

83 2/c

Meeting between President Navon and President Reagan
at the Oval Office
Wednesday, January 5, 1983
11:45 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS: President Navon, President Reagan, Vice President Bush,
Ambassador Arens, Secretary Shultz, Judge Clark, Netanyahu
Veliotos.

PRESIDENT REAGAN: We are very glad to have you here. This is an opportunity for me to get some things off my chest. I am disturbed by the perception of strained relations between our two countries. When the Prime Minister was here, I thought we had established a very strong bond and a personal friendship, and I still feel that holds.

On September 1st, I put forth my initiative as an answer to all who had questions about our commitment to peace in the Middle East. There is no question about Israel's ability to defend itself. There is a question on how long it can carry the economic toll. Our September initiative was the only way for us to convince the Arabs that we are committed to achieve a fair peace.

I had the opportunity to meet twice with Jordan's King Hussein recently. I was impressed that he has the same feeling about the necessity for peace and I was impressed by his sincere desire to bring a stable peace to the area. This is what has guided our policy all along, including during the AWACS sale. I had a bad feeling

from Prime Minister Begin's statement that we had abandoned Israel. We believe that the only real security for Israel lies in peace in the area. In my September speech I said we should get the Lebanon war cleaned up and then move on to the broader peace process (cleaning up Lebanon is not so simple; you know they have not one war, but eight wars). If we seem critical of the settlements, this is because we feel it's an issue that needs to be resolved in the Camp David process.

In their recent visit to Washington, King Hassan and King Hussein brought up the subject of the PLO. I made it clear that the U.S. cannot sit and talk to them until they recognize Israel's right to exist. We have not relented any in our desire for peace. Our September 1st initiative proposal suggested the giving up of territory for peace. We wouldn't accept anything less than real security for Israel. There has been no change in our feeling. We differ on some of the actions to bring this peace about. Hussein wants this too but he has to convince other Arabs that this is the way to go.

PRESIDENT NAVON: Did he condition his own involvement on the PLO's participation in the process?

PRESIDENT REAGAN: We made it very clear that the PLO can't participate until and unless they change their position. Hussein agrees with this. He may be thinking about the PLO once removed. He considers bringing Palestinians of the West Bank to the table, but he would be the leader of the negotiating party.

83/4/6

PRESIDENT NAVON: Well first, I didn't have a chance to thank you for your hospitality. It is very kind of you to take the time to see me. I bring you greetings from our Prime Minister. I saw him before I left and got from him an update of the latest developments.

What I can do, if that is all right with you, is to give you a general picture of the attitudes in Israel rather than the details of the various negotiations. You know, I am paid not to think aloud.

PRESIDENT REAGAN: I think that applies to me too sometimes.

(laughter).

PRESIDENT NAVON: I would like to give you some general impressions of the reaction to the American proposal and your speech. We view them as one unit. I must say that your friendship and sincerity for Israel came through very clearly in that speech. As to the proposal, some of the opposition parties -- actually Labor, which is the largest opposition party -- accept the proposal as a basis for negotiation, while the government does not. Both express their belief in your good faith and dedication to Israel which you expressed in your speech. Foreign Minister Shamir recently expressed his appreciation for your "iron-clad commitment" to Israel's security. Your statement that Israel has to live in defensible and secure boundaries, that Jerusalem should remain united, and that a PLO state is unacceptable, were backed up also by those who didn't accept the proposal itself. They view the

85/5/6

details of the proposal not acceptable from the point of view of security. So we have two approaches to this matter, the government's and the opposition's.

But now I would like to explain where we do have consensus. First, on the question of borders: We cannot accept that peace and only peace can be the sole basis for security. I think it was Kissinger who said that "all wars started with a peace." We must have security, and we cannot return to the 1967 borders. On this there is general agreement, including from the dovish elements. I don't know if King Hussein and the Arabs know this. One of the provisions of the proposal says that the extent of withdrawal will depend on the extent of peace. This implies that total peace would mean total withdrawal. We are unified that this cannot be. It is difficult for America with its vast dimensions to see why we argue about "a few lousy square miles". But that's all we have. The total area of Israel is 8,000 square miles, of which 60% is desert; the territories are only 2,000 square miles. But they are very important. We saw in 1973 that if the war had started in the international borders, rather than on the Golan Heights, the Arabs could have reached Haifa. Twenty kilometers can make a great difference. On this we are united. I'm saying this having spoken to many people with many opinions. I hope, therefore, that the Arabs don't develop a hope for a full return. No one in Israel could accept this, except the communists. Your mention of the dangers of the 10-mile wide strip is consistent with this view.

85/96

PRESIDENT REAGAN: Well, our view is that this is what needs to be negotiated. One side asks for the 1967 boundaries; you say you have security concerns. This should be negotiated.

(At this point the party was called to the
Cabinet room).

* NETANYAHU

41

שגרירות ישראל - וושינגטון

אל: המסרד ירושלים

ט ו פ ס מ כ ר ק

דף... 6... מחורן... דפים

סוג בטחוני... סודי

דחיסות... מדי

תאריך וז"ח... 051730 בדצמבר 83

מס' מברק... 81

שר החוץ

לשכת רה"מ

מנכ"ל, ממנכ"ל, מצפ"א

מציב חלק הסני של שיחת שני הנשיאים, החלק הראשון יוברק בנפרד.

ע י ב ל

שבת סופרת היא סופרת אהבת אמת ופורה
אין אהבת אמת

81 3/6

Meeting in the Cabinet Room between President Navon and President Reagan
Wednesday, January 5, 1983.

11:45 a.m.

PARTICIPATING: President Reagan, President Navon, Vice President Bush,
Meese, Clark, McFarlane, Kemp, Sec. Shultz, Teicher,
Lewis, Veliotis, Arens, Netanyahu, Bentsur, Sabal.

PRESIDENT REAGAN: Welcomed President Navon , expressed pleasure that
President Navon was going to receive an honorary degree at Johns Hopkins.

PRESIDENT NAVON expressed his appreciation for the President's hospitality.

REAGAN : As I explained in our meeting in the Oval Room, there is no
change in our pledge to the security of Israel and to our friendship
with Israel. I hope we can proceed on the peace plan and finally
bring it about.

NAVON: In our earlier meeting I tried to convey to you what is
common to both coalition and opposition in Israel. The problem of
borders. The fact that Jerusalem is united and must remain so.

I had met President Sadat and am a great admirer of his and his
death was a great tragedy to us. Sadat broke taboos that had
previously existed. On Jerusalem, his initial position was that
Jerusalem should remain united with one municipality and one mayor,

within this municipality, there should be a special department dealing with East Jerusalem and they would be entitled to a separate flag.

After about a year he started to begin talking about two different sovereignties in Jerusalem. When I met him, I told him that two sovereignties means two different states and after our discussion he said that they should indeed, try and find a different definition. In Israel, both the government and opposition are united in feeling that our capital cannot be divided.

The same is true for an independent Palestinian state, both government and coalition see it as an impossibility, it would be Soviet dominated and irredentist. The leaders of the PLO continue to make declarations that worry us. I don't even want to hear their talk of recognition of our right to exist.

We don't need Arafat to give us our right to exist. That we have from the Almighty.

They should change their covenant which talks about destroying the Zionist entity. In fact, it's a travesty to describe that document as a covenant. The tragedy of Beirut didn't change the attitude of the PLO.

Our concept of security is part of our concept of peace. Our peace treaty with Egypt is a mixture of hope and tragedy. We gave up the Sinai and we had been there for a long time. We gave up airfields and oil, we evacuated settlements, and it was a symbolic, painful event for us because they were pioneers who were developing the desert. We hoped all this would bring in a new era.

81/4/6

-3-

We don't think peace can be reached with all the Arab states at the same time. The extremist states like Syria and Libya will always tend to lead the others. We had peace with Egypt only since Sadat departed from the Arab consensus. We had many expectations from this peace and now what we have in fact is, ^a cold peace.

The articles against us in the Egyptian press during the Lebanon campaign went beyond any legitimate criticism, and the Egyptian press is not without government influence. There were attacks on Jewish character, on Jewish people and Nazi-like cartoons. I sent a message to Mubarak as I thought we had become personal friends.

This does not only imperil peace with Egypt, it is a danger to the prospect of peace with the other Arab countries. For if this is going to be the outcome of peace, then we've lost some of our faith in it. It worries me since I was a strong supporter of that peace agreement and it had the support of both opposition and government. I just read that the Egyptian table-tennis team in Brazil refused to play with an Israeli team. It's an insignificant incident but it denotes a boycott. You, of course, remember the significance of table-tennis in your relations with China. Another example is that an Egyptian/^{who}wants to visit Israel is subjected to questioning by Egyptian security services, which, of course, deters anybody from visiting.

81/5/6

-4-

REAGAN & SECRETARY SHULTZ both stated that they were not aware of the table-tennis incident.

NAVON: Egypt even warned Lebanon not to reach agreement with Israel on anything else, except withdrawal. If this is going to be the sort of peace we can reach, it is not encouraging as a model.

I know your people spoke to the Egyptians about this but I haven't yet seen results. We have some fifty agreements with Egyptians and they are not being respected. I understand President Mubarak is coming here to see you soon, contrary to what people say, he is not a closed person and I found him open and frank. The question is, do they want to return to the Arab fold by "erasing the black mark" of their relationship with Israel.

Sadat told me that Egypt is the "mother" of the Arab nations and they would eventually all come to Egypt. I don't think this is Mubarak's view.

REAGAN : We'll talk to him about it when he is here. With ^{other} regard to the/Arab states, we are talking about the moderate Arab states and it must be a real peace. The peace treaty between Egypt and Israel must be respected, as any peace must, we are not naive on the subject.

(The meeting broke up at 12:15 p.m. and the group moved into lunch, being joined by Mrs. Dole and Gerry Bremmer of the Department of State, and Gluska and Shai).

8/16/6

During lunch, Vice President Bush asked about Israel's relations with China. President Navon and Arens replied that indeed, there were signs of a improvement in Chinese statements as regards Israel but that there were no formal talks between Israel and China. They explained the Chinese move as increased awareness of the strategic anti-Soviet role played by Israel in the Middle East. President Navon explained in detail Israel's parliamentary system and the importance played by judiciary in Israel.

President Navon told various stories illustrating the smallness of Israel and the small size of its population. There was a discussion of development of water resources, using modern techniques. President Reagan showed great interest in the description given by Navon and Arens of the Dead Sea-Med Canal. At this stage Secretary Shultz commented that the problems involved were more political than technical.

Secretary Shultz pointed out that King Hussein, when he visited here, stressed the importance of joint water development with Israel, and how vital peace with Israel would be to Jordan in this respect.

Arens pointed out that Israel has no spare water and that we are utilizing nearly 100% of our capability.

Reagan asked whether Israel had considered using nuclear power for desalination and Arens replied that this had been considered.

Reagan ended up the meal by reassuring President Navon that he guarantees that any peace that will be achieved will be a real permanent peace and the U.S. is not naive in this respect.


A separate report on the meeting in the Oval Office will be cabled.

דף 1.. מתוך 1.. דפים

סדרג בטחוני...?

דחירות...???

תאריך רז"ח: 1000..5. ינואר 83

מס' מבוק...  מחלקת המידע

אל: המשד

מתכ"ל, מצפ"א

President Reagan's Speech following his visit with President Navon of Israel
On January 5, 1982.

President Reagan - - - It has been my great pleasure to welcome you to the White House and to the United States, as you begin your visit which will take you on to Boston and New York. We've had an excellent opportunity to meet each others acquaintance and to break bread together. I know now that Nancy and Mrs. Navon will have a chance to meet before Mrs. Navon's departure from the U.S., which both are looking forward to that. Your presence here as the President of Israel symbolizes the close ties that has always linked our two nations. Ours is a friendship that has deepened over time and daily expressed in our unswerving committment to the security and well being of Israel (undoubtedly) connected with peace in the Middle East; principal goals of both our peoples. The succession of American Presidents have committed this nation in assisting in the achievement of that goal. I can assure you that our committment to peace is one that I am proud to carry forward. Mr. President we wish you and Mrs. Navon an interesting and productive visit and a safe return to Israel

President Navon - - - I am very grateful to you for your kind invitation. It has been an opportunity to exchange views on important issues that relate to the mutual countries; to the peace in the Middle East, to the prospect of ^{peace} ~~peee~~ in the Middle East, and security. In Israel as you very well know, Mr. President there are different views as to the policies; whether those who accepted the American views as a basis for negotiations or whether those who found it not possible to accept as a basis. None of them has any doubt as to the - your

ט ר פ ס מ ב ר ק

דפוס 2. מתוך 2. דפים

סדרג בטחוני.....

דחירות.....

תאריך רז"ח:.....

מס' מברק 82.....

לשירות

אל:

dedication to peace - your sincerity and your commitment to peace and to the security of Israel. We are grateful to you Mr. President; and we are grateful to the American people for the generous aid that has always been rendering to my people and that feeling of gratitude is what I wanted to express to you Mr. President.

תחנות

מס' מברק 82 / תאריך רז"ח: / דפוס 2. מתוך 2. דפים / ט ר פ ס