

The original documents are located in Box 123, folder “Israel (2)” of the Ron Nessen Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Ron Nessen donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Nessen

AMBASSADOR DINITZ' REMARKS TO
THE PRESS
FOLLOWING MEETING WITH SECRETARY KISSINGER
JULY 7, 1975

Dinitz: I would like to say a word before I answer or try to answer questions. I have related to the Secretary of State the considerations of the Israeli Cabinet. We have discussed the points of clarification that I have brought and discussions on these topics will continue with the view which is common to all of us to try to make progress toward the possibility of an interim agreement.

Q: Do you mean you are coming back tomorrow? When will they be continued?

Dinitz: Well, we haven't fixed any date and it would be continued either with the Secretary or with Under Secretary, or in any other way. When I'm saying the dialogue, I am saying the dialogue between our two governments.

Q: By the way, is there any indication that the Egyptians are involved in a clarification process? Is their position subject to change, and has it been changing through the Secretary's offices?

Dinitz: Well, that you would have to ask the Secretary of State since we are not the ones who are dealing directly with the Egyptians.

Q: Have enough of the clarifications been made now that the framework has been established for the Secretary to meet with Prime Minister Rabin?

Dinitz: The idea of meeting between the Secretary of State and Prime Minister was discussed. We have not finalized yet the exact arrangements.

Q: Would you expect it this week?

Dinitz: I would not rule it out.

Q: Mr. Ambassador, do you feel that progress has been made toward an interim agreement and what are the prospects for such an agreement?

Dinitz: I would say as a general statement without entering into any details that every time clarifications are made things become clearer. And every time things become clearer there is progress.

Q: How intense is the arms disagreement? Have you ever been told that you are not going to get the aid and the arms if you don't give the passes?

Dinitz: We have never been told this and I believe that the American commitment, as the Secretary said, for the security of Israel is a standing commitment unrelated to political developments.

Q: Do you feel that the major obstacle now is a geographic one -- the eastern side of the Sinai passes?

Dinitz: The geography is one of the elements, obviously, now under the process of clarification.

Q: Is the aid level one of the other elements being discussed?

Dinitz: The bilateral relations including aid is one of the things being discussed.

Q: Do you have any idea when Israel will become eligible again for a new military aid agreement?

Dinitz: First of all, I want to make it plain that there is no, there wasn't, and there is no embargo of American military shipment to Israel. We were talking about new orders which were discussions -- discussions of which were suspended subject to the reassessment that was going on with the United States. When it will be resumed I cannot say because that will depend, I guess, on the decision of the American Government.

Q: Mr. Ambassador, did you get answers here that will satisfy the Israeli Cabinet?

Dinitz: The meeting was not primarily to get all the answers but to present all the questions. And that is why I said that the dialogue will continue.

Q: What will be the procedure after the possible meeting between the Prime Minister and the Secretary?

Dinitz: I suggest that we first see whether there is a meeting and then we will discuss what will happen later.

July 7, 1975

ISRAELI POSTPONEMENT OF DECISION ON SINAI

Q. Do you have any comment on the Israeli Cabinet decision to seek "clarifications and elucidations" of the Egyptian position on disengagement from the Sinai before taking any final position (NYT 7-7-75)? Will Sec. Kissinger meet with Prime Minister Rabin in Bonn later this week?

A. As to your first question, we have not yet received any official word on the Cabinet ~~decision.~~ ^{meeting. Amb. Dinitz will be returning to the United States + will be meeting w/ the Secretary} As to the possibility of a meeting between Sec. Kissinger and Prime Minister Rabin, ~~no firm plans have been made.~~ ^{we have nothing to announce.}

July 16, 1975

EXPULSION OF ISRAEL FROM THE U. N.

If asked about a possible move by Islamic Nations or Third World nation blocs to try to expel Israel from the U. N. in the coming General Assembly session, you should refer to Kissinger's response of yesterday to that question:

Sec. Kissinger: Well, we have not said exactly what we will do if the charter of the United Nations is violated in our view. We believe that the expulsion of member states by the General Assembly -- which is a responsibility under the Charter of the Security Council -- would be an act which would affect the American participation in the activities of that body.

To what degree, and in what manner remains to be determined. But we believe that the Charter should be strictly observed and should not be used for punitive purposes that are incompatible with it.

* * * * *

NOTE:

You may wish to refer to yesterday's guidance on our general U. N. policy.

July 16, 1975

EXPULSION OF ISRAEL FROM THE U. N.

If asked about a possible move by Islamic Nations or Third World nation blocs to try to expel Israel from the U. N. in the coming General Assembly session, you should refer to Kissinger's response of yesterday to that question:

Sec. Kissinger: Well, we have not said exactly what we will do if the charter of the United Nations is violated in our view. We believe that the expulsion of member states by the General Assembly -- which is a responsibility under the Charter of the Security Council -- would be an act which would affect the American participation in the activities of that body.

To what degree, and in what manner remains to be determined. But we believe that the Charter should be strictly observed and should not be used for punitive purposes that are incompatible with it.

* * * * *

NOTE:

You may wish to refer to yesterday's guidance on our general U. N. policy.

9-3-75

Ron:

Couple of items you might want to check on:

Do we have a firm date or target date for the President to go to New Hampshire to campaign for Louis Wyman?

Or is it possible that the cost is too great for Wyman and the President won't go after all?

And I noticed a nice quote in the press summary today by the Israeli ambassador to the UN, Chaim Herzog, which is attached.

JWH

Herzog Says U.S. Presence in Sinai is Crucial

Israeli Ambassador to the U.N. Chaim Herzog said Tuesday it is significant that Israel was willing to sign an agreement renouncing the use of force as a problem-solving means. But, he added, U.S. presence in the Sinai is essential to the success of the Mideast peace agreement.

"You've got to snap out of this Vietnam psychosis. No one is talking about Vietnam here," Herzog said in an interview. "Both sides have said we can't quite trust each other but we do trust the U.S. I don't think a greater compliment could be payed to a nation in the world today and we want the U.S. to help us supervise."

September 17, 1975

ISRAEL AND THE U. N.

The U. N. General Assembly opened yesterday with a new President -- Gaston Thorn (TORN) of Luxembourg.

The UNGA opened on a ⁹harring note when Syria took the floor to denounce Israel saying that the country "should be banished from the General Assembly" because of its occupation of foreign territory.

Q. What are your views on the question of any attempt to expel Israel from the UN? Will the U. S. leave the UN if Israel should be suspended or expelled? Will we take any actions against those who try to suspend or expel Israel?

A. The United States Government has been very clear on this issue: We strongly object to exclusion of any member from the General Assembly or other UN bodies as a method of conducting diplomacy. Exclusion from the UN or any of its organs is, under the UN Charter, a decision to be made by the Security Council. The United States will resist any such effort at exclusion, but I will not speculate on what actions the U. S. might take in any hypothetical situation ~~where Israel or another UN member were excluded.~~ Our main interest, hopefully shared by many other nations, is to prevent such a situation from arising.

FYI: Cable on Special Session attached.

September 17, 1975

DURATION OF TECHNICIANS' ROLE AND PRESENCE

Q. Yesterday the President responded to a question on the duration of the technicians role that they would remain for the duration of the agreement or until a President withdrew them because of danger to their lives. Isn't that in fact an open ended agreement?

A. No, it is not. I would refer you to Article 9 of the Agreement and points C 7 and 8 of the proposal. I would remind you that this is an interim accord, not a final overall peace agreement and as such, the terms of the proposal relating to it cannot, by definition, be open-ended.

September 17, 1975

HAWK SALES TO JORDAN

Q. What is the Administration reaction to the compromise on HAWK sales to Jordan? What is King Hussein's reaction?

A. The President is hopeful that the issue of the Hawk sales to Jordan can now be satisfactorily resolved, and that Jordan will receive the weapons to meet its legitimate defense needs.

FYI: (The House International Relations Committee meets today at 10:30 a. m. to consider the compromise on the sale).

Senator Case had a press conference on the compromise at 10:00 a. m.

IMPLICATIONS OF SADAT'S REMARKS ON ARMS TO ISRAEL

Speaking to the Egyptian parliament in Cairo Saturday, President Sadat said that Egypt would match any arms escalation occasioned by the U. S. supply of weapons of a particular quality (Pershings, F-16 fighters) to Israel.

Q. What is the U. S. reaction to Sadat's speech? Will these remarks cause any changes in American plans for weapons supply to Israel? Will the speech affect Sadat's visit here?

A. We would not want to characterize President Sadat's speech but let me say that the President looks forward to receiving President Sadat and his family next week. He anticipates that the visit will be in the spirit of their meetings in Salzburg and expects to continue the discussions with him on a broad range of subjects.

As to your question on weapons for Israel, we have said before that the entire question of arms for Israel is under review ~~and until that study is completed, I am not going to anticipate the results.~~

MOYNIHAN ON THE ZIONIST RESOLUTION

Q. Does the President agree with Ambassador Moynihan's remarks to the effect that we will oppose the UN committee resolution condemning Zionism as a form of racism?

A. We are opposed to the resolution but we oppose any action which undermines the purpose of the UN or its ability to function. *to serve as a boun for resolution of dispute*

FYI ONLY: Do not go beyond the above. On the eve of Sadat's visit, the White House must not be the source of comments that might undercut Sadat's position at home or in the Middle East. For this reason we want to use the word "we" rather than "the President" in our response.

November 11, 1975

PRESIDENT'S MEETING WITH ISRAELI PARLIAMENTARIANS

The President met in the Cabinet Room at 10:00 a.m. today with a delegation of Israeli Parliamentarians led by the speaker of the Israeli Parliament, Israel Yesha Yahu. Speaker Carl Albert and Ambassador Dinitz accompanied the group to the meeting. General Brent Scowcroft ~~and Secretary Kissinger~~ ^{WV} were also in attendance.

This meeting provided an opportunity for an exchange of views between the President and Israeli representatives of various backgrounds and political views on the Middle East situation. The President reaffirmed his strong commitment to maintaining the momentum of negotiations aimed at a just and durable settlement in that area, and to the survival and security of the State of Israel.

If asked | the resolution on Zionism adopted yesterday by the UNGA, ^{Did they discuss? Yes -} the President also affirmed that the US deplors the characterization of Zionism as a form of racism, and his belief that the adoption of this resolution

undermines the principles on which the UN is based. ^{The Israelis expressed their appreciation for the long and continuing relationship of support and assistance.}

The President expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to meet with this group, in view of the close relations which exist between our two governments and peoples.

(Press Statement -- List of Participants Attached).

Press Office Statement on Zionism Resolution

The US representative at the UN has already expressed the official US reaction to the General Assembly vote. As you know, the President has previously spoken out on this issue and, in the aftermath of last night's General Assembly vote, reemphasizes his views of the deplorable nature of this wholly unjustified action.

PARTICIPANTS

PRESIDENT'S MEETING WITH ISRAELI PARLIAMENTARIANS

November 11, 1975 - 10:00 a.m.

ISRAELIS

Ambassador Dinitz
Speaker Israel Yeshayahu
Menahem Begin
Ari Ankorin
Yitzhak Ben-Aharon
Mrs. Haika Grossman-Orkin
Josef Tamir
Zerah Warhaftig
Embassy Counselor Rafiah
Shmuel Jacobsen (secretary to
the delegation)
Dov Kedem (interpreter)

U.S.

Speaker Albert
Darrel St. Claire (Hill staffer)
Michael Reed (Hill staffer)
Howard Yourman (Hill staffer)

WHITE HOUSE PRESS GUIDANCE

MEETING WITH PRIME MINISTER JORGENSEN OF DENMARK

(Announcement to be made in Washington on Tuesday,
November 11, 1975, 12:00 noon EST)

The President will receive the Prime Minister of Denmark, Anker Henrik Jorgensen (YOR-gen-sen) for a meeting at the White House on November 13. Prime Minister Jorgensen will come to Washington following visits to Venezuela and Mexico.

* * * * *

Q: Have Prime Minister Jorgensen and the President met?

A: Yes. They had a meeting in Brussels last May at the time of the NATO Summit in Brussels.

Q: How long has Jorgensen been Prime Minister?

A: He has been Prime Minister since February, 1975. He also served as Prime Minister in 1972-1973.

Q: What is the purpose of this meeting?

A: The President attaches great importance to maintaining close and continuing consultations with our friends and allies in Western Europe. As part of that process, and taking advantage of the Prime Minister's presence in this hemisphere, the President extended an invitation for a meeting.

Q: Is this an official visit? Will there be a dinner?

A: This is a working visit. The President and the Prime Minister will meet during the morning of November 13, following which the Prime Minister will fly to New York to return to Denmark.

U. S. REACTION TO THE UN RESOLUTION ON ZIONISM

Q. How does the President feel about Moynihan's statement today that our bilateral relations with nations voting for the anti-Zionism resolution will be affected?

A. Bilateral relations between the US and other countries ^{are} ~~is~~ a complex mixture of factors, mutual interests, and the like and no two relationships are alike. Multilateral considerations are an element of these relationships.

Q. This morning, Amb. Moynihan said that the US will not forget those countries who voted in favor of the anti-Zionist resolution at the UNGA. Do we plan to retaliate against those countries? Specifically, will we cut our assistance to those Arab countries, such as Egypt, which supported the resolution?

A. We shall be reviewing the implications of the vote, and possible courses of action. Regarding US assistance to the Middle East we do not intend to reduce the level of our request to the Congress. The President feels very strongly that our aid to Egypt and other Arab states is an essential element of our efforts to attain a final peace in the Middle East. He does not believe we should play into the hands of those who want to provoke US action against these countries, whose moderate leadership and continued confidence in the US is fundamental to moving toward peace and away from war.

Q. Does the President intend to sit down with Congressional leaders to discuss further US action on the Resolution as Amb. Moynihan has suggested?

A. We are continuing to assess the situation. The President has addressed the issue yesterday and previously (Oct. 24) on the Resolution.

FYI:

If asked about our participation in the observance of the Decade for Action to combat Racism, you should say that State addressed this fully yesterday and we have nothing further to add; refer queries to State for amplification on the issue.

ANGOLA - UPDATE

ANGOLA - UPDATE

To expand on yesterday's background information, the Soviet-backed Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola yesterday named its leader, Agostinho Neto, President of Angola.

The Neto government quickly received recognition from the USSR, Romania, Cuba, and several African states with long ties to the Popular Movement. A number of East European countries have expressed "readiness" to establish diplomatic relations with the new "People's Republic of Angola."

The Popular Movement's rivals -- the National Front for the Liberation of Angola and the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola -- marked independence and the inauguration of their joint provisional government, in ceremonies at Nova Lisboa, the National Union's headquarters, and at Ambriz, the National Front's headquarters. The seat of the provisional government will be at Nova Lisboa, which has renamed Huambo.

Despite the independence ceremonies, the two rival "governments" quickly resumed military activities.

The National Front and the National Union still hope they can win enough territory to force the Movement to compromise. The Popular Movement is likely to be less inclined to consider a political accommodation with its rivals, now that it has Cuban and Soviet recognition.

Q. Do we intend to recognize Angolan independence?

A. As we said yesterday, we are following the situation in Angola closely and with concern for its people, but we are not prepared to make any decisions on recognition at this time.

FYI: As Secretary Kissinger said in his press conference, "the U. S. has no other interest except the territorial integrity and independence of Angola. We strongly support the case of the Organization of African Unity for a cease-fire and for negotiation among the three factions that are involved there to form a coalition government. . . ."

November 25, 1975

U. S. PRESSURE ON ISRAEL FOR GOLAN WITHDRAWAL

In addition to guidance you were provided yesterday, the State Department has used the following:

- Q. Is it true, as reported from Israel, that the U. S. has pledged secretly not to pressure Israel into anything more than "cosmetic concessions" in possible Israeli-Syrian talks on the Golan Heights?
- A. -- We have said repeatedly that some way has to be found to keep up momentum in the negotiating process for a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.
- The Secretary also said: We do not consider the Sinai Agreement as permitting stagnation in the process of negotiation. Its purpose is to give impetus to that process. We are prepared to work with all the parties toward a solution of all of the remaining issues, including the future of Palestinians.
- We have also said publicly and privately that we are ready to make a serious effort to get negotiations started between Syria and Israel, if the parties so desire.
- That remains our position.
- We see no point in commenting on speculative stories about what might come out of negotiations which have not even begun.

U. S. TO SELL ISRAEL AND SAUDI ARABIA MILITARY EQUIPMENT

Q. Why is the United States selling F-15s to Israel and why are we providing Saudi Arabia with a \$1.8 billion contract to help them improve their air force? How do we know that the discriminatory practices to which we object will not be employed once again in this contract arrangement?

A. The sale of the F-15s to Israel was approved in principle early this year, but as you recall, we had a policy reassessment which with other details delayed the letter of offer until early this week. As far as the ongoing contractual arrangements with Saudi Arabia are concerned, the \$1.8 billion contract represents the final phase in our overall program worked out between our two countries. I suggest DOD may be able to provide the details for you. Finally, as for any discriminatory practices, we have not seen evidence of such practices, and furthermore, the President has spelled out his policies on such discrimination recently in a series of directives.

FYI: You may wish to recall Ed Schmults' briefing at the time and refer specific questions to him.

December 11, 1975

ASIAN REACTION TO PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

Japan and South Korea have praised President Ford's speech in Honolulu this week, but North Korea has strongly denounced it.

The Japanese are clearly pleased that Washington has reaffirmed its commitment to play an active Asian role and the importance of the US-Japan alliance. Both the President's trip and his address were widely publicized in Japan, with editorial comment emphasizing the US resolve to remain a Pacific power. Since the fall of Indochina, there has been some concern in Tokyo that a US retrenchment in Asia could bring instability damaging to Japanese interests.

Tokyo is pleased to see that US relations with Peking remain on course and to note indications of a flexible US approach to Indochina. The Japanese also view the President's visits to Jakarta and Manila as important symbols of continued US involvement in Southeast Asia.

South Korea has generally expressed satisfaction with the speech, focusing more narrowly on Washington's determination to maintain its commitments to allies in Asia. President Ford's comments on the importance of maintain security and peace in Korea and his statement that Seoul must participate in any dialogue on the future of Korea were particularly well received.

Hoping to see a further US withdrawal from Asia after the fall of Indochina, Pyongyang has reacted in vitriolic fashion. Denouncing US policy as aimed at perpetuating the division of Korea, Pyongyang also directed special criticism at the US-Japan alliance and ignored the President's remarks about improving US-Chinese relations.

Hanoi, meanwhile, has rejected the President's expression of good will toward Vietnam, stating that the US still refuses to address the issue of compensation for war damages. The Vietnamese have maintained that Article 21 of the Paris Agreement, which calls for "healing the wounds of war." is still in effect and that war reparations must be negotiated before any consideration can be given to the establishment of diplomatic relations.

Our guidance on US-Vietnamese relations remains the same: that our attitude toward Vietnam will be predicated on Vietnam's attitude towards its neighbors and to us.

December 11, 1975

WHITE HOUSE TOUR FOR INTERNATIONAL WEIGHTLIFTING GROUP

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: to be provided only on an if asked basis.

The U. S. Amateur Athletic Union requested a White House tour for the European and Americas Olympic Weightlifting Teams. The tour, which will take place on Friday, December 12, was granted on a routine basis to this group as it would have been to any outstanding group of athletes. The teams will be in competition on December 13 in Gettysburg and are taking advantage of being in the area for the White House visit.

It is our understanding that the European group contains athletes and officials from ten European countries including the Soviet Union and representatives from both Eastern and Western Europe. The Americas group contains athletes and officials from eight American countries, including U. S., Brazil, Mexico and Cuba.

The visit is non-substantive, and the group will have no contact with White House officials. Additionally, the visit has no political significance and is in no way related to U. S. relations with any of the countries whose citizens are participating.

A breakdown of the teams is attached.

The breakdown of the Weightlifting teams:

Europeans:

Athletes:	Russia	4
	Bulgaria	4
	Poland	4
	Hungary	3
	Sweden	1
	France	1
	Czechoslovakia	1
	FRG	1

Officials:	Bulgaria	1
	Poland	1
	Spain	1
	England	1
	Russia	1
	Hungary	1

The Americas:

Athletes:	USA	5
	Cuba	6
	Canada	2
	Panama	2
	Mexico	1
	Dominican Repub.	1

Doctor	USA	1
--------	-----	---

Coaches:	USA	1
	Venezuela	1
	Cuba	1
	Panama	1

(This may not be a final list.)

*PORTION OF DAILY BRIEFING ON
JERRY O'LEARY STORY*

*State Briefing
1/23/76*

fourth stop.

A I have not any word on that.

Q Is there a fourth stop?

A Not that I am aware of.

Q Not yet?

A No.

Q Do you know what time he is getting back on Sunday?

A No, I don't, George. You will have to stay in touch with us over the weekend. I think it will be relatively early, but I just don't have any real reading on it yet.

Q When was this press conference in Brussels?

A It was about eleven o'clock this morning our time, somewhere close to that.

Questions.

Q One of our eminent colleagues has a story this morning in an afternoon newspaper that says the State Department was taken by surprise by publication of the budget figures about Israel's foreign aid. Is that true? I don't mean the story; I mean were you taken by surprise?

(Laughter)

A I do not know why that particular figure was published the other day. You shouldn't read any special significance into its publication.

Let me make a few general points on that. The general figure that you are talking about, that is, in the story that you are talking about, is in the budget, and it is correct, but it is only part of the security assistance package which the Administration will be proposing for Israel to Congress.

Q Is that \$1.5 billion?

A I think the story said \$1 billion, yes.

In mid-February we will be presenting a detailed assistance program to the Congress for other countries as well as for Israel, and, of course, I do not have any details for you on that now.

Q Do you have any breakdown of the aid program?

A For Israel? For Fiscal 76?

Q Right.

A I believe the overall figure was something like \$2.2 billion.

Q Do you know what the significance is of the \$250 million request for grant aid, which is in a Defense Department military aid budget?

A For which -- what fiscal year are you talking about?

Q For Fiscal 76 I think.

A I don't.

Q It is one of the supplementals they are asking for.

A I don't. Maybe you ought to ask them.

Q Okay.

A Now, as I said, I cannot go into the details of the overall package that will be presented for Israel, but I can say that it is quite substantial and was arrived at after very careful consideration of the security needs of Israel, in light of our own economic situation. And we well recognize that Israel also has serious economic problems.

We believe that our overall aid package will be adequate to insure Israel's ability to meet its security requirements in the future.

Q Do you have any new comment on the Beirut crisis?

A Not really any new information about what is happening there. Is that what you are asking me.

Q How can you say that?

(Laughter)

Q You are, in effect, by saying they appear to be accurate.

A I am saying that we do not have anything that would contradict the press reports.

Q You must have something that uncontradicts them.

(Laughter)

Q I don't think I understand wholly what you meant back on that line item on the aid to Israel when you said the general figure is correct but that it represents only part of the security assistance package. Are you saying that there are additional funds that will show up when the details are published?

A I am saying that what has been published is a military aid figure, that the economic supporting assistance figure is to be published or detailed to the Congress in February.

Q Has the State Department found out how that item on Israel's exact military assistance allocation got into the budget?

A No, I said I don't know why it was published. I am not aware we are investigating the reason.

Q I don't think anybody thinks the State Department was surprised by the figure, knowing full well the figure. The question was whether you were surprised at its publication.

A I wouldn't make a big thing out of it, no. I said the figure is correct as part of a total. I do not think that whether are surprised or not really has too much significance.

Q It does if you haven't told Israel yet.

A We have been in consultation with the Israelis all along. Sorry. It had been our intention to consult with them on this before the Rabin visit. The timing I think is really not important.

Q Is that the routine way that the recipient country is informed? Are they informed prior to the details going to the Congress or simultaneously?

A I do not think I can characterize it in any general way. I think in some cases there are consultations and in some cases there are not.

Q It would depend in this case on the circumstances of the Rabin visit coming prior to February 14, is that what you're saying?

A I am not sure I understand what you are saying.

Q Well, I mean if it is not routine to consult with the country on the final figure prior to the details, the line items, going to the Hill, then I assumed that you were suggesting that you would have consulted with the Israelis prior to that event was because of Rabin's visit.

A I do not know that that is so. I know we would have informed the Israelis of this before he came, and obviously it will be a subject of discussion with him while he is here. But, as I say, I do not know that there is a rule that you can apply to when consultations are or are not made, or if they are made, prior to publication.

Q John, how soon will the Secretary be going to Congress when he gets back from his trip to consult with Congressional leaders to urge restraint in our opposition.

A In reference to what subject?

Q At his press conference he said he would talk to Congressional leaders before or after he came back

FYI:

Amb. Moynihan was:

NOMINATED:

May 21, 1975

CONFIRMED:

June 9, 1975

SWORN-IN:

June 30, 1975

February 3, 1976

FORD PUSHING FOR ISRAELI-JORDANIAN TALKS?

Q. The New York Times carries a story today that President Ford has agreed to pursue a suggestion made by Prime Minister Rabin to see if it would be possible to arrange negotiations between Israel and Jordan for an accord on the West Bank. Can you verify the story, and will the U. S. use its good offices to see whether Jordan has an interest in negotiating with Israel?

A. We are not going to get into the details of discussions with the Israelis, but I can assure you that the President reaffirmed his intentions and the intention of his Administration to continue to work with the parties in the Middle East to see how progress can be made toward peace in the region.

2/10/76

EVANS & NOVACK: ISRAEL GOES TO CONGRESS

Q: According to Evans and Novack today, Secretary Kissinger in a conversation with Senator Humphrey reversed the Administration's carefully planned position to provide no additional funding assistance for the transition quarter. Can you confirm the story and has the Administration now shifted its position on security assistance for the transition quarter?

A: We wouldn't comment on conversations between the President and his advisors, but on the general question of our security assistance policy, I can say that the status of our security assistance legislation and plans for transition quarter funding are currently under review.

FYI Only: Do not go beyond the above, which is essentially the position State will take. The article is basically accurate. The Administration objected to a direct gift to Israel for the transition quarter but said we could live with transition funding for all assistance recipients based on the same percentage of the Administration's original security assistance request. This would prevent the Congress from slashing aid across the board to Arab countries while retaining Administration aid request levels for Israel. This is for your information only. The Congressional liaison officials are just beginning to consult with the leaders on the Hill on this issue.

March 23, 1976

ISRAEL AND THE PLO CLASH AT THE UN

Q: How will the U.S. position be reflected at the current UN debate at the Security Council. What is our position on the West Bank dispute?

A: We will be spelling out our position as the debate evolves.

Q: What do we think of the Israeli decision to participate in a debate with the PLO?

A: We welcome it. Of course, this was a decision for the Israelis to make and we accept their reasons for the decision.

Q: Why then did Ambassador Scranton vote against seating the PLO at the debate?

A: The Ambassador's vote on a procedural question was consistent with the two tenets of our legal position, viz:

- (1) that the PLO does not represent a State;
- (2) that the PLO does not recognize Israel's right to exist.

FYI: The above guidance coordinated with State. All further questions should be referred there.

SCRANTON'S SPEECH

Q. Do Ambassador Scranton's remarks about Israeli settlement accurately reflect U. S. policy? Are we taking a new, harder line toward Israel while softening our position toward the Arabs and the PLO?

A. The Ambassador's remarks on the Israeli settlements were a restatement of a publicly stated and clearly defined U. S. position. Ambassadors Goldberg in '68, Yost in '69, and Bush in '71, among others, articulated our position that the settlements are not helpful to a Middle East peace settlement. As to any change in our position on Israel, I would suggest you read the Ambassador's remarks in full. They include some good words for Israel on the government's handling of the West Bank problem, currently the subject of discussion at the UN Security Council. As for any signals or changes in our overall policy toward the PLO, that has not changed.

Refer additional inquiries to the Department of State.

April 5, 1976

ISRAEL READY TO USE A-WEAPONS IN '73 WAR

Q. The Washington Post reports this morning that Israel has 13 atomic bombs that were hastily assembled and readied for use during the October, 1973 war. Can you confirm that Israel has weapons and did so as early as 1973 for use in the October war?

A. We would not have any comment on the reports you mention. The Israeli Embassy has commented on the story (saying that there is nothing new we haven't heard before; it's all speculation; Israel is not a nuclear power) and we have nothing to add to their remarks.

April 22, 1976

ISRAEL AND THE PLO

Q: In his interview yesterday the President talked about Israel and the PLO. Does this signal a new Israeli position on the PLO? Was the President describing Israel's position on the PLO?

A: The President was not trying to describe the Israeli position on the PLO. As he stated in the interview yesterday and as he has stated before the decision on negotiations is an issue between Israel and the PLO to work out.

May 19, 1976

PRESIDENT'S MEETING WITH GOLDA MEIR

VOLUNTEER

The President will meet this afternoon at 2:00 pm with former Prime Minister Golda Meir. Mrs. Meir is in the United States on a private visit to receive an award from the AFL-CIO and to receive an honorary degree from Wellesley. She and the President wanted to take the opportunity of her visit to exchange views on the Middle East situation.

FYI ONLY:

Among the likely topics are the Syrian renewal of UNDOF, the West Bank unrest and Israeli settlements in the occupied territories, and bilaterally, U. S. aid to Israel.

May 27, 1976

U.S. POSITION IN UN DEBATE ON THE OCCUPIED

TERRITORIES -- US-ISRAELI DIFFERENCES

Q: What is the reaction to Israel's outcry over the position taken by the U.S. (Ambassador Scranton) in the UN Security Council debate that Israel's activities in the Occupied Territories are not helpful to the peace process?

A: -- We have and will continue to resist efforts to develop unbalanced resolutions at the UN on Middle East issues. As Scranton's remarks make clear, the U.S. disassociated itself from the Security Council statement released yesterday because of its lack of balance.

-- At the same time, the policy of this Administration on the matter of activities in the Occupied Territories is also clear.

The status of the Occupied Territories is a matter for negotiations among the parties. We oppose activities in those territories which are not in accord with international law as not helpful to the peace process. This has been the publicly stated policy of the U.S.

Government since 1967. Ambassador Scranton's statement yesterday reflects no change.

Q: Will the U.S. -Israeli relationship enter into a new period of strain as our differences on this issue are increasingly aired in public?

A: The Israelis have long known our position on activities in the Occupied Territories. It has not changed, nor do we expect any change in our fundamental relationship with Israel.

PRESIDENT'S ATTITUDE ON T. O. FUNDING:
WILLING TO COMPROMISE?

- Q. There are news reports this morning that the White House has offered an additional \$200 million transition quarter funding to Israel, with proportional amounts for other Middle East aid recipients. Are these reports true, and if so, isn't this a major change in the President's position on T. O. funding?
- A. The President has expressed himself before on transition quarter funding, both publicly and to the Congress. The present appropriation legislation has emerged from conference in disagreement, and at this point I think we will have to wait to see what develops in further legislative action. Members of Congress have made their views on transition quarter funding known to the President, and he will be considering their positions.
-

June 24, 1976

LOCATION OF US EMBASSY IN TEL AVIV INSTEAD OF IN JERUSALEM

Q. Did you find out for us what the policy is on moving the US Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem as called for by Jerry Brown?

A. Our policy relates to the broader issue on the status of the Occupied Territories. Our policy remains that the status of the Occupied Territories and the status of Jerusalem must be resolved in negotiations among the parties involved in a final settlement. This is neither a new policy nor a partisan policy. It has been followed by past Administrations, both Republican and Democratic. ~~It is in keeping with the Geneva Convention on Occupied Territories to which we adhere.~~ That is why our Embassy has remained in Tel Aviv ever since it was established in 1949.

Q. In other words, the US does not want to move its embassy to Jerusalem because it would then look as if the US recognizes that all of Jerusalem belongs to Israel? Does the US recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel? [FYI: The latter is the Israeli position.]

A. I have given you the broad outlines of our policy and the reasons for it. We do not wish to prejudge the outcome of negotiations. State can fill you in on the details.

Q. Why have other embassies of other countries been moved to ^{Jerusalem?} Tel Aviv?

A. State can address whether anyone else has moved. [FYI: as of 11:00 am we are still trying to confirm whether others have moved. So refer all questions on this to State without taking a position on whether any have moved. End FYI]

Aug 28, 1974
Trial Press
Conference

QUESTION: Mr. President, my question applies to a 1972 statement in which you said that an impediment to a regional peace settlement is an impediment to preserve the fiction that Jerusalem is not the capital of Israel. My question, sir, is would you, now that you set foreign policy, request that the Embassy be shifted from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem along with 17 other national Embassies?

THE PRESIDENT: Under the current circumstance and the importance of getting a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, I think that particular proposal ought to stand aside. We must come up with some answers between Israel and the Arab nations in order to achieve a peace that is both fair and durable.

QUESTION: Mr. President, do you contemplate any changes in our policy with Cuba?

THE PRESIDENT: The policy that we have toward Cuba today is determined by the sanctions voted by the Organization of American States and we abide by those actions that were taken by the members of that organization.

Now if Cuba changes its policy toward us and toward its Latin neighbors, we, of course, would exercise the option depending on what the changes were to change our policy. But before we made any change, we would certainly act in concert with the other members of the Organization of American States.

QUESTION: Mr. President, you have emphasized here your option of granting a pardon to the former President.

THE PRESIDENT: I intend to.

QUESTION: You intend to have that option. If an indictment is brought, would you grant a pardon before any trial took place?

THE PRESIDENT: I said at the outset that until the matter reaches me, I am not going to make any comment during the process of whatever charges are made.

QUESTION: Mr. President, two questions related, how long will the transition last, in your opinion, and, secondly, how soon would it be proper and fair for Democrats on the campaign trail this fall to hold you accountable for the economic policy and the economic problems the country faces?

THE PRESIDENT: I can't judge what the Democrats are going to say about my policies. They have been very friendly so far and very cooperative. I think it is a fair statement that our problems domestically, our economic problems, are the joint responsibility of Government. As a matter of fact, I think the last poll indicated that most Americans felt that our difficulties were caused by Government action and that, of course, includes the President and the Democratic Congress. So we are all in this boat together along with labor and management and everybody else. I don't think making partisan politics out of a serious domestic problem is good politics.

MORE

TRANSITION QUARTER FUNDING: --
ADMINISTRATION COMPROMISE

Q. Yesterday the House passed the Security Assistance Appropriations Legislation for FY 1076. It included \$275 million in FMS credits and supporting assistance for Israel during the transition quarter, and proportional amounts for Egypt Syria, and Jordan. Is the President prepared to accept the transition quarter funds in the legislation given his previous position?

A. The President is prepared to accept lower compromise levels that have been proposed for the Transition Quarter which constitute a carefully balanced package of additional assistance to key Middle East countries. These levels do include about \$275 million in TQ funds for Israel, as well as some TQ funds for Egypt, Syria and Jordan, As you know, the President opposed the larger amounts of TQ funding proposed by the Congress as not justified in a period of domestic austerity.

The total amount of assistance for Israel for FY '76, the TQ and FY 77 will be just over \$4.2 billion. This will be fully adequate to meet Israel's essential needs until October, 1977. Including these sums, the U. S. will have provided some \$10.6 billion to Israel since 1949 in military and economic aid. The funds requested by the Administration for FY 76 and FY 77 represent 40% of all U. S. aid to Israel since its creation.

Q. Isn't this new position in effect a capitulation by the President to the Congress?

A. After extensive consultation with members of Congress, the President feels that these funding levels represent a fair compromise which will result in a balanced program sufficient to meet the needs of our friends in the Middle East while at the same time reflecting the budget constraints our own domestic situation dictates.

If the Senate has not acted by the time of the briefing:

Q. Will the President accept further increases for TQ funding should the Senate add to the House-passed legislation?

A. The President will not accept further increases in TQ funding. I would only add that this legislation contains funds for many important security assistance programs. With the fiscal year ending tomorrow, attempts to further amend or increase levels in this bill will inevitably delay critical assistance to our friends and allies.

Q- Raise budget total?

A- No. Offsets by cuts.

July 6, 1976

ISRAELI RESCUE OF AIR FRANCE HOSTAGES; FOLLOW-UP

Q. What can you tell us about the U. S. ' knowledge or information about the rescue effort prior to its operation?

A. We had no prior knowledge, nor did we have any role in helping with the Israeli operation. On Saturday evening Ambassador Dinitz called Secretary Kissinger and General Scowcroft to advise them that the operation was underway. The Secretary then called the President, and General Scowcroft later provided a briefing update at the Kennedy Center that evening.

Q. Does the Administration believe that Israel was within its rights in conducting this operation? Do we think the Israelis violated Ugandan sovereignty?

A. The President has expressed himself on this issue as he wished to in his message to Prime Minister Rabin. I have nothing to add to his remarks.

Q. How would the U. S. respond to a UN resolution condemning Israel which the OAU recently voted to request?

A. We do not even know whether there will be a resolution introduced, let alone what it might say, so I cannot speculate on how the U. S. might respond.

Q. What do we know about Uganda's role in assisting the hijackers?

A. We do not have all the details of the hijacking or of the rescue operation, so we would not want to speculate about various aspects of either.

July 21, 1976

ISRAEL AID TO BEIRUT CHRISTIANS

Q: There are reports thst Israel is directly but covertly supplying military aid to Lebanon's Maronite Christians. Do you have any information on that? Is the "Military Aid" actually American equipment which we have sold or given the Israelis?

A: I've seen stories to that effect, but they are highly speculative, and I would have no comment.

IF PUSHED: We have no information on that one way or another.

August 12, 1976

U.S. EMBASSY -- WHY NOT IN JERUSALEM?

Q: Why doesn't the US move its embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem as called for in the Democratic Platform, especially since other nations have done this?

A: This relates to the broader issue of the status of Jerusalem. Our policy remains that this must be resolved in negotiations among the parties involved in a final settlement. This is neither a new policy nor a partisan policy. It has been followed by past Administrations, both Republican and Democratic. That is why our Embassy has remained in Tel Aviv.

Q: In other words, the US does not want to move its embassy to Jerusalem because it would look as if the US recognizes that all of Jerusalem belongs to Israel? Does the US recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel as the Israelis insist?

A: I have given you the broad outlines of what has been policy for many years. We do not wish to prejudge the outcome of negotiations. I cannot speak for other countries that may take different actions.

[13 countries -- 12 Latin American and the Netherlands -- have moved their embassies to Jerusalem.]

U. S. - ISRAELI DISPUTE OVER OIL EXPLORATION
IN THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA

Q. Can you confirm reports that the U. S. ~~was~~ angered over Israeli harrassment of U. S. oil companies trying to drill for oil in the Red Sea?

A. We have had talks recently with Israel concerning interference with the operation of our American drilling rig in the Gulf of Suez. These talks have taken place in both Washington and Tel Aviv, and we are seeking a practical solution to this issue.

The State Department has been addressing questions on this matter and I prefer thst you take your detailed questions there.

FYI:

The dispute involves legal complexities regarding U. S. contentions that our companies have a valid right to drill in the Gulf of Suez under 1964 concessions versus Israeli claims of military control up to a median line in the Gulf.

WHITE HOUSE STATEMENT FOLLOWING
MEETING BETWEEN PRESIDENT FORD
AND ISRAELI DEPUTY PRIME MINIS-
TER YIGAL ALLON, OCTOBER 11, 1976

President Ford and Israeli Deputy Prime Minister Yigal Allon met in the Oval Office for _____ minutes. The meeting was also attended by Secretary of State Kissinger and Brent Scowcroft on the American side, and Ambassador on the Israeli side.
Dinitz and Minister Bar On

The President expressed his personal pleasure at being able to welcome Mr. Allon once again to the White House. The President and Deputy Prime Minister reviewed the situation in the Middle East, with particular reference to the prospect for continuing the progress toward a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. They noted the success already achieved in reaching the Sinai Agreement between Israel and Egypt just over a year ago. The President restated the American commitment to continuing the peace process in the Middle East.

The President reaffirmed his continuing commitment to the security and survival of Israel, noting that the United States intends to continue its generous policy of economic and military aid to Israel. In the past two fiscal years alone that aid has totalled \$4.4 billion. The President and Deputy Prime Minister reviewed the excellent state of bilateral relations and affirmed the traditional friendship uniting their two nations. They agreed that this friendship forms a solid basis for addressing both bilateral questions and questions involved in the search for a peace settlement in the Middle East.

ISRAEL ARMS

Guidance: You have nothing to add to what you said on Monday. You can point out, if asked, that there are no plans to send any arms sales notifications to Congress before January.

F.Y.I.: Guidance prepared for the President's use is attached.

UN SECURITY COUNCIL STATEMENT ON OCCUPIED TERRITORIES

Q: Why did the United States join the UN Security Council consensus statement last week deploring measures taken by Israel on the occupied West Bank?

A: I understand the State Department has already dealt with this issue at great length. We were able to go along with this consensus statement because it reflected our long-standing position regarding the standards which should govern Israel's occupation of Arab territories.

Q: Now that the election is over, is it not true that you have changed the U.S. position, since you refused to join a consensus statement in the Security Council last May?

A: Our position has not changed. It is fully consistent with what our position has been over many years. It is based on our view that the Fourth Geneva Convention regarding the protection of war victims governs Israel's occupation. We stated that position in the Security Council debates in both March and May. We were able to join the consensus statement this time because it did not contain language to which we objected last time. We were able to change or delete entirely language which would have prevented our joining the consensus this time, and which if it had been deleted in May, would have made it possible for us to join a consensus statement then. We made this clear to other Council members at that time.

Q: What is the difference between a resolution and a consensus statement?

A: A consensus statement is not the same as a resolution because it is merely an informal expression of the Council's views. It of course does not bind any state under international law.

November 16, 1976

US POLICY ON OCCUPIED TERRITORIES

Q: Since the election is over, did the Administration then feel free to join the UN Security Council consensus statement last week deploring ~~th~~- measures taken by Israel on the occupied West Bank and why did the Administration do this, having refused to vote for a similar statement in March and May? Why has our position changed?

A: Despite all of the publicity over this issue, the fact of the matter remains that US policy on this issue has not changed since it was established in 1967. We voted for this consensus statement on its merits, because it reflected our long-standing position regarding Israel's occupation of Arab territories and our consistent view that the Fourth Geneva Convention on occupied territories should govern Israel's occupation. We have stated that position every year in the United Nations since 1967. The main difference between this Security Council session and the one last May is that the consensus statement did not contain language to which we objected the last time. In fact, we were able to change or delete entirely language which would have prevented our joining the consensus statement last May and would have prevented it this time had it not been removed.

Q: What is the difference between a resolution and a consensus statement? Is any further action expected as a result of this statement?

A: A consensus statement is not the same as a resolution because it is merely an informal expression of the Council's views. Approving the consensus does not mean agreeing with every word and we expressed our reservations on some elements of the statement. Nor is it a binding resolution under international law. It is an expression of opinion.

Q: Is this vote an indication that the present Administration has changed its attitude toward Israel since the elections?

A: Not at all. As I have said, our agreement with the consensus statements and our accompanying explanation are fully in accord with the position of this Administration and previous Administrations from 1967. Where we believe proposed resolutions do not accord with our policy, we fight them -- as we are presently doing in UNESCO. Where they are in accord with our policy, we support them.

(Note: Today's NY Times editorial is very good on this question.)

November 23, 1976

Q: What is the President's reaction to increased tension on the Israeli-Lebanese border and is it true that the U.S. passed Israeli warnings to the Syrians?

A: We are continuing to encourage and support efforts by the parties directly concerned to continue the favorable evolution of events in Lebanon. We hope that the situation in the border area does not become a major source of trouble. I am not going to get into the details of any diplomatic exchanges we have with the parties.

December 3, 1976

F-16's TO ISRAEL

Q: Has the U. S. agreed to sell F-16's to Israel?

A: We have an ongoing military supply relationship with Israel; however, as a matter of policy we do not comment on any specific items contemplated or under consideration. If and when letters of offer are proposed on any specific item, the normal procedure is to provide congressional notification as required by law.

F-16's TO ISRAEL

Q: Has the U. S. agreed to sell F-16's to Israel?

A: We have an ongoing military supply relationship with Israel; however, as a matter of policy we do not comment on any specific items contemplated or under consideration. If and when letters of offer are proposed on any specific item, the normal procedure is to provide congressional notification as required by law.

[State confirmed that Israel had requested the F-16 a while ago in conjunction with the Sinai II Accord, that the U. S. Government is studying the matter, and that no decision has been made. In response to a question, State also indicated a decision before January 20 is unlikely.]

ASSISTANCE TO ISRAEL

Q: Can you confirm press reports that the President has cut the total aid package to Israel to \$1.5 billion from the \$1.8 billion recommended by the Department of State and the \$2.3 billion which Israel had requested?

A: The President is considering carefully all of the different aspects involved in his preparation of the FY 78 budget. He will announce his budget to the Congress at the appropriate time. I have no comments on specific line items at this time.

Q: What is the status of the items which President Ford promised to Israel just before the election (tanks, howitzers, CBUs and infra-red night vision devices)?

A: The President is considering recommendations from the departments concerned on the manner of implementing his earlier decision in principle.

Q: Does this suggest that the President may change his mind about providing this material?

A: No.