today - but I don't quite understand, when you think it is a concession when the Arabs say they are not going to destroy us. I mean, they signed a charter. When they entered the UN; we all signed the charter. The charter said, live in peace with member states; no declarations of war, and many other nice things. So that's fine for everybody else. Supposing China will now be admitted to the UN; they accept the charter. Supposing West Germany, East Germany, will come into the UN. They are obligated by the charter. The only country against whom the charter has no force is against Israel. So if the Arabs will say, after they lost three wars, they say, we now recognize that Israel has a right to exist. I don't need that they should tell me that we have a right to exist. Egypt has the right to exist; Israel has the right to exist. It is exactly the same right; exactly the same right. I don't need a declaration of any right to live from Sadat or from Assaf or from Hussein. What we need is that we should live in peace. This is what we need. In order to live in peace, we have to come to a peace agreement, a negotiated peace agreement; not something dictated to us by the outside.

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

GUEST The question is if there is a rapproachment of the various position, things can be done before the negotiations. In such a case there is a movement on both sides, but if there is no possibility of a clarification before negotiations, then the question doesn't stand.

MRS. MEIR: But that isn't so. Because when we agreed to go to negotiations under Dr. Jarring, this was the procedure.

MR. HERZOG: This was a great concession on our part.

MRS. MEIR: This was our concession when we said, all right, not immediately direct negotiations; through Jarring and we said withdrawal. We never said that we see no other borders; that the cease fire lines are our final borders. We always said that the borders will be somewhere between the cease fire line and the 67 border. That has to be negotiated.

I want to say one more thing before closing. This too I want you to please convey to your leaders. We are very, very much appreciative of the number of Jews that were allowed to come in in the last two, two and one-half years. We would like to see this as a sign that every Jew that wants to come should be allowed to come. I want to tell you one thing. I have received many letters from Soviet Jews who lwant to come here. Over and over and over again in these letters they say, we have nothing against the Soviet Union. We are not running away from the Soviet Union. We want to be re united with our families. We want to be reunited with our people. We want to live in a Jewish State. We want to live with our culture. Never one word against the Soviet Union. You don't have enemies that

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

are leaving the Soviet Union and maybe you don't appreciate the goodwill here and among Jews all over the world, if Jews, those that want, actually will be allowed to come here. Every time that the radio announces that Soviet Jews have come in, believe me there is one more element of goodwill. Maybe it doesn't matter: you are a big country and Israel is a little, tiny country. But I want to say that in Israel and when we see Jewish reaction all over the world, millions of Jews are happy that the Soviet Union has allowed Jews to come. Please take this back and in closing, you don't have in Israel an enemy of the Soviet Union. We may have ideological differences - that's true. But there has been from the very beginni and I was lucky to be the first Israel diplomatic representative in Moscow. I came with a lot of goodwill. I found a lot of goodwill in Moscow at that time and that is what we would like to be our relationship, with difference of opinion, with different ideologies. I understand the policy of the Soviet Union is the same as ours. Every people has the right to live in the kind of regime they want for themselves, but that shouldn't be the barrier between countries. You have here a country with a lot of goodwill to the Soviet Union and with a sincere desire to have friendly relations between us. Even when there are differences of opinion.

GUEST: I thank you for these words and I will convey every thing you said. In connection with the right to leave the Soviet Union, I would like to point out that in this half-year four times more people have left the Soviet Union in comparison with the whole last years. This half year was four times more than the whole last year.

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

MRS. MEIR: Last month not so good.

GUEST: You are possibly the most experienced people in the world in questions of immigration -

MRS. MEIR: Also on the question of refugees.

GUEST: Refugees - not only ons these questions but many others. But you see, it is a very difficult problem, because some people are connected with defense work, and also the procedural part of the leaving takes some time some times. I wouldn't like to argue about it at all, but I know that in Israel that people who are of the age of military service, they are not allowed to leave. I al know that people who came to Israelwith the help of Jewish money, Jewish appeal, if they want to go away from Israel, they have to return what they got.

MRS. MEIR: For instance, if somebody comes here and we give him a house, we don't want him to sell the house and take the money with him.

GUEST: I only wanted to point out that there are many aspects. In general this problem. I only would like to point out again the figure I gave you before and I don't think it will change.

MRS. MEIR: I said I appreciate it. We all do. There are a few cases; sometimes it is bureaucracy. There is bureaucracy in Israel. Maybe there is a little in the Soviet Union. For instance some of the families that came in the last six months. some members came and some didn't: some were not allowed. There are cases. The papers write about it. A girl who is tubercular who is in prison, her family is here. But the main thing is that we appreciate in the

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

last six months what happend and if you say that it will go on, this is a good tiding, because we are worried. The last month, it has dropped, maybe because of the summer vacations.

GUEST: No, not vacations. I don't know exactly. But I was informed before my leaving. I talked to some responsible man because I knew thatyou would ask this, and I was assured that it will continue. But in replying, you see, about one thing, about the anti-Soviet propaganda raised by some radio stations from here It is not worth it.

MRS. MEIR: From Kol Zion La'gola?

GUEST: The Voice of Israel in Russian, about the situation of Jews in the Soviet Union. It doesn't work. Really. Because it doesn't work, not for our relations and not for this situation of Jews in Soviet Union.

MRS. MEIR: When I say, no, I can't say that I have listened to Russian Kol Zion La'gola. I think my friend Mr. Eliav does. But about the policy. We have nothing to do with Soviet politics. What this broadcast is is to tell in Russian, not only to Jews, but to everybody, news about Israel, Israel's development and so on. and it is true to Jews, but not against the Soviet Union.

GUEST: If it is something about the situation in Israel, it is all right, but if you are speaking and you are telling your listeners about the situation of the Soviet Jews, it is quite different. It is quite a different thing.

MRS. MEIR: The only thing is really, of the three million

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

Jews - some say 2 million - none of us is such a fool to think that three or four million Jews will get up. I don't know how many there are. But I remember that Premier Kosygin several years ago in Paris had a press conference, December 1966, and he said at the press conference, anyone that wants to go will be able to go. That's all we want. And this last six months, you are perfectly right. we thought, oh, this is it, but some people were not allowed to come and families are broken up, and what we are worried is that this last monht, it is not good. But if you tell me

(without interpreter)

GUEST: I don't think so. I think that it is not a pre condition for something, but it is linked with the political solution too, because if there will be a political solution. many of these things -

MRS. MEIR: Don't connect.

GUEST: I am not connecting.

MRS. MEIR: Look, Soviet Jews do not make Israel policy.

GUEST: This link, these two questions from this point of view - it is my point of view - they are linked because of the situation here. We have our allies and we have our relations with them too and sometimes we were accused that with the immigration we strengthen the confrontation with them. In realityh it is linked.

MRS. MEIR: It shouldn't be linked. It shouldn't be linked because for the policy of Israel. the Israeli government and the Israeli people are responsible. The Jews in America are not responsible: the Jews in the Soviet Union are not responsible. The may sympathize with us. But they are not responsible for the policy

Wilson Center Digital Archive Original Scan

And Jews that want to come here, I don't think they want to come here because of the policy. They want to come here because they hav relatives here. They want to live in a country that is Jewish. like every Russian wants to live in his country because it is Russian, or Ukranians because it is Ukraine. It is the most natura instict.

GUEST:A Anyhow, about all other citizens, we have quite different restrictions too -

MRS. MEIR: They don't have other states to go to of their own.

GUEST: Yes, but we have many Germans and others too.

MRS. MEIR: The Germans aren't going, are they?

GUEST:. . . .with the exception of the Jews.

MRS. MEIR: This discrimination I accept.

GUEST: Thank you.

MRS. MEIR: Thank you for your trouble in coming here and let us hope that the dialogue will go on.

GUEST: Thank you so much.