

5

5154/8-א

# מדינת ישראל

משרדי המנושלה

משרד

מנהל  
רפ"מ  
מנהל

למט, למט

לשכת מנהל משרד המט  
:בן.אהרון - מנהל מנהל  
בנה מנהל  
22.10.1987 - 12.10.1987

מס' תיק מקורי

מדינת ישראל  
ארכיון המדינה

מחלקה



שם תיק : בן-אהרון - ביקור שולץ

5154/8-א

מזהה פיו

מזהה פריט R000345

כתובת : 3-312-5-7-2

02/11/2020

נאריד הדפסה



ארכיון המדינה

מושרד ראש הממשלה

## טופס מראה מקום להוצאת תעודות יחידות\*

חטיבה מס': \_\_\_\_\_  
מיכל מס': 5154 / א  
תאריך התעודה: 12/10/1987  
שם מחבר התעודה: \_\_\_\_\_  
שם הנמען: \_\_\_\_\_  
סוג התעודה (סמן ✓ במקום המתאים):

- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| מכתב                                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| מברק                                    | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| תזכיר או מיזכר                          | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| דין וחשבון או זכרון דברים משיחה או דיון | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| פרוטוקול של שיחה, דיון או ישיבה         | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

\*הטופס ימולא בשני עותקים. העותק הירוק יוכנס לתיק במקום התעודה שהוצאה;  
העותק הלבן יצורף לתעודה שהוצאה.



מזכיר המדינה

כ"א בתשרי התשמ"ח  
14 באוקטובר 1987

לקראת ביקור מזכיר המדינה - אוקטובר 1987

להלן מספר נקודות שניתן לצפות שיועלו ע"י המזכיר:

1. מצב של אי-מוביליות בתחום המדיני עלול לסכן היציבות והשקט במז"ת.  
מן הראוי לכן לעשות מאמץ עתה להמשיך התהליך המדיני.
2. המשך התהליך המדיני מחייב תמיכה רחבה מצד כל מרכיבי הממשלה בישראל.
3. ארה"ב אינה נלהבת מהיוזמה לעריכת ועידה בין"ל ומעדיפה מו"מ בילטרלי - אך לנוכח עמדת ירדן ומצרים עלינו למצוא במשותף הדרך והנוסחה שיאפשרו המשך התהליך המדיני.
4. מאחר ולא ניתן להשיג הסכמה לגבי המתכונת המוסדית (FORMAT) מן הראוי שנקדיש מאמצים להעלאת רעיונות ומחשבות בתחום המהותי SUBSTANCE-.
5. הרעיונות שהועלו לאחרונה והמעוגנים בהבנות שהושגו בשיחות האוטונומיה - לגבי שיתופם של הירדנים והפלסטינאים בניהול המוסדות ביו"ש ועזה - הם בהחלט מעניינים אך בלתי מספיקים. כדי למשוך הירדנים והפלסטינאים למו"מ - בהעדר הסכמה על פתיחה בין"ל - יהיה צורך בהסכמה ונכונות ישראלית לדון ברעיונות לפתרון ארוך-טווח של הבעיות הנוגעות ליו"ש ועזה.
6. ברצוננו של שולץ להניח עתה היסודות הפורמליים להסכמה אמריקאית-ישראלית שתאפשר לישראל להכנס לתהליך המדיני ואשר יוכל להמשיך גם לאחר סיום כהונת הממשל הנוכחי.  
המזכיר סבור כי גישת ממשל רייגן והידידות שהנשיא ושולץ רוחשים לישראל - הם נכסים חשובים ביותר אשר מן הראוי לנצלם ללא דיחוי; קשה לתאר שאחרי הבחירות בנובמבר '88 - יכהן בבית הלבן בוושנינגטון נשיא ידידותי יותר לישראל ולכן חשוב להניח כבר עכשיו היסודות וההבנות ההדדיות בין ארה"ב לישראל.  
גיבוש הבנות אלו במסמך -מזכר הבנה בין ישראל לארה"ב, יאפשר לישראל להתחיל המו"מ בהקדם - תוך ידיעה שהממשל - לאחר 1988 - יתבסס על ההבנות והסיכומים שסוכמו עם הממשל הזה.







כפי שפרשנו בזמנו "רשת בטחון" שאיפשרה לישראל לקבל החלטות קשות ואמיצות בתחום הכלכלי - כן תוכל ישראל לקבל החלטות בתחום המדיני מתוך ידיעה שארה"ב עומדת לימינה.

7. המזכיר מעוניין להגיע למוסקבה - לאחר פגישותיו במז"ת ובלונדון - ולהציב בפני הסובייטים קו מדיני אשר ניתן להציגו כמייצג גישה מאוחדת ומשותפת לארה"ב ולבנות בריתה במז"ת.

8. המזכיר יעלה בארץ נושא יהודי בריה"מ ואופן הצגת העניין על ידו בפני מארחיו בבריה"מ.

9. מן הראוי להעלות בפני המזכיר השגותינו לגבי יישום מספר נושאים אשר נועדו להקל על המצוקה התעסוקתית בעקבות ההחלטה על הפסקת ייצור הלבאי.

מלבד איזכור הנושאים שהועלו במכתבו של שר הבטחון אל מזכיר ההגנה, רצוי להודות למזכיר על התערבותו לעזרתו בעניין מכירת הכפירים לקולובמיה.

קונקרטית רצוי להזכיר למזכיר כי אנו מבקשים שהממשל יאפשר לישראל השתתפות בתנאים תחרותיים במכרזים המתפרסמים ע"י כוחות ארה"ב באירופה (תחזוקה-שיפוצים) וכן במכרזים המתפרסמים ע"י הזרועות השונות בארה"ב עצמה.



ACTION USIS INFO CG DPO POL ACC 5

1Z020J002455Y5597

FM RUENJU

TO RUENJO #1736/01 2950003

INM UUUUU

230001Z OCT 87

FM USINFO WASHDC

TO ALL NEAR EAST POSTS PRIORITY

BT

INCLAS SECTION 01 OF 02

USINFO

ISIS FAO/IO FROM P/PEN

ATTN JORDAN AAMM

NO 12305 N/A

SUBJECT: NIT/FRIEDMAN/NEW M.E. PLAN--U.S.-ISR-JORDAN

SI-US47 10/22/87 (1075)

(FOLLOWING IS MATERIAL NOT FOR PUBLICATION)

FOLLOWING IS TEXT OF THOMAS L. FRIEDMAN'S OCTOBER 22  
 NEW YORK TIMES ARTICLE, "NEW MIDEAST PLAN DISCUSSED BY  
 U.S., ISRAEL AND JORDAN":

(BEGIN TEXT)

JERUSALEM, OCTOBER 21 --ISRAEL, JORDAN AND THE UNITED STATES ARE DISCUSSING A NEW PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE EAST PEACE TALKS IN WHICH JORDAN AND ISRAEL WOULD NEGOTIATE DIRECTLY UNDER THE JOINT AUSPICES OF MOSCOW AND WASHINGTON. A SENIOR ISRAELI OFFICIAL SAID TODAY (OCTOBER 21).

A DELEGATION OF PALESTINIANS WOULD BE PART OF THE JORDANIAN DELEGATION UNDER THIS PLAN. SYRIA WOULD ALSO BE INVITED TO HAVE DIRECT TALKS WITH ISRAEL SEPARATELY UNDER THE SAME SOVIET-AMERICAN SPONSORSHIP, THE ISRAELI OFFICIAL SAID.

THE NEGOTIATING FORMAT DIFFERS IN SOME RESPECTS FROM THE EARLIER IDEA FOR AN INTERNATIONAL PEACE CONFERENCE TO BE ATTENDED BY ISRAEL, EGYPT, SYRIA, JORDAN AND PALESTINIANS, PLUS THE FIVE PERMANENT MEMBERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL.

THE NEW PLAN DIFFERS IN ITS EMPHASIS ON DIRECT TALKS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND THE ARABS, AND IN THE LIMITATION ON THE NUMBER OF SECURITY COUNCIL PERMANENT MEMBERS WHO WOULD BE PRESENT. THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION WERE THE CO-CHAIRMAN OF THE 1973 MIDDLE EAST PEACE CONFERENCE IN GENEVA, WHICH BROKE UP AFTER A FEW DAYS AND HAS NEVER RECONVENED.

THE DECISION BY WASHINGTON IN EFFECT TO PROPOSE A NEW SOVIET-AMERICAN SPONSORSHIP OF MIDDLE EAST TALKS REPRESENTS SOMETHING OF A BREAK IN THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION'S CONSISTENT EFFORTS TO LIMIT SOVIET INVOLVEMENT IN THE MIDDLE EAST. IT HAS BEEN CLEAR FOR SOME TIME TO AMERICAN EXPERTS THAT THERE COULD BE NO ARAB-ISRAELI NEGOTIATIONS WITHOUT SOVIET PARTICIPATION BECAUSE KING HUSSEIN OF JORDAN HAD SAID HE WOULD NOT TAKE PART WITHOUT A SOVIET UMBRELLA.

23-OCT-87

TOR: 05:42

CN: 54543

CHRG: USIS

DIST: USFO



THE IDEA WAS BROACHED BY SECRETARY OF STATE GEORGE P. SHULTZ IN HIS MEETINGS OVER THE WEEKEND WITH THE ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER, YITZHAK SHAMIR, AND THE FOREIGN MINISTER, SHIMON PERES, SAID THE ISRAELI OFFICIAL, WHO DECLINED TO BE IDENTIFIED. BUT THE IDEA WAS APPARENTLY ORIGINALLY SUGGESTED TO MR. SHULTZ BY MR. PERES.

THE ISRAELI OFFICIAL CAUTIONED THAT THE PROPOSAL WAS STILL VERY MUCH IN THE TALKING STAGES, AND THAT MANY OF ITS DETAILS -- SOME OF THEM VERY IMPORTANT -- WERE KNOWN ONLY TO MR. SHULTZ, MR. PERES, MR. SHAMIR AND KING HUSSEIN, NONE OF WHOM HAVE YET BEEN WILLING TO DISCUSS THE PROPOSAL PUBLICLY. MORE IMPORTANT, THE OFFICIAL SAID, NONE OF THE PARTICIPANTS HAVE COMMITTED THEMSELVES TO ANYTHING AT THIS POINT.

THE OFFICIAL SAID KING HUSSEIN WOULD PROBABLY CRYSTALLIZE HIS POSITION ONLY AFTER THE NOV. 8 ARAB SUMMIT CONFERENCE IN AMMAN, WHEN HE WILL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS THE PROPOSAL WITH SYRIA AND OTHER KEY ARAB NATIONS. THE KING IS NOT EXPECTED TO AGREE TO ANY ALTERNATIVE TO AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SYRIANS AND MODERATE ARAB NATIONS SUCH AS EGYPT AND SAUDI ARABIA.



THE SOVIET POSITION WILL PROBABLY BE MADE CLEAR ONLY AFTER THE MEETING BETWEEN PRESIDENT REAGAN AND MIKHAIL S. GORBACHEV, THE SOVIET LEADER, EXPECTED LATER THIS YEAR.

NONETHELESS, THE PROPOSAL HAS BECOME THE FOCUS OF MUCH DIPLOMATIC ACTIVITY IN THE LAST FEW DAYS AND REPRESENTS A POTENTIAL OPENING IN A PEACE PROCESS THAT HAS RECENTLY BEEN DEADLOCKED.

AFTER LEAVING ISRAEL ON MONDAY, MR. SHULTZ BRIEFED EGYPTIAN LEADERS ON THE NEW PROPOSED FORMAT, AND LATER, IN LONDON, HE DID THE SAME WITH KING HUSSEIN.

TODAY, RICHARD W. MURPHY, THE AMERICAN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS, FLEW BACK FROM LONDON TO JERUSALEM TO REPORT TO MR. SHAMIR AND MR. PERES ON THE SHULTZ-HUSSEIN DISCUSSIONS.

AN ISRAELI OFFICIAL SAID KING HUSSEIN HAD NOT REJECTED THE SHULTZ PROPOSAL, BUT HAD NOT GIVEN ANY FINAL COMMITMENT TO IT EITHER.

ON FRIDAY, MR. SHULTZ IS TO MEET WITH MR. GORBACHEV AND PLANS TO BRING UP THE IDEA WITH HIM, THE ISRAELI OFFICIAL SAID.

IT WAS APPARENTLY VERY IMPORTANT FOR MR. SHULTZ TO GET THIS NEW PROPOSAL ON THE TABLE BEFORE HE WENT TO MOSCOW, SO AS TO DEMONSTRATE TO THE RUSSIANS THAT THERE IS NO VACUUM IN THE MIDDLE EAST FOR THEM TO FILL AND THAT WASHINGTON IS STILL THE DYNAMIC FORCE IN THE REGION, THE ISRAELI OFFICIAL SAID.

UNDER THE PROPOSAL, WASHINGTON AND MOSCOW WOULD SERVE AS JOINT SPONSORS FOR DIRECT TALKS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND JORDAN. CONCEIVABLY EGYPT AND SYRIA, AS WELL AS A PALESTINIAN DELEGATION ACCEPTABLE TO ISRAEL, MIGHT ALSO BE INVITED.

UNDER SUCH A FORMAT, KING HUSSEIN COULD FEEL THAT HE HAS THE "COVER" OF THE SOVIET UNION AGAINST RADICAL ARAB CRITICS. MR. SHAMIR COULD FEEL THAT HE WAS GETTING DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS WITH JORDAN, WITHOUT HAVING ISRAEL EXPOSED TO PRESSURES FROM A VARIETY OF EXTRANEOUS NATIONS THAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN INVITED TO A FULL-FLEDGED INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE, THE ISRAELI OFFICIAL SAID.

ALTHOUGH PRIME MINISTER SHAMIR ADAMANTLY OPPOSES ANY KIND OF INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE FORMAT, HE AGREED THAT MR. SHULTZ COULD EXPLORE THIS COMPROMISE PROPOSAL WITH KING HUSSEIN AND THE RUSSIANS. MR. SHAMIR FELT HE COULD NOT LET MR. SHULTZ LEAVE ISRAEL EMPTY-HANDED. ISRAELI OFFICIALS SAID, EVEN THOUGH THE PROPOSAL IS NOT HIS IDEAL APPROACH.

THE PLAN IS JUST BEGINNING TO BE REPORTED IN THE ISRAELI PRESS, AND ONCE IT BECOMES MORE PUBLIC, MR. SHAMIR COULD COME UNDER HEAVY PRESSURE FROM HARD-LINERS IN HIS LIKUD BLOC, WHO WILL INSIST ON DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS, WITHOUT THE RUSSIANS, OR NOTHING AT ALL.

MR. SHAMIR AND MR. PERES HAVE ALSO SET TOUGH TERMS FOR SOVIET INVOLVEMENT, WHICH MR. SHULTZ WILL CONVEY TO MOSCOW.

FIRST THE ISRAELIS INSIST THAT THE RUSSIAN MUST RESTORE FULL DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH ISRAEL, WHICH THEY SEVERED IN 1967, BEFORE THEY CAN ATTEND.

SECOND, THE ISRAELIS DEMAND A SUBSTANTIAL SHIFT IN SOVIET EMIGRATION POLICIES TO ALLOW FOR A LARGE NUMBER OF SOVIET JEWS TO COME TO ISRAEL. MR. PERES IS READY TO DISCUSS A SPECIFIC QUOTA OF SOVIET JEWS TO BE FREED, WHILE

UNCLASSIFIED 230001Z OCT 87

MR. SHAMIR IS DEMANDING THAT THE RUSSIANS ACCEPT THE PRINCIPLE THAT ALL SOVIET JEWS HAVE THE RIGHT TO COME TO ISRAEL. A MUCH TOUGHER DEMAND, AN ISRAELI OFFICIAL SAID.

MOSCOW HAS REPEATEDLY DECLARED THAT IT WOULD NOT RESUME DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH ISRAEL UNTIL THE ISRAELIS WITHDRAW FROM THE TERRITORIES THEY OCCUPIED IN THE 1967 WAR. AS FOR THE QUESTION OF SOVIET JEWS, MOSCOW HAS ALWAYS SAID THIS WAS AN INTERNAL AFFAIR AND NOT A SUBJECT FOR BILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS.

(END TEXT)

(PRECEDING FS MATERIAL NOT FOR PUBLICATION)

ITEM

BT

#1736

NNNN

UNCLASSIFIED 230001Z OCT 87



**EMBASSY OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

Tel Aviv

October 19, 1987

Dear Yossi:

The Secretary asked that I furnish you with  
a copy of the enclosed text.

Sincerely,

Thomas R. Pickering  
Ambassador

Enclosure: Text of Secretary Shultz's  
Press Conference

Mr. Yosef Ben-Aharon  
Director General  
Prime Ministry  
Jerusalem





# Visit of Secretary of State George P. Shultz

---

PRESS CONFERENCE  
BY SECRETARY OF STATE GEORGE P. SHULTZ

October 18, 1987, Jerusalem

Secretary Shultz: I have received a very warm and personal welcome here in Israel. I want to express my appreciation and the return of that warmth that goes for the constructive and worthwhile meetings I have had with Prime Minister Shamir, with Foreign Minister Peres, Defense Minister Rabin and their associates, the meetings at Tel Aviv University, and the ceremony at the Weizmann Institute and the luncheon following. The moving experience of meeting with Ida Nudel and Ilana Friedman, who I had met with before--both of them under different circumstances--was a genuine joy, but at the same time they and others whom I met with are continual reminders of the work yet to be done. I hope that my presence here before I go to Moscow makes clear by that fact the importance that the President and I think all Americans attach to the issues involved in human rights and Soviet Jewry. Of course we look forward to the continuing and very rich dialogue between our two countries. Prime Minister Shamir will be in Washington, I think on the 20th, to see the President and will come next year for a more formal visit. And we will be welcoming President Herzog earlier. So there are continuing discussions going on all the time. If you have any questions. I'll be glad to take them.

Q: Mr. Secretary, Barry Schweid of AP. Assuming you still apply the Loftus Rule, can you tell us if...

A: You mean if you don't have any news, don't hold a news conference?

Q: Well, the corollary (laughter).

A: See you later, fellows (laughter).



United States Information Service  
Tel Aviv, 71 Hayarkon Street, 63903 Tel. 654338 ext. 204  
Jerusalem, 19 Keren Hayesod Street, 94188 Tel. 222376



Q: I was thinking of the corollary, since you called this news conference surely you must have news.

A: No, I don't have any news.

Q: I might coax you into by asking if you think the situation, the peace process, really requires what a local paper here calls new ideas or if it requires the Arabs and the Israelis to find their own way to negotiation.

A: Obviously, the objective of all our efforts is peace. We believe it's pretty clear--I do, and I think all my friends here do--that the way to get there is through direct negotiations and how do you bring that about? So we continue to scratch our heads about that. There is a sense in which you have to say so many people who are very well informed and very bright have worked on these issues for so long that it is improbable that there are any genuinely new ideas. But the situation evolves and you try to arrange these, both substantively and procedurally, to see if you can't find a way for some progress. because the objective of peace is so important and the benefits potentially are so great. And I have been doing that with the Prime Minister whose drive for peace is quite apparent, as well as with the Foreign Minister who also has a great concern and is consumed by that objective. So that is what I have been doing. I will do that with President Mubarak, with King Hussein, again with Prime Minister Shamir when he is in Washington, and so on. We hope that we gradually get somewhere and in a way, if you look back a ways, there has been considerable progress.

Q: Jim Anderson from UPI. Following on, Mr. Secretary, would you continue, do you think, your talks with the Israelis have moved things forward at all? Do you see any rearrangements that give any possibility of any future movements?

A: I can't point to any particular thing and say "look, we have gone from here to there." But I do feel that we have had some...the discussions are always intense and good on this subject, but they have been very thorough, and I believe, at least from my standpoint, it has been beneficial and constructive. But I can't point to any particular thing at this point that is a big sign of progress.

Q: David Shipler from the New York Times. Would you like to see Prime Minister Shamir relax his objections to an international conference? Do you think that would help make progress?

A: He is concerned as we all are, by wanting to find a road to peace. And he is concerned as we all are, that we find a road that turns out to be fruitful and that doesn't get overwhelmed by risks. So I think he has an assessment of risks that is

quite understandable; and we have to keep working at this balance of the risks of doing something, the risks of not doing something; how to minimize the risk connected with any action that we contemplate and keep struggling at it. And that's what we are doing. So I am not trying to talk anybody into or out of any particular thing, but just find some avenue that we can all feel more comfortable with and he feels, obviously, with an international conference as described by many.

Q: Jay Bushinsky of the Chicago Sun Times. Do you agree with the Prime Minister, Mr. Shamir, that the main objection to the international conference is that the Soviet Union would be one of the participants, and that the Soviet Union could only be a destructive element in the peace process?

A: Of course there are the facts that in the past the Soviet Union has not been constructive toward this. And when somebody has made constructive moves like King Hussein's effort to find some reasonable ground with the PLO, and he seemed to be finding that, they waited on the other side of the ledger. They don't have diplomatic relations with all of the parties concerned, most particularly Israel. We have these continuing, very deep issues of Soviet Jewry that they need to face up to. So there are problems there. So that is something of an obstacle. There are other obstacles, but there are always obstacles. The question is how do you deal with them and solve the problems, so you get somewhere. I hope at some point the Soviet Union might be in a constructive frame of mind.

Q: Andrew Meisels of the Washington Times. Mr. Secretary, when you will be speaking to King Hussein in London, will you be able to give him a definitive answer on the international conference or will you be able to bring him some kind of an alternative for him to weigh based on your talks?

A: I will have some things to talk to King Hussein about, and I will reserve them for him.

Q: (Inaudible) News Service. Mr. Secretary, what did you mean by the risks of doing nothing...?

A: ...in the speech that I gave--what I mean by the risk of doing nothing is that if the situation just drifts and people get the feeling that there is no hope, then there tends to be a debilitating process take place. I think therefore, having a process that is alive--and to be seen to be alive, it has genuinely to be alive and moving--allows people to believe, at least with some genuine basis that things can be better. I think that is very important. The risk of people being resigned to feeling that nothing can change for the better are great risks because it tends to lead them to turn more to violence.



Q: Mr. Secretary, how do you perceive or consider the idea raised by the Prime Minister, Itzhak Shamir that a meeting between him and King Hussein without the framework of an international conference would serve the cause of peace better than the conference itself.

A: King Hussein has to judge the manner in which he can productively move forward, and I think we all have to respect the concerns of each party. In the end, of course, it's important that the key people in the area be able to sit down and talk to each other and talk through these problems. That's the way in which they are going to be dealt with. Outsiders really can't do it. But King Hussein has I think quite understandable reasons for proceeding with a certain amount of caution, as we have seen.

Q: Mr. Secretary, Glen Frankel from the Washington Post. One example of the frustration you may have been talking about was the refusal today of any of the Palestinian leaders you had invited here to attend. What was your reaction to that, and what do you think their reasoning was?

A: You'll have to ask them about their reasoning. But I think it is too bad for them because the Palestinians keep saying they want representation, they want to be heard, they want their point of view to be listened to, that they have ideas, that they have an important role, and of course I agree with all of that. And so does everybody. It's right in, for example, the Camp David Accords, that there are legitimate rights, and so on. So I came here and I have been listening to various people as you know, and I thought it would be worthwhile to listen to them so that they could tell me what their views are, and what their concerns are, and what their ideas are. So I think they have missed something in not taking part in an invitation to a dialogue. It's sort of contradictory for them to say that they need to be heard, but then when they are offered the chance not to take advantage of it. Undoubtedly as far as individual human beings are concerned, as I understand it, a number were threatened. That only reminds us that peace has enemies, and it reminds us of risks that people need to take. But we need to focus on the fact that the enemies of peace are not being constructive here, and the enemies of peace and the purveyors of violence, what have they achieved for the Palestinian people? Nothing. You can achieve more by dialogue and by constructive work, and there are many things that have been put in place in the last two or three years that are proving constructive. I just hope the enemies of peace will have some second thoughts and that they will find themselves increasingly in the minority. They are part of the problem that prevents the people that they allegedly, to them, represent. They are part of preventing those people from expressing their views and making their arguments; trying to help me gain more insight into their point of view.



Q: Mr. Secretary, Tom Friedman from the New York Times. Before you can bring the Israelis and Arabs together, it's clear you have to bring the Israelis together. Do you leave here feeling in your meetings with Mr. Shamir and Mr. Peres, that they are any closer together, or just as far apart as you knew them to be before you came?

A: I'm not going to comment on their differences, although I would say from my conversations that many of the things they say about their objectives are parallel. And I think there are questions of a judgement in assessing the prospectiveness of some course of action, or the risks of some course action. But as far as the desire to find a way to peace, as far as the recognition that somehow we have to find our way to bilateral negotiations are concerned and many other things, there's perhaps more unity in the unity government than people give it credit for.

Q: Mr. Secretary, you're being asked here to consider requests to deliver to the Soviets requests from Israel for direct flights for Soviet Jews to Israel, and as I understand it for a bilateral agreement between the Soviet Union and Israel concerning repatriation of Soviet Jews. What's the American view on those requests and other requests that might tend to have the effect of reducing the options available to those Soviet Jews who are allowed to emigrate?

A: Well of course if it turns out to be possible for Israel and the Soviet Union to make a bilateral agreement, and through that agreement to bring about the emigration and repatriation of more Jews who wish to leave the Soviet Union, I think that would be wonderful. Now, I do think it's important, I say this as a kind of libertarian, that individuals have freedom of choice. So I will always stand for that principle. But if somebody says that that person wants to emigrate to Israel, then that's fine, that's a choice, let them make it. I believe there was a great message also--I felt, from Ida Nudel--a person who had never before been in Israel. And when she was generous enough to call me up when she got here the other day. I was in Washington, as I reported, and what she said was "I'm home!" So I think there is a deep message in those two profound words from this most impressive lady.

Q: Mary Curtis, Boston Globe. I just wanted to follow up on Mr. Melman's question. Do you think it would be a good idea at this point in time for Prime Minister Shamir and King Hussein to meet? And would you want to put that forward as a proposal when you meet with the King?

A: If you say that you believe as I do, that in the end the way to settle these questions is through bilateral negotiations, then that's what you are trying to arrange--is a way to meet and to come to grips directly with these problems.



And in a sense, that is the question, how do you arrange the scenery so that such a negotiation is possible? And we all realize that there are impediments. So you try to deal with those impediments, and in a way, as you discuss the peace process, or as I do, you kind of ratchet back and forth between discussions of substantive issues, and discussions of procedural issues and try to find some combination that will work. We haven't found it, but we keep inching along at it. And that's what we are trying to do.

Q: Mr. Secretary, Daoud Koutab from East Jerusalem. You've talked about the improvement of the quality of life in the occupied territories, but since you've made this phrase, the Defense Minister Rabin has imposed deportations, administrative detentions, and town arrests. We also have the problem of Palestinian family reunification. Can you comment on these human rights violations?

A: Of course there are problems, as well as advances, and we discussed the problems. We have a very good, strong dialogue with Israel about them, and I think there have been a number that have been addressed in a satisfactory way. There have also been positive things that have taken place, that seem to be working, such as the establishment of an Arab Bank. It's now accumulating more branches, deposits are coming in and from the standpoint of the population, it's their bank so to speak, and it's working, and there are other examples. So, there are problems and there are advances and so you have to work to try to solve the problems and think of new things to do that will move matters along. And that's what we're doing. And we have a very good dialogue with the Government of Israel on this matter, Ambassador Pickering does, and I might say it's source of some satisfaction. And I think we should take some pride in the United States at the quality of our Ambassador here and I say that because wherever I go, people sort of casually seem to quietly let me know, "Gee you sure got a capable Ambassador here." And I might say we'll welcome the Israeli Ambassador to Washington. We're well represented in both countries.

Question: But the human rights issue, you didn't address, sir.

A: Well, I thought I did. I said that we have a strong dialogue, we discuss all these problems and so, on the one hand, you discuss the problems, where there are genuine problems and you try to work in a positive way. That's what we are doing.

Q: Mr. Secretary: It is now three months since...

A: I'm told that the only way to take control of press conferences, is to point to people. I got that information in Washington.

Q: Mr. Secretary, Don Oberdorfer of the Washington Post. Before you came your aids in Washington and practically all the Israeli papers since you've been here have talked new ideas being discussed and generated. In your speech today at the Weizmann Institute, you said, "Those who are reluctant to explore new ideas or even revisit old ones have an obligation to offer something different as an alternative to the status quo." Is this a description of the kind of reaction that there's been to some ideas that you have been proposing, or could you explain a little bit more of what you had in mind when you said that?

A: No, it's not a description of what I've run into here at all. Quite to the contrary. I find an eagerness to discuss the peace process on all sides. It's really very much akin to something I said earlier in Washington, in one of my talks, I forget which one, addressing this subject. And it's just by way of saying that I think all of us who have some responsibilities here need to keep thinking and working and examining new ideas, and being willing to take a look at the old ones again. And to the extent that we come up with a conclusion that maybe what we're talking about doesn't work, to dig in and try to think of some other ways. Because I think that just drifting is not good - that is also a course of action, and it also has its risks, and its problems. So doing nothing is not an empty course of action; it has consequences too. So I was just sort of exhorting, myself and everybody else, to keep working at it. Which is what we've been doing. And I have found great receptivity to that effort.

Q: John Broder from the Chicago Tribune. I'd like to ask a question about the Gulf, if I may.

A: I really don't have anything new to say from yesterday. I just checked in briefly. I've been busy all day, and I found that there's nothing in particular to add.

Q: Well, in the event of a major Iranian breakthrough against the Iraqis on the land war against Iraq, would the United States consider that enough of a threat or a potential threat to its interests in the Gulf, to make a clear commitment to the Arab Gulf states that it will not allow Iran to win the war, and that it will defend Arab Gulf states against aggression?

A: I don't see that there's any prospect of that, and particularly in the light of that fact and all the dangers involved in iffy questions, I'll pass.

Q: Palestine Press Service: I would like to hear an explanation from you sir, about this sort of contradiction in statements when a Jew in the Soviet Union is denied departure

A: Speak a little slowly because I am not understanding you.



Q: Okay, I am asking if possible for an explanation on this sort of contradiction in statements when a Jew in the Soviet Union is denied departure, you call it a human rights violation. When a whole nation is suppressed under occupation, you call it just problems, but you are having dialogue with Israeli authorities.

A: Well, I don't know of any limitations on emigration. There are problems in occupied territories. We know that. And as issues arise, some that fall under the category of human rights, and other issues as well, we discuss them with the government of Israel. At the same time, I am very glad to be able to say, that there are many things that have been done--and I have been working on them recently--that are designed to improve the general quality of life, including the ability to take part in governing yourself to a greater extent, and things of that kind. So the answer to your question is that we do speak about problems wherever they occur. That is the general policy of the United States, and my general policy. But if you are inferring that what's the case in the West Bank and what's the case in the Soviet Union are similar, I certainly don't agree with that at all.

Q: Mr. Secretary, David Bedein, Israel Resource Network in Efrat, a new Jewish suburb of Bethlehem. It is now three months since Meir Kahane has been sworn in the Israeli Knesset. Is the U.S. hesitancy to strip Kahane of his citizenship in any way connected to Kahane's past history of employment by U.S. intelligence?

A: No.

Q: Mr. Secretary, Rafi Mann, Maariv. Could you tell us please, in what ways can the U.S. assist minimizing the risks involved in an international peace conference at least as it is seen by Prime Minister Shamir? For example, would you consider some kind of a memorandum of understanding between the two governments prior to such a conference?

A: An international conference, as such, for its own sake, doesn't have any particular interest to the United States. We don't think that that as an objective is the way to achieve something. We think the way to achieve something is through direct negotiations. The question is whether or not some sort of international umbrella, auspices, conference or call it what you will, can be constructed that will make it easier to bring about those direct negotiations. As you try to do that, you see that there are problems of one kind or another--there's no doubt about it--connected with any such a gathering. So you scratch your head, and ask yourself how can you deal with these various problems, and try to explore just what they are. We have done that in the past, and we continue to look for other possible ways of bringing about the result we seek. I might

say the result is not bilateral negotiations any more than it is an international conference. The result we seek is peace. That's the object. So we keep struggling away at it.

Mr. Redman: Thank you.