FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

1969–1976

VOLUME XXV

ARAB-ISRAELI CRISIS AND WAR, 1973

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Washington

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969–1976

Volume XXV

Arab-Israeli Crisis and War, 1973

Editors Nina Howland
Craig Daigle

General Editor Edward C. Keefer

United States Government Printing Office
Washington
2011

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Office of the Historian

Bureau of Public Affairs

July 2011

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2250 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

Preface

The *Foreign Relations of the United States* series presents the official documentary historical record of major foreign policy decisions and significant diplomatic activity of the United States Government. The Historian of the Department of State is charged with the responsibility for the preparation of the *Foreign Relations* series. The staff of the Office of the Historian, Bureau of Public Affairs, under the direction of the General Editor of the *Foreign Relations* series, plans, researches, compiles, and edits the volumes in the series. Secretary of State Frank B. Kellogg first promulgated official regulations codifying specific standards for the selection and editing of documents for the series on March 26, 1925. These regulations, with minor modifications, guided the series through 1991.

Public Law 102–138, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, established a new statutory charter for the preparation of the series which was signed by President George H.W. Bush on October 28, 1991. Section 198 of P.L. 102–138 added a new Title IV to the Department of State's Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 4351, et seq.).

The statute requires that the *Foreign Relations* series be a thorough, accurate, and reliable record of major United States diplomatic activity. The volumes of the series should include all records needed to provide comprehensive documentation of major foreign policy decisions and actions of the United States Government. The statute also confirms the editing principles established by Secretary Kellogg: the *Foreign Relations* series is guided by the principles of historical objectivity and accuracy; records should not be altered or deletions made without indicating in the published text that a deletion has been made; the published record should omit no facts that were of major importance in reaching a decision; and nothing should be omitted for the purposes of concealing a defect in policy. The statute also requires that the *Foreign Relations* series be published not more than 30 years after the events recorded.

Structure and Scope of the Foreign Relations *Series*

This volume is part of a subseries of volumes of the *Foreign Relations* series that document the most important issues in the foreign policy of the administrations of Richard M. Nixon and Gerald R. Ford. The subseries presents a documentary record of major foreign policy decisions and actions of both presidents. This volume documents U.S. policymaking toward the Arab-Israeli dispute between January and

December 1973, i.e., the months before, during, and immediately after the Arab-Israeli War of October 1973.

Although part of a larger integrated series, this volume is intended to stand on its own. Readers who want a more complete context for U.S. policy toward the Arab-Israeli dispute during the Nixon and Ford administrations should consult other volumes in the 1969–1976 subseries of the *Foreign Relations* series. U.S. policy regarding the dispute during the first Nixon administration is covered in Volume XXIII, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1969–1972, while U.S. policy regarding the Jordan crisis of September 1970 is addressed in Volume XXIV, Middle East Region and Arabian Peninsula, 1969–1972; Jordan, September 1970. U.S.-Soviet discussions on the Arab-Israeli Dispute—the ''Two-Power Talks''—is documented in Volume XII, Soviet Union, 1969–1970, while superpower discussions on the Middle East leading up to and during the Moscow Summit is covered in Volume XIII, Soviet Union, 1970–1971 and Volume XIV, Soviet Union, 1971–1972. U.S.-Soviet discussions regarding the Arab-Israeli War of October 1973 are documented in Volume XV, Soviet Union, June 1972–August 1974. Readers will find extensive coverage of the oil and energy aspects of the dispute, including the U.S. response to the Arab oil embargo which followed the October 1973 War, in Volume XXXVI, Energy Crisis, 1969–1974, and Volume XXXVII, Energy Crisis, 1974–1980. The development of U.S. policy in the aftermath of the October 1973 War, highlighted by Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger's ''shuttle diplomacy'' between Israel and the Arab states, is documented in Volume XXVI, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1974–1976. Lastly, readers interested in bilateral relations with Iran and Iraq during the Nixon and Ford administrations should consult Volume E–4, Documents on Iran and Iraq, 1969–1972, and Volume XXVII, Iran; Iraq, 1973–1976.

Focus of Research and Principles of Selection for Foreign Relations, *1969–1976, Volume XXV*

The editors of this volume sought to present documentation that explains and illuminates the major foreign policy decisions taken by the administration of Richard M. Nixon toward the Arab-Israeli dispute in the months preceding, during, and immediately following the October 1973 War. Documentation in this volume includes memoranda; records of discussions both within the U.S. policy-making community, as well as with foreign officials; cables to and from U.S. diplomatic posts; and papers that set forth policy issues and options, and which show decisions or actions taken. The emphasis is on the process by which U.S. policy developed, and the major repercussions of its implementation rather than the details of policy execution.

This volume covers an important period in the history of the U.S. engagement with the Arab-Israeli dispute. The October 1973 War rep-

resented not only a renewed clash of Arab and Israeli forces, it ignited an energy crisis brought on by an Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries (OAPEC) oil embargo against the United States, and led to the threat of a direct superpower confrontation. The war also prompted the United States to undertake an unprecedented role in the pursuit of a negotiated settlement to the dispute.

At the beginning of 1973, the Middle East was in a state of diplomatic and military stalemate. There had been no overt armed clash of Arab and Israeli forces since the August 1970 ceasefire which ended the three-year Egyptian-Israeli War of Attrition and, with the exception of the Jordanian crisis the following month, no major event had occurred that disrupted the region's strategic status quo in over two years. Moreover, efforts toward a diplomatic settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute during President Nixon's first term, such as the Jarring mission and the Rogers Plan, had had little success. Even Egyptian President Anwar Sadat's decision to expel Soviet advisers from Egypt in July 1972 did not have an immediate effect on the stalemate. During his first term in office, Nixon and his Assistant for National Security Affairs, Henry Kissinger, had been preoccupied largely with ending U.S. military involvement in the Vietnam War, the burgeoning rapprochement with the People's Republic of China, and pursuing détente with the Soviet Union. Yet both Nixon and Kissinger were aware of the importance of the Middle East to U.S. national security—economically, politically, and militarily—and, with the signing of the Paris Peace Accords in January 1973, sought to launch a new diplomatic initiative for peace in the Middle East during Nixon's second term.

In order for this new initiative to succeed, Nixon's foreign policy team needed to confront the legacies of the 1967 war. The first third of this volume, covering January to October 1973, documents the Nixon administration's efforts to break this diplomatic and military impasse while seeking to prevent simmering tensions from instigating renewed hostilities. Within this context, Washington attempted to address Israel's continued insistence upon Arab recognition, direct negotiations, and security assurances as preconditions for its withdrawal from the territory it occupied in June 1967, territory which it considered necessary to act as a buffer against future Arab attacks. On the other hand, U.S. policymakers also had to grapple with Arab dissatisfaction toward a status quo that, from the Arab perspective, placed Israel in a dominant position. Indeed, Sadat had concluded by 1972 that military action was necessary to restore Egyptian honor and, more importantly, prompt U.S. diplomatic intervention, all with the ultimate aim of bringing about a peace settlement acceptable to the Arab states. Ultimately, the Nixon administration saw the conflict as part of the Cold War struggle; any move to bring the Arab states and Israel to a negoti-

ated settlement needed to take into consideration the Soviet Union, whose role in the region had risen significantly in the years since 1967.

The core of this volume is U.S. diplomacy during the course of the October 1973 War itself, the outbreak of which, following the attack by Egyptian and Syrian forces on Israeli positions in the Sinai Peninsula and Golan Heights on October 6, 1973, presented the United States with a number of profound and, at times, conflicting concerns. In a strictly regional context, the October 1973 War pushed the Nixon administration to weigh Washington's historic commitment to the security of Israel alongside a desire to avoid an irreparable rift with the Arab world, especially Arab states such as Jordan and Saudi Arabia with which the United States had generally maintained good relations. Concurrently, the Nixon administration was compelled to address mounting concerns that the Soviet Union might exploit the tensions in the region, a prospect that would hamper, if not wreck, its pursuit of East-West détente. Within weeks, the shifting tide of the war against the Egyptians pushed the superpowers toward a military confrontation of their own. U.S. policymakers sought to prevent the war from triggering a wider, more destructive conflict that would shatter the regional and global power balance. The volume provides extensive documentation of the high level contacts between Washington and officials of the belligerent countries, the United Nations, and the Soviet Union. Due to the increasing impact of Watergate on Nixon and many of his advisors, Kissinger undertook the management of the conflict and efforts to bring about a negotiated ceasefire. The volume also illustrates the actions undertaken to initiate and execute the massive military re-supply of the Israel Defense Forces following the IDF's heavy losses during the early stages of the war, the internal institutional politics of the airlift debate, and the largely unsuccessful diplomatic push to win the support for U.S. policy aims by Washington's Western European allies.

The volume concludes by documenting events during the immediate postwar period. Following the October 1973 War, the quest for peace between Israel and the Arab states became a top priority for U.S. policymakers. Kissinger's late October trip to the region, his first as Secretary of State, confirmed the U.S.' growing postwar position as mediator in the Arab-Israeli dispute, one which would continue through the remainder of the 1970s. Yet Washington's decision to actively aid the Israeli military presented a new set of diplomatic challenges. While the OAPEC oil embargo is documented extensively in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, Volume XXXVI, Energy Crisis, 1969–1974, the political dimensions of the embargo and the Nixon administration's immediate response to them are presented here.

Editorial Methodology

The documents are presented chronologically according to Washington time. Memoranda of conversations are placed according to the

time and date of the conversation, rather than the date the memorandum was drafted.

Editorial treatment of the documents published in the *Foreign Relations* series follows Office style guidelines, supplemented by guidance from the General Editor and the chief technical editor. The original document is reproduced as exactly as possible, including marginalia or other notations, which are described in the footnotes. Texts are transcribed and printed according to accepted conventions for the publication of historical documents in the limitations of modern typography. A heading has been supplied by the editors for each document included in the volume. Spelling, capitalization, and punctuation are retained as found in the original text, except that obvious typographical errors are silently corrected. Other mistakes and omissions in the documents are corrected by bracketed insertions: a correction is set in italic type; an addition in roman type. Words or phrases underlined in the source text are printed in italics. Abbreviations and contractions are preserved as found in the original text, and a list of abbreviations is included in the front matter of each volume.

Bracketed insertions are also used to indicate omitted text that deals with an unrelated subject (in roman type) or that remains classified after declassification review (in italic type). The amount and, where possible, the nature of the material not declassified has been noted by indicating the number of lines or pages of text that were omitted. Entire documents withheld for declassification purposes have been accounted for and are listed by headings, source notes, and numbers of pages not declassified in their chronological place. All brackets that appear in the original document are so identified by footnotes. All ellipses are in the original documents.

The first footnote to each document indicates the source of the document, original classification, distribution, and drafting information. This note also provides the background of important documents and policies and indicates whether the President or his major policy advisers read the document.

Editorial notes and additional annotation summarize pertinent material not printed in the volume, indicate the location of additional documentary sources, provide references to important related documents printed in other volumes, describe key events, and provide summaries of and citations to public statements that supplement and elucidate the printed documents. Information derived from memoirs and other first-hand accounts has been used when appropriate to supplement or explicate the official record.

The numbers in the index refer to document numbers rather than page numbers.

Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation

The Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation, established under the Foreign Relations statute, reviews records, advises, and makes recommendations concerning the *Foreign Relations* series. The Advisory Committee monitors the overall compilation and editorial process of the series and advises on all aspects of the preparation and declassification of the series. The Advisory Committee does not necessarily review the contents of individual volumes in the series, but it makes recommendations on issues that come to its attention and reviews volumes as it deems necessary to fulfill its advisory and statutory obligations.

Presidential Recordings and Materials Preservation Act Review

Under the terms of the Presidential Recordings and Materials Preservation Act (PRMPA) of 1974 (44 U.S.C. 2111 note), the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) has custody of the Nixon Presidential historical materials. The requirements of the PRMPA and implementing regulations govern access to the Nixon Presidential historical materials. The PRMPA and implementing public access regulations require NARA to review for additional restrictions in order to ensure the protection of the privacy rights of former Nixon White House officials, since these officials were not given the opportunity to separate their personal materials from public papers. Thus, the PRMPA and implementing public access regulations require NARA formally to notify the Nixon Estate and former Nixon White House staff members that the agency is scheduling for public release Nixon White House historical materials. The Nixon Estate and former White House staff members have 30 days to contest the release of Nixon historical materials in which they were a participant or are mentioned. Further, the PRMPA and implementing regulations require NARA to segregate and return to the creator of files private and personal materials. All *Foreign Relations* volumes that include materials from NARA's Nixon Presidential Materials Project are processed and released in accordance with the PRMPA.

Nixon White House Tapes

Access to the Nixon White House tape recordings is governed by the terms of the PRMPA and an access agreement with the Office of Presidential Libraries of the National Archives and Records Administration and the Nixon Estate. In February 1971, President Nixon initiated a voice activated taping system in the Oval Office of the White House and, subsequently, in the President's Office in the Executive Office Building, Camp David, the Cabinet Room, and the White House and Camp David telephones. The audiotapes include conversations of President Nixon with his Assistant for National Security Affairs, Henry

Kissinger, other White House aides, Secretary of State William P. Rogers, other Cabinet officers, members of Congress, and key foreign officials. The clarity of the voices on the tape recordings is often very poor, but the editors have made every effort to verify the accuracy of the transcripts produced here. Readers are advised that the tape recording is the official document; the transcript represents an interpretation of that document. Through the use of digital audio and other advances in technology, the Office of the Historian has been able to enhance the tape recordings and over time produce more accurate transcripts. The result is that some transcripts printed here may differ from transcripts of the same conversations printed in previous *Foreign Relations* volumes. The most accurate transcripts possible, however, cannot substitute for listening to the recordings. Readers are urged to consult the recordings themselves for a full appreciation of those aspects of the conversations that cannot be captured in a transcript, such as the speakers' inflections and emphases that may convey nuances of meaning, as well as the larger context of the discussion.

Declassification Review

The Office of Information Programs and Services, Bureau of Administration, conducted the declassification review for the Department of State of the documents published in this volume. The review was conducted in accordance with the standards set forth in Executive Order 12958, as amended, on Classified National Security Information and applicable laws.

The principle guiding declassification review is to release all information, subject only to the current requirements of national security as embodied in law and regulation. Declassification decisions entailed concurrence of the appropriate geographic and functional bureaus in the Department of State, other concerned agencies of the U.S. Government, and the appropriate foreign governments regarding specific documents of those governments. The declassification review of this volume, which began in 2006 and was completed in 2010, resulted in the decision to withhold 3 documents in full, excise a paragraph or more in 9 documents, and make minor excisions of less than a paragraph in 37 documents.

The Office of the Historian is confident, on the basis of the research conducted in preparing this volume and as a result of the declassification review process described above, that the documentation and editorial notes presented here provide a thorough, accurate and reliable account of the Nixon administration's policy toward the Arab-Israeli dispute in the months preceding, during, and immediately following the October 1973 War.

Acknowledgements

The editors wish to acknowledge the assistance of officials at the Nixon Presidential Materials Project, located at the time of research at the National Archives and Records Administration (Archives II), at College Park, Maryland. The editors also wish to acknowledge the Richard Nixon Estate for allowing access to the Nixon Presidential recordings and the Richard Nixon Library & Birthplace for facilitating that access. John Haynes of the Library of Congress was responsible for expediting access to the Kissinger Papers, including the transcripts of Henry Kissinger's telephone conversations. Bill Burr of the National Security Archive was helpful throughout the compiling process in pointing to and providing copies of documents in his edited collection on the October 1973 War. The editors were able to use the Kissinger Papers, including the transcripts of telephone conversations, with the permission of Henry Kissinger. The editors would like to thank Rita Baker and Laurie Van Hook for their intellectual contributions to the volume. The editors would also like to thank Alex Wieland for his assistance and contributions in the final stages of producing the volume.

The volume was researched, selected, and annotated by Nina Howland and Craig Daigle under the supervision of Edward C. Keefer, former General Editor of the *Foreign Relations* series. Chris Tudda coordinated the declassification review under the supervision of Susan C. Weetman, Chief of the Declassification and Publishing Division. Renée Goings did the copy and technical editing. Do Mi Stauber prepared the index.

Bureau of Public Affairs
July 2011

Ambassador Edward Brynn
Acting Historian

Contents

Preface III
Sources XIII
Abbreviations and Terms XXI
Persons XXVII
Arab-Israeli Crisis and War, 1973 1
Index 1215

Sources

Sources for the Foreign Relations *Series*

The 1991 *Foreign Relations* statute requires that the published record in the *Foreign Relations* series include all records needed to provide comprehensive documentation on major U.S. foreign policy decisions and significant U.S. diplomatic activity. It further requires that government agencies, departments, and other entities of the U.S. Government engaged in foreign policy formulation, execution, or support, cooperate with the Department of State by providing full and complete access to records pertinent to foreign policy decisions and actions and by providing copies of selected records.

The editors of the *Foreign Relations* series have complete access to all the retired records and papers of the Department of State: the central files of the Department; the special decentralized files (''lot files'') of the Department at the bureau, office, and division levels; the files of the Department's Executive Secretariat, which contain the records of international conferences and high-level official visits, correspondence with foreign leaders by the President and Secretary of State, and memoranda of conversations between the President and Secretary of State and foreign officials; and the files of overseas diplomatic posts. All of the Department's indexed Central Files through July 1973 have been permanently transferred to the National Archives and Records Administration at College Park, Maryland (Archives II). Beginning in July 1973, the Department phased out the old subject-numeric Central Files, replacing them with an electronic system, the State Archiving System (SAS), which have been transferred to the National Archives and, as the Central Foreign Policy File, comprises part of the online Access to Archival Databases (AAD). The reader will note a period of overlap of the two systems existed during 1973, which is reflected in the citations found in this volume. The Department's decentralized (or lot) files covering the 1969–1976 period, which the National Archives deems worthy of permanent retention, have been transferred or are in the process of being transferred from the Department's custody to Archives II.

The editors of the *Foreign Relations* series also have full access to the papers of President Nixon and other White House foreign policy records. Presidential papers maintained and preserved at the Presidential libraries and the Nixon Presidential Materials Project include some of the most significant foreign affairs-related documentation from the Department of State and other Federal agencies including the National

Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Nixon's papers were transferred to their permanent home at the Nixon Presidential Library and Museum, in Yorba Linda, California, after research for this volume was completed. The Nixon Library staff is processing and declassifying many of the documents used in this volume, but they may not be available in their entirety at the time of publication. Additional materials related to the foreign policy of the Nixon administration can also be found in the National Security Adviser files at the Ford Library. Dr. Henry Kissinger has approved access to his papers at the Library of Congress. The papers are a key source for the Nixon-Ford subseries of *Foreign Relations.*

Department of State historians also have full access to records of the Department of Defense, particularly the records of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretaries of Defense and their major assistants. The Central Intelligence Agency has provided full access to its files.

Research for this volume involved special access to restricted documents at the Nixon Presidential Materials Project, the Ford Library, the Library of Congress, and other agencies. While all of the material printed in this volume has been declassified, some of it has been extracted from still classified documents. The Ford Library staff is processing and declassifying many of the documents examined for this volume, but they may not be available in their entirety at the time of publication.

Sources for Foreign Relations, 1969–1976, *Volume XXV*

In the preparation of this volume, the editors made extensive use of Presidential papers and other White House records held, at the time of research, at the Nixon Presidential Materials Project, National Archives and Records Administration, in College Park, Maryland (Archives II). These files have subsequently been transferred to the Nixon Presidential Library and Museum in Yorba Linda, California. Within the National Security Council Files, several collections are invaluable. The Kissinger Office Files, especially the country files sub-collection, were critical for documenting the Nixon administration's efforts to manage the Arab-Israeli dispute in the months leading up to the outbreak of hostilities, as well as the administration's efforts to manage the conflict amidst the countervailing pressures of the U.S-Israeli bilateral relationship, relations with the Arab countries, domestic concerns, the Watergate investigations, and the Cold War. This collection yielded a large number of important high-level documents, including memoranda of conversations; correspondence with Soviet and Middle Eastern officials, including backchannel communications; intelligence reports; and extensive documentation related to Kissinger's travels to the region during and immediately after the war. Similarly, the

Country Files, Backchannel Messages file, Harold H. Saunders Files, Presidential Correspondence file, Presidential/HAK Memoranda of Conversations File, President's Daily Briefing File, the President's Trip Files, and the VIP Visit Files, are rich resources for documenting both the National Security Council's (NSC) role in the crisis and President Nixon's communications with the leaders of the Arab states, Israel, and the Soviet Union. Separate from the main NSC Files collection, the NSC Institutional Files, also known as the ''H-Files,'' contain records of high-level meetings, requests for studies, and presidential decisions; for this volume, this collection provided the crucial records of the Washington Special Actions Group (WSAG) meetings held following the outbreak of the war on October 6, 1973. Further NSC documentation can also be found in the NSC Secretariat Files.

One of the most important collections for documenting the war period is the Henry Kissinger Telephone Transcripts. As the October 1973 War began while Kissinger was in New York for the annual opening of the United Nations General Assembly, the ''telcons,'' produced from notes taken by White House secretaries and from tape recordings, are an essential source for documenting U.S. diplomatic moves taken at the outset of the crisis. In addition to this collection at the Nixon Library, these transcripts have also been made available online by the Department of State and the National Security Archive. Documentation in this volume of the pre-war period is enhanced by the White House tape recording collection. These conversations, transcribed from recordings made by President Nixon's secret taping system, in operation until its removal in July 1973, provides an intimate record of both U.S. policy considerations and the candid personal assessments of the situation by the President and his closest advisers. The President's Daily Diary, in the White House Central Files, is useful for tracking the President's daily schedule.

This Nixon Library's documentation on U.S. decision making before, during, and after the October 1973 War is supplemented by the National Security Adviser Files at the Ford Presidential Library in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Within these files, two collections were of particular importance to this volume. The Memoranda of Conversations collection covers nearly the entirety of the 1973–1976 period, making it almost as valuable a resource for research on the Nixon administration as it is for the Ford administration. Additional documentation on the October War can be found in the Scowcroft Daily Work Files. Moreover, the Papers of Henry Kissinger at the Library of Congress proved an important resource for rounding out the administration's handling of the October War. While nearly all of the documentation in the Kissinger Papers related to the policy decisions of the Nixon administration on the Arab-Israeli dispute during 1973 can also be found at the Nixon Li-

brary, the volume benefitted greatly from a number of important documents on the October War, including memoranda of conversations, found only in this collection.

In documenting the role of the Department of State in U.S. policy making, a number of sources are important. The Department of State Central Files, located at Archives II in College Park, Maryland, provide a rich repository of telegrams, memoranda of conversations, and intradepartmental correspondence on U.S. policy in the Middle East. For research on the Arab-Israeli conflict in general and the October War in particular, the files within the POL 27 and POL ISR–US subject-numeric headings are the most valuable. However, any researchers working in Department of State files for 1973 should be aware that beginning in July of that year, the Department began to phase out the old subject-numeric system in favor of the new electronic State Archiving System (SAS). Documents from the SAS system have been transferred to the National Archives and comprise the Central Foreign Policy File. Declassified documents within this collection are available online in the Access to Archival Databases (AAD). This systemic transition occurred over the course of several months. As a result, readers of this volume will see overlapping references to both systems during the last five months of 1973. In addition to the Central Files/Central Foreign Policy File, the Department of State lot files should not be overlooked. With Henry Kissinger's appointment as Secretary of State in September 1973, no research on the Department's role in shaping the Nixon administration's handling of the Arab-Israeli dispute would be complete without consulting the Office Records of Henry Kissinger (Lot 91 D 414) and the Transcripts of Secretary Kissinger's Staff Meetings (Lot 78 D 443). Research into the Department of State's role was enhanced by access to the appointment diaries of Secretary of State William P. Rogers which were made available to Department of State historians with the generous assistance of Secretary Rogers' estate.

For material on the Department of Defense's contribution to Washington's policy formulations, two collections stand out. The Diary of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Thomas Moorer, provides an extremely valuable source for documenting the United States airlift to Israel and the military alert of October 24–25, 1973. The Moorer Diary also reflects the sharp disagreements between the Departments of Defense and State during the October 1973 War and presents a very different perspective on the conflict from that offered by Kissinger and his staff. The Diary was transferred to the National Archives and Records Administration, where it is held as part of Record Group 218 (Records of the Joint Chiefs of Staff) at Archives II. Likewise, the papers of James R. Schlesinger at the Library of Congress also provide useful documentation regarding both the airlift and the alert, though these are

far more limited in scope than the Moorer Diary. On the Central Intelligence Agency's role, the Files of the Directorate of Intelligence and the Files of the National Intelligence Council proved the most valuable. It should also be noted that declassified CIA documentation related to the Arab-Israeli conflict and the October War can be found online through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Electronic Reading Room on the CIA's website.

Unpublished Sources

Department of State

Central Files. *See* National Archives and Records Administration below.

Lot Files. For lot files already transferred to the National Archives and Records Administration at College Park, Maryland, Record Group 59, see National Archives and Records Administration below.

National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland

Record Group 59, General Records of the Department of State

Central Foreign Policy File

Central Files

DEF 12–5 ISR
POL ISR–US
POL 7 JORDAN
POL 7 US/KISSINGER
POL 27 ARAB–ISR
POL 27–14 ARAB–ISR
POL 27–14 ARAB–ISR/UN
POL 27–15 ARAB–ISR

Lot Files

Office of the Secretary of State, Transcripts of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's Staff Meetings, 1973–1977, Lot 78 D 443
Office of the Secretary of State, Office Records of Henry A. Kissinger, Lot 91 D 414
S/S–I (Executive Secretariat) Files, Briefing Books: Lot 74 D 416

Record Group 218, Official Records of the Joint Staff

Records of Admiral Thomas H. Moorer
Diary, October 1973

Nixon Presidential Materials Project, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland (Now at the Nixon Presidential Library and Museum, Yorba Linda, California)

National Security Council Files
- Backchannel Files
- Country Files, Europe: U.S.-USSR, USSR
- Country Files, Middle East: Arab Republic of Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Middle East (General), Middle East War, Morocco; Secretary Kissinger's Trip to Middle East
- Harold H. Saunders Files: Jordan, Middle East Negotiations Files
- Henry A. Kissinger Office Files:
  - Country Files
    - Europe, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin and Kissinger
    - Europe, USSR
    - Middle East, Dinitz
    - Middle East, Egypt
    - Middle East, Egypt/Ismail
    - Middle East, Jordan/Rifai
    - Middle East, Palestinians
    - Middle East, Rabin/Dinitz
    - Middle East, Rabin/Kissinger (Dinitz)
    - Middle East, Saunders Memoranda—Sensitive
    - Middle East, Saudi Arabia
  - Kissinger Trip Files
- Henry A. Kissinger Telephone Transcripts
- Presidential Correspondence
- Presidential/HAK Memoranda of Conversations
- President's Daily Briefing File
- President's Trip Files
- Subject File
- VIP Visits File

National Security Council Institutional Files (H-Files)
- Washington Special Actions Group Meetings
- Washington Special Actions Group Minutes
- National Security Council Secretariat Files

White House Central Files: President's Daily Diary

White House Tapes

Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan

National Security Adviser Files
- Memoranda of Conversation
- Scowcroft Daily Work Files

Central Intelligence Agency

Files of the Directorate of Intelligence
- Job 79T00861A
- Job 79T01023A

Office of Economic Research Files
Job 80T01315A

Files of the National Intelligence Council (NIC)
Job 79R01012A

Library of Congress, Washington, DC

Papers of Henry A. Kissinger
Geopolitical File
Miscellany

Papers of James R. Schlesinger

Personal Papers of William P. Rogers

Appointment Books, 1973

Published Sources

Cline, Ray S. '''Policy Without Intelligence,'' *Foreign Policy,* No. 17 (Winter 1974–1975), pp. 121–135.
Kissinger, Henry. *Crisis: An Anatomy of Two Foreign Policy Crises.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 2003.
Kissinger, Henry. *Years of Upheaval.* Boston: Little, Brown, 1982.
Meir, Golda. *My Life.* New York: Putnam, 1975.
The New York Times
Nixon, Richard. *RN: The Memoirs of Richard Nixon.* New York: Grosset and Dunlop, 1978.
Rabin, Yitzhak. *The Rabin Memoirs.* Boston: Little, Brown, 1979.
Sadat, Anwar el-. *In Search of Identity: An Autobiography.* New York: Harper, 1978.
United Nations. Yearbook of the United Nations, 1973.
United States. Department of State. *Bulletin,* 1969–1973.
United States. National Archives and Records Administration. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Richard M. Nixon, 1973.* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1975.

Abbreviations and Terms

AAA, anti-aircraft artillery
addee, addressee
AEC, Atomic Energy Commission
AID, Agency for International Development
Amb, Ambassador
APC, armored personnel carrier
Aramco, Arabian American Oil Company
ARA, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Department of State

BAM, (Straits of) Bab al-Mandeb
BBC, British Broadcasting Corporation
BSO, Black September Organization

CBU, cluster bomb
CCC, Commodity Credit Corporation
CENTO, Central Treaty Organization
CIA, Central Intelligence Agency
CINCEUR, Commander in Chief, U.S. Forces, Europe
CINCMEAFSA, Commander in Chief, Middle East/South Asia and Africa South of the Sahara
CINCPAC, Commander in Chief, Pacific
CINCSTRIKE, Commander in Chief, Strike Command
CJCS, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
COMINT, communications intelligence
COMUSFORAZ, Commander, U.S. Forces, Azores
COSVN, Central Office for South Vietnam
CSCE, Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe
CY, calendar year

DAO, Defense Attaché Office
DATT, defense attaché
DCI, Director of Central Intelligence
DCM, Deputy Chief of Mission
DEFCON, Defense Condition
Dept, Department of State
Deptel, Department of State telegram
Deptoff, Department of State officer
DIA, Defense Intelligence Agency
DI/OER, Office of Economic Research, Directorate of Intelligence, Central Intelligence Agency
DirGen, Director General
DOD, Department of Defense
DOD/ISA, Department of Defense, International Security Affairs
DPRC, Defense Program Review Committee
DSD, Deputy Secretary of Defense

EC, European Community

ECM, electronic countermeasure
EDT, Eastern Daylight Time
ELINT, electronic intelligence
EmbOff, Embassy officer
EST, Eastern Standard Time
Exdis, Exclusive Distribution (extremely limited distribution)
EXIM, Export-Import Bank

FAO, Food and Agricultural Organization
FBI, Federal Bureau of Investigation
FBIS, Foreign Broadcast Information Service
FMS, Foreign Military Sales
FonMin, Foreign Minister
FonOff, Foreign Office
FRG, Federal Republic of Germany
FROG, Free-Rocket-Over-Ground
FY, fiscal year
FYI, for your information

GA, General Assembly (United Nations)
Gen., General
GMT, Greenwich Mean Time
GNP, Gross National Product
GOA, Government of Algeria
GOE, Government of Egypt
GOI, Government of Israel
GOJ, Government of Jordan
GOL, Government of Lebanon

HAK, Henry A. Kissinger
Hakto, series indicator for telegrams from Henry Kissinger
Helo(s), helicopter(s)
HHS, Harold H. Saunders
HUMINT, human intelligence

IAEC, Israel Atomic Energy Commission
IAF, Israeli Air Force
IBRD, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank)
ICAO, International Civil Aviation Organization
ICRC, International Committee of the Red Cross
IDA, Institute for Defense Analysis
IDF, Israeli Defense Forces
INR, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State
IO, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State
IO/UNP, Office of United Nations Political Affairs, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State
IRG, Interdepartmental Regional Group

JAA, Jordan Arab Army
JCS, Joint Chiefs of Staff
JCSM, Joint Chiefs of Staff Memorandum

K, Henry A. Kissinger
KGB, Komitet gosudarstvennoy bezopasnosti (State Security Committee) (USSR)

KM, kilometer

LAW, light anti-tank weapon
LIG, Legislative Interdepartmental Group
Limdis, Limited Distribution
LSE, Lawrence S. Eagleburger
LTA, light transport aircraft

MAC, Military Airlift Command (U.S. Air Force)
MAC, Military Assistance Commission
MAP, Military Assistance Program
MASF, Military Assistance Service Funded
MBFR, Mutual Balanced Force Reduction
M.B.P.D., million barrels per day
ME, Middle East
Memcon, Memorandum of Conversation
MFN, Most Favored Nation
MIG, A.I Mikoyan i M.I. Gurevich (commonly, the model of Soviet fighter aircraft named for aircraft designers Mikoyan and Gurevich)
MG, Major General
MilAtt, Military Attaché

NATO, North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NEA, Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, Department of State
NEA/ARN, Office of Lebanon, Jordan, Syrian Arab Republic and Iraq Affairs, Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, Department of State
NEA/EGY, Office of Egypt Affairs, Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, Department of State
NEA/IAI, Office of Israel and Arab-Israel Affairs, Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, Department of State
NESA, Near East and South Asia
NMCC, National Military Command Center
NIE, National Intelligence Estimate
NIC, National Intelligence Council
NoDis, No Distribution (other than to persons indicated)
Noforn, No Foreign Dissemination
Notal, not received by all addressees
NPT, Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
NSA, National Security Agency
NSC, National Security Council
NSCIC, National Security Council Intelligence Committee

OAPEC, Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries
OASD/ISA, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs
OAU, Organization of African Unity
OBE, overtaken by events
OMB, Office of Management and Budget
OC/T, Communications Center, Bureau of Administration, Department of State
OECD, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OPEC, Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries
OSD, Office of the Secretary of Defense

PCC, Palestine Conciliation Commission (United Nations)
PermRep, Permanent Representative (United Nations)

PFLOP, Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine
PFLP, Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine
PHOTINT, photographic intelligence
P.L., Public Law
PLO, Palestine Liberation Organization
PM, PriMin, PrMin, Prime Minister
POL, petroleum, oil, and lubricants; political
PolOff, Political Officer
POW, prisoner of war
PRC, People's Republic of China
PRCLO, Liaison Office of the People's Republic of China

Ref, reference
reftel, reference telegram
Rep(s), Representatives
Res., Resolution (United Nations)
RG, Record Group

SALT, Strategic Arms Limitation Talks
SAM, surface-to-air missile
SARG, Syrian Arab Republic Government
SC, Security Council (United Nations)
SecDef, Secretary of Defense
Sec. Gen., Secretary General
SecState, Secretary of State
Secto, series indicator for telegrams from the Secretary of State
septel, separate telegram
SIGINT, signals intelligence
SNIE, Special National Intelligence Estimate
SOB, son of a bitch (an expletive)
SUMED, Suez Mediterranean pipeline
SYG, Secretary-General (United Nations)

TAC, Tactical Air Command
TASS, Telegrafnoye agentstvo Sovetskovo Soyuza (Telegraph Agency of the Soviet Union), Soviet news agency
TDY, Temporary duty telcon, telephone conversation
TIAS, Treaties and International Acts Series
Tohak, series indicator for telegrams to Henry Kissinger
Tosec, series indicator for telegrams to the Secretary of State
TOW, tube-launched, optically-tracked, wire command data link, anti-tank missile
TS, top secret

U, unclassified
UAR, United Arab Republic
UK, United Kingdom
UN, United Nations
UNEF, United Nations Emergency Force
UNGA, United Nations General Assembly
UNRWA, United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
UNSC, United Nations Security Council
UNTSO, United Nations Truce Supervision Organization
US, United States

USA, United States of America; United States Army
USAF, United States Air Force
USCINCEUR, United States Commander-in-Chief, Europe
USDAO, United States Defense Attaché Office
USG, United States Government
USIB, United States Intelligence Board
USINT, United States Interests Section
USN, United States Navy
USNATO, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization
USRep(s), United States Representatives
USS, United States Ship
USSR, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
UST, United States Treaties and Other International Agreements
USUN, United States Mission to the United Nations

WH, White House
WSAG, Washington Special Actions Group

Z, zulu time (Greenwich Mean Time)

Persons

Abouhamad, Khalil, Lebanese Foreign Minister until July 1973
Abu Zaid, Salah, Jordanian Foreign Minister until May 1973
Adams, Sir Philip, British Ambassador to Egypt
Adham, Kamal, Advisor to the King of Saudi Arabia; Chief of the Saudi Intelligence Secretariat
Agnew, Spiro T., Vice President of the United States until October 10, 1973
Akins, James E., U.S. Ambassador to Saudi Arabia from November 1973
Albert, Carl, Democratic Congressman from Oklahoma; Speaker of the House of Representatives
Aldrich, George H., Deputy Legal Adviser, Department of State
Aleksandrov, Andrei M., Assistant to General Secretary Brezhnev
Ali, General Ahmed Ismail, Egyptian Minister of War from February 1973
Allaf, Mowaffak, Minister Counselor, Syrian Mission to the United Nations, Geneva
Allon, Yigal, Israeli Deputy Prime Minister
Arafat, Yasser, leader of Fatah and Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization
Armstrong, Willis C., Assistant Secretary of State for Economic and Business Affairs
Asad, Hafez al-, President of Syria
Atherton, Alfred L. (Roy), Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs
Atiqi, Abdul Rahman al-, Kuwaiti Minister of Oil and Finance
Azimov, Sarvar, Soviet Ambassador to Lebanon

Babenko, Yuri F., Third Secretary, Soviet Embassy in Washington
Bakr, Hassan, President of Iraq
Ball, George, Under Secretary of State, 1961–1968
Balniel, Lord (Robert Lindsay), British Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs
Bar-On, Lt. Colonel Aryeh, Aide to Israeli Defense Minister Dayan
Barzani, Mustafa, leader, Kurdistan Democratic Party
Begin, Menachem, leader, Herut party (Likud, from September 1973)
Benhima, Ahmed Taibi, Moroccan Foreign Minister
Benites, Leopoldo, President of the United Nations General Assembly
Bennett, W. Tapley, Jr., United States Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations General Assembly
Bentsur, Eliahu, Aide to Israeli Foreign Minister Eban
Bettal, Diya'allah al-, Director, United Nations Department, Syrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Bhutto, Zulfiqar Ali, President of Pakistan, to August 13, 1973; Prime Minister of Pakistan from August 14, 1973
Bin Shaker, General Zaid, Jordanian army Chief of Staff
Boumedienne, Houari, President of Algeria
Bourguiba, Habib, President of Tunisia
Bouteflika, Abdelaziz, Algerian Foreign Minister
Brandt, Willy, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany
Brett, Major General Devol, USAF, Director, Near East and South Asia Region, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, until September 1973

Brezhnev, Leonid, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union
Brown, L. Dean, U.S. Ambassador to Jordan until November 1973
Buffum, William B., U.S. Ambassador to Lebanon
Bunker, Ellsworth, U.S. Ambassador-at-Large; U.S. Representative to the Geneva Middle East Peace Conference, December 1973
Byrd, Robert C., Democratic Senator from West Virginia

Caetano, Marcelo, Prime Minister of Portugal
Campbell, Richard P., Jr., Staff Member of the Office of the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs; thereafter, Special Assistant to Secretary of State Kissinger
Casey, William J., Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs from February 2, 1973
Ceausescu, Nicolae, First Secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and President of Romania
Chamberlain, Neville, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, 1937–1940
Chou En-lai (Zhou Enlai), Premier of the People's Republic of China
Clements, William P., Jr., Deputy Secretary of Defense
Cline, Ray S., Director, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State, until November 24, 1973
Colby, William E., Director of Central Intelligence from September 4, 1973
Cooper, Charles, member, National Security Council staff
Cromer, Lord (George Rowland Stanley Baring), British Ambassador to the United States
Cronkite, Walter, U.S. television journalist
Cox, Archibald, Jr., Independent Special Prosecutor for Watergate case, May 19, 1973–October 20, 1973

Davies, Rodger P., Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs
Davis, Jeanne W., National Security Council Staff Secretary
Dayan, Moshe, Israeli Minister of Defense
De Gaulle, Charles, President of France, 1958–1969
DePoix, Vice Admiral Vincent P., USN, Director, Defense Intelligence Agency
DiBona, Charles, Consultant to the President for Energy
Dinitz, Simcha, Israeli Ambassador to the United States from March 1973
Dobrynin, Anatoli[y], Soviet Ambassador to the United States
Douglas-Home, Sir Alec, British Foreign Secretary
Dulles, John Foster, Secretary of State, 1953–1959

Eade, General George J. (Jim), USAF, Deputy Commander-in-Chief, U.S. European Command from April 1973
Eagleburger, Lawrence S., Executive Assistant to the Secretary of State from October 1973; member, National Security Council Staff from June 1973
Eban, Abba, Israeli Foreign Minister
Eilts, Hermann F., U.S. Ambassador-designate to Egypt and Principal Officer at the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo, November 1973 to February 1974
Elazar, General David, Chief of Staff, Israel Defense Forces
Eliot, Theodore L., Jr., Executive Secretary, Department of State
Erian (Iryan), Abdallah el-, Egyptian Ambassador to France
Elizur, Michael, Director, North American Affairs, Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Eshkol, Levi, Prime Minister of Israel, 1963–1969
Evron, Ephraim, Deputy Director General, Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Fahd ibn Abd al-Aziz Al Saud, Saudi Interior Minister and Second Deputy Prime Minister

Fahmi[y], Ismail, Egyptian Foreign Minister from October 1973
Faisal ibn Abd al-Aziz Al Saud, King of Saudi Arabia
Farhi, David, Adviser to Israeli Defense Minister Dayan
Farouk I, King of Egypt, 1936–1952
Fattal, Diyallah El-, Director, Office of United Nations Affairs, Syrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Ford, Gerald R., Vice President of the United States from December 3, 1973; previously, Republican Congressman from Michigan and Minority Leader in the House of Representatives
Frangie, Suleiman, President of Lebanon
Friedheim, Jerry W., Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, January 20, 1973–April 13, 1973; Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs from April 13,1973
Fulbright, J. William, Democratic Senator from Arkansas; Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee

Gamasy[i], Major General Mohammed Abdel Ghani al-, Chief of Operations of Egyptian Armed Forces until October 1973; Chief of Staff from October 1973; Egyptian representative at Kilometer (KM) 101 talks
Garment, Leonard, Special Consultant to the President
Gayler, Admiral Noel A., USN, Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Command
Gazit, Mordechai, Director, Office of the Prime Minister (Israel)
Ghanem, General Iskandar, Lebanese army Commander-in-Chief
Ghanim, Muhammad Hafiz, Political Adviser to President Sadat
Goodpaster, General Andrew, USA, Commander-in-Chief, U.S. European Command and Supreme Allied Commander, Europe
Graham, Pierre R., Charge d'Affaires, U.S. Embassy in Amman, from November 1973
Grechko, Marshal Andrei A., Soviet Defense Minister and Member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union
Greene, Joseph N., Jr., Principal Officer, U.S. Interests Section in Cairo, until July 1973
Gromyko, Andrei, Soviet Foreign Minister
Gur, General Mordechai, Military Attache, Israeli Embassy in Washington; Head of Israeli delegation, Egyptian-Israeli military working group, Geneva Middle East Peace Conference, December 1973

Habbash, George, Secretary General, Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine
Haig, Major General Alexander M., Jr., USA, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army, January 1973–August 1973; White House Chief of Staff from August 1973
Hannah, John A., Administrator of the Agency for International Development until October 7, 1973
Hassan II, King of Morocco
Hassan bin Talal, Crown Prince of Jordan
Heath, Edward, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom
Helms, Richard M., Director of Central Intelligence until February 2, 1973; thereafter, Ambassador to Iran
Hillenbrand, Martin J., U.S. Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany
Hoskinson, Samuel, National Intelligence Officer for the Middle East and Islamic World, Central Intelligence Agency, from 1972
Hoveyda, Amir-Abbas, Prime Minister of Iran
Howe, Commander Jonathan T., USN, member, National Security Council staff
Huang Hua, Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations
Huang Zhen (Chen), Head of the Liaison Office of the People's Republic of China in Washington

Hummel, Arthur W., Jr., Acting Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, May–December 1973
Hussein I, ibn Talal, King of Jordan
Hyland, William, member, National Security Council Staff

Idan, Avner, Minister, Israeli Embassy in Washington
Ismail, Hafiz, Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs
Ismail, Mohammed Zakariya, Syrian Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs

Jackson, Henry M. ("Scoop"), Democratic Senator from the state of Washington
Jamieson, J. Kenneth, Chairman of the Board, Exxon Corporation
Jarring, Gunnar, United Nations Special Representative for the Middle East
Jobert, Michel, French Foreign Minister from April 1973
Johnson, Lyndon B., President of the United States, 1963–1969
Johnson, U. Alexis, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs until February 1973; Ambassador at Large from February 1973
Jones, Curtis F., Director, Office of Research and Analysis for Near East and South Asia, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State

Kalb, Marvin, U.S. television journalist
Katushev, Konstantin, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union
Kaylani, Haytham, Syrian Permanent Representative to the United Nations
Keating, Kenneth, U.S. Ambassador to Israel from August 1973
Kennedy, John F., President of the United States, 1961–1963
Kennedy, Colonel Richard T., member, National Security Council staff
Khaddam, Abdal-Halim, Syrian Foreign Minister
Khalid al Hassan, Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, Palestinian National Council
Khammash, Amer, Minister of the Jordanian Royal Court
Kidron, Mordechai, Director General, Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Kissinger, Henry A., Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs; also Secretary of State from September 1973
Korn, David A., Country Director for Lebanon, Jordan, Syrian Arab Republic, and Iraq Affairs, Department of State
Kornienko, Georgi M., Head of the USA Division, Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Kosygin, Alexei N., Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR
Kraft, Joseph, U.S. newspaper columnist
Kubisch, Jack B., Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs from May 29, 1973
Kuznetsov, Vasily V., First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs (Soviet Union)
Laird, Melvin, Secretary of Defense until January 29, 1973

Le Duc Tho, Member of the Politburo of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam; Special Advisor to the DRV Delegation at the Paris Peace Negotiations, 1972–1973
Leor, General Yisrael, Special Assistant to the Israeli Prime Minister
Lindsay, John, Mayor of New York City
Lord, Winston, Director, Policy Planning Staff, Department of State, from October 12, 1973
Love, Governor John, Director of the White House Energy Policy Office and the President's Assistant for Energy; previously, Governor of Colorado
Luns, Joseph M.A.H., Secretary General, North Atlantic Treaty Organization

Magdoub, General Tabra el-, Head of Egyptian delegation, Egyptian-Israeli military working group at Geneva Middle East Peace Conference, December 1973

Mahon, George H., Democratic Congressman from Texas
Mailliard, William S., Republican Congressman from California
Maitland, Sir Donald, British Permanent Representative to the United Nations, 1973–1974
Makarov, Vasily, Counselor to the Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs
Malik, Yakov A., Soviet Permanent Representative to the United Nations
Mansfield, Mike, Democratic Senator from Montana
Mark, David E., Deputy Director, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State
McCarthy, Colman, U.S. journalist
McClellan, John L., Democratic Senator from Arkansas
McCloskey, Robert J., Ambassador at Large from February 1973
Mclntyre, Sir Laurence, Australian Permanent Representative to the United Nations; President, United Nations Security Council, October 1973
Meir, Golda, Prime Minister of Israel
Miskovic, Colonel General Ivan, Special Advisor to the Yugoslav Presidency for Security Affairs until June 1973
Moore, George C., Deputy Chief of Mission, U.S. Embassy in Khartoum until March 2, 1973
Moorer, Admiral Thomas, USN, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
Mufti, Zahayr Mahmud al-, Jordanian Ambassador to the United States until June 1973

Naffa, Fuad, Lebanese Foreign Minister after July 1973
Nasser [Nasir], Gamal Abdel, President of Egypt, 1956–1970
Newsom, David D., Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs
Nguyen Van Thieu, President of the Republic of Vietnam
Nixon, Richard M., President of the United States
Noel, Cleo A., Ambassador to Sudan until March 2, 1973
Noyes, James H., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs

Odeen, Philip, member, National Security Council staff
O'Neill, Thomas P. (''Tip''), Democratic Congressman from Massachusetts; Majority Leader in the House of Representatives

Parker, Richard B., Deputy Chief of Mission, U.S. Embassy in Rabat
Pahlavi, Mohammed Reza, Shah of Iran
Podgorny, Nikolai V., Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR
Pompidou, Georges, President of France
Popper, David H., Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, June 25, 1973–January 2, 1974
Porter, William J., Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs from February 2, 1973
Primakov, Yevgeny, Deputy Director, Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Academy of Sciences of the USSR

Quandt, William B., member, National Security Council staff
Qabus (Qaboos) bin Taymour, Sultan of Oman
Qadhafi (Kaddafi), Muammar al-, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council (Libya); also Libyan Defense Minister

Rabin, Yitzhak, Israeli Ambassador to the United States until March 1973
Reston, James (''Scotty''), U.S. newspaper journalist
Riad, Mahmoud, Secretary-General of the Arab League; formerly, Egyptian Minister of Foreign Affairs, 1964–1972

Ribicoff, Abraham A., Democratic Senator from Connecticut
Richardson, Elliot L., Secretary of Defense, January–May 1973; Attorney General, May–October 1973
Rifai, Abdul Munim, Jordanian diplomat; Prime Minister of Jordan, March–August 1969 and June–September 1970
Rifai, Zaid, Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Jordan from May 26, 1973
Rodman, Peter W., member, National Security Council staff
Rogers, William P., Secretary of State until September 1973
Ruckelshaus, William D., Deputy Attorney General, July 9, 1973–October 20, 1973; Acting Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, April 30, 1973–July 9, 1973; Director, Environmental Protection Agency, until April 30, 1973
Rush, Kenneth, Deputy Secretary of State from February 1973; Acting Secretary of State, September 3–September 22, 1973
Rusk, Dean, Secretary of State, 1961–1969

Sabah al-Ahmad al-Jabir al-Sabah, Kuwaiti Foreign Minister
Sadad, Farid al-, Jordanian Finance Minister until May 1973
Sadaqa, Najib, Director General, Lebanese Foreign Ministry
Sadat, Anwar al-, President of Egypt
Salah, Abdullah, Jordanian ambassador to the United States from June 1973
Sapir, Pinchas, Israeli Finance Minister
Saqqaf, Omar, Saudi Foreign Minister
Saunders, Harold H., member, National Security Council staff
Scali, John A., Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations from February 1973
Scheel, Walter, Vice Chancellor and Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany
Schlesinger, James R., Director of Central Intelligence, February 2–July 2, 1973; Secretary of Defense from July 1973
Scott, Hugh D., Jr., Republican Senator from Pennsylvania; Senate Minority Leader
Scott, William L., Republican Senator from Virginia
Scowcroft, Major General Brent, USAF, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Scranton, William W., Governor of Pennsylvania, 1963–1967
Selassie, Haile, Emperor of Ethiopia
Shalev, Mordechai, Deputy Chief of Mission, Israeli Embassy in Washington
Shawar, Majid Abu, Political Commissar, Al Asifa (military wing of Fatah) and Secretary, Revolutionary Council of Palestine Liberation Organization
Shultz, George S., Secretary of the Treasury
Siilasvuo, General Ensio, Commander-designate of the United Nations Emergency Force, October 1973
Simon, William E., Deputy Secretary of the Treasury until May 1974; Secretary of the Treasury, May 1974–January 1977
Sirri, Umar, Minister, Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Sisco, Joseph, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs
Smith, Richard W., Counselor, U.S. Interests Section, Cairo
Sonnenfeldt, Helmut, member, National Security Council staff
Stackhouse, H.H., Director, Office of Israel and Arab-Israeli Affairs, Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, Department of State
Stennis, John C., Democratic Senator from Mississippi; Chairman, Senate Committee on Armed Services
Sterner, Michael, Director, Office of Egypt Affairs, Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, Department of State
Stoessel, Walter J., Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs

Stoltzfus, William A., U.S. Ambassador to Kuwait
Stratton, Samuel S., Democratic Congressman from New York
Stukel, Lieutenant Colonel Donald, member, National Security Council staff
Sukhodrov, Viktor M., interpreter, Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Sulzberger, Cyrus L., II, U.S. newspaper journalist
Sumner, Major General Gordon, Director, Near East and South Asia Region, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, from September 1973
Symington, W. Stuart, Democratic Senator from Missouri; Chairman, Subcommittee of U.S. Security Arrangements and Commitments Abroad, Senate Foreign Relations Committee

Tanaka, Kakuei, Prime Minister of Japan
Taqi al-Din al-Sulh, Prime Minister of Lebanon from June 1973
Tarr, Curtis W., Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Issues until November 25, 1973
Tekoah, Yosef, Israeli Permanent Representative to the United Nations

U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, 1961–1971
Vavilov, Andrei, official, Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Veliotes, Nicholas, Deputy Chief of Mission, U.S. Embassy in Tel Aviv
Vest, George S., Special Assistant for Press Relations to Secretary of State Kissinger from October 1973
Vinogradov, Sergei, Soviet Ambassador to Egypt; Soviet Representative to the Geneva Middle East Peace Conference, December 1973
Von Staden, Berndt, West German ambassador to the United States from April 1973
Vorontsov, Yuli M., Minister Counselor, Embassy of the Soviet Union in Washington

Waldheim, Kurt, Secretary General of the United Nations
Walters, General Vernon A., USA, Deputy Director of Central Intelligence
Warren, Gerald L., White House Deputy Press Secretary
Weinel, Vice Admiral John P., USN, Assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
Westmoreland, General William C., USA, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, 1968–1972
Wiley, Marshall W., Counselor, U.S. Interests Section in Cairo

Yaariv, Major General Aharon, retired head of Israeli military intelligence; Israeli representative at the KM 101 talks
Yamani, Ahmad Zaki, Saudi Petroleum Minister
Yost, Charles, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, 1969–1971
Young, Milton R., Republican Senator from North Dakota

Zahedi, Ardeshir, Iranian Ambassador to the United States
Zayid bin Sultan Al Nahyan, Shaykh, Emir of Abu Dhabi and President of the United Arab Emirates
Zayyat, Mohamed Hassan el-, Egyptian Foreign Minister until October 1973
Ziegler, Ronald, White House Press Secretary
Zurhellen, Joseph O., Deputy Chief of Mission, U.S. Embassy in Tel Aviv, until June 1973

Arab-Israeli Crisis and War, 1973

1. Memorandum From Richard T. Kennedy of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, January 2, 1973.

SUBJECT

Secret Jordan-Egyptian Negotiations

At Tab A[2] is a memorandum from Director Helms conveying detailed information on secret negotiations between a representative of King Hussein and President Sadat which took place on 17 December. The key item is Sadat's assertion that he has decided Egypt must launch a war of attrition against Israel.

Zayd Rifai represented King Hussein at the talks which took place in Cairo. In essence, the King proposed that Egypt and Jordan resume diplomatic relations and that they work together through political efforts to force a settlement on Israel. Rifai stated that the Arabs cannot risk another full scale war with Israel. He argued that the Soviets, having reached an understanding with the U.S., do not wish to do anything that might jeopardize their newly-established working relationship with the Americans.

Thus, according to Rifai, the United States is the only country in a position to break the present impasse and force the Israelis to withdraw from occupied Arab territories. Rifai informed Sadat that it is for this reason that on King Hussein's last visit to Washington[3] he attempted to take the problem out of State Department channels and bring it to President Nixon's office. (CIA deleted this sentence from the version of this report sent to State and Defense.)

Sadat expressed pleasure at Hussein's initiative in sending an emissary to meet him. He denied having any direct contacts with Presi-

---

[1] Source: Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box CL 168, Geopolitical File, 15 May 1972–7 May 73. Secret; Sensitive. Sent for information.

[2] Attached, but not printed.

[3] King Hussein visited Washington March 28, 1972.

dent Nixon's representatives but he said that he had received letters from President Nixon, all of which he had answered. (This information was also deleted from the version of the report sent to State and Defense.)

Sadat told Rifai that he disagreed with Hussein on the Soviet role in the Middle East, asserting that Moscow does have a role to play in bringing about a solution to the Middle East problem, even though it is secondary to the role played by the United States.

Sadat informed Rifai that his major disagreement with Hussein's views is in regard to the question of war versus political pressure on Israel. Sadat stated that he is absolutely convinced that the only way to force Israel to surrender the occupied territories is by renewing a war of attrition. He said that he had carefully calculated the cost to Egypt of starting such a war and he believes that it can be sustained. By hitting hard and deep inside Israel and by inflicting a sizeable number of civilian casualties on a regular basis, Egypt could force Israel into deciding that it is better to surrender the occupied territories.

Sadat also told Rifai that under no circumstances should Jordan in any way become involved in Egypt's war of attrition because the Israelis would quickly overrun the East Bank and destroy the Jordanian army. Sadat also pushed aside Rifai's question about resuming normal diplomatic relations between Jordan and Egypt.

Sadat closed by telling Rifai that he would have some thoughts to convey to Hussein on what he could say to President Nixon about Egypt.[4]

At Tab B is a report of King Hussein's 22 December comments [*less than 1 line not declassified*] regarding Sadat's plans for a war of attrition.[5]

[4] King Hussein met with President Nixon on February 6 during his February 5–7 visit to the United States. See Document 14.

[5] Attached, but not printed. Hussein said he thought that Sadat's plans for a war of attrition would be a foolish course to follow and that the Israelis would certainly retaliate with a massive attack that would inflict heavy material and human casualties on Egypt.

2. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, January 11, 1973.

SUBJECT

Military Assistance for Jordan

You will see from the attached memo[2] that a brief message from the President to King Hussein is recommended to reassure him that our military assistance program remains on the rails.[3] [*1 line not declassified*] The question for you is whether you would be interested in sending a private word of reassurance [*less than 1 line not declassified*] to supplement the President's formal message.

Recommendation: That you authorize [*less than 1 line not declassified*] the following message to King Hussein [*less than 1 line not declassified*]:

"Your Majesty: The President has already responded to Your Majesty's message of concern on the US military assistance program. I would simply like to add informally that our firm commitment to completion of Jordan's military modernization program remains unchanged and that what is being discussed is only some relatively small adjustment in delivery schedules to meet problems created by our appropriations. I hope that any misunderstandings raised by this recent presentation on our ongoing program can be cleared up before your visit to Washington so that we may use that occasion to discuss impor-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 757, Presidential Correspondence, 1969–1974, Jordan–King Hussein. Secret; Nodis. Sent for action.

[2] The attached January 11 memorandum from Saunders to Scowcroft and Kennedy urged immediate approval of a brief message from President Nixon to King Hussein. Telegram 7545 to Amman, January 12, transmitted the message which reads: "Your Majesty: I have your message on our military assistance program which was transmitted by Ambassador Brown on January 7. Let me assure you that there has been no change in our very firm intention to honor our commitments to assist Your Majesty's Government. As I have said on previous occasions, Jordan's continuing security remains a matter of important interest to us. I am very much looking forward, as always, to discussing all matters of concern to both of us when you and members of your party are here in February. Sincerely, Richard Nixon." (Ibid.)

[3] Telegram 76 from Amman, January 7, transmitted a message from King Hussein to Nixon expressing the King's concern over delayed delivery of U.S. military equipment promised to Jordan. Hussein complained that 8 months had elapsed since his government had concluded its negotiations with the U.S. Government on MAP and FMS for 1972/1973 and that most of the major and important items included in those programs, such as the M60 tanks and the F5E planes, had not yet come. He noted that Jordan's plans for its armed forces were based on a meticulously studied and timed schedule starting July 1, 1972, which included the equipment specified in those programs. (Ibid., Box 617, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan)

tant future policies and programs. Of course, there will be ample opportunity to discuss with our experts any problems that remain, but I would hope that most of your basic concerns will have been allayed. I look forward to seeing you in early February and wish to convey to you my warmest regards. Henry A. Kissinger."[4]

[4] Kennedy initialed approval for Kissinger.

3. Paper Prepared in the Central Intelligence Agency[1]

Washington, January 15, 1973.

SECRET HIGH-LEVEL TALKS BETWEEN THE EGYPTIAN AND UNITED STATES GOVERNMENTS CONCERNING PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Summary: The holding of secret talks between the Egyptian and U.S. Governments at the level of the offices of the presidencies was first suggested informally in April 1972 [*less than 1 line not declassified*] in Cairo. Dr. Kissinger's initial reaction was favorable, but President Sadat then demurred. In July Dr. Kissinger renewed the proposal, and in September President Sadat accepted. It was agreed that these exploratory talks would be held in the U.S., in strict secrecy, for the purpose of determining what useful role the USG could play in implementing UN Resolution 242.[2] In October a four-man Egyptian delegation was named, and both sides hoped to get talks started by the end of October. Complications in the Vietnam negotiations then intruded to cause unexpected and protracted delay. The Egyptians have shown patience and understanding of the other demands on Dr. Kissinger, while repeatedly restating their interest in moving forward on the talks as soon

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 131, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. II, January 1–February 23, 1973. Secret; Sensitive. The paper was forwarded to Kissinger under cover of a January 16 memorandum from Helms who wrote that the enclosed résumé of the proposal to conduct secret talks between the United States and Egypt at the level of the offices of the presidencies as well as a more detailed chronological summary of the exchanges between the two governments might prove useful.

[2] UN Security Resolution 242, adopted November 22, 1967, called for Israeli withdrawal from territories occupied during the 1967 war and "acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of every state in the area."

as possible. The Egyptians in the meantime have requested a change of venue from the U.S. to Europe and have said they want to issue a public statement at the conclusion of the first round of talks. Dr. Kissinger has not yet responded on these two points. He has assured the Egyptian Government that after settlement of the Vietnam war, the USG will give the highest priority to the Middle East problem, and has invited the Egyptian Government in the interim to submit, [*less than 1 line not declassified*], any preliminary views it may wish to offer relative to the talks.[3] [*2 lines not declassified*]

[Omitted here is the body of the paper.]

[3] On January 15, Kissinger received a message from Ismail suggesting that the proposed first round of talks take place in London during the month of February. (Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Scowcroft Daily Work Files, Jan. 11–16, 1973, Box 1)

4. Backchannel Message From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail)[1]

Washington, undated.

Thank you for your message of January 15.[2] We have also received the message that Mr. Ismail plans to be in London around February 19.

We regret that concluding the Vietnam negotiations has occupied so much of Dr. Kissinger's time, both because of the extended negotiating sessions and because of the time needed for preparations for them.

We are prepared to start these discussions soon and we agree that the end of February offers a good opportunity. If Mr. Ismail could arrange to come to New York from London, under any pretext, private meetings could certainly be arranged in New York at that time. There is some possibility that Dr. Kissinger could arrange to be in London for a day and a half on February 22–23. Given the uncertainties in the current Indochina situation, Dr. Kissinger's schedule could be subject to unex-

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 131, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. II, January 1–February 23, 1973. No classification marking. The message is attached to a January 23 memorandum to Kissinger, marked Secret; Sensitive, that states that the January 21 message to Ismail had been passed to the Egyptian Government on January 22.

[2] See footnote 3, Document 3.

pected changes. This danger would be much smaller for a meeting in the U.S.

In either case the U.S. would prefer no publicity.

We agree that technical representatives should begin discussing the arrangements as soon as a date and venue are mutually decided. [*less than 1 line not declassified*] The U.S. side awaits an Egyptian proposal.

The U.S. side again expresses its appreciation for the patience of the Egyptian side.

We agree also to the Egyptian suggestion of January 4 that U.S. messages can be transmitted in the form of unsigned notes.[3]

[3] A January 25 memorandum from Scowcroft to Kissinger transmitted Ismail's reply agreeing to meet in London February 22–23, or in New York if Kissinger's schedule were subjected to "unexpected change." An attached memorandum noted that it would be much easier to keep the meeting secret if it were held in New York rather than London. Kissinger wrote on the top of the page that he would "strongly prefer N.Y." and that it would be "almost impossible" for him to arrange a pretext for his absence. He added: "Strongly recommend February 23–24 in U.S. Would take him to Camp David." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 131, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. II, January 1–February 23, 1973)

5. Telegram From the Embassy in Jordan to the Department of State[1]

Amman, January 22, 1973, 1030Z.

384. Department pass Cairo, Beirut, Tel Aviv.

1. Summary. Palace is still hopeful it can accomplish something dramatic with Syria and Cairo before King's trip to Washington. What King would like to be able to do is to say he is speaking for Assad and Sadat as well as himself. He thinks this would add urgency to his statements that a ME solution must be found this year and that USG must take over leadership in getting it nailed down.

2. King hopes his exchange of views with Sadat and Assad will lead to restoration of diplomatic relations. He would like to follow this up with quick flight to Cairo just before—or perhaps on way—to Washington, thus seizing headlines and making dramatic entrance.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret; Nodis.

3. It may be that King could pull this off. Both Assad and Sadat could see advantages in having the Arab friend of US carrying message that conditions are desperate and complete ME settlement is vital now. What is doubtful is that they will give King much more of a mandate than that. Subsequent to Washington meeting, they may well back away from anything King accomplishes. Two things seem sure in Middle East: No Arab nation will let any other speak for it; each is ready at any time to denounce the other.

4. Timing is also important. It is most doubtful anything will happen before Arab Defense Council which meets in Cairo starting Saturday.[2] What Qaddafi and Sadat agreed to—if anything—is unknown. Also unknown is what Assad and Sadat have been saying to each other about Hussein's initiatives.

5. All this gives impression of over-hasty patchwork. It is all being done in greatest secrecy here in Amman. Prime Minister knows only what he reads in *An-Nahar*. Foreign Minister has been pushed out of picture to his great unhappiness. Long-range implications have not been considered. What is being aimed at is two-fold: (1) political protection for Jordan should war of attrition break out and Jordan not join; and (2) a dramatic cover for King's trip which will give it international coverage and éclat.

6. *Comment:* I have been taking line here with King, Rifai, and others in palace that there is some value in covering Jordan's flanks diplomatically. Time is short, however, and Jordan should be sure it knows for whom it is speaking. What the common understandings are, and what public support its actions will be given before it gets itself so far out on a limb which others can saw off with a word.

Brown

[2] January 27.

6. Conversation Between President Nixon and Army Vice Chief of Staff (Haig)[1]

Washington, January 23, 1973.

Nixon: The point, though, is this: Let's take a problem like the Mideast. Now, you know very well that on the Mideast, while Henry talks about it in terms of the Soviet thing and the rest, he goes up the wall about Sisco, that Henry's filibustered the Mideast for almost four years, too, because he is totally attacking what the Jewish agenda wants. Now, he really is. He really is. What I am trying to say is this: That we've got to take it. We can't let State handle the Mideast; they'll screw it up. But, we have got to handle it here, but I just can't see Henry doing it. Now, I told him and practically choked right after the election. I said, "Henry, the time has now come that we've got to squeeze the old woman."[2] [unclear] 38 percent of the vote, but I said, "Screw the vote." I said, "We're doing this for the United States." Do you agree or not?

Haig: Well, I agree. [unclear] I think right now we could stir up a hornet's nest there.

Nixon: Screw them. To—to squeeze the—Mrs. Meir? What do you mean? She's going to attack?

Haig: Well, we're in a situation now where with Sadat he's in deep trouble. We are going to have to do something, but I think that we should [unclear] very careful [unclear]. Sadat may not survive this one. [unclear] more conservative [unclear]. State has carried out two times in past four years what they were [unclear].

Nixon: Yeah. Oh, I know that. I have no confidence in State. I'm just saying, too, though, Henry has somewhat of a blind spot here, because he doesn't want to do anything with the Israelis except reassure them and get them more arms. Well, now, the Israelis need a little restraint here, too, Al.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Tapes, Conversation No. 404–6. No classification marking. According to the President's Daily Diary, Nixon met with Haig in the Executive Office Building between 9:29 and 9:50 a.m. (Ibid., White House Central Files) The editors transcribed the portion of the conversation printed here specifically for this volume.

[2] Golda Meir.

7. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, January 24, 1973.

SUBJECT

Middle East Policy—Getting a Hold on Decision-Making

The attached cable[2] brings to attention the practical question of how you want to proceed toward decisions on next steps on the Arab-Israeli issue. I am sending you separately a memo on the substance of the decisions ahead.[3] The problem today is the procedural one of how to assure fundamental decisions on real alternatives in the weeks ahead.

The cable that State has just sent to Cairo without clearance here represents their view of how to proceed. Our minister in Cairo is instructed to explain to the Egyptians on an informal basis the following views:

—Washington is not satisfied with the present situation in the Middle East and believes we must continue efforts to make progress toward a peace settlement.

—*There is a general consensus in the USG that an interim Canal settlement is the best way to proceed. This is the "only proposition in sight that offers prospects of real progress at the present time."*

—While the terms of a final peace settlement cannot be predetermined now, we do not think that our concept of an interim agreement is in its essentials at variance with President Sadat's. The USG views an interim agreement as an integral part of a negotiating process for the full and complete implementation of Resolution 242.

While these instructions break no new ground, the mere reiteration now of the point that pursuit of an interim agreement is the only hope of movement will be read in Cairo as reflecting a decision that has not yet been made. Sadat is expecting a new US initiative and, since Greene has just been in Washington, the Egyptians are quite likely to conclude that this is the beginning of it.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 638, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. IX, January–October 73. Secret; Nodis. Sent for action.

[2] Telegram 12943 to Cairo, January 23; attached, but not printed.

[3] Document 8.

We do not yet have a formal *recommendation from Secretary Rogers,* but one can deduce from the things that have been said over recent weeks and from past style that his recommendation will contain the following elements:

—a new formula for getting proximity talks started *and*

—a formal approach to the Israelis, probably backed by a letter from the President putting this formula to the Prime Minister for discussion.

We do not know how or when the Secretary will present his proposal—whether he will send a memo to the President or bring it to him personally.

State's probable proposal represents one option, but since our next step will set the tone and approach for some time it should be considered carefully against other alternatives before we move. For one thing, we must consider that Sadat himself seems now to have concluded that the interim idea, which he himself raised, is a non-starter. We increasingly hear that he feels he made a serious mistake in offering a partial Canal agreement in early 1971. For another, we must be very careful in approaching the Israelis now so that we can keep them with us over the four-year course ahead. Repeating the style of past State Department initiatives may not be the best way to do this.

There is *an alternative to the probable State approach* which deserves a serious hearing. This alternative approach *would differ in two main respects from the State approach:*

1. *Style:* State will probably propose going to the Israelis with a fully worked out formula and then ask to discuss it. *The alternative* would be to go to the Israelis with a proposal to work out a formula, stating in general terms the main elements we feel would have to be included. We would then work with them to reduce the general proposition to writing in ways that meet Israeli concerns as much as possible. We would begin with quiet private talks, either with the Prime Minister or her representative, and would avoid publicizing a new US initiative. The objective of this style of approach to the Israelis would be to avoid confrontation by not presenting a finished formula while still engaging in substantive discussion at the outset. This is principally a difference in style, but how we deal with Israel will be of great importance in determining whether we can contribute anything to a negotiating process. The argument for State's approach is that Israel has responded in the past only when confronted by a hard US position backed by the President. The argument for the alternative is that the hard approach has tended to produce confrontation (as in December–January 1969–70 and August 1970) and that perhaps a lower key approach would enhance the spirit of consultation and lessen the appearance of our trying to force something of our making on Israel.

2. *Substance:* The *State approach* is to try to get talks going on an interim agreement while avoiding the hard issue of territory which will have to be addressed in a final agreement. They will probably propose some formula for beginning talks on an interim agreement by which both sides would agree that no outcome is precluded in advance of negotiations. There is a strong argument for simply getting the process of negotiation started, and in any course that is followed some such formula will probably have to be used publicly because neither side will be able to handle hard final decisions politically at the outset. However, it is also true that Sadat may not be willing to enter talks unless he knows generally where he might hope to come out, and the Israelis will be very suspicious that we will push the Rogers Plan.[4] There is an argument for saying simply that we feel that many elements of the Rogers Plan will warrant consideration in negotiations but that we cannot and will not impose them. But that approach may not satisfy either side.

There is an *alternative* which should be seriously considered because it at least may suggest some elaboration of the State approach. This alternative approach would face the issue of territory at the outset in private talks with the Israelis, and eventually with the Egyptians. This could be done in the form of the same kinds of general principles that we discussed before the Moscow summit last May. Essentially, we might strive for an Israeli agreement not to preclude the restoration of Egyptian sovereignty in Sinai, provided that concrete security arrangements could be worked out. These could include the agreed stationing of Israeli troops at key positions for extended periods, as we discussed last spring. The advantage of concentrating on "restoration of sovereignty" would be to shift the focus from "withdrawal", thus opening the way for return of Egyptian civil authority while preserving an Israeli security presence. The argument against this, of course, is that it would force the Israeli government to face up to a difficult decision on the eve of a national election. It should be possible, though, to handle this in a number of ways. For instance, the President and Mrs. Meir—or their representatives—might agree on a position to be taken publicly only after the Israeli election, which could permit us to take some measures now in the confidence that they would not be at odds with Israeli policy.

---

[4] The Rogers Plan was proposed by Secretary Rogers in a December 9, 1969, speech in which he called for an almost complete Israeli withdrawal from the territories occupied in 1967 within the framework of a binding peace treaty ending Israel's state of war with Jordan and Egypt. The plan also called for establishment of secure borders and demilitarized zones, maritime passage through the Suez Canal, and a just settlement of the refugee problem. For the complete text of Rogers's speech, see *The New York Times*, December 10, 1969.

The problem today is not to choose between these possible courses but to assure that there is thoughtful discussion of them before a choice is made. Cables such as the attached do not set a course irrevocably, but they do tend to point a direction and set style. Once again, a strong case can be made for not taking any steps until decisions are made. We are sending you separately a more substantive and less procedural memo on these decisions, but we wanted you to be aware of the procedural problem quickly.

Recommendations:

1. That you speak with Secretary Rogers and/or the President in an effort to reach understanding on how best to discuss these decisions and an understanding that no further actions be taken until those decisions are made.

2. That you ask Dick Campbell to set aside a few minutes in the next week to discuss with me how you would like to move both in terms of procedures and in terms of substance.[5]

[5] Neither the "Approve" nor the "Not Now" option is initialed. A handwritten notation at the bottom of the page reads: "HAK read this and asked Scowcroft to call State. HHS."

8. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, January 26, 1973.

SUBJECT

Next Steps on the Arab-Israeli Problem

In the next six weeks, the President will be seeing both King Hussein (February 6) and Prime Minister Meir (March 1). You already have available in your office a book from me on our broad options and a memo[2] on the desirability of reaching an understanding with State on how the next decisions on the Mid-East are to be made. The purpose of

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret. Sent for action.

[2] Document 7.

this memo is, in a more limited way, to outline for you the issues you and the President will face in connection with these visits and in setting our next steps on the Arab-Israeli problem.

It may sharpen the general issues for you right at the outset to know that there are two general viewpoints on how we should proceed. My purpose here is not to push one or the other but to assure that decisions can be made with full consideration of the alternatives. There are differences on the substance, style and timing of any new steps:

1. *Substance of a general approach.*

—The *State Department approach*[3] continues to favor (1) concentrating on an Egypt–Israel settlement, leaving a Jordan–Israel settlement till later and (2) trying to start Egypt–Israel negotiations on an interim agreement, establishing a commitment to negotiate later on an overall settlement but not addressing any of the fundamental issues like boundaries now.

—The *alternative* would be (1) to deal with a Jordan–Israel agreement simultaneously with Egypt–Israel negotiations, recognizing that the US role would be quite different and (2) to address the issue of territory, at least in terms of general principles, at the outset in private talks with the Israelis, and eventually with the Egyptians. The latter point could be handled on a separate track from proximity talks, supplementing them. There are elements of both approaches that are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

2. *Style.*

—The *State approach* has normally been to begin consultations with the Israelis and Egyptians on the basis of a formal démarche and a fully developed formula from which the two sides would begin negotiations. Although that formula may be presented with expression of readiness to consult fully, this approach can have the appearance of trying to force something of our making on Israel.

—*The alternative* is to make a more general but still substantive approach, speaking at first in terms of fundamental points but not having a fully worked out formula which we are pressing on all major issues. The initial approach would be less formal and dramatic. The purpose would be to preserve an atmosphere of collaboration, to minimize the appearance of pressure, to encourage the Israelis to develop a formula, and yet to make clear the points we feel must be addressed.

3. *Timing.*

—The *State approach* would be to launch a new initiative as soon as possible, and before Prime Minister Meir's visit, recognizing that exten-

[3] As outlined in Rogers's memorandum for the President, January 30. (National Archives, RG 59, Executive Secretariat, Briefing Books, 1958–1976: Lot 74 D 416, Box 17, Visit of King Hussein of Jordan, February 1973)

sive consultations would follow the initial approach and might not be completed until well after the visit.

—*The alternative* would be to use Mrs. Meir's visit to try to reach a general understanding that we propose to move ahead together and that we feel certain general issues need to be addressed. There could also be some understanding on timing and on what is possible during an Israeli election year. Consultations could follow and be paced in accordance with that understanding.

The purpose of this memo is, having described these broad issues, to review for you the specific political issues that relate to each of the coming visits. Issues of economic and military assistance are handled in other memos; those issues are basically in hand, and the President will be in a position to be responsive within the framework of budget decisions that have been made.

Talks with King Hussein: Jordan–Israel

The main issue for us in talking with King Hussein is whether we feel we should try to encourage movement on the Jordanian as well as on the Egyptian side in parallel fashion. The State Department recommendation will be to tell Hussein that "we think our efforts can best be directed in the first instance at least toward an attempt at getting an interim agreement between Egypt and Israel." We will, of course, want to know how he would feel about pursuing an agreement now, but his judgment will depend in part on how actively the US intends to involve itself.

The basic choice that *King Hussein will have* to make and will probably want to discuss is *a choice among three basic strategies:*

1. He could seek a *negotiated settlement,* knowing that he will get less than he wants. He will tell the President that the Israelis "seem as intransigent as ever on the basic issue of withdrawal" and that they "insist on annexing the western valley of the Jordan River as well as Jerusalem." For him, Jerusalem is the key, and other issues would be settled quickly if it were resolved. A negotiated agreement could be final; it could provide for staged implementation; or it could be "interim."

2. If a negotiated settlement is not possible now on terms he could live with, he could try for a *tacit agreement* among Jordan, Israel and the United States on a long-term strategy to return the West Bank to Arab control eventually, while in the meantime providing the Palestinians residing there a measure of autonomy under Israeli occupation and promising self-determination at some point.

3. He could simply *let matters drift* as they are. Some of his advisers argue that this is the safest course. Without high political cost, Jordan could stand back for a time and leave it to the Israelis to cope with grad-

ually increasing interest on the West Bank for greater autonomy and economic progress. At some time in the future, the Israelis may have to loosen their hold on the West Bank and at that point Jordan could work out a new association.

We cannot be sure at this point which of these alternatives the King would prefer. A major purpose during his visit will be to learn what considerations will govern his choice of strategy. In particular, we will want his judgment on:

—*Whether Jordan can enter an agreement with Israel ahead of Egypt.* If not, then we will not want to press Jordan at this time. On balance, however, we think the King will express a willingness to go first if the terms are good enough.

—*What it will take to bring Jordan and Israel close enough in their private talks to move toward agreement now.* We know that the main problems are Jerusalem, the Jordan Valley and Gaza, but if we were to get into this further we would need a much more precise view on where he could make concessions.

—*Whether, if there cannot be final agreement, Jordan sees any advantage in entering an interim agreement with Israel along the lines of the Allon plan,*[4] perhaps with some modifications on borders and provisions for Jordanian custody of the Holy Places in Jerusalem. The purpose of this approach would be to return the West Bank population to Hussein so that he could get on with organizing an autonomous West Bank for the Palestinians.

The *main issue for us* if the King wants help in making a hard try for a negotiated settlement is whether we will actively urge the Israelis toward a changed position on the West Bank and Jerusalem. Hussein may be more willing than some of his advisers to accept territorial changes on the West Bank during a transitional period provided that a part of Arab Jerusalem, including the Muslim Holy Places, were returned to his control. But only with a great deal of strain and imagination can an arrangement be worked out that both sides will feel they can live with.

The *second issue we may face* will arise if we and the King judge that it will not be possible to move Israel on the key issues. If this occurs, we

[4] The Allon Plan, initially presented in July 1967 by then Israeli Minister of Labor Yigal Allon, would have returned approximately two-thirds of the West Bank to a "Jordanian-Palestinian state" while Israel retained control of the Jordan Rift Valley and mountain ridges to the west from Nablus to Hebron with Israeli military outposts along the Jordan River and the remainder of the West Bank demilitarized. The Palestinians were to have self-administration in an autonomous or semi-autonomous region, and Israel would remain in full control of a united Jerusalem with a possible Jordanian status in the Muslim quarter of the old city.

might want to explore a long-term strategy for returning the West Bank to Arab control and allowing the Palestinians to choose their own political framework. If this cannot be done now by a formal settlement, it might be possible for Jordan, Israel and the US to discuss privately means by which the terms of the Israeli occupation might be modified to provide gradually increased authority for West Bank leaders. This might be a useful modification of simply letting the situation drift because it would provide a sense of direction.

The objective of such a tacitly agreed upon policy would be the emergence of moderate West Bank Palestinian leadership capable of assuming responsibility for local affairs initially and eventually able to organize the Palestinian community as it resumes control over the West Bank. Such a course would involve Israeli agreement to refrain from acts tantamount to annexing the territories, liberalized measures for allowing the free movement of people between the East and West Banks, and a gradual increase in self-government. There might also be some measures that we could take in the way of assistance to help West Bank Palestinians improve their social and economic prospects. After a period of perhaps five to ten years the West Bankers might choose what long-term association they would prefer.

We have not yet discussed this with the Israelis, and we do not know what King Hussein's judgment would be on whether this offers a useful alternative. We do know that at least some prominent Jordanians are thinking along these lines.

Prime Minister Meir's Visit: Egypt–Israel

The Jordan–Israel aspects of Mrs. Meir's visit are covered above. My purpose here is to discuss the Egypt–Israel front.

The first issue is whether and how we are going to try to put our relationship with Israel on a plane where the very high level of US diplomatic, economic and military support will be reciprocated by a serious Israeli effort to move toward peace in close collaboration with the US. *This is the major decision to be made and is a matter for general understanding at the highest level.* We certainly do not want Mrs. Meir to go away now with no inkling that we are going to urge new steps and then be hit by a new initiative in a few weeks or months. Involved in this understanding, of course, is what can be done before the Israeli election and what must be delayed until after.

If we are to proceed, *the next question* is how. This involves the general question of style—how to maintain as much Israeli confidence as possible. Then it involves such practical issues as how to develop a base for Egyptian-Israeli negotiations and how to handle the mechanics of preparation for negotiations. By this latter point, I mean specifically whether the President might choose to have the State Department work

on a formula for negotiating the first stage of withdrawal from the Canal, while you move on *a separate track* to discuss the general principles of an overall settlement so that we might address the big issues in a way that might keep those issues from stalling near-term progress on a first step.

On this latter point, there are some things you might inject into the process while leaving the detailed negotiating to State. Up until now, as you know, it has been impossible to make progress on an interim or full settlement of the Egyptian-Israeli conflict for two main reasons:

—Egypt will not negotiate the first stage of an agreement until she is assured of what the final stage will look like. In particular, Egypt insists that, before negotiations can begin, Israel must commit herself to full withdrawal in return for peace. Egypt has to be given a glimpse of what may eventually come out of a new peace initiative. In particular, Egypt must be convinced that it can regain sovereignty in Sinai eventually, even if there are conditions attached to this outcome. Some confidence from private conversations that we are addressing this issue seriously and realistically might help bring them into negotiations on a first-stage withdrawal.

—Israel refuses to make a prior commitment to full withdrawal, both because she intends to retain some Egyptian territory and because she does not want to give up what she considers her major bargaining asset before negotiations begin. It is a long shot, but it might reassure Israel to know through private conversation that we are prepared to work with Israel through a prolonged settlement process in an almost alliance-like relationship to preserve her security position in the Sinai, even though Egypt might have to regain sovereignty over most of the Sinai.

Whether or not there is a decision to work on two tracks as described above, there is *the third question* of what the substance of any new US position might be. This issue can best be described by highlighting two current viewpoints—the State Department's and an alternative.

We do not yet have a formal *recommendation from Secretary Rogers*, but one can deduce from the things that have been said over recent weeks and from past style that his recommendation will contain the following elements:

—a new formula for getting proximity talks started *and*

—a formal approach to the Israelis, probably backed by a letter from the President putting this formula to the Prime Minister for discussion.

In greater detail, I believe the State approach will be to try to get talks going on an interim agreement while *avoiding the hard issue of terri-*

tory which will have to be addressed in a final agreement. They will probably propose some formula for beginning talks on an interim agreement by which both sides would agree that no outcome is precluded in advance of negotiations. The argument is for simply getting the process of negotiation started. In any course that is followed some such general formula will probably have to be used publicly because neither side will be able to handle hard final decisions politically at the outset. However, it remains true that Sadat may not be willing to enter talks unless he knows generally where he might hope to come out, and the Israelis will be very suspicious that we will push the Rogers Plan. So there are advantages in not avoiding the ultimate issues, at least in general terms.

The *alternative* approach would *face the issue of territory at the outset in private talks with the Israelis*, and eventually with the Egyptians. This could be done in the form of the same kinds of general principles that we discussed before the Moscow summit last May.[5] Essentially, we might strive for an Israeli agreement not to preclude the restoration of Egyptian sovereignty in Sinai, provided that concrete security arrangements could be worked out. These could include the agreed stationing of Israeli troops at key positions for extended periods, as we discussed last spring. The advantage of concentrating on "restoration of sovereignty" would be to shift the focus from "withdrawal", thus opening the way for return of Egyptian civil authority while preserving an Israeli security presence. State has shown some interest in this concept, but has not worked it into its essentially tactical approach to an interim settlement. The argument against this, of course, is that it would force the Israeli government to face up to a difficult decision on the eve of a national election. It should be possible, though, to handle this in a number of ways. For instance, the President and Mrs. Meir—or their representatives—might agree on a position to be taken publicly only after the Israeli election, which could permit us to take some measures now in the confidence that they would not be at odds with Israeli policy.

Conclusion

My purpose here is obviously not to seek decisions on these issues but to ask for a few moments to discuss general directions with you so that I may prepare you and the President in the best way possible for the coming visits. The substance of the above boils down to two operational questions to begin with:

[5] Documentation on the May 1972 summit and the briefing and policy discussions preceding it is in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XIV, Soviet Union, October 1971–May 1972.

1. How far do you want to go in pursuing the details of a Jordan-Israel settlement during King Hussein's visit? The answer will dictate the kind of material we prepare for you.

2. Are you interested in developing the idea of two-track talks on an Egypt-Israel settlement, concentrating State's effort on a first-stage negotiation?

Recommendation: That you ask Dick Campbell to schedule 15–30 minutes in the coming week to discuss these issues with me.[6]

[6] Neither the "Approve" nor the "Not Now" option is initialed.

9. Message From the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin) to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, undated.

When we look back at the road covered in Soviet-American relations since the May meeting, we naturally feel satisfied with the positive changes in the relations between our countries. It is also quite understandable at the same time that our thoughts are more and more returning to those matters which happen to be yet unresolved. In this connection we would like to draw the President's attention first of all to the following two questions.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

Second. L.I. Brezhnev paid attention to the readiness of the President expressed in the message of December 18, 1972[2] to continue the discussion of the questions of the Middle East settlement, which the President quite justly ranks among the foremost foreign policy tasks, which demand the exertion of efforts on the part of our states in this 1973.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin and Kissinger, Vol. 5. No classification marking. A handwritten notation at the top of the page reads: "Handed to HAK by Dobrynin 1/28/73."

[2] Letter from Nixon to Brezhnev; ibid., Box 495, President's Trip Files, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 14. It is printed in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XV, Soviet Union, June 1972–August 1974, Document 71.

Consequently, we on our part repeatedly raised the question concerning the necessity of seeking a constructive settlement of the Middle East conflict and suggested to resume an active discussion of this question, particularly through the confidential channel.

However, in reply to our appeals we were told that the US were totally absorbed in the Vietnamese affairs and therefore could not for a while pay due attention to the subject of the Middle East.

Speaking about this question, it is necessary to emphasize that time is passing while the situation in the Middle East remains complicated and dangerous. If effective measures are not taken the events there can get out of control. There is no doubt that if hostilities in the Middle East erupt once again then—taking into account existent ties with this area of other states including major powers—there could develop quite unwelcome consequences for the cause of international security, and it is difficult to envisage what would be the end of it and for how long these complications would persist.

As is known, in the course of the Soviet-American exchange of opinion, including that on the highest level, a thought has been repeatedly stressed that the United States and the Soviet Union should not allow that the development of events in that area would lead to a confrontation between our countries; it was stressed that it is necessary and possible to find a solution answering to the interests of all states in the Middle East, to the interests of our states and the interests of peace in general. This has been pointed out personally by President Nixon as well, who not once spoke about his readiness to use his influence for the solution of the Middle East problem in this very spirit.

We think that both the USSR and the US really can use their influence, their weight, and nature of their ties with the countries—participants in the conflict in order to finally bring the whole matter to the liquidation of the military hotbed in the Middle East.

In this connection a postponement of the exchange of views between us on this important problem seems to be unjustified. There can be of course an order of priority in the solution of problems, but there are problems which can and should be solved in parallel with other urgent international issues. We believe that in the interests of big policy it is exactly in this way that we should approach the solution of the Middle East problem.

As for the Soviet Union, we are prepared for a confidential exchange of views with the American side on this problem. The President knows well the essence of the Soviet position. We have consistently proceeded and proceed from such provisions of principle, which are contained in the known resolution of the Security Council.

The key question of a settlement in the Middle East is, undoubtedly, the question of Israeli troops withdrawal from all the Arab terri-

tories occupied in 1967. If it is solved, then there can be no doubt that there will be no special difficulties in solving other questions of the settlement as well, such as providing for the security and independent existence of the state of Israel and of other countries of that area; establishing demilitarized zones, providing for the freedom of navigation of Israeli ships through the Suez Canal and in the Gulf of Aqaba, respect for the rights of the people of Palestine etc. Of course, the whole complex of the Middle East settlement should cover not only Egypt, but Syria and Jordan as well.

We have expressed those thoughts to the President more than once. Some time ago we have already forwarded to the US Government concrete proposals on this matter as well. We still believe that these proposals constitute an appropriate basis for agreement.

Now as never before the time factor has become of decisive importance in the question of political settlement in the Middle East. We are well aware of the feelings of the Arabs. Further existence of the deadlock in the settlement, for which Israel is to blame, cannot but force the Arab countries to seek a way out along the lines of using military methods to solve the lingering crisis no matter what would be the attitude of others to it.

Only substantial progress in the settlement through political means can prevent such a dangerous turn of affairs. We hope that in accordance with the results of the negotiations in Moscow we can start in the near future an exchange of views aimed at working out joint agreement on the settlement of the situation in the Middle East.

10. Paper Prepared in the Central Intelligence Agency[1]

Washington, undated.

COMMENTS ON THE EGYPTIAN GOVERNMENT MESSAGE OF 1 FEBRUARY 1973

1. Egyptian Presidential Advisor Hafiz Ismail's message of 1 February 1973[2] reflects more clearly than most previous Egyptian messages on the subject of secret US–Egyptian talks the paranoia and cynicism of the Egyptian leadership regarding the sincerity and good intentions of the US Government with respect to the terms of a "just" settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Egyptians find themselves torn between their hopes and their fears as they approach the hard, cold reality of negotiations on the basic problem that is eroding their political viability. On the one hand, they desperately wish a settlement and seem to be ready to take the internal and external risks they realize will be necessary throughout the process of obtaining one. On the other hand, they firmly believe they were misled and toyed with in the previous US peace initiative, that of 1970–71,[3] and they are still smarting from that experience.

2. Further, as Arabs, their emotions and exaggerated sense of pride continually interfere with their reasoning and judgment. Needless to say, this is particularly the case when the question involves Israel and American support of Israel. The Egyptians feel that their worst fears

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 131, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. II, January 1–February 23, 1973. Secret; Sensitive. The paper was forwarded to Kissinger under cover of a February 1 memorandum from Helms who wrote that the paper was in response to a February 1 request from Kissinger's office.

[2] Ismail's February 1 message stated that the Egyptian Government still considered London the most suitable place for the meeting and suggested that if Kissinger could not travel there on February 22–23, it might be advisable to postpone it to a later date. Ismail wrote that it was "simply not appropriate under current circumstances" for him to travel to the United States for a meeting with Kissinger. (Ibid.)

[3] In January 1971, UN Special Representative Gunnar Jarring proposed direct negotiations leading to a peace treaty between Israel and Egypt. In February, Sadat told Jarring that Egypt would terminate all states or claims of belligerency with Israel, as well as respect Israel's "right to live within secure and recognized boundaries" and would open the Suez Canal in exchange for Israeli withdrawal from the Canal. In a meeting with Rogers in Cairo, May 6, 1971, he added that if the Israelis agreed to this proposal he would also remove the Soviet military presence in Cairo. Although the peace "initiative" was Sadat's, it was quickly labeled a U.S. initiative when Secretary Rogers began active negotiations between Egypt and Israel, April–August 1971. Despite Rogers's efforts, and pressure from Nixon, the Israelis refused to withdraw from the Suez Canal. Documentation relating to the 1971 peace initiative are scheduled for publication in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXIII, Arab–Israeli Dispute, 1969–1972.

were confirmed by the results of the previous US discussions with them regarding a peace settlement and they are now alert to the slightest indicator that the US Government may not honor its commitments at each step of this new effort. They are quite likely to misinterpret minor differences in this light and to react to them in a manner that will appear out of all proportion to the technicality involved. Further, they are undoubtedly applying what they know of the American-Vietnamese negotiations as a guide as to how to proceed with honor in meeting secretly with a party that at this point they will not assume is a neutral. In that context they may well now have decided, upon further reflection, that they would appear too eager for a settlement and too ready to make concessions if they agree to come to the United States for the first meeting. Once the Egyptian leaders feel their pride is at stake on such a point, they could become quite obstinate and the only factor that then might move them to action would be what they seem to assess as the critical nature of their internal political situation.

3. Another major factor in considering the Egyptian response of 1 February is the consistent indication in their recent messages that they would like to publicize such a meeting as soon as it could be done without causing a breakdown in the negotiations. President Anwar Sadat has used nearly every trick in his bag to quiet his domestic and foreign critics. He has very little left in that respect and probably reasons that an official disclosure of a meeting between Dr. Kissinger and Mr. Ismail would be a political tour de force that would further quiet his critics, at least as long as the talks continued. (In relation to this point, we should stress that Sadat has shown himself to be a very short-range thinker.) Such publicity would make the site of the meeting an important factor in terms of Egyptian and Arab pride and critical comment. In Arab terms, a neutral point would not necessarily represent a compromise in dealings with the US Government, whereas a meeting site in the United States could be so interpreted by Sadat's critics.

4. The suggestion that Mr. Ismail could not now travel to the United States under any circumstances is, however, a distinct departure from the earlier Egyptian willingness to meet in New York if a meeting in London were not compatible with Dr. Kissinger's schedule. The previous Egyptian flexibility on this point was expressed specifically in their messages, including Mr. Ismail's previous message to Dr. Kissinger of 24 January 1973.[4] Admittedly, the Egyptians had always shown that they preferred a third country site, but they had also at one point gone so far as to allow us to obtain US visas for them in their alias passports. One incident of note between 24 January and the Egyptian

[4] See footnote 3, Document 4.

change of position on 1 February was the meeting in Cairo on 25 January between President Sadat and the Soviet Ambassador to Egypt, Vladimir Vinogradov, who had just returned from consultations in Moscow. We note this was their first meeting in six months. On the same day the Soviet Ambassador in Damascus conferred with Syrian President Hafiz Asad. On 30 January the Soviet Ambassador in Baghdad met Iraqi President Hassan Bakr. While we do not know specifically what was discussed at these sessions, it is perhaps noteworthy in this context that in his 1 February 1973 message, Hafiz Ismail explained that the prevailing state of US–Egyptian relations was the reason for his not agreeing to meet in the United States. He then noted that he would be travelling to Moscow in early February. Ismail further noted that the present state of Egyptian-Soviet relations is more favorable than that of Egyptian relations with the US. He added, "This is the difference." This flurry of Soviet diplomatic activity suggests that Moscow may be preparing for or even stimulating a revival of interest in a Middle Eastern settlement, now that a Vietnam peace agreement has been signed. The Soviets certainly would not wish to be left out of a settlement effort and could have made this point so strongly to Sadat that he now feels more restricted and inhibited, even in terms of the technicalities of meeting arrangements. The validity of this speculation may be enhanced by the information we received after drafting the comments above that Cairo's Middle East News Agency has reported that Soviet Ambassador Vinogradov received a Soviet military delegation from Moscow at Cairo International Airport on 1 February 1973.[5]

[5] On February 4, Ismail sent Kissinger a message that the Egyptian Government appreciated the difficulties of holding the meeting outside the United States during February, but that there were "certain considerations which render it difficult for Mr. Ismail to visit the United States for such a private meeting." Ismail noted, however, that it would be possible for him to proceed to Washington if an official invitation were extended to him by the U.S. Government. If this were acceptable, he could arrive in Washington on February 22, hold talks with Secretary Rogers on February 23, and meet with Kissinger at Camp David February 25–26. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 131, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/ Ismail, Vol. II, January 1–February 23, 1973) On February 6, Kissinger replied, suggesting the best mode for Ismail's proposed trip to the United States. (Ibid.)

11. Editorial Note

In his memoirs, President Nixon recalled: "Now that the Vietnam war had ended, we could turn our attention to the other area of the

world where war was always imminent and where the danger of a great-power nuclear confrontation was far greater than in Southeast Asia." On February 3, 1973, he wrote in his diary:

"I hit Henry [Kissinger] hard on the Mideast thing. He now wants to push it past the Israeli elections in October, but I told him unless we did it this year we wouldn't get it done at all in the four-year term.

"The Egyptian [Hafiz Ismail] is coming over. What he works out I don't know, but I feel that some way we have got to get the Israelis moved off of their intransigent position. Needless to say, we can't move to the all-out Egyptian or Arab position either, but there is some place in between where we can move. The interim settlement is, of course, the only thing we can talk about—that's the only thing the Israelis will ever go for—and the Egyptians are just simply going to have to take a settlement of that sort—or the Arabs are—with the assurance that we will do the best we can to get a total settlement later.

"I spoke to Henry about the need to get going on the Mideast. I am pressing him hard here because I don't want him to get off the hook with regard to the need to make a settlement this year because we won't be able to make it next year and, of course, not thereafter with '76 coming up. He brought that up himself so apparently the message is getting through. What he's afraid is that Rogers, et al. will get ahold of the issue and will try to make a big public play on it and that it will break down. This is the point that I made to Heath—that we couldn't go to the summit here and fail and, of course, the British understand this totally.

"On the other hand, Henry has constantly put off moving on it each time, suggesting that the political problems were too difficult. This is a matter which I, of course, will have to judge. He agreed that the problem with the Israelis in Israel was not nearly as difficult as the Jewish community here, but I am determined to bite this bullet and do it now because we just can't let the thing ride and have a hundred million Arabs hating us and providing a fishing ground not only for radicals but, of course, for the Soviets. I think actually the radicals are our greater danger because the Soviets will have their people be somewhat responsible whereas the radicals are likely to act in totally unmanageable ways.

"As I told Bob [Haldeman], I thought Henry was having a letdown now because he realized that he had participated in the three great events perhaps of the postwar era—the Soviet, the China, the Vietnam—and that everything else would pale by significance. The Mideast he just doesn't want to bite, I am sure because of the enormous pressures he's going to get from the Jewish groups in this country.

"Henry needs to have another great goal. Haig feels strongly that it should be Europe. Henry I noticed had picked up this theme in my last

talk with him. I kept hammering, however, with Haig the necessity of doing something about the Mideast." (*RN: The Memoirs of Richard Nixon*, pages 786–787)

---

12. Memorandum From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, undated.

SUBJECT

Secret Israel–Jordan Talks

As general background for your coming meetings with King Hussein (February 6) and Prime Minister Meir (March 1) you will want to be aware of a report [*less than 1 line not declassified*] on a January 3 meeting between the two leaders at a location in Israel south of the Dead Sea.

The full report is attached,[2] but the following are the highlights of their discussion:

—[*1 paragraph (10 lines) not declassified*]

—Hussein gave Mrs. Meir a paper setting forth the basic principles that he feels must govern a peace settlement. In doing so, he admitted that it was largely a rehash of old positions discussed in earlier Jordanian-Israeli meetings. Mrs. Meir agreed but affirmed that they must keep trying to reach an agreement. She did, however, suggest one new concession in the form of possibly allowing a separate Jordanian corridor to East Jerusalem so that the Muslim holy places could be visited without crossing Israeli territory but insisted that all of Jerusalem must be under Israeli sovereignty. Mrs. Meir did acknowledge that the subject of "occupation" will be *the* issue in the coming Israeli elections. The Jordanians also felt that she indicated receptivity to Gaza's becoming part of Jordan with a corridor linking it to the West Bank, but there may be an element of wishful thinking in that Jordanian assessment.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 137, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan/Rifai, January 3, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Outside the System. Sent for information.

[2] Attached, but not printed.

—Hussein is sending Mrs. Meir a message informing her of his plans to restore diplomatic relations with Egypt and Syria. In it, he assures her that this will not alter Jordan's policy in any way, especially concerning resumption of hostilities or opposing the fedayeen.

King Hussein's position paper concerning the terms of a peaceful settlement between Israel and Jordan sets forth these basic principles:

—Jordanian leaders are prepared to sign a formal peace treaty with "all necessary international guarantees."

—They would accept total demilitarization of the West Bank and would guarantee that no outside Arab armed forces would be stationed anywhere on Jordanian soil.

—They would agree to eventual establishment of normal diplomatic, commercial and economic relations between Jordan and Israel, including joint development projects in the Jordan Valley.

—There could be agreement on some form of resident alien permits to allow nationals of each country to reside inside the other with freedom of movement back and forth.

—No lasting peace is possible, however, if the solution to the Middle East problem is to be based on outright annexation of Arab territories. Rectification of the pre-1967 border can be negotiated with some reciprocity in ways that would permit its establishment as a permanent boundary.

—Jerusalem must be an open city, not divided and with free access to all people. It cannot, however, be a united Israeli city. The return of the Arab section of Jerusalem to Jordanian sovereignty is the cornerstone for peace in Jerusalem, but an exchange of sectors could be considered. The Jordanians believe that dual sovereignty is the only answer. There could be complete freedom of movement within the city. Two municipalities with a joint council to administer affairs of common concern might provide a method for joint administration of the city.

—The solution to the Gaza problem does not lie either in independence or in Israeli annexation. Jordanian leaders believe that the best solution would be for it to become part of the West Bank region of Jordan's United Arab Kingdom, with a corridor linking it to the West Bank.

—Palestinian refugees from 1967 would return to their homes in the West Bank. Refugees from 1948 would be given the right of repatriation to present day Israel or compensation. Limits on the numbers to return to Israel proper could be agreed.

This does not represent a significant change in the Jordanian position from the one King Hussein presented to you last March during his

visit.[3] The interesting point is that the top two leaders are discussing issues like Jerusalem and Gaza which would have to be addressed in a serious negotiation. Although the questions of borders and Jerusalem remain major obstacles to agreement, this discussion takes place against a background of renewed talk on both sides about practical elements of a settlement. According to one of Hussein's chief advisers, Hussein would be prepared to agree to the stationing of Israeli para-military settlements on the West Bank for a specified period as the first phase in an overall peace settlement until the Jordanians proved their ability to maintain security. On the Israeli side there was extensive debate within Mrs. Meir's Labor Party last fall on how prolonged occupation of Arab-populated areas would dilute the Jewish nature of Israel.

During his visit, Hussein will probably seek US support for his gaining a maximum response from the Israelis. The broad choice of strategy that he faces is a choice between (1) trying to gain a negotiated settlement along these lines, possibly implemented over a prolonged period and (2) living for some time with the present situation while working tacitly with the Israelis to assure increased Palestinian autonomy on the West Bank. In the latter course, it would be possible for Israel and Jordan to agree that no formal settlement is possible now but that the Israelis would prepare the West Bankers for eventual autonomy and choice on their association with Jordan. This is a choice which Hussein is going to have to make for himself, and we will want to have some feeling from him on how far he is prepared to go before Mrs. Meir comes.

[3] Nixon met with Hussein at the White House March 28, 1972. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Central Files, President's Daily Diary) The memorandum of conversation is scheduled for publication in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXIII, Arab–Israeli Dispute, 1969–1972.

13. Memorandum From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, undated.

SUBJECT

Your Meeting with King Hussein—Summary of Main Points

King Hussein will have two main points on his mind:

1. He will request US support in moving Israel's position to within negotiating range of Israel's [*Jordan's*] position on a peace agreement. His direct negotiations with Israel have so far not produced enough change in the Israeli position for him to be able to live with Israeli terms.

2. He will seek (a) a total of $80 million in budget support this year—$30 million of it before June—and (b) more military equipment.

In response, these are the main *points for you to make:*

1. We continue to regard King Hussein and a stable Jordan under his leadership as important in the movement toward a Middle East peace.

2. You regard this meeting as an opportunity to understand Hussein's positions fully. We appreciate his keeping us informed (through Dick Helms) of his exchanges with Israel, but there is no substitute for hearing his views directly. What we hear will be an important part of our deciding how we should proceed.

3. Helping to move the Middle East towards peace will be an important issue on the agenda of your second administration. The issues that remain to be decided are *how*—not whether—we are to involve ourselves actively in that effort.

4. Your talk with Prime Minister Meir on March 1 will also be an important part of our deciding what strategy to follow. Therefore, you will want to be in touch with him again. You do not believe it would be wise to commit ourselves to any course of action before this round of talks is complete.

5. You, therefore, would like to hear King Hussein's general assessment of the situation. Specifically:

—Under what circumstances, if any, would King Hussein feel Jordan could make peace with Israel before Egypt?

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 929, VIP Visits, Jordan (King Hussein Visit), 6 Feb 1973. Secret. Sent for action. A stamped notation on the first page reads: "The President has seen."

—What does the King feel might be ways of bridging the present negotiating gaps with Israel?

[6. If there would be some advantage in hearing the King in more detail and this could be done without any commitment on our side, Dr. Kissinger might chat further with the King this afternoon.][2]

7. On *military aid,* the State and Defense Departments are prepared this week to discuss an extension of the present three-year equipment modernization program beyond next year. This can help Jordan in two ways: (a) It will permit discussion of new equipment needs; (b) it will give Jordan the option for the first time of using some (perhaps $10 million) of our grant military aid to help meet operating costs and therefore help with the budget deficit. This might require stretching out some equipment deliveries, but our ability to extend the present program provides flexibility to do that.

8. On *economic aid,* we are in a position to provide $50 million in budget support in 1973. Together with grant military aid ($40 million) and loans for development projects ($10 million), this brings our overall aid to about $100 million. We would like to hold at that level now for two reasons: (a) We strongly feel that Jordan's Arab friends have an obligation to do more. We have increased our aid and feel they should. (b) We are making a major effort to get our own budget under control and are anxious to help Jordan do the same. [We do have $15 million more in FY 1974 money, and we should be prepared to provide this ultimately.][3]

In short, we will be discussing ways to move toward peace and details of military and economic assistance over the coming weeks. We will stay in close touch with King Hussein on both.

[2] Brackets in the original.

[3] Brackets in the original.

14. Memorandum for the President's File by the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, February 6, 1973, 11:35 a.m.–12:45 p.m.

SUBJECT

Meeting with King Hussein of Jordan, Political Adviser Zayd Rifa'i, and Henry A. Kissinger, February 6, 1973 11:35 a.m.–12:45 p.m., The Oval Office

The President opened the meeting by asking the King to give him his personal analysis of the Middle East situation. The President would be thinking about the situation very seriously and wanted the benefit of the King's views.

The King thanked the President for his interest, stressing that the United States was now in a situation of leadership on this issue. The President's initiative in making the Middle East a matter of high priority for the second term was "a victory for all of us."

The King then began a detailed analysis of the overall situation, reading from an aide-mémoire which is attached at Tab A.[2]

"Since our last meeting," the King began, "several significant developments have taken place in the area which we believe have a direct bearing on the chances for a peaceful solution of the Arab/Israeli problem. The Egyptians' expulsion of the Soviet advisors from Egypt was perhaps the most significant event.[3] While it removed the Soviet presence from possible direct involvement in any resumption of armed

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 137, Country Files, Middle East, Iran—Oil to JORDAN/RIFAI, January 3, 1973 [2 of 2]. Top Secret; Sensitive. A Presidential tape recording of the conversation is ibid., White House Tapes, Conversation No. 850–8.

[2] Attached, but not printed.

[3] Sadat announced on July 18, 1972, that he had ordered the immediate withdrawal of Soviet "military advisers and experts" from his country and the placing of Soviet bases and equipment under exclusive control of Egyptian forces. (*The New York Times*, July 19, 1972) In his autobiography, Sadat explained why he chose to remove the Soviets from his country: "One of the reasons behind my decision was the Soviet attitude to me; but another important reason was that within the strategy I had laid down, no war could be fought while Soviet experts worked in Egypt. The Soviet Union, the West, and Israel misinterpreted my decision to expel the military experts and reached an erroneous conclusion which in fact served my strategy, as I had expected—that it was an indication that I had finally decided not to fight my own battle. That interpretation made me happy; it was precisely what I wanted them to think. A further reason for the expulsion of the Soviet experts was that the Soviet Union had begun to feel that it enjoyed a privileged position in Egypt—so much so that the Soviet ambassador had assumed a position comparable to that of the British High Commissioner in the days of British occupation in Egypt. . . . Yet another reason for my decision was that I wanted to put the Soviet Union in its place—in its natural position as a friendly country, no more, no less." (*In Search of Identity*, pp. 230–231)

conflict between the Egyptians and the Israelis, it also increased the danger of President Sadat perhaps heating up the situation on his own by some form of limited offensive, which could escalate into an all out war. Indeed, we have heard from President Sadat himself that such are his intentions.

"Secondly, we have seen hostilities break out on the Israeli/Syrian front with increased regularity. The Syrians are already calling for more than moral support from the other Arab nations which reminds us of the pre-1967 war situation when the Syrian/Israeli confrontation compelled President Nasir to take his bold aggressive action which led to the Arab disaster.

"On the other hand, in very recent months both Syria and Egypt have demonstrated a conciliatory attitude toward Jordan, with Syria going as far as to reopen her borders and air space to Jordanian traffic. We also have established a diplomatic interests section in Damascus. We have held exploratory talks with the Egyptians, including President Sadat, in an effort to achieve mutual better understanding and to normalize our relations with Egypt. While nothing concrete has yet come of these maneuvers we can say there has been some forward movement. We cannot, however, accept any normalization of relations with these two countries by compromising two of our cardinal principles, (a) refusing return of any fedayeen forces to Jordan, and (b) resumption of hostilities on our front with Israel or handing over command of the armed forces to a unified command without a very clear joint policy drawn by the political supreme powers in the three countries and a clear definition of the command's authorities and terms of reference."

As for Sadat's negotiating position, the King felt that Sadat would still be interested in a partial settlement first as long as it was clearly linked to a total settlement.

The King then discussed Soviet policy, reading again from the aide-mémoire:

"The Soviet policy in the area, following the relative deterioration of their position in Egypt, appears to be one of:

"(a) Concentrating on saving what they could of their presence in Egypt and maintaining a footing there. As for the Arab/Israeli problem, and to serve their own ends, the Soviets continue to indicate their willingness to encourage efforts aimed at reopening the Suez Canal; while attempting at the same time to champion the Arab resolve to ensure full implementation of Security Council Resolution 242, i.e. complete withdrawal of Israel from all territories occupied in June 1967.

"(b) The Soviet Union appears bent on creating physical difficulties in the face of the implementation of 242 by the continuous flow of Soviet Jews to Israel in numbers that could, over a period of time,

largely increase Israel's population, and possibly eventually alter the nature of the state as a result of the predominance of a leftist oriented population.

"(c) The Soviets appear to be interested in avoiding over-stretching their reach in the area by concentrating on Iraq, which poses a nuisance to Iran and a threat to the Gulf States, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Jordan.

"(d) The Soviets are apparently most interested in Syria, and it is possible that they, either directly through their excessive military assistance, or indirectly through Iraq, may eventually bring Syria and Iraq into their orbit, thus straddling both the Gulf and the Mediterranean.

"(e) The Soviets are using Iraq as a base for Soviet intelligence in the area. They are strengthening the regime and the only possible threat comes from Mustafa Barzani,[4] who is constantly appealing for more of your help and support through Iran."

King Hussein then turned to his relations with Israel:

"We have managed to keep our border with the occupied territory quiet and have accomplished some steps through indirect cooperation with the Israelis which has eased the flow of traffic between the West and East Banks. We intend to continue our policy of maintaining quiet on this front and believe our internal security situation is such that this can be done without difficulty.

"As you are aware from our frequent statements and declarations, Jordan neither desires nor intends to enter into another conflict with Israel unless she is forced to do so in self-defense. Jordan wishes a peaceful settlement with Israel, but that settlement must be just and honorable. We have kept you advised of developments and exchanges with the Israelis and we are sorry to point out that the Israelis seem as intransigent as ever on the basic issue of withdrawal. They insist on annexing the Western Valley of the river Jordan, as well as Jerusalem, which, of course is the main stumbling block. Jerusalem is the key to any lasting Arab/Israeli settlement since if this question is solved, we believe all other problems will be quickly resolved."

The King handed over a paper summarizing Jordan's secret contacts with Israel and analyzing the obstacles to progress. [Tab B][5]

Jordan was also developing its relations with the States of the Persian Gulf, the King continued:

"Since we last met,[6] we have made a good deal of progress in assisting the Gulf States and further Jordanian relations and influence in the Gulf States. Our greatest contribution has, of course, been in Oman where we were able to furnish some much needed artillery, increase the number of Omanis being trained in various JAA and Jordanian civilian schools. We feel our presence in Oman and our training program

[4] Mustafa Barzani, leader of the Kurdistan Democratic Party (KDP).

[5] Attached, but not printed. All brackets are in the original.

[6] See footnote 3, Document 12.

for Omanis has had a significant impact on Sultan Qabus' own internal situation. We hope to be able to do more in the coming year.

"We have continued our training mission in Abu Dhabi and this too has begun to pay off. Also, we feel that through our conciliation efforts we contributed to the rapprochement between the Shah of Iran and Shaykh Zayid. Unfortunately, we have not been successful to date in helping bring about a resolution of the Saudi/Abu Dhabi territorial dispute, but we are still working on it.

"We now have four embassies functioning in the Gulf States and hope shortly to open an embassy in Sana. Through this latter embassy we will explore possible avenues of assistance we may be able to offer the new regime in the Yemen Arab Republic.

"We have noted that in all our contacts in the Gulf, we are constantly urged to bring to the attention of the United States Government the need for greater U.S. involvement in the Gulf in order to assist those states to ward off the communist and extremist influences that are increasingly coming to bear on the area. We are certain that basically all states in the Gulf are against communism and Arab extremism, but they lack the means and experience to combat it in some cases. Understanding U.S. reluctance to become directly involved, which we consider the correct decision, we believe we can expand our role in the Gulf if we receive the necessary financial support.

"We believe there is indeed the possibility of extremist and communist influence increasing in the Gulf, in fact we have had some intelligence reporting that indicates the leftist elements of the fedayeen are already well-established in some Gulf states and hope to expand their efforts there, given their untenable situations in Lebanon and Syria. We feel immediate action is necessary to counter this threat."

The King then turned to Jordan's internal situation, economic and military. He handed over a detailed paper [Tab C][7] on Jordan's budget and development requirements, and then spoke from the aide-mémoire.

"With the return of security and stability to Jordan, we have seen a slow but sure resurgence of economic activity. The opening of the Syrian border also helped our economy, although we suffered some severe losses to our agricultural production due to recent adverse weather. We held a very successful international conference at which we explained our Three Year Development Plan and frankly the response to that conference in forms of interest and offers of investment has been most satisfying. We are, however, still in a very difficult financial situation and will require budgetary assistance for some time to come, especially before July of this year. We have had to carry over from last year's budget into this year's one a substantial deficit, which, when added to the deficit of this year's budget, will amount to almost one third of our total recurring budget. We have, for the first time, separated the development budget from the recurring expenses budget,

[7] Attached, but not printed.

and it is this latter one which particularly needs your help and support. The forty million dollars which you have promised us in your fiscal year 74 will be of great help, but we will start receiving this as of July. We badly need a minimum of thirty million dollars between now and July. We still hope to regain the Khartoum subsidies, at least from Kuwait, but until our relations are normalized with Egypt and Syria, it is doubtful the Kuwaitis will be forthcoming.

"Our modernization program is moving along satisfactorily but we would appreciate a speed up in deliveries, and the necessity for a new program to meet our urgent requirements and provide us with badly needed items. We have no intention of enlarging our present armed forces strength, but wish to improve our firepower and mobility in order to meet the ever present Syrian and Iraqi threats to our territory. As you are aware, the Soviets are making large deliveries of the most advanced weaponry to the Syrian armed forces and this is creating a tremendous imbalance between our armed forces and the Syrians. We must emphasize that our wish to strengthen our armed forces is based solely on the principle of defense of our territory and deterrent in terms of mutual interest and help where required, since we have no aggressive intentions toward anyone. While our relations with Syria at the moment are improving, past experience has taught us that the situation could change overnight so we must always be adequately prepared to defend our northern border. This will be especially true if, God willing, we should enter into some negotiations or form of settlement with the Israelis. To do so we must be in a position of military strength since we may well have to ward off some military threats from the north and east. We believe that a militarily strong Jordan is imperative for a lasting peace in the area and it is for this reason that we would like to complete our modernization program as quickly as possible."

The President thanked the King for his clear analysis of the situation and his exposition of Jordanian policy. "We want you to survive as an independent country and we are willing to take considerable risks," the President stressed. Getting money, however, was difficult, as the King knew, and we would have difficulty arranging an increase.

Adviser Rifai pointed out that the major problem was to get another $30 million which Jordan badly needed to cover its deficit. The President assured him we would approach it sympathetically. The money needed was for the civilian recurring budget, Mr. Rifai observed. The President remarked that we would have to go back to the drawing boards on this. There was a severe Congressional problem with regard to all foreign aid.

The President then turned the discussion back to the negotiating situation. There were three possible strategies, he noted: Egypt-first, Egypt and Jordan together, and Jordan-first. He wanted the King's

judgment of the priority. "We don't want a public effort that only exacerbates the situation. We are concerned about having another public situation that fails. On the other hand, we have a great interest in getting this off dead center."

King Hussein replied that his effort had been to keep it away from the public eye. Jordan was willing to go alone, but believed that if it was kept private the chances were increased. "Must you wait for an Egyptian settlement?" the President asked. "We can't wait for the elections in Israel. We must try to get things off dead center." Mr. Rifai replied that Jordan didn't mind going first. The real question was, what was the content of the settlement? Jordan did not want a partial settlement; Jordan wanted an intermediate settlement. Sadat was certain to start another "war of attrition," Mr. Rifai was convinced. The Saudis said they would pay a subsidy if Jordan would let the fedayeen back in. But Jordan would never do this.

The President thanked the King again for his analysis. "It is a miracle that your country survives and that you survive. We are grateful for that. We have no bright new formula but we are going to study the issue and see where we can be helpful."

"We have had a good talk," the President concluded, "and we will have your concerns in mind." The President then pointed out that Dick Helms, newly appointed U.S. Ambassador in Iran, would have a special influence and a special responsibility in the area. Dr. Kissinger observed that there had been terrorist incidents in Tehran during the President's visit last June and that this was a source of concern.

The meeting then ended.[8]

[8] Kissinger later recalled that the February 6 meeting with Hussein was his first "direct exposure for what turned out to be a tragedy for the peace process in the Middle East: the personal distrust between Sadat and Hussein." He added that Hussein feared "Sadat's volatility might do harm to Jordan as had Nasser's," while Sadat dealt with Hussein at "arm's length, thus preventing the emergence of the one spokesman with whom Israel might have successfully negotiated with over the West Bank." "The pity was that these two moderate leaders failed to give each other the support that might have speeded up Middle East diplomacy; they wound up in an impasse from which the sole exit was war." (Kissinger, *Years of Upheaval*, p. 219)

15. Telegram From the Department of State to the Embassy in Jordan[1]

Washington, February 9, 1973, 1623Z.

25110. Subject: Secretary's Meeting With King Hussein.

1. Summary. Secretary met with King Hussein for working lunch and talk at Department February 6. Meeting was very cordial. Secretary stressed USG attaches great importance to process of negotiation and sees no substitute for negotiations in finding solution to Middle East problem. Secretary indicated our concern in this regard is mainly with Egypt, since Jordan has made clear its readiness to talk. Secretary pointed out USG wants to be helpful but, contrary to belief of some, we cannot impose a solution. We think that if agreement could be reached between Egypt and Israel on opening of Suez Canal it would generate momentum for settlement between Jordan and Israel. Secretary assured King Hussein we have Jordanian/Israeli side of problem very much in mind. King raised Jordanian assistance requests with Secretary in brief private meeting following luncheon and Secretary said we would do all we can to help Jordan within limit of our resources, which he noted are currently under great pressure.

2. King Hussein was accompanied at meeting by Royal Court Minister Amer Khammash, Foreign Minister Salah Abu Zaid, Political Adviser Zaid Rifai, Minister of Finance Farid al-Sadad, General Ben Shaker, and Jordanian Ambassador to US Mufti. On U.S. side Deputy Secretary Rush, AID Administrator Hannah, Under Secretary Tarr, Asst. Secy. Sisco, Ambassador Brown and ARN Country Director Korn were present. Luncheon and meeting afterwards were very cordial and warm, and lasted just over two hours.

3. Secretary opened by remarking that we have come to agreement in Viet-Nam and have created conditions in which there can be peace if the parties want it. Secretary pointed out that in every area of world except the Middle East we have been able to get parties to talk, in Germany, in Korea and in Viet-Nam. It is difficult to see how any progress can be made toward a Middle East solution unless Arabs and Israelis are ready to do the same as other parties to major world conflicts. Secretary said he wanted to make clear that his remarks about need for negotiations were not addressed to Jordanians, for we know that Jordan is ready to talk. But he wanted to stress that the Middle East conflict is far too complex to solve without an active exchange of ideas between the

[1] Source: National Archives. RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 7 JORDAN. Secret; Nodis. Drafted by Korn, cleared by Brown and Sisco, and approved by Rogers. Repeated to Beirut, Cairo, Tel Aviv, Kuwait, Jidda, London, Paris, Moscow, and USUN.

parties. Rifai referred to his recent visit to Cairo and his conversation with President Sadat and said that Sadat is ready to negotiate but needs a prior commitment from Israelis regarding the line of withdrawal. Rifai said President Sadat is neither willing nor able to discuss concessions with Israelis. He cannot give up sovereignty over any part of Sinai.

4. Secretary replied that it just does not make any sense to ask other side for commitments as precondition for entering into negotiations. Suppose we had done that in our negotiations with Russians? We would never have reached agreement with them on Berlin or on SALT. Deputy Secretary Rush pointed out that it took 18 months and difficult discussions to reach agreement on Berlin and that no progress would ever have been made had we not been prepared to participate in give and take of negotiations. Foreign Minister Abu Zaid interjected that it is Israelis, not Arabs, who put conditions on negotiations. Israelis say they are ready to conduct negotiations provided that Jerusalem, Sharm al-Sheikh and Golan Heights will not be subject to negotiation.

5. King Hussein said his feeling is that so many agreements have now taken place throughout the world that Middle East is only remaining problem. It is imperative now that world turn its attention to Middle East and that progress be made. King Hussein stressed importance of action now. Secretary pointed out that in every negotiation each side has its own position, and there is nothing unusual in one or both sides stating those positions. What is unusual is for one side to say to other that it must give in before there can even be talks. Secretary noted that Israel states that its principal concern is security. Egypt on other hand tells Israel that it does not need to worry about security once an agreement has been signed. Secretary said he saw no reason why Israeli and Egyptian positions need be irreconcilable. However, problems are so complex that it is impossible to decide them at any one time. If some progress can be made toward a Suez agreement, Secretary said, then momentum will be developed toward solution of other aspects of problem.

6. Rifai took issue with Secretary on foregoing and said Egypt would find itself weaker and further from achieving a lasting settlement if Suez agreement is concluded. Secretary said he disagreed absolutely. If an agreement is reached on Suez, this will very definitely create a new impetus for negotiations. Additionally, since Egyptians would cross to East Bank of canal in framework of a Suez agreement, he could not see how anyone could say that Egypt would be weaker militarily. Rifai objected that Egyptian military forces would not cross canal. Secretary pointed out that even so there would still be Egyptians on East Bank of canal for first time since 1967 and Israelis would with-

draw from the Bar Lev Line.[2] In these circumstances how could anyone say that Egypt would be weaker? Egypt would be much better off because world would want to keep canal open and would put pressure on Israel to move forward to a full settlement and not do anything which would place canal in danger. Moreover, Secretary pointed out, there would be some kind of force separating two sides, and Egypt would receive a commitment from Israel to continue negotiations for a full settlement. Secretary said he was sure Egypt could make a good settlement with Israel through negotiations, a much better one than could be achieved by any other means. Rifai said that in event of an Israeli/Egyptian settlement on canal, Jordan's position would be much weaker. Secretary said he did not agree. Rifai replied main problem is not the canal but Jerusalem and West Bank.

7. King Hussein said Sadat has begun recently to think of war as a serious alternative, even though following Russian withdrawal he may now be less capable of undertaking it. Problem is that Sadat feels himself unable to make concessions to Israel which would be needed for a negotiated settlement, but feels under pressure to do something. Sadat seems to think that war, if started, can be kept under control and would not get too far out of hand. Hussein said what he did not understand is how Sadat expects Israel will play the game of war with him in accordance with his own rules.

8. The Secretary said what is at issue basically in discussions between Egypt and Israel on a Suez agreement is the difference between "further withdrawal" and "total withdrawal". Israel is ready to give a commitment for "further withdrawal" but not for "total withdrawal". Secretary wondered if it might not be best to leave this issue ambiguous as was done in Resolution 242, and on some issues in the Vietnam agreement. The Secretary noted that Vietnam agreement would never have been reached had parties insisted on defining everything precisely; in order to reach agreement certain things have to be left ambiguous. Rifai objected that if there is going to be peace in the Middle East there must be total Israeli withdrawal. The question is whether Israel is going to withdraw totally or not. Rifai insisted it is not possible for Sadat or any other Arab leader to concede territory to Israel. The Secretary replied that what Rifai had said is not borne out anywhere in history. There has never been a war that was not followed by territorial changes. Moreover, wars have always been followed by long periods in which the situation was unclear. This, the Secretary noted, was true even of Second World War where Allied victory was completely

[2] The Bar-Lev Line, named for Israeli Chief of Staff Haim Bar-Lev, was a chain of fortifications that Israel built along the eastern coast of the Suez Canal after it captured the Sinai Peninsula from Egypt during the 1967 war.

clear-cut. Rifai said that what Secretary was in effect saying was that he agreed with Egyptians when they say that what was taken by force must be regained by force. No, not at all, Secretary replied. Secretary pointed out that there has almost never in history been a situation in which territory lost in a war was regained by force soon thereafter.

9. King Hussein said he feels main problem is really Jordanian-Israeli side of question. Whether a possible agreement between Egypt and Israel will help he did not know, though he had no objection to an effort being made for such an agreement. King Hussein said he felt Jerusalem was intended to be a city of peace, not one of war, and he did not see any reason it should not be possible to work out some sort of solution in regard to Jerusalem. On broader matter of negotiations, King Hussein pointed out that in all other major areas where agreement had been reached, in Germany, Vietnam and other places, the matter of reaching a settlement had not been left entirely to the parties concerned. The rest of the world had helped the parties to reach an understanding and in many cases the world's help had been significant if not crucial. King Hussein said he felt the same must apply to the Middle East. The parties' ability to help themselves in the Middle East conflict is limited, and the world must give them as much support as possible.

10. Secretary said he agreed entirely with King Hussein and had two comments: First is that US attaches tremendous importance to the process of negotiations. Mr. Rifai had pointed out that positions of two sides are intractable, but in our view that is precisely why there must be negotiations. Second point, Secretary said, is that one of the difficulties is that there is a feeling that USG can solve the Middle East problems if it wants to. Secretary emphasized that this is not true. USG can be helpful in framework of negotiating process but idea that USG can impose a solution is false. Secretary pointed out that USG has greatest interest in Jordan and feels strongest friendship and support for King Hussein. But despite this and all importance we attach to a settlement we are unable to impose one on the parties. Secretary stressed that he did not want to be critical of President Sadat but we do think Sadat is making a mistake in refusing to negotiate. We feel Sadat had done many good things and we want him to be successful. We believe if negotiations could get started between Egypt and Israel Egypt could get a much better solution than it could hope for by any other means. King Hussein said that in any event he thought Jordan's case was very strong. Secretary noted that when we talk to His Majesty about the need for negotiations we are talking to the converted, since King Hussein has been very open-minded on this subject. Under Secretary Tarr noted that settlement which was accepted by North and South Vietnamese would have been viewed by both sides as completely unacceptable at outset of negotiations.

11. King Hussein said he believes Jordan must do utmost to achieve a solution but whatever solution is reached must be one which will be accepted by people, and one which can be beginning of real progress and stability. Secretary and Deputy Secretary congratulated King on his statesmanship and remarked that his example is one which should be followed by Egyptians. Assistant Secretary Sisco asked if King were to find some glimmer of flexibility in the Israeli position, how would he feel about the question of which side there should be a settlement with first, Egypt or Jordan? Sisco said we have always thought a Suez agreement might be helpful to His Majesty in reaching an agreement with Israel. King Hussein replied that if there were a glimmer of hope he would do everything possible to reach an agreement with Israel. King said it of no importance to him whether Jordan is first, second or third to sign agreement with Israel as long as settlement is acceptable. If a Suez agreement would help in creating a good atmosphere that would be fine, the King said, but Jordan thinks Jerusalem and West Bank are the main issues. Secretary asked if it would be helpful if discussions were to start at same time between Jordan and Israel and Egypt and Israel. The King responded affirmatively. FonMin Abu Zaid said it is important, however, that in any such negotiations the parties not be left alone. Someone should be there to help them reach agreement.

12. King Hussein asked Secretary's evaluation of Soviet intentions with regard to Middle East conflict. Secretary said we do not think Soviets are trying to stimulate a renewal of hostilities. Soviets were very embarrassed by their expulsion from Egypt and are now trying to recover the lost ground in Syria and Iraq. We do not think the Soviets will try to promote negotiations at the outset at least, but if negotiations get started they might change their attitude. We believe Soviets welcome continuation of ceasefire. King Hussein asked whether opening of Suez Canal would not be to advantage of USSR. Secretary said there would be some advantage to Soviets but we feel that advantages to US would be even greater. USG has many and broad interests in Middle East and we have every reason to want a settlement. Only problem we have in our relations with Arabs is Israel. Otherwise, we get along fine with Arabs, Secretary said, much better than Soviets do.

13. Secretary remarked that Soviets are competing with China in Middle East and for this reason they may feel they have to continue to support Arab positions. Secretary said he thought Soviets might be pleased to have a settlement but for reason he had just cited might find it difficult to be active in promoting one. King Hussein said he thought Soviets would want a degree of trouble and chaos in Middle East because they profit from it. King noted Soviets are putting a lot of equipment into Iraq and have delivered large amounts of military hardware

to Syria. They would like to have Syria and Iraq together under USSR's aegis.

14. Finance Minister Saad said that with His Majesty's permission he wanted to say a word about Israeli actions in Jerusalem and on West Bank. Finance Minister noted he had been Governor of Palestine in Mandate times and he knew Israelis well and had learned their language. He could understand how there could be negotiations between two equal partners but felt that present situation was different. Israelis are laying claim to all parts of West Bank and are setting up settlements everywhere. Finance Minister said he would like to ask how Israeli withdrawal can be visualized when Israelis have put up so many settlements. Secretary said problem is difficult one, there is no doubt about that. But the longer the delay in beginning negotiations the more difficult it will become. Nothing is gained by delaying. It may be that Egypt and Israel cannot work out an agreement but even if that is case it will not hurt to try. Should an agreement be reached, Secretary said, he was sure it would help prospects for an agreement between Jordan and Israel. Secretary pointed out that USG does not support Israel's action in establishing settlements on West Bank and has said so publicly. This USG position has not stopped Israelis, but it may have slowed them down.

15. Asst. Secy. Sisco said one of reasons USG emphasizes Suez agreement is that if such agreement were to be reached it would create added incentive on Israel to face up to compromises needed to reach agreement with Jordan. Sisco said that it is this Jordanian side of problem which we have in mind when we say we do not see Suez agreement as an end in itself. Secretary said this is absolutely right. If there is agreement between Israel and Egypt, USG would be in much better position to be helpful on other issues.

16. At this point Secretary and King Hussein left group for brief private conversation in Secretary's office. When rest of group was invited to join them, Secretary said he and His Majesty had discussed Jordan's financial situation. Secretary said he had assured King Hussein we want to do everything we can to help Jordan, within the limits of our resources.[3] Secretary added he had pointed out that our financial problems are very difficult, too, perhaps even more difficult, he said jocularly, than Jordan's. Asst Secy Sisco said he would be discussing US

[3] A February 7 memorandum from Saunders to Scowcroft reported Kissinger's statement that the U.S. Government should go through with its talks that week on military and economic assistance for Jordan on the basis of a planning level of $100 million in total aid in 1973. He also suggested that it might be a good idea to promise the King an additional $15 million in budget support before he left the United States at the end of February. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 7 JORDAN)

assistance in meeting with Jordanians afternoon February 8.[4] Sisco added we feel economic development conference Jordanians held last November was very successful and are very pleased Jordan is turning its efforts toward development. USG representatives who attended development conference were very impressed with work and planning that went into it.

17. Secretary remarked USG is very impressed at actions His Majesty's Government had taken to eliminate fedayeen threat. We feel this was very important. Nothing has contributed more to stability in Jordan. Secretary said we have told this to Lebanese, have urged them to act against fedayeen also, and it appears that they are doing so. Secretary reiterated that USG wants to do everything it can to assist Jordan. Hussein said that Jordan had no choice but to take the action it did against fedayeen. He stressed that Jordan has no intention of re-admitting fedayeen to its territory: "We will never re-open our country to them". Sisco asked how tight a rein Syrians are keeping on fedayeen. King Hussein said Syrians are tightening up and have removed fedayeen from front line. King stressed that in recent Cairo Defense Council Jordan did not accept return of fedayeen and did not agree to put its army under any other command.[5] Sisco asked if there were a possibility for resumption of diplomatic relations with Egypt and Syria. King Hussein replied he thought so. Foreign Minister Abu Zaid responded that on basis of his contacts at Cairo meeting and elsewhere, he thought prospects are reasonably good.

18. In closing Secretary reiterated USG's high regard for the King and wished His Majesty a pleasant stay in the United States.[6]

---

[4] A February 12 Department of Defense memorandum for the record summarized a February 8 U.S.-Jordanian meeting chaired by Sisco during which he outlined the general scope of U.S. economic and military aid to Jordan and reiterated the U.S. intention to request $40 million in grant military aid for Jordan in FY 1974. The talks reconvened at the Defense Department on February 9. The conferees agreed on the composition of a $38.4 million program for FY 1973 and agreed in principle on the contents of a $40 million FY 1974 package which would cover the remainder of Jordan's three year plan except for $4.4 million in spare parts and equipment, which would be deferred until FY 1975. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 73)

[5] The Arab Defense Council met in Cairo in January.

[6] Printed from an unsigned copy.

16. Memorandum From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, February 13, 1973.

SUBJECT

Information Items

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

Israeli Attitudes: In a recent speech to the Jewish Agency Assembly, Mrs. Meir declared that she will be bringing no new ideas to Washington because the old ones are still good, since conditions in the area have not changed and because the Arabs persist in their old objectives.[2] She stressed that it was only the strength of the Israeli armed forces which can hope to assure stability in the Middle East. Finally, Mrs. Meir asserted that Israel is not susceptible as it was in 1967 to pressure for full withdrawal and that, in fact, outside pressure had decreased as the world observed the actions of the Arabs.

Our Embassy comments that this speech was probably as much a reaction to incipient debate within the Israeli Labor Party and to the fact that she was speaking to a fund-raising audience as it was meant to be a signal to the U.S. On the other hand, the Embassy also feels that it was meant to disabuse anyone who may still hope that Israel is inclined to launch its own Middle East peace initiative. This begins to set the stage for Mrs. Meir's talk with you.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 49, President's Daily Briefings, President's Daily Briefs, Feb 1–Feb 15, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Contains Codeword.

[2] Nixon underlined this sentence and wrote at the bottom of the page: "K—when you return—she must be informed in strong terms that this *totally* intransigent attitude will not wash here despite her election problems at home."

17. Telegram From the Embassy in Israel to the Department of State[1]

Tel Aviv, February 13, 1973, 1507Z.

1182. Subject: Meir Visit: Israel–Jordan Settlement.

1. Summary: Israelis are convinced that Hussein now wants peace, but in five years since Six-Day War their asking price for that settlement has grown. Israelis have always wanted to make West Bank part of Israel if they could, but have seen need to sacrifice dream to make reality of secure Israel. What has been happening in recent years is that gradually dream has begun to seem more realistic. Israelis now feel they can, in long run, get recognition of all Jerusalem as sovereign Israel, cession to Israel of one-third West Bank, and open borders allowing free trade, travel and settlement: conditions which at this point are impossible for Hussein. Result is impasse which is at least quiet and, from Embassy's perspective, is not intolerable. There is also possibility that a prior canal settlement might, by protecting Israeli rear, incline Israelis to be more forthcoming with Hussein. So, if interim settlement is real option in coming months, it is worthwhile delaying any attempts to get Jordan–Israel negotiations going. But time only increases Israeli comfort and investment in territories and further devalues Hussein's hand for negotiations. Thus, if canal settlement cannot be had for another two or three years, and it is determined interests of U.S. strongly involved in return of West Bank to Jordan, then this Embassy believes negotiations between Israel and Jordan can be delayed only at great risk. End summary.

2. Possibility of settlement between Israel and Jordan is exasperatingly complex. There is no doubt in Israeli minds that Hussein wants peace and that peace between Israel and Jordan would be advantageous to Israel. Both parties in past have shown they have no real hangups about getting together when it is advantageous to do so. Yet parties' positions on issues between them seem almost irreconcilable and just as far apart as they were five years ago.

3. Since 1967, with Israel in occupation of Arab land, changes have constantly been taking place on the ground and in Israeli psyche which serve to raise price of settlement on part of Israel. It is paradoxical that this point continues and probably will continue to delay a settlement on the very front where settlement would be made easiest by desire of both parties for peace.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 27–14 ARAB–ISR. Secret; Nodis; Cedar Plus.

4. Prior to 1967, Israelis say, they would have settled with Jordan on basis of divided Jerusalem. This would not have been a prior or desired settlement from Israeli point of view, but would have been endured because of greater good to be gained in a peace settlement. Once Arab part of city was "redeemed" in Six-Day War, however, mystique of Jerusalem as source of Jewish state was seen as more vital to Israel than any possibly transitory peace. Thus, when incorporation of entire city was possible in 1967, this was done with hardly a second thought, and it will not be undone while Israelis have power to prevent it.

5. In first flush of victory in 1967, when Israelis had surprised even themselves by their success and never again wanted to go through period like April–May 1967, all they felt was needed for Israel's security was minor border rectifications and two narrow pincers along Jordan River, open at Jericho. When Governor Scranton talked with Israelis at end of 1968, Eban told him in great confidence that one of these pincers could be dispensed with.[2] PriMin Eshkol said publicly that Israel's demands on West Bank were modest enough to permit return to Jordan, under a settlement, of 85 percent of territory and 90 percent of people. And, except for effective demilitarization, there were no requirements that area returned had to remain open to Israel. Today, Allon Plan, seen as minimalist position in Israel, would return only some two-thirds of territory and would demand freedom of settlement and residence for Israelis.

6. It is not that Israelis have changed their minds fundamentally about West Bank since 1967. What has been going on since 1920's is a continual struggle between Jews and Arabs for division of British Mandate less Trans Jordan. Each side has been trying to get as much as it can of this land which is roughly the territory of ancient Israel and Jews have gradually but persistently pushed Arabs back.

7. Attachment of Israelis to West Bank is not new. Jericho is more of a biblical site than Tel Aviv, and Hebron had its Jewish community until the massacre of 1929. In Jerusalem, holy and historical sites are completely intermixed and no dividing line could provide each side with what it wants. As we see it, Israeli Jews have always looked upon West Bank as part of historic image and would always have wanted to make it part of Israel if they could. What has been happening in past five years is that what used to look like only a dream which had to be sacrificed to make a reality of a secure Israel in its narrower borders has gradually begun to look like a realistic possibility.

8. One change in equation is that Israelis no longer feel themselves to be only suitor for peace. In Israeli view, Hussein sees that social and

---

[2] See *Foreign Relations*, 1964–1968, volume XX, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1967–1968, Document 346.

economic changes on West Bank are building obstacles to reunion with Jordan every day, and every day that passes will make reunion more difficult. And he is ready for real peace in usual sense of word, not some Arabic term for truce while he gets ready for next war. In short, Israelis believe Hussein is ready for peace and time works against him. A year ago Dayan said: "The most important change (in Israel's relation to Arabs), one of historic significance, is the fact that today the need for peace is mutual, and not merely an Israeli longing, and that the need to reach a settlement in the region is today as vital for the neighboring Arab states as it is for Israel." The conclusion Israelis are inclined to make is that in end Arabs will come around on question of territory.

9. A second factor is that value of Jordanian recognition in Israeli eyes has gone down. From Hussein's point of view, quick settlement with Israel should enhance his bargaining position. If he is first Arab to sign a peace treaty with Israel, and thus give Israelis recognition and legitimation which they have sought so long, this ought to gain him more concessions than would otherwise be case. Return he seeks is settlement that would enable him to portray himself to his own people and to Arab world as leader who had gotten his territory and holy city back from Israelis.

10. From Israel's point of view, however, factors that Hussein thinks should get him a better deal are not worth all that much. Israel wants peace, to be sure, but many Israelis see current situation on West Bank as closer to kind of peace they want than would be any settlement which Hussein is likely to accept. Israel has also wanted recognition and legitimation, particularly from Arabs, but its psychological need for this has gone down as its relative strength and self-confidence have gone up. Hussein's isolation in Arab world has made recognition by him less valuable than it would have been when he was closely associated with Nasser and other leaders. So those things that look to Hussein like trump cards are accorded less importance by the Israelis.

11. A third factor in Israeli feeling that their demands are feasible is what Israelis consider reduced chances for outside, particularly U.S. pressure. It should be remembered that in April 1968 Dayan said that from military and economic points of view Israel could maintain status quo indefinitely, but "it seems to me that the key is in the hands of the U.S. that is to say, if the U.S. is prepared that we should stick to this policy of ours, i.e., as long as there is no peace we maintain the status quo, we can do it." Today, with what Israelis consider to be de-Sovietization in large degree of Middle East conflict and U.S.-Soviet rapprochement, they think that U.S. fears of global confrontation no longer will lead to U.S. pressure. Also, U.S. has been doing nicely in Arab world and has no need to sacrifice Israel for position in Arab

world. Israelis no longer see U.S. self-interest so intensively engaged in Middle East conflict and outside pressure is no longer a credible threat.

12. For good measure, Israelis believe that coexistence they have worked out with West Bank takes heat out of situation. As Dayan said last year: "The more layers we can add to build up a normalization of the situation, the less pressure there will be on us to solve the matter even when the solution is not to our liking." Israelis convinced status quo on West Bank can go on for years without risk of significant violence and consequently without constituting threat to any outside power.

13. With increased Jordanian interest in peace, devaluation of what Hussein can offer Israelis in return for territory, and confidence that outside pressure is not in cards, Israelis are coming to conclusion that they can hold out for, and get, whatever they want on West Bank. Only major limitation most see is need to avoid absorbing large Arab population. Based on its desires and limited only be demographic factor, these then are Israel's conditions as of now for a settlement with Jordan: recognition of all Jerusalem as soverign Israel (but with religious control of the Moslem holy places under Jordanian authority); cession to Israel of about one-third of the West Bank, including bank of the Jordan River except for a small opening in Jericho area; open borders allowing free travel back and forth, trade, and probably settlement and residence. They have only to be stated for it to be seen how far short they fall of being advantageous to Hussein.

14. Where does this leave the U.S. on occasion of Mrs. Meir's visit? In the view of Embassy, while situation is far from ideal from our point of view, it is also far from being intolerable. More important, it has improved markedly over past two years. While Israel and Jordan have not made peace, they are also not on the point of war. For present, Jordan does not claim a credible military option for regaining West Bank and East Jerusalem and this is not likely in foreseeable future. In terms of short-term trilateral relations, therefore, we see no grounds for being overly concerned or any need for massive investment of American energy or initiative in bringing about a change in the situation.

15. Also, there may be positive fallout on Jordanian front if a prior canal settlement can be obtained. Israelis would worry about any settlement with Jordan that resulted in a withdrawal of Israeli forces or in any way weakened their position on Jordan River, as long as the other Arabs, but especially Egypt, remain committed even theoretically to war to regain the territories. Israel does not have such confidence in Hussein's staying power as to be willing to risk any of its security on him.

16. On other hand, if a settlement, even an interim settlement on the Suez Canal, is reached with Egypt, that might, in Israeli eyes, make

it possible to be more forthcoming with Jordan, even though their terms would still fall far short of what Hussein would minimally need to justify the settlement for himself. Israel therefore believes that a settlement with Jordan would be more realistic after an agreement of some kind with Egypt. To some extent, however, this is rationalization rather than reason, because Israelis also are getting more and more comfortable in their position on West Bank and feel under little pressure, if any, to work for a solution with Jordan.

17. Process on West Bank (and in Gaza) of integration into economy and social structure of Israel is proceeding at such a rate that it will within a few years foreclose possibility of kind of solution that has been under consideration up to now. If Jordan has any hope of getting back a major part of West Bank or a role in Jerusalem, that hope is on wane. Most likely outcome, in our view, is that Israel will become more and more the determinant as to future of the West Bank and Gaza, and rest of world, including Jordan, will have less and less to say about it. Strictly from point of view of our relations with Israel, which is limited responsibility of this Embassy, we see no great threat to American interests in that prospect. Case against this must be made by those responsible for a wider view of our relations with Arab world, and for our overall strategic position.

18. If it is believed that working out of present trends as we see them will seriously disadvantage United States, then time is not on our side. Cards which Hussein has are real ones, even if Israelis do not regard them highly. If we wait too long for a prior agreement with Egypt to take place, effect of "facts" created by Israel on West Bank and in Gaza may outweigh advantage of prior agreement with Egypt. If there is a prospect that real progress may be made on interim sttlement in, say, next two or three months, and especially if action on Jordanian front would inhibit that progress, then clearly that much of a wait is worthwhile. If, however, it should appear that it may be another two or three years before agreement can be had on canal, and if it is determined that interests of U.S. are strongly involved in a return of West Bank, or large part of it, to Jordan, then this Embassy believes that negotiations between Israel and Jordan could be allowed to wait only at great risk.

Zurhellen

18. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, February 13, 1973, 11:30 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

President Nixon
John Scali, Ambassador to the UN
M. Gen. Brent Scowcroft, Dept. Assistant to the President

President: When do you go?[2]

Scali: When Waldheim returns from Bangladesh.

President: He's not too strong. But he's better than U Thant. We had to give him a shot a while ago.

Give him my regards. Tell him on your own that his predecessor tilted constantly toward the bloc. We don't want him to tilt toward anyone.

On UN Finance, say it is tough. We will do what we can, but blame the Congress for our inability to do more.

In my view nothing has hurt the UN with the American people more than the failure to act on terrorism. It is difficult to understand how we are major supporters and can't get a resolution which everyone should want.

On environment, the progress is good. Peacekeeping in the Middle East.

On the Middle East, we are following two approaches. The open approach with Rogers, and our private contacts with the Russians, with the Egyptians in the next few weeks, and with Mrs. Meir.

You must know nothing officially of our private approach. You for your own background but don't know. If the open approach works, fine, but we are working two tracks and hopefully one will help the other succeed. You must know but keep totally to the public line.

We are Israel's only friend. Israel has only contempt for the UN. This is a tough issue and you keep close in contact with Rogers and the NSC.

You can float things a bit more. Mrs. Meir cannot keep this totally intransigent attitude and you might be able to float some things.

The Middle East will never be totally settled. We would like to get started on something, though, and the private channel is best. Because

---

[1] Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversation, Box 1. Secret; Nodis. The meeting was held in the Oval Office.

[2] Scali was appointed U.S. Representative to the United Nations on February 2.

if the public channel were to fail, it would be catastrophic. We'll go public in the channel only when we know it will succeed.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

---

19. Editorial Note

On February 13, 1973, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Henry Kissinger sent a message to Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs Hafiz Ismail agreeing to an earlier Egyptian suggestion that the most appropriate format for a secret meeting between Ismail and Kissinger would be in the context of an official visit by Ismail to the United States for meetings at the Department of State. Therefore, an invitation for an official visit would be extended to Ismail through Ambassador Greene. The message also informed Ismail that President Nixon would be able to meet with him at 9 a.m. on February 23. Following Ismail's meetings at the Department of State, Kissinger would join him at a Westchester County location outside of New York City for their meetings. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 131, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. II) In telegram 28752 to Cairo, February 15, the Department conveyed the same message to Greene. (Ibid.)

Ismail responded to Kissinger's message on February 14:

"Egypt, in making this contact with the US Government, is acting independently and is considering Egyptian national interests within the general framework of Arab interests. For a long time Egypt has shouldered the responsibility for the independence and development of Arab countries. In the future Egypt sees itself as a partner in the Arab community of states. Egypt believes that a good settlement is one that is defensible both with Egyptian public opinion and Arab public opinion.

"What we are trying to achieve is the formation of those conditions which will help to establish a stable peace in the area. This is the point of starting these contacts and the point from which these contacts must start. Egypt can see different ways of moving towards this objective. But Egypt does not wish to take steps into the dark and lose its way. Egypt is therefore starting these discussions with both eyes open, looking for opportunities that can be a basis for normalization of the Middle East situation.

"If Egypt thinks that there is a good solution that meets at least the minimum requirements of its people and the people of the area, it will

go ahead with it and will not allow it to be vetoed by anybody. Only in this way can the problem be settled so that both we and you are helped.

"Egypt appreciates the constructive attitude shown by the US Government. I personally am highly honored to be received by President Nixon. I am sure I will carry to him a message from President Sadat. I am looking forward to seeing Dr. Kissinger and hope our discussions will lead to further meetings in a way appropriate. We sincerely hope our contacts will be characterized by an early settlement." (Ibid.)

---

20. Message From the Soviet Leadership to President Nixon[1]

Moscow, undated.

In continuation of the confidential exchange of opinion on questions of the Middle East settlement we would like now to inform the President of a recent discussion on these questions with Mr. Ismail, President Sadat's advisor.

In receiving Mr. Ismail in Moscow the Soviet side proceeded from the fact that, though it was previously aware of Egypt's position of principle on the Middle East settlement it was useful and necessary to discuss the questions once again, having particularly in mind the prospective activization of the Soviet-American dialog on these questions, which is agreed upon between the President and L.I. Brezhnev.[2]

An exchange of opinion took place in the course of talks with Mr. Ismail on a general situation in the Middle East and also on possibilities of a settlement of the dangerous to world peace Middle East conflict, especially in the light of the achieved agreement on ending the war and restoring peace in Vietnam and in the light of a continuous lessening of tension in Europe.

Mr. Ismail reaffirmed the invariability of Egypt's position on the necessity to settle the Arab-Israeli conflict on a just basis which should mean fulfilment first of all of two main principles: a withdrawal of the

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin and Kissinger, Vol. 5. No classification marking. A handwritten notation at the top of the page reads: "Handcarried by Vorontsov on 2–18–73, 10:00 a.m."

[2] President Nixon and General Secretary Brezhnev agreed to this at the May 1972 summit. See *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XIV, Soviet Union, October 1971–May 1972, Document 284.

Israeli forces from all occupied Arab territories to the line of June 5, 1967, and guaranteeing of lawful rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

The settlement in the Middle East, as Egyptians stress it, can be carried out by several stages but within a framework of a single plan (in package), so that all elements of the settlement are coordinated and balanced among themselves, and in each of the stages the sides in conflict should undertake appropriate obligations.

Mr. Ismail has underlined that the Egyptian side continues to believe that as a basis for the solution of this problem can and should serve a plan of settlement which, as is known, was brought by us to the knowledge of the American side and was at one time the subject of a discussion. And it was clearly stated by Mr. Ismail that there can be no separate Israeli-Egyptian settlement independent from the settlement between Israel and other Arab countries involved in the conflict.

Mr. Ismail set forth well-grounded, to our mind, objections of the Egyptian side against any version of a "partial" settlement which, being not an inseparable, organic part of a single plan, could be used to perpetuate the Israeli occupation of Arab territories.

Mr. Ismail has noted that Egypt does not intend to connect the conflict in the Middle East with other international problems since the solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict can only be made more difficult if seach for such a solution is connected, for example, with the problem of European security and other problems.

In general as a result of our talks with Mr. Ismail we once again satisfied ourselves that the leaders of Egypt are ready to reach a political solution of the Middle East problem on a basis just to all the countries involved, including Israel. They are ready to try to have a new round of practical steps in that direction, though they claim that they do not specifically believe in the possibility of change towards realism in the positions of both Israel and the United States.

At the same time we have got an impression from our talks with Mr. Ismail that, if at this time also no progress is reached towards political solution of this vital to them problem, the Arabs can turn to the use of other possible means of its solution. While understanding the complexity of using other methods of struggle they nevertheless state that in case of a next failure of their efforts to reach a just political settlement they simply will have no other alternative.

We on our part have stressed the importance of finding practical ways for solution of this prolonged and utterly dangerous problem, having in mind that ultimately the Arab peoples themselves should decide both their position and their further method of action in solving this problem.

All this, to our mind, confirms the necessity to activize the search of a way out from the deadlock which developed in the question of the

Middle East settlement. For this purpose a joint contribution is needed on the part of all concerned, and not the least—on the part of our two countries, the United States and the Soviet Union. We on our part are ready for a more active and concrete discussion with the American side of the developed situation and of the ways to overcome difficulties in the Middle East settlement on the basis of implementation of the Security Council resolution what both our countries favour.

While informing the President of our talks with Mr. Ismail we proceed from the premise that a mutual exchange of information on this question is useful for rendering necessary assistance in finding an acceptable for all interested parties solution of the Middle East problem.[3]

[3] In his memoirs, Kissinger commented on the Soviet message: "In short, the Soviets were putting forward, under the threat of war, an intransigent Arab program certain to lead to deadlock or confrontation. By opposing both an interim agreement and a separate Israeli-Egyptian settlement, Moscow was objectively encouraging a blowup. The Kremlin may have calculated that a crisis would force the United States to engage itself. But excessive cleverness rarely pays in diplomacy. Moscow's dilemma was that it could contribute to a settlement only by urging its Arab clients to compromise. Unwilling to do this, it both encouraged a blowup and recoiled from its consequences, condemning itself eventually to a seat on the sidelines." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 210)

21. Message From Egyptian President Sadat to President Nixon[1]

Cairo, February 18, 1973.

Dear President Nixon,

We have received the invitation extended by The Government of the United States to Mr. Mohamed Hafez Ismail to visit Washington in order to exchange views on matters of interest to our two countries.[2] I have considered it an indication of the special interest of the United States Government in the Middle East crisis. I had also previously noted your statements confirming your concern in working towards achieving peace in the Middle East. These statements, coming after the termination of the war in Vietnam, confirm our conviction that circum-

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 131, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. II, January 1–Feb. 23, 1973. No classification marking. Marked "Unofficial Translation."

[2] See Document 19.

stances lend themselves now to exerting further efforts to achieve a full and just settlement of the conflict in our region.

I have consequently directed Mr. Ismail to proceed to Washington in response to your Government's invitation prompted by the hope that, in shouldering its international responsibilities, the United States will throw its weight in defense of freedom and independence and the legitimate right of peoples to self-determination.

The situation in our region has deteriorated almost to the point of explosion. And our intense awareness of our responsibilities urges us to exert a new and intensified effort to achieve peace based on justice guaranteeing the freedom and independence of our peoples.

Egypt will always remain faithful to the principles it has upheld with honour and determination, bearing its responsibilities towards its people and the other Arab peoples linked to her by common struggle, whatever the risks or sacrifices.

Please accept, Dear Mr. President, my best regards.

Mohamed Anwar El-Sadat[3]

[3] The translation bears this typed signature and an indication that Sadat signed the original.

22. Conversation Between President Nixon and his Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, February 21, 1973.

Kissinger: Now, we have one other thing, which has to do with the Middle East. Now, I have the impression that Rogers and Sisco are again cranking up one of their wild charges. Now, I agree we have to do something, but we don't have—we have, now, after years of effort, gotten the Arabs into a situation where they're coming to us.

Nixon: Yeah.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Tapes, Conversation No. 860–15. No classification marking. According to the President's Daily Diary, Nixon met with Kissinger in the Oval Office between 4:44 and 5:30 p.m. (Ibid., White House Central Files) The editors transcribed the portion printed here specifically for this volume.

Kissinger: We mustn't give the impression that every time there's a crisis in the Middle East, it's our crisis. It's a hell of a lot better to get the parties pleading with us to engage themselves—to be engaged, because we've got the Russians pleading with us now; we've got the Arabs pleading with us. I mean, today, the Israelis shot down a plane, a Libyan plane. It was a passenger plane.[2] It's inexcusable. And, I approved messages of condolence on your behalf to Qadhafi and Sadat.[3] But on top of them, now, Rogers has issued a statement.[4] He's called Ismail in London, and that makes an impression of panic. When the Israelis shoot down a plane it isn't our business. I mean, it isn't—we didn't shoot down—

Nixon: He called him, huh?

Kissinger: He called him in London. Now, you know that Ismail is coming over here, anyway; he was afraid to lose the visit. The Arabs need the bloody visit more than we do. And, I really hope we don't give anybody exclusive jurisdiction, because he'll [Rogers] get us into the same mess he's gotten us. Your methods—the methods you and I, on your behalf, have used—work because we never get ourselves in. We move slowly, deliberately. Now, what I plan to do with these Egyptians on Sunday and Monday, so that you know, is to say this: ''Look, for four years you've been talking. If the Israelis could have designed your strategy, they couldn't have done it better, because you come up with all these high-sounding formulae, which cannot be accepted, and

---

[2] Israeli fighter planes shot down a civilian Libyan jetliner over the Sinai desert on February 21, killing 106 passengers and crew members. In a telephone conversation with Kissinger that same afternoon, Rabin acknowledged that the attack was "really a blunder on our part." He said: "I don't believe that any Israeli pilot would have taken the decision on himself. I'm quite sure that it was on instructions on a relatively [low] level." (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Box 18) President Nixon called the incident "unbelievable" and instructed Kissinger to tell Rabin that he felt "very strongly" that "they ought to really compensate [the victims]." (Ibid., White House Tapes, Conversation No. 43–157) He also expressed concern that the incident could affect his upcoming meeting with Hafiz Ismail. In a telephone conversation on February 21, he asked Kissinger whether he believed Ismail would still proceed with the visit in light of the recent event. "No question about it," Kissinger replied. "They're getting more out of the visit than we are. We don't need the visit." (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Box 18)

[3] Nixon's condolence letter to Sadat is ibid., NSC Files, Box 751, Presidential Correspondence 1969–1974, Egypt, President Sadat.

[4] Rogers's statement reads: "We are saddened today to learn of the shooting down of the Libyan airliner resulting in the loss of some 70 lives. We extend the sympathies of the U.S. Government to the families of those who lost their lives in this tragedy." (*The New York Times*, February 22, 1973) Kissinger called Sisco to protest the wording of the statement. Sisco replied that the statement was an effort "to keep the situation cool." He added: "I think the danger in this situation at the present time is that Sadat will feel himself under pressure from [Qadhafi] to take some counter military action. And, I think the purpose of this statement is basically to disassociate the United States from this action." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Box 18)

which leads only to a stalemate, the result of which, then, is that the Israelis stay exactly where they are, which is what they want.

Nixon: That's right.

Kissinger: "If you—I think that if you want to talk to us in the White House, come up with a formula we can accept. We are willing to bring a lot of pressure on the Israelis, but we are not willing to have a war. And we are not willing to press the Israelis to a point where they'll go to war, but we're willing to press them just short of that. Now, if you can work with us in that framework, we can—"

Nixon: Well, let me—let me suggest one thing else. I—I see this as a situation where we've got to give both sides a little prick.

Kissinger: That's right.

Nixon: Now, what I would like for you to push on with them is to make to them—you say, "Now look, you know the President is a man who keeps his word." And I [unclear] "We can't tell you this, you can't use this [unclear], but the President is interested and he's committed to a permanent settlement. [unclear] He wants it to be accomplished while he is President."

Kissinger: That's right.

Nixon: "But, the way to get that is to have an interim settlement, and let's have this Arab settlement. Let's get what we can." And, you see, basically we have to know this: The Israelis do not want a permanent settlement, and the other people do. The thing to do is get the Egyptians to agree to a half-assed settlement, and that'll cool the thing. But the Egyptians are gonna—will only do that if they think we're going to continue to push the Israelis. So, I'd tell them that, "Yes, we're for a permanent settlement." And then, we can get us two years if we buy—I think with a—if we can—well, if we can get an interim settlement, you know, opening the Canal and then start relations with the Egyptians, we can turn them away. But they don't want—they don't need this goddamn land. You know what I mean? It's all a bunch of desert anyway.

Kissinger: No, it's—it's a symbolic thing for them.

Nixon: I know it is. But, they've got to get part of it; they've got to get some of it. You know what I mean? And they—

Kissinger: And I have had an idea, Mr. President, which—

Nixon: Which you—my advice: Use them, then—then kindly say, "Well, look: I'd make a private deal with you, you know, on this." They'll do something. That's right.

Kissinger: If we can do, for example, we could separate the issue of sovereignty from the issue of security, whereas if we said they can get back the territory, they can get sovereignty back to their old frontiers.

Nixon: Yeah.

Kissinger: But they've got to give the Israelis some special security zone. They can have the police, but the Israelis can have some bases there. There's no population, so a lot of complex things are possible.

Nixon: Right.

Kissinger: So then they don't lose face.

Nixon: Right.

Kissinger: And—but I'm not going to come up with any plans on that at this meeting, anyway. I think we, at this meeting, we should, should just talk. Now, almost certainly, that meeting is going to get out, and that's unavoidable. Now, he's going to come in to see you.

Nixon: Yeah.

Kissinger: Rogers—

Nixon: When he gets back?

Kissinger: Well, I thought it was best if you and I see him alone, and you just mention—I mean, with whoever and whatever Egyptians he brings with him—

Nixon: All right.

Kissinger: You should just mention to him that you're fully behind his meeting with me.

Nixon: Oh, yes. Sure.

Kissinger: And—

Nixon: Then he's going to have lunch with Rogers?

Kissinger: Oh, then he's going to have the whole day with Rogers. So, it's—but, they've—

Nixon: But Rogers doesn't know about his meeting with you?

Kissinger: No.

Nixon: That'll get out, though.

Kissinger: Certainly. But we can say they [unclear]—

Nixon: [unclear] Huh?

Kissinger: [unclear] it's—the way we can handle that is Rogers is leaving Saturday morning.[5] We can then say the Egyptians asked us on Saturday and that I decided—that you decided that I should see them, just to hear what they have to say.

Nixon: Yeah. I wouldn't say a damn thing unless we have to say something. Or, do you think we should say it?

Kissinger: Well, my judgment—

Nixon: You think it's better to say it, yeah?

Kissinger: My judgment is that they'll say it.

---

[5] February 24. Rogers traveled to Paris to attend a conference on Vietnam.

Nixon: They'll put it out?

Kissinger: Yeah.

Nixon: So, therefore, the thing to do is to just say you're going to see them in New York. They asked to see you in New York [unclear]—

Kissinger: I think we should, yeah. I think if it's clear to me that they're going to say it, we're better off making it as a joint announcement or something, or at least confirm their announcement.

[Pause]

Nixon: So, the way to visualize this is they would have a meeting with Rogers, too.

Kissinger: Friday night. And I'm seeing him Sunday afternoon and Monday.

Nixon: Yeah. [Pause] And, you're spending that much time?

Kissinger: That's what they want.

Nixon: Well, it's worth it if anything—you just don't know. They're probably just, you know, the damned Arabs just talk.

Kissinger: It's probably not going to work, and I think if it isn't going to work, we'd better not get you that deeply involved.[6]

[6] Kissinger spoke on the telephone with Sisco, February 22, 6:30 p.m., to voice his objection to the State Department approach in the Middle East. "Joe, I have to tell you I think you guys are going crazy again. . . . I mean calling ambassadors, calling Ismail—I mean, goddamn it, it took us two years to get the Egyptians in the frame of mind where they were pleading with us to get into it and now we are acting like puppy dogs. . . . I will tell you something—I haven't lost one of these yet. And I'm not losing it—I will not tolerate it—and you remember this—I will not tolerate any area being segregated as the exclusive jurisdiction of anybody." Sisco replied: "Henry, you ought to have enough experience to know that I am a goddamn lowly assistant secretary with practically no influence and Henry, you can call and bawl me out—I just don't have this kind of influence—I don't have this kind of power in the state department. . . . 9 times out of 10 you call me and bawl the hell out of me—I agree with you and you are putting me in an absolutely impossible position, I don't know what to do—you've gotten me to the point—I'm saying to myself I might as well get the hell out of here. . . . Henry, get off my back." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 18)

23. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, February 22, 1973, 3:30–4 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Ambassador Rabin
Henry A. Kissinger
Peter Rodman

Ambassador Rabin: Sisco talked to me this morning and yesterday. I said to him as to you about the Libyan business . . .[2]

Mr. Kissinger: Basically, it's a bore to me, unless you have something for me that is not previously known. It is the sort of problem that will go away in a few days.

Ambassador Rabin: I said that to Sisco. I said, "This meeting with Ismail and President is something new. Let's at our own level distinguish between the basic issues and incidents like this."

Mr. Kissinger: What did Sisco want?

Ambassador Rabin: Something on the airplane incident.

My people did not follow my advice. They are holding lots of press conferences, with the pilots and so forth, to defend themselves.

Mr. Kissinger: That's a mistake. It keeps the issue alive.

Ambassador Rabin: I said they were fools. I said to them, the more detail you give the more it becomes clear that more and more people were involved, for a longer time, at a higher level. The basic issue then is a higher-level decision to open fire on a civilian airliner.

Mr. Kissinger: Right, why did they do it?

Ambassador Rabin: They are fools. I told them to pipe down.

Mr. Kissinger: What worries me is if the Arabs learn that at every crisis Sisco goes into his usual pattern, there will be more crises.

Ambassador Rabin: I said to Sisco, let's talk about the two visits. He said the two visits will be under the shadow of the incident. I said, yes, publicly, but it should not be so on a government-to-government level. Secondly, I asked him what do you have on Ismail? Sisco said there was a report on Ismail's talks in London[3] but he had not read it. I

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 135, Country Files, Middle East, Rabin/Dinitz Sensitive Memcons, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting took place in the Military Aide's office at the White House. Brackets are in the original.

[2] See footnote 2, Document 22.

[3] In telegram 2084 from London, February 22, the Embassy reported that in February 20 discussions with British Foreign Secretary Douglas-Home, Ismail had taken a "very hard line" against an interim agreement or direct negotiations with Israel under

said, come on, Joe. I told him I was suspicious about Ismail's pressing to come prior to the Prime Minister's visit.

Mr. Kissinger: That's not fair to me.

Ambassador Rabin: I asked Sisco, how did Ismail manage to insert his own visit before Golda? He said they would like to prevent the President from committing himself to Golda to give us planes.

I said to Sisco: what he'll bring with him in terms of political ideas I don't know. Will he agree to an interim settlement? Will he agree to an interim if it is linked to an overall settlement? I said I thought he would try to link beginning negotiations with U.S. military assistance to Israel. This is the only reason he would have to insert his visit before Golda. Sisco said "I cannot say you are wrong, I think they will."

Mr. Kissinger: That's a pack of lies. We are right back where we were before. In London Ismail was so intransigent that even the British thought there was no hope for any progress.

Ambassador Rabin: He said the same things to Greene, too.

Mr. Kissinger: That does not exclude that he will give me something. But in London he refused to agree to any direct talks with Israel, he refused any discussion of the interim settlement—only a total settlement. Like in this Yugoslav paper,[4] it all had to be linked. Even the British felt there was no hope at all for any negotiation.

Ambassador Rabin: Sisco refused to give us any information at all about Greene and Ismail—because of the kind of a position that Ismail took.

Mr. Kissinger: That's right.

Ambassador Rabin: I have never heard any Egyptian talk in such a brutal uncompromising way as he talked to Greene before he went to Moscow.

Mr. Kissinger: But since he is now dealing on two tracks, it makes sense to keep tough with State and to make any concessions—if there are going to be any concessions—to me. He was totally intransigent with the British. He was even tougher than with the Yugoslav. I can assure you that our report from the British is that he was totally intransigent, and Home concluded that there was no hope whatever, and that there was nothing they could support in the way of any negotiation.

U.S. auspices. He seemed uninterested in significant negotiations until the U.S. Government attitude had been brought around from being a 100 percent pro-Israel stance to being disengaged. Ismail said that as long as the United States remained identified with Israel, Egyptian interests would clash with U.S. interests. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 666, Country Files, Middle East, USG-Egyptian relations, 1973)

[4] Not identified.

The British know from the Heath visit that I am seeing Ismail alone.[5] So I yesterday asked Cromer for a special report.

I am seeing Ismail Sunday and Monday[6] in a suburb of New York. I will present nothing. I will present no proposal of any kind. My line will be—and this will quickly find out what his line is—that I have absolutely no contribution to make if they continue the pattern that has been going on. I will suggest that if there is nothing new they can continue to talk to State and in the United Nations.

Ambassador Rabin: I think he will stick to the same line.

Mr. Kissinger: What is the line? Let me show you the message he sent to me. [Tab A, Statement made by Ismail to Trone in Cairo on February 13][7]

Ambassador Rabin: That says nothing. That says nothing.

Mr. Kissinger: That's all I know about the subject.

Ambassador Rabin: Practically nothing, because it stresses the Egyptian leadership role. This means he has to meet Egyptian national needs as well as the overall Arab world requirements. This is a tough beginning. I am more involved than you are in studying these Arab formulations.

Mr. Kissinger: I know. I will tell him that right away.

Ambassador Rabin: The most uncompromising formula was the one Sadat gave to Jarring in February 1970 [*1971*].[8] It cleverly distinguished between an agreement between Israel and Egypt, the essence of which is total withdrawal, but without committing Egypt on the issues that are really necessary for peace. Their basic strategy is to distinguish between the two phases of the struggle—Nasser called it land and people. Eliminating the consequences of aggression is one part of it. This is the difference between Syria and Egypt. For Syria the struggle is one protracted war, and there is no distinction between Golan and the rest.

And he says it here.

Mr. Kissinger: You mean the three kinds of countries, the confrontation states and the other kinds of states?

Ambassador Rabin: That's the way they would like to mobilize their Arab friends.

---

[5] Nixon met with British Prime Minister Edward Heath February 2, 10:35 a.m.–12:15 p.m. and 4:08 p.m.–6:05 p.m. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Central Files, President's Daily Diary)

[6] February 25 and 26.

[7] See Document 19.

[8] See footnote 3, Document 10.

You see how they lie to the Jordanians.

Mr. Kissinger: And to the Yugoslavs, too. They lied to the Yugoslavs. I have reviewed the record of our contacts. They started it in April, not we.

Ambassador Rabin: I explained that to the Prime Minister.

What I meant was, they state their intentions here [Ismail–Miskovic memcon, Tab B].[9] Their objectives are to weaken the link between the U.S. and Israel. They say there is no possibility of having peace unless after the solution of the armed struggle. After the Israelis withdraw from the territories, then there will be a peace conference. You see these terms "Israeli entity" and "Palestinian entity." This is very clever use of the concepts you use in Vietnam. It's what you are accustomed to.

Mr. Kissinger: I am accustomed to negotiations on the basis of reality.

Ambassador Rabin: Basically they have found a new formula which you used in your press conference; namely, the separation of military and political issues. The military issues will be the territories, and the political issue will be the settlement between Israel and the Palestinians.

Mr. Kissinger: That works in your favor.

Ambassador Rabin: If the people who are going to discuss this with Ismail are clever.

Mr. Kissinger: They are not clever.

You have a massive problem, in that there is great desire here to achieve another spectacular success.

Ambassador Rabin: I do not know why the Prime Minister allowed the raid into Lebanon.[10] When I was Chief of Staff, whenever we were trying to achieve something from the United States in the political arena, I piped everything down.

Mr. Kissinger: What do you think is the reason for these moves?

Ambassador Rabin: Frankly I think the only motive is Dayan's desire to prevent a successful visit by the Prime Minister. Because his chances are better if she retires before the election. It is a political year.

Mr. Kissinger: My strategy with Ismail will be to say next to nothing, or to speak at such a level of generality that it doesn't mean anything. Chou En-lai was asked at a press conference about me and he

---

[9] Not attached and not found.

[10] On February 21, Israeli troops entered Lebanon to raid what the Israeli Government said were two Arab guerrilla bases.

said the only man who can talk a half hour to the press without saying anything is Henry Kissinger. I mentioned this to Chou. He said, no not a half hour, an hour and a half.

I will start this way: "I want a serious talk with you, I don't know anything, I have not dealt with the Middle East lately. I've been preoccupied with Vietnam as you know. I have not had a chance to prepare myself adequately. If you think I am a miracle worker, remember that every negotiation I have been involved in took years to complete. The Vietnam negotiations took four years. The SALT negotiations took three years. So there cannot be a quick solution. Secondly, I promise nothing that I cannot deliver, therefore I can promise nothing. Thirdly, from a viewpoint of an outsider, I see no hope whatever in the normal methods—the United Nations, Resolution 242. If you think there is hope in these methods, pursue them through the State Department. If you have something new, I will listen to it."

I will make no proposals to them, no promises. I may make philosophical statements, such as that any settlement in the Middle East will inevitably leave both sides equally unhappy, and that running back and forth trying to trick two sides into an agreement by some procedure only leads to disaster. [Laughter] But as to concrete solutions, I will have nothing to present to them.

Ambassador Rabin: So you will stress these themes: that you are a newcomer, that you are not prepared and that you are not a miracle worker.

Mr. Kissinger: Right. First of all, I do not have a plan. I will never propose a plan that I have not discussed with you and have your approval on—since any solution has to have your approval anyway.

Take my negotiations with Le Duc Tho. First, I controlled all our assets. Here, my position is not as strong as it was when dealing with Vietnam. Secondly, in any time frame, my strategy is totally different from the Sisco strategy. My strategy is to give them just enough to keep them talking but never to give them much until they make a massive move. With Le Duc Tho three years were spent in abstract discussion. This summer we discussed possible approaches to a political settlement which I knew were unacceptable—until they dropped the whole idea of a political settlement.

Nothing will come out of this meeting unless they come in with a new proposal. And if they do that, I will tell them I will study it. My guess from these papers is that they will not have a new proposal.

After this I will leave it that we will stay in touch and see if we should have another meeting.

Contrary to Rogers and Sisco, I believe I should sell my involvement only in return for something from them. At this meeting I have to let them feel we are taking them seriously; otherwise there would not be enough to fill two hours, let alone two days.

I do not know what's going to happen. I will be seeing you Wednesday[11] morning.

Ambassador Rabin: Can I see you before then?

Mr. Kissinger: Sure. Maybe Tuesday or Monday afternoon.

Ambassador Rabin: Because I would like to get something from you before Wednesday morning, so the Prime Minister and I can consider it.

Mr. Kissinger: I will do it no later than Tuesday. Where will you be, in New York?

Ambassador Rabin: Here in Washington.

Mr. Kissinger: If I get back Monday afternoon, I will talk to you Monday afternoon. If I get back Monday night, I will see you Tuesday.

Ambassador Rabin: She will want to discuss with you after thinking over the meaning of what happened with Ismail.

Mr. Kissinger: On Vietnam, I knew what I wanted. Here I would not know how to speed up the process even if I wanted to. I do not want to speed it up, so you need not worry about something coming out of this meeting.

Ambassador Rabin: There will also be meetings with Rogers and Richardson. With Richardson there are three items: self-sufficiency in production, the Phantoms, and reciprocity.

Mr. Kissinger: What is reciprocity?

Ambassador Rabin: Waiving the Buy American Act.

Mr. Kissinger: What do you want to take up with the President?

Ambassador Rabin: The political issue, and planes and numbers, to get a commitment after 1973 of on-going supplies of planes to Israel. Let us stick to the present policies, maintenance of the balance, until and unless there is a change in the policy of the other side.

I hope the production question will get a positive response from Richardson.

Mr. Kissinger: Let me know.

Ambassador Rabin: On production I will let Richardson be the good guy. For the President, then there would remain only discussion of the political issue and the question of the principle of maintaining the balance.

---

[11] February 28. They met on February 27; see Document 31.

Mr. Kissinger: My advice is do not give him a lecture that nothing can be done. Mention the interim settlement, mention the principles you gave to me last January, those five principles.

Ambassador Rabin: Yes.

Rush wanted to cut our credit. It is so stupid. What Israel gets from the United States Government is $300 million in credits in the Military Sales Act, out of the total of $400 million. We are a cover for the U.S. Government; because of us they get these credits from Congress. It effectively releases $150 million for the United States Government for credits for other countries, mainly Southeast Asia. I tell Rush, do you want us to tell the Congress the deal we worked out?

Mr. Kissinger: At the meeting there will be Dinitz, you and the Prime Minister?

Ambassador Rabin: Yes.

Mr. Kissinger: On our side it will be me and Rodman. One other thing. In China for the first time there was a discussion on the Middle East. Their only interest is keeping the Russians out of the Middle East and their whole strategy is for that. They said they are not meddling. I said, "Yes, but we have one difference, you are against the existence of Israel." He said, "No, we just raise the moral issue of the Palestinians." After a long discussion, Chou said that if Israel goes to the 1967 borders, they are prepared to recognize it. "We are against imperialism, not against Israel. In any case, we will do nothing to disturb the situation."[12]

Ambassador Rabin: That's very interesting.

Mr. Kissinger: It's a beginning.

[From 4:15 to 4:30 Dr. Kissinger and the Ambassador conferred privately.]

[12] See *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XVIII, China, 1973–1976, Document 13.

24. Conversation Between President Nixon and his Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, February 23, 1973.

Kissinger: Rogers called.[2] He says he sees a great breakthrough coming here with Egypt, which is total nonsense. And he wants you to tell—

Nixon: Yeah?

Kissinger: —the Egyptians[3] that he, Rogers, is authorized to speak for you, to make a strong pitch to them. Now, the trouble is—

Nixon: We've got to take a very strong line with the Israelis. I know that. We've got to take a very strong line with these people.

Kissinger: Now, my worry is—

Nixon: But we—but we are not going to, we're not going to—we can't be in the position of telling these people anything until we've talked to the Israelis, too.

Kissinger: It took us 18 months to get these guys coming to us. If we now act like over-eager puppies, pleading with them to be permitted do something, we're dead.

Nixon: What's he want me to tell them?

Kissinger: That he is your spokesman, and he's going to make a big offer to them. Moreover—

Nixon: What's his offer?

Kissinger: Moreover, it's going to confuse the issue totally, because—

Nixon: No, I'm going to tell him to do the private thing. I—I've gone through the paper here,[4] and I've marked down some things I am concerned about. One thing I'm really, terribly concerned about: we—we're going to meet, and I'm going meet with them—we're going to put her—him in this channel with you.

Kissinger: Right—

Nixon: I'll do that today. He'll understand. The second point is that I'd tell her—we've got to be in a position, Henry, where we—we cannot

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Tapes, Conversation No. 862–9. No classification marking. According to the President's Daily Diary, Nixon met with Kissinger in the Oval Office between 11:14 and 11:21 a.m. (Ibid., White House Central Files) The editors transcribed the portion printed here specifically for this volume.

[2] No record of the conversation was found.

[3] Hafiz Ismail.

[4] See footnote 3, Document 8.

let Mrs. Meir come here and take the same hard-nose line about the election. That's all done now. Right now, this is going to be settled. And we—

Kissinger: Well—

Nixon: We're going to move. I mean, she's got to—if she comes here with that, and I go over and prepare—and propose the usual toasts, and all that sort of thing, and, "We're all working for peace," et cetera, just to—it just, it just isn't the time to do that. I'll propose the toast and the rest, but I want you to be sure Rabin knows that she must not come here and say, "Well, we're ready to wait." [unclear]—

Kissinger: Well, I've told him that yesterday, already.[5]

Nixon: See, I want, I want—Henry, understand: publicly, I don't want to say anything. I don't want to embarrass the Israelis. The Israelis privately have got to know if we're going to play this game with these people, they got to play a more conciliatory game with us. They can't, because they've given nothing—the Israelis.

Kissinger: Well, they're going to—

Nixon: These people are trying to give something.

Kissinger: Well, I'm not sure what they're willing to give, but we'll know that after I've talked to him. And then, we'll know how hard we can lean—

Nixon: The Egyptians? That's right.

Kissinger: —on the Israelis. But, in any event, the Israelis have to take a more conciliatory posture; there's no question about it.

Nixon: They can't come in and say we—we should be letting—

Kissinger: But the thing that kills us always in the Middle East is when State goes running like crazy without knowing where it's going. The things we've done well is when we kept maneuvering people until—we always had more options than they until somebody cracked. I mean every negotiation: SALT, Berlin, Vietnam; every one that has worked has been when we maneuvered them—

Nixon: Right. I know. [unclear] What is the—

Kissinger: I just don't want him to start playing State again—

[5] See Document 23.

25. Memorandum From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, February 23, 1973.

SUBJECT

Background for Your Meeting with Egyptian Emissary Hafiz Ismail

Setting. Ismail is coming to see whether Egypt can anticipate renewed US—particularly Presidential—help in achieving a settlement with Israel. His trip here follows visits to Moscow and London, and Egyptian Foreign Minister Zayyat is travelling to Moscow and Peking. It is difficult to know whether this is just another show of diplomatic activity or whether the Egyptians have indeed done some fresh thinking about their position and are prepared to enter the real give-and-take of negotiation.

Sadat feels that Egypt has made two major concessions to Israel and that Egypt has been let down both times. Egypt has stated publicly that it is prepared to make peace with Israel, and Sadat went out on a limb in 1971 against the counsel of his advisers to propose the idea of an interim agreement providing for partial withdrawal from the Suez Canal. He feels that Israel turned aside both of these initiatives and that, when Israel objected, the US backed down.

Sadat accepted the fact that the US could not involve itself in a major Mid-Eastern diplomatic initiative last year. His probing now is an effort to find out whether the US will now resume a more active role and—hopefully, from Egypt's viewpoint—be prepared to press Israel for concessions.

The Egyptian position now consists of two main points:

1. Sadat is prepared to accept Israel within its pre-war borders provided Israel will respect Egypt's territorial integrity within the same borders. He speaks of not surrendering Egyptian "sovereignty" over any Arab soil, but he seems prepared to bargain over the terms of demilitarizing the Sinai and over different possible modes of international guarantees for a settlement. How much flexibility there is in this position and whether it could lead to the basis for negotiations with Israel remains to be tested.

2. Sadat says he is no longer interested in an "interim" settlement. This does not necessarily mean that an arrangement for a short Israeli

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 131, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. II, January 1–February 23, 1973. Secret; Nodis; Cedar Double Plus. Sent for action. A stamped notation on the first page reads: "The President has seen."

withdrawal from the Canal might not be the first phase in a general settlement. It means that Sadat seems no longer willing to reach any agreement with Israel without assurance that he will regain sovereignty over all his territory. The implication of this for the US is that, since Sadat will insist on linking any partial agreement to the key elements of an overall agreement, any effort to achieve an interim agreement may again founder on the key issue of final boundaries.

There are *three basic choices* for the US in deciding what, if any, new effort should be made toward breaking the Arab-Israeli impasse:

1. We could *stand back* and let the two sides reflect further on their position.[2] This might be especially attractive in this Israeli election year. Mrs. Meir will argue vigorously for this course, so as not to encourage Sadat to think the US will relieve him of responsibility to make the hard decisions that will be required if Egypt is to come to terms with Israel. It is difficult to argue that another few months' delay in moving toward a negotiation would be disastrous for US interests.[3] The principal concern is that the passage of time seems gradually to increase the threat that the Arabs would try to use such US interests as our oil interests as leverage to press us toward greater effort on a[4] settlement. There is also the danger that hostilities would be renewed at some point.

2. We could renew the efforts to achieve an *interim settlement* that lost momentum in 1971. The State Department's view is that this is our only choice, given Israeli insistence on permanent changes in the boundary between Egypt and Israel. State sees no alternative to working toward an interim agreement and leaving the question of final boundaries up in the air for a later negotiation. State is therefore concentrating on trying to find a formula which would (a) commit both sides to negotiate on terms of an overall settlement after an interim agreement is reached and (b) provide that any such negotiation would begin with no possible solutions precluded at the outset.

3. We could try to work privately[5] toward an *understanding on the framework for an overall settlement*. This effort could take place on a separate track from the effort to reach an agreement on an initial withdrawal from the Suez Canal. It would stand or fall on whether Israel

---

[2] The President underlined most of this sentence and wrote in the margin: "K *Absolutely not*. Rabin must be told this categorically before I see her. I have delayed through two elections & this year I am determined to move off dead center."

[3] The President underlined this sentence and wrote in the margin: "I totally disagree. This thing is getting ready to blow."

[4] The President underlined the words beginning with "US interests" and wrote in the margin: "*This* is the danger."

[5] The President circled "work privately" and wrote in the margin: "The preferred track for action. At same time keep the public track going for external appearances—but keep it from interfering with the private track."

can be persuaded to think in terms of restoring Egyptian sovereignty over most of the Sinai while retaining control at strategic points—rather than insisting on a permanent change in boundaries.

The *basic question* now is whether either the Israelis or Egyptians are prepared to negotiate seriously. Specifically, is either one prepared to move back from present negotiating positions in response to significant concessions from the other side?

This question applies equally to both sides. But it is of particular importance for us not to let Egypt believe that we might deliver more than we could persuade Israel to accept. The concept of restoring Egyptian sovereignty in the Sinai while providing for Israeli military control of key points for some period is viable only if Israel is willing to give up its aspirations for a permanent change in the Sinai border. On the other hand, it would be pointless to pursue this idea with the Israelis unless we had some feeling that the Egyptians were prepared to think pragmatically about such a settlement.

Thus, *our principal objective in talks with Ismail* will be to discern whether Egypt would be prepared to discuss all possible overall solutions if Israel would do the same—that is, whether Egypt would be prepared to negotiate without preconditions on either side. Whatever we sense of Ismail's position could be conveyed to Mrs. Meir next week.

The talking points in the briefing memo at Tab A[6] indicate that we have no preconceived ideas about the outlines of a solution.

There is no harm in discussion of how progress might be made toward an interim agreement, but *my recommendation* is to avoid creating the impression that this is the only course that we are prepared to follow. It seems to me that the main point to be put across to Sadat through Ismail is that the US will be prepared to help pursue either an interim or an overall agreement—or both simultaneously—provided both Egyptians and Israelis are prepared to negotiate realistically. We will be talking to Prime Minister Meir next week and our purpose while Ismail is in the United States will be to discern whether Egypt is prepared to discuss all possible solutions realistically and without preconditions.[7]

---

[6] Dated February 22; attached, but not printed.

[7] The President wrote at the bottom of the page: "K—You know my position of standing firmly with Israel has been based on broader issues than just Israel's survival. Those issues now strongly argue for movement toward a settlement. We are now Israel's *only* major friend in the world. I have yet to see *one iota* of give on their part—conceding that Jordan & Egypt have not given enough on their side. This is the time to get moving—& they must be told that *firmly*." According to Kissinger, Nixon added, "[T]he time has come to quit pandering to Israel's intransigent position. Our actions over the past have led them to think we will stand with them *regardless* of how unreasonable they are." (Years of Upheaval, p. 212)

26. Memorandum for the President's Files by the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

Washington, February 23, 1973, 11:22 a.m.

SUBJECT

The President's Meeting with Hafiz Ismail, President Sadat's Adviser for National Security Affairs

PARTICIPANTS

The President
Hafiz Ismail, National Security Affairs Adviser to President Sadat of Egypt
Muhammad Hafiz Ghanim, Political Advisor to President Sadat
B/Gen. Brent Scowcroft
[Henry A. Kissinger joined toward end of meeting]

The meeting began at 11:22 a.m. During the photo opportunity, the President told Mr. Ismail that he had visited Egypt three times and had great affection for the Egyptian people. He pointed out that instant peace was only a dream and that permanent peace cannot be assured. What we hope to have as a goal is some movement off the present dead center. We do not know what can come of our discussions but it is important for us to have frank talks and exchange honest opinions. Mr. Ismail then handed the President a letter from President Sadat [attached][2] and said that he brings Sadat's greetings and the high appreciation of the Government of Egypt and expressed his own honor to be received in the White House. At this point [11:27 a.m.], the press departed.

The President began the discussion by expressing a personal regret that in his first four years in office, he did not make progress toward normalization of relations with Egypt. He said that he was very fond of the Egyptian people and that the present status was a loss for both sides. Nevertheless, the President understood why it had not been possible to move toward more normal relations and he expressed his understanding of the Egyptian Government's position and requirements in this regard.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 131, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. III, Feb. 23–26, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive. The meeting was held in the Oval Office. Brackets are in the original. There is a Presidential tape recording of this meeting ibid., White House Tapes, Oval Office, Conversation No. 862–10.

[2] Not attached, but printed as Document 21. Kissinger described the message in his memoirs as "the polite phrasing" that "contained a threat backing up a request for an overall settlement," and noted that Sadat warned that "the situation in our region has deteriorated almost to the point of explosion." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 213)

He then said he wanted Mr. Ismail to know that we approach these talks with no illusions whatever, and that we do not know what, if anything, can come of our discussions. He said he had made the same comment to King Hussein during his recent visit and would say the same thing to Prime Minister Meir. The important thing was to see where we stand to explore the possibilities that there might be some movement which could take place. The President announced as his goal that Egypt and the United States be friends. With this goal in mind, he thought it important to be very candid and to talk frankly with each other.

Mr. Ismail responded that his Government appreciated the opportunity for the visit very much and felt that it could be the starting point for a new relationship between the United States and Egypt and, as well, a start on the way to peace in the Middle East. Mr. Ismail said he considered that Egypt's relationships with the great powers should be balanced and that Egypt wanted good relations with both the Soviet Union and the United States. Egypt sought U.S. friendship and the removal of all barriers to that friendship. He emphasized that Egypt makes its decisions in Cairo and that it was not a satellite of any country and intended to remain that way—and on good terms with all. Mr. Ismail felt that the President's meeting in Moscow and Egypt's termination of the Soviet military presence in Egypt provided a basis for Egypt to normalize relations with the U.S. He felt that Egypt was now in a correct position for steps to be taken by the U.S. He observed that for 15 years Egypt and the U.S. had not seen eye to eye. The President interjected that he felt that the decision on the Aswan Dam had been a mistake.

Mr. Ismail said that Egypt was proud of its role in the Arab world, that Egypt promoted independence of the Arab States and supported the welfare of the Arab people. This position of leadership had been forced on Egypt as a result of its population size, geographic position, and its ancient culture and tradition. The President interrupted to say that he understood this point very well and that on his first trip to the Middle East in 1955, what had impressed him in all the countries that he visited was that most of the teachers were Egyptian. The cultural impact of Egypt throughout the region was profound, and the President wanted Ismail to know that he knew that and respected it. Mr. Ismail responded that Egypt had tens of thousands of teachers, farmers and other professionals and technicians all over the Middle East making a contribution. He felt that the U.S. should encourage such activities because a strong and vigorous Middle East could be a strong, positive partner in the world and not a burden.

The President said he wanted to speak very candidly and to point out that Nasser, who was a strong and good man, was so strong that Egypt's neighbors feared him and the possibility that he might be ex-

porting revolution. The President said he had the feeling that that was no longer the case and that Egypt was not thought of in that way. Mr. Ghanem agreed with the President, pointing out that Saudi Arabia used to fear that Egypt was exporting revolution but that they now welcomed Egyptian teachers to their land.

Mr. Ismail next moved to a discussion of peace in the Middle East. He pointed out that if Egypt were strong, the Middle East was strong, and that if Egypt were weak, the Middle East was weak. Egypt wants peace. It has had now a decade of almost constant military activity, but Egypt cannot accept peace at the expense of its sovereignty, territory, or pride. Egypt will not be humiliated and the Egyptian leadership would take no action for which its children would blame it in the future. Peace, said Mr. Ismail, must be as just as it is stable. Otherwise, it simply sows the seeds of another war. He said he noted with care the recent U.S. position; the President had declared a decade of peace. The President had brought peace to Vietnam and now was giving priority to the Middle East at the beginning of his second four years. The U.S. is an extremely important factor in the world and no peace in the Middle East is possible without U.S. participation. Time, said Mr. Ismail, is not on the side of peace, and he pointed out that just two days ago, 110 people (hostages) were shot down in cold blood. He compared this with the Egyptian diplomat in Bangkok who had rescued Israeli hostages at considerable risk.

The President said that Mr. Ismail had undoubtedly seen his statement on the recent tragedy and observed that no statement was adequate at such a time.[3] He said he was very impressed that, despite this tragedy, Mr. Ismail had kept on with his trip. The President felt that showed real statesmanship. Mr. Ismail responded that before starting his recent journeys, the Egyptian leadership had felt that they were in a dangerous stage of confrontation with Israel. There were certain parties not in favor of peace and they would attempt to dynamite any efforts. Egypt was therefore prepared for provocative acts and prepared to continue its efforts.

Mr. Ismail next stated that 30 months of ceasefire was no reason for congratulations. The ceasefire was becoming a burden and a strain, and that it was necessary either to break it or to establish peace. He said that Egypt had not been at fault in obstructing peace, and that Egypt had accepted and itself proposed peace initiatives. Israel, he felt, did not want peace because it has not achieved its goals. It wishes to wait another 10 years until further immigration and its own efforts enable it to establish its position in the occupied areas. What helps Israel to persist in this po-

[3] See footnote 2, Document 22.

sition—the President interrupted and said he knew what the rest of the statement was going to be, that it was the support that the U.S. gives to Israel. He urged Mr. Ismail to be frank and to openly state that he felt that U.S. support was what made Israel intransigent. Mr. Ismail responded that Egypt did not understand the U.S. policy of balance of force. This policy permitted Israel to hold on to Egyptian land, and Egypt thought it was not a fair policy. At one time, the Soviet Union was in Egypt, but the Soviet Union has now left and Egypt saw no further genuine motive for its support of Israel. Mr. Ismail said he was not suggesting that the U.S. could stop that support tomorrow, but it was time for the U.S. to begin a shift toward Egypt in the Middle East and to readjust accordingly its relationship with Israel. Otherwise, said Mr. Ismail, how can we move toward our goals?

Mr. Ismail said that Egypt saw a settlement in the Middle East in light of the origins of the conflict. If a settlement was seen in terms solely of the Suez issue, or a small agreement on one or another detailed aspect, there would be no solution. The origin of the conflict is in the Balfour Declaration[4] and the emergence of two communities in Palestine—the Jewish and the Palestinian communities. This is the core problem which must be solved. Egypt is not a part of this core problem and complete disengagement between Egypt and its neighbors would offer a means to a solution. Mr. Ismail said he was aware that Israel was not offered by the Arabs a homeland in Palestine but that was not a reality. He felt that Israel's wave of expansion must be stopped or it would continue to go on and on. If it were possible to disengage parties to the international conflict the Palestinian core problem would be solved on the basis of self-determination between the Jews and Palestinians. Once this fundamental problem is solved it would be possible to recognize new relationships in the area. If Israel would agree to withdraw to its borders, Egypt could agree to safeguards and guarantees and then it would be possible to work out the details of moving toward the resolution of the core issue. If we attempt to reach a settlement by step-to-step actions, said Ismail, we will bog down. We must have a final goal clearly in mind and move firmly and rapidly toward it.

According to Mr. Ismail, security was much more of a need on the Arab side because of the Zionist objectives of expansion at the expense of the Arabs. As long as Israel has these objectives, there is a serious threat and the Arabs were on the defensive. In illustration of this, Ismail pointed out that within 10 years, his people would all be liquidated in

[4] In November 1917, the British Government announced in a letter signed by Foreign Secretary Arthur James Balfour that it favored "the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people" and that it would use "its best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this objective."

the Gaza area. When Israel would be willing to recognize itself simply as a Middle East country, the Arabs would recognize it as such. But so long as it continued to bring in immigrants and money and to fight for expansion, there was no possibility of any solution. He pointed out that Prime Minister Meir had challenged President Sadat to say that he would sign an agreement. She promised that if he would do so, she would put her cards on the table. He did so and there is no response from Mrs. Meir. Mr. Ismail pointed out the development of long-range missiles and atomic weapon research going on in Israel. He asked rhetorically if Egypt could rest in peace when a sick member of the Middle East club across the river was doing such things. Mr. Ismail felt that the Arabs had offered all the security measures they could, but that the Israelis have offered none.

The Israelis tell us to sit down with them and negotiate an agreement, said Ismail. Our response, he said, is that Israel must sit down with the Palestinians and the refugees and resolve that issue. With Egypt, there is nothing to negotiate about with our land occupied. Egypt will negotiate, but not at the expense of its land. He pointed out that if Egypt could get an international commitment to a date of Israeli withdrawal, Egypt would negotiate. Otherwise, however, the talking would be still going on in 1983, with Israel still holding Arab land.

The time has come, said Mr. Ismail, when the United States and Egypt should start improved relations. Egypt is not hostile to the United States, and he hopes that the U.S. is not hostile to Egypt. He repeated that, because of their actions with respect to the Soviet Union, they are now in a position to be receptive toward movement by the U.S. in the direction of Egypt. It is time, said Mr. Ismail, for the U.S. to move toward an even-handed policy in the Middle East—to define objectives, and to tell Israel it is in the interest of all to get along. Ismail said he had no illusions about the prospects but he hoped that his visit would be the point of departure for some new movement.

At this point, Dr. Kissinger entered the discussions. The President noted that the Egyptian position was very firm, and so was that of the Israelis, and that the situation was analogous of the irresistible force meeting the immovable object. He said that Mr. Ismail's trip had aroused much interest and that the press will tend to believe that this diplomatic activity would bring an early solution. Both sides, said the President, know that is not so. The President said that the U.S. goal is to work for a solution, not to procrastinate, and not to be content to let the situation continue for five to 10 years, although it was possible that it could continue that long. The President expressed his concern about the present situation, noting that Egypt and Israel were far apart and the situation was very explosive.

The President then said he wanted to speak on very sensitive matters and that notes should not be taken. He said he thought discussions with Egypt should move on two tracks—a public track with the State Department,[5] and a private track with Dr. Kissinger. If the private track was to produce any benefits, it would be absolutely essential to keep it private. In responding to Mr. Ismail's previous statements, the President pointed out that Israel sees a security threat from radical elements in the Arab world and that this threat was, to Israel, a very serious one. As the President sees it, the big issue is between Egyptian sovereignty and Israeli security. The two sides, he felt, were very far apart and their positions were very hard. The President did not think that it was possible to solve the entire Middle East problem all at once and perhaps not at all. He expressed his understanding of Mr. Ismail's point about interim solutions turning into final solutions. The President gave his word that his goal was a permanent settlement, but he reiterated that he did not think it was possible, in view of the gulf between the parties, to reach such a settlement all at once. It may, therefore, be necessary to consider interim steps along the way. He said that perhaps the Egyptians would reject such an approach, but he urged Mr. Ismail to discuss it with Dr. Kissinger and he stressed that we were committed to a long-range solution to the problem. No possibility should be overlooked in our search for a way to move toward our goal. The President said he hoped that this would be only the first, and not the last, meeting. This should be the beginning of a dialogue, and if nothing concrete emerged, he hoped Mr. Ismail would not report back to Sadat that the effort had failed. Once again, the President pointed out the sensitivity of the private channel negotiations—they must be kept quiet and private if they were to succeed.

Dr. Kissinger observed that he and Mr. Ismail would explore all possibilities during their meetings on Sunday and Monday.[6] Mr. Ismail responded that he had received Dr. Kissinger's note about a possible second meeting in March, and he understood that the exchange must continue for some time.

The President said he had asked his daughter, Tricia, where she would prefer to go if she could go back to one of the countries she had visited. Her response was that she would like to return to Egypt, and the President said that he would like to visit Egypt during his present term of office. It was, of course, premature to talk of it now, but his statement was an earnest of his good will to improve Egypt-American relations. Mr. Ismail observed that with respect to those relations, every

---

[5] Ismail also met with Rogers, Rush, Sisco, and Atherton on February 23. See footnote 3, Document 27.

[6] February 25 and 26.

phase exhausts itself and that diplomatic relations will come when the situation is ripe. Egypt would look forward to a visit by the President because that would signify that the Middle East problem was solved. The President responded that such problems are never really solved but that it would mean that the situation was under satisfactory control.

The meeting concluded at 12:29 p.m.[7]

[7] Kissinger recalled: "As was his custom, Nixon expressed himself face to face with Ismail much more elliptically than in his marginal comments to me." He added: "Nixon, always uncomfortable with detailed negotiation, used my scheduled secret talks with Ismail as a device to avoid a clear-cut reply. Indeed, he pushed a program somewhat at variance from his marginal note to me. To my astonishment, he seemed to favor an interim Suez Canal settlement after all." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 213)

27. Telephone Conversation Between President Nixon and his Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

February 24, 1973.

Nixon: You're going to meet tomorrow, now, with all these people? I—

Kissinger: I'm going to meet tomorrow afternoon.[2]

Nixon: Yeah. Um-hmm.

Kissinger: Or, from—

Nixon: Now, you don't know what went on with their meeting at State,[3] huh?

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Tapes, Conversation No. 162–7. No classification marking. According to the President's Daily Diary, Nixon spoke with Kissinger from Camp David between 6:10 and 6:16 p.m. Kissinger was in New York. (Ibid., White House Central Files) The editors transcribed the portion printed here specifically for this volume.

[2] See Document 28.

[3] The conversation between Rogers and Ismail and their colleagues took place at the State Department from 12:50 to 3:22 p.m. on February 23. (Personal Papers of William P. Rogers, Appointment Books) According to a memorandum of conversation prepared by Atherton, Ismail indicated that Egypt was launching an effort "to persuade the U.S. to change its policy in the Middle East to one which would not be based on what Egypt considers total support for Israel." With regard to a peace settlement, Ismail stressed that Egypt "seeks a final settlement which would respect Egyptian sovereignty over all its territory," and is not seeking "partial" or "independent" solutions. Secretary Rogers responded by telling Ismail that an interim agreement to open the Suez Canal would

Kissinger: They took a very hard line and—

Nixon: Um-hmm?

Kissinger: —nothing really concrete.

Nixon: Well, their line couldn't possibly be harder then the Israelis' line. I mean, the Israelis, Henry, we've got to realize, haven't—haven't budged even a third of an inch. These people, at least, have said they'll recognize [laughs]—you know, they'll make a peace treaty.

Kissinger: Well—

Nixon: So, if we—

Kissinger: —but they're saying it in a complicated way. They say they'll make a cease—a cease-fire, and then the peace treaty they'll make if the Palestinians and the Israelis settle.

Nixon: Yeah, I know. I know. But, being objective, the Israelis haven't moved.

Kissinger: No, the Israelis haven't—

Nixon: And they're being—acting—I mean, the way they've handled this airplane thing[4] is just—I mean, it's worse than the way Laird handled the bombing of that goddamn French Embassy.[5]

Kissinger: Well, one problem—

Nixon: Unbelievable!

Kissinger: —is that they are having—I called Rabin to tell him about your view with respect to Mrs. Meir, that she shouldn't come in and say nothing can be done.[6] And he said they have an election campaign [unclear]—

Nixon: I know. Well, that's right.

Kissinger: Not about that, but about the plane.

Nixon: Yeah.

Kissinger: And, in Israel, to be a hawk is more popular than the other.

"move in the direction of such a settlement, and that, if once this journey could be started, it would lead to a result in which Egypt would achieve most, if not all, of what it seeks." (Memorandum of conversation; National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 131, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. III, [MEMCONS], Pres. Feb. 23—HAK Feb. 25–26, 1973)

[4] See footnote 2, Document 22.

[5] On October 11, 1972, the French diplomatic mission in Hanoi was heavily damaged during a U.S. bombing raid on the North Vietnamese capital. In response, Secretary of Defense Laird authorized a statement from the Pentagon, which expressed regret for "any personal injury or damage caused in the area of the French delegation building during the air strikes and the North Vietnamese firing on United States aircraft." (*The New York Times,* October 12, 1972)

[6] No record of the telephone call has been found.

Nixon: Right, I understand. Well, that's their deal this year, and then it's next year ours. But, this is our year to really do something. And so, we can—we'll have a little fun with it.

Kissinger: Right. [Laughs]

---

28. Memorandum From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, February 25–26, 1973.

SUBJECT

My Talks with Hafiz Ismail—Summary

This memorandum describes (1) Ismail's position on each of the main issues as it evolved over two days of talks and (2) the process he envisages over the coming months. In short, he did not change Egypt's position on any basic issue, but he seemed quite open-minded in considering fresh approaches.

Ismail's Position

A. *Urgency of An Overall Settlement*

Ismail began on the first day emphasizing the importance of a settlement in 1973. However, on the second day he outlined procedures which if followed through to their logical conclusion could take well beyond the end of 1973 to complete, although he would want agreement on fundamental principles of an agreement by this September (see description of procedures below).

He absolutely rejected an "interim settlement" and insisted that the fundamental issues of an overall settlement be addressed. But he readily agreed that the ideas represented in the idea of a partial withdrawal from the canal could be used as the opening phase of a broader process.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 131, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. IV, February 24–May 19, 1973. Secret. Sent for information. A stamped notation on the first page reads: "The President has seen." The President circled Kissinger's name and wrote the comment: "Excellent Job." This memorandum, which is dated March 6, summarizes the conversations between Kissinger and Ismail that took place in Armonk, New York, from 1:50 until 6:30 p.m. on February 25 and from 10:25 a.m. until 3:35 p.m. on February 26. (Memoranda of conversation; ibid., Vol. III, Feb. 23–26, 1973)

B. *Long-term Objective*

He spoke from the outset in terms of wanting to see develop a Middle East of strong, healthy, cooperative, independent states. He implied Israel could be among them if Israel recognized itself as a Middle Eastern state. A peace settlement could be a basis for *normalization* of relations, but that would take a long time. Normalization of relations would depend on, among other things, a refugee settlement.

C. *Recognition of Israel*

He said an Egypt–Israel agreement would establish a *state of peace.* This would end the state of war but would not be "full peace."

—This agreement would provide a situation different from the Egypt-Israel relationship before 1967 in that it would: allow Israel free passage through the Straits of Tiran and the Suez Canal; end the boycott on third-party goods; commit Egypt to prevent guerrilla operations from Egyptian soil and elsewhere to the extent possible; end Egypt's practice of adding a reservation clause when it signs multilateral agreements, saying that they do not apply to Israel; commit each side to non-intervention in each other's internal affairs, e.g. by radio.

—This agreement would not include exchanging ambassadors, trade agreement, borders open for routine travel. Those steps would be characteristics of later normalization.

By the second day he volunteered that in the transitional period between the ending of the state of war and the achievement of full peace there could begin some practical normal contacts between Egyptians and Israelis developing out of day-to-day situations.

He was uncertain about the timing of recognition, whether it should be tied to signing of the Syrian and Jordanian agreements. He rather thought so, but this is one of the aspects he is giving further thought to.

D. *Main Aspects of a Settlement*

He began by saying very generally that there were two main aspects of a settlement:

—The question of restoring Egyptian *sovereignty* over Egyptian territory. This required Israeli withdrawal to pre-war borders.

—The issue of *Palestinian rights*. This problem should be reduced to the size of Arab and Jewish communities within the area of mandated Palestine deciding how to divide that territory and live together.

In response to my questions on the first day, he developed these points the second day along the following lines:

—He spoke of the sovereignty problem in terms of reconciling Egypt's sovereignty with legitimate Israeli security concerns.

—Egypt was prepared to let Hussein negotiate his own agreement with Israel, including border changes (even a security corridor down

the Jordan River) but probably not major concessions in Jerusalem. Egypt would consider whatever Hussein worked out with the West Bank Palestinians as an internal Jordanian matter, not an Arab-Israeli matter.

—Gaza's self-determination should be worked out under UN auspices. An Egypt–Israel agreement should contain these principles: (1) Israel should agree to withdraw in principle so that (2) Gazans could freely exercise their right of self-determination (3) under UN auspices. This would also have to be related to a Jordan settlement. Gaza could become part of Jordan if the Gazans wished.

—A refugee settlement would have to be in accordance with UN resolutions (unlimited opportunity to return to Israel). This agreement might be worked out by the UN.

—The question of a Syria–Israel settlement was more serious to Egypt than a Jordan–Israel settlement because Syria was a member of the Egypt–Syria–Libya confederation. A Syrian settlement had to be based on the same principles as Egypt's.

E. *Meeting Israel's Security Concerns*

Ismail began talking about meeting Israel's "legitimate" security concerns in conventional ways, including international guarantees and Egyptian peace commitments (spelled out in C above):

—*Demilitarized zones* could vary in size on the two sides of the border. The Israeli zone could be symbolic. International observers would inspect these zones.

—An international force could be stationed in *areas of special importance* like Sharm al-Shaikh.

—There could be *big-power guarantees.*

On the second day, he indicated that he had not really considered what might be done if the issue of sovereignty and borders were dealt with separately from security arrangements. He said he thought there might be interim security arrangements at some points during a transitional period, but he would have to give more thought to this. For instance, he would consider whether there might be transitional security arrangement during the period between the end of the state of war and the advent of full peace. As he began to understand this proposition he said: "If the issues of territory and sovereignty could be put aside, we could be open-minded." This, of course, could be quite significant.

F. *Settlement by Stages and Sectors*

He felt a settlement could be reached by stages and sectors, but they had to be linked so as to lead to an overall settlement. There had to be a full settlement; Egypt could not accept a partial withdrawal "left hanging." Asked whether a Jordanian settlement could come before an Egyptian one, his view was that agreement first on the principles of an

Egypt–Israel settlement would help to "start the motors in other places." He saw the Syrian and Jordanian negotiations running one step behind the Egyptian negotiations. Egypt could sign a separate agreement with Israel provided Syrian and Jordanian negotiations were then in train.

The Procedures Ismail Suggests

Two possible approaches were posed on the first day:

1. The U.S. and Egypt could work out the principles of an agreement and then present them to Israel. This procedure failed in the past, Ismail felt, because understandings between the U.S. and Egypt came apart when Israel objected.

2. The U.S. could listen to both Egypt and Israel and try to develop a position that would meet the reasonable interests of both sides.

On the second day, Ismail opened by saying that the latter approach above seemed better to him. Once the U.S. has developed a sound position and reached an understanding with Egypt, the U.S. had to stand by it and influence Israel to accept it.

He elaborated this process with some precision on the second day:

1. (A) The objective in the *first stage* would be to develop what he called the "heads of an agreement," that is, the *fundamental principles* of an agreement, which would then be worked out in further U.S.-Egyptian talks. He left it to the U.S. to recommend when Israel would be brought into the process. He began talking about completing this stage by the end of May, but later he seemed to be discussing this plus a partial withdrawal (next paragraph) by September 1.

1. (B) In the course of this first stage, it might be possible concurrently in a separate channel to work out a first stage of an Israeli *withdrawal from the Suez Canal* along the lines of the State Department's idea for an interim agreement. Also, a prisoner exchange might be possible.

2. The *second stage* in the negotiating process would begin after Israel had accepted the "heads of agreement." The objective in this stage would be to develop the *"final provisions"* of an agreement. These would detail the obligations of both sides and the phasing of carrying out the provisions of the agreement. This stage would involve the Israelis "more actively, less indirectly." He did not set a limit to the amount of time it would take to work through this stage.

3. The third stage would be *implementation,* and this too could take place in phases.

As Egypt and Israel move through the above stages, Syria and Jordan would be roughly one stage behind.

What was new in Ismail's presentation?

In its essential points this was the familiar Egyptian position unchanged. However, there seemed to be several new points of emphasis which might lend thmselves to development.

—One of the two most interesting points was the prospect of *a process that might stretch over some period.* He seemed to be acknowledging, perhaps without having thought it through, that if there were a serious process, Egypt would not feel the need to set deadlines.

—If Egypt were "open-minded" on special *security arrangements through a transitional period* before full peace is reached, that could be quite significant. He promised to consider this.

—An *interim agreement* might be useful if it paralleled progress toward an overall agreement.

—*Normalization* of relations between Egypt and Israel. Although Ismail said this would take a long time, he spoke of normalization as being at the end of the road. If this could be developed concretely and related to steps in the settlement process, it could be useful in persuading Israel that Egypt would be willing to have a normal relationship.

—Egypt has not publicly endorsed *Hussein's plan for a United Arab Kingdom.* Ismail seemed to say Egypt would pose no objection to Hussein's getting the West Bank back and granting self-determination to the Palestinians, thereby making the Palestinian problem apart from a refugee settlement an internal Jordanian matter.

—Egypt has indicated before that it does not want *Gaza* but that it must remain Arab. More was said than previously about the mechanics (UN auspices with Egypt handling its negotiation) of achieving self-determination.

This, it seems to me, opens the possibility of letting State develop an interim agreement under our guidance while an overall agreement is discussed in this channel.[2]

---

[2] In his memoirs, Kissinger commented that Ismail "had come less to discuss mediation—and therefore compromise—than to put forward a polite ultimatum for terms beyond our capacity to fulfill. Spelling out what he had told Nixon, Ismail now argued that a settlement had to take place during 1973; at a minimum he hoped he could achieve by September an agreement on fundamental principles ('heads of agreement'). He never clearly explained what he understood by that or what would happen if such an agreement was not reached by the deadline. . . . Above all, Israel had to agree, before anything else happened, that it would return to its 1967 borders with *all* neighbors, with some margin for adjustment, perhaps, on the West Bank. Only on that basis would Egypt join the negotiating process, and then only to discuss security arrangements." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 215)

29. Editorial Note

On February 26, 1973, President Nixon met with his Assistant for National Security Affairs, Henry Kissinger, in the Executive Office Building, from 6:31 to 7:15 p.m., for an assessment of Kissinger's recent meetings in New York with Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs Hafiz Ismail. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Central Files, President's Daily Diary) Kissinger began by telling Nixon that Ismail was "not emotional and he didn't give us the old Arab—Arab procedures."

Turning to the details of his 4-hour "cross-examination" with Ismail, Kissinger stated, "I thought the most important thing, that he's never said to anyone and won't say to anybody," was that the Egyptians were "willing to make a separate Egyptian-Israeli deal, because they know that afterwards the Jordanians and Syrians are going to follow the same procedure." Kissinger added, "But that means the Jordanian-Syrian thing could follow a year or two afterwards." Kissinger acknowledged that "the problem is with the Israelis, who are going to be tough enough to budge on one of them rather than on all three of them simultaneously," but felt that the United States could "get the Israelis to start agreeing to thinking about it [an interim settlement]." After discussing additional details of a possible interim agreement, Kissinger added: "If we can get them over the hill, this is not a bad process. It's the first time—up to now, they've always taken the view, the Egyptians and the Russians, that the whole package must be done as one: Syria, Jordan and Egypt."

Kissinger and Nixon also discussed the negotiating process for the spring and summer, with particular reference to how the Middle East discussions could be linked to the June 1973 summit between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Kissinger: "So, I think if we can get some talks started on the interim settlement—frankly, until this weekend, I didn't know how to do it. I was—I had no concept of how to get this thing done."

Nixon: "Yeah, yeah."

Kissinger: "I now see a glimmer of how we might do it. If I—if we can get some thinking started on the interim settlement, have that in the bank, then after that, down the road a bit, throw in the principles. Now, if the Arabs cooperate with us and keep the principals working on it, so that the Israelis can't [unclear]—"

Nixon: "Um-hmm."

Kissinger: "—the negotiating thing either, then we put the two together, it'd work right into your summit. It gets the Russians off our back, because last May, the Russians said, 'We already worked out some principles that are joined—'" (See *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XIV, Soviet Union, October 1971–May 1972, Document 284)

Nixon: "Um-hmm."

Kissinger: "That was how we played—bought them off last year. If the Israelis would accept those principles, we can claim the Russians are involved there, too. Then you make those as a recommendation [unclear]. Then the Egyptians have a face-saving formula of saying they've got their interim agreement, and then, by September 1st—"

Nixon: "All right."

Kissinger: "—we have two things going: an interim settlement and direct negotiations between the Arabs and the Israelis. And it will look lovely, and it will be a tremendous boon."

The conversation then turned to the prospects of an interim agreement. Nixon pointed out that the situation in the Middle East "couldn't be any worse than when we exit Vietnam." Kissinger replied, "Not worse, yes. On the other hand, we had more assets, and we can't bomb there." Nixon agreed, and Kissinger continued, "To threaten to cut off aid to Israel is—we could do it," but such action would lead to "an uproar." Nixon responded, "We know we have very few assets there." Kissinger suggested, "I think we could get responsible members of the Jewish community and turn them around against Israel." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Tapes, Conversation No. 413–33)

---

30. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, February 27, 1973, 11:42 a.m.–12:45 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

King Hussein of Jordan
Zayd Rifai, Adviser to the King
Dr. Henry A. Kissinger
Peter W. Rodman

Kissinger: Are you going directly back?

Hussein: I will stop in Morocco first to see what the situation is.

Kissinger: I want to do two things. One, to talk about the conversation the President had with the Egyptians.[2] And second, to see if we can

---

[1] Source: Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box TS 32, Geopolitical File, Middle East, Chronological File, 27 Feb 73–16 May 73. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. All brackets except those that indicate omitted material are in the original.

[2] See Document 26.

be more specific for my own thinking about a possible Israeli settlement. [*2½ lines not declassified*]

My impression is the Egyptians don't know anything about it.

Hussein: No.

Kissinger: We, of course, did not say anything. They asked us and we told them frankly that most of our conversation concerned economic assistance, and that a peace settlement was discussed only in the most general terms.

First, on the aid thing, we can do the $15 million budgetary support. But we would like the $5 million now and let you go to the Saudis and Kuwaitis to see if you can get more from them, but with the understanding that if you cannot you will get the other $10 million from us. Just as a way to put pressure on them. If you don't like to do this, we can get you the $10 million.

Rifai: You mean $15 million between now and July?

Kissinger: Our idea is $5 million now, then you go to the Saudis.

Rifai: His Majesty went to them just before coming here. Faisal has just agreed to provide 7 million dinars, or $20 million, but only as an advance on the 1973 subsidy. We will have extensive talks when we go back in order to have it not considered as an advance on the subsidy. So it is unlikely he will agree to a new $10 million for any reason.

Kissinger: Can we leave it that you will try?

Rifai: All right, sir.

Kissinger: The $55 million in supporting assistance is in Fiscal Year 1974; that is really after July. The total package is either $55 or $65 million in supporting assistance, depending on what we decide here.

Rifai: The problem is to receive a guarantee of $15 million this year before July. The $40 million from July to December is all right; the $10 million for January 1974 is all right. But we have this critical period between now and July which we simply cannot manage without some help.

Kissinger: I will have to let you know this afternoon.

Rifai: Fine, sir. Our calendar year is also our fiscal year, so we are in Fiscal Year 1973. The $40 million allotted in your FY 1974 which we receive in July will take care of July through December. We realize you have a problem finding money in the current fiscal year. We may have to change our fiscal year in order to make all this easier!

We had asked for a total of $70 million in calendar year 1973. Now you are saying $65 million.

Kissinger: I think we can do it in Calendar Year 1973, but after July.

Rifai: That is what I think. This is a hell of a problem. If we can get that $15 million before July it will be a great help. I remember last year

we invaded Cambodia's funds for it. [laughter] So the total for calendar year 1973 is $65 million, or $55 million if we can get $10 million from the Saudis and $65 million if we cannot.[3]

Kissinger: Right.

Rifai: Thank you very much, sir.

Kissinger: Let's talk a bit about a settlement.

The Egyptians, when talking to the President, and a little less explicitly to the Secretary of State,[4]—and I had a brief conversation with Ismail—their line went something like this: They would like some general principles agreed upon, as vague as what Dean Rusk said in 1967. I frankly do not remember what Dean Rusk said in 1967.

Of course, this is strictly between us. But His Majesty has certainly proved his ability to keep secrets.

They are willing to make a separate agreement on an Egyptian/Israeli settlement. I asked whether they had a preference on whether an Egyptian settlement should precede a Jordanian settlement or not. I think they would prefer an Egyptian settlement first, but it is not a major issue to them. Then they said that after their settlement, Jordan and Syria should both be done. They are more concerned with the Syrian one because they feel no special obligation to Jordan. And Syria is a member of their Federation.

After all these are settled, the future of Palestine has to be settled. So I asked them, is Jordan competent to deal with this?

They were very vague. We took the position that we could not make a Middle East peace dependent on who speaks for the Palestinians. So then they said you could speak for the Palestinians, but that afterward they would reserve the right to express their view of your relations with the Palestinians. But it was not a requirement of peace in the Middle East that the relationship of Palestine and the East Bank be conclusively settled. On Gaza, they had no objection if Gaza went eventually to Jordan but they wanted a voice in the negotiation and some sort of plebiscite.

---

[3] On March 3, Kissinger sent Secretary Rogers a memorandum stating that the President had directed that the Government of Jordan be informed that the level of budget support provided from Supporting Assistance funds in CY 1973 should be $55 million, pending renewed Jordanian efforts to increase the level of assistance from other donors. The President had further directed that the United States be prepared to provide an additional $10 million in the second half of 1973 if the response of other donors proved inadequate. In addition, the U.S. Government was to make an effort within the approved total of assistance being provided to Jordan to help the Government of Jordan meet its shortage of funds before July 1, 1973. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January 73–October 73)

[4] See footnote 3, Document 27.

On the settlement terms with Israel, they were a little more flexible—or a little more vague. There was some willingness to consider security arrangements. But none of this is probably news to Your Majesty.

We are very reluctant about getting engaged before we know where we are going.

Is there anything new here?

Hussein: No sir. We are very interested in a solution in order to find a way out of our dilemma. At Nasser's time, their approach was very different than it is now. They felt more responsibility for Jordan. I did send President Sadat something to tell him I would be in touch with him when I got back from Washington. What I would do is press quietly in terms of positions and statements and see if anything happens.

Kissinger: My problem, as I told you and Mr. Rifai—we are very seriously considering getting involved. But here are some of our problems: The negotiations I have conducted always take a certain time to mature. For example, the Vietnam negotiations took several years. Secondly, in all the other negotiations I controlled all the assets. We could decide when to press and so forth. In the Middle East our assets are not that immediate. Thirdly, there are many different parties in the Middle East. And Your Majesty knows that while we have influence in Israel, it is not unlimited. If we were to consider getting into a position where we might pressure Israel, the only possibility would be if there were some new element that was introduced that justified this. Many of Israel's demands you are meeting in your case—such as meeting directly.

Hussein: Yes.

Kissinger: You are prepared to negotiate directly?

Hussein: Yes.

Kissinger: So then the question is what new element is conceivable? One problem is that if you give me a new element and we tell it to the Israelis, they will bank it and make a new demand.

There is no problem for Your Majesty in recognition of Israel?

Hussein: No, it is part of 242. The only question for opening negotiations is, under what umbrella? Our approach is to try to find what we can agree about, in order to help the negotiations.

Kissinger: I have reread your paper [the Rifai paper of May 15, 1972, Tab A].[5] Have you discussed it with Israel? I have never discussed it with them. Is total demilitarization a new element?

---

[5] Attached, but not printed.

Rifai: We never gave them detailed positions. But many subjects came up, including demilitarization. We tried many ideas to try to soften their position. Whenever we offered a concession, they would take it and not change their position.

Hussein: Which remains very unclear.

Rifai: This unfortunately is true also with respect to Egypt. Their general principles would include total withdrawal. A partial settlement, to the Egyptians, would be only an implementation of the final settlement.

Hussein: Their position is that Jerusalem is totally out of the picture?

Kissinger: That is their position.

Hussein: They want a security corridor down the Jordan River on the West Bank. We have said if this is a question of security, what does this line of settlements mean? What about our security?

They are willing to give us the population centers back. But Jerusalem is out of the picture. There can be no forces on the West Bank. They say, take it or leave it. And there is nothing about Gaza.

On our side we have proposed the United Arab Kingdom idea, which was a way to come to grips with the Palestinian issue. To get the entire issue out of the hands of other governments—who exploit it—and foreign governments. To get all the Palestinian settlement under one umbrella.

But we have never got anything from Israel. You see how far the gap is. Our objective is a peace that will last and that will survive those who follow us. But we get nothing from Israel. We see the U.S. concentrating on this.

Kissinger: If you could make our policy, what would you like us to do?

Hussein: We would like to work with you, sir. I think frankly that the last chance is before us, the next two or three years.

Kissinger: You know our admiration for you. Without the courage you showed in 1970, the whole Middle East would still be in turmoil.

Let me ask a difficult question. I recognize there has to be something on Jerusalem for Jordan; it is almost inconceivable for you to settle without something on Jerusalem.

Hussein: Yes.

Kissinger: Your position in the Arab world would depend on it. It is inconceivable that there could be some sort of military posts in the Jordan Valley if everything else could be done?

Hussein: I suppose it could be done. But what about Gaza?

Kissinger: In my mind I would think the logical connection of Gaza is to Jordan, not to Egypt. I agree with the concept of your paper, to group all the Palestinians under one umbrella. What would a plebiscite in Gaza yield?

Hussein: Our relations are quite good now.

Rifai: It depends on what choices are given. To join with Jordan? Or Israel? That is not conceivable. Or to be independent? Or to join with Egypt?

Kissinger: What if the Egyptians say there should be three choices, namely; join with Egypt, or Jordan, or be independent?

Rifai: They would choose Jordan.

Kissinger: They would choose Jordan. Is it possible in these conditions for them to make a rational choice?

Rifai: Yes. There is not that much room for agitation.

Hussein: And they had previous experience with Egypt.

Rifai: Without Jordan they cannot operate. They need our passports to travel.

To go back to your original point, I wish to submit very humbly what you earlier suggested. The best way to make progress is to present Israel not with Jordanian proposals but with American proposals.

Kissinger: I agree with that. But there is no sense our making proposals to them which you reject.

Rifai: Right, that's why we sent you the paper, for your consideration. To see how it can be improved, and adopted as your position. Therefore we want you to make suggestions to us, to improve it, so that you can either sell it or pressure them.

Kissinger: The trouble with you Jordanians is that you are so reasonable! What do you mean by (F) here [in Section III of the Rifai paper, Tab A]—"some form of resident alien permits to allow Israelis to reside in Jordanian territory near Jewish religious shrines."

Rifai: This is something the late Dr. Herzog[6] mentioned, having to do with Hebron and Nablus, where there is strong religious feeling on the part of the Israelis about the sites there. They have no desire to annex these but there is a strong desire of many Israelis to live there. I said it would be possible for Israeli citizens, including Orthodox Jews, to reside there close to their religious shrines. In a state of peace. The trouble with the military settlements is that they want to annex a part;

[6] Yaacov Herzog, Director General of the office of former Israeli Prime Minister Levi Eshkol.

they want sovereignty. This is an obstacle. If they want some arrangement to reside there, that is different.

Kissinger: That is what I thought you meant.

Rifai: That is the key. Jordanian sovereignty. Jerusalem too. His Majesty cannot give up sovereignty over the Eastern sector. But without sovereignty anything can be considered. In Jerusalem there can be a Jewish quarter and there can be an Arab quarter.

Kissinger: Have the Jews moved back in?

Rifai: Yes. Most of the new building is in the Eastern part. We will not kick them out.

Kissinger: Aside from Jerusalem, if the principle of sovereignty could be preserved in some way, then the presence of settlements on security grounds can be considered. I am not asking you to accept now.

Rifai: Yes, it can be considered. And it will be more acceptable if connected with a timetable. A sort of phased-withdrawal type of arrangement. We could start the withdrawal from the interior and ultimately—in an actual state of peace—go from there.

Kissinger: Have you ever put this to the Israelis in this way?

Rifai: Not in such detail, only in principle. Their Prime Minister always says that the Allon Plan[7] is the most moderate Israeli proposal. Their current position is more extreme. And it would take a split in the Cabinet and in the Parliament, so she says, if they were to accept the Allon Plan.

Kissinger: But you could go far toward the Allon Plan, aside from Jerusalem.

Rifai: But they want to annex a strip along with Jordan.

Kissinger: The Allon Plan involves annexation and not just security arrangements?

Rifai: Yes.

Hussein: Again, that is with respect to the Jordan Valley. Then there is the connection with Gaza. It has got to be balanced. A very weak President is going to be challenged some day.

Rifai: As for the demilitarization of the East Bank, we don't really see what their security problem is. They can always reoccupy the West Bank in no time at all if Arab troops move into the East Bank.

Kissinger: If Gaza could be made part of Jordan—there is no reason to suppose Israel would agree to it . . .

Rifai: Gaza has been annexed, to all practical purposes. They are moving people in. They consider it part of Israel. It is one of these

[7] See footnote 4, Document 8.

non-negotiable subjects; like Sharm el-Sheikh and the strip down the coast of Sinai.

Kissinger: Is it possible that any Arab state will ever accept that?

Rifai: Rogers once asked why the Arabs care about a few miles of desert; let the Israelis have it, he said. This misunderstands the Arab world. It is impossible that any Arab leader will give up territory just for peace.

The Prime Minister asked me, "What will you give me?" I said, I recognize your right to exist. She said, "I don't need that."

Hussein: But I don't think they have thought it out.

Kissinger: I think His Majesty is right. They have not systematically addressed themselves to the questions.

I will talk to the Prime Minister. I won't get anywhere. I have to say honestly that this is a very fair paper. I would push it a little towards Allon Plan. It is not in our interest to push you into a settlement that makes you vulnerable in the Arab world.

What is your view of what the Egyptians are really up to? Will they challenge you if you settle first?

Hussein: Yes, but we can face that.

Kissinger: You think you could handle any Egyptian challenge?

Hussein: Yes.

Kissinger: If one could somehow separate the security issue from the sovereignty issue, would that make the security issue much easier to solve?

Rifai: Yes. As you separated the military issues from the political issues. [laughter]

Kissinger: And now they won't give us back our POW's!

Rifai: The Egyptian challenge will really depend on the terms of the settlement. If they are honorable, there will be no problem.

Kissinger: Has Israel ever stated the outline of the borders it wants?

Rifai: Only generally. It means no Jerusalem, no Gaza, extension of the line to El Qualquilya, and annexing part of the Jordan Valley. There is no reciprocity. They publish these maps. If they would consider an exchange of territory, so it would not be one-sided, that would be better.

Kissinger: There could be an extraterritorial corridor to Gaza? How long will that be, 100 miles?

Hussein: Much less. Only 20 kilometers.

Rifai: We have been thinking that the Americans will build us an elevated highway so that we can get to Gaza without going through Israel!

Kissinger: Mr. Rifai, you could come over here if we ever get somewhere in these talks?

Rifai: Oh, yes.

Kissinger: We are seriously considering it. If you are prepared to go first, at least we can have a rational discussion with you. What is Your Majesty's estimate of the time we have left for a settlement? One year, two years?

Hussein: Two years at the most. Then the extremists will take over.

Rifai: What worries us most is a resumption of the fighting.

Kissinger: Who could do that?

Rifai: It could happen by accident. Of course they would be beaten, but they could get desperate.

Kissinger: What should we do with Egypt?

Hussein: Keep going with it. Keep it quiet.

Kissinger: And they won't be able to play the United States off against the Russians, because the Russians and we have more important common interests than Egypt.

Hussein: And you can keep the Russians out. If Israel is intransigent now, it would be much worse with the Russians in.

Kissinger: Could a settlement actually last without making you totally vulnerable?

Hussein: It can last.

Kissinger: We will take your paper very seriously. I will talk to Mrs. Meir and take the liberty of getting in touch with you and Mr. Rifai.

Hussein: There is another development I would like to raise with you. The situation in Oman is getting very difficult. They have asked for help, in the form of helicopters, transports and supplies, from the Saudi Arabians and us in order to prevent a disaster there. They are also asking us the position of our friends in the United States if the situation collapses, or if there is more open intervention by South Yemen.

Kissinger: What can we do?

Hussein: Our Saudi friends have the resources but not the imagination.

Kissinger: [*1 line not declassified*]

Hussein: [*1 line not declassified*]

Kissinger [to Rodman]: Peter, make sure that Scowcroft does too. We are seeing Helms today. He will have a special responsibility in this area. We want something done. Peter, have Scowcroft tell Schlesinger that we want something done.

Hussein: I want to discuss our military modernization program.

Rifai: We want to know where this stands.

Kissinger: Peter, have Scowcroft tell Defense that we want to see what the next three-year military assistance program looks like for Jordan. We will force them to develop a program and to discuss it with you. We will be very sympathetic on all of these things.

Rifai: Ironically, we will have to be stronger in the case of a peace settlement than if, God forbid, another war broke out.

Kissinger: You are right. There will be turmoil if there is peace.

Your Majesty was cooler in September 1970 than many of my colleagues. The night after we moved the aircraft carriers in, after the Syrians invaded, a senior colleague of mine called me and said, "You are responsible for starting World War III."

Rifai: Here is the paper we gave General Brett on our military assistance needs. [Tab B][8]

Kissinger: [To Rodman] Tell Scowcroft to send a memo to Defense. We want to see their program.

[The meeting then concluded.][9]

---

[8] Not attached, and not found.

[9] Kissinger recalled: "Hussein repeated his willingness to make peace with Israel. But despite secret contacts he faced an impasse. Hussein symbolized the fate of Arab moderates. He was caught between his inability to sustain a war and his unwillingness to make common cause with the radicals. He was prepared for a diplomatic solution, even a generous one, but Israel saw no incentive for negotiations so long as Hussein stood alone." Kissinger added that "Hussein . . . was profoundly mistrustful of Egypt, fearing that Sadat's volatility might do harm to Jordan as had Nasser's" and noted that what "turned out to be a tragedy for the peace process in the Middle East [was] the personal distrust between Sadat and Hussein." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 219)

31. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, February 27, 1973, 3:30–4 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Ambassador Rabin
Henry A. Kissinger
Peter Rodman

Dr. Kissinger: What is the chief significance of that document you gave me?[2]

Amb. Rabin: It's one of the fullest talks that covers all the issues between the two countries on the Arab side with Brezhnev. They reviewed the past, but talked about the future. He summed it up, and there is the memo he prepared for Sadat after he met with Brezhnev. And the letter.

Dr. Kissinger: You will get everything I tell them too? I said nice things about you! I told the Egyptians how dovish you are.

Amb. Rabin: There is a letter by Brezhnev committing himself to the MIG's—but warning them not to go to war without coordinating with the Russians. Therefore, I would say there are efforts of restraint on the part of the Russians. For that they will get a lot. He mentioned ground-to-ground missiles. Secondly, there was still a political option, but for that you have to mobilize the other Arab states, Brezhnev said, including the use of oil. Third, they are not against talking to you but it has to be done with very close consultation. Then Brezhnev and Ismail discussed the political approach, which was exactly as he put it to you.

The Prime Minister has read it. Her first reaction was, are they crazy to come with such a proposal to the Americans? It's the Russian proposal of 1969.[3] There is nothing new here.

Dr. Kissinger: That's all there is. In our discussions[4] there was something about staging and so forth, which I will give you orally.

Amb. Rabin: It's the toughest Egyptian position we have ever had.

Dr. Kissinger: Let me give you my impression. The factual situation. The position of Israel. There are not five Israelis who understand

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 135, Country Files, Middle East, Rabin, Vol. 3, 1972. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting took place in the Map Room at the White House. Brackets are in the original.

[2] Not attached.

[3] See *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XII, Soviet Union, January 1969–October 1970, Documents 58 and 60.

[4] See Document 28.

the American position, though three million think they do. You are one of the five.

I let him present his case. You will see the transcript. I asked questions, saying, "You want us to do something, therefore I have to know what you are talking about." So it was mostly cross examination by me. I did not express any view of the American position, except to say there has to be a new element. On a number of issues he said he would study it very carefully. This summary I sent you [Tab A][5] was done by Saunders.

I said there had to be some concreteness on security arrangements. So I did discuss whether special security zones could be discussed. He said, "What do you have in mind?" I summed up for him an article by the son of Rafael, which was in *Orbis* last year. He said he would study it.

Secondly, if I understand their proposal, they and we and you—but obviously they mean we deliver you—

Ambassador Rabin: This is how they discuss with the Russians.

Dr. Kissinger: —on general principles. Like, for example, what Dean Rusk said in 1967, it doesn't have to be more specific than that. Then after that they claim they would be willing to have more direct negotiations with Israel about the content of the principles and simultaneously begin the negotiations on Syria and Jordan. Unlike the Soviets. They said they would settle Egypt first and the others could come along close behind.

Amb. Rabin: That is nothing new.

Dr. Kissinger: I am just telling you. It's new to me but that doesn't make it new.

On the first day he took a hard line on the Palestinian issue. On the second day he retreated and said that the Jordanians could settle it, but he left it open that Egypt could raise the Palestinian issue within Jordan.

My impression is that in the context of total withdrawal they would agree to . . .

Amb. Rabin: To whatever stages of implementation.

Dr. Kissinger: They would not insist on demilitarized zones on the Israeli side, I think.

Amb. Rabin: Symbolic zones, it said.

Dr. Kissinger: But I think they would accept. On Sharm el-Sheik, he tried to indicate some flexibility on that. In the context of total withdrawal. Israeli international observers.

---

[5] Attached, but not printed.

Amb. Rabin: He said that to Sisco two years ago.

Dr. Kissinger: You look at the transcript when we get it done. The major point we have to come to some understanding on before you meet with the President is not to get into your Prime Minister's head that this is a triumphal tour of the United States. This is not how he is approaching the problem. Long speeches about how the status quo is the best will not help you. You do what you want, but I am telling you the facts.

Amb. Rabin: In the long run, I think she will say that we should try the lines we have tried. Of course, she will raise maintenance of the balance.

Dr. Kissinger: Continuation of the deliveries of planes?

Amb. Rabin: Yes, for 1974 and 1975. And the question of production.

Dr. Kissinger: What did Richardson say?

Amb. Rabin: We are meeting you first, before we see him. [*1 line not declassified*]

Dr. Kissinger: How did it go?

Amb. Rabin: I think he is not committed to anything.

Dr. Kissinger: The practical question the Prime Minister should focus on now is whether we can develop again a concrete strategy as we did in January.

Amb. Rabin: I asked myself, why do we need a new strategy?

Dr. Kissinger: Because there will be the Brezhnev meeting. One is the Egyptian strand; he will be back in touch with us.

Amb. Rabin: It is interesting in here: Brezhnev mentioned his talks with the United States—he did not say at what level—and wondered if the Soviets could continue contacts with the United States. He said he got the President to agree to 242 last year, in the communiqué.[6]

Dr. Kissinger: The Egyptians told me they had or would tell the Russians that they did not want the Russians to get into detailed negotiations with us, only give general support.

What you have to think about tomorrow morning is this: I can see some advantages in being in touch with the Egyptians and keeping the Russians out until summer. This is separate from what we talk about to the Egyptians.

Amb. Rabin: Did they say that as long as we are in touch you should not supply arms to Israel?

---

[6] The text of the May 29 communiqué issued at the conclusion of the U.S.-Soviet summit is printed in *Public Papers: Nixon, 1972*, pp. 635–642. Both sides reaffirmed their support for UNSC Resolution 242.

Dr. Kissinger: They didn't put it that crudely. He said it would be a big contribution.

[At this point Dr. Kissinger and the Ambassador conferred alone for the last five minutes.]

---

32. Conversation Between President Nixon and his Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, February 28, 1973.

Nixon: Hi, Henry.

Kissinger: I had a breakfast with Rabin and Golda Meir[2] [unclear]—

Nixon: I thought that's where you were. I told Ron, I said, "I'll bet you he's out [unclear]—"

Kissinger: I took—well, you wrote it on—slipped that I should talk to them before they came in to see you.

Nixon: Well, particularly in the light of your other conversation[3] [unclear]—

Kissinger: That's right; I gave them a brief summary of that.

Nixon: —what they've been saying is—

Kissinger: And also told them—

Nixon: You see, if they come in with a straight stonewall, and so forth, first, it's going to leak. And then—

Kissinger: No, I told them that that was impossible, and that they had to come—

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Tapes, Conversation No. 865–22. No classification marking. According to the President's Daily Diary, Nixon met with Kissinger in the Oval Office between 11:07 and 11:52 a.m. (Ibid., White House Central Files) The editors transcribed the portion printed here specifically for this volume.

[2] According to his Record of Schedule, Kissinger met Meir and Rabin on February 28 from 8:15 to 10:55 a.m. (Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box 238, Miscellany, 1968–1976) Rabin later recorded that Meir expressed to Kissinger "Israel's willingness to advance toward both an overall settlement and a partial agreement for the reopening of the canal. But Kissinger's only response was that 'in the absence of any new ideas or proposals, there will be no progress."' (Rabin, *The Rabin Memoirs*, p. 215)

[3] See Document 28.

Nixon: Well, they have begun. They've shifted their position, which I think was absolutely correct from the standpoint of their world initiative on the plane thing,[4] which I'll have you know, when you get—when you get caught with your hand in the cookie jar, you've got to [laughs], you've got to do it. They were on a bad wicket there. But, the other thing is more fundamental—more fundamental.

Kissinger: Well, I'm trying to see whether I can get them to tell you some details—

Nixon: Something—

Kissinger: —of an interim settlement they'd be willing to accept, so that we can get that thing started.

Nixon: Rather than the head—rather than the points.

Kissinger: Well, then, to agree in principle to a continued exchange—

Nixon: But you're aware—

Kissinger: —without telling them exactly what's going to be in that exchange until [unclear]—

Nixon: Yeah, yeah. I meant, though, I thought the interim settlement is much more difficult than getting the agreement on the general principles.

Kissinger: No, I think—

Nixon: With all the other—the second is the language thing, which the Israelis are brilliant at. The first is the substance thing, which they just don't want to give anything on.

Kissinger: No, they're so afraid that once they agree to general principles they're going to be pressured into an overall settlement. They were more receptive this morning to giving details on an interim agreement. I told them—

Nixon: We just couldn't stand here on this. You just can't say, for example, for them to come in, Henry, which is obvious from what I have seen, from [*2 seconds not declassified*], and then they in—they want more planes. They're not going to get 'em. They're not going to get 'em with—and not offering anything, because we've done it for four years and nothing has happened. Now, this doesn't mean we're going to force them, but we can't be in a position of saying to the Congress, "Look, more planes." What about the settlement? Nothing. Diddling us, they—they already have. They can get 'em if they need 'em. I asked Helms. You said to suggest—to ask him, you know, whether—what the balance was, and he said they can—he said that they could lick any and all of their enemies, provided the Soviet stays out, for five years

[4] See footnote 2, Document 22.

without any more planes, because their, he says, the advantage is enormous. But, he says, they don't—they won't admit it, which is a great tribute to how good they are. At least that's his analysis, for whatever it's worth.

Kissinger: They're certainly superior now. It depends how much the Russians put in. That's really what it depends upon—

Nixon: That's what Helms pointed out. He said that the Russians—the Russians, particularly in personnel [unclear]. And—but Helms's point seems to be that—which we're all aware of—that the Israelis are just so damn good with what they have than their damn, poor, stupid neighbors that can't act without the Russians. Maybe—

Kissinger: Well, if they don't get any planes, then they're going to be bastards in negotiations. So, the question is—

Nixon: What's the point? No, I'm all for—I'm all for quid pro quo. I mean, we got to. But you see, before, we said, "Give 'em the planes and keep giving them so that they will not be bastards in negotiations." We've given them the planes, and they've still been bastards in negotiations.

Kissinger: Yeah, well—

Nixon: Up to this point.

Kissinger: With the Jordanians. With the Egyptians, neither side has really done anything.

Nixon: Not too much.

Kissinger: But—but I agree that they have—

Nixon: If I were they, I'd do the same thing, but it's this position that we can't be in because of other games we're playing—

Kissinger: I agree.

Nixon: —on the world scene. That's the point, I mean, as you well know—

Kissinger: I agree completely.

33. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, March 1, 1973.

SUBJECT

Mrs. Meir's Talks Yesterday

Prime Minister Meir's talks in Washington yesterday seemed to have had their "ups and downs" and perhaps more of the latter.

She seems to have put her main emphasis on the subject of aircraft.

—In Defense, the discussion seems to have centered on the old argument by the Pentagon that Israel does not really need the aircraft, that it has enough security as is.[2]

—In State, Mr. Rush confirmed the principle of our ongoing supply relationship, made the point that these large deliveries cause problems for our own air force, and concluded that everything he said should be considered as preliminary comment since she would be seeing the President later.[3]

Apparently the conversation in State was mainly on these issues with Mr. Rush spending some time describing our impressions on the Hussein and Ismail visits, but she was unbriefed on the ICAO resolution[4] and got emotional about that. There was not a great deal of discussion about the question of peacemaking.

In short, she must have ended yesterday with more of a negative than a positive impression. Thus the usual has happened: Instead of trying to create a positive tone of close cooperation as a backdrop for whatever decisions are made, an atmosphere of some contention has been created. This, of course, leaves the President in a position to save

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 922, VIP Visits, Israel (Golda Meir's Visit), 1 Mar. 1973. Secret. Sent for information.

[2] The conversation between Meir and Secretary of Defense Richardson took place on February 28 at 4 p.m. in Richardson's office. (Memorandum of conversation; ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 135, Country Files, Middle East, Rabin/Kissinger (Dinitz), Jan.–July 1973 [2 of 3])

[3] The conversation between Prime Minister Meir and Acting Secretary of State Kenneth Rush took place on February 28. (Memorandum of conversation; ibid., Box 922, VIP Visits, Israel (Golda Meir's Visit), 1 Mar. 1973)

[4] On February 28, the Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization voted 105 to 1 (Israel) to condemn the Israeli actions that led to the downing of the Libyan airliner on February 21. U.S. Representative Betty Dillon voted "reluctantly" for the resolution, saying that the United States did not favor prejudging Israel by condemning it before the investigation had begun.

the day, but it does not necessarily create confidence in a close relationship between our two governments as well.

I am attaching rough and uncleared summaries from the talks in State and the Pentagon yesterday.[5]

[5] Attached, but not printed.

34. Conversation Between President Nixon and his Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, March 1, 1973.

Kissinger: Now on Mrs. Meir, [unclear] here's the situation. Here's the situation. We had a major crisis today; I didn't bother you yesterday. We condemned Israel in the United Nations for the shootdown. And she says she's up for election this year so if she comes over here why is she in this country.

Nixon: Why did we do that?

Kissinger: It was stupidity. Scali talked to the Israelis up there.

Nixon: Yeah.

Kissinger: Rabin says their guy up there is very anti-American, and the more we embarrass—and belongs to a faction that's against Mrs. Meir.

Nixon: Oh.

Kissinger: So he didn't report it properly; so it didn't come to our attention.

Nixon: Right.

Kissinger: Well, there are two issues: one is the negotiation; the other is the weapons. On the negotiation, she's prepared to tell you what they're willing to do on the interim agreement. She feels she cannot volunteer—

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Tapes, Conversation No. 866–4. No classification marking. According to the President's Daily Diary, Nixon met with Kissinger in the Oval Office between 9:47 and 10:37 a.m. (Ibid., White House Central Files) The editors transcribed the portion printed here specifically for this volume.

Nixon: Is she definitely going to run? I saw in the news summary, in your summary here,[2] that this fellow—

Kissinger: [unclear]—

Nixon: —says she's not going to run.

Kissinger: Well—

Nixon: She'll probably regardless.

Kissinger: She hasn't decided yet, but the impression she makes is that she's running.

Nixon: Yeah.

Kissinger: So, she is willing to proceed on the interim settlement and tell you what ideas she has, and they're—

Nixon: Right.

Kissinger: —they're at least workable with. On the private contacts, she feels she cannot volunteer, but if you ask her, she'll agree to it.

Nixon: Private contact with Sadat?

Kissinger: With Egypt and the Soviet Union. She feels—

Nixon: Right.

Kissinger: —she cannot be in position of telling you to ask for other contacts—

Nixon: I handle it. [unclear] Fine. Good.

Kissinger: —but that if you raise it, she'll agree to it. That's it for now. Second, on the planes, they have req—

Nixon: The only thing I was concerned about, the briefing paper here is that it's making a commitment for the planes.

Kissinger: Well, here it was—

Nixon: I think—I know we said it all along: "Well, let's not let the planes get in the way of the agreement." Well, if we [unclear]—

Kissinger: No, here's what the State and Defense Departments have recommended that we—you should recommend. They are in favor that—of your accepting aid in their production for a hundred planes. And—and giving them 15 a year for 4 years. My recommendation is that on the—they have asked for 66 a year. My recommendation is that you don't get into the numbers at all.

Nixon: All right.

Kissinger: That you say to them that you're willing to have them work out with our people the—for the future deliveries of F–4s and A–4s. Now, within the framework, you'll give it sympathetic consideration, now, and that you're willing to agree to the hundred, to the pro-

---

[2] Kissinger's news summary is ibid., NSC Files, Box 922, VIP Visits, Israel (Golda Meir's Visit), 1 Mar. 1973.

duction of a hundred airplanes. They're going to do it anyway; it's just a question of doing it a little faster—

Nixon: Yeah.

Kissinger: Then she can say—and that should be not enough, but at least she can go home to her Cabinet as if she got something. If you turn her off completely—which no one has recommended, incidentally, neither Defense nor State—this with respect to production is exactly what—

Nixon: What they want. I know.

Kissinger: —what State—no, no. It's half of what they want.

Nixon: On production?

Kissinger: They want to produce two hundred. It's exactly—

Nixon: Oh, exactly.

Kissinger: It's exactly what State and Defense recommended.

Nixon: I get it.

Kissinger: And on purchase, it leaves open the numbers for a later discussion. And if you can do that, I think then the discussion—I mean, that's much less than they want; it's half of what they want to produce, and it gives them no fixed figures on, on delivery.

Nixon: [Pause] Yeah. Ok.

---

35. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, March 1, 1973, 11:03–12:25 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

President Nixon
Golda Meir, Prime Minister of Israel
Yitzhak Rabin, Ambassador of Israel
Simcha Dinitz, Director General, Prime Minister's Office
Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
M. Gen. Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1026, Presidential/HAK Memcons, Memcons—Presidential/HAK, January–March 1973. Secret; Nodis. The meeting took place in the Oval Office. Brackets are in the original. There is a Presidential tape recording of the meeting ibid., White House Tapes, Oval Office, Conversation No. 866–15, that covers the period 11:03 a.m.–12:39 p.m.

[The press was admitted.]

President: You can imagine the problems we had on the dinner. We made 100 friends and 1000 enemies. Everyone wanted to come.

Ambassador Rabin, I want to congratulate you—I know you're 51 today. We first met after the '67 war. He's been a great Ambassador. I will miss him.

I want to welcome Mr. Dinitz. We first met in the Mayflower here in '68. My '67 trip was non-political.

Mrs. Holton said how kind you were to her son who visited Israel.

Meir: We are very happy to have visitors.

President: It takes time. That is the problem. There's only so much time in a day, so correspondence must be done at night.

[The President met the Israeli press. The press departed at 11:10 a.m.]

Meir: I want to give you congratulations from the depth of my heart on your revolutionizing the world and creating for the first time hope in the hearts of people that we are approaching the end of wars. That people with different ideas and beliefs can live in peace. This is a great contribution.

President: As you are aware, there are what we call hopeless idealists. They see us trusting Mao, trusting Brezhnev, and they think as a result the world has changed—that the Communists have changed, that we have, and that the world is safe. This may be partly true. As Ambassador Rabin said, we have changed the world because of this dialogue and these agreements. There are improved chances that confrontation will not explode into war.

We are realistic about the dangers which still exist. Many here say that since the world is at peace, we can reduce arms to spend on ghettos. But there will be more until our adversaries really change. So publicly we say that it is good to say that these moves have happened—we wouldn't have had a Vietnam settlement without our moves toward China and the Soviet Union, we wouldn't have these moves with the Soviet Union without the Chinese initiative—but we will not change our ground.

Meir: I told Willy Brandt—at the Socialist International—don't become dewy eyed or drop your guard.

President: One thing you can do with your fellow Socialists. They are naive and think we can all drop our defenses. It doesn't mean we're still in the Cold War, but we must be realistic.

They talk about the golden rule. My rule in international affairs is: do unto others as they would do unto you.

Kissinger: Plus 10 percent.

Meir: We must be realistic. There may be a possibility of coexistence.

President: We mean live separately.

Meir: In the meeting of the Socialist leaders . . .

Kissinger: [Explained the meeting.]

Meir: I said I knew all about cease fires and peacekeeping. Palme[2] said he knew the next most. Kreisky[3] is good.

President: It's too bad Austria is so small.

Meir: Brandt didn't come. The Belgian is good, and the British shadow cabinet.

President: Woodrow Wilson was the biggest idealist in this office. When he went to Versailles, the pragmatists gobbled him up.

Except for Versailles, there never would have been a Hitler. What do you think, Henry?

Kissinger: Versailles was either too soft or too tough.

President: It was too tough.

Kissinger: It humiliated Germany without weakening it. It put all the weight on France, and Russia fell out. A disaster.

President: I'm glad you had a talk with Henry.[4]

Get this out of the way because they will ask. On the plane accident. It was unfortunate. When you have this situation, things like this can happen.

Mrs. Meir wouldn't have wanted this to happen and if they did they would have been too smart to do it this way.

On ICAO, it never came to me. We would have pushed for an investigation first. It was a misunderstanding.

Meir: It was a misunderstanding. I want you to know that at the UN in January we got warnings from friends that the Black September Organization was planning a plane full of explosives to crash into an Israeli city. At Lod we had Japanese kamikazes. So we had to consider it a serious matter.

I want you to know that if we had any doubt that there were passengers we never would have done it. Nobody is more sorrowful than me.

President: We understand. The main thing is that we don't want the Israeli position in the world to suffer. Your statement was good—to help the innocent victims.

---

[2] Olof Palme, Swedish Prime Minister and leader of the Social Democratic Party.

[3] Bruno Kreisky, Chancellor of Austria.

[4] See footnote 2, Document 32.

In Vietnam, when we hit the hospital—our bombing was accurate because we could have wiped out Hanoi in three days. We want your position to be one which can be supported throughout the world.

Meir: In the Lebanon strike, the easiest way would have been air strikes. But they were next to a refugee camp, so we walked in for hours. We injured no refugees. I worried until they got back, but we did it to save lives.

President: Two major issues we always seem to discuss: arms and economic issues. On the negotiations. Do you have any others?

Let me begin. While you have been concerned at times over the past four years about us standing by you, I have kept our commitment to you and not squeezed you. That will continue.

Now we think it is important to move together to get off dead center in the negotiations. You can't link giving arms to negotiations. We give aid because it is in our interest that Israel be able to defend itself. But we also are interested, and you, in negotiating.

Meir: First, every commitment of yours has been meticulously kept. We never had it so good. There is mutual confidence. If you had doubts about our use of arms, we wouldn't get them. The arms we get are for self-defense and have also prevented war. Otherwise, there would have been shooting over the Canal.

Your policy has been correct. It has not only given us defense but prevented violence. We have been asked—now that Vietnam is over—don't you fear the US will be more active in the Middle East? The answer is we don't oppose it. On the contrary. The question is how to go about it.

Our stand is we will negotiate any time, anywhere.

We got a note last May that the Romanian Deputy Foreign Minister wanted to come in. Romania is the only Communist Government with diplomatic relations with us. He came in and told me that President Sadat wanted to see you. Can you come to Bucharest? I went and I was told Sadat wanted peace and Sadat thinks a meeting with Mrs. Meir is essential. I said tell him we sincerely want peace and would be glad to meet. He said good, you will hear within two weeks. Since then nothing. I am sure Ceausescu delivered the message, but nothing.

So we are prepared for direct negotiations, proximity talks which you suggested. All Israel is ready—with any Middle East country.

Kissinger: Hussein sent a special message the day before yesterday before he left.[5]

President: [Reads the note.]

---

[5] See footnote 2, Document 39.

Let me suggest a possible way to proceed. There are two tracks. The public track—the difficulty is once you launch it, it has to work or one or both sides must react. However, public discussions must go forth.

But just between us, we have found that because of my relations with Kissinger and the way we work together, by the time we go to the summit in Moscow and Peking we know what will and won't happen. So they were a success. We haven't done this in your area. You haven't wanted it.

Here is the proposal. You must have confidence in me. We know your elections are coming, and so on. The energy crisis is putting public pressure on doing something in the Middle East.

You are in a strong position—you can take care of yourself, except for the Soviet Union.

You are so strong that Egypt is coming to us. We think the Soviet Union wants to get Egypt off their back—we don't really know.

I would like Henry to explore privately with Egypt what might be possible—not negotiate for Israel, but he should know what your positions are. The same with the Soviet Union. Brezhnev will come, probably in June, and this will be an opportunity to do the same with them. Henry has told you of our dialogue with them. I can give assurance that Henry will conduct this absolutely off-the-record. If it is okay, let us see if there is a settlement possibility. You know Egypt wants to see an overall solution. You want security; they want sovereignty.

Now this is most sensitive. It must be fuzzy. Henry is a master of fuzzy language. The reason Sadat doesn't want to talk with you, Mrs. Meir, is he is afraid you would gobble him up.

Tell the Chou story, Henry.

Kissinger: Chou said "We don't have a chance. Kissinger is the only man who can talk for 1-1/2 hours without saying anything."

President: Maybe it won't work, but I think we should try, both tracks. We won't broker for you but we should know the outline of what you want.

Meir: We are strong, thanks to you, but we want a situation of peace in the Middle East.

We know you are talking to Egypt and the Soviet Union. Egypt wants you to deliver Israel to them. First they asked the Soviet Union, now you. We know better.

What we want is that you not come to a separate position that we would not know about. We want security; we are not concerned with sovereignty. What does Egypt really want? They tell their friends that Israel must go back to the '67 borders and deal with the Palestinians.

We agree with a Suez interim step. The line of withdrawal would be clearly temporary and subject to final negotiations. This means a lot to us. We would be leaving our natural defenses and the strongest point we have against Egypt; it shows we are prepared to take a risk for peace. We want the Suez Canal cleared and operating, in the hope that the sides, if separated from each other, won't shoot. We want people moving to their cities along the Canal, because that enhances the chance of no fighting.

We will even let some police on East Bank. We wouldn't implement a right to use the Suez Canal. We would insist on the right but not use it. That would save face for Sadat.

So here is something that can be done if they really want.

Kissinger: These proposals have never been formally put.

President: You mean publicly?

Kissinger: I have a number of points. It can be done in one of two ways. Let State start an interim settlement procedure, and get proximity talks going.

President: Don't tell State the Israeli position. Just that Israel will be reasonable.

State has to be doing something. Have State move, but don't give them the whole position. Let Henry sell this.

Meir: We won't say publicly, but we are willing to withdraw to the passes. But I won't tell State.

President: Yes, we can't have it leak.

Kissinger: There will be a couple of months of just getting things going in the public channel.

Meir: The trouble with Egypt is they want to end before they begin. Our stand is that the practical possibility is this interim agreement.

President: I have talked to Hafez Ismail.[6] They are hard, but I think there is a window, don't you think?

Kissinger: There is no flexibility in their position, but there is in their attitude. Now we know something of your position.

President: I told Ismail that the two are far apart and we must have something in between, and what is their view? That is where we are.

What is the Soviet position?

Kissinger: Now that Egyptian talks are going, the Soviet Union will want a position paper on it. We can say that now that we are talking with Egypt, Egypt says they don't want a specific scheme from the Soviet Union. Dobrynin will probably bring back a specific scheme from Moscow.

---

[6] See Document 26.

President: If we, as the middle man, are talking to both sides, you are in a good position, because we tilt to you.

Meir: The Soviet Union told Ismail don't give in to the U.S. They didn't say go to war—they were cautious there—but said they would get the MIG–23 and send pilots to the Soviet Union.

Kissinger: We always get the transcript of these exchanges.

Meir: We share them with you.

They want Egypt to be inflexible. They want a repeat of the '57 performance. So they say "Don't compromise."

Kissinger: They don't like Sadat. They keep him inflexible so as to undermine him.

President: The Soviet Union is playing to the radicals in the area. We can't let them play the middle man.

Meir: Yes, they are playing with Syria. Qaddafi is the first madman in the area, Syria is the second.

President: Shall we do this then? Kissinger and Dinitz.

Kissinger: And on your side, keep it in the Prime Minister's office?

Meir: Yes. And now to hardware.

Production. The Pentagon said they would help with the prototype. It was successful. Now we want production. We want the Pentagon to say the prototype is successful, now go ahead.

As I said, we never had it so good. The planes are coming in and we are okay through '73. But we need to know for 74–75. No publicity—only if the deliveries are not made. If you decide 36–30, for 74–75, there will be absolutely no publicity.

President: Nothing should be said. As I understand on the numbers, it is better to indicate agreement in principle, with the details to be worked out. Is that okay, Henry?

Kissinger: Yes, we look sympathetically in both places, but let the numbers be agreed on by the experts.

The difficulty we have is the bureaucracy recommended a very small number. The President can't just overrule.

President: The recommendation is for a small number. We know you feel strongly. We will look sympathetically on the number you suggested. We will not take the recommendation of State and DOD, but with your number, we will look on the basis of no linkage.

I don't want to be in a position of overruling the bureaucracy. We will treat you right.

Rabin: Distinguish between public and private. In public, Mrs. Meir will say we don't discuss our military relationship in public and the U.S. will say that it will do whatever is needed for the balance of

power. Privately, let's agree here we *will* get planes, both kinds, and you look sympathetically on the numbers.

President: How does that sound?

Meir: I always give in. [Laughter] Now on production.

President: You want 200, we will give you 100.

Rabin: At least 100.

President: Yes. Okay, Henry?

Kissinger: Yes.

Rabin: The problem is knowhow. We need decisions to give us knowhow. We can't go into production for only 100. Let's agree for now, at least 100, okay?

Kissinger: I'll check with DOD. As I see it, it makes no difference to us. We are not committed; we just left it open.

Meir and Rabin: What we want is that there is not now a decision of only 100, and nothing more.

President: Okay?

Kissinger: Make it clear to DOD. We are not committed to more than 100.

Meir: I don't want to go into details. My Finance Minister has talked . . .

President: We have budget problems, we understand.

[The President left at 12:21 and returned at 12:22]

Meir: Henry said we must break at 12:30.

One other point. We have people coming in, but the Soviet Union is bad. They have people in prison just because they want to go to Israel. This ransom is terrible. If they would only let them leave. Anyone who applies for emigration loses his job, and usually goes to prison.

President: I know about anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

Meir: Now it is official.

President: Yes. Now what do we do? We have talked to them, Henry and I, and we will continue—but privately. We could do it publicly—like the Congress—but what good would that do? They would slow down. It is unfortunate that Senators are tying MFN to exit fees. But that would be too popular for me.

I am willing to play a hard line—my Vietnam bombing decision indicates my toughness—if it will work. But if we do this publicly—tie them together—they can't back down. My view is we can accomplish more—our conversations with the Russians are tough, frankly; that is why we get along—by doing it privately. Publicly, they would slam the door.

Kissinger: I agree.

President: We will put it to the Soviet Union, you can be sure. We have experience with these people, and taking a public position would hurt. Privately, yes, but publicly we will deny we are linking. I am afraid if this continues to escalate, it will not help the Jewish Community. They are even worse than you say.

Meir: There is one with terminal TB.

I don't ask you to do it publicly. I don't expect the Soviet Union to publicly say "no more fees."

President: But Congressmen say the linking has the support of Israel.

Kissinger: The important thing is for you not to influence the Congressmen.

Meir: I can't talk to American Jews about Russian Jews. Not all Jews will go to Israel. The Soviets are fools. They could get all the good will in the world.

Kissinger: The problem is not that you should say anything, but if you could restrain friendly Senators not to push the Jackson Amendment.[7]

President: For us to make progress here is in your hands. We can't face down the Soviet Union any more—it would mean mutual suicide. We have a dialogue. You can lick anybody except the Soviet Union. We have to keep them out. Let us develop a Soviet policy so we can influence them. Brezhnev is a tough cookie.

[Everyone got up.]

You will be asked about planes by the press. Just stick to what we agreed.[8]

---

[7] On October 4, 1972, Senator Henry Jackson, who was responding to restrictions on Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union, sponsored an amendment to the trade bill that precluded granting Most-Favored-Nation status to any Communist country restricting emigration.

[8] Kissinger wrote in his memoirs: "With respect to negotiations, Golda's attitude was simple. She considered Israel militarily impregnable; there was, strictly speaking, no need for any change. But given the congenital inability of Americans to leave well enough alone, she was willing to enter talks, though not to commit herself to an outcome. She felt Jordanian matters were well in hand because there was already direct contact (which no fair-minded observer could claim had speeded up the process of settlement). As to Egypt, she was prepared to make an interim disengagement agreement along the Suez Canal as a first step toward a final settlement. But she would not agree to final boundaries before negotiations had even started: Egypt, she argued, was looking for someone to help it get everything for nothing." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 221)

36. Conversation Between President Nixon and his Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, March 1, 1973.

Kissinger: And that, that was a tough—I mean, they bloodied Joe, but, you know, they're, basically—if Rogers had made the proposition that he talk to the Egyptians and Russians, they would have been hanging from the ceiling. That's been a fixed position. I mean, you sort of—and all, and all those, so, of course, they have a hell of a lot more confidence in you.

Nixon: Well, they figure we're not going to screw them. Now, did they—is the position that they have suggested really something that—

Kissinger: But their position—

Nixon: —has any viability at all?

Kissinger: Well, their position—no, I think their position has viability, and I think the position itself—

Nixon: Then, for God's sakes, don't tell State.

Kissinger: The Egyptians will almost certainly accept. Where the hang-up will occur—I mean, there'll be some—

Nixon: Yeah?

Kissinger: The only hang-up in their position is going to be—they've given us a deeper withdrawal. I don't know whether you [unclear]—

Nixon: No, I don't know much—

Kissinger: She said[2] up to the passes. Well, that's twice as much as they've ever talked about.

Nixon: I don't—I don't think you—do you plan to sit down and go through that with Sisco, now?

Kissinger: No. No.

Nixon: Well, that's my point. I feel that—what are you going to have Sisco do then?

Kissinger: The lack of viability—now, the trouble with their position is they will only let police forces cross the Canal. The Egyptians will want to put some military forces across. That's going to be a

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Tapes, Conversation No. 866–16. No classification marking. According to the President's Daily Diary, Nixon met with Kissinger in the Oval Office between 12:44 and 1:06 p.m. (Ibid., White House Central Files) The editors transcribed the portion printed here specifically for this volume.

[2] Golda Meir.

hang-up. All the others, I think, are acceptable. The big hang-up is going to occur, not on that but on how to link the interim agreement to an overall agreement, and this interim defense. If the Egyptians were willing to accept fuzzy language on general principles, we'd be home free. Well, what we can get Sisco to do in about two weeks—it shouldn't happen all that eagerly—is to propose a procedure for interim, for talks on an interim settlement. That will get us into a lot of procedural crap for four weeks. By that time, I will have had another talk with the Egyptians.[3] If the Egyptians give us—

Nixon: Sadat?

Kissinger: —give us vague general principles, then we can really move full-speed into the substance of the other position and do it in our channel.

Nixon: Yeah, as far as we're concerned, your main problem is getting the principles vague enough that the Israelis will accept them—

Kissinger: We—that's right. If we can get vague general principles, then we're in business.

Nixon: Now, you don't think you can talk them into that, do you?

Kissinger: I can't tell you. This last session—we've achieved one thing: the Egyptians are panting to get us involved, and they're willing to pay some price. I mean, it would have been unthinkable that they'd come to us.

Nixon: Yeah.

Kissinger: And I've sent you [unclear]. It's coming to you—you judge for yourself—a memo of the conversation.[4] They've been more specific in detail. Now, I wouldn't expect it. As you told Ismail,[5] why should they give away their position [in] the first session? So, they said they'd go back and study it and come back to us. If they give us a—if they have a movement, then at some point we may have to squeeze the Israelis into some—

Nixon: [unclear]—

Kissinger: We might have to screw them a bit.

Nixon: Yeah. We've got to tell 'em we're not squeezing them and then squeeze 'em.

Kissinger: That's right. That's right. So, that's the—that's the biggest hang-up. The position itself on interim agreement is still gonna be tough, but that, I think, is manageable, because that can be a big issue of whether—

---

[3] See Document 63.

[4] See Document 28.

[5] See Document 26.

Nixon: Right.

Kissinger: —they put a few troops, or even if they call them police—

Nixon: Right.

Kissinger: —frontier guards, or whatever.

Nixon: Good. And, you know, as a matter of fact, though, I was thinking of this conversation, Henry, that we—you've had with them, and the way we prepared this—now, this is just one of the things—and the way that Kennedy, or for that matter Johnson would have. Johnson did not care about it—

Kissinger: Well, Johnson—

Nixon: For God's sakes, the problem was—the problem is in dealing with somebody that's intelligent, there's got to be subtlety. You got to go around. You got to hang up something good at the beginning and then come back with something else and then—

Kissinger: On it, you knew exactly where you were going. I mean, basically, you cut their request on production by—to a third. They asked for 300; they're down to 100. You didn't give them any specific commitments on airplanes, and you made them like it. That—and, also, that you prepare your meetings very carefully.

Nixon: Then, we also say we weren't linking anything, knowing damn well we will.

---

37. Memorandum From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to Secretary of State Rogers and Secretary of Defense Richardson[1]

Washington, March 2, 1973.

During his meeting with Prime Minister Meir on March 1, 1973, the President made the following decisions:

—The United States will assist Israel in the production of at least 100 Super Mirage aircraft. The technical arrangements are to be worked out immediately.

—There will be a continuation of the supply pipeline for A–4 and F–4 aircraft during the years FY 1974 and FY 1975. The Israeli requested

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 922, VIP Visits, Israel (Golda Meir's Visit), 1 Mar. 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive.

figures for numbers of aircraft to be supplied will be considered sympathetically, but the exact number will be determined through negotiation by the experts of the two countries.

For your guidance, the President is thinking in terms of a higher figure than the joint State–Defense recommendation, but did not wish to commit himself to any specific number.[2]

Henry A. Kissinger

[2] In addition, on March 2, Kissinger approved a recommendation in a memorandum from Saunders and Kennedy to sustain Nixon's December 1972 decision to provide Israel with $25 million in Supporting Assistance in FY 1974. The memorandum noted that this compared with $50 million in FY 1973, but explained that this reduction had been made because of Israel's good foreign exchange position and the President's desire to maintain a tight budgetary ceiling. A handwritten notation on the memorandum indicates that OMB was notified on March 6. (Ibid., Box 610, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 12 (Mar. 73–Oct. 73))

38. Editorial Note

On March 7, 1973, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Henry Kissinger forwarded a letter from Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev to President Nixon in which Brezhnev stated that a Middle East settlement remained "the second most important unfinished problem." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 495, President's Trip Files, Dobrynin–Kissinger, 1973, Vol. 15 [Jan.–1973]) On March 6 and March 8, Kissinger met with Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin, who had just returned from consultations in Moscow. In a March 8 memorandum, Kissinger reported to the President that he had given Dobrynin a rough summary of his talks with Ismail and had suggested that the United States and the Soviet Union might try to frame some general principles that could be used to promote an interim agreement. He noted that he had argued that there was no point in having detailed discussions as long as the United States was negotiating directly with the Egyptians; Dobrynin had not balked at this proposition. (Ibid.) Kissinger also told Dobrynin on March 8 that he thought there was no possibility of a settlement along the lines of the paper Gromyko had given him during his visit in April 1972, which represented the formal Arab position. (Memorandum of conversation, March 8; ibid.) On March 8, Nixon met with Dobrynin who concluded the conversation by citing the two issues Brezhnev regarded as the highest priority for the forthcoming June summit: the nuclear treaty

and the Middle East. (Memorandum of conversation, March 8; ibid.) Regarding the Soviet paper handed to Kissinger by Brezhnev during Kissinger's April 1972 visit to Moscow, see *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XIV, Soviet Union, October 1971–May 1972, Document 141, footnote 5.

On March 14, Brezhnev sent Nixon a message describing his talks in Moscow with Egypt's Minister of War, Ahmed Ismail, who had expressed the Egyptian Government's serious concern with the absence of any progress toward a peace settlement. Egypt had been subjected to Israeli aggression for six years and Arab lands were still occupied by Israel. Ismail had declared that although it preferred a peaceful settlement, the Egyptian Government was coming to the conclusion that military confrontation with Israel might become unavoidable. Therefore, Egypt had to prepare itself for the possibility of a new military clash. Brezhnev concluded his message by saying that he wanted to emphasize again the seriousness of the developing situation in the Middle East and to draw the President's attention to the necessity of taking constructive steps in order to prevent such a confrontation. Brezhnev argued that such a turn of events would not only cause irreparable damage to the countries in the region but hurt other countries as well. Therefore, much depended on having the Soviet Union and the United States take "agreed steps directed at settlement of the Middle East situation." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin and Kissinger, Vol. 5)

---

39. Backchannel Message From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to Jordanian King Hussein[1]

Washington, undated.

Your Majesty:

I want to thank you for your message of February 27, and also tell you how much I appreciated the chance to meet with you.[2] The President was most interested in what you had to say.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 137, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan/Rifai, January 3, 1973. No classification marking. The message is Tab A to a March 3 memorandum from Rodman to Kissinger which transmitted it as a draft reply to Hussein's February 27 message. A handwritten notation on the first page reads: "Sent 8 March 1973."

[2] In his message, which is attached, Hussein thanked Kissinger for meeting with him (see Document 30) and stated that he looked forward to "a continuation of our dia-

The suggestion you make in your message is of great interest, and we intend to look into it further.

As to the matters we discussed, I can report the following:

The President has directed A.I.D. and the State Department to assist your Government, within the approved total of assistance funds, in meeting the specific problem of the shortage of funds in the first half of this calendar year.[3]

I have communicated [*less than 1 line not declassified*] the President's interest in urgently addressing the Omani problem Your Majesty raised.

My office, at my direction, is closely monitoring the planning of military assistance for Jordan beyond the completion of your current three-year modernization program in FY 1974. We are studying the list which General Ben Shaker brought to Washington against U.S. availabilities and prices, and will then ask Your Majesty's permission formally to send a Defense Department team to Jordan to discuss requirements with your commanders on the ground. This is the procedure we followed with you in the formulation of the current three-year program. We shall then be in a position to develop a precise program together with your representatives. We would therefore hope to have by summer a response to your requests which would represent a follow-on three-year program for FY 1975–77.

I want to reiterate that, on this and other matters, the President is most anxious that Your Majesty call to his attention, through this channel, any specific difficulties or concerns that should arise. They will be addressed on an urgent basis and as a matter of personal Presidential priority.[4]

Warm regards.

---

logue and joint efforts to achieve our clear objective of an honorable, lasting peace in the Middle East." He also suggested "investigating the possibilities of setting up a multi-national Energy Commission which could arrive at long term arrangements of long duration with various oil producing countries in our area, thus helping to stabilize them and give them a degree of security and stability as far as their product's continuation is concerned, and perhaps eventually ensure that your own monetary problems are brought under control."

[3] See footnote 3, Document 30.

[4] Hussein replied on March 18, thanking Kissinger for his message and stating that the Jordanian Government had tried, as agreed in Washington, to solicit Saudi help to cover part of Jordan's $65 million budget shortfall. He regretted to say that they had been unsuccessful in their efforts and could not get the Saudis to understand or appreciate the urgency of Jordan's needs. Hussein said he realized that this placed an additional burden on the administration since Jordan now had to request the total amount of $65 million for CY 1973, with part of it needed before July 1. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 137, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan/ Rifai, January 3, 1973)

40. Memorandum From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, March 12, 1973.

SUBJECT

Comments by Ismail

Attached at Tab A[2] is a report of informal comments made by Egyptian emissary Ismail [*less than 1 line not declassified*] subsequent to the secret discussions. The following remarks are of particular interest. Ismail:

—Was highly pleased with the talks in every respect and deeply gratified by his entire reception in the U.S. The private talks exceeded his expectations because of their comprehensiveness and frankness.

—Regretted that he was unable to be more specific and hoped he could be more so at the next meeting. He is already considering plans for a secret trip in April and hopes that at some point I will be able to visit Cairo.

—Agreed to your formula regarding the balance between sovereignty and security. If Egyptian sovereignty over Sinai could be restored, practical security arrangements might be worked out.

—Noted that the new Defense Minister, General Ali, has worked effectively to heal divisions resulting from the decision to terminate the Soviet advisory program and that Ali's job now was to keep the military out of politics.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 131, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. IV, February 24–May 19, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Eyes Only. A stamped notation on the first page reads: "The President has seen."

[2] Attached, but not printed.

41. Backchannel Message From the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail) to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Cairo, March 20, 1973.

[*1 paragraph (7 lines) not declassified*]

Thank you for your message.[2]

1. In Dr. Kissinger's message, a reference was made to the unfortunate incident in Khartoum.[3] It was our understanding that such a question would be dealt with through other channels,[4] while we proceeded, surmounting all obstacles, in our effort towards achieving peace in our region. Commenting on that incident, as well as on the two previous in-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 131, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. IV, February 24–May 19, 1973. Secret; Sensitive.

[2] On March 9, Kissinger wrote Ismail that their talks had been of great value and that he appreciated the manner in which Ismail had conducted them. He said that, as promised, he had informed Prime Minister Meir privately about their extended talks and had characterized their discussion "in a very general way." Kissinger noted that he would be "talking intensively with the Israelis in an effort to develop an understanding of their position as it might relate to possible heads of agreement in the plan [Ismail] outlined." (Ibid.)

[3] In the early evening of March 1, eight Black September Organization terrorists seized the Saudi Embassy in Khartoum during a diplomatic reception. The terrorists took U.S. Ambassador Cleo Noel, U.S. Deputy Chief of Mission George C. Moore, the Belgian Chargé, the Saudi Ambassador, and the Jordanian Chargé hostage. In return for the hostages' freedom, the terrorists demanded the release of various individuals, mostly Palestinian guerrillas, imprisioned in Jordan, Israel, and the United States. The Khartoum operation was planned and carried out with the full knowledge and personal approval of Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization and the head of Fatah. When the terrorists became convinced that their demands would not be met and after they reportedly had received orders from Fatah headquarters in Beirut, they killed the two U.S. officials and the Belgian Chargé. Thirty-four hours later, upon receipt of orders from Arafat in Beirut, the terrorists released the other hostages unharmed and surrendered to Sudanese authorities.

[4] In telegram 51645 to Cairo, March 20, the Department suggested that if the Egyptians tried to link the subjects of terrorism and new U.S. arms contracts with Israel, the Interests Section should point out that the United States was committed to Israel's survival and defense and therefore had an ongoing military supply relationship with it. This did not alter the continued U.S. commitment to a peace settlement that would take legitimate Palestinian interests into account. The telegram noted the importance of preserving an international consensus as a foundation for an eventual peace settlement and warned that it was because Black September/Fatah terrorism threatened to strike at the heart of this consensus that Egypt, no less than the United States, should take a firm stand against it. If such terrorism were allowed to continue, it would drive a wedge between Arab states and the "entire civilized community which considers such methods anathema." (Ibid., Box 638, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, IX, January–October 73)

cidents over Sinai and on the northern borders of Lebanon, your attention is drawn to two considerations:

a. The gravity of the situation leading to serious developments due to the pressure of such incidents.

b. The extreme importance of reaching a settlement ensuring the political and human rights of the people of Palestine suffering, for the last quarter of a century, from loss of home and denial of identity.

2. We have taken note that Dr. Kissinger has started talks with the Israelis and that he intends to conduct further talks with them. At the same time, we expect that we continue exchanging thoughts so that we reach our next meeting with a clear picture of each other's views, a fact that might contribute to speedy progress.

3. In this regard, the preliminary assessment of the political leadership in Egypt of our talks is that Egypt is, again, expected to make concessions on the assumption that such concessions might presumably induce Israel to be more forthcoming. We have also noted the latest news reports concerning a new American commitment to provide Israel with new sophisticated weapons and military capabilities. This particular approach was precisely what caused the failure of the 1971 talks, and, if again adopted, it will keep us within the same vicious circle precluding any progress towards the kind of peace hoped for.[5]

4. Mr. Ismail received on March 10 the Soviet Ambassador and informed him of the results of the meeting with Dr. Kissinger, along the lines agreed upon. Mr. Ismail particularly told him of the agreement to pursue further contacts.[6]

---

[5] On March 22, Kissinger replied that he was proceeding with an earnest examination of the issues and was conducting discussions with other interested parties without revealing the content of his discussions with Ismail. He said that he was looking "forward to hearing the detailed reactions promised by Mr. Ismail at the last meeting and his proposals for a suitable date for the next meeting." (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 135, Country Files, Middle East, Rabin/Dinitz Sensitive Memcons, 1973)

[6] In telegram 859 from Cairo, March 22, Greene reported that he had met that day with Ismail and told him that the United States continued to search for a Middle East peace based on Resolution 242 that took into account the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinians, but took a "serious view of BSO/Fatah terror activities and Arab government support thereof." Ismail had "sternly rejected 'ultimatum'." He said that the Government of Egypt would not turn away from the Palestinians, considered that the United States rejected Resolution 242, was "accustomed to ups and downs in relations with [the U.S. Government] and [was] prepared to accept a down now." (Ibid., Box 638, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, IX, January–October 1973)

42. Memorandum From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, March 30, 1973.

SUBJECT

Fuller Analysis of President Sadat's Speech

The Daily Brief has contained the main points in President Sadat's speech of March 26. This memo includes a more extensive discussion and analysis, and excerpts of the section on foreign policy are attached.[2]

Background

Sadat has been struggling with troublesome domestic problems since last fall. Student riots in January were followed by press criticism of the regime's policies. Numerous journalists were dropped from the party or arrested last month. In February Sadat launched his diplomatic initiative, the main elements of which were Hafiz Ismail's visits to the Soviet Union and the United States. Sadat was roundly criticized in some Arab circles for opening a dialogue with the United States, especially after the news leaked that the US was preparing to continue supplying Israel with large quantities of arms and production facilities for aircraft.

The Content of the Speech

Sadat began his two and one-half hour speech by declaring that Egypt had reached a "prominent landmark." The stage which Egypt is entering is one of all-out confrontation. Turning to foreign policy, he chastised the United States, and Secretary Rogers in particular, for carrying on psychological warfare against Egypt over the past year by building up Israeli military superiority, thereby removing the hope that Egypt might regain its territory by military means. This created a "credibility gap" for Sadat both at home and in the Arab world.

Next Sadat described Hafiz Ismail's recent contacts with the USSR and the US. [See attachment for the relevant excerpts.][3] His main points about the US were that Egypt was being asked to make further concessions merely in order to start the process of a settlement, but not to solve the conflict; and that the US could not pressure Israel. Against

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1171, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—Jarring Talks, April 1–30, 1973. Secret. Sent for information. A handwritten note on the first page reads: "President has seen."

[2] Not attached.

[3] Brackets in the original.

these two facts, Sadat mentioned as a "positive" element your clarification of the need to find a way to balance Egyptian sovereignty and Israeli security concerns. He then retreated somewhat, referring to the possibility that this formula is simply a disguise for allowing Israel to remain in occupation of Egyptian territory indefinitely.

Much of the rest of the speech talked about the need for steadfastness on the domestic front and included a number of jibes at Marxist and other extremists.

Analysis

[*less than 1 line not declassified*] believes that Sadat's speech and the attendant Cabinet changes are aimed at strengthening his grip on the internal situation while he continues to move ahead with a comparatively "moderate" foreign policy. Rejecting the notion that the speech points up Sadat's weakness, [*less than 1 line not declassified*] view is that he has increased his own influence and control over the government. The chances for a new round of fighting have not increased. Sadat will continue his diplomatic initiatives and his military preparations. His terms for a settlement, however, have not softened.

The Interests Section, in contrast, says Sadat gave the impression of "a beleaguered man" reacting rather emotionally to problems with which he finds it difficult to cope. They note that his concept of "confrontation" appears to envision continuation of diplomatic efforts parallel to military preparations. The US remains the villain and, while the US view of reconciling Egypt's sovereignty with Israel's security may be "positive," subsequent US actions (e.g. more arms for Israel) gave this view the lie.[4]

My analysis is that Sadat has been giving considerable thought to what Ismail was told in Washington. He remains skeptical, but appears realistic about what he can expect from the US. Finally, he seems to be pondering the idea that the concept of restoring Egyptian sovereignty might allow for some arrangements that address Israel's security concerns. It would seem premature to judge that he has rejected the possibilities inherent in this concept. He carefully avoided any implied attack on you.

[4] The report is in telegram 909 from Cairo, March 27. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

43. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, March 30, 1973, noon–12:40 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Israeli Ambassador Simcha Dinitz
Minister Avner Idan
Dr. Henry A. Kissinger
Peter Rodman, NSC Staff

Amb. Dinitz: I appreciate very much that you can see me so soon. I just arrived last night.

Dr. Kissinger: We are going to California this afternoon.

Amb. Dinitz: Mrs. Meir sends her regards to you. I saw her last night before I left.

Dr. Kissinger: You can be sure we will work with you with the same openness that we had with your predecessor.

Amb. Dinitz: I appreciate that, I will do as little as possible to disturb you.

Dr. Kissinger: No, you should do whatever is necessary.

Amb. Dinitz: I have a few items to raise with you. First, about the meetings with Primakov.[2] This was the third time we met him. He was in Israel three years ago, when he met with the Prime Minister, the Minister of Defense and also myself. He said nothing of substance at that time. He just said that it was good for us to have an exchange of views. Then there was a more elaborate meeting that he had in Europe with Gazit in 1971. We told you about that. This time he asked for a meeting on his own initiative, not on ours. I should be more correct. Four months ago we wrote a letter responding to their letter after the 1971 meeting. They had said that it was a good meeting and they raised the possibility of other meetings. So we said we would be prepared if they were interested.

Two weeks ago, they replied.

The meeting took place in Vienna. It lasted eight hours, over three different sessions. The instructions that the Prime Minister issued to Gazit were that it was important to keep the pace of these meetings such as not to disturb the efforts of Dr. Kissinger.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 135, Country Files, Middle East, Rabin/Dinitz Sensitive Memcons, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting took place in the Military Aide's office in the East Wing of the White House.

[2] Yevgeny Primakov, Deputy Director of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Dr. Kissinger: She is so eager that I succeed!

Amb. Dinitz: We didn't value so much the contact but we couldn't say no.

Dr. Kissinger: No, you did the right thing.

Amb. Dinitz: He came with Kotov, who had been Second Secretary in their Embassy in Israel. The main point of the conversation was that they were trying to tell our representative that we had to enter detailed negotiations with them. "The time is past for general remarks. We put forth proposals in 1969 and you didn't negotiate." They wanted a mandate from us for the Soviets to play a role in the Middle East. "Don't assume that things can move without us." They were particularly disturbed that we were working only with the Americans. "Don't overestimate the events of July, 1972. It is not so important; we are still there, with friends and arms."

Throughout this discussion there was this veil of threats.

They said, "Frankly our position is in support of the Arab case, but we are different in that we support the survival and existence of Israel. Therefore, we don't support the elements in the Middle East that want your destruction."

They wanted our positions and they wanted negotiations. They said they were prepared to talk without prior conditions. They were so anxious for talks that they said—in the unofficial conversation—that they were prepared to send an official to Israel in a secret manner. We asked about the idea of sending an Israeli representative to Moscow. They were not particularly anxious for this. They said that an Israeli presence in Moscow would be an attraction to Soviet Jews.

On the question of Soviet Jews, he said that they were letting people out and no ransom was being collected. He did not think the number of Jews leaving would increase. He was quite reluctant to discuss the whole subject.

This covers the discussions. You may remember that they asked Ismail when he was in Moscow how the Arabs would look on it if the Soviets opened a dialogue with Israel. The Soviets explained it to him as something that would be good for the Arabs, as a form of pressure on Israel. That is how we see it—to embarrass the efforts we are taking with the United States.

Dr. Kissinger: I don't think they know where they are going either. We have no objection to your talking, as long as we keep each other informed.

We are following the strategy I explained to your Prime Minister. We are pushing nothing, we are wasting time. We are using the Egyptians to kill off talks with the Russians. The Egyptians also told them to stay out, so we are not under great pressure from them at the moment.

Here was a message I received from Ismail. [Tab A][3] I sent him a message about the Khartoum incident and this was his reply. I told you we might meet again with them around April 10. This is now impossible. If they behave stupidly, we can put it off until May.

Amb. Dinitz: Is there a new date?

Dr. Kissinger: No, I am waiting for their proposal. It is now impossible before early May, just as a matter of logistics. They may get in touch with us by next week, say April 5 or 6. I think it will take two or three weeks. Then I have to reply. Then, if I know them, they will make some conditions.

This is their dilemma. I told them I won't talk to them unless they have something new and different from the public position. You saw that even in the Sadat speech. If they give me something new that doesn't lead anywhere—that they have to resolve first.

Amb. Dinitz: Did the Russians raise it?

Dr. Kissinger: They raised it, but I told them what I told you. I told Ismail that he had to press the Russians not to press us on details but only on principles. Apparently he did it, because the Russians have not been pressing us since then. So with the Russians there is practically nothing going on.

As for the summit, a date has not yet been set, but it will probably be this summer.

It looks like a real dilemma for them.

Amb. Dinitz: Yes, and part of this dilemma is shared by the Russians.

Dr. Kissinger: I will take no initiatives. I will react in a slow-moving way to their proposals. If it moves slowly and drags through the summit, that is their problem. I am not aiming at a Nobel Prize on the Middle East.

Amb. Dinitz: Those who aim for it don't get it!

Dr. Kissinger: But I still think you should be intellectually prepared . . . As your predecessor and Mr. Idan can tell you, you have been saved by an accidental combination of circumstances. But at any moment it could . . .

Amb. Dinitz: Explode.

Dr. Kissinger: The Russians and now the Egyptians have been behaving stupidly, and our domestic situation has not crystallized. But you have to be prepared for a sudden purposeful and intelligent push. When your Prime Minister was here I thought it would crystallize before the summit. I was wrong then; I may be wrong now.

---

[3] Brackets in the original. Tab A is not attached, but see Document 41.

I will wait for them. I will make a non-substantive reply. I am not going to propose a meeting. They will have to propose a date. We won't accept the date they propose. And Brezhnev is going to Germany. That will take his time.

I must repeat what I told your Prime Minister and your Ambassador. You should think about eventual negotiations.

One other matter, the Most Favored Nation business. You will really lose the President if the Jewish community continues its behavior here on the MFN. I know your influence is not complete. We are talking to the Russians about the exit tax, and I hope that before I return from San Clemente I can get authorization to tell you the assurances they have given, but have not authorized me to tell you. We can't get a formal written commitment.

But I talked to the President this morning and he is really determined on this. He will not let one segment of the American public hold up American foreign policy.

Amb. Dinitz: You are right that we do not have great influence. Especially on an issue as emotional as this. Israel cannot go to American Jews and tell them not to be concerned.

Dr. Kissinger: I talked with Dobrynin today and that is when he gave me these assurances. There is no dispute over the merits; I am totally out of sympathy with them. The issue for American Jews is whether a major American foreign policy can be wrecked. What if the President went on television and spoke against Jewish pressure?

There is a second problem. I read in the paper today that some of these groups are planning domonstrations against Brezhnev when he comes here. When Pompidou was here and this happened, it produced an outburst by the President.

But this is all in the future.

Amb. Dinitz: Maybe by the time Brezhnev comes it will have changed. They are anxious too.

Dr. Kissinger: Believe me, we are pressing them. But if we did it in a formal note they would have to reject it. But we are raising it in my channel. I raise it on every occasion.

Amb. Dinitz: Yes, we appreciate it, and the President raised it too.

Dr. Kissinger: Yes.

Amb. Dinitz: May I remind you about Houphouet-Boigny.[4] It would be good if he could come here.

Dr. Kissinger: He will definitely be invited certainly this year, in the second half of the year. He is on the list.

---

[4] Felix Houphouet-Boigny, President of Côte d'Ivoire.

Amb. Dinitz: My people say that there has been no advance on the aircraft.

Dr. Kissinger: On production?

Amb. Dinitz: On production it is fine.

Minister Idan: It's all O.K.

Amb. Dinitz: But on the purchase there has been no movement.

Minister Idan: I inquired several times and our Military Attaché has inquired several times.

Dr. Kissinger: I don't know why our military think that you will make only a hundred planes!

Minister Idan: Your people tell us they are working on a long-range plan for 4 years.

Dr. Kissinger: The instruction I gave was for a substantial number.[5] I couldn't give a number. You are better off with a four-year program, aren't you?

Minister Idan: Yes, but I think they are thinking of stretching the same number over a longer period.

Dr. Kissinger: I will check it.

Amb. Dinitz: I have one last point. Foreign Minister Eban is coming to the United States on the 9th or 10th of May. He has a meeting with the Secretary of State on May 9. Last time he came he missed you. He had a cold.

Dr. Kissinger: Yes, he lost his voice, and for Eban to lose his voice is an affliction of God, not a disease!

Amb. Dinitz: He asked me to see if you would be able to see him.

Dr. Kissinger: Sure. Call my office and arrange it.

Amb. Dinitz: How about breakfast on the 9th?

Dr. Kissinger: Fine. The Shoreham is slightly more convenient.

Have you presented your credentials yet?

Amb. Dinitz: No, and I was not sure if it was proper for me to come here.

Dr. Kissinger: It makes no difference at all to our relationship.

Amb. Dinitz: We appreciate it. We will have for you the protocols of the meetings with the Russian.

---

[5] See Document 37.

44. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, April 5, 1973.

SUBJECT

Aid for Jordan—Message from Hussein

King Hussein has asked you (Tab B)[2] for the additional $10 million in budget support that you told him we would keep aside for him. He also thanks you for your message on proposed steps to work out the follow-on military modernization program.

This memo deals with both of these subjects and provides a draft reply at Tab A.[3] More important for the longer run, it raises some issues in connection with planning our future assistance program for Jordan. I am not seeking a decision on these at this point but would appreciate knowing how you lean.

Budget Support

During his visit to Washington, King Hussein was told:[4]

—We would provide Jordan with $55 million in budget support in CY 1973.

—We would make an effort to advance as much as $15 million of that between now and July 1.

—Jordan should make a serious effort to raise more money to cover its needs from its wealthy Arab neighbors, particularly Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. We would hold an additional $10 million in budget support in reserve pending the outcome of these efforts.

Shortly after his return to Jordan, King Hussein sent his Prime Minister to Saudi Arabia to ask for more help. The King in his message reports: "I regret to inform you that we were unsuccessful in our efforts and could not get the Saudis to understand or appreciate the urgency of our needs." What has actually happened is this:

—To help with Jordan's budget crunch last December, the Saudis agreed to advance two payments under the quarterly Khartoum sub-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret. Sent for action. Richard T. Kennedy initialed his concurrence.

[2] Attached, but not printed, but see footnote 4, Document 39.

[3] Attached, but not printed. See footnote 6 below.

[4] See Document 30.

sidies. These advanced payments would normally have been made in January and April 1973 for the first two quarters of this year.

—As a result of this recent trip, the Saudis reportedly agreed to go ahead and make the January and April payments despite the December advance. This effectively added $20 million to Jordan's revenues for this year.

—The Jordanians, however, apparently accepted the advance payment in December, applied it to the 1972 deficit, and then assumed that the Saudis would make their payments in the first two quarters of 1973 as scheduled, despite the advance on these payments made in December. Consequently, while the Saudis have provided $20 million more than the level of their normal yearly subsidy, the King does not view this added $20 million as anything new.

—In addition to the above, we have learned that Abu Dhabi has just given Jordan $10 million.

There are essentially two choices in responding to the King now:

1. *Continue to press other donors*. You would thank the King for his message; tactfully note the Saudi payments and hope for more; state the desirability of pressing other donors; say we will continue to hold the additional $10 million available; and note that we are working on ways to try to advance as much as $15 million before July 1 as promised. AID is working on this last point now, but funds are stretched very tight because of added requests for Vietnam. A decision should be possible by about April 15 on how much can be advanced to Jordan, but you should be aware that this may have to come out of funds otherwise earmarked for Vietnam.

2. *Promise the additional $10 million now*, subject to Congressional appropriation since it is FY 1974 money.

My recommendation would be to take the first approach above, since it remains in our interest as well as Jordan's to tap as much Arab oil money as possible for Jordan. One trip to Saudi Arabia will not necessarily tell the story for the entire year, and the Kuwaitis are clearly re-thinking their position in the wake of the Iraqi attack on them. Since the year still has nine months to go, I think we should keep the matter open. A reply along these lines is provided at Tab A.

A Broader Look at Aid for Jordan

This message raises again the serious question of how we get a grip on our Jordan aid programs—in Jordan's interests and ours. This experience with the Saudis shows that the Jordanians will take all the budget support they can get and press for more. On the economic side, our embassy for 1974 projects a $90 million budget deficit *assuming* present levels of US and Saudi aid. Ambassador Brown is speaking of Jordan's "headlong plunge into insolvency." On the military aid side,

the shopping list which Hussein gave the Pentagon when he was here has now been costed at about $240 million—twice the cost of the present three-year program.

In short, it is not in Jordan's interest to become so deeply dependent on foreign aid, and we will not have the money to meet these demands. Unless we make a fundamental decision to budget for a Jordanian aid program of a quite different order of magnitude from the present one. The purpose of this discussion is to address that issue. In any case, we need to get away from dealing with this yearly on an ad hoc basis.

There are two broad issues to be considered: (1) our aid relationship with Jordan and (2) the level of aid.

US–Jordanian Aid Relationship. There are two possible approaches:

1. We could try to reach *some form of understanding with the Jordanians relating our aid to Jordan's management of its own budget*.

We would certainly want to avoid any appearance of a patronizing involvement in what are properly Jordanian decisions, but we and the Jordanians share a common interest in assuring that Jordan has the financial help it needs. The objective would be a joint effort to provide greater assurance of financial support than our present year-by-year ad hoc approach.

On the Jordanian side this would require tighter control over spending. The problem is that Jordanian expenditures, particularly in the military field, have increased rapidly, without any commensurate increase in productivity or revenues within Jordan. This leads to a growing dependence on foreign aid, placing Jordan in a very exposed position in the event that such aid is not forthcoming. At a minimum, the unpredictability of behavior in the oil-rich Arab states and in the US Congress argue for trying to end Jordan's heavy dependence on these sources of support. We would try to help the Jordanians work out a plan for decreasing this dependence and develop a way of concentrating all their resources on priority expenditures. As matters stand now, there is little control exercised in deferring low-priority projects. For example, Jordan apparently intends to construct a new international airport, despite widespread advice from experts that this is a poor investment. The project will cost Jordan at least $15 million out of an already tight budget at a time when the King is pleading for urgent extra assistance.

On the side of aid donors, the obligation would be to assure adequate financial support for military and budgetary expenditures as well as for a development program which, over time, could gradually reduce dependence on outside aid. While some in State and AID would like to use this approach as a way of eventually reducing aid, the same

general approach is valid if we continue to provide Jordan with current levels of assistance or even increase aid in coming years.

2. *The alternative approach* is to continue to deal in an ad hoc way with Jordan's deficits and not try to develop a strategic concept for getting on top of the deficits over time.

Aid Levels. Apart from the question of aid relationship is the question of whether we should go to a substantially higher aid level. Again, there are two possible approaches:

1. One approach would be to *go to a substantially higher level for political and related development reasons.* The object would be to build up the East Bank rapidly, and perhaps even to channel some funds via Jordan into the West Bank as well, given the right political context. Over a period of years we would expect that the refugee camp population would decline, that Jordanians and Palestinians would be materially much better off than at present, and that this would provide part of the foundation for a Palestine settlement.

While the details of such a strategy remain to be worked out, some non-governmental groups have done studies suggesting the possibility of very substantial economic development in the Jordan–West Bank area if foreign capital is made available in large amounts. Jordan has begun to move in this direction with its current Development Plan, but the scale of the undertaking could be increased and tied to the West Bank more explicitly if that were desirable. This approach might be particularly attractive if we were looking for ways to work within the confines of the status quo toward a long-term outcome that could provide for a viable pattern of coexistence among Israelis, Palestinians and Jordanians.

2. *The alternative,* of course, is to *stay around current levels* of aid which are set in terms of meeting Jordan's budget deficits with as little aid as we can manage so as to remain within our budget and not to increase Jordanian dependence. This has the advantage of keeping our expenditures as low as possible. But it has the disadvantage of being an ad hoc exercise without much long-term sense of direction. It is no more than a policy of keeping Jordan afloat.

Military Equipment

Just to keep you up to date on the other subject of interest to Hussein, the following is the state of our consideration of his military equipment list:

During their recent visit the Jordanians left behind a list of equipment now costed at $240 million that they would like to receive after the current modernization program is completed in FY 1974. By order of priority, the list includes armored personnel carriers, F5E aircraft, heavy artillery, TOW anti-tank missiles, one C–130 aircraft, helicopters,

and various smaller items. The Jordanians seem to have another multi-year program in mind, with MAP aid continuing at much more than the current rate of $40 million per year.

The Defense Department has been reluctant to discuss a follow-on modernization program with the Jordanians. Ambassador Brown has recommended, however, that a survey team be sent to Jordan to assess Jordan's additional requests. This would be a fact-finding mission, and on the basis of its report decisions could be made in Washington later this year.[5] State agrees and is working out details.

Recommendations:

1. That you send the message at Tab A to King Hussein [*less than 1 line not declassified*].

Approve[6]

Other

2. That you indicate for my guidance your general feelings on developing alternative approaches on aid for Jordan:

—Could you see our working with the Jordanians to increase both outside aid and discipline in their budget with the aim of eventual self-reliance provided this were not done in a patronizing way, or do you feel we should limit ourselves mainly to offering the aid?

Work out details of a dialogue with the Jordanians[7]

Not now

—Are you interested in a plan for substantial increases in aid for Jordan (and perhaps the West Bank)?

---

[5] An April 9 Department of Defense memorandum to Scowcroft stated that Jordan's recent submission of a revised request for military assistance totaling $195 million indicated the usefulness of sending a small DOD fact-finding team to Jordan before the next meeting with the Jordanians. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January 73–October 1973)

[6] Kissinger initialed this option. On April 18, the backchannel message was sent from Kissinger to Hussein. The message reads: "In reply to your recent message, we are pleased to note that the Saudis have at least agreed to continue their quarterly payments. We will be in touch with them and with the Kuwaitis to urge them to provide Jordan with more help. We have in mind, of course, your serious economic needs and we are making our best efforts to advance some funds from our FY 1974 program to meet your current budget needs. It should be possible to notify you of our plans in the next month. In the meantime, please be assured that we continue to make every effort to be helpful."

[7] Kissinger wrote "See me" next to this option.

Pursue this idea further[8]

Not now

[8] Kissinger initialed this option. On May 11, Kissinger approved transmission of a message to King Hussein informing him that the United States could not provide economic help before July 1, but would be "as forthcoming as possible early in the new fiscal year." On June 2, Scowcroft notified the Executive Secretary of the Department of State that the Department's proposal to provide $25 million in Supporting Assistance to Jordan in July with subsequent tranches in September and November had been approved. (Memorandum from Saunders to Kissinger, May 11, with memorandum from Scowcroft, June 2, attached at Tab B; National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 73)

45. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders and William B. Quandt of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, April 9, 1973.

SUBJECT

Israeli Policy on the West Bank

You will want to be aware of the latest debate within Israel over policy toward the West Bank. It was on the agenda at yesterday's Cabinet meeting and Hussein may be sending the President a letter on the subject. More important is the relationship of any Israeli moves to strategy for a Jordan–Israel settlement.

As you know, since June 1967 the Israelis have adopted a policy of gradually building up their presence in selected areas of the occupied territories. Until recently, Israeli policy has been to encourage settlement in the Golan Heights, to make East Jerusalem an integral part of Israel, and to establish an Israeli settlement at Rafah junction on the southwestern end of the Gaza Strip. Otherwise the Israeli presence in the West Bank and Sinai has been largely dictated by military considerations, with the exception of a civilian settlement near religiously important sites at Hebron in the West Bank. Now, however, pressure has increased to allow Israelis to buy land on the West Bank.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 610, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 12, Mar. 73–Oct. 73. Secret. Sent for information.

Israeli Policy on Land Purchases in the West Bank

Defense Minister Dayan has long been an advocate of closer economic integration between Israel and the occupied areas, especially the West Bank. He shares with other Israelis who are very much hard-liners on territory a generally liberal view of how Israelis and Arabs should coexist within geographic Palestine. He is less worried than Prime Minister Meir or Finance Minister Sapir about the social, economic and political consequences of absorbing one million Arabs into Israeli society. Dayan, perhaps as part of his private electoral campaign, has recently publicly called for a change in Israeli policy of restricting land purchases on the West Bank. The Israeli government has already acquired a small amount of land, largely near Jerusalem, but private individuals and companies are barred from making purchases. This is the policy Dayan would like to change.

The Israeli Cabinet has now met to consider policy on land purchases and for the moment a decision has been taken to make no changes. In advance of the Cabinet meeting, Assistant Secretary Sisco informed the Israeli Ambassador here that we feel our interests would be affected if Israeli policy on land purchases were to change. He expressed concern that a new "liberal" policy allowing for individual purchases of land would be seen as creating new facts and making the occupation permanent.[2] For the moment the sense of urgency surrounding this issue is likely to die down, but it will doubtless arise again.

King Hussein has expressed serious concern over the possibility of a change in Israeli land purchase policy. He has received reports from West Bankers that reflect their high level of anxiety.[3] The King has said he intends to write to the President and Secretary Rogers in order to get US help in urging Israel to freeze its activities in Jerusalem and the West Bank. He apparently feels he was told during his February visit that we would approach the Israelis along these lines.

Israeli View of West Bank Trends

Apart from this particular issue is the broader question of what strategy to adopt toward the West Bank, especially if movement toward a Jordan–Israel settlement is to be slow.

---

[2] A report of Sisco's conversation with Dinitz is in telegram 64462 to Tel Aviv, April 6. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

[3] In telegram 1851 from Amman, April 8, the Embassy warned that it could not emphasize too strongly the adverse political effect that any alteration in Israeli land policies would have there. Therefore, the Embassy hoped that Sisco's démarche would be followed as soon as possible by additional U.S. representations at the highest level of the Israeli Government. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973)

A broader assessment of developments on the West Bank has been provided by David Farhi, adviser to Dayan on the occupied West Bank. He was recently in Washington and spoke with a number of US officials. Farhi, like Dayan, does not believe a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict is likely, and consequently thinks that the future of the West Bank will have to be worked out within the context of the Israeli occupation. He envisages a long-term outcome that could provide the Palestinians with self-government on the West Bank and would eventually lead to a loose, informal confederative relationship among Israel, the West Bank and Jordan.

Farhi believes that West Bankers are now better disposed toward King Hussein than was the case two years ago. This is not because they like his regime any better, but rather because it is the best available alternative to indefinite Israeli occupation, which they do not like despite some material benefits. They fear being isolated from the Arab world, as were the Palestinians who remained in Israel after 1948.

While preferring to return to Jordan under some new relationship, the West Bank Palestinians do not expect any imminent settlement. Consequently they are increasingly looking for ways to improve their lot under occupation. Demands on the Israeli authorities for the provision of social services, loans, and technical advice are increasingly being made in a businesslike way, and some joint Arab-Jewish enterprises have been established. Industrialization is just beginning, while agriculture has already been vastly improved. These changes have not contributed to greater friendship between Jews and Arabs, but some of the myths have been eroded on both sides, which makes for a tolerable, if not very warm coexistence.

Comment: The Israelis have still not faced up to the political issue of what to do with the West Bank, but through a series of individual decisions, perhaps most important of which will be the relaxation of restrictions on land purchases by Israelis in the occupied areas, they are convincing others that they intend to stay indefinitely. When they also reach this conclusion, other difficult economic and political choices will confront them involving their responsibilities toward the Palestinian Arab population living under their control.

At present we have no framework for dealing with these changes other than to regret any actions that make a settlement more difficult. If the chances for a settlement are rapidly receding in the West Bank, we should soon consciously decide between two possible courses: whether to press hard for a Jordan–Israel agreement that will reestablish Jordanian sovereignty in these areas, or, alternatively, to work quietly toward a joint US–Jordan–Israel understanding of where the occupation might lead over a fairly long period of time.

46. Memorandum From Secretary of State Rogers to President Nixon[1]

Washington, April 11, 1973.

SUBJECT

Actions to Encourage Lebanon to Move Against Black September and Other Terrorist Groups

As you know, the Black September Organization's operation in Khartoum was planned and directed from headquarters which that group has in Lebanon.[2] Since the murder of Ambassador Noel and Counselor Moore, we have been studying steps we might take that would encourage the Lebanese Government to arrest or expel from its territory all known Black September personnel and crack down on other Palestinian organizations which engage in terrorism.

The problem is a complex one, for Lebanon is a country with which we have many ties of friendship and many common interests. Lebanon's Christian leadership would like nothing better than to see the Arab terrorists and guerrilla organizations removed altogether from Lebanese soil; this feeling is shared even by some Lebanese Moslems, although they do not express it openly. However, the Lebanese Government feels it must move cautiously, owing to the large number of Palestinian refugees on its territory (some 300,000) and the small size of Lebanon's Army (about 15,000 men). Lebanese leaders also fear that Lebanese Moslem extremists and leftists would join the Palestinian guerrilla organizations in opposing moves which might seriously weaken them, and that this could lead to civil war.

For all their very real apprehensions, Lebanon's leaders have been able to take some steps to limit the freedom of action of the guerrilla organizations. Last fall, after a major Israeli raid deep into Lebanon in September, the Lebanese Army moved to clear the guerrillas from the immediate area of the border with Israel. This accounts for the quiet which has prevailed along the Lebanese-Israeli border these past months. The April 9 Israeli raids[3] have pushed the Lebanese Govern-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 621, Country Files, Middle East, Lebanon, Vol. III, Jan. 71–Oct. 73. Secret; Nodis.

[2] See footnote 3, Document 41.

[3] On April 9, following a Palestinian commando attack on an Israeli El Al aircraft at the Nicosia airport in Cyprus and a bomb explosion at the home of the Israeli Ambassador in Nicosia, Israeli commandos attacked Arab guerrilla bases in Beirut and the coastal city of Saida in Lebanon, killing three top Fatah and PLO leaders along with several members of other Palestinian organizations. In response to the Israeli attacks, Lebanese Ambassador Kabbani told Sisco that his government intended to call for a UN Secu-

ment further in the direction of a showdown with the terrorists. We believe that if the Lebanese Government is made to feel that it can count on the support of the United States in case of trouble it will be more readily inclined to arrest or expel the terrorists.

We are already taking steps to demonstrate our support for Lebanon. Your agreement to invite President Frangie to this country next year is a very important step. We have just informed the Lebanese that we will airlift for immediate delivery some small quantities of military materiel which they need urgently, and we are asking the Defense Department to make available right away communications equipment which the Lebanese Army needs for use against the guerrilla organizations.

Closer coordination with the Lebanese in regard to what we would do to help them in the event of a showdown with the Palestinians is another very important step we could take. Foreign Minister Abouhamad spoke to us last fall, when he was in this country for the UN General Assembly, about his concern over what would happen if Syria should intervene during a confrontation between the Lebanese Army and the Palestinian guerrilla organizations. The Foreign Minister, and Lebanese Army Commander-in-Chief Iskandar Ghanem, later told U.S. officials in Beirut that the Army could handle the guerrillas but feared being overwhelmed by an invasion from Syria. They asked what assistance Lebanon could expect from the United States in such a situation.

Unless we are prepared to respond to Foreign Minister Abouhamad, it will be difficult for us to press the Lebanese Government to move vigorously on terrorism. I believe that a sympathetic response, coupled with a reiteration of our own concern over the freedom of action which Lebanon allows the Black September and other terrorist groups, would now be especially timely and would encourage the Lebanese to act more firmly. The attached telegram,[4] which I plan to send unless you perceive objections, gives Ambassador Buffum instructions for discussion of both these issues with Foreign Minister Abouhamad. You will note that while we seek to be sympathetic and forthcoming with Foreign Minister Abouhamad, the operative portion of the in-

---

rity Council meeting to deal with the "repeated Israeli incursions" against targets in Lebanon, which constituted a violation of Lebanon's sovereignty, and gave Israel the "assumed right" to invade Lebanon whenever it desired. (Memorandum from Rogers to Nixon, April 10; National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 51, President's Daily Briefings, President's Daily Briefs, April 2–14, 1973) On April 21, by a vote of 11–0–4, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 332 (1973) condemning Israel's repeated military attacks on Lebanon and calling upon it to "desist forthwith." Although the resolution condemned "all acts of violence which endanger or take innocent lives," the United States abstained on the grounds that it was not evenhanded.

[4] Attached, but not printed.

struction has been couched in terms which carefully avoid any new or unusual commitments on our part.

William P. Rogers

---

47. Backchannel Message From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail)[1]

Washington, April 11, 1973.

[*1 line not declassified*]

1. Dr. Kissinger appreciates Mr. Ismail's thoughtful message of April 7.[2]

2. Dr. Kissinger agrees that U.S.–Egyptian relations require patience, moderation and wisdom on both sides. For its part, the U.S. will make a sincere and serious effort to put this relationship on a new basis.

3. With respect to Mr. Ismail's assumptions, the U.S. position is as follows:

a. The White House has engaged itself in a serious effort to determine whether it can play a useful role. It will not mislead Egypt; but promise only what it believes it can deliver. On the other hand, it will make a major effort to live up to what it promises.

b. The United States is not certain about Israel's reaction since it has sought to avoid theoretical discussions. Dr. Kissinger's understanding was that the next meeting would involve a discussion of what Mr. Ismail called heads of agreement[3] which could serve as a link to the opening of the Suez Canal as well as the overall agreement. These would, of course, be based on Security Council Resolution 242.

4. Within this context, the U.S. affirms its serious interest in movement toward a peace agreement and is prepared to discuss possible heads of agreement. To provide for a fruitful discussion, the U.S. side assumes that the Egyptian side will be prepared to put forward its pre-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 131, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. IV, February 24–May 19, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Eyes Only.

[2] Not found.

[3] See Document 28.

cise ideas on the issues raised at the last meeting. As discussed then, it might be useful if some of those could be sent in advance.

5. Dr. Kissinger would welcome another meeting. He would prefer to meet in the U.S. and would find it difficult to make a special trip to Europe at this time. However, he is planning to be in Europe for other business about May 8 and could arrange to meet around May 9. If Mr. Ismail agrees, Dr. Kissinger will [*less than 1 line not declassified*] work out modalities.

6. There is one final important point that must be mentioned regarding the security of these talks. A report reached us late last week from Mr. Greene, the head of our Interests Section in Cairo, of a conversation between him and Mr. Kamal Adham.[4] Mr. Greene reported at some length Mr. Adham's comments on our discussions here which he allegedly received from high Egyptian sources. For one thing, Mr. Adham reported some points which were simply not true. For instance, he said it was agreed that there was no need for Mr. Ismail to tell the Soviets about the conversation since Dr. Kissinger would do that. This, as Mr. Ismail knows, is inaccurate since it was agreed that both sides would mention the meeting to the USSR. He also reported to Greene Dr. Kissinger's having said that Mr. Ismail could disregard what he might hear in the State Department. This, too, is not true. It was Dr. Kissinger's understanding that the so-called interim arrangement would continue to be pursued in State Department channels.

7. Adham also reported that the Egyptian side was offended by an alleged phrase of Dr. Kissinger's; to the effect that Israel was now on the Canal and there was nothing Egypt could do about it. The U.S. record shows no such remark by Dr. Kissinger. Throughout, Dr. Kissinger attempted to explain the realities which were needed to frame a settlement. Apart from these and other inaccuracies, a serious question about the security of these conversations is raised. Dr. Kissinger must know in what channels the conversations might appear. Obviously, his own conduct will be affected by it. If tight security cannot be maintained, Dr. Kissinger will have to reconsider his own participation. Dr. Kissinger would appreciate categoric assurances on these points. Obviously, he can have no interest in discussions whose primary purpose is to establish a villain.

8. Dr. Kissinger looks forward to another meeting with Mr. Ismail."[5]

---

[4] Reported in telegram 1024 from Cairo, April 6. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

[5] Ismail agreed to meet Kissinger on May 9. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 131, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. IV, February 24–May 19, 1973)

Oral Addition to the Message:

"The U.S. side recognizes the Egyptian concerns about past experiences. It would not, however, pursue these channels if it wished to repeat the patterns of the past."

---

48. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, April 13, 1973.

SUBJECT

Memorandum Recording Your Conversation with Ismail

At Tab A[2] as you requested is a record of your conversations with Mr. Ismail which you could show to Joe Sisco. It is written as the kind of memcon I might have done had I been doing a record of the conversation other than a verbatim one.[3] This provides a convincingly full record without having to cover all of the details.

You should be aware that I have omitted the following subjects or abbreviated reference to them as indicated below:

—All references to *procedures* used in establishing and following through *on direct communication* between you and Mr. Ismail have been omitted. This also omits any reference to the relationship between your channel and Egypt's normal contact with the State Department. [FYI, the transcript did *not* show at any point your saying that the Egyptians should disregard the State Department.]

—Discussion of exactly *what role the US should play between Egypt and Israel* through this special channel has been omitted. This means omission of any discussion of the specific procedures of trying to reach agreement on heads of agreement and on when Israel should be brought into that process. I have, however, included one paragraph in

---

[1] Source: Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box TS 32, Geopolitical File, Middle East, Chronological File, 27 Feb–14 May 73. Top Secret; Sensitive. A handwritten note on the first page reads: "Shown to Sisco May 14, 1973." Brackets are in the original.

[2] Attached, but not printed.

[3] See Document 28 for the record of Kissinger's February 25–26 conversations with Ismail sent to the President.

which Ismail described in very general terms a three-part process beginning with agreement on general principles, filling in provisions and then moving on to implementation. This is cast, however, as a very general statement of his view on what needs to be done, so it does not get into the idea of working out those heads of agreement in this separate channel. It is desirable to have some general statement as a framework within which to record your agreement that negotiation of an interim settlement with State Department help could be useful as an opening phase in this process.

—I have included one very brief mention of agreement that *Ismail would tell the Soviets* about his talk in Washington so as to cover that point. I have, however, omitted more detailed description of exactly what you and he might say to your respective Soviet contacts about your particular conversation.

—The discussion of *what went wrong in 1971* is omitted.

—The fairly detailed discussion of demilitarization and possible long term *transitional security arrangements* in the Sinai is much abbreviated. However, I have left in one sentence in the form of a question by you which raises the possibility of such arrangements. This is done in the context of the concept of reconciling Egyptian sovereignty with the requirements of Israeli security—a concept which was in the initial State Department talking points for the President.

In this connection, you should be aware of the *State Department memorandum* at Tab B[4] saying that Secretary Rogers has asked him to request that he be provided with copies of the memoranda concerning the President's and your conversation with Hafiz Ismail. Not knowing whether you plan to use the memorandum at Tab A directly with Sisco or whether that is by arrangement with the Secretary, I simply request your guidance on the handling of this State Department request.[5]

---

[4] Attached, but not printed.

[5] In his memoirs, Kissinger described the events leading up to his decision to have Saunders prepare this memorandum for Sisco. He recorded that Greene, head of the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo, first learned of the secret talks with Ismail from the Arabic version of Sadat's March 29 interview with *Newsweek* editor Arnaud de Borchgrave, information which was then confirmed in Cairo. Greene then sent the Saudi version of these talks, which a Saudi official had supplied, to Washington in a "regular State telegram." Kissinger noted that "there was no way now to negotiate over the Middle East without involving the interested departments," and that he briefed Sisco on his exchanges with Ismail on April 9. (*Years of Upheaval*, pp. 224–225)

49. Conversation Among President Nixon, his Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger), and the Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs (Sisco)[1]

Washington, April 13, 1973.

Nixon: After Bill went back to—went over to Paris, you know, left after seeing the Egyptian—after I saw the Egyptian,[2] and Bill took off for Paris,[3] and the—Henry went to New York, and the Egyptian, Sadat, sent [*10 seconds not declassified*] a message to me[4] that he would like for his fellow—what's his name?

Kissinger: Ismail.

Sisco: Ismail—

Nixon: Ismail to talk to Henry. So, I said, "Fine, talk. Talk in complete confidence," and so forth and so on. Henry had a long, long, long talk with him.[5] And Henry has already, I guess—

Sisco: Yes, he's filled me in—

Nixon: Now, they want to talk again. To be perfectly frank with you, I don't know what—I haven't followed it closely enough to know whether it means a damn thing, or whether it's worth doing. As you know, in both our Sino—China and Soviet initiatives, and, also, for that matter, the goddamn North Vietnamese, though, we have—people have kind of gotten used to this business of trying to work in—not only in public—in other words, two courses: a parallel course. I mean, where the one where we work publicly and through formal channels, and another through informal channels. It seems to me that it's worth a try. Now, it will only work, however, if you are totally in the game. In other words, you—you've—I've seen your strategy; I think it's exactly right, and, but you're totally in the game in the sense that Henry will inform you when he's going over there to do this. I would not want you, however—it just isn't going to be healthy to have him go in—

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Tapes, Conversation No. 895–24. No classification marking. According to the President's Daily Diary, Nixon met with Sisco and Kissinger in the Oval Office between 4:31 and 4:41 p.m. (Ibid., White House Central Files) The editors transcribed the portion printed here specifically for this volume.

[2] Hafiz Ismail. See Document 26.

[3] Secretary Rogers traveled to Paris on February 24 to attend a conference on Vietnam.

[4] See Document 3.

[5] See Document 28.

Sisco: Sure.

Nixon: —any further than that. You know what I mean? I'm not trying to [unclear]—

Sisco: I understand.

Nixon: And if it works, fine. Then, everybody's going to get the credit. We're not looking for any big grandstand play here. But I don't—I don't have much confidence in having worked with these people. But, on the other hand, I feel that we've got to go the extra mile with the goddamn Egyptians, and they seem to put a great deal of, shall we say, stake, or emphasis, on the fact that they ought to have something.

Sisco: Right.

Nixon: A—something, some direct communication with the President, as others have had, to see if there's—if the logjam can be broken. And, I think that's basically it. Henry, do you want to add anything to that? Have I stated the case—?

Kissinger: Well, Joe and I have been talking for months, and as it—I asked him to prepare a paper[6] before he knew this, as I told you.

Nixon: Right, right.

Kissinger: And, actually, the strategy he recommended—

Nixon: It's the same.

Nixon: —is exactly what you are—

Nixon: The same; that's correct. I saw it. Exactly—

Kissinger: —what you are saying.

Sisco: Right.

Kissinger: And—

Nixon: But I just want you to be sure. I want you to know that if it isn't any—the question is—there's no question of trying to have—to undercut your negotiating strategy.

Sisco: Oh, no.

Nixon: The main thing is to get it done.

Sisco: That's right.

---

[6] Kissinger is apparently referring to Sisco's strategy paper of February 7. In the paper, Sisco wrote that "undertaking a parallel completely secret second track would offer more hope that some progress could be made or at least help keep the problem manageable." He added: "U.S. contacts could be established here with the Israelis in the first instance and subsequently with the Egyptians, their purpose being to culminate in direct, unpublicized Egypt-Israeli contacts on the detailed terms of a final rather than an interim Egyptian-Israeli settlement." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 130, Country Files, Middle East, Saunders Memoranda—Sensitive, Egypt/Hafez Ismail, 1973)

Nixon: Now, I don't know whether or not—maybe you'll do it; maybe not. And, also, we may have to speak with two voices. You may have to take one voice, and he may have to take another voice. But, the main thing is that you and Henry have got to speak in total confidence with each other, and then forget that you've talked.

Sisco: I think the extra voice—

Nixon: Is that all right?

Sisco: —is fine with me. And I think the extra mile is worth it, Mr. President, for only one reason: I don't think we have—we're going to be able to solve this thing in the foreseeable future.

Nixon: Um-hmm.

Sisco: It's as you say, the game is up. But, to the extent to which we are involved as a government, in a credible way, and certainly Henry being involved, and they [the Egyptians] having this feeling that they need that we're in direct communication with the President on this matter. This, psychologically, Mr. President, is one of the—

Nixon: [unclear]—

Sisco: —most important deterrents in area. Now, this fellow [Sadat] knows that if he exercises the military option, he's going to get clobbered.

Nixon: [exhales] Yeah.

Sisco: But, the element of irrationality is going up. But, to the extent to which Henry can keep the leash on—I don't give a damn if it's for eight months, Henry; that means you're bulwarking the cease-fire.

Nixon: That's right.

Sisco: That's the reason for this strategy.

Nixon: You've got to give them the hope. It's really a—frankly, let's face it: you've really got to make them think that there's some motion; that something is going on; that we're really doing our best with the Israelis. Now, we all know the Israelis are just impossible. I mean, we have two impossibles—

Sisco: Yes.

Nixon: —and the Israelis have not given a goddamn inch.

Sisco: We're getting closer to their election, too, Mr. President.

Nixon: Well, yeah, but they're always close to an election. Then, they'll be closer to ours. See, that's always the excuse they've taken.

Sisco: What you're saying—

Nixon: It's either—it's either our election, or theirs.

Sisco: [laughs]

Nixon: And, I don't—I'm not suggesting I have the answer to it, but on the other hand, we—I think Henry's, if—I want you just to hold

their hand as much as you can, and let him do it in his—when would you see them, if you see them again, Henry?

Kissinger: Middle of May.

Nixon: Where would you see them? In Europe someplace—?

Kissinger: That's still being debated.

Nixon: It depends on whether you're traveling. You'd have to have another reason to go.

Kissinger: I'd have to have another reason to go—

Nixon: And, you know, that's fine.

Sisco: And you know, Henry, they're lousy at this business of leaks.

Nixon: Oh!

Sisco: It's worse in the Arab world than anywhere else—

Kissinger: Yeah.

Sisco: —in any other area that I can think of. Operating with the Chinese, you were able to keep—

Nixon: That's right.

Sisco: —the channels. These people will just open their mouths, largely because of the fact that words have become a substitute for action. Thank God for that.

Nixon: Yeah. That's good.

Sisco: So you're [unclear]—

Nixon: Let me say this—let me say this: Joe, remember the time you and I talked in the Lincoln Room? There's been a lot of water under the bridge since then. I want you to know that I have great confidence in your skill in this area, given what you've done, and what you've gone through. And I have confidence, naturally, in Henry. But I want—and I don't want any of this feeling of State fighting the White House. That's crap.

Sisco: I've never had this feeling, as Henry [unclear]—

Nixon: We have made a lot of yardage in certain areas, and if you and Henry can just work, work together, and I know in any event if something leaks out, why, then we'll just say whether you're out, I'll tell, tell Bill or anybody that's [unclear] over there and these people want to see him. And we saw 'em. I mean, there's—there's no problem with that. No problem. We can't be—we can't be in any position, if it leaks out, to deny it.

Kissinger: Oh, no. No, no, no.

Nixon: Yeah. But we—but, on the other hand, don't volunteer anything. Fair enough?

Kissinger: And we're in a pretty good position right now on—

Nixon: [unclear]—

Kissinger: We've—we've handled what—

Nixon: If you would sort of work to try to develop something, so that Henry can have piece of paper that you can work from.

Sisco: Henry, I can feed you some concrete—

Nixon: And also—

[Unclear exchange]

Nixon: General—general—particularly in the general principle area, Henry, I think that Joe can get some [unclear]—

Kissinger: I'd be very grateful, and I'd love to work—

Nixon: The general—I think the principle area, and then, the—I mean, if you've got—you've started the same thing. Let's get some general principles and [unclear]—

Kissinger: Once—I mean, now that you've explained the strategy to Joe—

Nixon: Yeah?

Kissinger: —and he and I can meet, and—

Nixon: Yeah.

Kissinger: 'Cause he has a very fertile imagination—

Nixon: That's right.

Kissinger: —and he spends much more time on it.

Nixon: What I would like to suggest, Joe, is that, just on occasion, that you just, if you don't mind, pop over here, and so that we can just—and it can be done. And I'd suggest, Henry, that you meet him over in the Map Room—

Kissinger: All right.

Nixon: —so it isn't a case where it looks as if something big is—or, maybe, you should meet in your office. I don't care.

Kissinger: Actually, it's easiest in my office.

Nixon: Sure.

Kissinger: We can always drum up some excuse.

Nixon: All right, then you come over [unclear]—

Kissinger: I mean, we have a lot of current business.

50. Memorandum From Director of Central Intelligence Schlesinger to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, April 16, 1973.

SUBJECT

Israeli Estimates of Egypt's Present Military Intentions

Recent assertions regarding the probability of Egyptian military moves against Israel are in conflict with the assessment the Israeli military intelligence has provided the United States as recently as the end of last week. Other indicators of Egyptian military intentions remain negative.

On 12 April 1973, General Shalev, Deputy Chief of Israeli Military Intelligence, told the American Defense Attaché in Tel Aviv that he does not believe Egyptian President Sadat has made a decision to renew hostilities against Israel or that he will decide to do so in the near term. Shalev outlined at considerable length his reasons for reaching this conclusion despite certain recent developments in the Egyptian military, notably the transfer from Libya to Egypt of Libyan Mirage V aircraft, which have given rise to questions about present Egyptian intentions. A copy of the Defense Attaché's report of this conversation with Shalev is provided as Attachment A[2] to this memorandum.

Attachment B to this memorandum provides a listing of available items of recent intelligence which constitute indicators of Egyptian military intentions. Taken in the sum of their content, they do not seem to indicate an Egyptian intention to renew hostilities. They do, however, seem to indicate an element of bluff, to suggest the intention to either increase pressure on Israel, or the United States, to be more responsive to Egyptian wishes in connection with a peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem, or to divert Egyptian public opinion from focus on dissatisfaction with conditions in Egypt, or both.

Given the weak Egyptian military capability against Israel, any military move by Sadat would be an act of desperation. We see no evidence that he is that desperate at present.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 135, Country Files, Middle East, Rabin/Dinitz Sensitive Memcons, 1973. Secret; Sensitive.

[2] Attachments A–C are attached, but not printed.

In judging Ambassador Dinitz's statement,[3] consideration should also be given to the possibility that the Israeli Government's estimate of current Egyptian intentions may be distorted. The Israelis have already shown considerable concern over reports in the public domain about Egyptian diplomatic initiatives with the United States. This concern may also have been heightened within the past few days by discussion in the UN of the recent Israeli raid against Palestinian targets in Beirut and Sidon, Lebanon. Finally, it cannot be ruled out that the Israelis may also be seeking to lay the groundwork for offensive military action they might themselves be planning to take against Egypt. In this connection, we note the elaborate replica of the important Al Mansurah Airfield which the Israelis have constructed north of Elat. (See photo at Attachment C.)

If the Israelis now really believe that the Egyptians are prepared to attack, something significant—and unknown to us—must have happened to change their estimate [*less than 1 line not declassified*]. It has never been characteristic of Israeli officials to understate the dangers facing Israel, and the record of Israeli Military Intelligence with respect to its estimates of Egyptian capabilities and intentions is excellent.

JR Schlesinger

[3] On April 24, Dinitz showed Kissinger an Israeli intelligence report speculating that Egypt was making military preparations for an attack, but Dinitz admitted: "It is not a problem in the military sense, therefore there is low probability. But as our people say, logic does not always prevail in our region." (Memorandum of conversation; National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 135, Country Files, Middle East, Rabin/Dinitz Sensitive Memcons, 1973)

51. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, May 3, 1973, 6:30–7:15 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Ambassador Dinitz of Israel
Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Special Adviser to the President for National Security Affairs
Peter Rodman, NSC Staff

Amb. Dinitz: We got a message from our neighbor Hussein. The Prime Minister asked me to bring this to your attention

The King says: "A major international military fiasco in the area is inevitable. Algerian ground units will soon be in Egypt. The Sudanese will also be in Egypt. Morocco will send forces to Syria. Libyan Mirages are already in Egypt. Considerable Iraqi forces will be in Iraq very close to our borders under a united command.

"If Jordan's fate were in the hands of the Iraqi Commander, Iraqi Lightnings would be in Jordan now, but probably they will end up in another theater. This is the alarming outline I see."[2]

Dr. Kissinger: Can I pass this on to our intelligence people?

Amb. Dinitz: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Our remarks are that the information in the King's message generally confirms our information from other sources. It doesn't match every detail but it generally checks.

We also know Syrians have a major function in any military act. We also know the Syrians began military preparations.

We also call attention to the fact that Jordan will find itself under pressure from Egypt, Syria and possibly also Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

These are the questions I am supposed to ask you: Do you have such information?

Dr. Kissinger: Not yet.

Amb. Dinitz: I am to ask whether the King has given you such information.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 135, Country Files, Middle East, Rabin/Dinitz Sensitive Memcons, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting took place in the Map Room at the White House.

[2] Rodman sent a copy of this message to Scowcroft, commenting that "the Israelis have confirmation of this general situation—though not every detail—from other sources, and want to know if we do. [*less than 1 line not declassified*] HAK told Dinitz he would have you check and give Dinitz our answer." Scowcroft wrote: "Done, BS" at the bottom of the page. (Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box TS 3, Geopolitical File, Jordan, Chronological File, Mar. 73–Sept. 76)

Dr. Kissinger: I will have to check.

Amb. Dinitz: The third question is whether the Syrians and the Iraqi forces will try to enter Jordan against the will of the King, but unlike 1970, not against his regime but to take positions against Israel.

Dr. Kissinger: What do you think?

Amb. Dinitz: We think the King tends to exaggerate, to be alarmist. But what concerns me is that what this message says we also have similar information.

My concern is whether Syria would do such a thing without the encouragement of the Russians. And there is no evidence of the Russians encouraging this.

Dr. Kissinger: It is not plausible before the Summit.

Amb. Dinitz: Right.

Dr. Kissinger: Egypt is also part of this.

Amb. Dinitz: It seems like part and parcel of the whole strategy, in which Syria will play an important part. Where Egypt might take action independent of the Russians, Syria is much less likely to because of the flow of Soviet arms. It doesn't seem likely.

If in your absence this develops, whom do I see?

Dr. Kissinger: Scowcroft. You don't think it is so imminent that we should make contingency plans? I should be here.

Amb. Dinitz: Within a month.

Dr. Kissinger: We will get our intelligence people to check and we will let you know.

Amb. Dinitz: Sisco wants to have lunch with me, alone, on something he heard from the White House. Would this be Russian Jews?

Dr. Kissinger: Maybe the Ismail talks, because the Egyptians leaked it to our Interests Section.[3] If he raises Ismail, you can say you got a brief account from the White House. On the Russian Jews, it is up to you.

Amb. Dinitz: If it is in regard to Russian Jews, I won't talk to them in the same way as to you.

Dr. Kissinger: I really must implore you—

Amb. Dinitz: I really tried hard before the meeting with the President.[4]

Dr. Kissinger: I knew, I could tell.

---

[3] See footnote 5, Document 48.

[4] Dinitz is presumably referring to President Nixon's meeting with Prime Minister Meir; see Document 35.

Amb. Dinitz: It is really difficult here, because of the guilt feeling here because of the holocaust. In Israel it is a big issue because Golda has not come out for the Jackson Amendment.

May I say that a meeting between Jackson and the President should take place.

Dr. Kissinger: A private meeting?

Amb. Dinitz: Yes. The Senator is upset that he did not see the President alone.

Dr. Kissinger: I saw him alone. He is the only one who got advance word.

Amb. Dinitz: I have reason to know that if he gets a private meeting he might be willing to redraft the amendment along the lines you suggested—more monitoring than preventive, and eliminate the harassment provisions. It is easier for the Jews.

Dr. Kissinger: I saw Jackson last night and I think he will be reasonable. I wanted to show you my last message to Ismail. [Tab A][5] As you see, I have not committed myself to anything. Just a few general statements.

Amb. Dinitz: Well, there are many many pitfalls along the way.

Dr. Kissinger: Nothing can happen. It is too complex.

Amb. Dinitz: Very interesting his last speech.[6] Total withdrawal from any reasonable diplomatic approach. To warn the Soviets against falling into the trap of the U.S. proposal when it was their proposal.

Dr. Kissinger: I don't think they have any serious interest. Last March, and November, there were no proposals but at least there was some interest. Now it takes weeks to get an answer.

Maybe we should take an initiative, just to make it concrete.

---

[5] Not attached. Brackets in the original. In the May 3 backchannel message, Kissinger proposed moving the meeting to May 18. Kissinger also asked for confirmation that Egypt was prepared "to present more detailed views" at the next meeting of "heads of agreement which could lead to simultaneous negotiations on arrangements for withdrawal from the Suez Canal and on a final settlement." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 131, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. IV)

[6] On May 3, Saunders and Quandt sent Kissinger a memorandum informing him of Sadat's May Day speech before Kissinger's forthcoming talks in Moscow. In his speech, Sadat warned his "Soviet friends" that continuing the cease-fire was a U.S. policy that served U.S. and Israeli interests and that the U.S. objective was "to allow Israel to strengthen its presence in the occupied areas, to force Egypt to make concessions, and to weaken Arab solidarity." The memorandum noted that Sadat was clearly worried that the United States and the Soviet Union had reached an agreement on preserving the status quo in the Middle East and that the bulk of his speech was concerned with urging both countries to become more actively involved in solving the Arab-Israeli conflict. (Ibid., Box 1172, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, ME [Middle East], Jarring Talks, May 1, 1973–May 31, 1973 [2 of 3])

Amb. Dinitz: Along the lines of negotiations.

Dr. Kissinger: I know your domestic situation, but just to make a concrete proposal.

Amb. Dinitz: There are dangers. It prejudges you in negotiations.

Dr. Kissinger: Yes, but doing nothing has its dangers too.

Amb. Dinitz: The onus is on them, because we have accepted the two proposals from State put to us.

Dr. Kissinger: It can't go on indefinitely.

Amb. Dinitz: In Moscow will it come up?

Dr. Kissinger: We will get a two-hour speech.

---

52. Memorandum From Director of Central Intelligence Schlesinger to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, May 5, 1973.

SUBJECT

Middle East Military Situation

Attached is our assessment of the present military situation between the Arab states and Israel.[2]

The pattern of Arab activity does not suggest that an outbreak of hostilities is likely before the UN debate on the Middle East in late May, and we doubt that Sadat will decide to try a major operation within the next six weeks.

The moves that the Arabs have made, taken collectively, have the objective at this time of bringing maximum psychological pressure on the US and Israel. There is danger that these moves will in the future develop some momentum of their own.

The Soviets are seriously concerned and are counseling the Arabs against precipitate military action, even though some Soviet officials have contributed to keeping a relatively high level of tension in the Middle East area.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 647, Country Files, Middle East (General) Vol. #9, 1972[–August 1974]. Secret; Sensitive.

[2] Attached, but not printed.

The Israelis are watching the situation closely, and probably are more concerned than their intelligence assessments indicate. So far, these assessments still judge that Sadat will not go to war.[3]

JR Schlesinger

[3] On May 4, the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo sent an assessment of the prospects for peace or war in the Middle East in telegram 1316, which noted that Sadat and the Government of Egypt seemed to despair of the United States playing a role in a peace settlement acceptable to Egypt, yet also hoped that it would come around before it was too late, i.e., by producing some change in the Israeli position. Egyptian officials spoke of a "grave situation" with the "only remaining option being military action." Diplomatic colleagues in Cairo increasingly thought that this might happen either by an "admittedly self-destructive Egyptian initiative, or by Israeli preemptive action provoked by Egyptian rhetoric." (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

53. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Zavidovo, May 7, 1973, 7:40–11:40 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Leonid I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee, CPSU
Andrei A. Gromyko, Minister for Foreign Affairs
Anatoli F. Dobrynin, Ambassador to the USA
Andrei M. Aleksandrov, Assistant to Brezhnev
Georgi M. Kornienko, Head of USA Division, Foreign Ministry
Andrei Vavilov, Foreign Ministry
Viktor M. Sukhodrov, Foreign Ministry, Interpreter
Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Helmut Sonnenfeldt, NSC Senior Staff
Philip Odeen, NSC Senior Staff
William Hyland, NSC Senior Staff
Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff
Richard Campbell, NSC Staff

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 75, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Kissinger Conversations at Zavidovo, May 5–8, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The conversation took place in Brezhnev's Office at the Politburo Villa in Zavidovo. All brackets except those that indicate omitted material are in the original.

SUBJECTS

Nuclear Treaty; SALT Principles; Middle East; Communiqués of HAK visit and Brezhnev visit

Brezhnev: I have one major question. The rest—the Middle East,[2] the principles—are minor matters. Can we trust him—Gromyko?

Kissinger: I have often wondered. He knows more than any other Foreign Minister.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

The Middle East

Brezhnev: Let us turn to an easy question now, the Middle East. Let us send Dr. Kissinger to the Middle East for two weeks.

Gromyko: President Nixon and I will write out a brief lucid instruction, and it is done with.

Kissinger: You know the story of the scorpion who wanted to cross the Suez Canal. He asked a camel if he could ride on his back. The camel said, "If I do and you sting me, I will be dead." The scorpion said, "I will drown also, so you have every guarantee." So the camel took the scorpion on his back and they started across. In the middle of the Canal the scorpion stung the camel and as they drowned the camel asked, "what did you do this for?" The scorpion said, "you forgot this is the Middle East." [Laughter]

Gromyko: Very good.

Brezhnev: I have heard a different version, a scorpion—on the back of a frog. And the frog said, "That is just my nature!"

Kissinger: There is a story about an Arab lying in his tent trying to take an afternoon sleep. There were a lot of children making a lot of noise. So he told the children, "In the village they are giving away free grapes and you should go there." So the children went away to the village. It got very quiet. Just as he was falling asleep he said to himself, "You idiot, what are you doing here if they are giving away free grapes?" So he went to the village. [Laughter]

So I think it would take three weeks.

---

[2] On May 1, President Nixon sent Brezhnev a personal message, noting that Kissinger would shortly be meeting with him to review the state of preparations for their forthcoming summit talks in June. Kissinger would be prepared to review all subjects of mutual interest, including the Middle East. (Ibid., Box 68, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 17, [May 1973–June 7, 1973]) On May 3, Brezhnev replied, stating that one important matter to discuss at the summit would be the "extremely dangerous" situation in the Middle East. He argued that it was important to reach mutual U.S.–Soviet understanding regarding the principles on which a Middle East settlement should be built and suggested that work on such principles be done while Kissinger was in the Soviet Union. (Ibid., Box 72, Country Files, Europe, US–USSR, Brezhnev–Nixon Exchanges, 1973)

Brezhnev: Three! Since this is the evening of jokes, I will tell you one.

Kissinger: I was hoping to trigger you—you are much better at it.

Brezhnev: Sometimes in our negotiations something happens that applies to Jackson. Two Jews meet. One asks, "Abraham, why are you not going to Israel? You applied for a permit and everything seemed to be settled." The other replied, "Some goddamn fool wrote an anonymous letter on me alleging I am not a Jew." [Laughter]

So with the communiqué we still have time, and Mr. Nixon can still take a look at it. The experience of the Moscow Summit shows it can be done.

Sonnenfeldt: Kornienko and I spent all night on it.

Brezhnev: Is not that a pleasant way? Let me tell you another story: Two Jews meet: One asks, "Abraham, did you hear that Isaac's dacha burned down?" Abraham says, "So what, it is none of my business." "It is really none of my business either," the first one says, "but it is pleasant nonetheless."[3]

Kissinger: When your Ambassador and I drove in from the airport we discussed our mutual interest, first, that there should not be a war at all, and, . . .

Brezhnev: Let me suggest, we could discuss the principles we handed over[4] some later time, and just discuss the general situation now.

Kissinger: I would be prepared.

As a result of this I asked our intelligence people to make an analysis of what they know, and I would be glad to discuss this with you.

Brezhnev: Please, I do think it is important.

---

[3] Describing his trip to Zavidovo in his memoirs, Kissinger wrote: "Brezhnev's idea of diplomacy was to beat the other party into submission or cajole it with heavy-handed humor. My tactic was to reduce matters to easy banter to avoid personal showdowns and to give emphasis to our sticking points when I turned serious." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 282)

[4] Attached, but not printed. The principles called for "the complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Arab territories occupied in 1967" and stated that "the international lines of demarcation, which existed between Israel and the neighbouring Arab countries as of June 4, 1967 shall be recognized as the final boundaries between them." Commenting on this exchange in his memoirs, Kissinger wrote: "Brezhnev had offered me no program. I thought the veiled threat of war was a bluff because in our view a war would lead to a defeat for the Arabs from which the Soviets would not be able to extricate their clients. Gromyko had given me a set of principles at Zavidovo, but they were identical to the Arab program. Since Brezhnev in his talk with me had not been prepared to retreat one inch from it, we had deferred discussion until the June summit." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 296)

Kissinger: Because we have a major and an immediate interest. The major interest is to avoid war altogether; the immediate interest is to avoid a war before the General Secretary's trip to the United States.[5]

The general assessment of our people is that it is unlikely that the Egyptians and the Syrians will start military operations in the next six weeks. And we also know from our sources that at a high level you have been urging restraint. We have this from our own sources too. Some of your lower level people are sometimes more adventurous.[6]

Brezhnev: That is absolutely true; at the high level we are urging restraint. Then I guess we should discuss which one of us has more adventurists in our midst, the Soviet Union or the United States.

Kissinger: I am sure we have some too.

Brezhnev: We withdraw that from the discussion anyway.

Kissinger: We have some military information—I do not know if you want to go through it—of various movements in the Arab world.

Sukhodrev: Troop movements?

Kissinger: Airplanes, military forces. I can run through it.

Brezhnev: Yes.

Kissinger: Within Egypt, they have moved what we call SA–6 surface-to-air missiles to within 20 miles of the Suez Canal. They have received 30 Mirage fighters from Libya. They have moved TU–16 bombers, which you gave them, from Aswan to Cairo. There is a high state of alert in the Egyptian Air Force, and reservists have been recalled. They have moved some commando units closer to the Suez Canal. We have information that at the Arab Chiefs of Staff meeting, April 21–25, there was an atmosphere of despair and foreboding because of the Egyptian determination to go to war regardless of the consequences. A Moroccan squadron of planes has gone to Syria. Two squadrons of Algerian MIG–21 aircraft have gone to Libya. They also may have sent MIG–16 and 19's to Syria. But you would know that better than we. They also plan to send Sudanese ground forces to Egypt and there is a vaguer plan to send some to Syria.

So there are these movements of these other Arab forces. Our assessment is it is still largely psychological. But we do take it very seri-

---

[5] Brezhnev and Gromyko visited Washington and San Clemente June 18–26. See Documents 72–74.

[6] In a May 8 meeting with Kissinger, Gromyko insisted that Kissinger was "underestimating the danger of the situation" in the Middle East, and that the United States was unwilling, for reasons of its own, to try to find a real solution. "If the United States thinks that the Soviet Union will be a partner to agreements promoting the Israeli occupation of lands," said Gromyko, "it shows that we are talking in two different languages; and we might as well draw an X through this paper." (Memorandum of conversation; National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 75, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Kissinger Conversations at Zavidovo, May 5–8, 1973)

ously, and there is a possibility that there is a plan to do something before the summit to force us into joint action.

As I told your Foreign Minister, I am planning to meet Ismail next weekend in Paris, probably Paris.

Brezhnev: That's not bad intelligence. Israel also is recalling its reservists and has banned holidays and vacations for doctors. And they have deployed advance hospitals with a capacity for 1,000 wounded. I'm not familiar with other substantial latest developments, but we can both note from our discussions that certain preparations are under way. And on the part of all these countries together—Egypt, Israel, Syria, Libya and others—they can be assumed to have concentrated an army jointly of some million men. I'd say if we were to pool the intelligence available to both sides, we would be close to an accurate estimate. That is, of course, what amounts to a serious problem. I wouldn't go so far as to take it for absolute truth, but according to TASS in Syria and Lebanon all sorts of committees are being formed and all sorts of military meetings are being held—not just to have a few drinks but to discuss military matters.

In any event, there are grounds to draw the conclusion that in this area where we would both like to see a just peace and guarantees for states, the course of events is proceeding in the wrong direction. If you take a superficial look at this general picture, the United States would seem to be taking a tranquil attitude toward these events, obviously drawing its own conclusion as to the possible results of a new military flare-up. I can conceive of the idea that perhaps they are thinking that the Russians can do everything in that area.

Kissinger: What do you mean?

Brezhnev: I'll explain. In the sense that we can tell the Arabs not to fight. All that has been done until now in the direction of urging restraint has had its positive results in the sense of contributing to such restraint. And our influence could go on having a positive effect in that direction, provided the Arab states could see prospects ahead for a basis being found for a peaceful solution to the problem. But the mistake of the US—and obviously ourselves too—may lie in fact that neither side can count on its influence being effective if the sides there don't see prospects for a peaceful settlement. If we don't take steps in that direction, i.e., practical steps toward a settlement, we can't count on a peaceful solution. All our hopes in that area will be proved untrue. Because the Arabs have before them the task of returning their lands and in those circumstances if Israel, counting on the success achieved in the short war, remains in place, we might not be able to maintain the status quo in the situation, and then we may be confronted by events that will present us both—the US and the Soviet Union—with complex problems.

I want to be quite frank. And in that spirit of frankness I want to say that all good things done by us in the direction at the Summit of achieving détente and avoiding a confrontation will all be scrapped, and no one will believe us any more. No one can say what practical nature such a war will assume. Secondly, beyond all doubt in that case the whole world will be in turmoil over this war—propaganda, mass media, everything.

That is how we view the general situation. It's our feeling that you and we can prevent such a course of events only if we can work out some principles and measures aimed at putting both sides on the right track.

Such, as I say, is our view of the general situation. We had a brief opportunity to exchange a few words on this yesterday. It will certainly be very strange indeed and incomprehensible if two big states as the US and the Soviet Union should prove to be so impotent as to be unable to solve this problem. This is something no one in the world could understand. That is, I feel, the political basis upon which we should try to think about some practical measures. On this topic we have officially stated 150 times, and I wish to confirm this again, and you can say this to President Nixon: This isn't a question involving the specific interests of the Soviet Union and the United States. It is a question concerning the need to restore order and assure a tranquil life for all the states in the area.

I'd also like Dr. Kissinger to communicate to President Nixon another important fact: We've never spoken with the Arab states—nor do we intend to take any action in that regard—in the sense of impinging upon the economic interests of the Arab countries regarding the interests of third countries. If I'm saying something that is not true, this will one day come out anyway. I stress this fact because we know there exist certain traditional ties regarding oil and other areas, and that is entirely the business of Britain, France and the US. And that is something we don't interfere in at all. Our only interest is to preserve the peace.

Let's reflect on this a little bit. In June, I'm supposed to be the guest of President Nixon personally, and I'm certainly counting on good results from that. Then, suddenly a war breaks out. Last year, you started a vicious bombing campaign in Vietnam and resorted to measures you had never done before, but nevertheless we gave President Nixon a warm reception in the Soviet Union. And our entire Party took an understanding attitude toward this. But if war breaks out now, the country will take an entirely different attitude.

Kissinger: That's a delicate way of putting it.

Brezhnev: And in this country too, there would be a different attitude: a wave of protest among the working class and the intelligentsia.

All this cannot allow us to simply turn a blind eye on this question. And all of the calculations and hopes that somebody might exert a beneficial influence or that one side may prove stronger, may be toppled. It is very easy to make a mistake in this field.

I don't have much more to say. It's quite enough for a general discussion.

Kissinger: I appreciate the General Secretary's remarks and the spirit in which he made them.

First—this isn't exactly relevant to what the General Secretary said, but it is important to his trip. We will make an absolutely maximum effort to prevent actions by minority groups inconsistent with the spirit of the development of Soviet-American relations, and will not allow any special groups to interfere with our foreign policy. This is separate from what the General Secretary said.

Brezhnev: To that I approach in this way: I am not going on a visit to any groups in the United States. I am going to visit the President. I am not interested in any actions by groups of 100 to 200 people somewhere; though they can be unpleasant. Any country, by normal international standards, tries to treat guests in a normal way regardless of the color of their skin or flag. No one will try to overturn my car. Nor am I going in the expectation of having the American people rise up with red flags. I have been abroad and seen people raise their own flags. Here too, foreign visitors come—the King of Afghanistan, Emperor Haile Selassie, King Hassan—and we fly our flag and theirs. If someone shouts catcalls, that's their business. When I visited France, there was concerned discussion of anti-Sovietism—not because they were afraid of me but because they thought they should treat guests civilly in accordance with international law.

They don't have to shout hurrahs. I'm quite sure indeed there are certain groups in the United States that would be very eager to inflict inconveniences during my visit or commit some act. But in that respect I value very highly the concern of President Nixon to avoid that.

Kissinger: Mr. General Secretary, let me turn to the specific problem of the Middle East. We agree substantially with your analysis of the situation. We agree there are great dangers, produced by the despair of the Arabs produced by their lack of a sense of proportion, on one hand, and the intransigence of the Israelis on the other side. The trouble is, the Arabs cannot win a war, and the Israelis cannot achieve a peace by their own efforts and on their present course. Now, in this situation, it is clear that unless some new element is introduced into the situation, the stalemate will continue. And again we substantially understand your point of view. But we have to be realistic in recognizing the scope of effective action. You have referred to the fact that some people overestimate what you can do with the Arabs, and this is prob-

ably true. But some people also overestimate what we can do with the Israelis, especially in a short period of time. The present situation is intractable because both sides would rather go to war than accept the program of the other.

Brezhnev: I would like to speak about our influence over the Arab governments. I spoke in the sense that it is hard to exert influence when there is no prospect for the liberation of occupied territory. The Arabs will ask us what we are in favor of. What are we proposing? If, on the other hand, the U.S. supports the present position of Israel, of course Israel will fly with wings in the air shouting "America will help us; what have we to fear?" So there are two sides to the question of influence.

When the United States really took the path of searching for peace in Vietnam, then we really started using our influence in Vietnam. We sent Katushev, and when that wasn't enough, Podgorny, then Katushev again. And those efforts were contributions to the achievement of the agreement to end the war. But if you say you can't influence Israel, how can you count on us to influence the Arabs?

Kissinger: We can influence Israel, and we are prepared to do so, up to a certain point. What is important is to know what that realistic point is. We can't influence Israel in the direction of the maximum Arab position.

I told your Ambassador: When I met Ismail he said Israel had to withdraw. I asked "In return for what"? He said, an end of the state of belligerence. When I asked him what this was, it was indistinguishable from the present ceasefire. Then after that, Israel still had to have negotiations with the Palestinians. Only then would there be a state of peace. It is hard to convince the Israelis why they should give up the territory in exchange for something which they already have, in order to avoid a war they can win—only to have to negotiate then with the most intransigent element of the Arabs.

I give this example to show the complexity of the situation.

So we have been looking for some realistic formulation—not an Israeli one but perhaps one somewhat more flexible than the Arab one—that will perhaps start a process that will give the Arabs some hope that progress is being made. And we are prepared to discuss this with the Egyptians and with you. One difficulty is, when I look, for example, at the principles you handed us—and we won't have time to discuss them tonight—I see this is essentially the Egyptian position. If we on our side give you then a set of proposals that is the same as the Israeli position, then there will be total deadlock. What we should do is to work out principles that are sufficiently general to urge on both sides and get negotiations going simultaneously on a provisional solution and an overall solution. At the same time we can try to work out concrete provisions for certain parts of it. If we discuss the situation only abstractly,

it will only result in a continuation of the status quo or some irrational outburst of violence.

Brezhnev: I've been listening very attentively, and I would like again to introduce one element and to say that as I see it, the Arab world—that is, those directly linked with the military actions of Israel—and Israel itself is waiting to see what will happen after the Brezhnev visit to the United States, and what Nixon and Brezhnev will have to say on the situation in the Mideast, and how what they say can influence the settlement of the conflict. If they simply read, instead of realistic things, a mere weak brew, it will be hard for them to find anything on which to act. Now they know preparations for this are under way, and this is a restraining factor. If on the eve of my visit, or during my visit, no signal is given to Golda Meir or Sadat or Assad, then it is very difficult to foresee what will happen. After all, all these are sovereign states—not our colonies, not your colonies. What can be expected in the U.S. is heating up in connection with this visit. Not so in this country. How then can Brezhnev go to the U.S. if we don't have something realistic? We'll lose the very ground from under our feet, and lose all the progress in our efforts for peace. It is a very complex problem, and it needs every effort.

When we sign the main document, the agreement on the prevention of nuclear war,[7] everyone will understand what it means. There will be explanations, but the document is clear. It means there will be no war. But here, on this problem, if we pass over it in silence or have only a weak brew, it will have a harmful effect from the political point of view. Our interests are involved because this is very close to our borders, and the U.S. is very close. So it is impossible not to take some steps, or else President Nixon and I might find ourselves in an impossible situation. After all, nothing in this world is eternal—similarly the present military advantage enjoyed by Israel is not eternal either. Israel is somewhat concerned that some have severed diplomatic relations with her, and the front around her is growing tighter. But now she's easy because she enjoys the support of the United States—but is that an eternal category? Maybe it will be shown as a result of my visit that both the U.S. and the USSR are quite impotent in the Mideast, but in practice that is not so.

All I've been saying on this score is something on which I've not consulted my colleagues. They are my own feelings and thoughts.

Kissinger: One problem about the Mideast is that there have been endless theoretical debates, and every side wants their total program. We are interested in concrete discussions, but they have to be in some

[7] See footnote 3, Document 58.

realistic framework. You fear the Arabs may start a war if their objectives are not satisfied, or it is also possible Israel will start a war if they fear their concerns are not met.

Last night in the tower you spoke of the spirit of compromise. I agree we should have concrete discussions on a set of principles which we can try to urge on the parties to implement.

Brezhnev: Yesterday I was very modest in my discussion with you, because I felt it was a subject for fuller discussion.

Kissinger: No, I don't consider it a formal statement.

Brezhnev: We were talking on a different plane.

Kissinger: Good, I agree.

Brezhnev: That's all very true, but also it has to be borne in mind. But for six years we have been saying principles, principles, principles, but going no further.

Kissinger: I agree. That's what I've been saying about SALT. It would be useful if one could think of some concrete steps that could be taken immediately, that could at least start the process.

In the case of our Berlin negotiations, Mr. General Secretary, we went through many years of abstract discussions, but then settled it in six months, nine months—by becoming very concrete and both sides making some concessions. I think the same procedure might work in the Mideast.

Gromyko: In the case of West Berlin, it took about three years.

Kissinger: But when we started getting serious between us, it took about a year.

Gromyko: The general bilateral talks took three years; the formal talks took one year. But that's just a factual statement of the case.

Brezhnev: But finally, can we at least agree on a first point, a second point, a third, a fourth, and a fifth point? Because now we have no points; all we have is this weak brew.

Last year we had a discussion that seemed to inspire us with hopes that in 1973 some concrete measures might be possible.[8] Now we're already in the fifth month of 1973 and we've not yet even begun to talk about concrete measures.

So where do we go from here?

Kissinger: Well, of course, we have your proposed principles. And I will see—I expect—Mr. Ismail the end of next week. And I will inform your Ambassador of the results, as I did last time. And perhaps out of these discussions some concrete statement can be developed that can

[8] See *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XIV, Soviet Union, October 1971–May 1972, Document 284.

be urged on both sides. And in the meantime we can discuss in a preliminary way the principles you gave us. But I would frankly like to hear what Ismail has to say before I make a final judgment.

Brezhnev: So you feel that it would be best first to wait for the results of your meeting with Ismail before becoming very concrete?

Kissinger: Yes. And frankly, this is what Ismail said to me last time I met him.

Brezhnev: I too have met our Ismail, another Ismail [referring to Egyptian War Minister Ahmed Ismail's visit to Moscow following Hafiz Ismail's visit]. I will probably become an Ismail too. And you too will become an Ismail. And then we will be two Ismails.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

---

54. Memorandum From the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, May 8, 1973.

Dr. Kissinger has asked that the following report be passed to you:[2]

I had about eight hours with Brezhnev today in formal sessions, following several hours Sunday when we talked informally while he took me to his hunting preserve.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

Soviets have also given me a new paper on the Middle East which does not however materially go beyond existing Arab positions.[3] Brezhnev has several times stressed his concern that conflict may break out before, during or shortly after his visit. He says that he can exert effective influence on Arabs only if latter see hope of a settlement. I have stressed the need to get away from abstractions and maximum positions and our readiness to play role in realistic negotiations, including our willingness to exert influence on Israelis in that case. I suggested

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 32, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Moscow, London Trip, HAKTO & Misc., May 4–11, 1973. Secret; Eyes Only. Sent for information.

[2] The report was transmitted to Scowcroft in telegram Hakto 19A from Moscow, May 8. (Ibid.)

[3] See footnote 4, Document 53.

leaving further US–Soviet exchanges until my next meeting with Ismail next week.[4]

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

[4] During his afternoon conversation with the General Secretary on May 8, Kissinger told Brezhnev: "When my trip to the Soviet Union was being planned, a detailed discussion of the Middle East was not foreseen. It was only the night before I left, when the President had already left, that I learned the General Secretary's desire to discuss the subject in detail. And I myself was leaving in four hours. We share the General Secretary's concern that there must not be an outbreak of war either before or after his visit to the United States, and we will cooperate seriously in that effort. I will go over the principles with the Foreign Minister, and then I will meet with Mr. Ismail, and after that we should see if we can develop a concrete procedure that gets the process started." (Memorandum of conversation, 2:10–4:20 p.m., May 8; National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 75, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Kissinger Conversations at Zavidovo, May 5–8, 1973)

55. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, May 12, 1973, 9:50–10:40 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Mr. Abba Eban, Israeli Minister of Foreign Affairs
Ambassador Simcha Dinitz, of Israel
Mr. Avner Idan, Minister of the Embassy of Israel
Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Mr. Harold Saunders, NSC Staff
Mr. Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff

Eban: The people I spoke to made an effort to devote their attention to what I was saying. They had a kind of glazed look.

Kissinger: Really?

Eban: Rogers and Shultz. They spoke to me with a kind of lordly assumption that nothing was happening here.[2] Has there been any foreign reaction yet?

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 135, Country Files, Middle East, Rabin/Dinitz Sensitive Memcons, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting took place in Kissinger's office at the White House. All brackets are in the original.

[2] On May 2, heavy fighting between the Lebanese army and Palestinian guerrillas erupted in Lebanon. The fighting continued despite a cease-fire agreement reached the evening of May 3. A new cease-fire agreement was reached May 4. Fighting erupted again on May 7 and the Lebanese Government declared a state of emergency, placing the

Kissigner: No.

Eban: From Moscow?

Kissinger: No.

Eban: Did they talk [in Zavidovo] about us and our region?

Kissinger: Yes. Very passionately and very aggressively.[3] They think there is the possibility of a war. They say they are exercising a restraining influence. We have independent evidence of that.

Eban: Yes, we do also. If our neighbors were not Arabs, the probability would be zero. But they must give the impression of an eve-of-war atmosphere, to show movement. Everything proceeds now from their internal situation, which is always the first order of business. Internationally they are not only antagonistic to us and to you but also they are increasingly suspicious of the Soviet Union. It is now explicit, not just coffee-house gossip.

The result would be catastrophic for them, militarily, politically, domestically, and internationally. The humiliation at home; the Soviet Union would say we told you so.

Kissinger: But the Soviet Union might not do that. They might try to stop you. And if an oil boycott is organized, they would gain something in the west.

Eban: But a boycott wouldn't work, because Iran would not go along.

This is unlike 1967 when the Soviet Union was instigating it.

Sadat is not bright, but he can think a few moves ahead. He is not so volatile.

Kissinger: That is not my impression. He shows no capacity for thinking moves ahead.

Eban: But domestically he has shown an enormous capacity to reconcile the belligerent rhetoric with non-shooting. He has shown a meticulous ability to avoid shooting.

On the ground, the Mirages are effectively in Egypt. Saudi Arabia, Iraq and Kuwait have aircraft, but not long-range. The army across the Canal is unshaven, playing cards; there is no vigilance. Sadat shows up at the Canal with a hat, expecting to be photographed.

We have told our military to assume we may fight.

---

country under martial law. A third cease-fire was announced on May 8 several hours after Syria closed the border with Lebanon and threatened to intervene on behalf of the Palestinians. (Memorandum from Director of Central Intelligence Schlesinger to President Nixon, May 9; ibid., Box 51, President's Daily Briefings, President's Daily Briefs, May 1–15, 1973)

[3] See Documents 53 and 54.

Kissinger: The Soviets said you were constructing field hospitals in the Sinai.

Eban: [laughing] They are already there.

Politically they are trying a pressure tactic. They see the Summit and hope to see it take place in the context of an international crisis atmosphere, and a United Nations Security Council debate. They are unhappy because they are not getting enough attention here; the press is occupied with other things!

Kissinger: Are you keeping this going!

Saunders: The Egyptians are saying that.

Eban: They are disappointed with the relative quiet.

Kissinger: Of course, you have an interest in keeping things appearing excessively quiet, to keep us from doing anything.

Eban: Yes. The usual problem of the wish as father to the thought.

Kissinger: During the Khartoum incident, someone suggested we ask you for help. You would have blown up Beirut.

Eban: You know that it was from Beirut that the phone call went to finish them off.[4]

Kissinger: We know that.

Eban: We don't have the feeling we should revise our estimate of the general situation. It is developing positively but slowly.

Kissinger: How do you see things developing?

Eban: Assuming he does not want to start shooting, he can even use these diplomatic events—the Summit, the Security Council—to avoid shooting. Politically, they want to use international pressure on us to commit ourselves to total withdrawal—which we won't do.

I wondered about your reaction after Ismail's visit here—which I assume might have a continuation. If there is no continuation, he will have to find a substitute.

I am relieved at my conversation with the Secretary.[5] I felt no sense of having to do something urgently. It would be objectively bad.

We have to block their actions. In the Security Council, they want to set up international machinery. I can't blame them. We oppose new machinery. Secretary Rogers says he opposes new machinery. It would be an alibi for them to avoid realistic negotiations. We don't need further channels. If there is no negotiation, it is not because of a shortage of frameworks, channels or gimmicks. If we are to get them to change their view, we follow our psychological plan of trying to get them to see

---

[4] See footnote 3, Document 41.

[5] Eban met with Rogers at the State Department, May 10, 3:10 p.m. (Personal Papers of William P. Rogers, Appointment books)

that their options are really very few—the status quo or realistic negotiation.

In the President's statement we see a general feeling that immobility is unsatisfactory.[6] What is behind this?

Kissinger: As I have told your Ambassador, American passivity is due to a fortuitous combination of circumstances and cannot be counted on indefinitely. If you look at the constellation of leading officials, you cannot count on the continuation of the present . . . So far, the Egyptian policy is so stupid, there is no particular challenge. But what would the American response be if the Egyptians became more flexible, even procedurally, it is hard to say. It may be in your interest to try to preempt this with a scheme of your own.

I have been reluctant to get us into the position where both sides can shoot at us without considering any scheme. Unless one side or the other gives us a foothold . . .

Dinitz: You think the Egyptians might come around to a special agreement on the Canal?

Kissinger: No. What might be possible is some souped-up version of Resolution 242 that might provide an alibi for the Egyptians for a Rhodes-type negotiation. It could be a link to an interim agreement in the guise of being linked to an overall one. It might be extended over years.

I have not seen any indication from the Egyptians that they are willing to show that degree of flexibility.

When I saw Ismail, he said he would think about ways of reconciling sovereignty and security. But we never heard from them.

Eban: I don't think they make the distinction in a way that the Israeli military presence can remain anywhere. They see it as complete withdrawal and complete sovereignty.

Kissinger: I have no evidence otherwise.

Eban: On the Israeli side, we definitely don't accept the idea that boundary changes must be ruled out. Whether we could get them in negotiations cannot be foreseen. Whether they would be substantial or not cannot be foretold. There is a dynamic and transforming element in a negotiation itself. But no Israeli government will say in advance that it rules out boundary changes.

There are gimmicks that reconcile the sovereignty of one with the security of another. We are aware of that. Golda once told Rogers that

---

[6] Eban is possibly referring to President Nixon's May 3 radio address about his administration's fourth annual foreign policy report to Congress. See *Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, pp. 345–347.

Sharm . . . he suggested a 99-year lease; she said 49 years would be o.k.! Further north, it is harder.

They want 100% withdrawal in stage one but won't offer 100% in stage one.

It is too optimistic to think they are in that stage of flexibility. On our side, I believe there would be flexibility in a negotiation. But I don't think we will give up our positions ahead of the negotiations.

Kissinger: There are more pleasant experiences than negotiating with Israelis who are holding the subject matter of the negotiations.

Eban: I congratulated Bhutto on the UN resolution last year. He said, "We have the resolution; those bastards have the territory." I said, "No comment."

I hope you realize on sovereignty versus security that your only problem is not Egypt.

Kissinger: No, I understand. I personally have no desire to seek the Nobel Peace Prize in that area.

Eban: We favor a no-prejudice formula for early negotiations. They can't graft their position onto us.

Kissinger: How about the Jordanian side?

Eban: He now asserts quite frankly, that he doesn't want to be first. He told Lord Balniel after Hussein was here. He feels he could not bear the brunt of it.

The Shah told me he was advising Hussein not to be first.

On the question of the Persian Gulf. I found the Shah very relaxed, for two reasons: He was very satisfied with the United States for the first time. They are usually very querulous that he can't get enough; now he can. Secondly, on oil, he feels there is a United States interest now. What he told Cyrus Sulzberger was revealed doctrine. He wants to be strong enough to resist any threat except the Soviet Union. He thinks the Soviets are shifting away from Egypt to the Persian Gulf because of less American resistance.

Kissinger: They would be wrong.

Eban: He feels that documents are not important. For instance, the India–Pakistan crisis showed this. But he is creating an American interest there, which is more.

He sees a triangle—Israel, Ethiopia, and Iran—which if buttressed by US support will be a stabilizing influence. We exchanged information with respect to the internal stability, and the problem about Ethiopia. We hope he [the Emperor] gets strong support here. The military always say he can't use this and that—I hope your criteria are something other than that.

Kissinger: Our military are especially hard on allies.

Dinitz: We know.

Kissinger: You can't complain! The trouble is he is the most tiresome head of state.

Eban: He insists on surviving.

Kissinger: I mean he is boring.

Eban: On airplanes, the Ambassador said he was told it was stuck particularly for preoccupation reasons. With the Mirages, our concern is naturally a little more lively now.

Kissinger: There is no problem in substance, but it is a matter of getting attention.

Eban: On the Soviet Jews.

Kissinger: They said they would not increase it but it would continue at the same level, 36,000. They would consider the special cases I gave them a list of. They had the preoccupation that every time they made concessions we increased our demand. We think we have done a helluva lot.

Eban: We think it is of because of public pressure.

Kissinger: Up to a point it is helpful—but not to the point of defeating MFN.

Eban: They are going to have trials in Minsk. This could stimulate trouble.

Kissinger: I raised it twice. There was an explosion each time.

[The meeting then ended.]

---

56. Message From Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev to President Nixon[1]

Washington, May 13, 1973.

Dear Mr. President,

You have already been informed, of course, by Dr. Kissinger of the talks we had with him in Moscow. On my part, I feel that the exchange of opinion which took place, was useful, from the point of view of

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 72, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Brezhnev–Nixon Exchanges, 1973. No classification marking. A handwritten notation at the top of the page reads: "Handed to HAK by D[obrynin], 1:00 p.m., 5/15/73."

moving ahead in the questions that will be the subject of our discussions during my visit to the US next June.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

As for the international problems, we always believed that one of the most critical issues is that of the Middle East. And now great dangers are in wait of us in the Middle East. The developments there can take such a turn which neither we, nor—I believe—you would like to happen. We frankly expressed to Dr. Kissinger our appraisal of the present situation. Our statements might have sounded quite blunt to Dr. Kissinger, yet the bluntness is dictated by the explosiveness of the situation itself.

In the conversation with Dr. Kissinger it was said—and I would like to repeat it to you personally—that if the main question of withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Arab territories occupied in 1967, is settled, then all the other questions, including those of the security of Israel and of other countries of the region, can be solved; frankly speaking, they will not then be an obstacle for the settlement. And it is the leaders of Israel themselves who constantly maintain, that those are the very questions, i.e. the questions of security, which concern them.

Dr. Kissinger also offered a number of considerations on how, in the US opinion, it would be possible to act further on the questions of the Middle East settlement. Certain ideas, expressed by him, went, in our view, in the direction of facilitating the search of a solution of the main question—that of the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories. But, frankly speaking, there is a lack of completeness here. We hope that necessary clarity will be added to the US position on this question when we receive the communication from you on that matter, as was promised by Dr. Kissinger, within 7 or 10 days after his return to Washington.

We, on our part, are prepared to work on the Middle East problem, sparing neither time nor efforts, before my visit to the US. There may not be any doubt that the fixation at our meeting of exact and clear understanding between ourselves regarding the ways of the Middle East settlement on a just and solid basis would be another major milestone both in the relations between our countries and in the normalization of the world situation as a whole. I believe that this is a feasible task and the achievement of such mutual understanding would undoubtedly give a due impetus to the peaceful settlement in the Middle East and to the working out by the parties concerned of concrete measures of its implementation.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

In conclusion, I would like once more to note the constructiveness of the talks with Dr. Kissinger and the atmosphere of frankness, in which they were held and which increasingly characterize our rela-

tions. The talks were a useful prelude to the important negotiations which we shall have with you in the month of June.[2]

Sincerely,

L. Brezhnev[3]

---

[2] On May 16, Nixon replied, saying that he had noted the General Secretary's comments in his May 13 letter concerning forthcoming negotiations including the Middle East problem. He promised to address these important matters in a subsequent message. (Ibid., Box 940, VIP Visits, General Secretary Brezhnev Visit to USA, June 1973, Briefing Book [1 of 2])

[3] The original bears this typed signature.

---

57. Minutes of Senior Washington Special Actions Group Meeting[1]

Washington, May 15, 1973, 3:20–4:09 p.m.

SUBJECT

Lebanon and Middle East Hostilities

PARTICIPANTS

Chairman—Henry A. Kissinger

State—
William Porter
Joseph Sisco
David Korn

Defense—
William P. Clements, Jr.
James H. Noyes

JCS—
Vice Adm. John P. Weinel

CIA—
James Schlesinger
John Waller
Samuel Hoskinson

NSC Staff—
Brig. Gen. Brent Scowcroft
Richard T. Kennedy
Harold H. Saunders
Jeanne W. Davis

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

It was agreed that:

1) A Working Group would prepare some plans based on various contingencies;

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, NSC Insititutional Files (H–Files), Box H–117, Minutes Files (1969–1974), WSAG Minutes, Originals, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Codeword. The meeting took place in the White House Situation Room.

2) State and Defense would prepare an options paper on Libyan nationalization of American oil companies;

3) the overall strategy paper on the Middle East will be updated and submitted.

Mr. Kissinger: (to Schlesinger) Can you give us a run-down?

(Mr. Schlesinger briefed from the attached text.)[2]

Mr. Sisco: I agree with this evaluation. It accords with State's analysis.

Mr. Kissinger: What I want to get out of this meeting is to get a Working Group started on three contingencies: (1) a plan for an outbreak of fighting in Lebanon that might involve Syria—an approximation of what we should do if a situation similar to that in Jordan in 1970 occurs. What might the Israelis do? What would we want them to do? How would we react to a Syrian invasion of Lebanon?

Mr. Porter: Would you include an Israeli invasion to push the Syrians out?

Mr. Kissinger: That's right.

Mr. Sisco: Eban told us that when the Israelis last got together with the Lebanese in their Military Armistice Commission contacts, the Lebanese said they assumed Israel would be there if the Syrians should intervene.

Mr. Kissinger: In 1970 Jordan wanted the Israelis to come in at the right moment. Let's focus on our diplomatic posture, our military posture, and our attitude toward the Soviet Union and any moves they might make in such a situation.

Mr. Porter: Including the evacuation of American citizens?

Mr. Kissinger: I have assumed that was a State Department responsibility.

Mr. Porter: This could put you ashore momentarily if you wanted.

Mr. Kissinger: I don't know whether we will want to go ashore, but we had damned well better have the option and know how to do it. I would like to know with some precision the various ways in which we might become involved. For example: (1) if the Israelis go in and the Soviets threaten; (2) if the Israelis go in and we want to get them out; (3) if we want to keep the Israelis out while we evacuate American citizens. We're certainly not looking for an excuse to go into Lebanon; we want

[2] Attached, but not printed.

to stay out. But in 1970 the planning we did in this room enabled us to move with great speed if we had had to.[3]

I also want to know the contingencies in which US intervention might be contemplated. We shouldn't focus initially on military movements, but on political and diplomatic moves and what military moves we might have to make to back them up.

The second contingency relates to the kinds of things the Egyptians might do, the various ways in which the Israelis might react and the diplomatic issues that might ensue. Short of actual Soviet intervention, it's hard to envisage any direct US action. But we should consider what to do to keep the Soviets out; the ways in which we might use the crisis to get diplomatic movement, if that is what we want, or to return to the status quo ante if it is decided that is desirable.

Mr. Schlesinger: We have just seen the fourth bucket from our most recent photo run, and Egypt has moved no equipment up to the Canal. This means that their military options are limited to an air attack on Israel which would be extremely ill-advised.

Mr. Kissinger: That's all they could do?

Mr. Schlesinger: Yes; they're extremely limited.

Mr. Kissinger: Didn't I see a report that they were dropping a parachute brigade into Sinai?

Mr. Sisco: That was one isolated report.

Mr. Schlesinger: If Egypt should start something, it would be part of a diplomatic move to elicit sympathy when they were whipped by the Israelis.

Mr. Sisco: They're trying to follow the Vietnamese pattern. They need a little fighting to attract attention. I think the reason Egypt played a major role in mediating the situation in Lebanon was that they are afraid the balloon might go up in Lebanon, Syria might invade, and Egypt might be shown up as a paper tiger.

Mr. Clements: (to Schlesinger) What was the date of your last photo mission?

Mr. Schlesinger: It was seven to ten days ago. All indicators were that things were calming down.

Mr. Porter: Do you think there's any connection with the Security Council review?[4]

---

[3] For documentation on the U.S. response to the 1970 crisis in Jordan, see *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXIV, Middle East Region and Arabian Peninsula, 1969–1972; Jordan, September 1970.

[4] After an April 11 Israeli commando raid on Palestinian guerrillas in Beirut, the UN Security Council decided on April 20, at Egyptian request, to examine the situation in the Middle East on the basis of a comprehensive report to be prepared by the Secretary General. (*Yearbook of the United Nations, 1973*, p. 176)

Mr. Schlesinger: Possibly, if it is considered a prelude to a diplomatic or military move for sympathy.

Mr. Kissinger: What form of military move? If they bomb Israel, they would forfeit sympathy if they should get a tremendous Israeli counterblow. It would be all over. There would be no war going on. They have to start something that they could continue.

Mr. Schlesinger: I agree it would be unrealistic. Even if they are talking about only getting a toehold on Sinai, the best estimate is that they could hold it only for a week. It wouldn't give them the kind of war they need to get negotiations started.

Mr. Clements: I take a different view. The area to watch is Syria. They're volatile as hell.

Mr. Kissinger: The thing might develop a momentum of its own. Let's do a contingency plan for that. Dick (Kennedy), will you help them, based on your Jordan experience.

Mr. Porter: What about the draft cable that has been circulated authorizing an approach that is meant to be reassuring to the Lebanese?[5]

Mr. Kissinger: If there is no great urgency, could we wait on that until we have a chance to develop some of these contingency plans?

Mr. Sisco: We can hold it another week. We have two problems: (1) no answer we can conceivably give will provide the kind of blank check the Lebanese want, so any reply will be disappointing; (2) on the other hand, they asked for this last September and no reply at all will have a worse effect.

Mr. Kissinger: I'm in favor of an answer. In fact, we think we can be a bit more forthcoming than your draft.

Mr. Porter: It would be better to wait then.

Mr. Schlesinger: With regard to the telegram, I'd like to raise a question about pressuring them on Black September. Let's be careful we don't jump from the frying pan into the fire. If we force Black September headquarters out of Lebanon, they will go to Syria. [*1½ lines not declassified*]

Mr. Kissinger: Why are they not in Damascus?

Mr. Porter: They like it in Lebanon.

Mr. Sisco: If they were operating out of Syria, the counterblow would come from Israel on Syria, not Lebanon.

Mr. Porter: And the banks that pay them are in Lebanon. No responsible bank will operate in Syria.

Mr. Clements: How much of the pressure on the fedayeen is really coming from Israel?

---

[5] Not found.

Mr. Sisco: There are two kinds of pressure. The Israeli pressure is operating on a worldwide scale to rout them out wherever they are. But the more important pressure is coming from the Lebanese Army and Government. They're not trying to kick the fedayeen out of Lebanon. That would buy Syrian intervention. They're just trying to make the situation more manageable, by restricting them to light arms, concentrating them in camps, etc.

Mr. Clements: Isn't there Israel–Lebanon government-to-government pressure?

Mr. Noyes: Dayan has been making strong statements against Lebanon, not Syria.

Mr. Sisco: We have called that to their attention. We think they should continue to do what they're doing, but should keep quiet about it.

Mr. Noyes: Do we accept the Israeli thesis that Jordan can be equated with Lebanon?

Mr. Sisco: We have to acknowledge that Israeli military pressure has forced the hand of the Lebanese Government and Army. And they have been more forceful than we thought they would be.

Mr. Kissinger: I have reluctantly come to that conclusion.

Mr. Sisco: We would be concerned if we thought the Lebanese Government objective was to drive the fedayeen out. But they have no such intention.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to Middle East contingencies.]

---

58. Conversation Between President Nixon and his Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, May 16, 1973.

Kissinger: And you know I'm seeing Ismail?[2]

Nixon: Yeah, yeah. I know. [Laughs] You don't expect to get out of that, do you?

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Tapes, Conversation No. 919–3. No classification marking. According to the President's Daily Diary, Nixon met with Kissinger in the Oval Office between 9:07 and 9:25 a.m. (Ibid., White House Central Files) The editors transcribed the portion printed here specifically for this volume.

[2] See Document 63.

Kissinger: No. No, but I—

Nixon: Don't we need for you to do our best there, too?

Kissinger: I think we ought to waste time so that there's no blowup until—'til the summit. Now, we are—

Nixon: Oh, good God, yes!

Kissinger: We're under massive pressure from the Soviets to, uh—

Nixon: Squeeze the Israelis?

Kissinger: [unclear] to have some Middle East result at the summit. I think we're giving them enough, already, on that nuclear treaty.[3] But, I've been talking to the Israelis. I think they're moving a little, but not enough. But, after I come back from talking to Ismail, Mr. President, we might review that situation.

Nixon: Yep.

Kissinger: So that you know where it stands.

Nixon: Yeah, we don't want to have a Middle East war on, on our hands or consciences this summer. [Laughs]

Kissinger: No. No. No.

Nixon: Huh?

Kissinger: There is a chance that it can happen, not because—simply because of the irrationality of the Arabs.

Nixon: But look: that's always the reason. It's always the reason. Nobody thought there was going to be one in '67. I remember I talked to Gene Rostow[4] about it [unclear].

Kissinger: [unclear]

Nixon: Never. That doesn't mean he [Rostow] was dumb; it just meant that everybody was telling him that.

Kissinger: No, they were absolutely convinced. I was convinced, then, that as soon as they closed the Straits of Tiran that there'd be a war. But, I think there might be an Egyptian military move, but I don't think they can do—I've had an intelligence assessment made of it;[5] it doesn't look as if they can do anything of a substantial size. They don't have any heavy equipment forward. They don't have any units that could do it. But, I've thought out a procedure by which we could get talks started.

Nixon: Um-hmm?

Kissinger: It depends on two things: The Russians have agreed, in principle, but we haven't given it substance, yet. If we could come up,

---

[3] Kissinger is referring to the Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War, which was signed in Washington on June 22. (24 UST 1478; TIAS 7654)

[4] Eugene Rostow, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, 1967.

[5] See Document 59.

perhaps even at the summit, with a set of principles that are very vague, that don't mean anything, but are different from the Security Council Resolution, then, perhaps, the Egyptians could say they got something. The Israelis could acquiesce, and they could use that as a basis to start negotiating the interim settlement. And the Egyptians will probably want that the overall settlement is negotiated simultaneously. I've talked to the Israelis about it; they don't want to accept that. But I think we could get them to accept that. But—

Nixon: We have to.

Kissinger: But all that would depend, here, Mr. President, on whether we can get propositions that are general enough—

Nixon: Um-hmm.

Kissinger: —so that both sides can accept them. If that would work, we could buy ourselves a year—

Nixon: Um-hmm.

Kissinger: —anyway.

Nixon: Um-hmm. Um-hmm. Hmm. That'd be great. I know you've talked about that before, and I—

Kissinger: Well, I've got the—that—

Nixon: I'll look—I'll concentrate on it. I'm going to try to get my mind on one of these things as time goes on here.

Kissinger: The Russians have agreed to it as a concept. Now, between their agreeing to it as a concept—

Nixon: Yeah?

Kissinger: —and, uh—

Nixon: Hmm.

Kissinger: —and then finding words that are really general enough—Brezhnev has written you a burbling letter about my visit.

Nixon: Good.

59. National Intelligence Estimate[1]

NIE 30–73 Washington, May 17, 1973.

POSSIBLE EGYPTIAN-ISRAELI HOSTILITIES: DETERMINANTS AND IMPLICATIONS

Précis

Believing that perpetuation of the present Middle Eastern situation is intolerable for himself and for Egypt, Sadat is pressing ahead with his campaign of threats in the hope of inspiring US pressure on Israel. This could, over time, get out of control. But substantial Egyptian-Israel hostilities appear unlikely in the next few weeks.[2]

The danger probably will rise if Middle East debates in the UN Security Council (early June) and the Nixon–Brezhnev summit (late June) pass without any results Sadat considers useful. The US and the USSR have some, but limited, leverage in the situation.

—Among factors tending to precipitate hostilities:

Continuing diplomatic stalemate, combined with Egyptian conviction that hostilities would stimulate more active US and Soviet involvement in the settlement process

Egyptian calculation that hostilities would trigger anti-US action by the Saudis and other oil producers—leading to US pressures on Israel

Provocative actions by Egypt or other Arab parties and preemption or retaliation by Israel

—Among those tending to discourage hostilities:

Diplomatic movement Sadat could convincingly cite as evidence of progress toward regaining territory

A US move to distance itself diplomatically from Israel

Clear and continuing warnings from the USSR to its Arab clients

Arab-Israeli hostilities taking place in 1973 would not involve wide-ranging ground warfare on the Egyptian front, as in 1967, or a long and continuing war of attrition, as in 1969–1970. There might be

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, NSC Institutional Files (H–Files), Box H–91, Meeting Files, WSAG Meetings, 1973. Secret; No Foreign Dissem.

[2] A paper prepared by the National Security Council staff, probably in early May, came to similar conclusions. Entitled "Indications of Arab Intentions To Initiate Hostilities," the paper posited that the Egyptian and Arab military moves suggested a "pattern of action that could be preparation for hostilities against Israel, but they are also part of an effort to arouse international concern and put psychological pressures on Israel and the US." (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 135, Rabin/Kissinger (Dinitz) 1973, Jan–July (2 of 3))

small, brief Egyptian commando raids or Egyptian artillery barrages—and then massive Israeli retaliation. And large-scale Israeli pre-emption would occur if Egypt appeared on the verge of an air strike against civilian targets in Israel.

Substantial hostilities which left Egyptian forces shattered by Israeli pre-emption or retaliation could have major consequences.

—US interests and the US presence throughout the Arab world would be subject to attack.

—The Egyptian Government probably would move against all US interests in Egypt.

—Some or all Arab oil producers probably would move to embargo oil shipments to the US and to hurt US oil companies in other ways.

—Most Arab countries commonly identified as close friends of the US would be under great pressure to strike out at the US—by breaking diplomatic relations, expelling military contingents, or denying the use of air space and commercial or military facilities. Not all these things would occur, but some would.

—The USSR would preserve its ties with Egypt, probably offering carefully measured amounts of replacement equipment in exchange for renewed access to military facilities and a greater role in Egyptian policy.

—Most major industrial nations would disassociate themselves as publicly as possible from US policy in the Middle East. Moreover, Europeans and Japanese probably would be spurred to seek oil under new arrangements offering a minimal role for US companies,

—The already slim prospect of a negotiated settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict would be eliminated—probably for years to come.

[Omitted here is the body of the estimate.]

60. Memorandum From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, May 17, 1973.

SUBJECT

Aircraft for Israel

You will recall that in your meeting with Prime Minister Meir you indicated that we would view Israeli requests for additional aircraft with sympathy but made no specific commitment on numbers.[2] The Departments of State and Defense have now developed several options for responding.

The Israelis have formally requested 36 F–4 Phantoms and 30 A–4 Skyhawks during the period 1974–1975.

One possible response is to meet their request in full for the next two years, although Defense would prefer to bunch the delivery of F–4s primarily in 1975 in order to allow the USAF to rebuild its own inventory.

A theoretically possible alternative would be to provide a much lower number than requested as a signal that we intend to cut back significantly on the level of our military assistance to Israel. This might gain us some credit among the Arab states at a time when we are being sharply criticized for making it possible for Israel to "remain intransigent" on issues of a settlement. However, it would cause a crisis of confidence with Israel without getting anything in return, and I assume that you do not want to pursue this approach.

A more attractive *alternative to giving Israel what it has asked for over the next two years would be to aim for a longer term agreement over a period of four years—1974 to 1977—involving at least as many, and perhaps more, aircraft than the Israelis have now requested, but somewhat less than we anticipate they will want during the whole four-year period ahead.* The advantage to us would be that we might not have to make new decisions on aircraft for Israel at least until late 1975 or 1976. This longer-term agreement would provide the Israelis with continuity of supply, though in somewhat smaller numbers than they might like.

The Departments of State and Defense prefer this four-year approach and recommend that you approve the delivery of 36 F–4s and 42 A–4s during the 1974–77 period. As a modification of this option, they

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 610, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 12, Mar. 73–Oct. 73. Secret; Nodis. Sent for action. A stamped notation on the first page reads: "The President has seen."

[2] See Document 35.

suggest that the number of F–4s could be increased to 48, or even higher, over four years, if you feel we should be more forthcoming.

I see considerable *merit in deciding now on a delivery schedule on aircraft that would cover a four-year period.* The basic Israeli request would be met, although with fewer aircraft than they would request over that period. Our relations with Arab friends would not be periodically strained by announcements of new agreements on aircraft for Israel. And our air force would be able to rebuild its inventory of F–4s instead of diverting planes from its own inventory for Israel.

I would *recommend* offering Israel a *four-year agreement for 48 F–4 Phantoms* rather than the 36 that State and Defense suggest and offering *42 A–4 Skyhawks*.

There is a question of timing. It would not be helpful to have publicity on these decisions until reaction to Israel's raid on Beirut dies down.[3] I shall work that out when a decision has been made.

Apart from this decision, Defense is going ahead as you instructed with aid to permit Israel to produce at least 100 Super Mirage aircraft.[4]

Recommendation: That you approve a *four-year* delivery schedule for aircraft to Israel, consisting of 48 F–4 Phantoms delivered at the rate of 12 a year and 42 A–4 Skyhawks distributed more or less evenly over the four years. If you approve, I shall sign the attached decision memorandum.[5]

Approve

Prefer *two-year* package meeting present Israeli requests for 36 F–4s and 30 A–4s

Prefer *four-year* approach with State–Defense recommendation option of 36 Phantoms and 42 Skyhawks

[3] See footnote 4, Document 57. The day after the Israeli raid, student demonstrators marched on the U.S. Embassy and cultural center in Beirut, and in the United Nations in New York, Arab spokesmen denounced both the United States and Israel for the raid.

[4] See Document 37.

[5] The President initialed his approval. Kissinger sent the decision memorandum to the Secretaries of State and Defense on May 29. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 610, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 12, Mar. 73–Oct. 73)

61. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, May 17, 1973.

SUBJECT

Messages from King Hussein

King Hussein has sent you two messages [Tab A][2] regarding the possible resumption of hostilities with Israel. The messages are summarized below and a reply to King Hussein is recommended.

On Syrian Military Intentions and Capabilities:

—Orders have been issued to all Syrian forces to concentrate on night training. A top secret military operations plan has been drawn up that would involve a night-time offensive by three divisions to clear away initial Israeli defenses on the Golan Heights. The following day an armored division would try to recapture the rest of the heights. Iraq may provide two divisions as strategic reserves.

—Large quantities of Soviet military equipment have arrived in Syria in recent months, including SAMs, tanks, aircraft and advanced radars. [*Comment:* CIA has been able to confirm most, but not all, of the equipment reported by Hussein to have reached Syria.]

On Egyptian Preparations:

—Iraqi and Libyan aircraft have been transferred to Egypt.

—The Egyptians and Syrians are pressuring Jordan to join the Unified Arab Command.

—The Egyptians may initiate some action against the Israelis soon, although the Syrians may strike first, followed by Egyptian action along the Suez Canal.

Observations on Iraq:

—He again alluded to his judgment of a Soviet role in Iraq. The King warns of possible Soviet preparations to bring about a change of government in Syria in order to bring Damascus into line with

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 757, Presidential Correspondence, 1969–1974, Jordan King Hussein Corres. Secret; Sensitive. Sent for action. A handwritten notation on the first page reads: "Done. Retype cable." Brackets are in the original.

[2] Attached, but not printed.

Baghdad. [An earlier fuller message on this subject is at Tab B[3] for reference.]

—The incident between Iraq and Kuwait was a probe to test the reactions of Kuwait's friends.

—Iraq is actively promoting subversion in the Gulf.

Jordan's Position:

—Jordan has no intention of turning over its armed forces to the Unified Arab Command.

—In a condition of war, Jordan will maintain strict control and non-involvement by Jordanian troops unless Jordanian territory is violated.

—Jordan has not taken any action on the Arab-Israeli issue on the political level, pending your advice. Jordan feels the need to take some steps, but does not want to place obstacles in your path.

—The King asks for your maximum help regarding Jordan's military and other requirements; he asks for your views on what political course Jordan should follow; and he urges that Soviet policies in the event of war in the Middle East be examined.

A message to King Hussein at this stage should probably avoid any detailed political suggestions. The following proposed draft thanks the King for calling to your attention certain military information, but does not go into any detail on diplomatic initiatives:

"Your Majesty:

"I greatly appreciate your calling to my personal attention information concerning the possible resumption of hostilities in the Middle East and your own views of the pressures leading toward a resumption. You may be assured that we are watching the situation very carefully. Your assurances of Jordan's intentions to defend its own interests and to work for our common objectives of peace and stability are most gratifying.

"The crisis in Lebanon has been of concern to us as it has been to you. We have taken some steps to help the Lebanese deal with threats to their sovereignty and appreciate what you have done. Other actions are under consideration here should Lebanon need further assistance. I can tell you now that we are determined to preserve the independence of Lebanon.[4]

"On the broader front, you will be reassured to know that we are conducting a thorough and quick review of all aspects of the US posi-

---

[3] Attached, but not printed.

[4] Kissinger added this sentence by hand.

tion across the area, taking into account the positions of our friends and of the USSR.

"I will be in touch with you separately on the question of diplomatic initiatives. Please be assured that we are working with great seriousness on these matters. This has taken longer than we anticipated.

"Sincerely, Henry A. Kissinger"

Recommendation: That you approve sending the above message [*less than 1 line not declassified*] to King Hussein.[5]

Approve

Revise as indicated

[5] There is no indication of approval or disapproval on the memorandum, but the revised message from Kissinger to Hussein was sent on May 26. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1295, Harold H. Saunders Files, Jordan, 1/1/73–8/31/73)

62. Backchannel Message From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to Jordanian King Hussein[1]

Washington, May 18, 1973.

Dr. Kissinger has asked that the following answers to King Hussein's recent queries[2] be conveyed.

The US supports the Lebanese Government in its current effort and welcomes the assistance that King Hussein has provided. It notes with appreciation His Majesty's offer to use the Jordanian C–130 to de-

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 137, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan/Rifai, January 3, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only.

[2] In telegram Tohak 54/13268 to Paris, May 18, Scowcroft reported to Kissinger that Hussein had asked two questions. Hussein reported that Jordan had received an urgent request for ammunition from the Chief of Staff of the Lebanese Army, and that he had sent 50 aircraft rockets in response and was planning on sending another 250 rockets by May 15. He asked if his policy of aiding Lebanon in any way he could coincided with that of the United States. Hussein also noted that, while awaiting a substantive move on the part of the United States, he had not yet taken a strong position at the United Nations regarding the forthcoming UN Security Council debate on the Middle East. He now wondered whether he should take a different tack. (Ibid., Box 34, Kissinger Trip Files, Secretary's File, TOHAK–HAKTO [3 of 3])

liver arms and ammunition to Lebanon if necessary. There is no present need, but we are discussing with the Lebanese some possible new shipments, and we shall keep the King's offer actively in mind.

Regarding the forthcoming UN Security Council debate on the Middle East, we do not yet have a clear picture of what situation will develop there. Our concern is to avoid a situation which will make it more difficult to begin the negotiating process which, as the King knows, the US regards as essential to any movement toward peace. Experience has shown the US that it takes time and quiet diplomacy to develop a sound negotiating process, and the US would be concerned over any exercise which tended to divert energy from such a process. At the United Nations, the US has an interest in avoiding any outcome that would create a virtually useless new diplomatic mechanism or unbalance the negotiating framework which Resolution 242 provides. Any help King Hussein can give in that general direction at this point will be appreciated.

---

63. Memorandum From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, May 20, 1973.

SUBJECT

Meeting with Hafiz Ismail on May 20

In short, Ismail came to this meeting to probe White House intentions further—not to discuss concrete elements of a possible Egypt–Israel agreement. The result was that the formal talks were less useful than last time,[2] but I felt that more progress was made than last time in bringing Ismail to understand the reasoning and the domestic

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VI, May 20–Sept. 30, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Eyes Only; Outside System. Sent for information. Brackets are in the original. This memorandum, which is dated June 2, summarizes a meeting that took place on May 20 in Moulin St. Fargeau, Rochefort, France, from 10:15 a.m.–3:20 p.m. Participants on the Egyptian side were Muhammad Hafiz Ismail; Ambassador Jamal-al-din Barakat, Presidential Office; Dr. Abd-al-Hadi Makhluf, Ismail's Chef de Cabinet; Ahmad Mahir al Sayyid; and Ihab Said Wahba of Ismail's staff. Participants on the U.S. side were Kissinger, Atherton, Saunders, Rodman, and Irene G. Derus, the notetaker. A memorandum of conversation is ibid., Vol. V, [Memcon], May 20, 1973.

[2] See Document 28.

political realities behind our proposal to move toward a settlement in a step-by-step approach. Last time he had listened well, but only in this second talk did I feel that he fully understood the implications of the step-by-step approach we are proposing.

I explained to him concretely in private talks that it is essential for us, if we are to be influential with the Israelis, to be dealing with proposals which represent politically manageable steps rather than tackling the issue of total withdrawal all at once. It remains very much an open question how Sadat will respond; he has rejected this approach before and may do so again. The issue on Sadat's mind is whether the White House will remain engaged beyond the first stage. It may be that he needed to hear this directly from us.

The issue I posed, which the Egyptians are now considering, is whether a general statement of principles like that in Resolution 242 could be used to get talks started on the first phase of an agreement provided the US and Israel stated publicly that this first step would not become the final statement. Ismail promised to let me know before your meetings with Brezhnev. If the Egyptians are agreeable, some progress in working out a set of principles might be made during the summit meetings here.

Background

These talks took place against the background of an agenda of *specific issues left from the February meeting* which Ismail had promised to consider. These included:

—As full and concrete a statement as possible of the obligations Egypt and Israel would accept toward each other in a state of *peace*.

—The *relationship* of an Egypt–Israel agreement to other aspects of a Palestine settlement. For example: Could a state of peace become effective between Egypt and Israel before Syrian and Jordanian settlements with Israel or a refugee settlement are achieved?

—Concrete ways for assuring Israeli *security* in the Sinai while restoring Egyptian sovereignty there.

Ismail's Position This Time

It quickly became apparent that Ismail was not prepared this time to discuss those issues left from our first meeting.[3] *He wanted to discuss US intentions*. These were the main points in his presentation:

---

[3] In his memoirs, Kissinger described his conversations with Ismail, saying that "we had what the diplomats would call 'useful'—that is to say, ultimately unproductive—talks. The difficulty was that Ismail would not deviate from his original program, which he must have known could never be sold to Israel in one stage. He pretended to take umbrage at my suggestion that Egypt come up with something new to get the negotiating process started. But it took no great acumen to grasp that Egypt's position—in effect what

—The Egyptian side had the impression from the last talks that Egypt was being asked to come up with a new position that would enable the US to try to move Israel.

—Even with a new Egyptian position, however, the US seemed uncertain whether Israel would withdraw. In the Egyptian view, Israel has shown no sign that it is interested in peace.

—Ismail had found continued hesitancy about the role, if any, to be played by the White House. It is not clear that the White House has decided to put its weight behind an effort to achieve a peace settlement.

—The events of March, April and early May had raised further questions in Egyptian minds about US intentions:

—The decision to continue aircraft deliveries to Israel through 1974–75 was "very revealing."
—The decision to provide technological assistance to Israeli military industry was "dangerous" because it would free Israel of US influence.
—US financing ($50 million) for the settlement in Israel of Jewish émigrés from the USSR further supports Israel's growth.
—The US equating of the acts of the radical Palestinians with Israel's raid in Beirut was "most unfair."
—Egypt had observed how pressure from the US Congress had forced the Administration against its will to put pressure on the USSR for the emigration of Soviet Jews. This caused Egypt to wonder whether the US could freely play a role in the Middle East.
—It cannot even be excluded that there is US nuclear cooperation with Israel.

—Egypt feels that the most important factor encouraging Israel to stand fast is the fact that the US is committed to defend Israel's conquests until the Arabs concede to Israel's demands. Unless there is a more balanced US approach, it is difficult to see how there can be progress. If the US is prepared to shift its "balance of power" approach of assuring overwhelming Israeli predominance, there could be some positive results.

—Egypt is, therefore, faced with two choices:

—It can accept an "interim agreement" which will "almost certainly" become a final one.
—Or it can move toward a final agreement which would require "enormous concessions" by Egypt.

—If neither approach is acceptable, what is left to Egypt except military action? [Ismail in private conversation said he felt military ac-

---

Egypt had been proposing since February 1971 and which had been consistently rejected—would not give us the means to start a new negotiating process with an Israel that saw no need for it to begin with." Kissinger noted that "Ismail remained cool to my scheme of separating sovereignty and security. He . . . said he would check with Sadat and let me know. I never heard from him." (*Years of Upheaval* p. 227)

tion would be "too adventurous" now, so he was apparently thinking of the longer term future.]

My Response

Given Ismail's unreadiness to talk about the concrete elements of a settlement, it seemed to me most useful to concentrate my discussion with him on *the general theory of how we should proceed.* I had a long private talk with him in which I made these points:

—The US is not trying to exploit the Arab-Israeli conflict to achieve some global objective. The US remains prepared to work with Egypt for a just solution.

—The most the US can now foresee persuading Israel to accept is restoration of nominal Egyptian sovereignty in the Sinai with a transitional Israeli security presence at key positions. This might not be the full exercise of sovereignty but it would establish the principle of legal sovereignty.

—It might be 1974 before real progress on an interim agreement could be made and a year after that before there could be progress on an overall agreement.

—On the other hand, it is *not* the US strategy to keep the Israelis in the Sinai. It is the US policy to try to get a process going in which the US could exercise its influence.

—The US has no interest in bringing about a change in Egypt–Israel frontiers. The longer the present situation continues, the greater the danger that it will become permanent. Any line through the Sinai would be less natural than the Suez Canal, so there is advantage simply in beginning Israeli movement back. If a negotiating process could be started, the US would stick with it beyond the first-stage agreement for withdrawal from the Suez Canal. We would make this clear publicly and elicit a comparable public commitment from Israel. It is not excluded that negotiations on a Canal agreement and on an overall agreement could be carried on simultaneously.

—The US view is that an effort should be made soon to work out general principles of agreement that could get talks started. The US needs to avoid the kind of concrete detail that would trigger sharp domestic and Israeli pressures on us at the outset and limit the usefulness of our involvement before we have even begun. The potential of these public pressures is great. It might be useful to work toward such principles with the USSR during the summit.

—Debate in the UN Security Council (beginning June 4) could complicate the process of arriving at some useful understanding with the USSR, if the Egyptians thought some such understanding would be helpful. Ismail said that, if the Security Council debate dragged on to

the eve of the US–USSR summit, Egypt would be receptive to a proposal for adjournment.

Where the Matter Stands

The issue now is whether Sadat can accept the step-by-step approach with assurance of persistent White House involvement. Ismail frankly said he could not commit himself; he would have to talk with Sadat.[4] There is a good chance that Sadat will not feel able to go along. Ismail said he would send word of Sadat's reaction in the next couple of weeks.

If Sadat were prepared to engage on the basis I outlined, then it might be possible to make some progress on a statement of principles during the US–Soviet summit. We would try to keep these general, and this would be one reason for Egyptian hesitancy. If we were to proceed, we would want to discuss this approach further with the Israelis.

[4] Kissinger later recalled that according to an American observer, Ismail was "visibly dispirited and glum" after their talks: "Ismail knew that Sadat was determined on war. Only an American guarantee that we would fulfill the entire Arab program in a brief time could have dissuaded him. That was patently impossible. And Ismail, though a military man, was enough imbued with the extraordinary humanity of the Egyptian to dread what reason told him was now inevitable. The Middle East was heading toward war. We did not know it. But he did." (Ibid.)

64. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, May 25, 1973.

SUBJECT

Jordan–Israel Developments

Earlier this month Prime Minister Meir asked to meet with King Hussein.[2] The meeting took place in Tel Aviv, with Dayan and Zayd Rafai also participating. Hussein assumed that Dayan's inclusion may indicate that Mrs. Meir is preparing him for more regular participation in these meetings in the future. At the meeting Dayan was more friendly and responsive, according to Hussein, than in their one previous encounter.

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the situation in the Middle East. Political issues between Jordan and Israel were not discussed. Hussein has told us that he will not discuss matters involving a settlement until he knows what direction President Nixon would like him to take.

In discussing Lebanon, Mrs. Meir confirmed that Israel is in contact with the Lebanese and has tried to be helpful during the recent crisis. She believed the Syrians would not intervene out of fear of Israeli retaliation.

The Israelis reportedly agreed with King Hussein that Egypt and Syria might be planning some military action, perhaps to coincide with the UN debate later this month or the US–Soviet summit. Mrs. Meir apparently stated her belief that the Soviets desire a peaceful political settlement in the area and will use their influence on their clients, especially Syria, to discourage any military ventures. Dayan thought Egypt might be capable of limited military action, but that the Israeli counter attack would leave Egypt with worse lines than it has now.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret; Sensitive. Sent for information. Kissinger initialed the memorandum.

[2] On May 8, Hussein advised Kissinger that his next secret meeting with Prime Minister Meir was scheduled for May 9 in Tel Aviv. Hussein acknowledged the risk but noted that it was one he was willing to take in view of the current Middle East situation. He also commented that he was amazed at the Israeli assessment of the Syrian situation because the Israelis had told him that there was no immediate threat since Syria had pulled back its troops from the border. Hussein noted, however, "Jordanian Military Intelligence has received a report from a well-placed Syrian source that Syrian troops have been pulled back for reorganization in order to prepare for the implementation of a military operation planned against the Golan Heights." (Ibid.)

Both sides explained their intentions toward each other in the event of renewed hostilities. Hussein requested regular aerial photo coverage to keep abreast of Syrian and Egyptian military movements. Hussein indicated that Jordan has plans for preemptive strikes in the event of threatening troop movements.

King Hussein complained of new Israeli taxes on West Bank residents. Mrs. Meir agreed that the Arabs were not getting their fair share of services and that this situation would be corrected. Increased exchange of intelligence on the fedayeen was discussed.

The King was generally pleased with the meeting and feels that as long as there is no progress toward a settlement these exchanges are most useful.

Both Mrs. Meir and the King mentioned their close ties to the White House and their reluctance to deal with the State Department.

Comment: There is little new of substance in this account, but you may want to make special note of Mrs. Meir's somewhat surprising views on Soviet interests in a peaceful settlement. We have received some collateral information on Soviet efforts to restrain the Syrians from joining in a renewal of war with Israel.

No action is required in response to this information. The attached copies[3] are for your files.

[3] Not attached.

65. Editorial Note

On May 31, 1973, Director of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research Ray S. Cline presented an Information Memorandum to Secretary of State Rogers that argued the case for war largely on political grounds. "INR is inclined to state the case on the risk of hostilities for a political purpose with a little more urgency [than the NIE]. If the UN debate of next week produces no convincing movement in the Israeli-Egyptian impasse, our view is that the resumption of hostilities by autumn will become a better than even bet." Reference is to NIE 30–73, Document 59. The memorandum continues:

"Sadat's national security adviser . . . has recently been saying . . . that the no-war, no peace situation is more dangerous for the future of Egypt than war itself . . . [and this] probably accurately stated Sadat's feeling. . . . Sadat has long preferred a political settlement to renewed

combat . . . [but] mounting evidence indicates that he is becoming ever more strongly tempted to resort to arms. . . .

"Although he has no illusions that Egypt can defeat Israel militarily, he seems on the verge of concluding that only limited hostilities against Israel stand any real chance of breaking the negotiating stalemate by forcing the big powers to intervene with an imposed solution. Should he shed his last doubts about whether military action is essential to achieve this American shift, the only remaining decision would relate to the timing and scope of his move. . . .

"It is not very relevant to weigh the credibility of any particular military scenario. From Sadat's point of view, the overriding desideratum is some form of military action which can be sustained long enough, despite Israel's counterattacks, both to activate Washington and Moscow and to galvanize the other Arab states, especially the major oil producers, into anti-American moves."

The memorandum has not been found, but these excerpts, which include the brackets and ellipses, are quoted in the December 20 paper prepared by the Intelligence Community staff, "The Performance of the Intelligence Community Before the Arab-Israeli War of October 6, 1973: A Preliminary Post-Mortem Report," parts of which are printed as Document 412.

Henry Kissinger also mentioned the memorandum in his memoirs when discussing the intelligence available to policymakers before the outbreak of the fighting in October. (*Years of Upheaval*, page 462)

At a conference in Washington October 9–10, 1998, to discuss the 1973 Arab-Israeli war, Roger Merrick, who drafted the memorandum for INR, stated that "the central judgment was that there was a better than 50 percent chance of major hostilities between Egypt and Israel within six months unless there was a major, credible U.S. peace initiative." Because of this judgment, Merrick noted, Kissinger asked Cline and Joseph Sisco "to reconcile their different positions on the likelihood of major hostilities. Mike Sterner, country director for Egypt, drafted several papers which were rejected by INR. The dispute between INR and NEA continued throughout the summer and fall until hostilities erupted." Sisco, who also attended the conference, commented on this dispute: "The reason why there was an ambiguous reaction, certainly on my own part, as to how seriously that ought to be taken was that I was getting Israeli assurances that things were okay. . . . So, Roger, I was getting really two views, the essence from what Ray Cline was telling me, and what I was getting on the Israeli side." (Parker, *The October War*, pages 113–125)

66. Intelligence Memorandum Prepared in the Central Intelligence Agency[1]

No. 1652/73 Washington, June 1973.

THE STATUS OF SOVIET RELATIONS WITH EGYPT AND THE PALESTINIANS

Summary

Since their expulsion from Egypt last July, the Soviets have cautiously strengthened their interests and widened their contacts throughout the Middle East. Military deliveries to Syria, Iraq, and South Yemen have increased, and the Soviets have made a stronger effort to cultivate Sudan and the Maghreb states. The Russians have not yet replaced the military facilities they previously controlled in Egypt, however, and basic divergences between Soviet and Arab interests continue to limit the closeness of their relations.

Nowhere is this more apparent than in Moscow's ties to Egypt and the Palestinians. The Soviets have tried but failed to convince the Palestinians to unify because it is more effective, to reject terrorism because it is counterproductive, or to discard their hopes of liquidating Israel because it is unrealistic. Meanwhile, Egyptian bitterness over repeated Soviet refusals to supply the type of military and diplomatic support it wants lingers on, as does the disenchantment in Moscow over the lack of gratitude exhibited by its number-one aid recipient. All of the parties involved, however, have an interest in preventing any further deterioration in relations. The Egyptians and Palestinians cannot get anywhere else the support Moscow is providing, and the Soviets have been able to capitalize on their role as champions of the Arab cause throughout the Middle East. This arrangement could last for some time.

Egypt

Moscow's pursuit of détente with the US and Cairo's expulsion of Soviet military advisers from Egypt have added to the mutual distrust that has permeated Soviet-Egyptian relations for several years. Both sides nevertheless have a stake in working together. For Moscow, Egypt remains the political center of gravity of the Arab world and the leading state in the confrontation with Israel. The Soviets cannot abandon the Sadat regime without damaging their relations

[1] Source: Central Intelligence Agency, Directorate of Intelligence, Office of Current Intelligence, Job 79–T00861A, Box 16, Folder 40. Secret; No Foreign Dissem.

throughout the Arab world. They have, however, set certain limits on their support—denial of weapons that might encourage the Egyptians to resume hostilities, for example—and Moscow has made clear its displeasure over Egyptian press criticism of the USSR.

The Egyptians have adjusted, somewhat grudgingly, to these guidelines. They have little choice if they want to establish a credible military posture against Israel. Egyptian efforts to purchase sophisticated arms from Western Europe have not been successful, and it is clear that Cairo still wants and needs Soviet political, economic, and military support. It is, in fact, receiving substantial amounts of military and economic assistance, although the level has fallen from the high point of two years ago. Moscow can also be counted on to support Egypt's position politically, at the UN and elsewhere.

Current Soviet military deliveries appear designed to maintain Cairo's arms inventories rather than to introduce new weapons systems. Sixty MIG–21s that had been operated by the Soviets in Egypt were turned over to the Egyptians following the expulsion. Since then, only seven MIG–21s, 15 SU–17 fighter bombers, and two helicopters have been delivered. Although the Soviet-manned SA–6 missile equipment defending the Aswan Dam was shipped back to the USSR following the Soviets' ouster, SA–6s for Egyptian units started arriving in Alexandria last September. Other identified cargos have included T–62 medium tanks, armored personnel carriers, artillery, vehicles, and support equipment.

This outward cooperation between the two countries has not been matched by the restoration of mutual confidence. Following the expulsion, Sadat's standing with the Kremlin was near zero, and it is unlikely that the Soviets will ever put much faith in him again. Indeed, most signs indicate that the Soviets are becoming increasingly disenchanted with the Sadat government. Moscow may, in fact, be genuinely concerned that Egypt is, as one source put it, "sliding to the right." The Soviets were upset, for example, when Premier Sidqi—the one remaining pro-Soviet figure in the leadership—was dismissed in March. The student arrests and writers' purge also bothered the Soviets, who tend to interpret these events as moves to rid Egypt of pro-leftist sentiments. The possibility of Egypt's unity with Libya in September also makes Moscow uneasy. The Soviets despise Qadhafi—Gromyko recently compared him to Hitler—and recognize that their interests might be jeopardized if the merger takes place.

Dissatisfaction with the Soviets is increasing in Cairo. The Egyptians are particularly frustrated by the priority Moscow gives to improving relations with the US. The progress of US–Soviet trade negotiations, the suspension of the emigration tax, the coming Brezhnev visit, all have grated on Egyptian sensitivities. One Egyptian is reported to

have asked a Soviet Embassy officer, "How can we expect the Soviets to support our point of view in the area when the Americans are feeding them?"

On the problem of Israel, the Egyptians regard the present stalemate as intolerable and more difficult to change with each passing day. Cairo wants a sponsor which will take decisive action—toward peace or war—that will recover Arab territory. The Soviets are not concerned about lost Arab lands and surely do not want to risk a confrontation with the US over this issue. Arab-Israeli tensions have helped the Soviets establish themselves in the Middle East, and the Soviets will not expend much diplomatic energy to release this tension unless they believe it will create new opportunities to extend their influence.

It is difficult to see how a new round of Soviet-Egyptian talks could solve their differences. Sadat has called for a summit since the day he ousted the Russians, but Moscow has been unresponsive. It is now rumored that Premier Kosygin will visit Egypt and Syria in June or July in connection with the official opening of economic aid projects. If Kosygin does go to Egypt, he will certainly face some intensive questioning about Soviet intentions, and the results may reinforce mutual suspicions rather than contribute to an improvement in bilateral relations.

Palestinians

Fedayeen activities are an important element in the Middle East equation that the Soviets can neither ignore nor control. Moscow cannot ignore the fedayeen because their goal—the return of displaced Palestinians to their homeland—enjoys considerable emotional support throughout the Arab world. Soviet influence with the Palestinian movement is minimal, however, because Moscow will not endorse the destruction of Israel or terrorist tactics.

The USSR is the primary source of arms for the fedayeen. Since 1969, Moscow—using Egypt, Syria, and Iraq as intermediaries—has supplied the fedayeen with rifles, machine guns, and bazooka-type rockets, in addition to military training for selected fedayeen officers. Fedayeen leader Yasir Arafat has made four trips to the USSR seeking heavier arms and Moscow's official recognition of the fedayeen as a national liberation movement. The Soviets continue to refuse his requests. Instead, the Soviets have demanded that the gaggle of assorted fedayeen organizations unify and concentrate more on political action if they want serious Soviet support.

Moscow's disapproval of terrorism is based not on moral scruples, but on the belief that such tactics are generally unproductive and can lead to unforeseen and often uncontrollable consequences. From the Soviet viewpoint, fedayeen terrorism carries the inherent risk of over-

heating the Middle East situation, which could in turn plunge Moscow into a confrontation it prefers to avoid.

The Soviets are not above stirring up the fedayeen against the West and particularly the US; there is some evidence they did so after the Israeli raid in Beirut in April. It would be uncharacteristic of Moscow to miss an opportunity to blame Arab misfortunes on the US and thus undermine the US role in the Middle East. The Soviets are careful not to push this too far, however, because it might jeopardize the nucleus of Brezhnev's foreign policy program—détente with the US.

Evidence indicates that the Soviets have restrained rather than encouraged fedayeen militancy at times of high tension. During the recent fighting between the Lebanese Government and the Palestinians, for example, the Soviets actively tried to limit the scope of the trouble. One source reports that Soviet Ambassador Azimov delivered a letter to Arafat from the Soviet leadership which advised the fedayeen not to seek a confrontation with Lebanon. The letter also pledged additional Soviet support to the fedayeen if the Lebanese attempted to crush them. This mixture of qualified support typifies the Soviet approach to the fedayeen.

In the future the Soviets are unlikely to cut off political or military support to the Palestinians, nor will they criticize the movement as a whole. Some of the most "progressive" Arabs in the Middle East are deeply involved in fedayeen activities, and the Soviets may still have some hope of shaping this revolutionary force into a more realistic mold. In the interim, Moscow appears reconciled to the limited influence it has with the fedayeen and will seek to ensure that no other foreign power—China or Libya, for example—comes to dominate the movement.

67. Telegram From the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo to the Department of State[1]

Cairo, June 2, 1973, 1005Z.

1619. Subject: Likelihood of Middle East Hostilities. Ref: Cairo 1421 (Notal).[2]

1. During recent weeks we have received several indications that Sadat has informed high level visitors to Egypt that he intends to launch a military operation against Israel some time in June or July. We still believe that his principal purpose in making these statements is to influence the United States to take more vigorous action with respect to the Middle East.

2. As we study the indicators available to us, however, we are led increasingly to believe that Sadat has no clear idea of what he is going to do. He is certainly aware of the fact that his talk of war unaccompanied by action raises serious questions about his credibility, but his general mood of anger and frustration leads him to make ill-advised war-like declarations to his official visitors which he himself may well believe at the time that he makes them. Subsequently, however, he perceives the disadvantages of such course of action and finds some excuse, such as a new diplomatic initiative, for accepting the recommendation of his more moderate advisors. As these diversionary tactics are played out with no evident progress towards Egypt's basic goal of recovering its land, he becomes more frustrated and the cycle is repeated.

Greene

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 27 ARAB–ISR. Secret. Repeated to Amman, Beirut, Jidda, Tel Aviv, Tripoli, and USUN.

[2] In telegram 1421 from Cairo, May 14, Greene reported that Sadat's failure to achieve the major and overriding objective of Egyptian foreign policy, recovery of occupied Egyptian territory, was a continuing embarrassment. Sadat believed that Egypt's only hope of stopping Israeli expansion and recovering occupied land was to engage the support of powers stronger than Israel, and he thought that the United States was the key to the solution of his problem. Sadat's current saber-rattling was designed to raise apprehensions within the U.S. Government that war was imminent and would be harmful to U.S. interests. Thus, he hoped to convince the United States to persuade Israel to become more flexible in its settlement terms. (Ibid., Central Foreign Policy Files)

68. Editorial Note

In a June 2, 1973, message to Jordanian King Hussein, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Henry Kissinger stated that the U.S. Government had been trying to meet Jordan's request for additional funds, but that developments in Southeast Asia had placed great pressures on the limited funds available and it appeared to be impossible to advance funds to Jordan as hoped. The United States would, however, plan to provide Jordan with $25 million in July immediately after the beginning of the new fiscal year with subsequent payments of $10 million in September and November. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973)

King Hussein responded to Kissinger's message on June 4:

"On receiving a message you sent me a short while ago . . . , following one which I had sent you regarding the rapidly deteriorating situation in this area and the large question mark it raises to the real Soviet objectives in the Middle East [see Document 61], I took comfort from your reference to the urgent study you had underway and in particular the emphasis you placed on the current situation of your friends in the area. I can assure you now that the situation grows steadily worse and that the eruption on a military basis appears to be most imminent. In this situation your friends in Jordan seem to face a dismal prospect. Financially, I have asked the Prime Minister, Mr. Zayd al-Rifa'i, to send you his comments on your latest message. As to your reference to your continued hope that some of our neighbors may help us in the months ahead, I can now categorically inform you that the price we are requested to pay for their generosity is to hand over, soonest and in advance of any such help, the command of our armed forces to the Egyptian commander of the two neighbors of Israel, Egypt and Syria. It would be ironic if Washington wishes us to do so. Furthermore, on the military level we are more than disturbed and disheartened to note the tremendous Syrian and Iraqi build-up of the most modern Soviet weaponry on the one hand, the United States' countering moves to supply the Saudis, Kuwaitis, and others with equally modern weapons, all of which inevitably will lead on the other hand to the U.S. supplying Israel with more weapons.

"Where does all this leave Jordan in its critical position facing Syria and Iraq, or Israel, if it is Washington's desire that Egypt control its forces, a Jordan which is committed to combatting extremist elements all over the Arabian Peninsula and which in terms of its human resources has had up to now the most efficient, loyal, and professional armed forces? I do not know. We are living on hope in the fulfillment of the promises of our friends.

"As for deliveries, we have received to date fifty out of eighty-eight M–60's. Syria alone already operates more than three hundred T–62 tanks. We are still operating Hawker Hunters, and only God knows when and how many F–5's we may receive, while Phantoms and Bloc-built aircraft are in abundance everywhere. Most of our armor is outgunned and outranged. Our artillery support is inadequate. Our anti-aircraft capability is almost nil. Our airbases are exposed. Our radar is inadequate. Our infantry has been promised the TOW anti-tank missiles, deliveries to commence in the unknown future. Our air transport capability is one C–130.

"I am sorry to take up your precious time in stating some of the grim facts we face. Yet, I am compelled to do so to illustrate the kind of impossible situation I am forced to take with a smile and the kind of demands I have to make on my people and armed forces in terms of their morale, hope, and faith in our friends. The string is stretched to almost the breaking point. This is all I can state.

"With my best regards, respects to the President, and the best personal good wishes to him and to your good self. Husayn I" (Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box CL 168, Geopolitical File, Jordan, Chronological File, 4 June 73–5 Nov. 73)

On June 4, Jordanian Prime Minister Rifai wrote Kissinger that his message regarding budgetary assistance to Jordan had come as "a big shock and complete surprise" since Jordan had been counting on receiving at least some U.S. assistance before July 1. As a result, the government would have to attempt to borrow funds from local commercial banks to cover June expenses. He pointed out that the total amount of projected U.S. aid from July to November would be only $45 million—$20 million less than President Nixon and Kissinger had agreed upon with King Hussein. Rifai warned that Jordan's budget at the end of the year would suffer a deficit of $110 million if U.S. aid were reduced and that if the $16 million military debt Jordan owed to the United States were added, the total deficit would total almost half of Jordan's 1974 budget—an unbearable situation. (Ibid.)

69. Backchannel Message From the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail) to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Cairo, June 10, 1973.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the October 1973 War.]

Mr. Ismail has received with thanks Dr. Kissinger's messages delivered in Cairo on 4 and 6 June. [Copies attached hereto][2]

With regard to the first message, Mr. Ismail would like to reassert the Egyptian Government's opposition to the continuance of an American policy of military balance of force. Furthermore, the significance of the timing of the American administration's decision to agree to Israel's request, did not escape the Egyptian Government's attention.

As regards the second message, Mr. Ismail would like to point out what appeared to be the American position manifested on two occasions:

First: Mr. Scali's declaration in a press conference after a White House meeting in which he referred to "mutual pullback of forces from the area of the Suez Canal".[3] Although the official text omitted the expression "mutual", yet the Egyptian side has to inquire about the truth of the matter.

Second: Mr. Scali's discussion with the Egyptian Foreign Minister in which he maintained that the U.S. Government (USG) was not prepared to accept any Security Council resolution interpreting its Resolution 242.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VI, May 20–September 30, 1973. Secret; Sensitive.

[2] Brackets in the original. In his June 4 message to Ismail, Kissinger explained the current U.S. position on military assistance to Israel. He stated that the U.S. Government had just completed certain internal procedures relating to the ongoing military supply relationship, which he had discussed with Ismail during their May 20 meeting. Kissinger added that nothing in the way of military supplies was involved beyond what he had described at that meeting and that the amount involved was a reduction over current deliveries. In his June 6 message to Ismail, Kissinger said that "the U.S. side would appreciate it if Mr. Ismail could clarify whether the U.S. side can discuss with the Soviet Union the principles for a settlement along the lines outlined by Dr. Kissinger in his meeting with Mr. Ismail, that is, principles of a general nature which would permit the parties to start a process of negotiation." Regarding their May 20 meeting, see Document 63.

[3] On May 29, after meeting with Nixon and Kissinger in Washington, Scali read a statement issued by the White House that reiterated U.S. support for Security Council Resolution 242 and the withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied territories. See *The New York Times*, May 30, 1973.

This confirms Dr. Kissinger's suggestion during the May meeting about a U.S. Government's "general" declaration to assert the linkage between the "opening phase" and the "final settlement", and Dr. Kissinger's expectation to be able to "convince" Israel to issue a similar declaration. (It is noteworthy that certain Israeli leaders have already issued such a declaration without need to be "convinced" by the Americans.)

It is thus the Egyptian side's appraisal that the present USG position is coming back to adopting the Israeli point of view and relinquishing its earlier stand in the years 1968 and 1971 when it agreed to the Jarring proposals.[4] This USG new position might even be a deviation from the understanding on which the present Egyptian-American discussions was based.

At any rate the Egyptian point of view has been stated during the two rounds of meetings of Mr. Ismail and Dr. Kissinger,[5] which had as their objective reaching a definite accord about "heads of agreement" for a peace agreement, the basic elements of which include final withdrawal of Israeli forces to Egypt's international boundaries.

Due to the ambiguity that envelops the American position, Mr. Ismail will appreciate it if Dr. Kissinger clarifies what he exactly means by "principles of a general nature which would permit the parties to start a process of negotiation", which Dr. Kissinger proposes to discuss with the Soviet side. This will enable the Egyptian side to state its point of view in a precise manner.

---

[4] Jarring's first mission to the Middle East was in early 1968. For documentation, see *Foreign Relations*, 1964–1968, volume XX, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1967–1968. Regarding his 1971 proposals, see footnote 3, Document 10.

[5] The first meetings were held February 25 and 26; see Document 28.

70. Memorandum From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, June 14, 1973, 10 a.m.

SUBJECT

Your Meetings with Brezhnev

This is your basic memorandum. It contains a review of all the major issues that are likely to arise in your discussions, and provides talking points on each.

More detailed papers on the major subjects for your background and use are also enclosed in this book.[2]

Additional background material is in a separate briefing book. Also in the separate books are your conversations at the last summit, and my conversations in Zavidovo.[3]

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

Middle East

The one area where Soviet policy seems most uncertain and confused is *the Middle East*. The abrupt dismissal of the Soviet advisers from the UAR last summer may well have been the high water mark for the Soviet offensive in the Middle East. Their influence with Sadat has declined and they no longer conceal their rage at Quadhafi's anti-communism.[4] They have been and are shifting their focus to the Persian Gulf, partly because of oil, but also they perceive a classical power vacuum, and local conflicts that can be exploited.[5]

Nevertheless, in Zavidovo Brezhnev was clearly worried about another Israeli war. It would present him with a painful question: If Israel forces begin to defeat the Arabs, would the USSR help? If so, what are the risks of confrontation with the US? This latter fear inspires Brezhnev to want some tangible sign of progress toward a peace settlement. He has no ideas and his "principles" of a settlement are a stale repetition and a retrogression from last year. He has a simple concept

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 75, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Meetings With Brezhnev, Memorandum From Kissinger. Secret; Sensitive. A stamped note on the first page reads: "The President has seen."

[2] Attached, but not printed.

[3] Attached, but not printed. For Kissinger's conversations in Zavidovo, see Documents 53 and 54.

[4] The President underlined "Quadhafi's anti-communism."

[5] The President underlined the second half of this sentence.

that we can simply deliver the Israelis.[6] In his talks in Washington he will press you for some action, on the grounds that the Arabs are so frustrated that they must now be shown that there is some hope. The alternative, he believes, is a war.[7]

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

B. *The Middle East*

On the Arab-Israeli issue, we have to keep two fronts in mind:

1. *Egypt.* President Sadat and Hafiz Ismail are still withholding their decision on whether or not to enter the step-by-step negotiating process that we have proposed and, specifically, on whether they would begin on the basis of general principles worked out by the US and USSR. The reason for their hesitation is that we have proposed starting that process on the basis of a general statement of the principles that would govern a settlement, and they are concerned that talks would immediately deadlock because there would be no prior assurance that they will get all Egyptian territory back.[8] Right now, they seem to be waiting to see whether either your meetings with Brezhnev or the UN Security Council can produce a US pressure for an Israeli commitment to total withdrawal. Sadat continues to hold out the resumption of hostilities as his only choice if there is no diplomatic movement on a basis he considers acceptable.

2. *USSR*. The discussions with Brezhnev could be used to persuade Sadat that he has no real choice but to proceed as we propose. There are two issues to be discussed:

—*Arab-Israel diplomacy*. At last year's meetings in Moscow, we reached tentative working agreement on a list of general principles, with some reservations.[9] We would want to make some changes in these before giving them any status. We might even wish to try to develop the principles just enough farther to show the Egyptians that even the USSR has acquiesced in the step-by-step negotiating process

---

[6] The President underlined this sentence.

[7] On June 7, Nixon wrote Brezhnev that he shared the General Secretary's concern that the situation in the Middle East was "potentially explosive" and appreciated that they were both working toward a solution that was durable and just for all parties. The President added that he would be prepared to go into this matter in more detail during their forthcoming discussions. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 940, VIP Visits, General Secretary Brezhnev Visit to USA, June 1973, Briefing Book [1 of 2])

[8] In telegram 1689 from Cairo, June 8, Greene reported that on June 7 he paid a farewell call on Ismail, who had expressed the harshest version yet of the Egyptian line and said that he saw no prospect of a change in the U.S. position on the Middle East, and thus no chance of improvement in the Middle East situation. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

[9] See *Foreign Relations,* 1969–1976, volume XIV, Soviet Union, October 1971–May 1972, Document 284.

we have proposed without prior commitment on the territorial settlement.[10] When I returned to Moscow last month, Gromyko gave me a new list of principles that represented a major retrogression on all but one point.[11] I told Gromyko that if there were to be any progress, we would have to go back to the principles we were working on last year. Even if it were possible to get agreement, we would still have to decide whether we could use these principles with Egypt and Israel to get talks started.

—*Military contingencies*. The other subject worth discussing is how the US and USSR would conduct themselves if hostilities break out again in the Middle East. This could be handled publicly as a follow-on to last year's "Basic Principles" in US–USSR Relations,[12] and it could have the advantage of persuading Sadat that neither superpower would support his resuming fighting. Privately, the advantage would lie in our making clear to each other where our important interests would lie in a new round of fighting.

Brezhnev's Position

The Soviets will presumably want to show the Arabs that they pressed the US hard to endorse the principle of total Israeli withdrawal and the start of a settlement process on that basis. They may also be reluctant to appear openly opposed to Sadat's threats to resume fighting, although they have privately told him that he is not ready.

Your Objectives:

—To persuade the Soviets either to acquiesce in our *step-by-step approach* to an Arab-Israeli settlement or at least to persuade them to accept enough of our principles so that it would be clear to Sadat that the Soviets are not going to change our position.

—To engage in enough discussion on *military contingencies* so that (a) we will have a basis on which to conduct our relations if fighting breaks out again and (b) Sadat will get the impression that neither superpower will help him if he begins fighting again.

Your Main Points:

—The US continues to favor a step-by-step approach to an Arab-Israeli settlement. This means establishing a negotiating process without having to settle the key issues like final borders in advance. This is the only practical way we can see to begin Israeli withdrawal.

---

[10] The President underlined this sentence.

[11] See footnote 4, Document 53.

[12] "Basic Principles of Relations Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" was issued on May 29, 1972, at the conclusion of the summit. For text, see *Public Papers: Nixon, 1972*, pp. 633–635.

—The objective of a negotiation between Egypt and Israel is to find a way of reconciling Egyptian sovereignty in the Sinai with security arrangements that would help lessen the danger of another war. We do not see how such arrangements, some of which might be transitional, can be worked out unless there is a situation in which the two sides can exchange compromises.

—The Egyptians seem to want someone else to make these decisions for them. No one else can. They have to make a decision to negotiate in one form or another before progress can be made. Both the US and USSR have to make this clear to Sadat.

—We recognize the danger that fighting might resume either in Lebanon or on the broader front. Both the US and USSR have an interest in maintaining the ceasefire[13]—because fighting would set back negotiations and because it could bring our interests into conflict. We would like to propose discussion during the visit of how we would conduct ourselves if fighting is renewed.[14] It may be desirable to discuss including language in the communiqué that would affirm our respective interests in maintaining peace and our intent not to seek any special advantage if hostilities resume.

—One specific point that we would like to mention: After Israel's raid in Beirut, there was evidence that the Soviet press and some officials in the Middle East helped to spread the charge that the US collaborated with Israel in that raid. This was totally untrue, and encouraging the Arabs to believe the charge greatly increased the danger to American lives. We do not feel this Soviet action is consistent with the relationship we are trying to build.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

[13] The President underlined the first part of this sentence.

[14] The President underlined most of this sentence.

71. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, June 19, 1973, 2–2:40 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Simcha Dinitz, Israeli Ambassador
Avner Idan, Minister

Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff

[The Ambassador made the following presentation, on the basis of a cable he had just received from the Prime Minister.]

Dinitz: First a couple of general remarks, then some specific remarks. These are from the Prime Minister. We have succeeded in communicating with her, and these are her remarks, after consultation with us. We offered some of our own ideas.

She is now stronger in her opinion that our original request was the correct one, that is, that every effort should be made that there should not be a joint document. The effort of Dr. Kissinger to draft such a new paper only points out the dangers that exist in such an exercise.

Secondly, we continue to negate the necessity . . . we continue to believe in the lack of necessity for a joint document between the two superpowers in a documented form as a contribution to the solution to our problem—which we continue to see as only through negotiations between the parties.

The third general remark is that all the reservations we have stated to Dr. Kissinger in our last meeting of June 15[2] are valid also for any subsequent remarks, and in fact they were strengthened by this development.

The fourth point: We want to reemphasize that in our response to your request to give our remarks, we are not either partners to the preparation of the document nor are we obligated in any way or form to its content.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 135, Country Files, Middle East, Rabin/Dinitz Sensitive Memcons, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting took place in the Ambassador's office at the Israeli Embassy. Brackets are in the original.

[2] In a meeting at the White House on June 15, Dinitz told Kissinger that the joint U.S.–USSR paper discussed at the 1972 Moscow summit could not serve as the basis for an Egyptian-Israeli peace agreement since it failed to address Israel's "right to live within secure and recognized boundaries" and permitted international forces at Sharm el-Sheikh. "We don't understand why the United States at any point should agree to a document that is worse than [United Nations Security Council Resolution] 242," Dinitz said. "We don't accept it at all." (Memorandum of conversation, June 15; ibid., Rabin/Dinitz Sensitive Memcons, 1973)

Now I want to add my own personal point, as number five, to relay to Dr. Kissinger. I know it was a difficult decision for the Prime Minister to go ahead with commenting on the matter, and I know she was guided by two considerations: She trusts Dr. Kissinger, and she didn't want to make his already difficult work more difficult. And second, she did not want the impression to be created that by not reacting we are in acquiescence with some of the serious points we see in it.

So far for general remarks. Now, the particular remarks to some of the most important points. We don't say that if we sat down with legalistic eyes we wouldn't draft it differently on other points, but these are the most important. I will cover these in order of the paragraphs, not the order of importance.

[The paper to which these comments are addressed is at Tab A.]

In paragraph four, the word "agreement" does appear, but to make it clearer we think it must be supplemented by "between the parties." So it wouldn't be thought it meant agreement among the superpowers or someone else. This goes to our original philosophy that security arrangements and guarantees cannot be instead of secure borders but at best in addition to them, with the agreement of the parties concerned. I would add orally that there couldn't be a situation where the Soviet Union and the U.S. come to us and say "we have decided to guarantee you." Security must result from secure borders that we will achieve in agreement with our neighbors. If there are any additional guarantees, it will be in addition and after agreement between parties.

Second, in the same paragraph 4—I told you earlier that the Prime Minister was concerned about a Soviet foothold in the area. A physical Soviet presence. You have corrected it somewhat. But the word "participation" can have a dual meaning. You probably meant participation in the international negotiation, but it could mean physical presence. We suggest saying: "International guarantees could include the Soviet Union and the United States." In other words, take away "appropriate participation." We don't want them there.

In paragraph six, our remarks are very simple. We kindly request you omit the whole paragraph. Because the problematics of it are clear. You're talking about the specific status of the Suez Canal. But you're not talking about the specific status of Sharm el-Sheikh except in terms of freedom of navigation. We don't think you will get a phrase about continued Israeli control of Sharm el-Sheikh, so we are better off without it. If your friends ask, "what about freedom of navigation?" you can say it's covered by Resolution 242 and there is no need to restate it.

The most serious problem is paragraph seven. This is crucial. This is for us very serious. I presume you didn't even realize what a serious word you introduced into it. In 1972 you succeeded in preventing inclusion of this item because there was a reference to UN decisions, UN resolutions. That was very good, very clever. But now you are taking from these UN resolutions the most bitter pill for us—free choice—and incorporate it in the document by saying in paragraph seven "implementing the choices of the refugees." This is absolutely unacceptable for us. We have opposed it bitterly ever since 1949.

And this is in spite of the fact that you did incorporate the sentence "consistent with national sovereignty." We don't think this is enough of a safeguard.

So we repeat our request to deal with the refugee problem in the manner that Resolution 242 dealt with it: "the necessity . . . for achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem." Period.

It would have been desirable to add that sentence which I gave you earlier [about sovereignty]—I feel it's a good thing for both parties. But if Dr. Kissinger has any difficulties with this, it would suffice to have only the reference to Resolution 242. But by no means can we accept this question of choice.

Regarding paragraph eight, we really feel that such a paragraph should be included in the peace treaty and not in a general document of principles. So we feel it's premature and not necessary. This is not so much a remark of substance but rather an observation.

[This was the end of the Ambassador's comments on the paper at Tab A. He then raised a few other matters.]

Tab A

Washington, undated.

General Working Principles

1. The political settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict should be embodied in a set of agreements between Israel and each of the neighboring Arab countries directly involved in the conflict. They should be based on Resolution 242 in order to achieve a final peace. The completion of the agreements should at some stage involve negotiation between the signatories. Separate agreements on specific issues are not precluded.

2. The agreements should contain provisions for withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in 1967 to secure and recognized boundaries.

3. Any border changes, which may take place, should result from voluntary agreement between the parties concerned.

4. Arrangements for mutual security could by agreement include demilitarized and other security zones; establishment of an international force including participation of the signatory nations; stationing of such a force at strategic points; and the most effective international guarantees with the appropriate participation of the Soviet Union and the United States.

5. Recognition of the independence and sovereignty of all states in the Middle East, including Israel, is one of the basic principles on which the peace treaties must be based.

6. Freedom of navigation through the international waterways in the area should be assured to all nations including Israel. This is fully consistent with Egyptian sovereignty over the Suez Canal.

7. The problem of the Palestinian refugees should be solved on a just basis which provides for registering and implementing the choices of the refugees in ways consistent with national sovereignty and for compensation.

8. A material breach of the agreement by one of the parties shall entitle the other to invoke the breach as a ground for suspending its performance in whole or in part until the breach is rectified.

---

72. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

San Clemente, June 23, 1973, 10 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Andrei Gromyko, Foreign Minister of the USSR
Anatoliy Dobrynin, Ambassador of the USSR
Mr. Makarov, Counselor to the Foreign Minister

Henry A. Kissinger, Assistant to the President
Harold H. Saunders, NSC Staff

The discussion fell into four sections: (1) brief discussion of the press reaction to the signing on June 22 of the agreement on avoiding

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 75, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Brezhnev Visit, June 18–25, 1973, Memcons. Secret; Sensitive. Drafted by Saunders. The meeting took place in Kissinger's office at the Western White House in San Clemente, California.

nuclear war; (2) brief discussion of some details of the US–USSR communiqué to be issued at the end of the Brezhnev visit; (3) discussion of the Middle East paragraphs of the communiqué; (4) discussion of the "general working principles" paper.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

The Middle East in the Communiqué

Dr. Kissinger continued, saying that the only issue left is the Middle East.

Foreign Minister Gromyko said that, as the Soviet side sees the situation, it is difficult to agree on any "substantial" text for the communiqué. It could be stated that both parties expressed their positions and added that they would continue to exercise efforts to promote a just settlement of the problem which is in accord with the interests of independence and sovereignty of all the states in the area.

Dr. Kissinger said that such a statement would be "less than last year's."

Foreign Minister Gromyko said, "in one sense less; in another sense more." It would not mention Resolution 242. Last year, he said, the two sides had hidden the differences between them and accentuated the matters on which there was agreement. But since the areas of agreement were thin and the Arabs did not particularly like last year's communiqué, he felt that the two sides should simply indicate that they had expressed their views. He indicated that the Soviet side would be willing to mention Resolution 242 if the US were prepared to mention the Jarring memorandum of 1971.[2]

Dr. Kissinger replied that the US could not do that. In any case, the two documents were of a quite different character.

Foreign Minister Gromyko said that they could be mentioned together, and Dr. Kissinger replied that we had never mentioned the Jarring memorandum.

The Foreign Minister noted that the US had initially expressed a positive view.

Dr. Kissinger replied that this had been purely a unilateral expression of view.

Dr. Kissinger said that he did not see how "we" could separate ourselves from Resolution 242. He felt it would be a pity after a week of substantial harmony if the press were to report disagreement on the issue of the Middle East.

Foreign Minister Gromyko acknowledged that the press might report such disagreement, but the reality is that there is disagreement on

[2] See footnote 3, Document 10.

fundamental points. The US side in Moscow in 1972 had said it would show flexibility on the issue of withdrawal of Israeli troops, but that flexibility has not materialized. The crucial point is withdrawal. Nothing has happened in the past year.

Foreign Minister Gromyko said that he had talked with Secretary Rogers on the plane the previous afternoon. They had not discussed a text, but on the basis of the talks they did have, the Foreign Minister proposed the following:

"The parties expressed their deep concern with the situation in the Middle East and exchanged opinions regarding ways of reaching a Middle East settlement.

"Each of the parties set forth its position on this problem.

"Both parties agreed to continue to exert their efforts in the direction of the quickest possible settlement in the Middle East. This settlement should be in accordance with the interests of all states and peoples in the area and with the interests of their independence and sovereignty."

Dr. Kissinger asked the Foreign Minister what the phrase "and peoples" was intended to reflect. He said he did not understand how the two were different in a context like this or how we could distinguish "peoples" in the context of a situation like this. He asked the Minister what he intended to convey. He indicated that the US would prefer to drop that phrase.

When Foreign Minister Gromyko said he felt there was no important distinction, Dr. Kissinger countered that, to be frank, the problem was that this raised the whole question of the Palestinians. He noted that in his conversations with Egyptian National Security Adviser Hafiz Ismail, Ismail had talked in terms of getting Israel back to its borders simply in order to gain an end of the state of belligerency—nothing more than a virtual continuation of the cease-fire. Thus, the Egyptians seem to be putting themselves in a position to make the establishment of peace between Egypt and Israel contingent on a later solution to the problem of the Palestinians.

Ambassador Dobrynin recalled that this issue had been discussed at length between him and Assistant Secretary of State Sisco in 1969[3] and that the USSR had substantially met that objection by the US. He said he did not feel that was an issue any more.

Dr. Kissinger recalled that he had not been a party to those discussions. In any case, we preferred not to see the word "peoples" introduced in this context.

---

[3] For Dobrynin's conversations with Sisco in July 1969, see *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XII, Soviet Union, January 1969–October 1970, Document 176.

Foreign Minister Gromyko then said that he would drop the phrase "and peoples" provided the following sentence could be added at the end: "Both parties stand for the fulfillment of decisions of the United Nations on this question."

Dr. Kissinger said that this is too open-ended for the US side. There are UN decisions which the US has not voted for.

Foreign Minister Gromyko suggested inserting the word "appropriate" before "decisions." Dr. Kissinger repeated the point he had made earlier that the US did not want to indicate unqualified support for decisions which reach back over a number of years. He said that he would have to go back and look at them all to agree to this point. He would prefer not to have a sentence of this kind.

Foreign Minister Gromyko then went back to saying that the USSR would want either this sentence or the words "and peoples" in the previous sentence.

Dr. Kissinger indicated that perhaps if the word "appropriate" were inserted, that the US could consider the sentence.

At this point, Dr. Kissinger read through the text as it had been developed in the conversation, editing as he went through and reaching the following version:

"The parties expressed their deep concern with the situation in the Middle East and exchanged opinions regarding ways of reaching a Middle East settlement.

"Each of the parties set forth its position on this problem.

"Both parties agreed to continue to exert their efforts to promote the quickest possible settlement in the Middle East. This settlement should be in accordance with the interests of all states in the area and consistent with their independence and sovereignty.

"Both parties stand for the fulfillment of appropriate decisions of the UN on this question."

Dr. Kissinger and the Foreign Minister agreed that they would discuss this with their principals, and Dr. Kissinger indicated that he would tell Secretary Rogers that the Foreign Minister had presented this proposal following his conversation with the Secretary on the plane the day before.[4]

---

[4] Kissinger described the disagreement over the wording of the communiqué in his memoirs: "Gromyko was very wary. After all, the previous summit and its communiqué had been a major factor in the expulsion of the Soviet advisors from Egypt. . . . This time Gromyko refused even to include a reference to Security Council Resolution 242, the different interpretations of which were the heart of the liturgy of Middle East negotiations, because we refused to go along with the Soviets' pro-Arab interpretation of the resolution. In 1972, Gromyko had sought to avoid any expressions of differences on the Middle East; in 1973, he insisted on it. It was only a brief sentence, but it would prevent the debacle of the preceding year, when a vague anodyne formulation had been interpreted by

Foreign Minister Gromyko indicated that General Secretary Brezhnev was "generally very satisfied" with the visit.

Working Principles on the Arab-Israel Issue

Foreign Minister Gromyko asked, "What about the principles?" He asked whether there is anything new worth talking about. He felt that there is no point in spending time on the project unless it is possible to make some progress.

Dr. Kissinger said he had talked with the Israelis generally and had studied again the paper presented in Moscow this May. He indicated that he had worked out a new version which he then handed to Gromyko [copy attached at Tab A].

Foreign Minister Gromyko read through the principles and made the points indicated below:

On *paragraph 1,* he felt that the paragraph as now drafted reflected a different approach from the one in the principles discussed in Moscow in 1972 [copy attached at Tab B].[5] He said that the paragraph as now drafted loses the idea of a comprehensive settlement in which all parts of the settlement are inter-related. Introducing the idea of "separate agreements" suggests that it would be possible to have something like an interim Canal agreement outside the scope of the general system of overall agreements.

On *paragraph 2,* he said that "this is not the answer." He said that there are different interpretations of Security Council Resolution 242 and that this paragraph did not say what is necessary.

On *paragraph 3,* he said that this point would refer only to Jordan. He said that this had been made clear in the discussions in Moscow in 1972.

Dr. Kissinger said that he wanted to get the history of this point clear. When it had been discussed in Moscow, it was not limited to Jordan. The following day in Kiev, Ambassador Dobrynin on the Foreign Minister's behalf had come to Dr. Kissinger and said that the Soviet side regarded this as applying only to Jordan. But when it was drafted, Jordan had not been discussed. The Foreign Minister said that he felt Jordan was mentioned several times.

Dr. Kissinger said he would have a great deal of difficulty identifying Jordan in this paragraph. He stepped back to describe his overall philosophy about a set of principles like this. He felt that if the US and USSR could agree on a set of general principles that succeeded in

---

Sadat as a Soviet sellout of Arab interests." (*Years of Upheaval*, pp. 295–296) For the text of this joint communiqué issued on June 25, see *Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, pp. 611–619. The final text omitted the last paragraph on the UN decisions.

[5] Attached, but not printed.

starting negotiations, then each side could give its own particular interpretation of what any of these principles meant. The USSR could say that the principle applied only to Jordan. The US would simply say, "Let's see what emerges from the negotiations." The issue is whether the two sides could find a set of propositions general enough to get talks started.

Foreign Minister Gromyko then turned to *paragraph 4.* He objected to the words "including participation of the signatory nations." He said that if that meant that Israel could participate, this could not be accepted.

He then indicated that *paragraph 5 and 6* were all right. On *paragraph 7,* he indicated that it would be necessary to make reference to the appropriate UN decisions.

Foreign Minister Gromyko said that he could not give a final answer at this meeting. He had simply given a quick judgment on what changes would be required if the principles were to become more acceptable to the Soviet side.

Dr. Kissinger said he would like to recapitulate the Foreign Minister's comments and to make some comments of his own.

On *paragraph 1*, he said that the US could accept a formulation which indicated the comprehensive nature of the settlement. As far as "separate agreements" are concerned, a way could be found to indicate that they would be part of a general settlement. It would also be possible, as Ambassador Dobrynin had suggested, to use the phrase "appropriate forms of negotiation" rather than "negotiations between the signatories." The Foreign Minister interjected that this was important because the phrase "negotiation between the signatories" would be like a red flag to a bull because it connoted direct negotiations.

Continuing, Dr. Kissinger said that the US would have to have some reference to Security Council Resolution 242. Foreign Minister Gromyko said, "Impossible." There was a moment of silence, and Dr. Kissinger continued.

On *paragraph 3,* if the Soviet side wanted to say explicitly that border changes would take place only on the Jordanian front, that would be impossible. The US could note the Soviet view. The Foreign Minister said that would do no good because it would not bring the two views together. He suggested that the US might at least confidentially indicate that this point applied only to the Jordanian sector. Otherwise, there would be major problems if the Egyptians and the Syrians thought there were to be changes in their borders.

Dr. Kissinger suggested that it might be possible to agree confidentially that we would both exercise our influence for a return to 1967 borders. But this would have to be agreed confidentially. He noted that

keeping things like this confidential in the Arab world was often an impossibility.

On *paragraph 4,* he felt that the US could meet the objection to including Israel explicitly in the composition of the international forces. The words "participation of the signatory nations" would not be necessary.

Foreign Minister Gromyko said the problem with including it is that it reflects Israeli aspirations to keep its troops in the Sinai.

Dr. Kissinger said that he understood. He would not insist on this point. In the framework of what we are trying to achieve with these principles, it would be all right to drop that point. He felt that the only way to get the talks started was to be sufficiently vague. He agreed that we could eliminate the phrase.

Dr. Kissinger noted that *paragraphs 5 and 6* were agreed. At this point, he called attention to the fact that a paragraph from the May 1972 principles had been dropped. It was the one which read, "The agreements should lead to an end of a state of belligerency and to the establishment of peace." He explained that we had dropped it because there was reference to "final peace" in the new paragraph 1. We felt that it was not needed.

Foreign Minister Gromyko said he would like to keep that paragraph. It was more favorable to Israel. It might facilitate negotiation. The Foreign Minister asked whether he was being "too pro-Israel."

Dr. Kissinger joked that this was because of the large Jewish population in the Soviet Union. The Foreign Minister acknowledged the quip.

Foreign Minister Gromyko said he wanted to go back to the *first paragraph.* He had not looked at it carefully. He said that the USSR could not say anything that looked like direct negotiations. Therefore he wanted to insert the idea of "appropriate forms of negotiation which would be agreeable to all the parties concerned." Dr. Kissinger indicated that we could probably work something out along these lines.

On *paragraph 7*, Foreign Minister Gromyko said that it would be necessary to include some reference to the UN decisions. Perhaps the same language could be used as had been proposed for the draft communiqué—"appropriate decisions of the UN on this question."

Dr. Kissinger summed up saying that we had simply maintained some of the principles from the May 1972 draft. He felt that *paragraph 4* is manageable. He felt that on *paragraph 1*, the US side would have no objection in principle to a comprehensive settlement as long as it could take place in stages.

Dr. Kissinger indicated that he would try to produce another draft before the 2:00 p.m. meeting that would represent a US revision taking

into account the informal comments made by the Foreign Minister and the Ambassador.

Ambassador Dobrynin suggested that perhaps brackets could be used to show any point that had not been resolved in the discussion.

Foreign Minister Gromyko said he would prefer not to show the draft as Dr. Kissinger had handed it to him to General Secretary Brezhnev. He would, however, like to be able to report to the General Secretary and suggested that Dr. Kissinger reshape his proposal along the lines of the comments he had made. If a new US version could be handed to him in the afternoon, he would talk to the General Secretary about it. Then Ambassador Dobrynin could continue talks with Dr. Kissinger after his return to Washington.

Foreign Minister Gromyko reflected that there is one new element in the principles—namely, the element of negotiation. He said that he would not exclude some form of negotiation along the lines of the Rhodes talks. A long time ago, he recalled, Foreign Minister Riad of Egypt had told him that the Arabs would not exclude talks along the lines of the Rhodes formula. [*Note:* The "Rhodes Formula" refers to the negotiating procedures used at Rhodes during negotiation of the Arab-Israeli armistice agreements in 1949.] He said the Arabs had changed their position on Rhodes-type talks in 1969 only after the Israelis had made certain public comments. He repeated that he did not exclude the possibility that the Arabs might agree to the Rhodes formula. He noted that the talks might not necessarily take place at Rhodes; they might just as well take place at the UN in New York. He felt this problem would be taken care of in the draft if we could say that "appropriate forms of negotiation should be used acceptable to the parties concerned." If anything is said that the Arabs interpret as "direct negotiations," then any progress we made on the other points would be spoiled by the negative reaction the Arabs would have to this one.

The meeting concluded with the understanding that Dr. Kissinger would revise the principles and bring a copy to the afternoon meeting.

Harold H. Saunders[6]

[6] Saunders signed his initials above his typed signature.

Tab A

San Clemente, June 21, 1973.

General Working Principles

1. The political settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict should be embodied in a set of agreements between Israel and each of the neighboring Arab countries directly involved in the conflict designed to achieve a final peace. The completion of the agreements should at some stage involve negotiation between the signatories. Separate agreements on specific issues are not precluded.

2. The agreements should contain provisions for withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in 1967 consistent with Security Council Resolution 242.

3. Any border changes, which may take place, should result from voluntary agreement between the parties concerned.

4. Arrangements for mutual security could by agreement between the parties include demilitarized and other security zones; establishment of an international force including participation of the signatory nations; stationing of such a force at strategic points; and the most effective international guarantees which could include the Soviet Union and the United States.

5. Recognition of the independence and sovereignty of all states in the Middle East, including Israel, is one of the basic principles on which the peace treaties must be based.

6. Freedom of navigation through the international waterways in the area should be assured to all nations including Israel. This is fully consistent with Egyptian sovereignty over the Suez Canal.

7. There must be a just settlement of the refugee problem through mutually agreed procedures and with appropriate international assistance.

73. Memorandum for the President's Files by the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

San Clemente, June 23, 1973, 10:30 p.m.

SUBJECT

President's meeting with General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev on Saturday, June 23, 1973 at 10:30 p.m. at the Western White House, San Clemente, California

PARTICIPANTS

The President
Leonid I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee, CPSU
Andrei A. Gromyko, Minister for Foreign Affairs
Anatoli F. Dobrynin, Ambassador to the United States
Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

[The principal subject of the meeting was the Middle East. At the close, there was a brief discussion of the exchange of letters on Soviet grain purchases, and of Brezhnev's forthcoming meeting with President Pompidou in Paris.][2]

[Pleasantries were exchanged at the beginning of the meeting regarding Brezhnev's visit to the West Coast of the United States.]

General Secretary Brezhnev: I would be glad to hear your views on the Middle East problem.

The President: The main problem in our view is to get talks started. Once we get them started, we would use our influence with the Israelis and you with the Arabs. But if we just talk about principles, we'll never get them. Dr. Kissinger and Mr. Gromyko seem to have agreed on five principles and disagreed on three. We can do nothing about it in the abstract; we need a concrete negotiation. Then we can be effective. I understand that Dr. Kissinger is redrafting the document.[3]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 75, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Brezhnev Visit, June 18–25, 1973, Memcons. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. All brackets except those that indicate omitted material are in the original.

[2] This meeting was unscheduled, as Kissinger relates in his memoirs, noting that they had all gone to bed early in the evening of June 23, the last day at San Clemente. "At ten o'clock my phone rang. It was the Secret Service informing me that Brezhnev was up and demanding an immediate meeting with the President, who was asleep. It was a gross breach of protocol. For a foreign guest late at night to ask for an unscheduled meeting with the President on an unspecified subject on the last evening of a State visit was then, and has remained, unparalleled. It was also a transparent ploy to catch Nixon off guard and with luck to separate him from his advisors. . . . It transpired that Brezhnev had been seized with an all-consuming desire to discuss the Middle East." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 297)

[3] See Document 72.

Dr. Kissinger: Right. And we will send it to Camp David.

General Secretary Brezhnev: The substance of the principles is essential, at least in confidential form. I fully understand that we cannot write into the communiqué all the details. But we must put this warlike situation to an end. The Arabs cannot hold direct talks with Israel without knowing the principles on which to proceed. We must have a discussion on these principles. If there is no clarity about the principles we will have difficulty keeping the military situation from flaring up. Everything depends on troop withdrawals and adequate guarantees. I can assure you that nothing will go beyond this room. But if we agree on Israeli withdrawals, then everything will fall into place.[4]

The President: On a subject as difficult as this, we cannot say anything definitive. We will look at all your suggestions and incorporate them into the paper. Right, Henry?

Dr. Kissinger: Yes. We will send them to you in Camp David tomorrow.

The President: I am not trying to put you off. It is easy to put down principles in such a way that parties will not agree to talk. If we do it this way, then we can use our influence and you can use yours, to get a resolution of the differences. I can assure you I want a settlement—but we don't get it just by talking principles.

General Secretary Brezhnev: [launching into a long speech] Proceeding from the logic of things, without an agreement on general principles we don't see how we can act. Last year we couldn't agree on a set of principles. We should find some form of words we can agree on. What are the principles? (1) Guarantees for Israel and the other states. This can be done in strict confidence. (2) We can ensure by the guarantees that there is no confrontation from the occupied territories. (3) Israeli withdrawal from Arab territories. (4) There will be unobstructed passage for all through the straits. And if we can get agreement on these principles we can then discuss how to use any influence on the contending parties. We should use our confidential channel with Dr. Kissinger and Ambassador Dobrynin. If we don't do that, we have no basis for using our influence. I agree with everyone present here that

[4] Kissinger wrote: "So it happened that around 10:45 p.m. on Brezhnev's last night with Nixon, the Soviet leader made his most important proposition of the entire trip: that the United States and the Soviet Union agree then and there on a Middle East settlement, based on total Israeli withdrawal to the 1967 borders in return not for peace but an end to the state of belligerency. Final peace would depend on subsequent negotiations with the Palestinians; the arrangement would be guaranteed by the great powers. This was, of course, the standard Arab position. Brezhnev must have understood—and if he did not, Gromyko was much too experienced not to know—that there was no chance whatever of implementing such a proposal or of reaching any such agreement in the remaining few hours." (*Years of Upheaval*, pp. 297–298)

we can't say it in the communiqué. But we should know in what direction to act.

We are reaching results as a result of our confidential exchanges. This is not a demand. But it is something we should do. It is necessary not only for the Arabs but for others too. As soon as there is a lasting peace, our diplomatic relations will be restored with Israel. We could agree on Vietnam. Why can't we do it here? Once the principles are agreed, we can go on. That is why I would like to know that we have reached agreement on principles. If we agree, the result will be a stronger peace in the area. But if the state of vagueness continues, the situation will deteriorate. Of course we are great powers and we can bring to bear our influence. But the principles are a minimum. If we can't reach agreement, it will undermine confidence in us. Peace must be worldwide. Our actions should be aimed at an enduring and lasting peace. I am trying to see things realistically. But to influence things we must know the principles on the basis of which we can do good work together.

The President: We can't settle this tonight. I want you to know I consider the Arab-Israeli dispute a matter of highest urgency. I will look over Dr. Kissinger's notes and we will send you our best thinking. Henry, do you have anything to add?

Dr. Kissinger: Only that all the headings mentioned by General Secretary will be covered. The big issue is the degree of precision to be achieved and how much should be left to the parties.

The President: A year ago when we met I had primary concern with Vietnam. I still have concern. I will say to General Secretary I agree with him and the Foreign Minister as to the urgency of this; we disagree only on tactics. We will try to find a formula that can work. We must avoid the issue—we must find words with subtlety that will bring both sides together. We have got to find a solution. I will devote my best efforts to bring it about.

General Secretary Brezhnev: We need not define all the principles and forms on which they can be carried out. We can't write down everything. But I would like to attach to the communiqué some principles. These would be: withdrawal of Israeli troops, recognition of boundaries, free passage of ships, and guarantees. Without some measures of confidential agreement, we don't know where we are going.

[Editorial comment by Dr. Kissinger: Typical of Soviets to spring on us at last moment without any preparation.]

The President: We are not prepared to go any further. We can't abstractly beat the issue to death. We don't owe anything to the Israelis. That means I am interested in a settlement. We will work on it. We can

make some progress in moving this problem off dead center. We can't take intransigent position. I am prepared to move towards a settlement.

General Secretary Brezhnev: We have indeed talked about it extensively last year and even before our meeting. I have no doubt about our agreement in principle. But we must come to an understanding on this issue.[5] We will study your messages carefully. I do not ask that we agree on all the tactics now. We will never leak any of our discussions. We can't reach agreed positions if we start taking sides. We can make a gentleman's agreement. We will be loyal to this promise. Then the channel—Kissinger/Dobrynin—can be used to elaborate the tactics.

I am categorically opposed to a resumption of the war. But without agreed principles that will ultimately help situation in area, we cannot do this.[6] If there is a settlement, we can renew relations with Israel. Without such agreement our further cooperation will be weakened. We shall continue contacts but we will have problems. I know we have found common language regarding aims.

Perhaps I am tiring you out. But we must reach an understanding. We must be careful that is the case. We must act in order to achieve the desired results. The Arab states are not ours: Israel is not yours—we helped form the State of Israel. I am for full respect for the sovereignty of all the states of the area.

I will think over our conversation. You know the role I play in my country, just as I know yours. I will always act in concert with you. You trust Dr. Kissinger; I trust Dobrynin. We will have confidential consultations. If we can now agree on a gentleman's basis on two or three principles, then Dr. Kissinger and Ambassador Dobrynin can implement them. We will keep this here in this room; the people in this room

---

[5] In his memoirs, Nixon wrote: "We had a session that in emotional intensity almost rivaled the one on Vietnam at the dacha during Summit I. This time the subject was the Middle East, with Brezhnev trying to browbeat me into imposing on Israel a settlement based on Arab terms. He kept hammering at what he described as the need for the two of us to agree, even if only privately, on a set of 'principles' to govern a Middle East settlement. . . . I pointed out that there was no way I could agree to any such 'principles' without prejudicing Israel's rights. I insisted that the important thing was to get talks started between the Arabs and the Israelis, and I argued that if we laid down controversial principles beforehand, both parties would refuse to talk—in which case the principles would have defeated their purpose." (*RN: The Memoirs of Richard Nixon*, p. 885)

[6] Kissinger commented: "In other words, twenty-four hours after renouncing the threat of force in the Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War, Brezhnev was in effect threatening us with a Middle East war unless we accepted his terms. And he was vehement as he did so. Dobrynin told me afterward that he had told Sukhodrev to refrain from translating some of Brezhnev's more pointed remarks. But what got through was clear enough. Brezhnev wanted to settle the Middle East conflict that summer and the terms he proposed were the Arabs' demands. The fact was that there was no chance even of launching a serious peace process before the Israeli elections four months away, and there was no possibility at any time of achieving the terms Brezhnev was proposing." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 298)

won't disclose what has been said. What goes through this channel goes only to me. All that I say should be seen as the subject of an oral understanding not communicated to anyone.

The President: As for an oral agreement, I can go no further than to look over the Gromyko discussions. I'll be in communication with him. I am trying to find a solution.

General Secretary Brezhnev: It is not necessary for the principles to be in written form. Very well. I agree that we should work on one principle—withdrawal of forces—alone.

Recall how hard it was for us to meet last year. Some people preached to me the impossibility of a meeting. Bear in mind this difficulty. Do not let me leave without this assurance.

The President: This is of course the key question. I will look at this question in the morning. It is not as simple as all that. That could be a goal. But it wouldn't lead to a settlement. We have to face the problem in a pragmatic way.

General Secretary Brezhnev: Without the principle there is nothing I can do. Without a gentleman's agreement we can't use the channel. We need a friendly agreement. Or I will leave empty-handed. We should have an agreement without divulging the agreement to the Arabs.

The President: I will take it into account tomorrow. We won't say anything in terms of a gentleman's agreement. I hope you won't go back empty handed. But we have to break up now.[7]

It would be very easy for me to say that Israel should withdraw from all the occupied territories and call it an agreed principle. But that's what the argument is about: I will agree to principles which will bring a settlement. That will be our project this year. The Middle East is most urgent place.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

---

[7] Kissinger wrote: "After an hour and a half of Brezhnev's monologue, Nixon brought matters to a conclusion firmly, and with great dignity by stating that he would look over the record of discussions in the morning; the problem was not as simple as Brezhnev had presented it; the best he could do was to ask me to present a counterdraft to the principles submitted at Zavidovo by Gromyko." (Ibid., p. 299) Nixon commented: "Whether he already had a commitment to the Arabs to support an attack against Israel is not clear, but I am confident that the firmness I showed that night reinforced the seriousness of the message I conveyed to the Soviets when I ordered a military alert four months later during the Yom Kippur War." (*RN: The Memoirs of Richard Nixon*, p. 885)

74. Paper Prepared by the National Security Council Staff[1]

Washington, undated.

The attached document is based on the conversation between Foreign Minister Gromyko and Dr. Kissinger June 23[2] and the subsequent conversation between the General Secretary and the President.[3] It makes a maximum effort to take into account Soviet views. At the same time, the U.S. holds the view that the working principles should not be used to support the position of either party but to get negotiations started. The U.S. has made minimum changes in previously discussed positions in order to get a negotiating process started. The following points are noted:

Paragraph 1: This paragraph is essentially from the Zavidovo paper[4] with the addition of the objective of achieving a final peace and the formulation on negotiation discussed June 23 in San Clemente. The last sentence is in the formulation of the May 1972 draft.

Paragraph 2: The word "agreements" is changed to "settlement" in this and subsequent paragraphs in accordance with the discussion June 23 despite the fact that it was taken from Foreign Minister Gromyko's paper at Zavidovo. The remainder is the sentence of the May 1972 draft with simple reference to "appropriate UN resolutions" added.

Paragraph 3: This remains unchanged from the draft of May 1972.

Paragraph 4: This has been simplified in the light of the Gromyko–Kissinger conversation of June 23. It contains the same elements as in the May 1972 draft.

Paragraph 5: Again, the word "agreement" is replaced with "settlement." Since the point now refers to the over-all settlement rather than to any specific agreement, the words "lead to" are dropped.

Paragraph 6: This is the same as the May 1972 draft.

Paragraph 7: This remains as accepted in discussions June 23. It is essentially the same as in the May 1972 draft.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin and Kissinger, Vol. 6. No classification marking. A handwritten notation at the top of the page reads: "Delivered by messenger to Amb. Dobrynin at Camp David, 6/24/73 o/a 9:00 p.m." There is no drafting information, but an earlier and slightly different draft of the attached General Working Principles was forwarded from Saunders to Rodman with a handwritten note stating that it reflected the Kissinger–Gromyko conversation on the morning of June 23 and that it had been used as a basis for discussion on the evening of June 23, from which had come the revision of June 24 sent to Camp David. (Ibid.)

[2] See Document 72.

[3] See Document 73.

[4] See footnote 4, Document 53.

Paragraph 8: The language of the communiqué is introduced.

Attachment

Washington, June 24, 1973.

General Working Principles

1. The political settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict should be comprehensive, embracing all parties concerned and all issues. This settlement means the elaboration and implementation of a set of agreements between Israel and each of the neighboring Arab countries directly involved in the conflict that would achieve a final peace. This should at some stage involve appropriate forms of negotiation between the parties acceptable to all parties concerned. In the process of working out agreement on the whole complex of questions relating to the settlement, the possibility is not precluded of this settlement being implemented by stages or that some issues may be resolved on a priority basis.

2. The settlement should contain provisions for withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in 1967 in accordance with appropriate UN resolutions.

3. Any border changes, which may take place, should result from voluntary agreement between the parties concerned.

4. Arrangements for mutual security could include demilitarized zones; establishment of an international force; stationing of such a force at strategic points; and the most effective international guarantees which could include the Soviet Union and the United States.

5. The settlement should end the state of belligerency and establish a state of peace.

6. Recognition of the independence and sovereignty of all states in the Middle East, including Israel, is one of the basic principles on which the settlement must be based.

7. Freedom of navigation through the international waterways in the area should be assured to all nations including Israel. This is fully consistent with Egyptian sovereignty over the Suez Canal.

8. The refugee problem should be settled on a just basis through agreed procedures and taking into due account the legitimate interests of the Palestinian people.

75. Memorandum From Secretary of State Rogers to President Nixon[1]

Washington, June 28, 1973.

SUBJECT

Next Steps on the Middle East

I believe the stage is set and the time is now ripe for us to make a diplomatic move seeking to make some modest progress on an Arab-Israeli settlement.

The discussion of the Middle East at the recent Summit made clear that we and the Soviets continue to have a common interest in avoiding a resumption of Arab-Israeli hostilities and a confrontation between ourselves in the area, but that we are no closer together in our approaches to a settlement. In the Security Council debate before the Summit, we left no doubt that we will oppose any attempt in the Council, when it reconvenes in mid-July, to support a one-sided outcome such as a resolution endorsing in some form the Arab-Soviet interpretation of Security Council Resolution 242.[2] We have also said that we will oppose efforts to reactivate major power talks or to create some new outside mechanism as a substitute for negotiations involving the parties themselves.

The Egyptians, who remain key to a negotiated settlement, can thus be under no illusions that the United States will cooperate in efforts to get others to do the job for them or to impose concessions on Israel. At the same time, we do not agree with Israel's views that, if all other doors are kept firmly closed Sadat will come around to negotiating on Israeli terms as they now stand—i.e., negotiations without pre-conditions but against the background of the Israeli position, as stated to Ambassador Jarring in early 1971, that Israel will not withdraw to the pre-June 5, 1967 lines.[3] While Sadat's demand for a prior Israeli commitment to total Israeli withdrawal from Sinai is unrealistic, we have always felt the Israelis are equally unrealistic and are going be-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 27–14 ARAB–ISR. Secret; Nodis; Cedar; Double Plus. A copy was sent eyes only to Sisco on June 29.

[2] The UN Security Council met June 6–14 to consider the situation in the Middle East. U.S. Representative Scali reiterated the U.S. position that Resolution 242 called for agreemeent among the parties, which could be achieved only through direct or indirect negotiations aimed at reconciling sovereignty and security. (*Yearbook of the United Nations, 1973*, pp. 185–186) A draft of Scali's statement was sent to Sisco in telegram 112140 to Tehran, June 9. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

[3] See footnote 3, Document 10.

yond the provisions of Resolution 242 when they exclude total withdrawal ab initio.

We doubt that Sadat is on the verge of resorting to hostilities, although this risk—costly as it would be for him—will grow the longer the stalemate continues. For now, however, we expect that Sadat will continue to pursue his diplomatic strategy of seeking to (1) mobilize support in the United Nations and world public opinion for the Egyptian position on a settlement, isolating the United States and Israel in the process, and (2) persuade those Arab countries where we have important interests (especially Saudi Arabia) to press the United States to modify what the Arabs see as a policy of total support for Israel's position. While we do not foresee immediate dangers to our interests as a result of this strategy, there is no doubt that King Faisal is becoming increasingly restive, and the danger of pressure on our oil needs cannot be ruled out in the longer run. If hostilities were to break out, the risk to U.S. interests in the area would of course rise sharply.

What is needed is a catalyst to get an Egyptian-Israeli negotiating process started. To that end we have developed an essentially procedural proposal under which the two sides would agree to explore in secret talks under US auspices, prior to entering formal negotiations, the basic issue of a final settlement—how to reconcile Israel's security concerns vis-à-vis Egypt with Egypt's position that it cannot surrender sovereignty over Egyptian territory. To get such secret talks started, we would seek the parties' agreement to a formulation that would provide the conceptual framework for their exploratory talks, (1) establishing the premise that Israel's security and Egypt's territorial concerns are not necessarily irreconcible, and (2) acknowledging that Resolution 242 neither endorses nor precludes the pre-June 5, 1967 lines as the final Egyptian-Israeli boundary. A specific formulation along these lines is enclosed.

I plan to explore this approach in the first instance with the Israelis through their new Ambassador here. Only if Israel agrees would we then approach the Egyptians. Israel will have some problems with such a formulation, particularly in this Israeli election year, but it nevertheless contains certain attractive features. Specifically, it promises a forum for direct Israeli-Egyptian negotiations and does not commit Israel in advance of such negotiations to any change in its substantive position. While this formula would probably not be acceptable to Egypt, at least at the outset, we believe it is not one they could disregard in present circumstances should the Israelis be willing to go along.

There are a number of advantages in taking this step now. Israel is pleased with the outcome of the Summit discussions of the Middle East, with our stance in the Security Council and with our present arms relationship. It should therefore be as receptive as it ever will be to a

proposal which we would emphasize we consider important to our national interests in the area. On the Egyptian side, Sadat is looking for a diplomatic alternative and recognizes that the United States must play a key role. Such a move with Israel will be complementary to and, if it works, will reinforce our present dialogue with the Egyptians. Making this effort could also relieve Egyptian pressure in the Security Council for an outcome that could polarize positions further, make both Egypt and Israel even more inflexible, and possibly force us to a veto which would both inhibit our ability to play a constructive middleman role and add to the unhappiness with the U.S. position in the Arab world generally. Such an effort on our part would be particularly welcome to Faisal as evidence of the kind of activity on our part that he has long sought. Finally, we expect that one result of the Security Council round in late July will be renewed activity by Ambassador Jarring or, more likely, a more active role by Secretary General Waldheim, who is already talking about a trip to the area in late July or early August. Such evidence of diplomatic activity in the United Nations context would both buy time and provide public cover for our secret diplomatic efforts.

I will be undertaking exploratory talks with the Israeli Ambassador as outlined in this memorandum before my departure for Europe. After we have had an Israeli reaction, I will want to discuss the results with you and seek your approval before any approach to the Egyptians.[4]

William P. Rogers

Enclosure

FORMULA WE WOULD EXPLORE WITH ISRAEL CALLING FOR TALKS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND EGYPT

The Governments of Egypt and Israel agree to engage in private talks under the auspices of the United States for the purpose of exploring whether they can achieve an agreed basis for negotiations on the terms of the peaceful and accepted settlement called for in Security Council Resolution 242. They agree to proceed in these talks on the

[4] In a June 29 Memorandum for the Record, Executive Secretary of the Department of State Theodore Eliot wrote that Haig had called him that morning to say that the President did not want the Secretary to proceed with the initiative outlined in his memorandum. Haig said that the President was awaiting a response from Brezhnev following their June 23 discussion on the Middle East and did not want anything else done on this subject until Brezhnev's response was received. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 27–14 ARAB–ISR)

basis that they would be without prejudice to the positions of either party. The talks would be devoted in the first instance to examining, before formal negotiations are initiated, possibilities for reconciling Israel's concern for security with Egypt's concern for sovereignty over its territory, consistent with the provisions and principles of Resolution 242.

In agreeing to engage in such talks, Egypt and Israel take note of the fact that Resolution 242 neither explicitly endorses nor explicitly precludes the line which existed on June 4, 1967 as the final, secure and recognized boundary between them.

Upon notification to each other through the United States of the acceptance of the above as a basis for their secret talks, Egypt and Israel will designate representatives to meet under U.S. auspices in Washington.

Egypt and Israel agree to maintain absolute secrecy regarding both the existence and substance of these talks. It is understood that these talks do not preclude any efforts or activities looking toward a settlement that may be in progress in any other forum.

---

76. Memorandum From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, July 2, 1973.

SUBJECT

Arms Package for Lebanon

Following the Lebanese government's crackdown on the Palestinian guerrillas in May, the government asked us for $45–$50 million of military equipment to build up the army. The army numbers only about 14,000 men, only half of whom are combatants. In view of a possible serious crisis in Lebanon, the government is conscious of its need to increase the army's mobility and firepower, since improved equip-

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 621, Country Files, Middle East, Lebanon, Vol. III, Jan. 71–Oct. 73. Secret. Sent for action. Saunders forwarded this memorandum to Kissinger under a covering memorandum of June 28 that recommended that Kissinger send it to the President as soon as possible.

ment constitutes the quickest way to compensate for the potential numerical superiority of the guerrillas.

State and Defense have put together a package of equipment which can be delivered to the Lebanese beginning almost immediately and stretching out over the next several months. This does not respond to all the Lebanese requests because there are some items that are not quickly available or do not seem to be the most suitable weapon for the job; these will need to be discussed with the Lebanese.

The major items in the State–Defense package, totalling about $20 million, are sixteen A–4 Skyhawk aircraft, 60 armored personnel carriers, 2 patrol boats, 4 helicopters, and ammunition. The Lebanese have been told that all items except the A–4 Skyhawks are available for immediate purchase. The Lebanese will be able to draw on some credits from the US Foreign Military Sales program and other commercial means to finance the sale.

There is little question that we should do everything possible to put the Lebanese in a position to cope with their security problems by themselves. The reason for bringing this package to your attention is that it does include 16 A–4 Skyhawk aircraft—the first to be offered to an Arab country. We had offered them to the Lebanese in 1972, but at the time they had not made up their minds about what they needed. Their main requirement is for a subsonic ground support aircraft like the A–4; faster planes like the Mirage proved to be relatively ineffective in the May fighting against the guerrillas. The model the Lebanese are interested in is being phased out of our own forces and is considerably older than the Skyhawks the Israelis have received. Israel will have 237 newer Skyhawks by mid-1974.

The Israelis have objected to our selling the F–4 Phantom to Saudi Arabia. They have every interest in preserving the stability of Lebanon, but may believe their psychological advantage will be lessened if both their main aircraft are in Arab hands. The number of aircraft is small, however, and the Skyhawk does not begin to have the psychological significance of the Phantom. Therefore, I think we should go ahead, informing the Israelis of our decision.

The items that we would not at this point be offering to the Lebanese include tanks and heavy artillery. These will have to be discussed further because the models they have requested are not readily available and because there is some question about what is appropriate to their needs. The only items we will refuse to supply are flamethrowers and helicopter armament systems which we have consistently declined to make available to any states in the Middle East.

Recommendation: That you approve the proposal to offer 16 A–4 Skyhawk aircraft to Lebanon.[2]

[2] The President initialed his approval. Telegram 135365 to Beirut, July 11, instructed the Embassy to inform the Government of Lebanon that the U.S. Government was prepared to furnish 16 A–4C Skyhawks following overhaul within 4 to 6 months at a cost of $12 million. Alternatively, 16 A–4B's with associated equipment could be furnished within 12 months at an estimated cost of $9.2 million. The transaction would be on a sales basis. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

77. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, July 3, 1973.

SUBJECT

Aid for Jordan

Your message of June 2 to King Hussein informing him that we could not advance funds before July 1 led to two sharp replies, one from Prime Minister Zayd Rifai and one from the King [See Tab A].[2] Basically, however, Jordan was in a position to get through June until our July help could be provided.

Related to the broader issue of aid for Jordan, Secretary Rogers has sent a memorandum [under memo at Tab B][3] to the President recommending that he send a message to King Hussein advising him of the limits of our economic support in the hope of encouraging greater budget discipline in Jordan.

This memo deals with (1) your replies to Prime Minister Rifai and to King Hussein and (2) whether the President should become involved at this point as Secretary Rogers recommends.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret. Sent for action. All brackets are in the original.

[2] Attached, but not printed. See Document 68.

[3] Attached, but not printed.

Reply to Zayd Rifai

Rifai, with his manner of overdramatizing, found your message a surprise and shock. He admitted, however, that Jordan could get through the month of June by engaging in a bit of domestic borrowing. His more urgent—but unfounded—concern was that the US had reneged on commitments made to King Hussein last February.[4] He claimed that the $45 million in Supporting Assistance that we plan to provide between July and November is $20 million less than promised, but this is not true.

The US aid offer remains exactly as you described it to Hussein in February. All your recent message did was to say that the next payment would come in July rather than June. As you recall, we agreed to give Jordan $55 million in CY 1973, which includes a $10 million payment made in the first half of CY 1973. Thus the $45 million we promised between July and November is the remainder of that $55 million commitment. In addition, you told Hussein that we would hold $10 million in reserve on a contingency basis, pending the results of Jordan's efforts to get support from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.[5] This $10 million could either be provided in December 1973 or early in 1974. In either case it would be applied to the 1973 budget deficit. If we provide it in 1973, however, Jordan will receive only $10 million more in the first half of 1974, and Congress seems unlikely to agree to a supplemental appropriation. Thus, we would prefer, if possible, to hold this $10 million until early 1974. There is an element of choice here, however, and if you feel the time has come to release the extra $10 million for payment in December 1973, you could so notify Rifai. State would also have to be told. The main reason for not doing so now is that it is still in our interest and Jordan's to maximize aid from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. Also, the tone of these particular messages is unusually shrill, and as a matter of principle it would seem better not to change our position in response—especially when he has misrepresented our commitments.

Recommendation: I propose that you send a brief, straight-forward reply to Prime Minister Rifai, as follows:

"Dear Prime Minister Rifai,

"I would like to reassure you that the commitment made to King Hussein concerning the amount of aid for Jordan has not changed. Unfortunately, we were not able to advance funds before July 1 as we had hoped to do, but the total figure for Jordan in 1973 will not be affected. The July installment is now being prepared. Ambassador Brown can

[4] See Document 30.

[5] See Documents 39 and 44.

clear up any misunderstandings that may remain on accounting procedures. As you know, our funds for aid are always subject to Congressional approval, but we continue to have the firm intention to maintain our program in Jordan.

"It is encouraging to hear of your efforts to bring Jordan's budget deficits under control. Even those friends like ourselves who are helping Jordan significantly have been deeply concerned over Jordan's increasing dependence on outside assistance and its consequent vulnerability. It is gratifying to see underway an effort to reverse that trend.

"Warm regards, Henry A. Kissinger."

Approve [*1 line not declassified*][6]

Revise to include extra $10 million in December 1973

Reply to King Hussein's Message

King Hussein repeats his earlier expressed concern about the deterioration of the Middle East situation.[7] Military conflict, he says, is imminent. Turning to financial problems, the King categorically says that Jordan cannot find more financial aid in the Arab world unless it agrees to turn over its armed forces to an Egyptian commander by joining the Unified Arab Command. He feels left out when he sees large quantities of military equipment going to countries on all sides of him, while his requests encounter "delays." He paints a sorry picture of Jordan's military forces. In conclusion, he states that the "string is stretched almost to the breaking point." Although he does not say so in this message, he remains interested in knowing what diplomatic progress there has been on a peace settlement and what US strategy is.

This message came at a time when Hussein felt under pressure from Egypt and Syria to commit Jordan to military action against Israel if hostilities resumed. He also had just appointed Zayd Rifai Prime Minister, in part to try to get a firmer grip on Jordan's financial problems. It coincided with reports about our military sales to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait—both nations from which Jordan would like more financial help.

As you know, we have pushed the limits of our own present aid resources, and we have had a military team in Jordan to plan the next round of arms shipments. The Jordanians naturally find it difficult to understand why Jordan gets much less aid than Israel. On the other hand, the Jordanians have been guilty of considerable fiscal irresponsi-

[6] Kissinger initialed his approval.

[7] See Document 61.

bility. Our posture can be one of continuing support without wanting to see Jordan become any more heavily dependent on outside aid.

Recommendation: That you send the following reply to King Hussein:

"Your Majesty:

"I have very much appreciated having Your Majesty's assessments of Jordan's situation. I hope that the pressures for Jordan's association with any resumption of military action have somewhat lessened. As you know, the United States has no interest in seeing Jordan place its troops under a foreign commander. The military team that recently visited Jordan is now preparing its recommendations for further US military supply shipments to Jordan, and we look forward to discussing our views with your officers as soon as the report is ready.

"The pace of diplomacy on a peace settlement has been slower than I thought it might be when we talked in February, and it seems likely to be at least a little while longer before we shall know what kind of negotiating process may be possible between Egypt and Israel. I recognize that it is of primary concern to Your Majesty to know in what context Jordan will be working. The main issue at this point seems to be whether Egypt is prepared to make a decision to engage in a negotiation. I shall inform you when there seems to be something of interest to report.

"I have written separately to Prime Minister Rifai on the question of aid. In short, our overall position for calendar year 1973 remains exactly as I described it to Your Majesty in February, and the July disbursement is now being prepared. As Your Majesty knows, we have made a significant contribution and will continue to do so this year. We have two concerns: first, that Jordan have what it needs within the limits of its friends' ability to help; second, that the trend of Jordan's increasing dependence on outside aid gradually be reversed. In this latter connection, it is encouraging to know that the Prime Minister is working vigorously to tighten the grip on mounting government budget deficits. Knowing our own problem of appropriations, I would not want Jordan to be dependent on sharply increasing external assistance.

"We continue to have Jordan's interests very much at heart.

"Warm regards. Henry A. Kissinger."

Approve [*less than 1 line not declassified*][8]

As revised

[8] Kissinger indicated his approval with a checkmark.

Secretary Rogers' Recommendation of Presidential Letter

Secretary Rogers points out in his memorandum to the President [under the memo at Tab B] that Jordan's spending is accelerating rapidly and that budget discipline appears to have broken down. This is true, although since the Secretary's memo was written the King has appointed Zayd Rifai Prime Minister with instructions to get a grip on the budget deficits. [Action on this memo was held by agreement with State until our own FY 1974 Supporting Assistance picture clarified.]

Some of the spending is for marginal items and projects. Given the trend of rising Jordanian demands and declining US aid levels, we are headed for problems. Our choices, as outlined by Secretary Rogers, are to do nothing now in the hope that Jordan's Arab neighbors will provide more help; to seek more funds from Congress; or to advise the Jordanians that there are limits on US aid. The Secretary recommends the last course and provides a draft message from the President to King Hussein.

If you judge that a message from the President is appropriate at this time, a memo from you to the President is attached. However, I would suggest that such a message *not* be sent at this time. I have included the point in your two messages because it is a serious concern. It just seems to me that the context is not right now for this kind of admonition. If the President were writing a more general letter, this subject could be included, but it seems a bit abrupt to send a letter on this subject alone.

Recommendation: That you *not* forward the memorandum at Tab B to the President and that, instead, State be informed as follows: The President does not wish to send such a message by itself at this time but would be prepared to reconsider if the approach could be made in a broader context.

Approve[9]

Send memo at Tab B to President

[9] Kissinger initialed his approval.

78. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

San Clemente, July 3, 1973.

PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Major General Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Simcha Dinitz, Ambassador of Israel
Mordechai Shalev, Minister, Embassy of Israel

SUBJECT

Report on Brezhnev Visit

Kissinger: The Middle East was a problem of the greatest difficulty at the summit. The Soviets raised it every day, but we avoided it until Wednesday.[2] I had a meeting with Gromyko Wednesday to just discuss principles.[3] I said what we wanted was something that each side could interpret differently—but it was a way to get negotiations started. Gromyko said he thought we weren't serious, that they had decisions to make on deliveries, etc.

We had two problems: what would be in the communiqué, and that what would appear would be as a result of the summit, not at the summit. I think you are not too dissatisfied.

Dinitz: Only with one phrase.

Kissinger: That was inserted as a result of Rogers discussion with Gromyko. I didn't feel I could overrule Rogers. [This is only for the Prime Minister.] I threatened to Gromyko not to have a communiqué.

Dinitz: Aside from this point, it was better than 1972. It left all options open; it didn't foreclose anything.

Kissinger: The reason we managed to avoid specifics in the communiqué was by agreeing to substantive discussions on the Middle East, which took place on Saturday. My strategy on the communiqué was to get everything in reach . . .

[Read different formulations.]

On Saturday morning they resumed on the formulation I read. They wanted a reference to the UN, and we just sat tight. On Saturday

---

[1] Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversation, Box 2. Secret; Nodis. The meeting was held at the Western White House in San Clemente. Brackets are in the original.

[2] June 20.

[3] The definitive discussion between Gromyko and Kissinger was on Saturday, June 23; see Document 72.

morning, we left the communiqué in abeyance and went to the principles. Gromyko rejected the principles of 72, modified as you insisted.[4] Brezhnev requested a meeting with the President alone, to avoid this.[5] I agreed to modify the principles for discussion.

Dinitz: It was a question of the free choice of the refugees still remaining.

Kissinger: No, all your points were taken account of. [He read the refugee point.] Through maneuvers I won't describe. They wanted a return to 1967, guarantees, international waterways, security zones. Gromyko and Dobrynin were present. We rejected it. Brezhnev said this agreement would never leave the room. We said making an agreement that no one knew about was hard to understand.

Dinitz: If we are expected to be asked to return to the 1967 borders, we have to be asked.

Kissinger: I wouldn't agree the first time.

Dinitz: Or the second.

Kissinger: The discussion got very nasty. Then Brezhnev said he would withdraw all of the points but the 1967 borders. The President asked what he disagreed with. Brezhnev said we had withdrawn from the 1972 proposals. We agreed to redo it and send it to him at Camp David.

Before you explode, let me describe the tactical situation. We wanted to avoid having something we would be trapped into agreeing to, and we sent this to them after they had left—at Camp David. They have never even acknowledged it. [He hands Dinitz a copy of Tab A.][6]

Let me point out the differences. Paragraph one mentions a final peace and appropriate negotiations.

Paragraph two says, "in accordance with appropriate UN resolutions."

Paragraph four—we have eliminated reference to Sharm el Sheikh and the word "temporary."

Paragraph five—"Should lead to an end to a state of belligerency" rather than "end the state of belligerency."

The refugee clause is stated in the language of the communiqué.

I think there is no chance of an agreement.

Dinitz: I must read it through more carefully, but certain things come to mind.

---

[4] See footnote 2, Document 71.

[5] See Document 73.

[6] Attached, but not printed. See Document 74.

Incorporation of the UN resolutions in paragraph 2. Resolution 242 is interpreted differently by the different parties. There are September 1971 and 1972 General Assembly resolutions that can be read as calling for a total withdrawal,[7] and that is how they will be read, and in conjunction with withdrawal. If this is how it will be read.

Kissinger: They know we mean 242.

Dinitz: It depends on how it is read.

Demilitarized zones. "By agreement of the parties" should be included.

Kissinger: The whole thing must be negotiated. That's in paragraph one.

Dinitz: Paragraph five—end to the state of belligerency without the state of peace. You can have the end of belligerency without having a state of peace. A state of peace in the mind of the Soviet Union is less than peace.

Paragraph seven—International waterways. We don't want freedom of navigation at Sharm el Sheikh assured to us; we want to assure it ourselves.

Kissinger: They will never agree.

Dinitz: Paragraph eight is spoiled by the "legitimate interests of the Palestine people."

If this seems to kill the 1972 principles, it is preferable. If it is an agreed paper at the highest level, it has bad features.

Kissinger: If the document is subject to different interpretations, we could accept it with an understanding on our interpretation. On the UN resolutions, we would make clear that we mean 242. On the others, you could interpret it as the negotiations go on.

Dinitz: If they use this as a starting point for further moves, then this as a bad starting point would lead to bad future modifications.

Kissinger: You think this is a bad paper. The Arabs would not agree. Egypt wants an agreement that we understand that border changes apply only to Jordan and that with Israel it applies to total Israeli withdrawal.

Dinitz: The Soviet Union has hinted in many ways that they don't exclude changes, but on the Eastern front. They are playing politics. With Egypt they will interpret a withdrawal as total and the changes as on the Jordanian front.

We have a good chance in the negotiations, but not on the basis of a document which has bad features. On the basis of 242, all options are open, and preferable to this which has some confining features. It is

[7] UN General Assembly Resolutions 2799 (XXVI) and 2949 (XXVII).

worse than 242 on security guarantees, secure boundaries, and international waterways.

Our reading was that the Summit produced positive results, because the Soviet Union now has to explain it to Egypt, there are troubles in Iraq, and differences between Egypt and Libya.

Kissinger: The tactical situation was—take it or leave it. If all our people had been present, it would have agreed to go back to the 1967 borders. You must compare it with this, not with your maximum position. You got out of the summit with a minimum of damage.

Dinitz: This paper would be great if it removed the 1972 paper without substituting another.

Kissinger: But this is better.

Dinitz: But as a talking basis, not an agreed paper.

Kissinger: They won't accept it, so there is no agreed paper. If they propose changes, so will we. They either got from the Arabs an agreement that it should be vague—like the Vietnam negotiations, where I produced a new paper each week. This is no basis for joint action until there is agreement on a basis so vague that it can be interpreted differently by both sides and negotiations can go on. It must be so vague that it is not totally unacceptable to both. We can't move until Egypt agrees to principles that are so vague that they can be interpreted differently by both sides. Until that basic decision is made, we must give the illusion of movement and avoid a showdown with us, Egypt, the Soviet Union—anything which keeps the process going.

Dinitz: That works in our favor. As long as it doesn't undermine our position.

Kissinger: An unsigned document of general principles can't be used to undermine your position. The points that give you trouble we can interpret our way. I am not asking you to accept this. We are informing you. We don't need a formal government position unless they come back to us; we won't press them for an answer. If they do, we will see if we need a formal answer from you.

Dinitz: Okay.

Kissinger: Let me discuss the proposed State Department initiative.[8] The basic idea is to invite you and Egypt to begin private negotiations in Washington under U.S. auspices. [Read conditions.] Note that 242 neither explicitly accepts or rejects the 4 June boundary as final.

---

[8] See Document 75. On July 4, Dinitz telephoned Kissinger to inform him that the Prime Minister's reaction to the new Rogers initiative was "totally and definitely negative" and that she urged Kissinger to do everything in his power to "nip it in the bud." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 20)

Dinitz: By private, you mean secret?

Kissinger: Yes, but with Egypt and the State Department, it can't be secret.

Dinitz: Have you discussed it yet with Egypt?

Kissinger: They say no, but don't bet on it.

Dinitz: Anything else?

Kissinger: Proximity probably—in the same hotel on different floors, or in different hotels.

Dinitz: Sisco talked twice that he is preparing something for me, he talked generally on the Summit.

Kissinger: What was said was: They wanted total withdrawal; 242; the Jarring paper and the Secretary and Sisco. They didn't succeed in mentioning 242 and Jarring.

There are no agreements other than the communiqué. You shouldn't interpret it that the U.S. has withdrawn its interest in 242, and Jarring, etc., but since the Soviet Union wanted to make 242 more explicit, Rogers got it dropped. At the last minute, the Secretary called Sisco in to rescue the communiqué.

Dinitz: On the UN Secretary General's visit, here is our answer, in conjunction with State. [He read and handed over the note at Tab B.][9]

I will pass this to the Prime Minister on a close hold basis. Such a formula will never be agreeable. I can't accept a document which says a return to 1967 is not excluded. The new borders must be the result of negotiations. This would be a new change in policy which I don't think we will make. It is different when the U.S. says that than when we say it.

Kissinger: I don't think either side can accept this. Egypt will object that 242 can allow modification.

Dinitz: So why produce an initiative at all? It could be a move backward.

Kissinger: I can't promise. But if we can get an answer on this, I can discuss it with the President.

Don't show your foreign office.

Dinitz: Shalev has the Prime Minister's full backing.

I have a few more points:

The Prime Minister, subsequent to the Brandt visit said he sent a letter to Nixon and Brezhnev talking of his impression of Israel's desire for peace. She wanted the President to know this in light of the Heath

[9] Attached, but not printed. The Embassy in Tel Aviv reported on June 25 that Waldheim had raised with Eban the possibility of visiting the Middle East. (Telegram 4987 from Tel Aviv, June 25; National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

letter.[10] When these people come to Israel they talk differently. She expressed the hope the President would not take the Heath letter seriously. Talking to the British Deputy Foreign Minister, he said to someone that Israel was responsible for the Six-Day War.

Kissinger: I don't remember the contents, but Brandt is not noted for his precision of thought. He said he favored a Middle East settlement.

Dinitz: We have been active in Washington to get Jordanian MAP restored.[11] We will try to influence the German Government, if you don't object.

Kissinger: No, we will too.

On Ethiopia, the instructions were to be forthcoming, except where Congressional restrictions prevent it.

Dinitz: Anything new on the Saudi F–4? Will it go ahead?

Kissinger: I think so.

Dinitz: Is there anything we can do? Gave Rush a note.

Kissinger: Let me think about it. We haven't answered the last Egyptian note, but probably will. The more forums we keep open the better.

Dinitz: Yes, that is why we go along with the Secretary General.

---

[10] On the eve of the summit, Kissinger forwarded to the President Heath's June 14 letter, which stated that "the best hope for progress toward a settlement would be if the Israelis were to state unequivocally that Israel regarded the frontier between her and Egypt as being the old Palestine mandatory frontier (regardless of whatever security arrangements might be made in Sinai." (Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box CL 145, Geopolitical File, Great Britain, Chronological File, Mar.–July 1973)

[11] On June 12, Prime Minister Meir sent a message to King Hussein in which she told the King that she had instructed "Israeli representatives in the United States to inform 'some of our American friends in the Senate' that Israel considered the original Administration request for $65 million in aid to Jordan during Fiscal Year 1974 as totally justified." On June 26, she sent a letter to Hussein stating that she had learned from Dinitz that he had taken "appropriate actions with 'Israeli friends' in the Congress" and assured her that the budget support funds for Jordan, which had been cut by the Committee, would be restored. On June 26, by a vote of 65 to 28, the Senate approved aid to Jordan in an amount not less than $65 million. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973)

79. Memorandum From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, July 21, 1973.

SUBJECT

Dobrynin's Message on the Middle East: Brezhnev/Ismail Conversations in Moscow

On Thursday, July 19, we received an oral note from the Soviet Embassy (Tab A),[2] which reports to you on Brezhnev's talks in Moscow on July 13 with Hafez Ismail, Sadat's national security adviser. Brezhnev briefed Ismail on the U.S.–Soviet summit. The key points in the note are as follows:

—Brezhnev told Ismail that the U.S. considered the Middle East a very important problem. However, he claimed that the U.S. had not put forward "concrete considerations aimed at achieving a mutually acceptable solution." In particular, the U.S. did not make a firm statement supporting the Arab demand for total Israeli withdrawal.

—Brezhnev told Ismail that the U.S. was inclined to favor direct negotiations but did not rule out other indirect forms of contact, such as the Rhodes formula. The U.S. admitted the need for a comprehensive settlement but envisaged the possibility of separate solutions to individual aspects as well.

—Brezhnev described the Soviet position as based on the principle of total Israeli withdrawal. The solution of this problem, he said, "would facilitate reaching agreement on all other aspects of the settlement."

—Ismail saw the situation in the Middle East as "very complicated and fraught with danger of serious explosion," which demands urgent measures. Egypt was convinced that the U.S. and Israel do not intend to modify their positions, particularly on troop withdrawal, and that this, "to a great extent," prevents a just settlement.

—Ismail expressed satisfaction with the Soviet position and "stressed" that the establishment of a just and lasting peace was "unthinkable without active participation of the Soviet Union."

—Although the Egyptians are "losing their confidence" in getting a settlement by political means, Ismail said, they continue to count to a

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 68, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 19, July 13, 1973–Oct. 11, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. Sent for information.

[2] Attached, but not printed.

certain extent on assistance from the UN Security Council. In particular, they hope a resolution will be adopted in the forthcoming session which will "move the settlement off dead center."

—Brezhnev concludes his report to you by stressing the Soviets' "serious concern" that an aggravation of the Mideast situation could worsen the international climate in general, which would accord with neither Soviet nor U.S. interests.

The Soviet message contains no surprises and shows no movement by the Soviets or Egyptians from their maximum position. The report takes no account of the U.S. proposal for a set of vague general principles which could serve as a basis for beginning indirect talks and working out a Canal settlement as a first step. The Egyptians and Soviets had shown interest in this idea on earlier occasions this year. The U.S. idea was in fact a modification of a suggestion Ismail made to me in February.[3]

I will be meeting with Dobrynin to explore the question further,[4] and will probably see Ismail again sometime next month.

---

[3] See Document 28.

[4] On July 30, Kissinger sent a memorandum to the President reporting on his "very cordial luncheon meeting with Dobrynin" on July 26 and forwarded a memorandum of conversation of that meeting. He noted that "Dobrynin indicated that the Soviets were pretty fed up with Egypt. Hafez Ismail's talks in Moscow had contributed to this." The memorandum of conversation recorded that Dobynin said that "Egyptian foreign policy sometimes seemed to be made by madmen. Ismail, when he was in Moscow in early July, had done everything to strengthen those who were in favor of doing less for Egypt." He assured Kissinger that the Soviet Union was a "restraining influence." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 68, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 19, July 13, 1973–Oct. 11, 1973)

80. Memorandum From the Executive Secretary of the Department of State (Eliot) to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, July 24, 1973.

SUBJECT

Security Council Review of Middle East

The Security Council review of the Middle East is expected to come to a head this week with a vote on a resolution that will present the U.S. with a difficult choice.

Under Egyptian prompting the non-aligned group has now surfaced an unbalanced draft resolution which contains several unacceptable features for the US.[2] One article "condemns" Israel for its continued occupation of Arab territory; another "expresses serious concern" at Israel's failure to respond to Jarring's February 1971 memorandum (that memorandum asked Israel for a commitment to withdraw to the pre-June war Egypt–Israel border, in return for Arab commitments to peace).[3] Another article refers to the "legitimate rights and aspirations of the Palestinian people."

UN Secretary General Waldheim has asked both sides if they would be willing to have him visit the area after the Council review, and has suggested that a simple, non-controversial resolution or consensus statement, reaffirming S.C. Resolution 242 and endorsing his visit, would be the best outcome for the Council review. The Egyptians say they would receive Waldheim, but that his visit should not sidetrack the Council from "facing up to its responsibilities" on the territorial issue of a settlement. The Israelis have accepted a Waldheim visit "in principle" but state their final agreement depends on the outcome of the present debate. Should there be a one-sided resolution—e.g., a resolution which reinterprets or distorts S.C. Resolution 242—they are unlikely to accept a Waldheim visit.

We ourselves have hoped to avoid a formal resolution and vote by pushing the consensus idea as the best basis for putting Waldheim into motion. We have made it clear we cannot accept language which reinterprets or distorts SC Resolution 242.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 27–14 ARAB–ISR/UN. Secret. Drafted by Sterner on July 23; cleared in IO, NEA, and by Sisco.

[2] The text of the draft resolution is in telegram 2659 from USUN, July 24. (Ibid., Central Foreign Policy Files)

[3] See footnote 3, Document 10.

It is now beginning to look doubtful, however, that this tactic will succeed in sidetracking a resolution. The Soviets and French are solidly behind the Egyptian position. The British are leaning that way: they would genuinely like to find a compromise that would avoid an American veto, but their own policy coincides with the Jarring memorandum. In the last analysis the British would vote for a resolution which endorsed the Jarring memorandum if some of the stronger anti-Israeli language were watered down, as we believe will happen.

Our plan is to maintain a tough bargaining position in the hopes that the Egyptians, to avoid a US veto, will either adopt the consensus idea, or at least prove willing to drop any reference to the Jarring memorandum and the "rights" of the Palestinians in a resolution. However, we no longer have much confidence that the Egyptians will be prepared to pay this kind of price to avoid a US veto, particularly in view of Sadat's tough speech on July 23.[4] A US veto will, in Cairo's eyes, isolate the US with Israel and strengthen Egypt's strategy of seeking to convince other Arab states—our concern is particularly Saudi Arabia—that the time has come to take action against US interests. This is a sufficiently attractive outcome for the Egyptians to give us little leverage by threatening use of the veto. While continuing our efforts to avoid it, we must realistically be prepared for a decision as to how to vote on a resolution which, among other things, in some manner endorses the Jarring memorandum, expresses concern at the continued Israeli occupation, and/or refers to the "rights" of the Palestinians. The issue is whether to veto or abstain, since there is little likelihood that the Egyptians and their supporters would agree to a resolution that we could vote for.

A resolution endorsing the Jarring memorandum in some way will invest that document with increased stature, and tend to strengthen the Egyptian claim (with which we do not agree) that S.C. Res 242 precludes the possibility of changes in the Egypt–Israel border. The Israelis will be upset, would probably refuse to receive Waldheim, and may well decide the UN, thus circumscribed, has no further role in negotiations for a peace settlement.[5] If we do not veto, Israel will be critical,

---

[4] In his July 23 Revolution Day speech, Sadat "reacted with considerable emotion and anger" to U.S. tactics in the Security Council debate, rejected the U.S. proposal for proximity talks, and said that Egypt was preparing for a confrontation with Israel and the United States. (Telegram 2193 from Cairo, July 23; National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

[5] On July 25, Shalev met with Rodman and expressed great Israeli concern over U.S. proposed amendments to the July 20 draft resolution before the Security Council, which included two references to the Palestinians. Shalev said: "The main point is this: Scali should stop cooperating in trying to amend the nonaligned resolution and should return to his basic position: That no resolution is necessary, that no change in 242 is acceptable, and that anything that goes beyond 242 will be vetoed by the United States." (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 135, Country Files, Middle East, Rabin/Dinitz Sensitive Memcons, 1973)

and we may have a harder time engaging Israel in any negotiations under our auspices. Realistically, however, we must rate the chances of getting meaningful negotiations going as low in any case.

On the other hand, if we veto even a watered down version of the present draft, the repercussions in the Arab world would be adverse. Egypt will be further disenchanted about our intentions. We believe this would add fuel to Faisal's criticism of U.S. policy. As you know, Faisal has become increasingly frustrated about U.S. policy on the Arab–Israel problem, and has spoken several times to journalists about his unwillingness to cooperate with the U.S. on oil matters unless U.S. policy changes. He will see a U.S. veto of a "reasonable" (in Arab eyes) resolution as further convincing proof that the U.S. is incapable of distancing itself from Israel. If we veto a reference to Jarring's 1971 memorandum, we are likely to be reminded that we spoke favorably of that Jarring initiative and of the Egyptian reply at the time. The fact is, however, that the dispute over the Egyptian and Israeli replies to Jarring has been the principal obstacle to his making progress for over two years.

A final decision will depend on the wording of the version of the resolution that is tabled.[6]

Theodore L. Eliot, Jr.[7]
Executive Secretary

[6] On July 26, the Security Council voted on the non-aligned draft resolution. Because of "the unbalanced nature" of the resolution, the United States vetoed it. The final vote was 13 in favor, one abstention (China), and the U.S. veto.

[7] Barnes signed for Eliot above Eliot's typed signature.

81. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, August 3, 1973, 4:30 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Henry A. Kissinger, Assistant to the President
Richard Helms, US Ambassador to Iran
Harold H. Saunders, NSC Staff

Kissinger: I have thought about your message from Arafat.[2] We have a nothing message to send back to him. It doesn't say anything. As long as he hears from us, that is something.

Helms: I will tell my man simply to keep the channel open and to say that if they have anything to tell us, he will be available.

Kissinger: We have a few paragraphs here which you could have your man pass on. They don't really say anything. [Memo attached.]

Helms: [After reading] The last paragraph is all that really is needed.

Kissinger: My experience with these channels is that all one really needs to do is to keep them open and to see what the other side puts into them.

Helms: I will keep this piece of paper to myself. It is too formal to give them a paper. I will let my man pass on the substance orally.

Kissinger: From whom will you say this is a response?

Helms: The US government. I think it is desirable to keep this as general as possible. They should know that they will just clog up the system if they press for too precise an answer. They are beggars, not choosers in this situation.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1027, Presidential/HAK Memcons, April–November 1973 [3 of 5]. Secret; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting took place in Kissinger's office. The memorandum of conversation was prepared, presumably by Saunders, on August 7. All brackets are in the original.

[2] At a July 23 meeting, Ambassador Helms gave Kissinger a report from a Fatah contact whom he described as "Arafat's right hand man." The contact reported that while Arafat could not guarantee complete immunity from terrorist acts, he, Arafat, had "'put the lid on' American operations by the fedayeen and that the lid would stay on as long as both sides could maintain a dialogue." The contact went on to say that this was "not a threat," rather, it was a "recognition that talking was necessary." (Ibid.)

Attachment[3]

PAPER FOR RESPONSE TO PALESTINIAN APPROACH

When the USG says that an Arab-Israeli settlement must take "Palestinian interests" into account, it has two points in mind: First, there has to be a far-reaching solution of the refugee problem, and the US is prepared to participate actively in a major program to help these people re-establish normal lives. Second, it is apparent that some Palestinians have an interest in political self-expression of some kind.

A peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli problem must take into account the reasonable interests of all the people in the area, including both the people in existing states and the Palestinians. The US objective is to help achieve peaceful coexistence among all the peoples in the area over time because we believe that is the best way to assure their well-being and happiness.

Exactly how Palestinian interests reach an accommodation with those of others in the area is best decided by negotiation. If the Palestinians are prepared to participate in a settlement by negotiation, the US would be pleased to hear their ideas. The objective of overthrowing existing governments by force, however, does not provide the best way.

[3] Secret; Eyes Only.

82. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, August 23, 1973.

SUBJECT

Waldheim Requests Your Counsel on Middle East

You will see from the attached cable[2] that Waldheim has told Scali that he would welcome any counsel you might wish to relay on the tactics he might follow during his Middle East trip which begins Saturday.[3] Scali will be seeing him in New York Friday, so any reply you wish to have him convey should be passed to him today. Scali comments that Waldheim is clearly anxious to get on a good footing with you and will probably be more receptive to advice now than later.

Waldheim has told Scali that the purpose of his trip is not to find a solution to the Middle East problem but to consult with the parties, assess the situation and "contribute modestly to efforts for peace." However, other reports from New York suggest that he has much more activist intentions in mind—for instance, that he might try out a proposal for "Rhodes talks" or for a Middle East Peace Conference. Our main interest is in not having him raise Egyptian hopes unrealistically about what he can and cannot deliver.

It seems to me that it might be useful to ask Scali to convey the following cautionary points:

—We thoroughly endorse the approach of quiet diplomacy. When the Egyptians' hopes are raised too high or when Israeli fears of precipitous movement are aroused, we have found peace-making efforts are set back. Our experience suggests that only a very gradual and undramatic approach has any chance of success.

—It seems to us that the Secretary General's trip can be useful if it helps to put him in a better position for possible future action. With the Israeli election campaign now beginning, it seems early to expect any definitive discussions with the Israelis.

—Our primary concern is to encourage a situation in which there can be genuine negotiations. No outsider will be able to play an effec-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1172, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, M.E. [Middle East] Jarring Talks, 8/1/73–8/31/73. Secret. Sent for action. Printed from an uninitialed copy.

[2] Telegram 2940 from USUN, August 22; attached, but not printed.

[3] August 25.

tive role until each side has made a fundamental decision to enter the give-and-take of negotiations. This is a point which the Secretary General can make in the interest of all who would play a role in a settlement.

—A major objective now, in our view, is to break the present deadlock and to begin the process of settlement. We do not feel that this can be accomplished all in one step and are therefore urging that a first step be found to begin the process. We recognize the problem this causes for the Egyptians, but we see the advantage of breaking the deadlock as outweighing the disadvantage of perpetuating the present situation. This is a general point which the Secretary General might pursue.[4]

The tactical issue is whether you wish to have this put into a State Department telegram in response to Scali's or whether you want to telephone him. I would recommend the latter so that you can give him some personal flavor.

Recommendation: That you or General Scowcroft telephone Scali today making the above points.[5]

Approve

Give it to State in general terms for a telegram.

[4] Waldheim arrived in Israel on August 30 after visiting Syria and Lebanon. In telegram 6898 from Tel Aviv, August 31, the Embassy reported that Meir told Keating that Waldheim had "brought nothing" to Israel. She said that the Syrians had demanded Israeli withdrawal from the Golan Heights before even considering negotiations, while making it clear they did not accept Resolution 242. Waldheim had suggested a possible Israeli initiative indicating willingness to negotiate on the basis of the UN Charter and that Israel "imply" that it was willing to go back to the 1967 borders. Israel had rejected these suggestions and insisted that Resolution 242 had to be used as the basis for any negotiations. Meir said that the problem was to get Arab leaders to accept the existence of Israel, rather than to indulge in semantics designed to cover the aim of Israel's destruction. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

[5] The original bears no indication of Kissinger's action.

83. National Intelligence Analytical Memorandum[1]

NIAM 36.7–73 Washington, August 24, 1973.

SYRIA'S MIDDLE EASTERN ROLE

Précis

Syria is no longer the erratic, coup-prone cockpit of inter-Arab politics that it was in the 1950s and early 1960s. Multiple upheavals have helped to produce, and to mask, a thoroughgoing revolution in national institutions and attitudes. The new pattern that has developed in the past decade appears to have a number of durable elements.

—The military establishment is certain to remain the principal element of political power, promoting limited socialism, secularization, and strong central government through the mechanism of the Baath Party.

—Syria will retain the ability to create serious difficulties for its Arab neighbors. It will exercise that ability on occasion in pursuit of Syrian interests but not gratuitously and not as the agent of any other nation.

—It will remain hostile to Israel but incapable of serious military challenge and extremely wary of provoking Israeli attack.

—It will remain sympathetic to the Palestinian cause, simultaneously supporting various fedayeen groups and seeking to increase Syrian influence over the fedayeen movement.

—It will offer little in the way of vulnerabilities or weaknesses exploitable by outsiders—Arab countries, the Western Powers, or the USSR. But the exception to this generalization—dependence on the Soviets for military supplies—will persist.

—The recent record of economic progress—made possible by a combination of good weather and a stable government following pragmatic economic policies that encourage private as well as public enterprises—is likely to continue for some time.

There are, nonetheless, uncertainties. Some aspects of current Syrian policy are reflections of the President, Hafiz al-Asad, rather than of the new order.

---

[1] Source: Central Intelligence Agency, NIC Files, Job 79–R01012A, Box 466, Folder 5. Secret. The Central Intelligence Agency and the intelligence organizations of the Departments of State and Defense, and the NSA participated in the preparation of this memorandum. The Director of CIA submitted this memorandum with the concurrence of all members of the USIB except the representatives of the FBI and Treasury who abstained on the grounds that it was outside their jurisdiction.

—Asad is notable for his caution and pragmatism; a successor might be more of an ideologue or more inclined to risk-taking.

—Improvement of relations with Egypt and establishment of a National Progressive Front which includes both Nasserists and Communists in the government are Asad policies and would not necessarily be followed by a successor.

—Asad appears to have a good grip on power at present, but factionalism continues within the Army.

Syria's political system is acceptable to the Soviets; so are its attitudes on many international issues. The Syrians value Soviet military and economic aid and diplomatic support. But they would react negatively if the Soviets should press for military access more extensive than the use of facilities in Latakiyah and Tartus. Nor would Soviet pressure induce the Syrians to establish cordial relations with the Baghdad government—which Syria considers a rival and an upstart.

The Syrians are not in a position to harm the US seriously, but they are sure to take actions in respect of their immediate neighbors that affect the US. They will be willing to put strong political and economic pressure on Beirut to insure that the fedayeen continue to have a presence in Lebanon. Harassments of Jordan—including border closings, propaganda, and denial of overflights to and from Amman intended to weaken the Jordanian regime or to force changes in Jordanian international policies, are likely from time to time. Such acts are not likely to go to extremes—e.g., another military intervention in Jordan—under Asad, but a successor might prove less cautious.

[Omitted here is the body of the memorandum.]

84. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, August 30, 1973.

SUBJECT

The Middle East—Where the Arab-Israeli Issue Stands and a Broader Strategy Toward the Area

The Middle East—General Strategy

There are two aspects of our strategy in the Middle East—(1) strategy toward the broader area from the Eastern Mediterranean through South Asia and (2) our approach to the Arab-Israeli problem. Behind both are the energy problem.

In the past four years State has used the greater part of its energies on trying to resolve the Arab-Israeli problem, largely on the theory that a solution would reduce our other problems in the area.

In the next three years, I hope the priorities will be rebalanced. Of course, we will want to press efforts for an Arab-Israeli negotiation insofar as possible. But a solution is not primarily within our control. What seems to rate more attention is an effort to strengthen our position in other parts of the area, and at least to contain whatever damage a continued Arab-Israeli impasse may do us.

This process has been well begun by the recent SRG meetings on our general strategy in this area, by your talks with the Shah, by efforts to shore up our relationships in the Persian Gulf and the Arabian Peninsula, and by our work with Jordan. There is an important opportunity in following through on each of these tracks, and this will be done separately.

That said, the main purpose of this book is to draw together material on where the Arab-Israeli situation stands.[2]

Elements in the Arab-Israeli Situation Now

These are the main considerations that will shape decisions on Arab-Israeli negotiations over the next few months:

The Israeli elections are scheduled for October 29. While quiet discussion between you and the Israelis is possible before then, the Israelis

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1337, NSC Secretariat, NSC Unfiled Material, 1973, 12 of 12. Secret.

[2] Tab II, "Jordan–Israel" is attached, but not printed. Tab I, "Egypt–Israel" and Tab III, "Reference Papers" are not attached.

will not be ready for any serious negotiation until afterward. In the meantime, campaign statements by Israeli leaders, as well as new policies in the occupied areas, are likely to make it harder for Sadat to begin negotiating because they will underline Israel's intention to keep some of the occupied land. The elections themselves may produce a ruling coalition that has even less latitude on territorial issues than the present cabinet.

Sadat has spent the last six months experimenting with a range of options for strengthening his position vis-à-vis Israel. These have included trying to build European support, going to the UN Security Council, talking about resuming hostilities, exploring the US position again, and working out a closer relationship with Saudi Arabia with the thought over time of developing leverage from Saudi oil and financial resources. The last of these is the most active at the moment, but the others are still available to be called forward in some new combination as new situations evolve.

At this point, Sadat's main preoccupation is with broadening his base of dependable Arab support. To do this, he has to find new balance between his relationship with Libya on one side and with Saudi Arabia on the other. King Faisal has offered him major incentives to avoid or limit the Libyan merger. He has offered to replace Libyan financial support and now plans large scale investment in the stagnant Egyptian economy. He has also apparently offered to help increase support and arms supply from Europe. Finally, there is the enticement of the potential of oil as a political weapon against the US. These elements combine in support of a long-term strategy of building Arab strength with the help of large Gulf oil revenues and European technological help. Other coming events where Sadat will hope to find further international support include the non-aligned conference in Algiers and the UN General Assembly.

Jordan, alone having tried negotiation with Israel, has concluded that it is not likely to get all of its territory back unaided by outside pressure on Israel. Jerusalem remains a key obstacle. King Hussein appears to have decided instead on a long-term strategy of tacit collaboration with Israel while he strengthens his own country.[3] He would be prepared to join a general negotiation at any point, but for the moment

[3] King Hussein and Prime Minister Meir had a meeting on August 6. The main purpose of the meeting was for Hussein to give Meir a report on his July visits to Iran and the United Kingdom. The two leaders agreed that the present situation would probably prevail for some time to come, due to the absence of any progress toward negotiation. They agreed to continue their present state of relations, including Israeli plans to arrange economic aid for Jordan through third parties. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 137, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan/Rifai, January 3, 1973)

does not want to isolate himself further by making peace alone with Israel, especially on the unattractive terms now offered by the Israelis.

Strategy Choices Now

There are two questions to be kept in mind: (1) how to get Egypt–Israel talks started and (2) how to relate Egypt–Israel talks, if any, to the settlement process on the Jordan–Israel front.

1. The US objective remains getting talks started between Egypt and Israel and the problem remains persuading the two—especially Egypt—to begin talks on the basis of an understanding or formula that leaves most of the crucial issues for negotiation. The available formulae—the versions you have discussed with the Soviets and the one Sisco proposed in the spring[4]—are at the first two sub-tabs under the "Egypt–Israel" tab for your reference.

One tactical issue that will be discussed is whether we should deal first with Egypt or with Israel and whether we should seek some movement from basic positions on either side as a basis for talks.

—You will recall that the Sisco paper in the spring proposed negotiating first with the Israelis. Sisco proposed negotiations on two tracks: (1) talks on an interim settlement and (2) exploratory discussions to see whether Egypt and Israel could agree on a basis for negotiations on the terms of an overall settlement. Sisco proposed pinning this down with the Israelis first and suggested that both sides agree to this point among others: ". . . both parties take note of the fact that Resolution 242 neither explicitly precludes the line which existed on June 5, 1967, as the final, secure and recognized boundary between them." Accepting this formulation would require an important decision for Israel.

—The alternative is to explore with both sides a formula for starting talks on the basis of present positions. This is essentially the course you have been following. This relies mainly on convincing the Egyptians that the Administration has the intention and the capability to press Israel for a reasonable solution in talks going beyond the first phase of a settlement. Exactly what next steps may be appropriate will depend on the state of your explorations toward the end of October when the Israeli elections are over.

2. The other question that must be considered is *what kind of process on the Jordan–Israel front* would be compatible with an Egypt–Israel settlement, if any. King Hussein seems to have concluded that letting his tacit relationship with Israel evolve is preferable to any explicit agreement he could reach now. If this is the course to be followed, then we would face two decisions:

---

[4] See Document 72. Sisco's paper is attached to Document 75.

—If we believe that the evolutionary process between Israel and Jordan is preferable to trying to force a settlement that Hussein could live with, then we should acknowledge this to ourselves. The last time Hussein was here, he asked what our plans for negotiation were and we promised to be in touch with him.[5] We had in mind then waiting until we knew how the Egyptian position would develop in the wake of Ismail's visit. Because that has not developed quickly, we have not had much to say to Hussein. Meanwhile, he seems to have moved more toward a policy of working in complementary ways to Israel for the development of the east and west banks of the Jordan. One question is whether we should relate ourselves to that process, but more important we owe it to Hussein to tell him what our general strategy is.

—If Egypt–Israel negotiations were to begin, we would then have to decide whether to try for a compatible settlement on the Jordan front or whether to try to find a formulation for describing the Jordan–Israel process in such a way that it could be accepted by the Egyptians and permit them not to make their settlement contingent on specific achievements in the Jordan–Israel–Palestinian process.

[5] See Document 14.

85. Telegram From the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo to the Department of State[1]

Cairo, August 31, 1973, 0955Z.

2625. Subject: Egyptian Perceptions of U.S. Motives in Middle East.

1. My contacts with Egyptians at various levels since USG veto of Security Council resolution on Mid-East on July 26[2] have led me to conclude that GOE thinking has now crystallized on following theory to explain USG intentions and actions in Middle East:

2. Egyptian officials believe that USG has concluded that its interests in area can be best served by arming Israel and Iran as military surrogates and keeping Arabs, particularly Egypt, weak and divided.

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files. Secret; Exdis. Repeated to Amman, Beirut, Jerusalem, Jidda, London, Moscow, Paris, Tel Aviv, and USUN.

[2] See Document 80 and footnote 5 thereto.

Iranian military power can be used, if necessary, to preserve US oil interests in Persian Gulf. Israelis are being strengthened so that they can continue to occupy Egyptian territory, dissipate Egyptian energies, force Egypt to direct scarce economic resources to defense budget, and distract GOE from possible anti-U.S. role in the area by keeping it preoccupied with Israeli aggression. USG strategy is thus viewed by Egyptians as effort to block peace efforts and keep Israeli boots on Egyptian necks in order to distract Egypt from possible future moves against U.S. interests. To further this objective, USG is also attempting to promote internal division within Egypt and is taking steps to weaken Egypt economically. Latest example cited to us by several official Egyptians is cancellation of USG participation in FAO program for school lunches in rural area of Egypt (State 156142).[3]

3. Even the more sophisticated Egyptians have decided this theory is only reasonable explanation of USG veto and continued heavy U.S. economic, political, and military support for Israel. If USG means what it says about achieving a political settlement, it would be relatively easy, they reason, for USG to apply enough pressure on Israel, through U.S. control of Israel's economic and military lifelines, to bring about more flexibility in Israel's negotiating posture. Fact that we have not done so can only mean that USG is not interested in a settlement, but is interested in curbing Egyptian power through use of Israel as chosen instrument.

4. USG condemnation of Israel on UNSC airliner diversion resolution is considered window dressing, because USG refused to consider sanctions that would have put teeth into Security Council condemnation and made it something more than a verbal exercise.[4]

5. In absence of any indication of USG pressure on Israel, GOE will probably react to this perception of USG intentions by intensifying its efforts to lash out against U.S. interests. Effort is now apparently under way to solicit cooperation of Saudi Arabia and Gulf States in applying pressure on U.S. oil interests and utilizing Arab financial reserves in ways that would undercut U.S. international monetary objectives. Fortunately for U.S., Egyptian need for Saudi economic support has given Saudis the upper hand in negotiating with Sadat and has apparently

[3] Not found.

[4] On August 15, the UN Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 337 (1973), which condemned the Israeli Government for the forcible diversion and seizure by the Israeli Air Force of a Lebanese airliner from Lebanon's air space. The Council called on the International Civil Aviation Organization to take account of the resolution when considering measures to safeguard international civil aviation against these actions, and called on Israel to desist from all acts that violated Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity and endangered the safety of international civil aviation. (*Yearbook of the United Nations, 1973*, p. 252)

enabled Faisal to moderate Sadat's inclination to strike out at United States economic interests. In order to bring about a rapprochement with Faisal, Sadat has had to agree to go along with Faisal's more moderate approach to the use of oil as a political weapon. The Saudis have apparently intervened with Sadat on behalf of the American proposal on SUMED and we have received reports that Sadat has agreed to support Faisal's oil diplomacy at the upcoming Arab meetings at Algiers.

6. On more parochial issues, such as American cultural interests in Egypt and USINT's freedom of action, the Saudis will have little interest, and we may be in for some difficult days ahead.

Wiley

---

86. Memorandum From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, September 1, 1973.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

Israeli Policy on Occupied Territories: On Monday the Israeli Labor Party will adopt policy guidelines toward the occupied Arab territories. In order to appeal to a growing body of annexationist opinion within Israel and to keep General Dayan within the Party, the new policy will call for an active Israeli role in settling and developing the occupied areas. Following are the main elements in the policy:

—expansion of the municipal boundaries of Jerusalem;
—establishment of 36 Jewish settlements, in addition to the 48 now in existence, during the next four years;
—accelerated Israeli Government acquisition of Arab lands and increased opportunities for private Israeli citizens and companies to purchase Arab land;
—incentives for Israeli businesses within the territories and expanded economic and social services for the Arab population.

The practical consequences of these measures, which Ambassador Keating terms creeping annexation, will be to make Israeli relinquishment of the West Bank and Jerusalem even more unlikely than at

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 54, President's Daily Briefing, President's Daily Briefs, September 1–15, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Contains Codeword. A stamped note on the first page reads: "The President has seen."

present and to establish an enclave of Jewish settlements in northeastern Sinai, cutting off the Gaza Strip from the rest of the former Egyptian territory.

While much of what the Israeli Labor Party is planning to do in the occupied areas is consistent with past policies, the establishment of a town in Sinai and allowing private land purchases are new departures. Ambassador Keating feels that the added momentum toward annexation created by this policy may undercut the prospects for starting a Middle East negotiating process.[2]

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

[2] A handwritten note by Nixon reads: "K—This is an enormous mistake—tell the Israelis in unmistakable terms that I believe they hurt their cause and jeopardize our (my) support by such brutal tactics."

87. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders and William B. Quandt of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, September 4, 1973

SUBJECT

Israel's Policy Toward Occupied Territories

As you know, the Israeli Labor Party has developed a program for dealing with the occupied Arab territories over the next four years.[2] There is nothing we can do to affect the adoption of the program, but its eventual implementation is yet to be determined. In the past, Israeli leaders have read our silence as acquiescence in the steps Israel has taken toward annexing or settling parts of the occupied areas. The most

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 610, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 12, Mar. 73–Oct. 73. Secret. Sent for action. All brackets are in the original.

[2] The Israeli Government announced the new policy on August 22. See *The New York Times*, August 23, 1973.

explicit statement made on this topic was by Ambassador Yost in 1969 [Tab B],[3] which was reaffirmed by the State Department on August 23.[4]

Three elements of the new Israeli program could cause us difficulties if a genuine negotiation were ever to take place. First, the Labor Party is calling for an expansion of Jerusalem's municipal boundaries. Second, the policy of restricting private land purchases by Israelis in the occupied territories may be loosened. Third, a sizable Israeli town is planned for the northeastern Sinai, which would effectively cut Gaza off from the Egyptian town of al-Arish.

Ambassador Keating has suggested in a cable to you [Tab A][5] that we should talk to the Israelis to try to persuade them to delay implementation of the new program. He feels that Ambassador Dinitz would be the proper person to discuss this with at the outset, and that he be authorized later to raise the matter officially in Israel before the elections are held.

Assistant Secretary Sisco has indicated an interest in talking to the Israelis about this when he gets back to Washington this week.[6] Before then, you may want to make the point quietly with Dinitz that any Israeli actions in the occupied territories that make negotiations less likely will not have our support. In addition, if this process leads toward disguised annexation, the US and Israel will end up inevitably on opposite sides of some of the key issues of a peace settlement. One purpose of talking to Dinitz yourself is to avoid the appearance of a major public US démarche on the subject.

Recommendation: That you talk informally with Ambassador Dinitz about our concern with Israel's new policy toward the occupied territories.

Approve[7]

Let Sisco talk to Dinitz about this, but tell him not to make a public démarche.

---

[3] Attached, but not printed. Ambassador Charles W. Yost addressed the UN Security Council on July 1, 1969. The Security Council was meeting to consider Jordanian charges that Israel was deporting Arabs from Jerusalem and attempting to destroy parts of the Arab sector. The U.S., U.K., Soviet, and French Representatives warned Israel against acting to absorb the Arab sectors of Jerusalem. See ibid., July 2, 1969.

[4] Department of State spokesman Paul Hare reiterated during an August 23 news briefing U.S. opposition to changes in the status of Israeli-occupied Arab territory. See ibid., August 24, 1973.

[5] Telegram 6846 from Tel Aviv, August 30; attached, but not printed.

[6] This sentence is underlined and a handwritten notation in the margin reads: "Henry—note."

[7] Kissinger initialed his approval.

88. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, September 10, 1973, 6:03–6:45 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Simcha Dinitz, Ambassador of Israel
Mordechai Shalev, Minister

Henry A. Kissinger, Assistant to the President
Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff

Dinitz: I just finished an hour-long talk with Secretary Rush. It was just a general review of the situation.[2]

Kissinger: Who was there? Sisco?

Dinitz: Yes. Also his aide, Samuels.

Kissinger: He's good.

Shalev: Also Stackhouse, of the Israel-Arab desk.

Dinitz: I reviewed the question of terror, particularly our concern with these missiles in Rome [rockets discovered by Italian police in the hands of Arab terrorists].[3] We know they're serialized, so the Russians must have an accounting of where they are located. It would not be difficult for them to trace if they wanted to.

I asked Secretary Rush that you find a way to convey this concern to the Russians, and secondly, that in the ICAO in Rome now you will put the gravity of the situation on record and help draft legislation to deal with this situation.

Kissinger: What did he say?

Dinitz: He said you [the USG] had been in communication with the Russians on this and that he would take our advice in the ICAO into consideration, and you were with us on this.

Kissinger: Can you give me the serial numbers?

Dinitz: Yes, I didn't give them to him but I can give them to you.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 135, Country Files, Middle East, Rabin/Dinitz, Sensitive Memcons, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting took place in the Miltary Aide's office at the White House. All brackets are in the original.

[2] A record of Ambassador Dinitz's September 10 conversation with Acting Secretary Rush is in telegram 181236 to Tel Aviv, September 11. (Ibid., Box 610, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 12, Mar. 73–Oct. 73)

[3] On September 5, Italian police arrested five Arabs who had transformed an apartment 4 miles from the Fiumicino airport in Rome into a base from which they planned to shoot down an Israeli airliner. The police said they found two Soviet-made ground-to-air missile launchers and other weapons hidden in the apartment.

Kissinger: I am seeing Dobrynin on Thursday.[4]

Dinitz: Then we talked about oil and diplomacy.

Kissinger: You noticed what the President said Saturday.[5] It is going in the direction I have pointed out.

Dinitz: I noted to Rush that much of it—on energy—is helpful to our relations, but much of the press interpretation frankly is not. He agreed. Then I called attention to the Sisco interview in the Jordanian paper.[6]

Kissinger: What did Sisco say?

Dinitz: Nothing at all during this conversation. Sisco had said—spoken in terms of—Palestinian "rights", not "interests". He called for some movement in advance of negotiations, and third, that an initiative was coming. I asked for Rush's cooperation on muting this sort of thing, because it just means a debate through the press, and nothing but harm to our relations could come of this.

He said he was very much in accord with me. He said the U.S.' and Israel's strategic interests are the same. He said the U.S. is not pro-Israel, or pro-Arab but pro-peace. (I heard this before.) But then he said the status quo was no good; and we had to get the negotiations off dead center.

I said that we agreed completely; Israel wanted to convert the status quo into peace and security. I then went into a long discourse about how whenever we came forward with a new proposal, it just postponed negotiations. I pointed out that the Arabs were now linking everything with Palestine. He said he wasn't asking us to take a unilateral step or to negotiate from a point of weakness. He said he knew from his negotiations on Berlin that the only way to deal was through a

---

[4] September 13.

[5] September 8. Following a 2-hour meeting at the White House with his energy advisers, President Nixon stated that the United States was "keenly aware of the fact that no nation, and particularly no industrial nation, must be in the position of being at the mercy of any other nation by having its energy supplies cut off. We are going to do the very best we can to work out problems with the Mideastern countries so that we can continue to have a flow of imports into the United States of oil products particularly." He also proposed programs that would deal with "developing within the United States itself the capability of providing for our energy resources." (*Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, p. 754)

[6] On August 29, Department of State press officer Paul Hare was asked to comment on an interview Assistant Secretary Sisco had given on August 17 to a Jordanian journalist in which it was reported that the United States would soon make an attempt to arrange indirect negotiations between Israel and the Arabs. Hare said, based on the notes taken by a Department of State official during the interview, that Sisco had not discussed any new initiatives or the possible role of the United States in the negotiations. Sisco had reiterated, however, the longstanding position that the United States would like to see the negotiating process underway, either directly or indirectly. The transcript of Hare's press briefing was sent to all posts in the Middle East in telegram 172049, August 29. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

position of strength. He ended by asking us what our government could do, in concert with you, to get talks moving.

Kissinger: First—let me make clear I am not talking now in my official capacity. We should still meet in this restricted channel.

Dinitz: Separate it.

Kissinger: Yes. It is important for the Prime Minister to understand my judgment on this. All of these are just phrases—the ones that assure you and also those that disquiet you. You shouldn't attach too much importance to it.

Dinitz: I know, I was just reporting.

Kissinger: As I told your Prime Minister, and as I have told you before, the trend here to do something is getting overwhelming. It can be delayed but it cannot be arrested. If you look at the balance of individuals, and the influence of the companies . . . Two years ago I suggested to Ambassador Rabin and the Prime Minister that we should do something in the area of an interim settlement. You didn't do too badly in following that advice.

The trouble is, the U.S. public doesn't understand what it really is that the Arabs are proposing—that as a precondition for a negotiation you give up all the territory in exchange for an "end to the state of belligerency," which is indistinguishable from the ceasefire that exists. They think the issue is Israeli intransigence. Most people don't understand. So an Israeli initiative would at least have the advantage that one could dramatize what the Arabs are asking. I have no concrete proposal. But I exhausted Le Duc Tho last year by giving him in rapid succession five different proposals which were all plausible but none of which gave up our key position—that we would not overthrow Thieu. In case the negotiations broke down, we could show he had rejected, not our maximum position, but all these successive proposals.

I must say our troubles with the South Vietnamese started when we did this because they thought we were giving up something. But we weren't. Every concession was at the periphery, not on the main issue. And this would keep the initiative with you.

My second strategic concern is that we have to find a way of splitting the Arabs and also of splitting the pressures in this country. We can't have all the pressures here together—the oil companies, the Arabists—against the Jews. We could try to split off the Saudis. Three years ago, the oil company leaders came in here. The issue then was to do something about Jerusalem. They wanted it to be a neutral city, and I know this is unacceptable to you. But I wonder why there can't be some formula for some extraterritoriality, plus some access route . . .

This won't be made as an American proposal; you can count on that. But it would help with the Saudis; this is the only thing they ex-

press themselves on. It would help domestically. What the President said—even with what I told you—you should not believe it might not return.

Now I can use the discussions with Ismail; nothing will happen until after your election. So there is no immediate pressure. I have not even discussed this Jerusalem proposal with the President. There won't be a big initiative when I come in.

Maybe a settlement first with Jordan would do it. Maybe you have some other cleverer idea.

Dinitz: I noted before that your mind was moving on Jerusalem, first when you asked Eban about it, and second when you said before that what concerned you was to remove Faisal from the picture and to isolate Sadat.[7] Incidentally, I thought your sending Phantoms to Faisal would do the opposite; and only attract Sadat to him.

Jerusalem is of course the most sensitive issue with us. This is just off the cuff. I will of course report all of this to the Prime Minister.

Kissinger: Maybe she has a better idea.

Dinitz: But usually when you try to defuse an issue you try a less sensitive, less emotionally-laden issue. Jerusalem will be the hardest with Jordan. We have tried some phrases before, like "some extra-territorial status" for the Holy Places.

Kissinger: Please don't interpret this in legalistic terms, but in strategic terms.

Dinitz: I see the strategy.

Kissinger: I think the borders will be the most sensitive.

Dinitz: No, I think it will be easier to decide with Sadat where the final borders will be than to agree to a split in Jerusalem's sovereignty. Anyone in Israel who suggested it would be shot out of office, not run out. We could agree to a passage for the Jordanians to go to the Mosque of Omar without going through Israeli checkpoints.

Let me ask two questions, Dr. Kissinger. Do you mean something that Israel should think of independently of a course of negotiations commencing?

Kissinger: There are many ways of doing it. We could tell the Saudis that we heard this from you and you are willing to discuss it. Or

---

[7] Kissinger met with Eban, August 17, 8:30–9:50 a.m., at the Israeli Ambassador's residence in Washington. According to a memorandum of conversation prepared by Rodman, Kissinger said to Eban: "My personal view is that it is a mistake to get the Saudis involved in the Arab–Israeli dispute. Either there will be no outcome, or no possible outcome will live up to the expectations that are raised. Either way it will undermine the government." (National Archives. Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 135, Rabin/Dinitz Sensitive Memcons, 1973)

you could make it as a public offer. Or as a private offer, and then publicize it if it doesn't work.

Dinitz: My second question is, do you mean to say that you believe something like this could move the Saudis?

Kissinger: I have no feel for the Saudis, quite honestly. I met only Yamani, when he was here. And fifteen months ago I met with their prince.

We have informally asked Prince Fahd to come over. We did this in order to avoid having too many of our delegations going over there. It has nothing to do with Israel. He's available to come in late November or early December. That would be a good occasion.

My strategy is to keep the Saudis out of the Arab-Israeli dispute, because any settlement achievable wouldn't be satisfactory to Arabs, and it would only weaken the regime to have to take responsibility for it. It might help to take some action on the one area of their religious concern.

Dinitz: I'll pass on your thinking to the Prime Minister.

Kissinger: I have no idea what Rush has in mind when he says off dead center.

Dinitz: Nor has he.

Kissinger: It is absolutely necessary that you don't let yourself be put into the position of looking like the obstacle to peace. You must keep the Arabs on the defensive. The British have told us they want to talk to us about it, and the French too.

I'm not interested in the Nobel Peace Prize.

Dinitz: I wouldn't mind seeing you win it, Dr. Kissinger. Nothing would give me greater pleasure.

Kissinger: But there is no way for *us* to do it without brutalizing everybody. It would be moved into special channels.

Dinitz: What do you mean?

Kissinger: Some special envoy will be appointed by the President.

Dinitz: To solve the Middle East crisis?

Kissinger: Yes. I really have no specific ideas.

[to Rodman:] Have we heard from Zahedi [on his talks with Ismail in Geneva]?[8]

---

[8] According to an August 13 meeting that Kissinger had with Iranian Ambassador Zahedi, Zahedi was scheduled to meet with Ismail on August 25 in Geneva. Kissinger gave him a paper for Ismail, which included the following point: "By asking for a commitment now to total withdrawal—which no Israeli government will give at this point—the Egyptian government is making it easy for the Israeli government to avoid a decision that would break the present deadlock and begin the process of withdrawal." The memorandum of conversation, August 13, with attached paper, is in the National Archives,

Rodman: Not yet.

Kissinger: Check on it.

Dinitz: Do you think you can get the Arabs off their position of demanding a commitment to total withdrawal as a precondition to negotiations?

Kissinger: My strategy is to exhaust the Arabs. We have been doing it, but every time, some one of our people pops off. But can I do it? It's extraordinary that the Egyptians haven't leaked my negotiations with Ismail. It shows they haven't given up yet on my approach.

Dinitz: Our sources say they now think that oil will do it for them.

Kissinger: If we can figure out some way to split the Saudis off . . . Jordan is already split off. The Syrians won't be. But Egypt is already willing to make a separate peace.

Dinitz: I think the pivot of it is their oil strategy. You have today the first visit by Hussein to Egypt. You could tell the King it is not a good idea.

Kissinger: I will do that. [to Rodman:] Is Rifai coming to the UNGA?

Rodman: I'll check.

Dinitz: When the Shah was here, did you talk to him about his contributing to Jordan?

Kissinger: Yes, at great length. But he said that, while from his selfish point of view and strategically he's with you, from the tactical point of view he'd like some movement.[9]

Dinitz: But he has no idea what it should be.

Kissinger: Right.

Dinitz: I don't have as pessimistic reading of consensus in this country as you do. What you describe is a feeling in this Administration, but not the country. It is not just the Jews, but Congress.

Kissinger: The Congress is against whatever the Administration is for!

Dinitz: But the labor movement, and the media, and editorial pressures.

Kissinger: That I wouldn't attach too much importance to. That we can easily handle if we have a platform on which to stand. We are not asking you to give up essential positions.

Dinitz: Yes.

Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Egypt, Ismail, Vol. VI, May 20–Sept 30, 1973.

[9] See footnote 2, Document 84.

Kissinger: One amazing thing about my hearings is to see the liberals attacking me for being too soft on the Russians![10] For 5 years they attacked us for being hard. But in a crisis they will run.

Dinitz: Yes. They think goodwill is the solution.

Kissinger: You remember the Jordanian crisis. I've never seen so effective an example of crisis management. We worked well together.

Dinitz: Yes, I was on the other end.

[10] Kissinger is referring to the confirmation hearings for his appointment as Secretary of State.

89. Paper by Harold H. Saunders and William B. Quandt of the National Security Council Staff[1]

Washington, September 20, 1973.

PRESIDENT'S FRIDAY BRIEFING

For HAK

New Jordanian Foreign Policy: Since the restoration of Egyptian-Jordanian relations last week, King Hussein has been actively pressing new foreign policy initiatives. His objectives are, at a minimum, to restore relations also with Syria, to regain the Kuwaiti annual subsidy of $40 million and to strengthen his claim to speak on behalf of the Palestinians in any future peace settlement.[2]

King Hussein sees Jordan as internally secure and less threatened externally than has been true in recent years. Consequently he is willing to take measures that will further ease internal pressures and will enhance his standing in other Arab countries and among the Palestinians. His offer of amnesty to all political prisoners, including some

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1296, Harold H. Saunders Files, Jordan, 9/1/73–12/31/73. Secret; Nodis. Submitted for inclusion in the President's September 21 briefing.

[2] In telegram 4922 from Amman, September 15, the Embassy reported that Hussein had come out the "winner" at the September 10–11 meeting of Sadat, Hussein, and Assad in Cairo. Jordanian–Egyptian relations were normalized, and Assad would try to normalize Jordanian–Syrian relations. On the military side, it was agreed that there would be talks, but no unified command and no stationing of Egyptian or Syrian troops in Jordan. The King had refused any deal on the fedayeen, which had been the most contentious issue. (Ibid., Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January 73–October 73)

prominent fedayeen leaders, was a first step in this direction. Now he says he intends to offer to open a dialogue with the Palestine Liberation Organization of Yasir Arafat.[3] He recognizes that the PLO has a political role to play in the area, but continues to be adamant in refusing to permit the fedayeen to return to Jordan.

Ambassador Brown reports some dissatisfaction with the King's new policies in important sectors of Jordanian society, but he assumes the top military men have all been reassured. The King is gambling that he can maneuver successfully among the many cross-currents of inter-Arab politics, and thus far he has done remarkedly well in view of his isolated position only a few months ago.

Amman 5040 191345ZSep 73[4]

Quandt/Saunders[5]

[3] On September 28, Brown reported that Hussein had read to him his letter to Assad and Sadat, which stressed Jordan's responsibilities to the Palestinians, most of whom lived in Jordan, and its dedication to their cause. The letter emphasized, however, that Jordan could not accept fedayeen actions within its territory like those that had threatened Jordan's political structure and stability in the past. The King said that the three nations had to work together on the next step, which was opening a dialogue with the PLO, and stated that the PLO should be expanded to include Palestinian voices outside of Jordan. (Telegram 5190, September 28; ibid.)

[4] In telegram 5040 from Amman, September 19, Brown reported that the King had been talking about the need to widen Jordan's horizons by trying new initiatives in foreign policy. As Hussein saw it, Jordan was now in a solid political situation and could thus afford to make gestures that would further ease internal pressures and have a shock effect in neighboring countries, such as his abrupt announcement of amnesty for political prisoners and detainees and his hope of offering a dialogue to the PLO. The Ambassador noted that the King was incorrect in assuming that everyone was praising his amnesty policy and that the possibility of a Government of Jordan–PLO dialogue, when it came out, would increase that uneasiness. (Ibid.)

[5] The original bears these typed signatures.

90. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, September 20, 1973, 6:50 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Henry A. Kissinger
Ambassador William B. Buffum
Richard Campbell

Ambassador Buffum: Congratulations. It's nice that the confirmation[2] is coming right before the UN.

Mr. Kissinger: But that doesn't mean that I have a speech.

Ambassador Buffum: The last time I saw you, Mr. Secretary, was with U Thant.

Mr. Kissinger: That must have been in 1968. U Thant was not one of my great idols. [Mr. Kissinger takes phone call from Eagleburger on the UN speech.][3] Most of these speeches are banal and this one will be banal also.

Ambassador Buffum: On the Mid-East, at least, I hope it is.

Mr. Kissinger: I'm no dummy on this.

Ambassador Buffum: The President attracted so much attention.[4] Verbiage is very important, especially to the Arabs.

Mr. Kissinger: What could I conceivably say that wouldn't cause more harm than good?

Ambassador Buffum: You could say something traditional using a basis on 242 and that they are all sovereign states and possibly about the withdrawal from occupied territory.

Mr. Kissinger: What can we do in the Middle East?

Ambassador Buffum: There is no panacea.

Mr. Kissinger: I know.

Ambassador Buffum: All we can do is to keep prodding. The President's press conference was a good prod. It showed we were getting impatient. That was important. The Arabs are a little leery of us with our voting in the UN and our military assistance to Israel. With the Is-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1027, Presidential/HAK Memcons, Memcons, April–Nov. 1973, HAK & Presidential [3 of 5]. No classification marking. The meeting took place at the White House. All brackets except those that indicate omitted material are in the original.

[2] The Senate confirmed Henry Kissinger as Secretary of State on September 22.

[3] Kissinger addressed the United Nations on September 24.

[4] Presumably Buffum is referring to the President's September 5 press conference; see *Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, pp. 732–743.

raeli elections coming up, we should walk carefully. Everyone knows there will be no dramatic breakthroughs. We were very close in agreement in the Four Power talks.[5] It was on the refinement of 242. Of course, it's probably been overtaken by events as the Israelis have solidified their position.

Mr. Kissinger: I've never agreed that the Israelis would accept that position.

Ambassador Buffum: In the recent Chief of Missions Conference, Ambassador Helms told us of the expensive installations being installed in the Sinai. The new plank in the Labor Party platform is not leaving. We find ourselves in a shaky position. Additional assistance looks like it's for defense of conquered territory rather than the protection of the homeland. When the Russians were there, we had a good excuse for our military assistance program. I assume you see no settlement in the Middle East, Mr. Secretary. We should show we have made every effort to get one. Some say we should push harder.

Mr. Kissinger: My experience is you don't get a settlement. Why should the Israelis give up anything?

Ambassador Buffum: Some have given thought to the danger of going down the present path. The Arabs will have finances if Faisal gives the aid it looks like he will. The Commandos will have additional recourse to acts of desperation.

Mr. Kissinger: Against the Arabs or the Israelis?

Ambassador Buffum: Both. The Israelis' security is so tight that it can do it only with great losses as they have shown they are willing to do. They feel the Arabs think they're selling them out. Beirut on the other hand, has had to clamp down.

Mr. Kissinger: My problem is I don't know how you get from here to there.

Ambassador Buffum: Mr. Secretary, George Ball had a piece in *Foreign Affairs* three or four years ago where he discussed how you get an imposed solution.[6] You have to use a carrot and stick approach. We should not undertake anything unless we plan to carry through. Before we succeed, we must be prepared to take a lot of heat.

Mr. Kissinger: We might come up with terms that neither side would accept. Unless we get one side lined up before, it's a hell of a position between the two.

---

[5] Documentation on the Four-Power talks held in 1969 is scheduled for publication in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXIII, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1969–1972.

[6] The article, entitled "Slogans and Realities," appeared in the July 1969 issue of *Foreign Affairs*.

Ambassador Buffum: We can get a UN force into the Sinai probably with U.S. participation.

Mr. Kissinger: All of the Sinai?

Ambassador Buffum: No, just the Gulf of Aqaba and the Straits.

Mr. Kissinger: Oh, yes, that they'd accept.

Ambassador Buffum: I think the answer is using international force for a limited time.

Mr. Kissinger: But I don't think the Israelis will accept that without murderous pressure being applied to them. The worst outcome can be if we make an effort and not succeed. The Arabs will never believe that we have done all we could do. And then there are significant risks. There is the risk of war and the risk of Soviet intervention. You've sure made a difference in Lebanon.

Ambassador Buffum: It's not over. There is no obvious outcome at present. The rivalries between the Palestinians might force moves by the government to break down their cohesion. They are talking about a Black October and November openly now in Beirut. They may talk themselves into something. There is no reason why.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

Mr. Kissinger: Getting back to the Middle East, based on my experience in Vietnam, I know it is unworkable unless we have an agreement with one side. Whenever I formulated my positions, both sides sniped at me. How do we agree with the Arab side? They think that if they give us a concession it will be banked for the next round.

Ambassador Buffum: That's right.

Mr. Kissinger: Is there a way out?

Ambassador Buffum: The Israelis have to find some security without holding territory. Perhaps make Gaza a sovereign state. The Arabs never wanted Gaza and there must be a Palestinian nationality.

Mr. Kissinger: Won't that split off Jordan?

Ambassador Buffum: Not necessarily.

Mr. Kissinger: I think the solution is with Jordan.

Ambassador Buffum: If anything is to succeed, there is no way to do it without total secrecy and I'm not sure either will do that. We must persist and we must use pressure. It would be a significant political decision to take it on. I doubt the President is willing to incur that risk.

Mr. Kissinger: Worse would be if he was willing to take the risk until he gets . . . there and realizes what's happening.

Ambassador Buffum: Yes, you can really cause an uproar with any move.

Mr. Kissinger: Our problem would be controlling the media and financial pressure. If we don't get our ducks in a row before we start, I

don't think it will work. In my successes I have always dealt in total secrecy and have moved very fast. That was what was wrong in 1970. Every place we . . . hostages everywhere. Was that generally helpful?

Ambassador Buffum: It did no great harm, in Lebanon at least.

Mr. Kissinger: How long will you be here?

Ambassador Buffum: My plans are open.

Mr. Kissinger: Stay a few more days. I may want to talk to you again. I haven't worked on the speech. Maybe tomorrow, maybe Saturday.[7]

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

[7] September 22.

91. Paper Prepared by the National Security Council Staff[1]

Washington, September 24, 1973.

MIDDLE EAST DEVELOPMENTS AND THE PROSPECTS FOR AN ARAB-ISRAELI SETTLEMENT

Developments within the Middle East over the past two months may well have increased the prospects for movement toward an overall Arab-Israeli settlement. The key changes have occurred in the Arab world, with the result that Egypt and Jordan are in a better position to address questions of peace than has been true in years. In addition, the ability and incentives of the Syrians or Palestinians to block progress toward negotiation has been reduced. Similarly, the Soviet standing in the area is much lower than it has been in several years, with the significant exception of Iraq, and consequently Soviet ability to impede a peace settlement has diminished. Finally, Israeli leaders are signalling an interest in ideas that might help to overcome Egyptian reluctance to enter negotiations. While there are no grounds for believing that an Arab-Israeli peace settlement is imminent, the atmosphere is more conducive to serious diplomatic efforts than has been the case since early 1971.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1173, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, M.E. [Middle East] Jarring Talks, 9/1/73–10/31/73 [1 of 2]. Secret. Drafted by Quandt.

Egypt

For much of this year President Sadat seemed unable to decide on a direction for Egypt's foreign policy. He first probed the prospects of a diplomatic approach, then threatened to resume hostilities, and in the end announced that Egypt was prepared to develop a long-term strategy of mobilizing Arab resources for the battle with Israel. Oil and Arab financial support were the key ingredients of this strategy, and as the year wore on it became apparent that Sadat had his eye on the largest source of these resources, Saudi Arabia, and was willing to hold Libya at arms length in order to develop a close relationship with King Faisal. In opting for a Saudi connection instead of a Libyan one, Sadat was also rejecting President Qadhafi's messianic vision and the concept of integral Arab unity under Egyptian hegemony—the Nasserist legacy—in favor of a more traditional view of building strength by coordinating the policies of the key independent Arab states acting in accord with the requirements of the balance of power rather than ideological imperatives. Thus "socialist" Egypt and Syria could very well work together with conservative Jordan and Saudi Arabia.

Thus far President Sadat's strategy has worked quite well. He reportedly has received $800 million in aid in recent months from Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf Emirates. Saudi Arabia and Libya both seem to be willing to purchase military equipment for Egypt. King Faisal has given cautious verbal support to the idea of using oil as a political weapon, and Qadhafi has engaged the battle in earnest. This is not a bad record for Sadat who seemed to be giving away his trump card in July 1972 by expelling over 10,000 Soviet advisers and combat personnel.

As Sadat's domestic opposition has lessened recently, and as his relations with Saudi Arabia have improved, he has appeared to be less enamoured by radical rhetoric and more intrigued by diplomatic and economic means of advancing Egypt's cause. With little thought for his reputation among the fedayeen, Sadat recently restored diplomatic relations with Jordan without preconditions.

While President Sadat has been sorting out his Arab relationships, his Foreign Minister has provided several hints of a soft line toward a settlement with Israel. Earlier in the year he publicly distinguished between Egypt's problem of securing Israeli withdrawal from Sinai and the overall Palestine problem, which he implied was not of equal concern to Egypt and should be left to the Palestinians (and now Jordanians) to solve. Later, at the UN in July, Foreign Minister Zayyat said that Egypt would be willing to have direct contacts with Israel if Israel were to drop the precondition of refusing to consider full withdrawal. President Sadat reportedly told Secretary Waldheim much the same

thing, saying that direct negotiations could begin as soon as some form of withdrawal was underway.

Jordan

During his twenty years in power, King Hussein has wavered between asserting his credentials as an Arab nationalist in cooperation with his neighbors in opposition to Israel and standing alone in the face of radical opposition from both inside and outside Jordan. After three years of virtual isolation in the inter-Arab context, Jordan is now embarked on a course of returning to the ranks of Arab respectability. Among other things, this requires the King to be conciliatory toward the Palestinians, including some of the more moderate fedayeen elements within the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO).

The King is a shrewd and skillful politician, but is not immune from making serious miscalculations, such as his entry into the 1967 war against Israel. Nonetheless, he seems to be clearsighted in defining his present objectives: restoration of normal relations with Syria, which has economic and political benefits; resumption of the Kuwaiti annual subsidy of $40 million, possibly with back balances held in escrow of over $100 million; support from his Palestinian subjects, especially those on the West Bank; weakening the fedayeen movement by neutralizing active Syrian and Egyptian support and by drawing moderate leaders into a dialogue with Jordan.

If King Hussein's new policy is successful, his country will not only be more economically viable than it has been in the past three years, but also he will be protected from radical pressures in any future settlement with Israel. In addition, his claim to speak on behalf of the bulk of the Palestinians will be supported by key Arab countries. The only price he pays for these gains is a commitment to forego a separate agreement with Israel, which has never really been in the cards, and the offer of a limited reconciliation with the Palestinians, which would be an essential prelude to his recovering the West Bank in any case. If he can keep his balance in the game of inter-Arab politics, King Hussein, like President Sadat, may be in a relatively strong position to sustain a serious interest in a peace settlement with Israel over a prolonged period of time.

The Palestinians

Palestinian political life is intimately bound up in inter-Arab politics, and thus has been in flux in recent months. Palestinians on the West Bank and in Gaza have still not developed institutions or leadership of their own, but have shown anxiety about Israeli annexationist tendencies and a renewed interest in King Hussein's bid for reconciliation. The fedayeen organizations in Lebanon and Syria have continued to suffer from severe factionalism, but the trend of the main body of the

movement toward terrorism, which was apparent earlier in the year, now seems to have been reversed, with the Syrian supported Saiqa openly condemning terrorism and supporting rapprochement with Jordan. Fatah and the PLO leadership have also publicly denounced recent terrorist acts, and have sought to present an image of respectability. Part of Fatah, however, as well as some of the smaller radical groups, continues to use terror as a primary means of advancing Palestinian interests. Libya, and perhaps Iraq, provide resources and funds for these efforts, which may place the terrorist minority beyond the control of other Arab supporters of the Palestinians and of the fedayeen leadership itself.

King Hussein's recent offer of amnesty to imprisoned fedayeen may further accentuate splits within the movement. President Asad has already closed down the Palestinian broadcasting station inside Syria and seems to be trying to weaken Fatah in favor of Saiqa, the Syrian supported movement. President Sadat seems to have turned his back on the fedayeen for the moment, and King Faisal continues to try to isolate radicals by supporting moderates. From time to time we receive indirect queries from the fedayeen leadership concerning USG views, which indicates a continuing interest in relating to any eventual political settlement that might offer some outlet for a Palestinian identity. On balance, these developments suggest that the fedayeen, as well as other Palestinians, neither have the capability nor the strong incentive to block a movement toward a peace settlement, nor are they likely to have the support of Syria and Egypt in any efforts to unseat King Hussein or interfere in Lebanese internal politics.

Syria

President Asad continues to be skeptical that a peace settlement can be reached, but he has been willing to reduce pressure on Jordan, to keep the fedayeen in Syria under control, and to hold the Soviets at arms length, while taking their weapons in large quantities. King Hussein seems to feel that he can work with Asad and has reported the Syrian President as saying that he will join Egypt and Jordan if serious prospects for peace arise.

Saudi Arabia

King Faisal has adroitly dealt with Egypt over the past year to minimize Soviet influence, to dampen Sadat's militancy on the Arab-Israeli issue, and to introduce the oil factor into Middle East politics. Thus far Faisal has not threatened to use oil in an overt manner to change US policy, and in fact we have been reassured on numerous occasions that Faisal does not intend to weaken his relationship with the United States. He has not yet placed Saudi prestige on the line with respect to solving the Arab-Israeli conflict, and seems aware of the dangers of

doing so. Thus far his role has contributed substantially to structuring the inter-Arab contest in ways conducive to a peace settlement.

Israel

The Israeli leadership seems to sense that the status quo is not uniformly developing in Israel's favor, particularly as Arab oil and wealth begin to make themselves felt in Europe and the United States. Impending Israeli elections have precluded any new initiatives and have led to a hardening of Israeli policy toward the occupied areas as the price for keeping Dayan in the party. Nonetheless, Israelis appear to sense that the United States is serious when it says a Middle East settlement is of high priority. Dayan, among others, seems to feel that Israeli interests would be well served by putting forward new positions concerning Egypt that would shift US attention from trying to elicit Israeli flexibility to persuading the Egyptians to enter negotiations. At the same time, Eban has been downplaying the importance of the new policy toward the occupied territories, terming all of Israel's territorial demands negotiable. With the Soviets out of Egypt and the specter of growing oil power, some Israelis apparently have concluded that the time may be approaching when issues of an Arab-Israeli settlement must be addressed with a new sense of seriousness.

---

92. Editorial Note

On September 28, 1973, President Richard Nixon and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger met with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko and Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin from 10 a.m. to 12:05 p.m. at the White House. According to a memorandum of conversation, Gromyko began with a brief discussion of the Jackson–Vanik Amendment, the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, and European security, and then turned to the Middle East:

"Your assessment and ours do not fully coincide, even if at first sight it seems that we do since both sides feel the situation is complicated and dangerous. But we have a different assessment of the danger because we feel the possibility could not be excluded that we could all wake up one day and find there is a real conflagration in that area. That has to be kept in mind. Is it worth the risk? A serious effort has to be made for a solution because a solution will not just fall down from the sky."

President Nixon responded that he also believed the Middle East to be a priority, and pointed out that he had given Secretary Kissinger a direct assignment to push for an agreement with the Soviets. "While we may have differences on how it comes out," Nixon said, "we want progress on an interim basis certainly, or perhaps on principles." Before the meeting concluded, the President added that he would be sending Kissinger to Moscow within 60 to 90 days to pursue this matter, but that the Secretary "has lots to do so this is the soonest we can do it." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 71, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Gromyko 1973) The full text of the memorandum of conversation is scheduled for publication in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XV, Soviet Union, June 1972–August 1974.

---

93. Briefing Memorandum From the Director of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research (Cline) to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

RCI–2997 Washington, September 30, 1973.

SYRIAN MILITARY INTENTIONS

There are reports that Syria is preparing for an attack on Israel, but conclusive evidence is lacking. In our view, the political climate in the Arab states argues against a major Syrian military move against Israel at this time. The possibility of a more limited Syrian strike—perhaps one designed to retaliate for the pounding the Syrian Air Force took from the Israelis on September 13[2]—cannot, of course, be excluded.

On September 26, during a visit to Israeli positions on the Golan Heights, Defense Minister Dayan stated, according to a Jerusalem broadcast, that Syria had massed hundreds of tanks and artillery pieces just beyond the Israeli lines in the area.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1173, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, 1973 Middle East War, File 1, October 6, 1973 [1 of 2]. Top Secret; Umbra; No Foreign Dissem; Gamma Controlled; No Dissem Abroad; Controlled Dissem; Not For Inclusion in any Other Document. Drafted by N.C. Wood and P.H. Stoddard of INR.

[2] In a September 13 air battle over the Mediterranean Sea, Israeli jet fighters downed 13 Syrian MIGs. One Israeli Mirage was lost.

[*1½ lines not declassified*] Syrian units are expected to be in position by the end of September for an attack on Israel that has been in preparation since May. Missiles and anti-aircraft units are deployed close to the front lines, and Damascus is taking civil defense precautions. [*2 lines not declassified*]

King Hussein, [*less than 1 line not declassified*], was seriously concerned about the plan, and the Jordanians had agreed to receive on September 30 the chief of Syrian intelligence, who was bringing a message from the Syrian Chief of Staff. (Of possible relevance in this connection, the Jordanian Premier was to carry a message from the King to Syrian President Asad on September 29 and one to Egyptian President Sadat on October 1, [*4½ lines not declassified*] there had been "strange activity" by the Syrian military in the past two days and that all civilian cargo vehicles had been commandeered. [*1½ lines not declassified*]

Our capacity to obtain evidence on Syrian ground preparations is extremely limited, but apart from [*less than 1 line not declassified*] Dayan's allegation we have as yet no information to indicate that Syria is preparing for military action against Israel. If Syria were already in an advanced state of military preparation, the Israelis almost certainly would have approached us with considerable alarm through liaison channels. There is no evidence to connect the increased readiness of Egyptian air and air defense units, which went into effect on September 26, with any Syrian military moves.

In our view, Syrian military activity at this time would more probably be part of a contingency plan for defense than the final steps before offensive action. When the Syrian plan was under discussion in May, Syria and Egypt were talking about resuming hostilities. This alarmed King Faisal, who tried to dampen their zeal for fighting and to make clear to the US that he expected some shift in US policy toward Israel if Saudi oil were to flow in the requisite amounts. The indications have been that Syria and Egypt accepted Faisal's strategy and were downplaying the military option for the moment. Also arguing against a Syrian military adventure at present are the current Syrian efforts to consolidate the fedayeen movement under Saiqa and Syria's desire for assurance of Jordanian cooperation in meeting an Israeli counterthrust before launching action of its own.

94. Telegram From the Embassy in Israel to the Department of State[1]

Tel Aviv, October 1, 1973, 1151Z.

7570. For Sisco from Ambassador. Subject: Rumored Egyptian Alert; Syrian Military Activity. Ref: Tel Aviv 7555, State 194280 and 194592.[2]

1. As we reported last night and as DATT had reported earlier yesterday, Israelis do not perceive a threat at this time from either Syria or Egypt. The Israelis continue to watch Egypt closely and are aware of Syrian redeployments.

2. At my instruction DATT has been in continuous contact with Israeli military intelligence on these subjects since State reftels were received and is to have further IDF briefing today, results of which he will report immediately.[3]

3. I note Dayan's remarks September 26 to troops on Golan Heights about Syrian concentrations[4] (FBIS London 262034Z Sep 73), which may have contributed to concern. Purpose we would see behind Dayan's comments is reassurance to troops on ceasefire line who had not

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files. Secret; Immediate; Exdis. Repeated to Amman, Beirut, Cairo, and Jerusalem.

[2] In telegram 7555 from Tel Aviv, September 30, the Embassy reported the Defense Attaché's assessment that Syrian military action against Israel was improbable and the Israeli Defense Force's view that the Syrian deployment was a typical Syrian defensive posture. Thus, the IDF was watchful but not overly concerned. (Ibid.) In telegram 194280 to Tel Aviv, September 28, the Department asked the Embassy to obtain an Israeli assessment of a report that Egyptian air defense had gone on alert early that day. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 610, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 12, Mar. 73–Oct. 73) In telegram 194592 to Tel Aviv, September 30, the Department asked the Embassy for Israeli comments on and evaluation of reported Syrian military activity. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

[3] In JCS telegram 1448 from Tel Aviv, October 2, the Defense Attaché reported a long discussion with Colonel Reuter, IDF Intelligence Liaison Officer, on October 1. The Attaché emphasized U.S. concern over the increased tension and the need for an official IDF estimate of the situation. Reuter said that the IDF considered the Syrian and Egyptian buildups "a coincidental juxtaposition of two actions motivated by entirely different reasons." He conceded that Egypt's large-scale exercise could serve as a cover for offensive preparations, but said that since no collateral indications supported this, the IDF considered this "to be merely an exercise." The IDF judged that Syria did not yet feel able to occupy the Golan Heights; thus, it considered the Syrian deployment a defensive one. In summary, the IDF was keeping a close watch on both fronts, but there were no indications of IDF mobilization or increased alert. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 659, Country Files, Middle East, [Computer Cables—Mideast War—1], October 1973)

[4] See Document 93.

been given leave to spend Jewish new year holiday with their families that their remaining on station was for solid reason.

Keating

---

95. Telegram From the Department of State to the Embassy in Israel[1]

Washington, October 3, 1973, 2322Z.

197251. Subject: Dinitz Presents GOI Assessment Military Situation.

1. Summary: In course of Oct 1 meeting with Asst Sec Sisco, Israeli Amb Dinitz presented current GOI assessment of military situation in addition to political tour d'horizon (State 196714).[2] Dinitz said that while in Israel on consultations he found growing concern with new equipment entering Arab inventories from Soviet Union and West. Dinitz stressed that Arabs have theoretical capability to attack all Israeli population centers either with aircraft or with missiles, including Soviet supplied Scud. Dinitz argued that U.S. and Israel should examine motivation for Soviet upgrading of Arab capabilities and see what this means for spirit of détente. He added that Israel must also consider how escalation affects Israeli arms requirements and recalled that Israeli requests for U.S. "smart" bombs and number of other items were still outstanding. Sisco thanked Dinitz for presentation and withheld comment pending study of points raised.

[2. Dinitz said][3] That while he was in Israel he had found greater concern about military situation than he had anticipated. Israel sees escalation in both numbers and types of weapons Arab states now re-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files. Secret; Priority; Exdis. Drafted by Walker, cleared in NEA/IAI and NEA, and approved by Sisco.

[2] Telegram 196714 to Tel Aviv, October 3, reported Ambassador Dinitz's description of current Israeli Government thinking on the Middle East political situation following his return from consultations in Israel. Dinitz told Sisco that Israel remained committed to progress on negotiations, but had never been given a chance to demonstrate flexibility in an ongoing process. He stated that the Arabs were more openly expressing their demands for more than Israeli withdrawal to the 1967 lines, which he argued was just one stage of the Arab plan for liquidation of Israel as an independent state. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1173, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, M.E. [Middle East], Jarring Talks, 9/1/73–10/31/73 [2 of 2])

[3] Apparent omission in the original.

ceiving. Soviet Union no longer has monopoly since Western arms now flowing in. Dinitz felt this makes weird combination; Soviets finding it necessary to escalate their arms shipments to maintain commitment of their Arab clients in face unlimited financial resources of some Arab countries and unlimited willingness of Western country like France to sell arms. Thus, Arab inventories contain Sukois, Tupulovs, MIGs and Mirages and boast SAM Twos, Sixes and in Syria and Egypt, FROG missiles. FROG is more dangerous in Syria than in Egypt, since range does not carry Egyptian FROGs out of Sinai, but Syrian FROGs can reach suburbs of Haifa. Dinitz said Israel believes Egyptians and Syrians may now have more sophisticated missile in Soviet Scud.

3. Dinitz said new Arab equipment transformed military picture by giving Arabs strategic attack capability. Arabs now have at least theoretical capability for low-level penetration raids. With Sukoi 20 and new configuration of Mirage 5, Arabs can fly under Israeli radar net and reach population centers. With these planes plus missiles like FROG 7 and Scud, Arabs have capability to hit practically every population center in Israel.

4. Dinitz said Israel had to regard this as very grave development which raised two problems. First is how Soviet supplies fit into entire picture of détente and what Soviet interest is in upgrading capabilities of equipment being provided to Arabs. Question is whether Soviets are simply reacting to escalation of weapons being provided to Arabs by West or if it represents policy of deeper Soviet penetration in Persian Gulf. Israel wonders how this fits in with spirit of détente in world and feels this possibly area for joint U.S.-Israeli evaluation.

5. Dinitz said second problem was how Israel should rearm itself to meet this change in balance. New equipment does not represent upset in balance but does represent change, and this is trend which must be watched closely. This particularly true of Scud missile which is introduction of comparatively new element in balance.

6. Dinitz said he did not want go into formal presentation of what this all means in terms Israeli equipment needs. Fortunately, difficult hurdle of agreement on planes is now behind U.S. and Israel. But there are still many requests pending. Dinitz did not want go into details equipment outstanding but noted it included number types of bombs which had high degree of accuracy in hitting target. He added some requests have been pending for over year. Dinitz reiterated his statement this was not formal presentation on these outstanding items but had to be mentioned since analysis would not be complete without this information.

7. Dinitz added Israeli analysts now convinced Saudi Arabia has sealed agreement with France for Mirage aircraft. Sisco said U.S. had heard deal was for 38 or 39 aircraft but U.S. cannot say deal is firm. U.S.

asked Saudis for explanation and did not receive satisfactory reply. Sisco added that if Israel has firm information on this it would be helpful to pass it on to us. Though U.S. may have no doubts as to accuracy of rumors, there is no way to prove allegation. Dinitz promised to pass on any info he could get and said this concluded his presentation.

8. Sisco thanked Dinitz for presentation and said U.S. would study points Dinitz raised before attempting comment.

Rush

---

96. Memorandum From Director of Central Intelligence Colby to Secretary of State Kissinger

Washington, October 5, 1973.

[Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 137, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan/Rifai, January 3, 1973. Secret; Sensitive. 4 pages not declassified.]

97. Message From Israeli Prime Minister Meir to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, undated.

1. Information that has been accumulating obliges us to take into consideration that the military preparations in Syria and Egypt, the battle deployment and state of alert of their armed forces, and in particular the increased military concentrations at their front lines with us,[2] may be motivated by one of the following two possibilities:

A. A bona fide assessment by both or one of these countries, for whatever reason, that Israel intends to carry out an offensive military operation against them or against one of them;

B. The intention on their part—or on the part of one of them—to initiate an offensive military operation against Israel.[3]

2. In case, however, this development stems from their apprehensions about an offensive military operation from the side of Israel, such apprehensions are completely without foundation. We wish to assure you personally that Israel has no intention whatever to initiate offen-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, June 4–Oct. 31, 1973. No classification marking. This message is attached to an October 5 transmittal memorandum from Scowcroft to Kissinger stating that Shalev had called on him at 5:30 p.m. at which time he passed this message to Scowcroft. Scowcroft's transmittal memorandum is marked Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only; Via Special Channel and bears the typed instruction: "Deliver to Peter Rodman in Sealed Envelope."

[2] At 5:30 p.m., Shalev also handed Scowcroft an Israeli report stating that during the last 10 days the Egyptian army had reinforced its deployment in the canal zone within a range of up to 30 kilometers west of the canal and that all arms of the Egyptian army were in a state of high alert. Syria's state of alert and the Syrian army's move into emergency dispositions continued, and the Syrians had advanced fighter bombers to relatively close airfields in which they had not previously been stationed. During the night of October 4–5, 11 Soviet passenger planes landed in the Damascus and Cairo airports and some had already taken off in the direction of the Soviet Union. The report concluded that these measures were in part connected with maneuvers and in part due to fears of offensive actions by Israel, and it considered "the opening of military operations against Israel by the two armies as of low probability." (Ibid.)

[3] In his memoirs, Kissinger described the reassuring assessments just before the war by Israeli intelligence as well as by CIA, DIA, and INR that the Egyptian and Syrian military movements were routine, coincidental, and "not designed to lead to major hostilities." He wrote: "Clearly, there was an intelligence failure, but misjudgment was not confined to the agencies. Every policymaker knew all the facts. The Israelis were monitoring the movement of every Egyptian and Syrian unit. The general plan of attack, especially of the Syrians, was fairly well understood. What no one believed—the consumers no more than the producers of intelligence—was that the Arabs would act on it. Our definition of rationality did not take seriously the notion of starting an unwinnable war to restore self-respect. There was no defense against our own preconceptions or those of our allies." (*Years of Upheaval*, pp. 464–465)

sive military operations against Syria or Egypt. We are, on the contrary, most eager to contribute towards an easing of the military tension in the area. On these grounds we wish, through your good office, to inform the Arabs and the Soviets of our attitude, with the view of allaying their suspicions and the aim of restoring calm to the area.

3. Should Syria or Egypt intend to launch offensive military operations, it would be important to make it clear to them in advance that Israel will react militarily, with firmness and in great strength. We would like you to bring this to the knowledge of the Arabs and Soviets through the channels at your disposal.[4]

---

[4] Kissinger, who was at the United Nations, recalled that Scowcroft immediately wired the messages to his New York office, but that since his staff saw no urgent reason to interrupt him, he did not see them until the next morning. He wrote: "Nor am I sure I would have done anything immediately with the messages had I received them. It was now the middle of the night in all capitals concerned; nothing menacing seemed afoot. We were not informed that Israel had taken any special precautions—and it had not called up reserves. It is also clear in retrospect that any effort by us then would have been academic. The Arab assault was deliberate, not even remotely prompted by fear of an Israeli attack. Any last-minute message to Egypt and Syria reassuring them that Israel would not preempt would only have been greeted with elation in the war rooms of Cairo and Damascus." (Ibid.)

---

98. Special National Intelligence Estimate[1]

SNIE 35/36–73 Washington, October 6, 1973.

ARAB-ISRAELI HOSTILITIES AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS[2]

Précis

Heavy fighting is almost certain to be short in duration—no more than a week. Neither side is logistically prepared for lengthy hostilities. The Israelis have the strength to blunt the Syrian offensive capability

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, NSC Institutional Files (H–Files), Box H–94, WSAG Meetings, Meetings, Originals, 1973. Top Secret; Umbra. The Central Intelligence Agency and the intelligence organizations of the Departments of State and Defense participated in the preparation of this estimate. The Director of CIA submitted this estimate with the concurrence of all members of the USIB except the representatives of the AEC and FBI who abstained on the grounds that it was outside their jurisdiction.

[2] This Estimate has been reviewed by the USIB Agencies at the working level. It has not been reviewed by the USIB itself. [Footnote in the original.]

within a few days and, as quickly, to push the Egyptians back across the canal. Fighting on a lesser scale, say an artillery duel across the canal, however, could be more prolonged.

The hostilities pose serious threat to American interests. All Arabs, even those most well disposed to the US, will press Washington to be at least even-handed, if not to join in sanctions against Israel. The more radical states—Libya, Syria, and Iraq in particular—will be strident in attacking the US. They will not limit themselves to oratory and maneuvers in the UN but will also foster moves against US personnel and property in their own countries and elsewhere. Even moderates like Kings Husayn and Faysal will be under increasing pressure to distance themselves from the US.

Some interruption of oil supply to the West is likely, whether through Arab government action or through sabotage of oil facilities. Libya is almost certain to be the first to retaliate against Western oil interests. Particularly if the fighting does not end immediately, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states are likely to limit oil production and may join in a general oil embargo. Though this would most hurt Western Europe and Japan in the first instance it would also aggravate the present supply problems in the US. The Arabs would hope that the West Europeans and Japan would press the US to bring influence to bear on Israel.

The Soviets will have to give political support to the Arab side, but they are following a cautious policy and would probably be willing to concert with the US in dampening tensions.

[Omitted here is the body of the estimate.]

99. Memorandum From William B. Quandt of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

Washington, October 6, 1973.

SUBJECT

Arab-Israel Tensions

Ambassador Keating met with Prime Minister Meir this morning[2] and was informed that Israel had received information from totally reliable sources that Syria and Egypt are planning a coordinated attack against Israel today in the late afternoon. In addition, she confirmed that Soviet dependents and some advisers are being evacuated from Egypt and Syria. She has asked that we inform the Soviets and the Egyptians that:

—Israel is not planning to attack Syria or Egypt. It has called up "some reserves" on a contingency basis, but has not declared a general mobilization.

—Israel is aware of military dispositions in Egypt and Syria and knows that in any war they will lose, even if Israel will suffer some casualties.

Mrs. Meir assured Ambassador Keating that Israel does not intend to launch a preemptive attack and is genuinely interested in avoiding war.

Other information of note is that Cairo appears normal this morning, with no sign of special military precautions. We do, however, have confirmation that as many as 1,000 Soviet dependents have left Egypt. Some reduction in the number of Soviet advisers in Syria is also apparently underway. In addition, we know that the Egyptian forces, as part of their current fall maneuvers, are on a high state of alert and that Syrian forces have been repositioned along the Golan Heights cease-fire lines.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 664, Country Files, Middle East, Middle East War, Memos & Misc., Oct. 6, 1973–Oct. 17, 1973. No classification marking.

[2] Keating's conversation with Prime Minister Meir was reported in telegram 7766 from Tel Aviv, October 6, 1033Z, 5:33 a.m. in Washington and New York. (Ibid., Box 610, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 12, March 73–October 1973) The Ambassador pointed out that the Embassy had taken the initiative to discuss the military situation with the IDF on several occasions and had been told that the situation was not dangerous. Meir said that this had been an accurate evaluation at the time, but that within the last 12 hours the situation had become very serious. A copy of the telegram was delivered to Dobrynin at 8:25 a.m. (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 68, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 19, [July 13, 1973–Oct. 11, 1973])

Several possible interpretations of the evidence can be made:

1. Egypt and Syria, despite the military odds against success, do intend to initiate hostilities as a way of forcing international attention to the Middle East and activating the use of oil as a political weapon against the United States. The Soviets have gotten wind of this and are evacuating dependents and some advisers. In so far as Soviet advisers are included in the evacuation, the effectiveness of an Arab attack is likely to be somewhat degraded and the risks of Soviet involvement will lessen.

2. A major crisis is under way in Arab-Soviet relations, and under the cover of a war scare, Soviet advisers are being expelled from both Egypt and Syria. There have been numerous strains in Arab-Soviet relations recently, and King Faisal has been pressing hard to convince Sadat and Asad to cut their ties to Moscow.

Our intelligence services have continued to downplay the likelihood of an Arab attack on Israel and still have no signs that such action is imminent. They appear to favor the alternative explanation of a crisis in Arab-Soviet relations.

If hostilities are imminent, we should immediately consider the following actions:

—Démarche to the Soviets and Egyptians to convey Prime Minister Meir's message and to add our own statement about the need to avoid hostilities.[3]

—Activate first steps for possible evacuation of U.S. citizens from key Arab countries (Lebanon, Libya, Saudi Arabia)

—Convene oil task force to prepare on a contingency basis for cutoff of Arab oil.

—Consult with Israelis and Jordanians on steps to be taken in the event of hostilities. In particular, we want to make sure that Jordan does not get drawn in.

—Ask the Shah of Iran to use his influence with President Sadat to discourage a resort to force.

—Alert U.S. forces in the Mediterranean and Europe for possible action in the Middle East.

---

[3] Meir's message is Document 97. Kissinger recorded in his book, *Crisis: The Anatomy of Two Major Foreign Policy Crises*, that Sisco awakened him at 6:15 a.m. in his suite at the Waldorf Towers in New York with the news that Egypt and Syria were about to go to war with Israel. He wrote: "When Sisco awakened me there were only ninety minutes of peace left for the Middle East. So skillfully had Egypt and Syria masked their war preparations that even at this stage the Israelis expected the attack to come four hours later than the time actually set. I knew that no diplomacy would work if an Arab attack were premeditated. But my view was still colored by the consistent Israeli reports, confirmed by U.S. intelligence dispatches, that such an attack was nearly impossible. I therefore plunged into a frenetic period of intense diplomacy to head off a clash, more than half convinced that Egyptian and Syrian actions grew out of a misunderstanding of Israeli intentions." (*Crisis*, p. 14)

100. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

October 6, 1973, 6:40 a.m.

K: Where did we get you?

D: At home.

K: Are you in Maryland.

D: I am in the Embassy.

K: We have information from the Israelis that the Arabs and Syrians are planning an attack within the next 6 hours and that your people are evacuating civilians from Damascus and Cairo.[2]

D: Syrians and who?

K: And Egypt are planning an attack within the next 6 hours.

D: Yes.

K: And that your people are evacuating some civilians from Damascus and Cairo.

D: Yes.

K: And they want us to tell all interested parties that if the reason is that you are expecting an Israeli attack—not you—there is no intention of any attack.

D: What was the last phrase?

K: They have no intention of attacking.

D: Israelis?

K: Have no intention of attacking, if your motives for attacking are defensive. If there is attack they will react very strongly and violently.

D: Yes.

K: I want to add a United States word to this.

D: They asked you to tell us this?

K: They asked us to tell this. I have just received this message from the Israelis.

D: This is what they said.

K: That is correct.

D: (Unable to hear)

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking. Kissinger was in New York; Dobrynin was in Washington. Ellipses are in the original.

[2] See Document 99.

K: The Israelis are telling us that Egypt and Syria are planning an attack very shortly and that your people are evacuating from Damascus and Cairo.

D: Yes.

K: If the reason for your evacuation . . .

D: For our . . .

K: Yes. The Soviet evacuation is the fear of an Israeli attack, then the Israelis are asking us to tell you as well as asking us to tell the Arabs.

D: The Israelis?

K: Yes. They have no plans whatever to attack.

D: Yes.

K: But if the Egyptians and Syrians do attack the Israeli response will be extremely strong.

D: Yes.

K: But the Israelis will be prepared to cooperate in an easing of military tension.

D: What?

K: Cooperation in an easing of military tension.

D: Yes.

K: All right. From us to you. The President believes that you and we have a special responsibility to restrain our respective friends.

D: Yes.

K: We are urging communicating to the Israelis.

D: You?

K: Yes.

D: Communicate to the Israelis?

K: If this keeps up this is going—there is going to be a war before you understand my message.

D: I understand. You have communicated with the Arabs and Israelis.

K: Yes and particularly to Israel warning it against a precipitate move.

D: I understand.

K: And we hope you might do the same thing and use your influence to the greatest extent possible with your friends.

D: Just a minute. This is the end of message.

K: That is right. I would like to tell you as you no doubt—that this is very important for our relationship that we do not have an explosion in the Middle East right now.

D: What is our relationship?

K: Until an hour ago I did not take it seriously but we have now received an urgent phone call from Jerusalem saying the Israelis believe it will happen within six hours and they are mobilizing.

D: Who? Israelis? Don't you think the Israelis are trying to do something on their own?[3]

K: If it is, we are telling them not to do it. I cannot judge it. As of yesterday, our evaluation was that the Egyptians and Syrians were making military preparations but we thought another one of those bluffs. You understand?

D: I understand.

K: As of yesterday, Israelis had made no preparations that we had picked up but as you know they can move fast.

D: I understand and I will transmit this message. I will do it and take all measures necessary.

K: You can assure Moscow we are taking most urgent messages with Israel.

D: I understand and will do it right away. You are where?

K: I am in New York.

D: Very good. I can reach you.

K: Yes. On Chile—never mind you had better get your message off.

D: Could we use the . . .

K: Use the White House. Use the hotline and I will tell Scowcroft.

D: On ordinary phone. The military you will tell.

K: Are you coming to the White House?

D: Could I call through the ordinary phone?

K: Certainly. Can Scowcroft get you on the direct line?

D: Yes.

K: On the line that goes to my office. We will move immediately.

D: Thank you very much.

---

[3] At 6:55 a.m., Kissinger spoke with Israeli Minister Shalev saying that he was in touch with the Soviets and Egyptians urging the utmost restraint, and wanted to urge Israel against taking any preemptive action or else the situation would get "very serious." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) At 7:25 a.m., Kissinger phoned Dobrynin's assistant, Oleg Yedanov, asking that he inform the Ambassador that the U.S. Government had just been given an assurance by Israel that it would not launch a preemptive attack. (Ibid.) At 7:47 a.m., Dobrynin told Kissinger that he had passed his message on to Moscow. (Ibid.) The transcript of the conversation between Kissinger and Shalev is printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 17–18.

101. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and Egyptian Foreign Minister Zayyat[1]

New York, October 6, 1973, 7 a.m.

K: Mr. Foreign Minister, sorry to disturb you. We have had a report, which does seem very reliable, and an appeal from the Israelis to the effect that your forces and the Syrian forces are planning attacks within the next several hours.

Z: Several hours?

K: Yes. We have been in touch with the Israelis. The Israelis have asked us to tell you of the seriousness and that they have no intention of attacking, so that if your preparations are caused by fear of an Israeli attack, they are groundless.

Z: Yes.

K: And on the other hand, if you are going to attack, they will take extremely strong measures. This is a message I am passing to you from Israel. I want to tell you I have just called the Israeli Minister and I have told him that if Israel attacks first we would take a very serious view of the situation and have told him on behalf of the United States that Israel must not attack, no matter what they think the provocation is.

Now, I would like to ask you, Mr. Foreign Minister, to communicate this to your Government.

Z: I will do that.

K: Urgently. And to ask them on our behalf to show restraint at a time when we are at last beginning to . . .

Z: I will do this immediately although I am very apprehensive that this is a pretext on the Israeli part.

K: If it is a pretext we will take a strong measure against them.

Z: Thanks for calling, and I will take care of this.

K: All right, Mr. Minister.[2]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking.

[2] At 7:35 a.m., Kissinger called Zayyat again and informed him that he had a reply from the Israelis to his request that they not initiate any military operations, and had received formal assurance that they would not launch an attack. (Ibid.) Printed in part in Kissinger, *Crisis*, p. 21.

102. Telegram From the Department of State to the Embassies in Jordan and Saudi Arabia[1]

Washington, October 6, 1973, 1233Z.

199583. Subj: Message From Secretary to King Faisal and King Hussein.

1. Please send following oral message to King Faisal and King Hussein from Secretary of State Kissinger:

"Your Majesty:

We have just received the report from the Israelis that Egyptian and Syrian forces are planning a coordinated attack within the next several hours.[2] We have urged the Israelis not to launch any preemptive attack. I have spoken with the Egyptian Foreign Minister to urge that his government refrain from launching any attack which could lead to serious consequences. We have also discussed this matter on a most urgent basis with the Soviets.[3]

I ask Your Majesty to intervene immediately with Presidents Sadat and Assad and urge that no such attack be launched on their part. We believe this is a time for restraint, not only because of the obvious dangers that are involved but because it is important to maintain conditions which will make it possible in the days ahead to pursue a peaceful resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict."[4]

Rush

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 659, Country Files, Middle East, [Computer Cables—Mideast War—1], October 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Flash; Immediate. Repeated Niact Immediate to Cairo, Moscow, Tel Aviv, Beirut, and Immediate to USUN as Tosec 141.

[2] See Document 99.

[3] See Documents 100 and 101.

[4] In telegram 5335 from Amman, October 6, Graham reported that he had delivered the Secretary's message to Hussein at 3:30 p.m. local time (8:30 a.m. Washington time). The King said he appreciated the spirit in which the message had been sent, but that it was unfortunately too late. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 27 ARAB–ISR) Faisal made public his reply in which he claimed that the Arabs had never committed any aggression against Israel. It had always been Israel that began aggression and this attack was "a link in the chain of the Israeli policy designed to implement the expansionist plan as part of her aggressive policy against the Arab countries." (FBIS 113, October 6; ibid., NSC Files, Nixon Presidential Materials, Box 1173, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, 1973 War, 6 October, 1973—File No. 1 [1 of 2]) In telegram 1486 from Tel Aviv, October 6, the Defense Attaché reported that at 1200Z (8 a.m. Washington time and 2 p.m. local time), Syria and Egypt launched air and artillery attacks in the Golan Heights and Sinai. (Ibid., Box 659, Country Files, Middle East, [Computer Cables—Mideast War—1], October 1973)

103. Minutes of Washington Special Actions Group Meeting[1]

Washington, October 6, 1973, 9:01–10:06 a.m.

SUBJECT

Middle East

PARTICIPANTS

Chairman—Major Gen. Brent Scowcroft

State
Kenneth Rush
Roy Atherton

DOD
James Schlesinger
James Noyes

JCS
Adm. Thomas H. Moorer
Vice Adm. John P. Weinel

CIA
William Colby
William Parmenter

NSC Staff
William Quandt
Lt. Col. Donald Stukel
Jeanne W. Davis

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS[2]

It was agreed that:

1) Defense will survey the naval forces available in the Mediterranean and in the Atlantic, their capabilities, where they are, and how long it would take to move them into the area;

2) CIA will prepare an estimate of how the fighting will go and on the possibility and impact of an oil embargo.

3) no U.S. military equipment should move to either side;

4) there should be no discussions with the press until an agreed press line has been developed, and all official press statements should come from one place.

Gen. Scowcroft: The latest we have is from our Consul in Jerusalem reporting that the UN Truce Supervisor has said that air and

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, NSC Files, NSC Institutional Files (H–Files), Box H–117, WSAG Meetings Minutes, Originals, 1973. Top Secret; Nodis; Codeword. The meeting took place in the White House Situation Room.

[2] Kissinger talked to Scowcroft at 8:50 a.m. and instructed him to tell the 9 a.m. WSAG meeting to "stay quiet" and that any statements would come from Key Biscayne or McCloskey. He ordered that the Sixth Fleet be put into position so it could be moved if necessary, and asked for a plan from Moorer by noon to see what the United States could move if the situation were to get out of hand. Kissinger reiterated that the Department of Defense should "shut-up about military moves or anything." (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22)

ground fire is being exchanged around Suez, the Golan Heights and the Lebanese border.

Mr. Quandt: Of course it could be the fedayeen.

Gen. Scowcroft: They also report open hostilities have broken out and that Syrian and Israeli aircraft are dog-fighting over the Golan Heights.[3]

Mr. Schlesinger: Does NSA have any messages that tell us who started it?

Mr. Colby: Damascus Radio says Israeli forces launched the attack.

Mr. Schlesinger: Their reputation for veracity is not very high, but if the Israelis didn't start it it's the first time in 20 years.

Mr. Rush: Mrs. Meir told Ambassador Keating that Israel would not launch a preemptive attack.[4]

Gen. Scowcroft: (to Mr. Colby) May we have your briefing?

Mr. Colby briefed from the attached text.[5]

Mr. Colby: Also, I would like to remind you that we have been unable to confirm the story about the SCUD missiles being delivered to the Middle East. Some of the ones we saw are still on the docks.

Adm. Moorer: Over the last two or three months, North Korean pilots have been coming into Egypt to fly the XS [excess?] aircraft that the Soviets left behind there. Also the Soviets have been giving the Syrians an abnormally large number of surface-to-air missiles. It could be that Israel felt things were getting out of hand and followed their normal reaction and let fly. The missile buildup in Syria is denser than around Hanoi—and they are the new attack missiles, too. They're not operational yet, but the Israelis may have decided to try to knock them off before they became operational.

Mr. Atherton: I accept that Israel will preempt when they can. But all the evidence is that they were caught by surprise. This is the last day in the year (Yom Kippur) when they would have started something. And there were no signs of advance Israeli preparation.

Gen. Scowcroft: Yes, until yesterday they had assessed the situation as being defensive.

Mr. Schlesinger: This could be part of an elaborate cover story. On Yom Kippur, little Israel was set upon by Arab extremists.

Mr. Noyes: They have been intensely preoccupied with all that military equipment in Syria. They have wanted to knock it out, or at least to go in and get some of it.

---

[3] Telegrams 1068 and 1069 from Jerusalem, October 6, 1226Z and 1348Z, respectively. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

[4] See footnote 2, Document 99.

[5] Not attached.

Mr. Rush: The Soviets were very quick in getting their people out. They must have received some good intelligence.

Mr. Noyes: This could be a further break-down in Syrian-Soviet political relations.

Gen. Scowcroft: That's the way the Soviet pull-out was interpreted yesterday.

Mr. Schlesinger: The pressure that was being put on the U.S. by the Saudis and others may have led Israel to the conviction that the long-run trend was not favorable to Israeli interests. Experience has shown that it's easier to marshall U.S. support in time of crisis. That, at least, would be a plausible motive. I just don't see any motive on the Egyptian-Syrian side.

Mr. Colby: Egypt has been very soft in recent months. Sadat has obviously been trying to withdraw from the edge.

Mr. Rush: On that hypothesis, do you think Faisal has been deceiving Sadat?

Adm. Moorer: We had a report two weeks ago that Sadat was losing control of his military.

Gen. Scowcroft: And the buildup of Egyptian and Syrian forces has been unmistakeable.

Mr. Schlesinger: That could argue either way. The Israelis may have seized the opportunity.

Gen. Scowcroft: What about the 6th Fleet?

Adm. Moorer: There are two carriers, one in Athens and one in Palma. One is one day and the other is two days away. We have double the number of Marines out there for that NATO exercise.

Mr. Schlesinger: Where should they go? This will have consequences throughout the area. Qadhafi in Libya is likely to take off after the Americans there. I think American forces in the Israeli area are redundant. We might need them elsewhere much more.

Adm. Moorer: We shouldn't make any move now. The 6th Fleet will go on alert and could move quickly. The Soviets apparently aren't making any move. Any U.S. moves could be counterproductive politically and they might pull us out of position.

Gen. Scowcroft: But they should be ready.

Adm. Moorer: They're ready.

Gen. Scowcroft: We should also know what kinds of units we have in the Atlantic that could be moved in.

Adm. Moorer: We know all that. But any movement is a political decision.

Gen. Scowcroft: Yes; we don't want to do anything at the moment.

Mr. Schlesinger: The problem is Qadhafi and what he does about the Americans. There will be secondary consequences.

Mr. Atherton: We will have to think about evacuating Americans from any Arab country if this turns into a debacle for the Arabs.

Adm. Moorer: We're already thinking about that. We have 43,000 Americans in Israel, 200 USG employees and 1000 tourists. We have 1127 in Jordan, 800 in Egypt, 7500 in Lebanon.

Mr. Schlesinger: We must anticipate that Qadhafi will announce today that all American oil firms have been nationalized.

Adm. Moorer: And they have a law that says the operators of the plants can't leave the country. That's when the trouble will start.

Mr. Schlesinger: An occasion may develop in which Qadhafi [*less than 1 line not declassified*].

Adm. Moorer: [*less than 1 line not declassified*] report saying that he was unhappy over the failure of the link with Egypt and that he was relinquishing some of his power.

Mr. Schlesinger: If he is losing power, he will take to the hustings.

Gen. Scowcroft: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Schlesinger: I wasn't talking about that. But if there is an attack on Americans there, our ships should steam to Tripoli.

Mr. Rush: Any such action would stimulate an oil embargo and arouse the whole Arab world.

Gen. Scowcroft: In addition to the two carriers, we have the LTA. That would be valuable for evacuation if the critical spot is Libya.

Adm. Moorer: But you can't take the helos in unless they are covered with fighter aircraft. And the Libyans are sitting there on Wheelus Field.

Mr. Schlesinger: We shouldn't make any move toward Libya. This would be interpreted as a coordinated action.

Mr. Rush: It would be seen as a conspiracy that would galvanize the entire Arab world.

Gen. Scowcroft: But if we move toward the Eastern Mediterranean, we can do it without threatening Libya.

Mr. Rush: We should keep a low profile.

Gen. Scowcroft: No question.

Mr. Schlesinger: But we should anticipate all possible threats.

Mr. Colby: Action should basically be in New York.

Gen. Scowcroft: We're fortunate that there are a number of Foreign Ministers there.

Mr. Colby: I've just received some additional items. They've confirmed fighting at Little Bitter Lake near Suez, with aerial dog-fights.

Reuters reports that Egypt and Syria attacked Golan and Sinai and that the Israelis replied. The Israeli Military Attaché here says Egypt attacked across the southern part of the Canal and that Egypt was bombing Sharm-el Shaik. I'm not sure how much of that is real.

Mr. Atherton: The smartest thing the Israelis could do would be to call for a Security Council meeting in New York.

Mr. Schlesinger: What is the possibility of an oil embargo?

Mr. Atherton: Very high. I think they'll embargo first, then possibly go after our communities. In 1967 there was even trouble in Dhahran. The local governments can lose control. The Arab radio keeps pouring out the propaganda on an Israeli sneak attack.

Mr. Schlesinger: Lebanon and Libya are the most dangerous.

Mr. Atherton: I would add Kuwait and I wouldn't rule out Dhahran.

Mr. Schlesinger: Egypt and Jordan can maintain order?

Mr. Atherton: Yes.

Mr. Schlesinger: I also think there's a high risk of some internal moves.

Mr. Colby: There could be fedayeen involvement.

Adm. Moorer: The most sophisticated fedayeen force is the one that jumps back and forth between Syria and Lebanon.

Mr. Rush: Maybe Roy (Atherton) could give us a run-down on our diplomatic moves.

Mr. Atherton: The Secretary called Dobrynin this morning who indicated he would call Moscow.[6]

Gen. Scowcroft: We got him a line to Moscow and he has talked to them.

Mr. Atherton: The Secretary also talked to Zaid [*Zayyat*] and sent messages to Faisal and Hussein.[7] In both cases he said we were urging Israel to stand down. We've also sent an alert message to all posts instructing them to take internal precautions.[8] We're awaiting guidance on a press line.

Mr. Schlesinger: How long can we hold out without saying something?

Mr. Atherton: The sooner the better.

Gen. Scowcroft: We should stay very quiet. Any press releases should come from New York or Key Biscayne.

---

[6] See Document 100.

[7] See Documents 101 and 102.

[8] Telegram 199582 to Middle Eastern posts, October 6, 1217Z. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

Mr. Schlesinger: But we should say something.

Gen. Scowcroft: But we should say it in one place.

Mr. Atherton: I'd like to get the word to the Israelis in New York about the possibility of their calling a Security Council meeting—say "here's your chance".

Mr. Rush: They would have the initiative for peace.

Mr. Schlesinger: I urge that we say something—the U.S. looks with regret on the outbreak of hostilities which has taken place, possibly by accident, and we urge all sides, etc.

Gen. Scowcroft: We could express concern at the apparent outbreak of hostilities, urge all sides to stop the fighting.

Mr. Atherton: Let's put it in terms of violation of the cease-fire. That puts it in a lower key.

Mr. Rush: And urge all parties to cease hostilities.

Mr. Noyes: Does the cease-fire line cut out Syria?

Mr. Atherton: No, there was a 1967 cease-fire involving Syria.

Mr. Rush: It should be an impartial statement urging cessation of hostilities.

Mr. Schlesinger: We have two alternatives: 1) a low-profile, bland statement, with no finger-pointing, and 2) a slightly more vigorous statement, that we view with regret the outbreak of hostilities and that neither side should attain any advantage from the fighting. I'm looking ahead five or six days from now. If Israel started it, is the U.S. prepared to call them aggressors?

Mr. Rush: I would add a call on the parties to return to their original positions. A cessation of hostilities, no advantage to either side, and restore the situation as it was.

Mr. Atherton: And that we will continue to attempt to pursue peace efforts once this is over.

Mr. Rush: Either the Israelis or we and the Russians together could call for a Security Council meeting to restore peace and get the other nations involved.

Gen. Scowcroft: There are problems with Israel calling for a Security Council meeting. The Arabs will accuse Israel and they automatically have a majority.

Mr. Rush: We should call for the meeting. If the Russians join in, it would appear more impartial. We should try to get them to join us.

Adm. Moorer: That would put us in a good position.

Gen. Scowcroft: That's a good thought.

Mr. Schlesinger: The American objective is to give every appearance of being uninvolved with either side. Our public posture should be built that way.

Mr. Rush: The call for a Security Council meeting should be in the press release.

Adm. Moorer: That would depend on when we get word from the Russians.

Gen. Scowcroft: It doesn't have to be in the first press release.

Mr. Rush: We should 1) deplore the outbreak of fighting; 2) call for cessation of hostilities; 3) call on the parties to restore the previous situation with no advantage to either side; and 4) call the nations together to stop it.

Gen. Scowcroft: We could call on the parties to restore the situation and to give some time for diplomatic efforts.

Mr. Rush: Yes. Should we say anything about the protection of American lives?

Mr. Schlesinger: What would be the advantage?

Gen. Scowcroft: That might signal intervention to all the Arabs.

Mr. Rush: You're right.

Mr. Atherton: How can we keep people from speculating on who started it? The press will be calling every desk officer.

Gen. Scowcroft: For the moment they shouldn't talk to the press at all.

Mr. Rush: If we accept the Israeli view that they have been attacked, this could be deadly for us in the Arab world. We could say the situation is unclear.

Gen. Scowcroft: We just don't know.

Mr. Schlesinger: That has been no bar in the past.

Adm. Moorer: There should be one central point for official statements, but we can't stop people from speculating.

Gen. Scowcroft: We'll do our damnedest. We have the advantage of a three-day weekend. The less we get into speculation, the better. Let's find out what forces we have in the area, what they can do, and when. Are there any other steps we should think about? What about an oil embargo? Is there anything we could do now?

Mr. Rush: We have to look at the oil picture in the light of the dangers.

Adm. Moorer: The real danger point is Saudi Arabia. We can do without oil from Libya.

Gen. Scowcroft: But the Europeans can't—we would have them to worry about.

Mr. Colby: We should also get to the Saudis to see if they could damp things down.

Gen. Scowcroft: We have gone to Faisal.

Mr. Schlesinger: Maybe Hussein, Faisal and the U.S. could call for a Security Council meeting.

Mr. Atherton: The odds on Faisal's agreeing to that are very slim.

Mr. Rush: I think it would be best with the Russians who are outside the area. Hussein has been completely inactive—they haven't mobilized.

Adm. Moorer: If we could make a move toward Faisal—he's the key to the oil problem for us. If Western Europe is denied oil from Libya, that might be helpful. They have been less than sympathetic in the oil situation. The German Foreign Minister told me no matter what Qadhafi does they would have to let him do it.

Mr. Rush: I'm afraid that might work the other way.

Adm. Moorer: We have no real problem as long as we have access to Saudi Arabian oil.

Mr. Rush: But there is a problem for Europe. Libya is very important in the overall scheme.

Gen. Scowcroft: Are there any steps we should take now on oil?

Mr. Schlesinger: We're in fair shape.

Mr. Rush: We have no plans in the event of an oil embargo. If there is an embargo, we're all in a helluva fix. We only have 30 days supply and the Europeans have about 60 days. And that is to catastrophe. Within 15 days there would be panic.

Mr. Colby: The Middle East doesn't provide that much of our oil.

Mr. Rush: Our total oil imports are about 25% and that includes oil from Canada, Venezuela, etc. Only about 7% of our oil comes from the Middle East.

Adm. Moorer: But there's a lot of back-scratching on transportation. For instance, we get sweet oil from Nigeria, but it is owned in Libya. Nigeria is just closer to the U.S.

Mr. Rush: Yes, they do a lot of swapping around to get the closest transportation route.

Mr. Noyes: The Japanese have about a 10-minute supply.

Mr. Atherton: A selective embargo would be the most effective.

Adm. Moorer: The Japanese get 90% of their oil from the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Rush: A Middle East embargo of the U.S. wouldn't be catastrophic.

Adm. Moorer: But Europe would go into a frenzy. They might do something political.

Mr. Schlesinger: If Egypt and Syria started this deliberately and calculatingly, the only reason would be that they think they can trigger an embargo. That is the only rational reason for proceeding in this

manner, particularly with the growing relations between Faisal and Sadat.

Mr. Rush: You mean Faisal was deceived by Sadat?

Adm. Moorer: There's the remote possibility that Sadat has lost control.

Mr. Colby: All the indications are not there.

Mr. Rush: Coordination with the Syrians would have to have been without Sadat's knowledge.

Gen. Scowcroft: It would be hard for him not to know.

Adm. Moorer: He may not have been able to stop it.

Mr. Atherton: This is one of the two tracks Sadat was talking about six months ago. Then he did his flip-flop. You could make the case that his change of heart was a master deceit.

Gen. Scowcroft: If so, he was awfully clever—better than his track record would indicate.

Mr. Atherton: But we did have a report of this scenario in May.[9]

Gen. Scowcroft: No question.

Mr. Schlesinger: Should we move forces from the Atlantic?

Gen. Scowcroft: It's too early to know. But we should know what we have, where it is, and how long it would take to get there.

Mr. Rush: Any military movements should be as quiet as possible.

Mr. Schlesinger: That's clear in the Mediterranean. But in the Atlantic, we could start moving toward Gibraltar.

Mr. Colby: Movement of a rowboat in Norfolk harbor would be news.

Gen. Scowcroft: I agree.

Adm. Moorer: We should let our commanders know what we are thinking about. We will look at all the ships in the Atlantic. During the Jordan crisis we were lucky that the *Kennedy* was at sea, and we just let it go on to Gibraltar rather than bringing it back to port.

Adm. Weinel: We have a carrier force in the North Sea.

(Gen. Scowcroft left the room to take a call from Secretary Kissinger)

Adm. Moorer: The *Kennedy* is in the North Sea.

Mr. Schlesinger: What about our troops in Germany? Should we get them back in their barracks?

Adm. Moorer: We have one ready unit on short notice. We could add to that and do the same on the airlift. We will set up an alert

[9] See Document 59.

schedule for all units, but we shouldn't have them make a mad rush for their barracks.

Mr. Schlesinger: Can we reach the Middle East from Fort Bragg with C–5As?

Adm. Moorer: We would have to stage through [*less than 1 line not declassified*].

Mr. Schlesinger: Could we use [*less than 1 line not declassified*]?

Adm. Moorer: Yes, we did it before.

Mr. Schlesinger: [*less than 1 line not declassified*] with the Arab world.

Adm. Moorer: In the Lebanon crisis, and when we set up the hospital in Amman, [*1½ lines not declassified*].

Mr. Schlesinger: Even if we don't have clarification before Tuesday[10] as to what is going on, events may force our hand. Qadhafi may start to move.

Mr. Rush: He may complete the nationalization but I don't believe he will declare an embargo.

Mr. Schlesinger: He could start attacking Americans.

Mr. Rush: He could do that, but it is illegal for Americans to leave unless we take them out by force. This would galvanize the Middle East and end the oil supply.

Adm. Moorer: What if they start killing Americans?

Mr. Rush: Then we would have to do something.

Mr. Atherton: Are there any moves we could make now? I am concerned about our appearing to have a guilty conscience.

(General Scowcroft returned)

Mr. Rush: In the press release we could call on all parties to protect the lives of all foreign nationals across the board, both in the country and from bombing from outside the country.

Mr. Noyes: The Israelis move quickly—they've just sent us a list of equipment they need urgently.

Gen. Scowcroft: Secretary Kissinger is coming down from New York—he should leave about 11:00 a.m. Bill (Colby), he would like you to prepare an estimate of how the fighting will go. And he also wants to know what units are in the Atlantic.

Mr. Colby: We'll also give you an estimate on an oil embargo. Is 2:00 p.m. okay?

Gen. Scowcroft: Okay.

Mr. Atherton: The Israelis may try to take Damascus this time.

---

[10] October 8.

Mr. Noyes: Yes, Israeli Embassy people here have said informally that in the next round they would move considerably forward, then negotiate back to their present lines which would give them a secure border.

Adm. Moorer: Also they want to destroy all that equipment, both to get rid of the equipment and also to give the Soviets a clear signal that equipping the Arab countries is a loser. They lost all that equipment in 1967, too.

Mr. Atherton: And they want to bring down some governments.

Mr. Schlesinger: If the Israelis move toward Damascus, we can't afford not to choose sides. If we don't, we will have de facto chosen sides. We either have to come out strongly against aggression and wind up opposed to Israel, or, if we do not, be identified as being with Israel.

Adm. Moorer: If we give them a single item of equipment, we will have taken sides.

Mr. Rush: Any movement of equipment by us would involve a very serious situation.

Mr. Noyes: This Israeli request for equipment is just an effort to get us in motion. They don't really need the equipment.

Mr. Rush: If they really need anything on that list, they have been woefully inept in equipping themselves.

Gen. Scowcroft: And they don't have that reputation.

Mr. Rush: For now, we should call on all parties to stop the fighting.

Mr. Schlesinger: We have neither the desire or the information to go beyond that. But if Israel moves toward Damascus, we will have to.

Mr. Atherton: We could call for everyone to get back behind their cease-fire lines. Whoever crosses them, we could go after them.

Mr. Schlesinger: If Israel moves and we fail to come down on them, we've had it!

Mr. Atherton: A lot of sympathy is with Egypt and Syria over what is seen as their patience over the last six years.

Mr. Rush: But a lot of people in this country think that the first strike in 1967 was by the Arabs and the Israelis were defending themselves. It will be the same now.

Gen. Scowcroft: We have to think not only of our public posture, but what kind of position the U.S. should be in to give us the best chance to bring about a peace. If the Israelis move toward Damascus, it would be good publicity to stand up, but what would this do to our leverage with Israel to try to stop them, for example.

Mr. Schlesinger: It would be a damage-limiting move.

Mr. Rush: The basic problem is how to limit the damage in the Arab world.

Gen. Scowcroft: I understand that, but the question goes further than the immediate impression in the public mind.

Mr. Rush: It could be a catalyst for action by Faisal and others. Or they could lose control.

Mr. Schlesinger: If we want Faisal to help we have to give him something to hang his hat on.

Mr. Rush: We will have to help him resist the pressure in his own country.

Adm. Moorer: It would be good to give him some feeling that we are taking him into our confidence.

Mr. Colby: Maybe Hussein can do something with Sadat.

Gen. Scowcroft: We have sent messages to both Faisal and Hussein.

Mr. Rush: We should maintain continuing communication with them.

Mr. Schlesinger: There will be attempts to overthrow some regimes that are not directly involved—Morocco, for example. Everyone will look on this opportunistically.

Adm. Moorer: There are Moroccan soldiers in Syria. They may be inspired to go do something.

Mr. Schlesinger: Are there Americans in Algeria and Morocco?

Mr. Quandt: About 1000 in Algeria and a few more in Morocco.

Mr. Rush: We should also maintain communication with Arab leaders with whom we are still friendly—Hassan, the Shah, the Emirates.

Adm. Moorer: Have we had any communication with the Shah?

Mr. Atherton: Not that I know of.

Mr. Schlesinger: We should treat the Shah with some distance.

Gen. Scowcroft: But we should keep him informed.

Mr. Rush: That's all we should do with Hassan is keep him informed.

Mr. Schlesinger: Bourguiba has always been helpful.

Gen. Scowcroft: Is there anything more that would be useful for us to do at the moment? If not, we'll wait for that appraisal from Colby.

Adm. Moorer: They have two more hours of daylight there. The Syrians and Egyptians may try to do something at night when they are not so vulnerable to Israeli air. The attack began at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Atherton: But it was apparently moved up. The original plan was to attack at nightfall.

Adm. Moorer: That argues for the Egyptians and Syrians having started it. It would be to Israel's military advantage to start at daylight and in the Arab's favor to start in the late afternoon.

Gen. Scowcroft: I expect we'll have another WSAG meeting this afternoon, and I would appreciate your all staying available.

---

104. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

October 6, 1973, 9:25 a.m.

P: Hello, Henry. I wanted you to know I am keeping on top of reports here. The Russians claim to be surprised.

K: The Russians claim to be surprised and my impression is that they were supposed to be surprised because apparently there has been an airlift of dependents out of the area going on for the last 2 or 3 days.

P: I agree.

K: And so our impression is that they knew about it or knew it was possible. They did not warn us.

P: What is happening now? What is the status?

K: Fighting has broken out on the Golan Heights and along the Sinai.[2] The Egyptians claim that the Israelis had launched a naval attack in the Gulf of Suez which triggered the whole thing.[3] That I just can't

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking. Nixon was in Key Biscayne and Kissinger was in New York.

[2] At 9 a.m., Shalev telephoned Kissinger and reported: "The latest I have is a full scale battle along the canal with the Egyptians trying to cross in our direction. They have bombed various places in Sinai. The story about a naval battle is a cover-up for their action." (Ibid.) At 9:07 a.m., Eban called Kissinger and said "the PM asked me to tell you that the story of naval action by us at the Gulf of Suez is false. Her Hebrew vocabulary is very rich and she poured it out. I asked her about our action so far. Our reaction so far has been defensive." (Ibid.) Both printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 31–32.

[3] On October 6, Zayyat sent a letter to the President of the UN General Assembly, informing him that at 6:30 a.m. that day Israeli air formations and naval units had attacked Egyptian forces stationed on the Gulf of Suez, and Egyptian forces were at present engaged in military operations against Israeli forces. The letter maintained that the aggression was a continuation of Israel's policy of annexation and consolidation of Arab territories and its insistence on the humiliation of the Arab peoples. Egypt called on all peace-loving peoples and countries to help put an end to Israel's continued acts of aggression, and Zayyat asked that this statement be circulated as a document of the General Assembly. Syrian Representative Kelani sent a similar letter to the President of the Security Council. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1173, Har-

believe. Why a naval attack? The Israelis claim that so far the fighting is still mostly in Israeli territory and that they have confined themselves to defensive action. My own impression is that this one almost certainly was started by the Arabs. It is almost inconceivable that the Israelis would start on the holiest holiday for the Jews when there is no need to and there is no evidence that the Israelis launched air attacks, and they gave us an assurance which we passed on this morning that they would not launch a preemptive attack and we told the Arabs that if the Israelis launch a preemptive attack that we would oppose them and they should exercise restraint. My view is that the primary problem is to get the fighting stopped and then use the opportunity to see whether a settlement could be enforced.

P: You mean a diplomatic settlement of the bigger problem?

K: That is right. There is going to be a Security Council meeting almost certainly today and we are still debating whether we should call it or the Israelis should. Somebody has to call it in the next hour.

P: I think we should. We ought to take the initiative. Can't we get the Russians to? I think we ought to take the initiative and you ought to indicate you talked to me.

K: Let me call Dobrynin right away on that. In the debate there are going to be a lot of wild charges all over the place.

P: Don't take sides. Nobody ever knows who starts the wars out there.

K: There are two problems on the immediate thing. The long term I think it is impossible now to keep maintaining the status quo ante. On the immediate thing we have to get the Soviets drawn in on the side of the Arab group—then it would be involved. If they join us in a neutral approach in which both of us say we don't know who started it but that we want to stop it, that would be best. If they make a defense on the part of the Arabs. But first we ought to see if they will join us in a neutral approach—that will be the best.

P: Let me know what develops.

K: We have sent you a report an hour ago,[4] but that is already overtaken. I may return to Washington today.

P: OK, thank you.

---

old H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, 1973 Middle East War, 7 October 1973, File No. 2) USUN transmitted the texts of the two letters in telegram 3696, October 7. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

[4] Message from Kissinger to Nixon, October 6, 1250Z. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 664, Country Files, Middle East, Middle East War, Memos & Misc., Oct. 6, 1973–Oct. 17, 1973)

105. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

October 6, 1973, 9:35 a.m.

K: I have just talked to the President[2] and he asked me to make the following suggestion to you. There will be undoubtedly a Security Council meeting today don't you think?

D: I think so. Because the situation is very dangerous.

K: We would be prepared to take a neutral position in the Council as to the facts of the matter asking that we don't know who started what but we are in favor of status quo ante.

D: Your suggestion is restoration of ceasefire line.

K: Restoration of ceasefire line and restoration of ceasefiring and then have a fact finding commission. We are prepared to proceed with the discussions which Gromyko and I and the President agreed on on the settlement.

D: Outside the SC.

K: Yes.

D: Just between us.

K: Right. We are willing to look at the whole situation. Now if you take the position that you will have to defend the Arabs we will be forced into the position of defending what we believe—of making clear we believed the Arabs launched the attack[3] and we are then in a hell of a mess. It will affect a lot of our relationships.

D: I understand.

K: Moscow's constructive approach would be if we both took the position of it's not the time to discuss who started what. Let's get the

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking. Kissinger was in New York; Dobrynin was in Washington.

[2] See Document 104.

[3] During a 9:20 a.m. telephone conversation, Kissinger discussed the question of an Israeli attack with Dobrynin: "K: Our information is that the Egyptians and Syrians have attacked all along their fronts and also . . . D: Is it the canal? K: The canal and the Golan Heights. Zayyat is claiming the Israelis launched a naval attack on some isolated spot in the Gulf of Suez and that triggered the whole thing." Kissinger went on to say that an Israeli attack on the Gulf of Suez was "baloney." He indicated that the United States was using "maximum influence with the Israelis to show restraint." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22)

fighting stopped and restore the ceasefire line and call on all parties to observe the ceasefire line.

D: I think it is a constructive way to start.

K: We will hold up anything until we hear from you. Can you get us a quick answer?

D: If I could use the hot line. I have my own ticker. It is open.

K: This is no secret.

D: I will use the ticker.

K: Do it on the ticker. I would say people listening in on your end are under better control than on ours. I think it's all right. You go ahead.

D: O.k.

---

106. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the White House Chief of Staff (Haig)[1]

October 6, 1973, 10:35 a.m.

K: I wanted to bring you up to date on where we stand and to tell you my strategy. You may have to calm some people down.

H: Good. I am sitting with the President.

K: O.K. The Egyptians have crossed the Canal at five places and the Syrians have penetrated in two places into the Golan Heights. This we get from the UN observers. Our assessment here is re the facts, it is inconceivable that the Israelis' attack would turn in two hours and have the Egyptians crossing the Canal.

H: No question about that.

K: Inconceivable. We have to assume an Arab attack.

H: I think the President feels that way.

K: The open question is, is it with Soviet collusion or against Soviet opposition. On that we have no answer yet. I have called first, as for as our public position, the Sec. Gen. who leaks like a sieve, to tell him about all of the efforts we have made and I have told him that I have

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking. Haig was in Key Biscayne with the President and Kissinger was in New York.

been in touch with the Soviets. I have been in touch with Dobrynin and said we should jointly call a Security Council.[2] The Soviets and we. And we jointly offer a resolution calling for an end of the fighting and return to the ceasefire lines established in 1967. I have told them this would be a sign of good faith towards both of us and we would hold up calling for a Security Council until we hear from them. I have informed the Sec. Gen. of that. The Soviets said they would get an answer from Moscow. This is designed in part to smoke them out. If they want the fighting stopped this will stop it fast. If they refuse to do this then we have to assume some collusion. Now if they refuse to do it we have two problems. The first is to get the fighting stopped and the second is the longterm policy. In order to get the fighting stopped we cannot give the Soviets and the Arabs the impression that we are separating too far from the Israelis. That will keep it going.

H: Right.

K: Therefore, as to the facts of the issue, if the Soviets could cooperate with us we will take a neutral position. We will say we don't know the facts but they should stop fighting. You see what I mean?

H: Right.

K: If the Soviets do not cooperate with us and wholeheartedly back the Arabs on the immediate issue of the fighting we, in my judgment, have to lean toward the Israelis.

H: Right.

K: For these reasons: 1) In order to get the fighting stopped; 2) to prevent the Soviets from coming in at least with (bluster and get a *cheap* shot?)[3] and 3) to put some money in the bank with the disassociation with the Israelis in subsequent efforts to get a settlement. All depends now on the Soviet reaction. Then after we get the fighting stopped we should use this as a vehicle to get the diplomacy started. Now there is no longer an excuse for a delay. The return to the ceasefire will have two aspects. If today the problem means the Arabs would have to give up a little territory—my estimate is that starting tomorrow evening the (Arabs) will have to give up territory. My view is if the Israelis make territorial acquisitions we have to come down hard on them to force them to give them up. You see.

H: Yes.

K: We have to do that in case of the Arabs but I think it is an embarrassment—we won't have very long.

---

[2] See Document 105.

[3] Apparently the recording secretary was uncertain of Kissinger's words.

H: Yes. Unless we have had a terrible erosion there.

K: That is the strategy that I am proposing. I think we have no choice. I think the worst thing we could do is to now take a sort of neutral position while the fighting is going on, unless the Soviets take a neutral position with us. If they take one with us, we should take a neutral position. That is ideal. If they don't join us and go to the other side we have to tilt.

H: Sure.

K: You see what I mean?

H: Absolutely.

K: If the Soviets are all out on the other side we have a mischievous case of collusion and then we have September 1970 all over again and we had better then be tough as nails.

H: The President is seriously considering going back to Washington.

K: I think that a grave mistake. There is nothing we can do right now. You should wait to see how it develops. Wait until at least this afternoon. So far not even a Security Council meeting has been called.

H: He agrees with that. His problem is if it is an all out war for him to be sitting down here in this climate would be very, very bad.

K: Let's wait for the Soviet answer. If the Soviets refuse to cooperate with us, we will know we are in a confrontation and he should then take leadership.[4]

H: I think he will be comfortable with that.

K: If the Soviets do not face us, then I think he should stay down there.

H: Right. O.K.

K: You will make sure that the President is comfortable with this strategy. I think it is our only possible course and it has to be seen in the general context of his ability to act and of what follows afterwards.

H: Is there any effort to get the fleet in a decent posture. The President is concerned about that.

---

[4] At 11:25 a.m., Kissinger telephoned Dobrynin and said he had talked to the President, who had asked that he call and "underline his very grave concern that this not be used to destroy everything that it has taken us three years to build up." After warning that all-out Soviet support for the Arabs would be in effect encouraging what seemed clearly an Arab attack, Kissinger said that the United States was prepared to take a neutral position before the Security Council if the Soviet Union did and to support a joint resolution calling for a return to the cease-fire line. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 47–48.

K: That is right. The fleet has been instructed into a position just short of calling them back to ship. They are to locate their people and move on several hours notice.[5]

H: He does want them assembled as soon as possible for appropriate action if needed.

K: That is being done but we wanted to wait until reports are confirmed and that will be issued within the hour. They need that much time to locate their people.

H: I will be back after discussing it with the President.

[5] At 11:55 a.m., Kissinger called Shalev and informed him that the United States was getting the Sixth Fleet together and would start moving it toward the Eastern Mediterranean. He said that the U.S. Government would "almost certainly approve tomorrow the military equipment within reason that you need, especially if the Soviets line up with the Arabs, then we will certainly do it." Kissinger added that when there was a Security Council meeting, the United States was going to propose a restoration of the cease-fire and the cease-fire lines, whether or not the Soviets agreed. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 50–51.

107. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the White House Chief of Staff (Haig)[1]

October 6, 1973, 12:45 p.m.

H: I wanted to tell you the President feels he definitely has to come back to Washington.

K: I think you are making a terrible mistake.

H: We are not going to announce it and we will not go back until 7:00 tonight.

K: I would urge you to keep any Walter Mitty tendencies under control.

H: That is not the problem. He has a situation with Agnew[2] which prohibits his staying down here. On top of that he knows if he is sitting here in the sun and there is a war going on he is in for terrible criticism.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking. Haig was in Key Biscayne with the President and Kissinger was in New York.

[2] Vice President Spiro Agnew was under pressure to resign for financial irregularities when he was a state official and later Governor of Maryland. Agnew resigned on October 10.

K: What time are you leaving.

H: We would leave about 7:00 and announce it around 3:00 or 4:00. We could do it low key.

K: There is no low-key way to do it.

H: That is true but he feels very strongly that he is just not going to sit down here.

K: What does he think is going on?

H: He thinks nothing is going on.

K: Are you with him now?

H: No, I just left him.

K: What we don't need now is a war council meeting and getting ourselves into the middle of it. We are not in the middle of it. To the American people it is a local war. Let them beat them up for a day or two and that will quiet them down.

H: We have no doubt about that but suppose you get a negative response.

K: So what. Our line is we are for a ceasefire and a return to pre-ceasefire positions. Let the Soviets take another line and we will start moving the fleet around a little bit which will take 48 hours to surface. I just think we should be tough in substance but not have any dramatic moves.

H: We are returning to Washington.

K: What is he going to do?

H: It is conceivable we will have an announcement about the Vice President. That is the first thing.

K: That is a slightly different problem.

H: You bet it is and what I am telling you is the two are going to be linked together. He cannot be sitting down here in the sun with what is going on in the VP thing. It is not firm yet but we will know very shortly.

K: If that other thing is happening then I can see a reason for coming back from the point of view of diplomacy. I would keep his return for later. Supposing the Soviets get tough and if he then returns that would be a good move. If he returns early it looks like an hysterical move. I am giving you my honest opinion. If the Soviets took a position of having kicked us in the teeth that would be a signal that things are getting serious. We will not have heard by 3:00. We probably won't know until the first thing in the morning.

H: Alright. I will try to hold this down here.

K: I would hold him until the first thing in the morning.

H: O.K.

K: We have put him into the involvement with all morning phone calls. Ron[3] can put that out too.

H: Right. O.K.

K: But don't you agree, speaking personally?

H: I know, except I know about the other problem.[4]

K: You are a better judge of that. The problem I am handling in my judgment is if we played this as a crisis—say nothing, act tough, without stirring up the atmosphere.

H: Right. I will be in touch. I will go back to him on this thing.

K: Thank you.[5]

---

[3] Ron Ziegler, White House Press Secretary.

[4] The unraveling of the Watergate scandal.

[5] At 1:10 p.m., Kissinger called Haig back and said that he was opposed to Nixon's return unless there was an overriding reason. He noted that, first, "this thing" might be over in 24 hours; second, it might be amicably settled; and third, they should use the President when it would do him some good. He warned that Nixon must avoid looking hysterical. Haig said that he had taken care of it and that the President had settled down. Kissinger said he would come to the White House when he returned and hold a WSAG meeting. He said he would report to them in detail, and added that he was trying to get the President involved in a way that would do the country some good. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22)

---

108. Message From the Soviet Leadership to President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Moscow, October 6, 1973, 2:10 p.m.

The Soviet leadership got the information about the beginning of military actions in the Middle East at the same time as you got it.[2] We take all possible measures to clarify real state of affairs in that region, since the information from there is of a contradictory nature. We fully share your concern about the conflagration of the situation in the

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 68, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 19, July 13, 1973–Oct. 11, 1973. Top Secret. The message was telephoned by Ambassador Dobrynin.

[2] Kissinger wrote later that "this may have been technically true. But they withdrew their civilians from Egypt and Syria two days before, clearly in anticipation of imminent war." (*Crisis*, p. 53)

Middle East. We repeatedly pointed in the past to the dangerous situation in that area.

We are considering now as well as you do, possible steps to be taken. We hope soon to contact you again for possible coordination of positions.[3]

[3] Kissinger telephoned Dobrynin at 3:50 p.m. and said that the Soviet message either meant they were confused or that they were cooperating with the Arabs. He warned that putting the issue before the UN General Assembly, as the Egyptians wanted, would be "a frivolous act" and that if it turned into a General Assembly debate, the United States would let the fighting take its course, certain that it would end in a military victory for the Israelis. He emphasized that the issue should be put before the Security Council and said he would wait until 5 p.m. for a Soviet answer. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) When he talked with Shalev at 4 p.m., Kissinger said that the United States thought that the General Assembly was an extremely bad forum for Israel and that they had to call a Security Council meeting. Shalev agreed. (Ibid.) Kissinger told Haig at 4:15 p.m. to tell the President he was still waiting for the Soviet reply and if he didn't have it by 6 p.m., the United States would call for a Security Council meeting. (Ibid.) All transcripts are printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 55–58.

109. Memorandum From Secretary of State Kissinger to President Nixon[1]

Washington, October 6, 1973.

SUBJECT

Arab-Israeli Fighting

Fighting broke out on the Egyptian and Syrian fronts at about 2:00 Middle East time (8:00 a.m. Washington). Tension had been building for several days as a result of the high state of Egyptian alert and Syrian troop redeployments. Yesterday the Soviets began to fly transport planes into Damascus and Cairo to take dependents out of the area, apparently in anticipation of imminent conflict. Early this morning the Israelis, reversing their earlier assessment, told us that they had firm intelligence that a coordinated Egyptian-Syrian attack would take place before nightfall.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 664, Country Files, Middle East, Middle East War, Memos & Misc., Oct. 6, 1973–Oct. 17, 1973. Top Secret; Codeword. Printed from an uninitialed copy. The memorandum is on White House stationery but Kissinger was still in New York.

The Course of the Fighting

The Israelis told us that they would not open hostilities, and we have no reason to believe that they did. Their reconnaissance planes were active just prior to the outbreak of the fighting, however, and our intelligence sources are not exactly sure how the battle began. In the first day of combat, most of the fighting has been along the cease-fire lines. The Israelis appear to have attained control of the air, but have not bombed Arab airfields or made deep raids beyond the cease-fire lines. The Egyptians have managed to cross the Suez Canal in a few areas, and are trying to maintain their toeholds in the Sinai. Israeli counterattacks against these positions can be expected during the night. The Israelis will be very reluctant to accept a cease-fire with a return to the status quo ante.

On the Syrian front there has been intense fighting, but Syrian forces have not penetrated Israeli anti-tank defenses. Jordan has remained outside the battle. Casualties are not yet known, but the Egyptians have admitted losing ten aircraft. Soviet military moves in the area have not been provocative thus far.

Diplomatic Steps

As soon as we learned of the likelihood of hostilities, I contacted Ambassador Dobrynin and told him the Israelis had told us they would not open hostilities. I also talked to the Israelis, who reassured me there would be no preemptive strike.[2] Subsequently, I saw the Egyptian and Syrian Foreign Ministers.[3] We sent messages to Kings Hussein and Faisal as well.[4] Once hostilities had begun, we explored the possibility of gaining Soviet support for a Security Council meeting that would call for a cease-fire with a return to the status quo ante. We have had no reply and have not formally asked for a Security Council meeting.

The WSAG met this morning[5] to consider what step we should take to protect US interests. It will meet again this afternoon. US forces in the Mediterranean have been alerted, but have not been moved as yet.

Critical Issues

Thus far American citizens in the Middle East seem to be safe and there have been no threats of an Arab oil boycott. If fighting resumes to-

---

[2] See Documents 99 and 100.

[3] See Document 101. The meeting with Syrian Foreign Minister Kelani has not been identified.

[4] See Document 102.

[5] See Document 103.

morrow and the Arabs suffer serious setbacks, both these US interests could be endangered.

On the diplomatic front we face a possible issue of how to handle a call for a cease-fire in place. The Israelis would be very reluctant to accept a cease-fire that left any of the occupied territories in Arab hands, but we could encounter strong international pressures to urge the Israelis not to reopen hostilities tomorrow.

---

110. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, October 6, 1973, 5:45 p.m.

Dobrynin: I have a reply from Moscow in connection with the two or three talks with the President on the convocation of the Security Council. Here is a summary:

We have a serious doubt about what kind of results could be achieved by a hasty convocation of the Security Council meeting right now. As far as we know not a single side asked for a convocation of the Security Council from the conflicting parties.[2]

Secondly, the circumstances are not quite clear in a sense that there is no yet clear communications with the conflicting parties. We presume, both we and you, have no circumstance to have good communications with the parties of the conflict to find out what is going on. Under these circumstances, we feel it would be rather undesirable to have the meeting because this meeting would lead to open polemics between yours and ours as is well known our position in the Middle East

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 68, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 19, July 13, 1973–Oct. 11, 1973. Top Secret.

[2] At 5:20 p.m., Ambassador Scali telephoned Kissinger to report that Security Council members favored informal consultations among individual members, the purpose of which would be to produce a paper under the name of Sir Laurence McIntyre, President of the Security Council, or the Secretary General appealing to both sides for a cease-fire, rather than a formal meeting. Scali questioned whether informal Security Council sessions would be adequate and warned that unless the Security Council was formally seized of the matter, it might lead to a big General Assembly debate. Kissinger said that they would be getting messages from the Soviets in the next hour and that he would then have specific instructions. (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22)

is known. And our positions wouldn't change for this particular meeting of the Security Council. We would be forced to state our known position and open confrontation with you.

Our position in the Middle East for many years since '67—Israel who occupied Arab lands and victims of aggression, the Arab countries, whose territories are occupied. We don't think this will lead anywhere. We will be forced to say already there are good resolutions in the UN organization. The matter is to fulfill them. We feel it is undesirable to convene the Security Council. At the same time in the complicated and rather dangerous situation, the matter continues of close consultation between us and how to settle the Middle East problem. This is a summary of the telegram. I will be here. I am available.[3]

[3] At 6:20 p.m., Kissinger telephoned Dobrynin and asked for his interpretation of the Soviet message. Dobrynin responded that his impression was that his government did not have information from the Arabs and thought that a Security Council session would become polemical with their two countries on the front lines. Kissinger pointed out that there had been a military attack and that it was one thing for the Soviet Union to take a stand in preliminary negotiations, but quite another once hostilities had started. He asked why, if the Soviets knew of the impending attack, they did not inform the United States. He warned that a brawl in the General Assembly on Monday (October 8) would make the situation insoluble and noted that the United States had been holding up the Israelis on bombing but doubted it could keep this up. Dobrynin promised to talk to Moscow. (Ibid.) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 63–65.

111. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, October 6, 1973, 7:20 p.m.

K: Here is what we will do. In deference to the message which you have sent us[2] we will not go to the SC tonight though it originally was to go at 6:00 o'clock. We will wait for a decision on how to proceed until 9:00 tomorrow.

D: In the morning.

K: Yes. Give you a chance to go to church. If you could get me an answer from Moscow which is a little more specific than this.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking. Blank underscores are omissions in the original.

[2] See Document 110.

D: On what.

K: What exactly are your intentions. My impression is—I understand you don't want to get into a public disassociation.

D: I will put it quite friendly. We are rather in a difficult position publicly.

K: If you can give us some indication what you are doing privately. You and I have handled these things private. We are interested in the results. We want a ceasefire and status quo ante. I repeat by Tuesday[3] you will be asking us. It is not a question in which we are asking for a favor. We are trying to prevent an exacerbation of our relationship. A situation where in this country and the Congress will have very serious consequences. If you tell us you are working with the Egyptians and the Syrians and by Monday morning this will be over and no further debate is necessary.

If you will tell us that you believe that by Monday morning that there is in effect a ceasefire and return to the status quo ante. We don't want this to become a public affair. Tell us something we can understand. It will be kept confidential as everything has been kept between us. I am not asking for you to agree for concerted publication. I am asking you tomorrow morning for a concerted practical action. That will lead to the result we want. I genuinely believe and you will tell Gromyko and Brezhnev by Tuesday at the latest the situation will be a different show. Right, no?

D: I understand.

K: Our reading of the situation is that the Arab attack has been totally contained, that now they are going to be pushed back and this process will accelerate as the mobilization is completed which will be no later than Monday morning and after that we will see what we have seen before. This is our military reading of the situation. We think if the matter could be wound up tomorrow. The Arabs have proved their point. They have attacked across the Canal. They can withdraw on their own and return to the status quo. We can both enjoy a good SC debate.

D: I don't understand in a political sense what do you think. What do you want? From our point of view our position which is a principle from the beginning of '67.

K: I know your position.

D: It is not a public debate that I am telling you for us to tell the Arabs is very difficult. I had rather hear from Moscow but as I understand our position the difficulties we are now facing is that the Arabs

[3] October 9.

are trying to regain the lands occupied by Israel. They have been using that argument to us and for us to tell them you cannot free your land, it is ridiculous.

K: I recognize the situation. I am not saying it is all easy. We have a different situation. There have not been any raids on Damascus and Cairo but I would not bet anything on tomorrow.

D: I understand.

K: Is it possible for the Politburo to imagine a complete course of action which we agree on privately.

D: What course of action do you propose besides SC.

K: A de facto return to the status quo ante, a de facto return of the ceasefire. I have already told the Egyptians that I would make an effort after the Israeli election. I have told Gromyko I would talk to him in January. None of this we will do if these pressures continue.

D: I understand.

K: We have a framework out of which we could crystallize. The Arabs have now proved their point.

D: Henry, how could they?

K: You see they are going to lose. It is not a case where we are asking. Not like India and Pakistan.

D: I understand. The military point of view. I cannot argue with you. You know the situation better. I am trying to understand the situation better politically. Million or half a million.

K: They have next to nothing.

D: What is the question—asking them to return somewhere if they have nothing.

K: We have two choices; we can let this war continue until the exact calibrated moment when the Israelis have pushed out of every territory but before they start heading for Damascus. If we are lucky and hit that moment exactly right we can hit the ceasefire then. Probability is that the Arabs can hold on another 24 hours and then going to retreat to their capital and wait for winter.

D: I understand what the situation really is. But for us to go to the Arabs and say look here I don't know how many you have, one—one or two miles, but you have to go back. They say you invite us to give back territory that belongs to us.

K: Can you not say that it was your understanding that an effort was going to be made for negotiations. They have proved their point of the urgency in which they see this and this is a good psychological moment for them to make a generous gesture rather than wait until the outcome of these hostilities. By Monday evening they will be flown out of there anyway.

D: I understand.

K: This is a new strategy of using the threat of one's own defeat.

D: I know. There are many that could be said. The question is from the practical way. From a practical point of view because they put on us all the cats and dogs. On the Russians because we asked them to give back land which we have already said . . .

K: I understand your dilemma.

D: They will say you are in collusion with the US and Israelis.

K: Who will be the first.

D: Cairo. From a man you met. The Russians were in collusion with the US and (unable to understand).

K: If you and we could find a way of settling this now then it would be an overwhelming argument in all of the things we have been going through as to what the practical consequences have been of our relationship.

D: I understand.

K: I think it would overwhelm in one blow all of these things we have been facing. If it goes the other way and Monday you and we are going to be up at the rostrum calling each other names. It will be a disaster

D: I can assure you we will not be calling the US names. I am not sure what the Israelis will be calling.

K: You know some of the local people cannot always distinguish those two.

D: We will try to put them out of the country on this particular American line. You understand?

K: I understand.

D: This we could take care of.

K: It still would not change the objective condition. The various people who are harassing you will be more inflamed.

D: I know. That is why I keep returning to the practical thing. You understand.

K: I understand it.

D: They would say you have spoken of liberating. It is impossible for us.

K: I think directed against both of us.

D: For us to tell Sadat make a communiqué.

K: Anatol, with all due respect, we will face this problem somewhere in the next 48 hours. Suppose you do nothing and we do nothing by Tuesday, or Wednesday at the latest the Arabs will be defeated unless our estimates are wrong. At that point what are we going to do.

D: Did you approach once more the Egyptians.

K: No. You think I should.

D: I think you should. Tell them your estimate. Otherwise it would be such an invitation. You are _____ and we their friends are saying go back from your own land.

K: I will approach them tonight and I will call you after I have talked to them.[4]

D: I think it would be much better. From us, it would look like we are trying to sell them out.

K: We have to leave it at this. We will not go to the SC tonight to give ourselves a chance to think. You think and we will think. Try to get me an expression from Moscow by 8:00 in the morning.

D: Ask for 9:00. That is 5:00.

K: Tell them they will have to go to early mass.

D: They would find it strange to have these kind of discussions going on over the weekend.

K: I can imagine what kind of discussion is going on there. I understand the _____ are very happy today.

D: This is a basic problem. I also understand your ingenuity.

K: If I have any ideas I will call you.

D: Not at night. I go to sleep quite early.

K: You are not going to bed now, are you.

D: No.

K: What you have to understand is if it turns into a propaganda battle on Monday in the GA, then our only protection is to be extremely tough and to teach the facts of life to people who like to make great speeches and we will see what is more important—a speech or reality. I will be very brutal. That will be our strategy. We want to get it settled before then at least with an understanding.

D: As from the US no particular attempt from our side.

K: Anatol, in the GA it will be a bloody mess. Nobody can control it.

D: You are right.

---

[4] Kissinger telephoned Zayyat at 8:48 p.m. to "touch base at the end of a hectic day." Kissinger gave Zayyat his estimate of the outcome of the fighting and told him "we would like to have this thing wound up in a way that does not make it more difficult to resume what I thought was a beginning of a better possibility of a discussion." Zayyat denied that he wanted a debate in the General Assembly. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) At 9:10 p.m., Kissinger telephoned Dobrynin to give him the gist of his talk with Zayyat. (Ibid.) The transcript of the conversation with Zayyat is printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 76–81.

K: It is going to be a blood bath.

D: It is true.

K: Then your allies are going to get up there and you will have to do as well as they.

D: As to speaking about allies I read you were going to build a pipeline.

K: A pipeline.

D: I mean your Asian friends.

K: I am saying the GA will be a mess. Why don't you report this to Gromyko.

D: You keep in mind what I mentioned to you. About asking them to withdraw from what is theirs.

K: I understand that problem. Maybe there is some formula we can both think about. Let's not let time slip by. I believe the military will rapidly deteriorate and we will be in a mess.[5]

[5] At 8:20 p.m., Kissinger telephoned Dobrynin and said he had talked again to the President, who asked him to call the Ambassador to reaffirm personally that he supported everything Kissinger had said and that the United States would wait another 12 hours. (Ibid.) Kissinger telephoned again at 11 p.m. to reiterate that Nixon had agreed that they would wait until 9 a.m. the next day. He noted that they had not yet decided whether to ask for a Security Council meeting, but they had decided to do something. (Ibid.)

112. Minutes of Washington Special Actions Group Meeting[1]

Washington, October 6, 1973, 7:22–8:27 p.m.

SUBJECT

Middle East

PARTICIPANTS

Chairman—Henry A. Kissinger

State
Kenneth Rush
Joseph Sisco
Robert McCloskey

DOD
James Schlesinger
James Noyes
Jerry W. Friedheim

JCS
Adm. Thomas H. Moorer

CIA
William Colby

NSC Staff
Major Gen. Brent Scowcroft
William Quandt
Jeanne W. Davis

Treasury
William Simon

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

It was agreed that:

1) the Carrier Task Force in Athens will be ordered to proceed to the eastern end of Crete;

2) any reply to the Israeli request for equipment would be delayed until Monday or Tuesday;[2]

3) State will prepare a report on the status of plans for evacuation of Americans from the area, should this become necessary;

4) a Task Force under the direction of Mr. Sisco will prepare a coordinated, detailed contingency scenario for a possible move into Libya to rescue American citizens;

5) a coordinated study will be prepared by State, Treasury and the NSC on various contingencies involving an oil cut-off and our choices in each contingency;[3]

6) press statements will be coordinated by Bob McCloskey at State until the return of Ron Ziegler, when coordination will transfer to the White House; if asked about 6th Fleet movements, Defense will confirm the movements but say we do not discuss details of such move-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 129, Country Files, Middle East, Nodis/Cedar/Plus, 1971–1974. Top Secret; Nodis; Codeword. The meeting took place in the White House Situation Room.

[2] October 8 or 9.

[3] This paper was discussed at the October 7 WSAG meeting; see Document 121.

ments; if asked about American citizens, we will say that the need for evacuation has not arisen but that we have contingency plans and are ready to act.

Mr. Kissinger: Bill (Colby), may we have your briefing? I have already read your latest situation report. (attached)[4] Has everyone read it? If so, maybe we don't need a briefing.

Mr. Colby: I'll just summarize briefly. The Egyptians did make some progress over the Canal. They also carried out some helicopter operations and lost some in the process. Things have quieted down some now with nightfall.

Adm. Moorer: They lost 4 out of 15 in one group and 6 out of 10 in another.

Mr. Kissinger: Eban told me the Egyptians lost 15 helos.[5] How many men does that mean?

Mr. Schlesinger: 30 per aircraft.

Mr. Colby: Israel's defense on the Canal isn't a line defense—it's a series of bunkers.

Mr. Kissinger: How long will it take Israel to push them out?

Mr. Colby: A couple of days.

Mr. Kissinger: Tom (Moorer), do you agree?

Adm. Moorer: Yes. Israel will start working on them about 1:00 a.m. our time when it gets light.

Mr. Kissinger: How did they pull off such a surprise?

Mr. Colby: Because they had had this exercise going for the last few days, and there had been a lot of activity, much of it unimportant.

Adm. Moorer: They have done it before. They have moved their forces up to the Canal and have sent raiding parties across. They have even exercised this bridge operation. [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Colby: On the Golan Heights the Israelis appear to have contained them.

---

[4] Attached, but not printed.

[5] At 6 p.m. on October 6, Eban provided Kissinger with a report over the telephone of the current military situation: "The Syrian advance fell because of nightfall. A garrison surrounded at Mount Hermon. No communication with the people in it. We have destroyed sixty tanks. A number of ours are out of action. Syrians have fired three missiles of the Frog type." Later in the conversation, Eban reported that Israel remained in a difficult position on the Egyptian front: "Have a bridgehead and during the night will try to pass forces over them. They shot one air-to-ground missile toward Tel Aviv. One of our aircraft shot it down—brought it down—while still in the air. Brought down about fifteen helicopters. Lost three aircraft on the Egyptian front. Fifty killed and 140 wounded." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 62–63.

Mr. Kissinger: Eban told me an Israeli outpost on Mount Hermon was surrounded.

Mr. Colby: The Israelis now claim to have retaken Mount Hermon.

Adm. Moorer: The Syrian tanks got in a minefield up there and had heavy losses. For what it's worth, Soviet naval forces in the Mediterranean are still in a routine disposition. The flagship is steaming east, but the rest of the ships are pretty well distributed throughout the area. (Displayed maps showing disposition of Soviet and U.S. fleet units in Mediterranean).

Mr. Kissinger: (referring to map) Our ships are sure as hell distributed throughout the area. You have called the men back to their ships?

Adm. Moorer: Yes.

Mr. Kissinger: The President wants to start moving them east. We can hold them around Crete.

Adm. Moorer: Do you want us to get them underway? That will be quite visible.

Mr. Kissinger: That's what he wants.

Mr. Schlesinger: Do you want both Task Forces to move? It will take about [*less than 1 line not declassified*] to get the one from Spain.

Mr. Kissinger: Let's keep the one in Athens until we get the other one further east.

Mr. Schlesinger: If you want to keep some ability in the area, we should move the one out of Athens. If you want visibility, we should move the one out of Spain.

Mr. Kissinger: It will be visible either way.

Mr. Schlesinger: You will be sending a clear signal either way. You may want to send that signal without necessarily moving deeper into the area.

Mr. Kissinger: Then let's move the one out of Athens. We may move the other one tomorrow, but for today let's move the Athens part.

Adm. Moorer: Do you want to move the carrier task force only?

Mr. Kissinger: What else do we have there?

Adm. Moorer: We've got an amphibious force—9 ships—that were there for that exercise.

Mr. Kissinger: Let's move only the carrier task force. Don't move the amphibious ships yet. Where are the amphibians?

Adm. Moorer: In Pireus with the carrier force.

Mr. Kissinger: Let's keep the amphibious there.

Mr. Schlesinger: It depends on where you think you might want to use them. If there is any trouble, I think it will be in Libya.

Gen. Scowcroft: Isn't part of that amphibious force a helo carrier?

Adm. Moorer: Yes, the *Guadalcanal*.

Mr. Kissinger: It seems most logical to move the carrier task force.

Adm. Moorer: To Crete.

Mr. Kissinger: Is that closer or further away?

Adm. Moorer: It's half-way between Tripoli and the Eastern Mediterranean.

Mr. Kissinger: Let's move toward the eastern end of Crete. Then if the situation is worse tomorrow, we can start moving the amphibious force. Later, if necessary, we can move the Western task force.

Adm. Moorer: I agree that the most likely evacuation area will be here. (indicating Libya on map)

Mr. Kissinger: But we may have to stand the Soviets off somewhere. There is no sign of that yet, but they may trigger themselves. Is either Arab state going to suffer a catastrophic defeat if the war continues?

Adm. Moorer: My personal view is that Israel will take advantage of the opportunity to severely punish Syria, by flanking movements and other means. Also, there are 2000 Moroccan soldiers in the southwest part of Syria who might get involved. I think the Israelis will see how many casualties they can inflict but I don't think they will go to Damascus.

Mr. Kissinger: If the Arabs suffer a real debacle, the Soviets may have difficulty staying out.

Mr. Colby: We may have the answer tonight. Israeli air can thoroughly punish Syrian military capability.

Adm. Moorer: I think they'll try to force the Egyptians back across the Canal, then stop.

Mr. Kissinger: How long will that take?

Adm. Moorer: A couple of days in the south. A little longer in the north.

Mr. Kissinger: How many Egyptians got across?

Adm. Moorer: About 20,000. They have been coming across at night. They try to do everything they can in darkness to escape the Israeli air. In the morning there will be a heavy Israeli air strike and the Egyptians have no place to hide.

Mr. Colby: The real question is whether Israel will confine itself to this or whether they will go further inland.

Mr. Schlesinger: It will be an abortive effort by the Egyptians. Whether or not it is a debacle depends on how soon it can be terminated. The Israelis will focus first on the Egyptians then will turn to the Syrians up north.

Mr. Colby: Remember this is the third round for the Soviets in providing equipment for Egypt. They might get a bit desperate.

Adm. Moorer: The Soviets haven't taken any military action that we know about.

Mr. Schlesinger: Quite the contrary.

Mr. Kissinger: What sort of action do you envisage over the next two days?

Mr. Colby: Elimination of the Egyptian bridgeheads, continued fighting and extension into Syria.

Adm. Moorer: And heavy air activity.

Mr. Kissinger: But no breakthrough? In previous wars, the Israelis have had a breakthrough within 36 hours. Not now?

Mr. Colby: It's a different situation.

Adm. Moorer: We had one report of a Kelt missile fired at Tel Aviv. If Tel Aviv is bombed, Israel might go for Cairo. But I think they will remove the bridgeheads, hold east of the Canal and then wax the Syrians up north.

Mr. Kissinger: Can they do this?

Adm. Moorer: I think so. Also they will attack the Frog missiles and the SAMs in Egypt.

Mr. Rush: I estimate that within a day or two a ceasefire with return to the status quo ante will be in order.

Adm. Moorer: A ceasefire will be easier to bring about in Egypt than in Syria. The ceasefire line will be restored more quickly in the south than in the north.

Mr. Kissinger: All right. First we have a number of practical things, then I'd like to discuss the political issues and our general strategy. What about evacuation?

Mr. Sisco: We have sent an alert message to our missions telling them to take preliminary precautions.[6] Assuming the military scenario goes as you describe, the frustration level will be pretty high in the Arab world. If their military activity is choked off, the danger of our missions increases substantially. We need to examine closely what we can do.

Mr. Kissinger: Have you checked with the Embassies to see that their plans are all in order?

Mr. Sisco: We have done that.

Mr. Kissinger: Are there any technical problems?

Mr. Sisco: The Task Force is working on that right now.

---

[6] See footnote 8, Document 103.

Adm. Moorer: I've talked to General Lee and told him to review the evacuation plans with emphasis on Lebanon and Libya.

Mr. Schlesinger: We should think about Dhahran, too.

Mr. Sisco: And Morocco.

Mr. Kissinger: We'll have another WSAG meeting tomorrow.[7] Can you have a report by then?

Mr. Sisco: Yes.

Mr. Kissinger: If the situation gets out of hand, we may want to put some additional forces into the Mediterranean. Do we know where they are?

Adm. Moorer: We've got that. The *Kennedy* is in the North Sea.

Mr. Kissinger: How long will it take to get it to the Mediterranean?

Adm. Moorer: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Schlesinger: There's no reason why it can't steam to Gibraltar.

Mr. Kissinger: It's too early for that. We don't want to excite the Russians.

Adm. Moorer: The *Kennedy*, 8 destroyers and 1 cruiser—they can be there [*less than 1 line not declassified*].

Mr. Kissinger: We may want to do that tomorrow.

Adm. Moorer: We also have an amphibious ready group in San Juan. That could be there in [*less than 1 line not declassified*]. This is a battalion—the same as in Athens. We had two battalions in Athens because of the exercise, but one Marine group was in reserve so they have been removed. But we have one ready group that we could fly back into Athens right away.

Mr. Kissinger: I'm just looking at various means of escalation. We have the task force in the Western Mediterranean, we could move the *Kennedy* south, and we have the amphibious unit in Puerto Rico. We have plenty to move.

Mr. Schlesinger: We also have our forces in Europe and we have the 82nd Airborne.

Adm. Moorer: We have one 82nd ready company now, one brigade in [*less than 1 line not declassified*] and the entire division in [*less than 1 line not declassified*].

Mr. Kissinger: Could you compress that to [*less than 1 line not declassified*]?

Adm. Moorer: We could compress it some. We have the unit in Germany, too: one air-borne infantry company in [*less than 1 line not de-*

[7] See Document 121.

classified] plus travel time; one airborne battalion and one brigade in [*less than 1 line not declassified*] plus travel time.

Mr. Schlesinger: You would have political problems in moving troops out of Germany.

Adm. Moorer: I've contacted all the commanders of the 82nd Airborne and our naval forces in the Mediterranean and the Atlantic. They're ready to move when they get the word.

Mr. Kissinger: It's still a little premature. As long as the commanders know and are at maximum readiness without calling people back onto base.

Adm. Moorer: The only callback is the 6th Fleet.

Mr. Kissinger: That's what we want. How would we get the 82nd Airborne in?

Adm. Moorer: Fly them in [*less than 1 line not declassified*].

Mr. Schlesinger: It would be easier through [*less than 1 line not declassified*].

Mr. Kissinger: Could they go directly from [*less than 1 line not declassified*]?

Adm. Moorer: In the Jordanian crisis we went [*less than 1 line not declassified*]. But Joe (Sisco) has [*less than 1 line not declassified*] so mad at us, they may not let us this time.

Mr. Sisco: (to Mr. Kissinger) I did think [*less than 1 line not declassified*] seemed a little prickly last night.

Mr. Schlesinger: [*less than 1 line not declassified*] has more fish to fry in the Arab world. It might be easier through [*less than 1 line not declassified*].

Mr. Kissinger: [*less than 1 line not declassified*] should be happy to do it since I refused to see their Foreign Minister.

Mr. Sisco: What about our public posture?

Mr. Kissinger: We'll talk about that later. We'll get McCloskey and Friedheim in for that. What about intelligence flights? I'm inclined to think we should stand down our routine flights off shore.

Adm. Moorer: We've backed off from [*less than 1 line not declassified*].

Mr. Kissinger: Right. Do we have a U–2 flight scheduled?

Mr. Colby: No. [*1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Kissinger: [*1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Colby: [*2 lines not declassified*]

Mr. Kissinger: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Colby: [*1½ lines not declassified*]

Mr. Kissinger: Let me bring you up to date on our diplomatic activity. If you have any comments, I will pass them to the President. The first thing I heard was at 6:00 this morning when I got the cable from (Ambassador) Keating on his conversation with the Prime Minister. I called Eban, Dobrynin, Zayyat, and the Israeli man here. I told them if Israel took preemptive action, we would oppose them. I told the Arabs not to move. Israel came back in about an hour and promised not to take preemptive action. I told the Egyptians and the Soviets this, but an hour later the action started. We also made an approach to Faisal and Hussein to use their influence. The Saudis have already published their rejection. Our major effort was to see how we could get it quieted down. Our major problems were 1) the position of the UN; 2) the general U.S. stance; and 3) the Soviet Union. Ideally we would like to deal with the matter jointly with the Soviet Union to get a ceasefire and a restoration of the status quo ante. But the Arabs in their demented state are opposed to the phrase "status quo ante." In three days, they will be begging us for it. But our problem is to get a position we can stand on for a few days. The Arabs are opposed to a Security Council meeting. They want to go to the General Assembly. The Europeans were all in favor of the Security Council until they ran into a little Arab opposition. Now they want informal consultations. At noon today, the British were begging me for condemnation of the Arabs, but now they want a simple ceasefire declaration.[8] If we don't get this into the Security Council, we will find ourselves in the General Assembly by Monday. The Arabs have indicated they will inscribe themselves for debate on Monday. They have told Secretary General Waldheim that the time on Monday depends on the military situation,[9] which is a truly cynical approach. If that happens, the situation will get out of control. First because of the Sino-Soviet dispute. Then, the Soviets will be driven by the non-aligned countries and the non-aligned countries are driven by the Arabs. We must get into the Security Council before it gets to the General Assembly. Then we can stone-wall in the General Assembly on the basis that the matter is in the hands of the Security Council. We have tried to get a common approach with the Soviets but they have difficulty with getting the Arabs to withdraw from the areas that were conquered. They haven't given us their last word on this, though.

Mr. Schlesinger: How about a joint position on a ceasefire?

Mr. Kissinger: Yes, but Israel won't accept it until the Egyptians and Syrians are thrown out. We'll have the situation where a Security

---

[8] Kissinger spoke on the telephone with Sir Donald Maitland at 11:35 a.m. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22)

[9] Waldheim summarized his talk with Zayyat during a 1:20 p.m. telephone conversation with Kissinger. (Ibid.)

Council resolution will be used against the victim. This will teach aggressors that they can launch an attack, then call for a Security Council resolution for a cease-fire and, if it is not accepted, call for its use against the victim. This makes the UN a completely cynical exercise. The Israelis will go to an all-out attack, get a ceasefire resolution drafted, grab as much territory as they can, then accept the ceasefire. If the Arabs were not demented, they will realize that in the long term, and I mean by Wednesday. . . . If we can go in with a ceasefire resolution which Israel can accept, then we could use it against Israel if necessary. And the Soviets won't get the credit for stopping the fighting.

So our strategy is to go in with a ceasefire, status quo ante resolution. We will let the military situation go on until all parties want to grab the resolution.

Mr. Schlesinger: Even Israel?

Mr. Kissinger: If it is done with the concurrence of Israel, they can't very well ask us to pull it back.

Mr. Colby: If the Israelis have moved far ahead, we will have a bargaining point.

Mr. Kissinger: Even if Israel wins, we will stick to the resolution. If we can force Israel out of their forward position, it will be a good point with the Arabs—if Israel gets beyond the ceasefire line.

Mr. Colby: Israel isn't interested in territory this time. They're interested in beating up the Arab forces.

Mr. Kissinger: This is a very critical period in our relations with the Soviets. If the Soviets get themselves into an anti-U.S. or an anti-Israel position, they can kiss MFN and the other things goodby. If we can get joint action, it might turn the situation around. They have a big stake in this. But if it gets into the General Assembly, the non-aligned countries are more anti-American than the Communists. The Non-aligned Conference passed 18 resolutions, of which 10 were violently anti-American and not one was supportive of the U.S. In the General Assembly we would have to be very tough. Our forum is the Security Council.

Mr. Colby: Is there an argument with the Soviets that their real interest lies with us and not with the crazy Arabs?

Mr. Kissinger: If anyone here can come up with a concrete proposal for the Soviets by about 10:00 p.m. this evening, it might get accepted. The Arabs and possibly the Soviets have been somewhat duplicitous. We had even discussed a schedule of negotiations—the next round in November and another in January. But that isn't important. We hadn't a prayer in the negotiations for a final settlement. One of the things we can offer Israel is some U.S. guarantee in return for withdrawal from some territory. This might give us a better opportunity to

make the guarantee look real, unless Israel steps across the ceasefire line.

Mr. Colby: If they agree to step back, we can give them the guarantee.

Mr. Kissinger: Are there any different views?

Mr. Schlesinger: Israel has requested a fairly substantial amount of military assistance. Their only real shortage is in mortar rounds.

Adm. Moorer: They've also asked for trucks and Sidewinder missiles.

Mr. Schlesinger: We can delay on this. Our shipping any stuff into Israel blows any image we may have as an honest broker.

Mr. Kissinger: Let's wait until tomorrow.

Mr. Schlesinger: We can hold off until Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. Rush: They have no real shortages. They plan better than that.

Mr. Schlesinger: I have one further question. Suppose Qadhafi begins to misbehave tomorrow?

Mr. Kissinger: What constitutes misbehaviour?

Mr. Schlesinger: Attacks on Americans sanctioned by the Government. We can expect him to nationalize the oil companies, sweeping aside the negotiations.

Mr. Rush: And the law prevents anyone engaged in operating a nationalized property from leaving the country.

Mr. Kissinger: What can we do?

Mr. Schlesinger: If he nationalizes, nothing. The real problem would be attacks on Americans. Then the question is if we go in just to rescue Americans or to stay.

Mr. Kissinger: We wouldn't get any Congressional amendment cutting off funds for that. Do we have a plan to get in?

Mr. Schlesinger: The Marines would take Wheelus Field and start flying in troops.

Mr. Kissinger: Could they hold Wheelus?

Adm. Moorer: Yes.

Mr. Kissinger: Then fly in the 82nd Airborne?

Mr. Schlesinger: Yes, or troops from Germany. There would be some short and long-term costs, but maybe some benefits, too.

Mr. Kissinger: The worst thing would be for the U.S. to come out looking as though our domestic difficulties had paralyzed us.

Mr. Schlesinger: But we have to wait for provocation. Otherwise it will look like 1956.

Mr. Kissinger: But we wouldn't move just for nationalization.

Mr. Colby: If we mounted anything more than a pure rescue mission, we would be in difficulty with the Soviets and in oil.

Mr. Kissinger: Let's get a coordinated, detailed contingency plan on what happens if we go into Libya. Alex Johnson was a master at this. Let's get a spread sheet, showing what agency is responsible for what, who has to be notified, what landing rights are required and when do we ask for them, when should we go to the Portuguese, etc. Let's get this by tomorrow night. From the time the first order is given until the 82nd Airborne is all in. (to Mr. Sisco) Joe, will you get a Task Force together to do this, with Defense, JCS and CIA.

Mr. Sisco: Yes, you all let me know whom we should work with.

Mr. Kissinger: What if oil supplies are cut off? What do we do?

Mr. Schlesinger: It depends on the kind of cut-off. If they cut off the U.S., it would be a failure. Qadhafi can do anything. They have a 60-day supply in Europe.

Mr. Rush: There would be no real problem for us.

Mr. Simon: Do you believe Libya would cut off the 300,000 barrels a day? Just against us?

Mr. Rush: They all exchange oil so freely that it wouldn't work.

Mr. Schlesinger: Qadhafi would just go into a rage and cut off everything.

Mr. Simon: You say Europe has a 60-day supply, but I don't believe it. If they do, it's like our 80-day supply which really isn't that, because we can't move it from place to place, it gets bogged down in pockets, etc.

Mr. Kissinger: So what happens?

Mr. Colby: The Europeans will scream.

Mr. Simon: The European fear of a cut-off might create an export embargo by the European Community.

Mr. Colby: A refining embargo.

Mr. Simon: We need this fuel oil to heat this winter.

Mr. Kissinger: What do we do?

Mr. Schlesinger: Begin to ration.

Mr. Simon: If there is a cut-off, we're already there.

Mr. Kissinger: We need to get an understanding of what will happen, and of what our choices are in each contingency. Who could do what? What does the U.S. Government do and with whom? Could we get this by tomorrow night.

Mr. Simon: Whom shall I work with.

Mr. Kissinger: Roy Atherton and Brent Scowcroft. What time shall we meet tomorrow?

Adm. Moorer: The afternoon will give us more time to work.

Mr. Kissinger: 5:00 p.m.?

Mr. Sisco: Also it will be dark by that time and we can assess the activities of the day.

Mr. Colby: Tomorrow's events will be from 1:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m., our time.

Mr. Kissinger: We'll keep you informed through Scowcroft if anything dramatic occurs.

Mr. Schlesinger: What about the movement of forces?

Mr. Kissinger: If I hear from the Soviets in the morning, I'll be in touch with you.

Adm. Moorer: I'll be home all day and will stay in touch with Jim (Schlesinger). We'll work it out.

Mr. Kissinger: I don't see the need for moving a lot of forces. Even a little move would be picked up, wouldn't it?

Adm. Moorer: You bet!

Mr. Schlesinger: What if Qadhafi goes on a rampage?

Mr. Kissinger: Then we'll get the Marines moving.

Let's get the public affairs people in. If we can get our resolution in, it might even be easier for the Russians to back us if Israel has crossed the ceasefire line. I think the Russians have no doubt who will win.

(Messrs. McCloskey and Friedheim joined the meeting)

Mr. Kissinger: Until Ziegler gets back, Bob McCloskey will give general guidance. He will tell everyone what we propose to say and everyone should clear any statements with him. When Ziegler gets back, the coordination will be done out of the White House. In New York, we have been talking in general terms without going in detail.

Mr. McCloskey: We have said nothing officially in New York. With regard to a Security Council meeting, we have said we are not opposed and that this is the subject of consultation among the Security Council members. I have traced the chronology of events and have implied we were misled—that throughout the Secretary's many conversations with Arab leaders there was no indication that the build-up was anything other than defensive. I have said that we had some independent reports and we ran them back through our own channels and were satisfied. The first indication we had was one report last night, then the word at 6:00 a.m. this morning. Our first step was to undertake diplomatic consultations to try to prevent the outbreak of fighting. Once the fighting had begun, we urged restraint on all parties. I have underscored throughout that the Secretary is carrying out the instructions of the President. I said there was a WSAG meeting earlier today and the press is aware of this meeting.

Mr. Kissinger: Defense will be questioned about the movement of forces. We should say yes, they are moving.

Adm. Moorer: We've already been asked about the callback for 6th Fleet personnel. We said it was precautionary.

Mr. Schlesinger: We can say they are putting to sea as a precautionary measure in order to be more ready if called on.

Mr. Kissinger: Let's make it as bland as possible. There should be no speculation on our UN activity or anything else.

Mr. Sisco: Who will put this out?

Mr. Kissinger: We should wait until Defense is asked about it, then have them reply. We shouldn't volunteer.

Mr. Schlesinger: We don't need to.

Adm. Moorer: Shall I instruct the commanders now to say the move is precautionary, or do you want them to come back here?

Mr. Schlesinger: They had better "no comment" and come back here. Jerry Friedheim can handle it.

Mr. McCloskey: If we're that explicit, it might raise the level. I think we should just say we don't discuss fleet movements. It depends on the effect you want.

Mr. Kissinger: If we say we don't discuss fleet movements, that implies we're moving. It sounds more mysterious and that might be better for us.

Mr. McCloskey: If you're more explicit and go into the Security Council, it just gives people another thing to hammer you on.

Mr. Friedheim: We can confirm that the ships have moved, but say we don't discuss details of fleet movements.

Mr. Schlesinger: When would they move?

Adm. Moorer: I was going to tell them tomorrow morning—at 9:00 a.m. their time.

Mr. Kissinger: That's 2:00 a.m. our time so, by tomorrow morning, the move will be known.

Adm. Moorer: I will say in the morning of October 7 move to a holding area southeast of Crete. Then we can say we don't discuss the details of fleet movements.

Mr. Schlesinger: The problem is that they might infer that the ships are moving into the area itself. Of course, we may want them to think that.

Mr. Kissinger: We mustn't be too defensive. Then every time they move further east, there will be trouble. I can live with the statement about a precautionary measure, but I think it's best to say we don't discuss fleet movements. Some people will scream, but we can talk later about evacuation if we want to.

Adm. Moorer: If one force stays in port, it's not the same as if the whole Fleet were moving.

Mr. McCloskey: What about American citizens?

Mr. Kissinger: We should say we have contingency plans. That the need hasn't arisen for evacuation, but we are ready to act.

Adm. Moorer: I told Senator Fulbright that we constantly maintained our contingency plans.

Mr. Kissinger: We can say we are getting our evacuation plans in order. We'll meet at 5:00 p.m. tomorrow.

---

113. Message From Secretary of State Kissinger's Executive Assistant (Eagleburger) to Secretary of State Kissinger)[1]

Washington, October 6, 1973.

Sir:

Eban just called to pass on the following points to you:

—Israel appreciates the Secretary's decision to defer Security Council action.

—Israel will accept no ceasefire as long as Syrian/Egyptian troops are "over the line."

—The Israelis believe "there are good prospects" of forcing the Egyptian and Syrian troops out of their territory within three days.

—Israel will never accept any solution which gives an advantage to an aggressor.

—The military situation is "not unsatisfactory."[2]

—In sum, Israel desires time to recoup its position. At that time Israel will be prepared to accept "a plain ceasefire."

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 27 ARAB–ISR. Top Secret; Sensitive. A handwritten note reads: "Passed to Brent [Scowcroft] at Larry's request."

[2] At 6:25 p.m., Eban had telephoned Kissinger with a detailed report on the military situation, saying that the Syrian advance had been checked because of nightfall and that 60 Syrian tanks had been destroyed. The Israeli base described the position on the Egyptian front as "difficult" with more drastic losses. Kissinger asked about Israeli plans, to which Eban responded that Dayan had said it would take some days, but that they were confident that Israel would improve its position with time. Kissinger asked about going to the Security Council and Eban said he would get a judgment, but agreed that going before the General Assembly would be a problem. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22)

—If this line of approach is acceptable to the USG Eban is prepared to discuss with Ambassador Scali how we might orchestrate the Security Council issue. Eban went on to say that it might in fact be better to delay any Security Council action until Monday.[3]

Eban would like to talk with you this evening if you have a chance. He can be reached at the Hotel Plaza. Shalev has been instructed to call me to present the latest military appreciation. If he has called before you return I will attach it to this report.

LSE[4]

[3] October 8.

[4] The original bears these typed initials.

114. Editorial Note

At the end of the day on October 6, 1973, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger met with the head of the People's Republic of China's Liaison Office, Huang Zhen, at the White House. According to a memorandum of conversation, Kissinger discussed the United States' grand strategy in the current Middle East crisis. He assured the Chinese that "our strategic objective is to prevent the Soviet Union from getting a dominant position in the Middle East," and maintained that the President wanted to use this crisis "to demonstrate that whoever gets help from the Soviet Union cannot achieve his objective, whatever it is." Kissinger also noted that the United States hoped to prevent "a situation in which a country uses international disputes to attack and then ask for a cease-fire after it has gained some territory." As far as the Arab states were concerned, Kissinger emphasized to Ambassador Huang that he was doing them a favor by calling for an immediate return to the status quo ante before the fighting started:

"Kissinger: For today and tomorrow the Arabs think this is disadvantageous for them. They think it is asking them to give something up. By Tuesday and Wednesday if the war isn't ended, the Arabs will be pleading with us to get this for them, since within 72 to 96 hours the Arabs will be completely defeated. And we have to think of that situation, not of today's situation when they have gained a little territory. I am not asking anything from the Chinese side. I am really explaining what we are thinking.

"Huang: It is not possible for us to do anything.

"Kissinger: I am not asking you to do anything. I thought the Prime Minister and Vice Prime Minister in New York might like to know what our thinking is as the situation develops. So we want to say now that we are for a return to the ceasefire line, so we can say it later when Israel has broken through into Syria."

Kissinger also told Ambassador Huang that Israel was merely "a secondary, emotional problem having to do with domestic politics here." (Memorandum of conversation, October 6, 9:10–9:30 p.m.; National Archives, RG 59, Records of the Policy Planning Staff, Director's Files (Winston Lord), 1969–1977, Box 328, China Exchanges July 10–October 31, 1973)

Following his meeting with Huang, Kissinger telephoned the British Ambassador to the United States, Lord Cromer, at 9:38 p.m. to reiterate the need for a cease-fire and to inform him of the actions the United States would be taking in the Security Council the following day:

"[K:] Our thinking is that we probably won't be able to avoid calling for the Security Council meeting tomorrow sometime.

"C: No. That is OK.

"K: But we really feel very strongly that a simple ceasefire is (a) short sighted in the present circumstances and I will tell you why. Our judgment is that within 72 hours the Israelis will be pushing deep into Syria. They may not go into—beyond the Suez Canal but they will wipe out what is there. And we may then find such a resolution extremely handy on getting them back. Oh, well—

"C: Oh, well, I think . . .

"K: In addition to the general principles which I stated earlier. Now we are quite determined that if the Israelis go beyond the present cease-fire lines that we will push them back.

"C: Yes, that is the point I was trying to make. If we they do that, then I think we are going to have a new situation.

"K: Yes, but if we don't position ourselves now. Let me tell you, Eban is not eager to have a Security Council meeting.

"C: I am sure he is not.

"K: And . . . if there is one, he wants to return to the status quo ante.

"C: Yes . . . I think it is a very difficult one.

"K: Now what we will do—it will go to the Security Council tomorrow and I am just telling it to your people so that they can think about it. We do not intend to fall on our swords to get a vote tomorrow.

"C: No.

"K: What we will do is to introduce our resolution. And then we don't mind going at a stately pace." (National Archives, Nixon Presi-

dential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22)

---

115. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, October 7, 1973.

PARTICIPANTS

Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Mordechai Shalev, Israeli Chargé
Lawrence S. Eagleburger, Executive Assistant to Secretary Kissinger

SUBJECT

Middle East Situation

Chargé Shalev: I have two messages to deliver to you from the Prime Minister. First as to the situation as we now see it in Israel, the Prime Minister has the following message for you:

"Our military people estimate, and I rely on their estimates since they have never deceived themselves or the government before, that we are engaged in heavy battles but with our reserves of men and equipment the fighting will turn in our favor. We are fighting on two fronts and the heavy concentration of SAM 3s and 6s on both fronts makes actions by our air force difficult. Tremendously powerful forces are arrayed against us, but the full activation of our air force should bring a turn in the situation.

"You know the reasons why we took no preemptive action. Our failure to take such action is the reason for our situation now. If I had given the chief of staff authority to preempt, as he had recommended, some hours before the attacks began, there is no doubt that our situation would now be different.

"I appreciate all you have done for us thus far and agree with your negative view of General Assembly involvement in this issue. As to the Security Council, we do not desire a confrontation there when our position is still difficult. Thus we believe it would be best if you postpone

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 27 ARAB–ISR. Secret; Sensitive. Drafted by Eagleburger. The meeting took place in the Secretary's office at the Department of State. According to Kissinger's Record of Schedule, the meeting began at 9:20 a.m. (Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box 438, Miscellany, 1968–76)

any action in the Security Council until Wednesday or Thursday.[2] I have reason to believe that by that time we will be in a position of attack rather than defense. I am sure you will do all in your power to enable us to achieve this position.

"I would not have come to you if I did not think the situation would improve within the next few days."

That is the first message. The second message is as follows:

"The Prime Minister requests that the equipment urgently requested of the United States Government be supplied. This is especially important because of the quantitative superiority of the enemy, and because we have been forced to adopt a defensive strategy."

Mr. Secretary a jumbo jet is now on its way to New York and could pick up this equipment and take it to Israel.

Secretary Kissinger: Let me talk first about the Security Council problem. It is a difficult situation; we nearly had a vote yesterday asking for a simple ceasefire.

If someone else comes in with a simple ceasefire resolution first, we will be in a difficult situation. It would be far better for us to ask for a ceasefire and a return to the status quo ante. Such a resolution would, of course, fail but it would take time.

I should tell you that it has been the President's intention to call for an urgent meeting of the Security Council late today. If we call for the meeting and put in our resolution, we would be the first to speak and ours would be the first resolution on which there would be a vote.

If we are forced, in the first instance, to veto a simple ceasefire resolution, it will not be understood.

We would intend to move slowly; we are in no hurry to get to a vote. Surely if there is a debate others will be called in to speak, including Foreign Minister Eban. I am confident that he could speak for at least two hours without getting through his introduction. I think this is the best way to go. We would tell our man in New York to go slowly as well.

If we don't do it this way, we will be dragged into a meeting where we have to veto a simple ceasefire. That would be very difficult.

Chargé Shalev: The main thing, of course, is to gain a period of time.

Secretary Kissinger: I understand. The President originally wanted the Security Council meeting yesterday morning. It will be hard for me to delay much longer.

---

[2] October 10 or 11.

Chargé Shalev: If the matter should come to a vote on a ceasefire without a return to lines preceding the attack, we will not accept the resolution.

Secretary Kissinger: We would not vote for such a resolution. The question then is whether we would veto or abstain. At this point I cannot give you a one hundred percent guarantee how we will go. The important thing is how quickly you can get on the offensive.

Chargé Shalev: We are doing that now. You understand, of course, that the Prime Minister's message was written after your talk with Foreign Minister Eban last night.[3]

Secretary Kissinger: Is that so? You must tell the Prime Minister that we will do our utmost to get her the time but we will have to maneuver this.

The Soviets are already on the defensive because of our suggestion of a ceasefire and a return to the status quo ante. They have refused our suggestion but they have done so gently.

But I am not sure we can delay until Wednesday. That would be tough. I don't see how we can delay so long. We may start the Security Council action tonight and then be able to delay a vote until Tuesday perhaps. Maybe we could put the resolution in late today, debate tomorrow, vote on Tuesday and then return to debate again on Wednesday.[4]

On the other thing (the requested arms) I will see what we can do.[5]

---

[3] See footnote 2, Document 113.

[4] At 10 a.m. on October 7, Eban telephoned Kissinger to say that he had two things to add to what Shalev had told him and that he would be getting a report on the military situation very soon. The night had not been particularly good and more forces had been sent over. Eban said he was talking about Sinai, but noted that even in the north there had been further penetration and that the Israeli garrison had fallen at Mt. Hermon. He asked Kissinger if he had requested a special Security Council meeting that night, and Kissinger said yes, noting that this was done to pre-empt somebody else introducing a straight cease-fire resolution. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 87–88.

[5] Kissinger called Schlesinger at 1:30 p.m. to urge that the Defense Department provide some of the military equipment requested by Israel without the action leaking. Schlesinger thought it could be done and that Sidewinder missiles were what Israel desperately wanted. At 3:45 p.m., Kissinger again called Schlesinger to tell him the President approved supplying the Israelis with the equipment. (Both in National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) These transcripts are printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 93–94.

116. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the White House Chief of Staff (Haig)[1]

October 7, 1973, 9:35 a.m.

K. Where are you?

H. In my room, about to go to see the boss.

K. We haven't heard from the Soviets. I think around noon Ziegler ought to say we are going to the Security Council. Before it's done check again. We have next to no support. On the other hand the Arabs are doing better than anyone thought possible. I have just talked to the Israelis.[2] They will need until Wednesday or Thursday.[3] They are not all that eager for a Security Council mtg. In fact, nobody is—the Israelis, the Soviets, the Egyptians, the British. On the other hand I think we can have a low-key meeting. For the Security Council to do nothing while fighting goes on is absolutely intolerable and I think we have to go ahead. We should seek return to the status quo ante.

H. Yes—

K. If we go we must ask for return—the Israelis will never forgive us for a straight ceasefire and they'd never observe it anyway.

H. It's going to be tough if we are all alone.

K. On the other hand, a simple ceasefire request would make it seem that we have turned against the Israelis and this would have incalcuable domestic consequences . . . and international ones too, and we would have changed our position of yesterday.

H. Are the Israelis panicking?

K. They are almost . . . they are anxious to get some equipment which has been approved and which some SOB in Defense held up which I didn't know about. I think myself we should release some of it.

H. I think so, too.

K. I think if the Arabs win they will be impossible and there will be no negotiations. A change would be ascribed to our own domestic crisis.

H. Right, I agree. I think we have got to stand by principle.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking. Haig was in Key Biscayne with the President; Kissinger was in Washington.

[2] See Document 115.

[3] October 10 or 11.

We'll have to provide the stuff we have been committed to unless they can stabilize this thing quickly—two or three days.

K. That's what they think. If we don't move today somebody will move with a simple ceasefire resolution.

H. On our return—I though we should go back normally tonight.

K. I think you should come back tonight. That's when you were coming back anyway?[4]

H. We had planned to come back tomorrow night.

K. I think it would have ginned (?) things up too much if you had come back last night.

H. If you need anything . . .

K. If Ziegler makes the statement, that's enough. They have been in touch with me and . . . check with me again because I might have heard from the Soviets.

H. Anything else the boss should know, Henry?

K. No, those are the main things.

H. Interesting report. The Israelis are shocked by the confidence of the Arabs.

K. Yes, that's right.

H. This might make easier negotiations.

K. Depends on how we conduct ourselves. We must be on their side now so that they have something to lose afterwards. Therefore I think we have to give the equipment.

H. What are we talking about, ammunition and spares?

K. Let me see, I have it here. (reads from list) What we can do is send those which have already been approved.

H. Do we airlift them.

K. We don't have to do anything. They are sending a plane over and we could do it on the ground that they were picking up things they had already ordered. My profound conviction is that if we play this the hard way, it's the last time they're going to listen. If we kick them in the teeth they have nothing to lose. Later if we support them they would be willing to help with Jewish emigration or MFN or other stuff.

H. Will be in touch before noon.

K. Have Ziegler read the announcement to me.

---

[4] The President returned to Washington at 10 p.m. on October 7.

117. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

October 7, 1973, 10:18 a.m.

K. I just wanted to tell you we have had a call from Dobrynin that a message from Brezhnev to you is coming through in the next two hours so I think we should hold this thing up until we get this message.[2] I know this might be impatient-making.

P. It what?

K. I know that these delays are difficult but the problem is we may end up with no support at all.

P. We can't do that.

K. I think we should make a record that we have been very active before we go to the Security Council and not get totally isolated. It is best to know where the cards lie. I think we can wait even if we take some flak. If we can see this through we have a major platform.[3]

P. We'll have to do that. With Brezhnev I don't think we will learn anything.

K . . . Somebody on the Arab side will put in a simple ceasefire resolution. It will be the India/Pakistan thing all over again. We're going to be in a hell of a position in vetoing or voting against a simple ceasefire. We had a message saying they will have their equipment by Wednesday or Thursday but they will not accept a ceasefire before they have thrown them out.[4] My view is that if we can not break ranks during this crisis we can really do it afterwards because then they will have something to lose.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking. Nixon was in Key Biscayne and Kissinger was in Washington.

[2] At 12:40 p.m., Dobrynin telephoned Kissinger and said he was still waiting for a message. Kissinger pointed out that the United States had been delaying action until it heard from the Soviets. (Ibid.) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 90–91.

[3] At 12:55 p.m., Waldheim telephoned Kissinger, who explained that he had been exchanging thoughts with the Soviets to see what could be done, but the Soviets were not willing to do very much. Waldheim indicated that most members did not seem interested in having a Security Council meeting that day. Kissinger replied that what worried him was that this was a major military conflict. He asked what the Security Council was for if it could not meet on this. He reiterated that the United States was expecting a communication from the Soviets and said he would call Waldheim around 4 p.m. to see about convening the Security Council, perhaps for the following morning. Waldheim agreed, noting that this meant they could avoid debate in the General Assembly since under UN rules of procedure, the General Assembly could not meet if the Security Council was meeting. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 91–92.

[4] See Document 115.

P. One thing that we have to have in the back of our minds is we don't want to be so pro-Israel that the oil states—the Arabs that are not involved in the fighting will break ranks.

K. So far we haven't done anything.

P. You are keeping Scali informed?

K. Yes.

P. PR is terribly important. Even if we don't do anything . . . Let Scali go out . . . he can do a lot and prattle and cause no problem.

K. We held a meeting of 4 Perm Reps and some others to . . .

P. You keep one step removed . . . we can use you for the power punch.

K. I recommend that you announce that you have asked for a meeting of the Security Council as soon as we have the Soviet message. I have told Dobrynin that we are not hell bent on a Security Council meeting—that if the Soviets made a proposal where we could settle outside the Security Council, we would consider it. I called the Egyptian Foreign Minister last night.[5] Some of our oil people in this country are[6]

[5] See footnote 4, Document 111.

[6] A handwritten notation indicates that the transcript was "not finished."

118. Backchannel Message From the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail) to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Cairo, October 7, 1973.

A. Dr. Zayat has conveyed to us the talks and discussions that have taken place between the two of you in the last few days.

B. I would like, in conformity with the spirit of frankness that prevailed in our meetings, to make a few remarks concerning the points which were brought up during your discussions:

1. The engagements taking place at present in the area should not arouse any surprise to all those who have followed the continuous Israeli provocations not only on the Syrian and Lebanese lines but also on the Egyptian front. We have many times drawn the attention to such provocations which never ceased in spite of international condemnation.

2. Egypt therefore had to take a decision to confront any new Israeli provocations with firmness, and consequently took the necessary precautions in order to face any such Israeli action similar to that over Syria on 13 September 1973.[2]

3. The clashes that occurred on the canal front as a result of the Israeli provocations, were intended from our side to show to Israel that we were not afraid or helpless and that we refuse to capitulate to the conditions of an aggressive planning to retain our land as hostage for bargaining.

4. As a result of the engagements a new situation has been created in the area and although it is natural to expect new developments within the coming few days, we would like to define the framework of our position.

5. Our basic objective remains as always, the achievement of peace in the Middle East and not to achieve partial settlements.

6. We do not intend to deepen the engagements or widen the confrontation.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. Secret; Sensitive. Enclosed in an October 7 memorandum to Kissinger, which indicated the message was received in Cairo at 9 p.m.

[2] See footnote 2, Document 93.

C. I reckon you have received from Mr. Rockefeller our President's reply to your message, in which reply our position, as pointed out since our first contact was reaffirmed.[3] Allow me to make it clear once more:

1. Israel has to withdraw from all occupied territories.

2. We will be then prepared to participate in a peace conference in the U.N. in whatever agreeable form, whether it be under the auspices of the Secretary General or the representatives of the permanent members of the Security Council or any other suitable body.[4]

3. We agree to the freedom of navigation in the Straits of Tiran and we accept, as a guarantee, an international presence for a limited period.

D. I feel confident that you will appreciate that this reexplanation of our position emanates from a real and genuine desire for the realization of peace and not from readiness to start a series of concessions. In fact we remember that Mr. Rogers impaired peace chances when he mistakenly interpreted our peace initiative of February 1971 in such a manner that deviated it from its true nature and objective.

Please accept my best wishes.

[3] Not found.

[4] Kissinger spoke with Nixon at 2:07 p.m. about the possibility of calling for a Security Council meeting. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) At 4:55 p.m., Kissinger telephoned Zayyat and informed him that the United States was going to call for a Security Council meeting the next day. He said he wanted to explain that the United States was doing this as a matter of principle of not having a war going on that was not even discussed in the United Nations. He said that the United States would conduct the debate on its side without criticism of any country and that he would let the Foreign Minister know if the United States decided to put forward a resolution. Zayyat commented that it would be very embarrassing and that Egypt would object. (Ibid.) Both transcripts are printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 94–96, 102–104.

119. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and Israeli Foreign Minister Eban[1]

October 7, 1973, 5:08 p.m.

K: Good afternoon. We have now decided to go ahead long the lines we discussed earlier. Therefore, you mustn't do anything . . . The President, not the President himself but Key Biscayne, is going to announce that we will ask for a meeting of the Security Council. We will then, around 5:30, ask the President of the Security Council for a meeting tomorrow.[2] We will let it go at that for tonight. We will not indicate today whether we will table a resolution or what it will be. Don't want to get too much . . . generated. We will table a resolution along, this is for your private information, lines we discussed. I understand you will have to speak before the Council.

E: I will have to speak very early.

K: At the Council . . . we will count on your elequence . . . and in this case wouldn't mind if you sacrificed eloquence to length.

E: Oh, yes, I agree it often happens in inverse relation. I'll just say we want . . . cease fire in full.

K: Not necessary for you to make any proposal as long as you discuss the situation in great detail.

E: . . . saying Egypt and Syria encroached on us and not us on them. I assure you we are keeping an eye on other Western Europeans, presume you are doing so as well.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking. Kissinger was in Washington; Eban was in New York.

[2] The text of Scali's letter to President of the UN Security Council McIntyre is in telegram 3705 from USUN, October 7. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

120. Message From Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev to President Nixon[1]

Moscow, undated.

Dear Mr. President:

The messages you transmitted to us through Dr. Kissinger in connection with the latest developments in the Middle East have been thoroughly considered by myself and my colleagues, and we have already expressed to you some of our own considerations on the matter.

Now I would like to share with you in greater detail some of the thoughts in connection with that of your messages, in which you regarded the situation in the Middle East as a "very and very serious" one.

You do remember of course, Mr. President, that both in our talks in Moscow, Washington and San-Clemente and in my correspondence with you I, on my part, constantly expressed a serious concern about the lack of progress in the political settlement, and emphasized in every way possible that in these circumstances a new outbreak of hostilities may happen there at any moment.

Quite recently in his talks with you, Mr. Gromyko stated the same as well, on behalf of the Soviet leadership.[2]

In order to prevent dangerous developments and to give a necessary impetus to the peaceful settlement in the Middle East on the basis of the known UN decisions, we suggested to you that the USSR and the US should reach a mutual understanding regarding the key points of such a settlement.

Unfortunately you were not, however, ready for that. And now the situation in the Middle East has once again gravely deteriorated.

As it was to be expected, the calculations that the cease-fire would last there indefinitely without the termination of the Israeli aggression, without the withdrawal of the Israeli troops from all the Arab territories occupied by it in 1967, turned out to be in vain.

It would be possible to say a lot more on that matter but the main thing now, when our warnings have already come true, is to take urgently effective measures for eliminating the initial cause of the conflict. Without it the situation in the Middle East will continue to remain the source of constant danger. Partial measures will not help here.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 68, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 19 [July 13, 1973–Oct. 11, 1973]. Top Secret. A handwritten notation at the top of the page reads: "Handed to Gen. Scowcroft by Minister Vorontsov, 6:00 p.m., October 7, 1973."

[2] See Document 92.

In this connection, in our view, it would be very important if there come on the part of Israel a clear, without any reservations, statement of its readiness to withdraw from the Arab territories occupied by it, having in mind that at the same time security of Israel, as well as of other countries of that area, would be guaranteed.

What is unacceptable in this for Israel if—as its leaders constantly claim—they are concerned with these very questions of security? Would it not correspond to the interests of the Israeli people themselves and is it at all possible to seek security of a state in a seizure of foreign territories?

As you know, Mr. President, we have always called upon the sides to exercise restraint, consistently advocating the very cause of political settlement. But the lack of any progress up till now in this direction could certainly not but affect the effectiveness of such our calls.

And, as we firmly believe, the giving up by Israel of its claims to the Arab lands could ensure a turning point in the dangerous situation in the Middle East, could be a beginning of the process of settlement on the basis of the UN decisions.

We would like to hope that now, when the situation makes it espesially imperative, the United States will use the means at their disposal for a necessary influence on Israel in this direction.

It goes without saying that we are ready to continue the Soviet-American confidential consultations on the whole Middle Eastern problem along the lines we have talked about during the meeting with you, Mr. President.

We would like to underline specifically the following. We firmly proceed from the premise that the current events in the Middle East should not cast a shadow on all the good things which have developed recently in the Soviet-American relations. We do not allow a thought to the contrary.[3]

Respectfully,

L. Brezhnev[4]

---

[3] At 3:25 p.m. on October 7, prior to delivery of this message, Dobrynin telephoned Kissinger to give him the Soviet reply. Kissinger said that Dobrynin knew as well as he did that this message did not say anything, and commented that they were going to have "a critical period" that week. Dobrynin expressed the hope that it would not be a crisis. Kissinger commented that Dobrynin knew perfectly well that the United States was prepared to ask Israel after the fighting was over to make "accelerated diplomatic moves." He noted that he had been prepared to make a speech the next day in which he was going to advocate MFN for the Soviet Union, among other things, but that he might have to drop that section from the speech, depending on developments. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Material, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 97–98.

[4] The original bears this typed signature.

121. Minutes of Washington Special Actions Group Meeting[1]

Washington, October 7, 1973, 6:06–7:06 p.m.

SUBJECT

Middle East

PARTICIPANTS

Chairman—Henry A. Kissinger

State
Kenneth Rush
Joseph Sisco

Defense
James Schlesinger
William P. Clements, Jr.

JCS
Adm. Thomas H. Moorer
Vice Adm. John P. Weinel

CIA
William Colby

Treasury
William Simon

NSC Staff
Brig. Gen. Brent Scowcroft
William Quandt
Lt. Col. Donald Stukel
Jeanne W. Davis

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

It was agreed that:

1) Treasury would prepare by Tuesday evening (October 9) a contingency plan for US action in the event of an oil cut-off;

2) there should be no immediate movement of forces; however, the *Kennedy* task force in the North Sea should start easing toward Gibraltar toward the middle of the week when its current exercise is over; the *Roosevelt* carrier task force in Spain should go back to sea on its regular schedule at the end of the week and start easing eastward;

3) CIA and JCS will prepare by noon Monday (October 8) a judgment of the military situation, particularly what we can expect in the next day or two;

4) Secretary Kissinger will check with the President on provision [*less than 1 line not declassified*];

5) a U–2 mission will be flown on Monday, October 8.

Secretary Kissinger: Bill, Could we have your briefing?

Mr. Colby briefed from the attached Situation Report. (Tab A)[2]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, NSC Institutional Files (H–Files), Box H–117, WSAG Meetings Minutes, Originals, 1973. Top Secret; Nodis; Codeword. The meeting took place in the White House Situation Room.

[2] A copy of Colby's briefing is in Central Intelligence Agency, OPI 16, Directorate of Intelligence, Office of Current Intelligence, Job 79–T01023A. In the briefing, Colby concluded that "Israel has concentrated its military effort on blunting the Syrian offensive in the Golan Heights," and that the overall Israeli effort on the Egyptian front was much less

Secretary Kissinger: What do they mean when they say they have destroyed "most" of the bridges?

Mr. Colby: They have destroyed eight.

Mr. Schlesinger: They're down to one or zero.

Mr. Rush: (to Mr. Colby) You think it will last longer than you did yesterday?[3]

Mr. Colby: Yes. The missing element yesterday was the non-mobilization of the Israelis. We didn't give that enough weight in our estimate. Normally, they have a 35,000-man force. They can increase in 48 hours to almost 300,000 and in seven days can have 450,000.

Secretary Kissinger: They've never had to fight from a defensive position before.

Adm. Moorer: It was the same pattern in 1967. They put most of their effort on the Golan Heights, then turned to the Egyptians.

Secretary Kissinger: No, they hit Egypt first.

Adm. Moorer: They secured the Heights first.

Secretary Kissinger: They secured the Heights last. That's what led to the break with the Soviets. They broke through in the Sinai, then jumped the Syrians on Friday or Saturday. Are the Arabs doing better or is this because the Israelis were unprepared?

Mr. Colby: The Syrians have a large force on the Heights—three infantry and one armored division. They're doing better than 1967.

Adm. Moorer: During the Jordan crisis the Syrians weren't worth a damn. They have had a little experience now. They had to learn something if they're going to fight a war every two years.

Mr. Schlesinger: The Israelis say the Syrians are doing better—that they're not behaving like Arabs.

Mr. Sisco: In the 1967 war the Syrians did well in the last 24 hours.

Mr. Rush: (to Mr. Colby) Why is Tel Aviv grim?

Mr. Colby: Because they have a real problem on the Golan Heights.

Secretary Kissinger: And their casualties are heavier.

Mr. Colby: They're taking substantial casualties. Israel may fear a Syrian breakthrough.

Secretary Kissinger: (to Adm. Moorer) Tom, how do you read the situation?

Adm. Moorer: I agree with Bill (Colby). In one or two days Israel will settle things up north, then they will concentrate on Egypt.

---

than in Syria. "The Israelis seem confident that once the Golan Heights are under control, they can isolate and mop up the Egyptian bridgeheads."

[3] See Document 112.

(Secretary Kissinger left the room)

Mr. Schlesinger: Will the Israelis go around behind them, west to Mount Hermon? If they do, they're practically in Damascus.

Mr. Rush: That's what they did in 1967.

Mr. Colby: No, they stayed up on the Heights—took the high ground.

Mr. Schlesinger: The number of Egyptians across the Canal changed from 3,000 men and 60 tanks to 15,000 men and 400 tanks in the course of the day.

Mr. Colby: That number sounds pretty high.

Adm. Moorer: That's inconsistent. They say they have all those tanks across but they say they didn't move much across last night. That means they were already there.

Mr. Schlesinger: The story has some inconsistencies. I don't know why the Israelis didn't attack.

Mr. Clements: How good is our information on the bridges?

Adm. Moorer: That's the Israeli story.

Mr. Schlesinger: We're completely dependent on the Israelis for our information.

Mr. Rush: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Adm. Moorer: Not in that detail.

Mr. Rush: (to Mr. Schlesinger) Do you agree with Bill's (Colby) time assessment?

Mr. Schlesinger: Yes.

(Secretary Kissinger returned)

Secretary Kissinger: That was the Egyptian Foreign Minister on the phone. There are demonstrations in front of the Egyptian Embassy in New York. All the windows are broken and the police are apparently just standing by. He sounded panicky. (to Gen. Scowcroft) Can we do anything? (Gen. Scowcroft left the room) Get me John Lindsay on the phone.[4]

Adm. Moorer: I think the major effort by the Israelis will be in the north initially, then they will turn south. The way their mobilization works, [*2 lines not declassified*].

Secretary Kissinger: (to Adm. Moorer) Do you think they will clean up Syria in two or three days?

---

[4] Transcripts of Kissinger's 6:20 p.m. telephone conversation with Zayyat and 7:10 p.m. telephone conversation with John Lindsay, Mayor of New York, are in National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. The first is printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, p. 106.

Adm. Moorer: They won't be mobilized until Monday noon. It will be two or three days after that. We're talking about Tuesday for a full-scale effort.

Mr. Schlesinger: They're beginning to move forces today.

(General Scowcroft returned)

Gen. Scowcroft: I talked to Len Garment and he'll be in touch with the FBI.

Adm. Moorer: The Israeli public assumed they would be successful immediately.

Mr. Colby: "Grim" also refers to their feeling mean.

Secretary Kissinger: Even if they restore the situation, if it cost 500 casualties to get back to where they were, that's like 50,000 for us. Do you think they will wipe out Syria?

Adm. Moorer: They'll inflict heavy personnel and equipment casualties. They already have.

Mr. Schlesinger: The Syrians are backed up against the minefields. They have been going through them slowly, and they will have to go back through them.

Secretary Kissinger: Then how do you explain the cockiness of the Arabs? Why aren't they calling for a ceasefire?

Mr. Schlesinger: Euphoria has set in.

Mr. Colby: The Syrians think they're doing well. They're not looking at the long term. Egypt may have intended to make only a limited move across the Canal.

Secretary Kissinger: Why aren't they clinching their gain? Every foreign ambassador who saw Sadat today was told that Egypt didn't want a ceasefire until they were at the Israeli border.

Mr. Schlesinger: You're being logical. You can't ascribe that kind of logic to them.

Mr. Rush: It's difficult to think Sadat would cross the Suez and just sit there.

Secretary Kissinger: My judgement is that he *will* cross the Suez and just sit there. I don't think he will penetrate further.

Mr. Clements: I agree, but it doesn't make much sense. Why would he do it?

Secretary Kissinger: Their reasoning was that the Israelis have been arguing that the situation is calm and there is no reason to do anything. They knew we wouldn't do anything unless things were stirred up. But they haven't thought through to five days later. They're just hoping something will happen.

Mr. Colby: We had an estimate a few months ago that they might create an issue so that the great powers would solve their problem for them.[5]

Mr. Rush: And they want to inflict casualties on the Israeli forces.

Mr. Clements: What are the chances of a world-wide uproar, through the UN perhaps, so that a ceasefire would be forced on them?

Secretary Kissinger: They don't want to go to the UN. They're discouraging everyone from going to the UN.

Mr. Clements: Isn't that a trading position?

Secretary Kissinger: Trade for what?

Mr. Clements: They say "we're doing great, we don't need you." They're in the Heights and across the Canal, and have a stand-off.

Secretary Kissinger: But by Wednesday,[6] they will be creamed on the Golan Heights.

Mr. Clements: I doubt that.

Secretary Kissinger: If Bill Colby's assessment is correct, by Wednesday evening, our time, they will be more or less wiped out.

Mr. Colby: Not wiped out, but in trouble.

Secretary Kissinger: In deep trouble. Then they'll start making noise in the UN, but Israel won't stop until they have knocked them out.

To bring you up to date on our diplomatic activity. We have had active exchanges with the Soviets. They are leaning over backward not to get involved and to make it clear to us that they're not getting involved.

Mr. Schlesinger: They're moving their ships west, away from the action.

Secretary Kissinger: They don't want a confrontation with us at the UN, and they have made that clear to us. They told us they pulled their people out of the area against the advice of the local governments, but that must not be repeated. That creates a problem for them. If the Arabs do unexpectedly well, the Soviets are in deep trouble.

Mr. Colby: Their pull-out instructions were issued on October 3. They had something. They were either told there was going to be trouble, or at least they got a very hard tip.

Secretary Kissinger: They're now in the position that, if the Israelis lose, the Soviets are in trouble with the Arabs. If Israel wins—I almost believe the Soviets would prefer it if the Arabs were taught a lesson.

---

[5] See Document 59.

[6] October 10.

Now, at 5:00 p.m. today the President will say that we are going to the Security Council. No Department should say anything about our UN strategy. We will try to avoid a General Assembly meeting tomorrow. We can resist on procedural grounds.

(Secretary Kissinger left to take a call from Mayor Lindsay)

Mr. Sisco: I've heard Henry say that all the Soviet advisers are out, and I thought some were still there. We need a clarification of that.

Mr. Clements: Our briefing said there were still some in Syria.

Mr. Sisco: I know there are some in Syria. I'm talking about Egypt. I thought there was a residue of Soviet advisers still there.

Mr. Colby: They have some people working on the Helmand plant.

Mr. Sisco: I thought they still had some involved in radar and some training. We need a precise statement on this.

(Secretary Kissinger returned)

Secretary Kissinger: It is imperative that no one speculates about the situation. The best thing we can do is to keep everyone calm and try to stop the fighting. I've talked to the Secretary General and the President of the Security Council and to Foreign Minister Zayyat. Egypt doesn't want a confrontation with us at the UN and the Soviets don't want a confrontation with us. Our general position will be a restoration of the ceasefire lines. The Arabs will scream that they are being deprived of their birthright, but by Thursday they will be on their knees begging us for a ceasefire. We have to take this position now. That's the strategy we're pursuing. We're trying to get this over with a limited amount of damage to our relations with the Arabs and the Soviets. If we can also put some money in the bank with the Israelis to draw on in later negotiations, well and good. But we should all try to be enigmatic. Everyone is positioned at the UN. Everyone is in a non-confrontation mood. We'll try to hold this until one party or the other wins. Our policy is to stop Israel at the ceasefire line, but not before Thursday.

(Gen. Scowcroft left the room.)

Mr. Schlesinger: Or roll them back to the ceasefire line.

Secretary Kissinger: Or roll them back, but we mustn't tip our hand. In this phase, we have to get the fighting stopped. After the Israeli elections in three weeks, that will be the time to negotiate. In that sense, the Arabs have achieved something.

Mr. Clements: (to Adm. Moorer) I think Henry should be aware of the turn-around of the eight submarines in the Western Mediterranean.

Adm. Moorer: The Soviets were in the process of a normal relief of their diesel subs in the Mediterranean, so they have twice as many as normal there right now. It just happened.

Mr. Clements: I don't believe it just happened.

Adm. Moorer: We have twice as many amphibious forces in the Mediterranean now, and that just happened.

Secretary Kissinger: On the contingency plan on Libya, how do you propose to handle the problem that the airbase is 21 miles from town? How will you get the people to the airbase?

Adm. Moorer: (referring to map) [*3½ lines not declassified*] The 82nd Airborne could land here (indicating an area to the south of Tripoli on map) out of range of any missiles and without a confrontation with the brigade defending Tripoli. One force can rescue the 800 Americans in the oil area, and the other can rescue the 1000 Americans in the other area. We're still looking at other options because I'm not satisfied we have the best plan. But if we use airborne, we should go into the Tripoli airport. If our objective is to rescue Americans, this has to happen awfully fast, since if the Marines get bogged down in fighting, this will give the mobs time to go after the Americans.

Secretary Kissinger: How long will it take to get the 82nd Airborne in?

Adm. Moorer: [*less than 1 line not declassified*] from the "go".

Secretary Kissinger: How long before they start moving to the Americans?

Adm. Moorer: Right away. We would drop some Marines right on top of the Americans to defend them until the main force gets to them. It's just sand and olive trees where they are.

Mr. Schlesinger: We can get the forces in. The critical issue is that the Libyans have air at Wheelus. The plan calls for hosing down the Libyan Air Force, and that's a major step. We'd be shooting up an Arab country, with all that would mean.

Secretary Kissinger: But we won't do that unless American lives are in danger.

Adm. Moorer: Yes, but it would have a major effect in other countries. It would be better if we could take them out with helicopters.

Mr. Schlesinger: We don't want to put the 82nd Airborne in unless we want to take over Libya. If our design is limited to getting the Americans out, we don't want the 82nd Airborne.

Secretary Kissinger: We don't want to tie the 82nd down if we don't have to.

Adm. Moorer: We worked on this option because it is the most complex, but I'm not satisfied with it.

Mr. Clements: But we would have to hose down Wheelus to be sure the Libyan air doesn't get involved.

Adm. Moorer: We could just stand by. We would have heavy air cover, but we wouldn't shoot unless they made the first move. We

should communicate with our State man there and see what his plans are for getting the Americans together.

Mr. Clements: If we move into Libya, there will be overrun into other Arab countries.

Mr. Kissinger: We won't do it without overwhelming provocation.

(General Scowcroft returned)

Secretary Kissinger: They're getting us a Security Council meeting at 3:30 tomorrow afternoon.

Now, what about the oil situation?

Mr. Simon summarized briefly the oil papers at Tab B.[7]

(Secretary Kissinger left the room)

Mr. Simon: Our situation will be bad anyway. (referring to the papers at Tab B) As you see, we need an additional 350–700,000 barrels per day, depending on the severity of the winter. We should have been bringing in this much more during the past five or six weeks. So we're in a situation where, in the heating season, we have to play catch-up ball. The Europeans can't refine that much. They're probably sitting around discussing this just as we are, and saying that they will protect their supplies and they won't export to us. New England will be very cold this winter. We would have had problems even if this trouble hadn't happened.

(Secretary Kissinger returned)

Mr. Clements: No one is telling it like it is on the fuel oil shortage. We would have had a bad problem even without this.

Secretary Kissinger: Some day I would like someone to explain to me how this happened. Can we develop a plan that, if there is a cut-off, what can we do? What does the President say on the day of the cut-off?

Mr. Simon: He institutes rationing. There will be a lot of argument, of course.

Secretary Kissinger: What is the argument against it?

Mr. Simon: Bureaucratic. The same as we had over the mandatory allocation. They talk about it's affecting the middle of the barrel, but I say you can't do that without affecting the whole barrel.

Secretary Kissinger: (indicating Messrs Simon and Clements) Does anyone here understand what these two are talking about?

Mr. Rush: I have some faint understanding.

Mr. Simon: We should get together tomorrow and set up a contingency emergency program.

---

[7] Attached, but not printed.

Mr. Kissinger: We need an emergency program. With regard to the Arabs, they have to learn what the limits are or they will nibble us to death. But this is a helluva time to teach them the limits.

Mr. Colby: Better now than later. We're less dependent on them for oil than we will be five years from now.

Mr. Rush: As the price goes up, their urge to produce goes down. We're killing the goose by raising prices.

Mr. Simon: The Japanese are willing to pay the price. They are taking our market away from us.

Mr. Colby: 12% of our consumption comes from the Arab countries. In five years, it will be 35%.

Mr. Simon: But I think that, if we do our job, by 1980–81 it will tilt the other way.

Secretary Kissinger: What about this big research and development program?

Mr. Clements: Nothing is happening.

Secretary Kissinger: Who's in charge?

Mr. Clements: Whoever is in charge, absolutely nothing is happening.

Secretary Kissinger: (to Mr. Simon) Can you get us a program by Tuesday[8] evening? The Arabs will be doing okay until Tuesday night. They won't do anything against us until they start losing. The President may ask for a program Wednesday or Thursday.

Mr. Simon: Is there anything we can do without scaring the Europeans? Is there some way we could talk to them?

Secretary Kissinger: No, that would panic them. Let's get a program now of what we want to do.

Mr. Simon: If you want that, you should get hold of Governor Love and his staff tonight.[9] I would be usurping his authority if I did anything.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's get the program and the President will decide. (to Gen. Scowcroft) Will you get hold of the energy people. I'll square it with Governor Love.

Mr. Clements: You're talking about rationing.

Secretary Kissinger: (to Mr. Simon) That's why you're at this meeting. Let's get a concrete program. I'll talk to Governor Love on Tuesday, if necessary. Bill (Clements), can you help him? If Love gets

---

[8] October 9.

[9] John A. Love, former Governor of Colorado, was the Director of the Office of Energy Policy in the White House.

involved, that will get Interior involved, and you might as well put it in the newspapers. Can your people keep it quiet?

Mr. Simon: I have a good, small group. I'm not worried about the Treasury and conversation.

Mr. Schlesinger: What about moving forces? We have that Task Force in the North Sea [*less than 1 line not declassified*] from Gibraltar.

Secretary Kissinger: I see no reason to move anything. Where is that Task Force going?

Adm. Moorer: It's just diddling around on an exercise.

Mr. Schlesinger: It could ease down toward Gibraltar.

Adm. Moorer: It will be making some port calls when the exercise is over.

Secretary Kissinger: When is the exercise over?

Adm. Weinel: This week.

Secretary Kissinger: Toward the middle of the week, when the exercise is over, let it start easing down. I'll talk to the President tonight; he's coming in about 10:00 p.m.

Mr. Schlesinger: And the *Roosevelt* stays in Spain.

Secretary Kissinger: For how long?

Adm. Moorer: It will go back to sea at the end of the week on its regular schedule.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's let it ease back, too. The major objective is not to get anyone excited. Were there any questions about the movement of the Athens Task Force?

Mr. Sisco: A few, as we expected. We handled it as we agreed, and it went very well.

Secretary Kissinger: (to Mr. Sisco) What do you think about moving forces?

Mr. Sisco: I think we should do nothing.

Secretary Kissinger: Shall we meet tomorrow afternoon? I may want to check with you all before the Security Council meeting. Could I have JCS and CIA's best judgements of the situation by noon, particularly, what we can expect in the next day or two. Then we can fine-tune what needs to be done at the Security Council in the light of the situation. I haven't seen an estimate of the losses. Can we get one?

Adm. Moorer: That's very hard to get.

Mr. Schlesinger: The Israelis admit 100 dead.

Secretary Kissinger: How many planes?

Mr. Schlesinger: 15 A–4s, but they're asking for 40 replacements.

Secretary Kissinger: How about the other side?

Mr. Schlesinger: Very substantial losses.

Adm. Moorer: 40–50 planes.

Secretary Kissinger: The Israeli Ambassador is coming in to see me. If I get anything from him, I'll let you know.

Mr. Colby: [*4½ lines not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Colby: [*1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Schlesinger: We might put a U–2 over.

Secretary Kissinger: Can we do it? Is there any objection?

Mr. Colby: We can fly one Monday if we have to.

Secretary Kissinger: Okay, let's do it.

---

122. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 7, 1973, 10:30 p.m.

K: Hello.

N: Hello Henry, what's new?

K: We have got the thing pretty well orchestrated, Mr. President. The Security Council meeting is set for 3:30 tomorrow afternoon.

N: At our request.

K: Yes at our request.

N: I mean is anybody joining us?

K: In calling it? No but we don't need anyone to join us. . . . I've got us well positioned. I think we should not, Mr. President, not to propose a resolution which will only be defeated, but develop our philosophy . . . how it should end.

N: Right. Resolutions don't mean anything, they never have. What we need to do is talk about how to end the war. Who's going to do it, are you going up there or is Scali going to?

K: No, Scali can do it.

N: If the UN is going to fail, let if fail without us.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking. The blank underscore indicates an omission in the original.

K: By Thursday evening[2] everyone will be pleading with us to introduce that resolution. I told the Russians we were not introducing a resolution . . . have consultations.

N: No message from Brezhnev?

K: Oh, yes we heard from him.

N: What did he say?

K: It was a friendly message,[3] but it didn't say anything. One thing it did say was that the Russians pulled out all their advisers against the wishes of the Arab governments and we have confirmed that through our sources. Also they have withdrawn their fleet in the Mediterranean.

N: Where's our fleet?

K: Well actually our two fleets are very close together. Ours went East and theirs went West. They have moved back and we have moved up. . . . military situation sufficiently clear. Everybody wants a settlement. Also arrangement for Israelis to stick to. . . . if they go beyond the . . . side, if you appeal to them to return, they must return. I have checked this with Mrs. Meir and she agrees.

N: I see. With regard to the report I was reading coming up on the plane, possibly out of date by now, but the doggoned Syrians surprised me. They're doing better than I ever thought.

K: The Israelis haven't thrown in the reserves yet. They're doing damned well. They've taken _____, penetrated two points and that mountain, you must have seen it when you were there.

N: Yes, I remember.

K: They have done pretty well. Implacement won't be complete until tomorrow. Then Ismail sent me a message suggesting possible framework for negotiations.[4] Not yet adequate. It's where North Viet-Nam was 4 months before the breakthrough. The same message was sent through the Shah,[5] but it's not yet adequate and it's not quite time to do. We have to get the war stopped first. Then . . . diplomacy.

N: The thing to do now is to get the war stopped. That would be great achievement. One of the greatest achievements of all. People in this country would think . . . really tough.

K: [*4 lines not declassified*]

N: I know. They are emotional, delightful, but completely unorganized. None of them have their heads screwed on right.

---

[2] October 11.

[3] Document 120.

[4] Document 118.

[5] See Document 125.

K: It's a little premature. One usually smells a point when one can say they see it come together. Wednesday or Thursday perhaps. I've been calling a lot of Senators in your behalf, after you decided to go to the UN.

N: I will be in in the morning. Will you be at the White House tomorrow.

K: I'll be in around 8, 8:30.

N: Good. Why don't you come over and we'll have a talk, publicize it.

---

123. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, October 8, 1973, 9:54 a.m.

D: Hello.

K: Anatol!

D: Hello, Henry. I just received an oral message—a very short one, but I think it is fairly urgent. An oral message from Brezhnev to the President and he asked me to tell you personally about it. The message is very short and I will just read it. "We have contacted the leaders of the Arab states on the question of ceasefire. We hope to get a reply shortly. We feel that we should act in cooperation with you, being guided by the broad interests of maintaining peace and developing the Soviet-American relations. We hope that President Nixon will act likewise."

K: I can answer that for you right away because I have just come from the President.[2] This reflects our spirit and we will also—we are eager to cooperate in bringing peace. I was going to call you. Just for your guidance—with reference to the discussions we have had, we were not going to put in a resolution at the Security Council this afternoon.

D: Not going to?

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking.

[2] Nixon met with Kissinger from 9:20 to 9:42. Ziegler was present for part of that time. (Ibid., White House Central Files, President's Daily Diary)

K: No, we are just going to have a general discussion. But we would appreciate it since we are doing that, that you don't confront us with one without discussion.

D: I don't know—I have a telegram from—which will be sent to our Ambassador to the delegation to the United Nations—with instructions—I don't know yet.

K: Will you let me know what you are going to do.

D: But I will right now mention to them that you are not going to put any—you are not going to today, yes?

K: We have no intention to put one in today unless there is a drastic change.

D: Of the situation.

K: We thought that since you wouldn't agree with us on our proposal and since we wouldn't agree with you, it would be best to have a general discussion.

D: I think so. Maybe there will be some reply and then we will be in touch with you, of course. But as of now my personal feeling is that the best thing to do is a general discussion without . . .

K: Why don't you inform Moscow of this?

D: I will do that right away.

K: Also, we will take a conciliatory—you know not a conciliatory but . . .

D: I understand—under the circumstances.

K: We will follow your line of not attacking you.

D: I understand.

K: And I will include finally some reference of the discussion of MFN in my speech tonight.[3]

D: I think, under the circumstances, it would be a good idea—from our side, too.

K: I will do that. Good.

D: What about the telephone? Couldn't you extend this particular telephone. Your own people probably know.

K: I will get it done within the next few days.

D: Yeah. It's just an extension of your telephone in your office to the department. There is nothing to be done on my side, really.

K: No, no, it will be done. You can be sure.

D: Because otherwise to call by . . .

K: No, no, I understand. You can count on it.

---

[3] Kissinger spoke in Washington before the foreign policy convocation "Pacem in Terris III," sponsored by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

D: Okay.
K: Bye.
D: Bye. Bye.

---

124. Memorandum From William B. Quandt and Donald Stukel of the National Security Council Staff to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 8, 1973.

SUBJECT

Arab-Israeli Situation Report

Ambassador Keating reports that today will be critical to the Israeli position, as the IDF, now fully mobilized seeks to regain lost ground on the Syrian front.[2] The eventual outcome of the fighting is not in doubt, but the price to be paid for expelling Syrian and Egyptian forces will be high. Already the Israelis have admitted to *35 aircraft lost* in suppressing SAM sites in Syria, an unexpectedly large number. The Syrians have apparently captured some of the pilots.

The Egyptians have apparently gained control of the entire east bank of the Canal, with at least 500 tanks having crossed, along with 20–25,000 troops. Israeli air attacks this morning initially concentrated on suppressing SAMs on the western bank of the Canal, a necessary prelude to a counterattack against the Egyptian forces on the east bank. The Israeli Embassy here claims that Israeli armor has crossed to the West Bank of the Canal as part of an encircling move designed to wipe out SAM sites and cut off the Egyptian forces in Sinai. We have little in-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 664, Country Files, Middle East, Middle East War, Memos & Misc., Oct. 6–Oct. 17, 1973. Secret. Sent for information. A notation by Scowcroft reads: "HAK has seen."

[2] At 1041Z (6:41 a.m. Washington time) on October 8, Keating reported in telegram 7847 from Tel Aviv, that he was still fairly certain that Israel would win. He noted that as soon as Embassy officers had a better idea of how long the war would last and what it would cost Israel, they would be better able to judge the direction in which the U.S. Government could usefully seek to guide Israeli policy. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files) At 1140Z (7:40 a.m. Washington time), October 8, in telegram 1531 from USDAO/Tel Aviv, the Defense Attaché reported that IDF ground forces with close IAF support had shifted to counter-attack on both fronts that morning. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 660, Country Files, Middle East, [Computer Cables—Mideast War—1], October 1973)

formation on this as yet, but it obviously would open a new dimension to the fighting.

Israeli leaders are clearly not pleased with the course of the fighting, although they appear to be confident of the outcome. The Israeli public has not been made aware of the extent of Israeli losses. It appears as if intense fighting will continue today on both fronts.

It is worth noting that neither side has yet attacked population centers or industrial sites, although the Egyptians did try to sink a tanker en route to Eilat with oil from Iran. If the Israelis do succeed in crossing the Canal into Egypt, however, attacks could spread beyond the current lines.

Pressures are obviously mounting in *Jordan* to join the battle, and Jordan has claimed shooting down one Israeli aircraft. Other Arab countries have promised to make contributions, and *Iraq* has announced it will send troops and aircraft. *Morocco* has indicated that 3,000 troops are available to be airlifted to the Egyptian front. On balance, it would seem that *only Jordan's participation in the fighting is likely to be particularly important*, while the other Arab involvement would be less significant.

We still have *no reports of attacks on American citizens* in any Arab countries. *Nor has Soviet activity been of particular concern. Libya* has been unusually quiet, with Qadhafi offering money but not troops.

From our perspective today, the most important developments are the following:

—If Israel has crossed to the West Bank of the Canal, the possibility of both sides accepting the formula of cease-fire status quo ante will increase.

—If Israeli casualties and aircraft losses grow, Israel may resort to unconventional tactics of trying to outflank Syrian forces by going through Lebanon or Jordan, thus risking the broadening of the war. *If we hope to keep Jordan out of the fighting, we may have to talk to both Israelis and Jordanians soon.*

—*Israel will doubtless request some urgent arms deliveries.* We should probably hold off for another day, but on a contingency basis look into what can be done rapidly.[3]

---

[3] At 11:20 p.m. on October 7, Dinitz called Kissinger to report that the Soviets were definitely involved in the Syrian operation and to complain that when Israelis had gone to make arrangements for transporting the promised U.S. military equipment and had a plane ready to take them, the Americans would not let the plane land at any U.S. airbases. Kissinger replied: "That's nonsense. We had it all arranged." Dinitz said that the Israelis were working on chartering an American plane to fly to Israel. After exclaiming "Oh, those God Damn idiots," Kissinger suggested that they keep the plane in the United States to transport some of the ammunition the next day. (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22)

125. Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail)[1]

Washington, October 8, 1973.

I very much appreciate your taking the time amidst your present heavy preoccupations to share with me your thinking concerning developments in the Middle East.[2]

Even before the outbreak of the current hostilities, I had told Foreign Minister Zayat that I was prepared to explore seriously and intensely with all parties, and especially with Egypt, what the United States might be able to do to assist the parties in bringing peace to the Middle East. This offer still stands.

Obviously, such an effort can best succeed in the calmest possible atmosphere. It is for this reason that the United States has attempted to bring about a ceasefire without at the same time taking a position which might produce a confrontation with the Egyptian side.

With respect to the specifics in your note of October 7, there are two questions. First, the U.S. side is not clear as to whether the first point in the position of the Egyptian side, that Israel has to withdraw from all occupied territories, must be implemented before a conference can take place or whether agreement in principle to such a condition is what is anticipated. Secondly, the U.S. side has received the following message from its Ambassador in Tehran:

"Prime Minister Hoveyda, at Shah's instruction, summoned me at 2315 local to read me cable to Shah from President Sadat transmitted via Iranian Ambassador to Cairo who saw Sadat early afternoon Egyptian time October 7. To summarize, cable gives optimistic description of Egyptian military position on East Bank of Suez Canal and of Egyptian prowess in crossing Canal and establishing bridgehead there. Then cable requests Shah to inform President Nixon that Egypt until now, in order to avoid fighting, has been ready to accept peace under certain conditions. However, Egypt has now been obliged to fight and to take casualties. It still wants peace, a lasting peace in the area. Sadat wants President Nixon to know that if Israel will evacuate all the territories occupied since June 5, 1967, Egypt will be ready to negotiate sincerely

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. No classification marking. The message is attached to an October 8 note from Kissinger to Zayyat stating that, as promised, attached was the message sent that morning to Ismail and expressing his appreciation for his contacts with the Foreign Minister over the past days. See footnote 4 below.

[2] Document 118.

to place these territories under the control of the United Nations, or under the control of the four big powers, or under some other international control to be agreed. As for Sharm Al Sheikh, Egypt is prepared to accept international supervision of freedom of navigation through Gulf of Aqaba after Israeli withdrawal. Sadat wants Shah to explain foregoing to President Nixon so that casualties may be stopped as soon as possible."

The U.S. side would greatly appreciate clarification of the position on withdrawal and of the differences between the positions of the Egyptian side contained in your note and as passed to our Ambassador. In particular, did our Ambassador convey accurately the position of President Sadat regarding evacuation of territories and the placing of them under international control?[3]

I would like to reiterate that the United States will do everything possible to assist the contending parties to bring the fighting to a halt. The United States, and I personally, will also actively participate in assisting the parties to reach a just resolution of the problems which have for so long plagued the Middle East.[4]

Warm personal regards.

---

[3] In telegram 5360 from Amman, October 8, Brown reported that according to Jordan's Ambassador to Egypt, Abdul Munim Rifai, Sadat had learned that the U.S. Government was planning to push for a cease-fire and return to status quo ante and considered this completely unacceptable to Egypt. Brown wrote that Rifai would be reporting to King Hussein that Sadat and the Egyptian military believed they had won an important victory and could not be pushed back across the canal. The Egyptian military believed they had the strength to push well into the Sinai and were urging this on Sadat. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 73)

[4] At 1:45 p.m. on October 8, Kissinger telephoned Zayyat and stated that he had softened the statement the United States would make in the United Nations to "an almost unrecognizable point" and had added another point that peace in the Middle East required observance of all the UN resolutions, which, he pointed out, the Israelis would not be enthusiastic about. He noted that Zayyat would find that this was "a minimum statement given our conditions here." Zayyat complained that the United States was helping Israel to stay on this "false issue of security." Kissinger stated that the U.S. position and the principles it would announce would be maintained even if the Israelis were gaining territories. He agreed to send a copy of his message to Ismail to the Foreign Minister at his suite in the Waldorf Towers. (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 128–130.

126. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Israeli Ambassador (Dinitz)[1]

Washington, October 8, 1973, 1:14 p.m.

K: How are you?

D: Fine. How are you? Is this call from me to you?

K: It is from me to you.

D: With your permission I will give you the latest information I have and the special thing from the Prime Minister. The situation on the front looks considerably better. We have gone over from the containment to attack both on the Sinai and Golan Heights. Our military people think that a good possibility we will push the Syrians all the way across the ceasefire line and we are also moving out the Egyptian forces in the Sinai.

K: I have seen a report that you have crossed the canal.

D: I have seen this too and I talked to the Prime Minister's office an hour ago and I could not get any confirmation. I was waiting confirmation on that. I will read to you this subsequent message. Continuing with the military review. It is all the more important for us to gain time to complete the job. We will not only reject—I am waiting instructions from the Prime Minister—we not only reject that which freezes the cease fire but which calls for return which is unrealistic because there is no guarantee they will withdraw their forces. I want to tell you we suffered very heavy casualties both in human and equipment. From the SAM–6s which were very effective against our planes. I don't have an additional figure against the 35 planes I told you about yesterday. The human casualties I think are over 100 or maybe hundreds. We have no confirmation.

K: Hundreds?

D: Yes. Hundreds. It is quite possible that we will take some military positions on the other side of the canal. I am saying this without confirmation. The earlier message from the Prime Minister is that it is possible that we will take military positions on the other side of the canal and on the former ceasefire line of the Golan Heights in hot pursuit and to insure ourselves against new attacks and to have some new political cards to play as we talked yesterday. I don't have confirmation of any action such as this because the fighting is still to the best of my knowledge still on our side of the ceasefire line. Now I have a special

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking.

message from the Prime Minister to you which I will read and when we see each other I will take it to Peter so he can take it. "The Prime Minister wishes to convey to you her profound appreciation not only for your help but for your wise counsel. She says in the cable that you understand exactly the situation that goes on in our minds as if you were sitting with us here. The aims of our fighting are absolutely clear to you. It is our objective that the heavy blows we will strike at the invaders will deprive them of any appetite they will have for any future assault. Our extraordinary military efforts extolled a heavy price, especially planes. We are faced with a tremendous gap in quantity. Our planes are hit and being worn out. The Prime Minister urgently appeals to you that there is an immediate start of delivery of at least some of the new Phantom planes. End of message."

K: I will do my best and tell her for her information I have talked to the President this morning and to General Haig about the replacing of aircraft losses which as you know met some opposition yesterday and he has agreed in principle.[2]

D: I see. How do we proceed. Shall I wait to hear from you.

K: You had better wait to hear from me. It might affect your own calculations.

D: That is very important. I will send a message right away.

K: I don't want to mislead you. We will maintain our position on the ceasefire line. We discussed this yesterday without prejudice to the immediate military operations. That is the position we will take at the Security Council. We will not introduce a resolution just a philosophical talk.

D: Of course.

K: One other thing. We have had a much more conciliatory Soviet message[3] this morning urging us to urge restraint but we have answered that we are urging restraint. At any rate we are warning them against any action and I am giving a speech tonight in the Pacem in Terris conference and I am making two pointed references that détente cannot survive irresponsible actions. In one context I mention specifically the Middle East. I am going also in this speech to mention our MFN position and I hope to God this is not a week when the Jewish League will start attacking me on this position.

D: To a degree I can speak in the name, that I don't think that it will happen this week in any way.

---

[2] Kissinger met with Nixon and Haig from 9:55 to 10:18 a.m. (Ibid., White House Central Files, President's Daily Diary)

[3] See Document 123.

K: I don't think it would be very wise. That is not my major problem. The final question I have, Mr. Ambassador, is the Lebanese have asked us to appeal to you that you should not violate their sovereignty[4] and rather than send you a message through the ambassadorial channel I thought it easier to tell you directly and not have too much paper work.

D: I am sure we have no designs to violate their sovereignty.

K: If you have no such designs and you could pass such a message to me that I could pass to them and to the British it would help establish the climate we all need.

D: I will confirm it to you. We will keep the British out.

K: Confirm it to me and if you could do it soon it would be helpful.

D: I have one item for you—an additional item. I have received many calls during the morning from senators of all sorts. All with sympathy and request for help. I assured them all that American Government is urging peace, stability and seeing things eye to eye and that we have no problem. Some wanted to sponsor a resolution and instead of this I think what they are doing at this stage is coming out with a statement. Scott will be contacting you shortly.

K: He has done so and I have told him that I have no objection to the sort of resolution[5] and I discussed it yesterday with him. I am not pushing it.

D: I am not either by the way. Sen. Bayh and Senator from Calif. and Kennedy[6] came out with a statement. They are all lining up. I am not asking any initiative on their part. Just briefing them and many are asking whether they can help materially. I say to them I am in close touch with the Government and we have no outstanding problems.

K: Right.

D: Yesterday I gave you information from our intelligence re the Russians and the Syrians.[7] I have a correction. They are not sure about it and ask me to tell you not to use it unless we have further confirmation.

K: O.K.

D: Whatever can be done on the planes and other equipment we would be grateful and it would be helpful.

---

[4] Buffum reported the Lebanese démarche in telegram 11884 from Beirut, October 7. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

[5] Kissinger spoke with Senator Hugh Scott (R–Pennsylvania) about the resolution at 11:35 a.m. and again at 1:15 p.m. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22)

[6] Senators Birch Bayh (D–Indiana) and Edward M. Kennedy (D–Massachusetts).

[7] See footnote 3, Document 124.

K: The other equipment I will do something about today.

D: I will wait to hear from you and I will tell the Prime Minister what you have told me.

K: I will try to get the anti-tank and electronic stuff today.

D: Perhaps we should schedule to see each other—you are going to . . .

K: We might be able to do it later this afternoon.

---

127. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 8, 1973, 2:35 p.m.

K: I forgot to mention to you this morning that I had worked out with Benites, the President of the GA, that he would recognize only three speakers. We did not want a debate in the General Assembly. It would have been a massacre. The Syrians, Egyptians and Eban spoke and the GA adjourned on that topic. This afternoon at 3:30 we are speaking. We have a rather good statement for the Security Council but it is mild.[2]

N: Yes.

K: So far no one else has asked for the floor. The Soviets are playing the game we discussed this morning. They are laying low.

N: Yes.

K: We will be the only ones speaking and the only one with a proposal. I have just talked to the Egyptian For. Min. and he will not speak

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking.

[2] Telegram 3742 from USUN, October 9, contains a report on the October 8 UN Security Council session on the Middle East, which convened shortly after 6 p.m. that day. Scali's statement at the session is in telegram 3744, October 9. The Syrian statement is in telegram 3711, the Egyptian statement is in telegram 3714, and the Soviet statement is in telegram 3759, all October 9. (All in National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files) For a detailed account of the session, see *Yearbook of the United Nations, 1973*, pp. 194–196.

unless Eban does. I have a call into Eban to tell him not to speak.[3] I have Waldheim lined up. The tactical situation is that we will be the only one with a proposal on the table. It will not be rejected and will not be voted on. By tomorrow they all will be begging for it.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

[K:] Mansfield and Scott called and the Senate is going to pass a resolution applauding your action up to now and urging us to have a ceasefire and a return to the previous positions which is our position.[4] The reason this is good for us is if we have to turn on the Israelis and turn them back we will have all of the Israeli supporters lined up.

N: They will not know what has hit them. That is good. Fine. Fine.

K: Right Mr. President.

[3] Kissinger spoke to Zayyat at 1:45 p.m. and to Eban at 2:40 p.m. Kissinger told Eban that the Egyptians had agreed not to speak before the Security Council if Eban did not. Kissinger said the U.S. principle was that "the Governments should set a ceasefire." He went on to say that ultimately "the Governments should return to the original positions." (Both in National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 130–131.

[4] On October 8, the U.S. Senate passed a resolution sponsored by Senators Mike Mansfield and Hugh Scott that called for a cease-fire in the Middle East and the return of Arab and Israeli forces to the positions they occupied before the outbreak of hostilities on October 6.

128. Telegram From the Embassy in Jordan to the Department of State[1]

Amman, October 8, 1973, 2115Z.

5368. Subj: Hussein's Views.

1. Have just returned from meeting with King held in army's war room where Jordanian military and civilian leaders congregating. They are sleepless and living on cigarettes and coffee. King himself said he

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret; Flash; Exdis. Also sent Flash to USUN; Niact Immediate to Tel Aviv, Jidda, Beirut, and DIA; and Priority to Jerusalem and Cairo.

felt incoherent. This psychological atmosphere must be considered as we look at what he has to say.

2. First, he thinks that the Syrians are going to get a pasting. I said I agreed as it seemed to me that the Israelis will concentrate first on that front, that their mobilization is complete, and that we may see a different story on the Golan than we had had up to now. What disturbs him the most is that the Israelis will not be content to drive the Syrians back to the cease-fire line but will want to pursue and destroy even if this takes them to Damascus. Of first importance, he believes, is get point across to Israelis that this is unacceptable. Here he thinks big powers, especially U.S., have major responsibility. A large-scale Israeli invasion of Syria, he warns, could drag Jordan in willy-nilly.

2. Second, and this is related, Israel must stop its constant over-flying of Jordan. Today, 64 Israeli planes used Mafraq airbase as a homing area for repeated attacks at Syrian targets. His air force stood on the ground and his pilots feel increasingly humiliated. Israeli planes have constantly and continuously violated Jordan air space on their forays to and from Syria but Mafraq action is a step up over casual passage.

4. Third, the Security Council must act and promptly. It cannot simply be a call for all parties to return to their original positions. A straight-forward simple demand for a cease-fire is what is needed. To it should be coupled something which will re-launch negotiations. He hopes it will come tonight and not drag on.[2]

5. The King asked what I thought. I said that, while it might sound trite, he should cool it. Jordan has been under pressure before. It has stood up well. This is no time for its resolution to waver. Most of all it should not give in to the emotional call of other Arabs, especially those who have absolutely nothing to lose. Jordan has. Its people, its armed forces, and its future development plans are what are at stake.

---

[2] An October 8 memorandum to Kissinger reported Rifai's statement that political pressures on Jordan to intervene in the current Middle East crisis were reaching an intolerable level and that although Jordan could stall for "a day or two," the King could not maintain this position indefinitely. Also, this position probably could not be maintained if the military situation should change drastically, which Rifai thought it ultimately would. Therefore, Rifai considered it essential from the Jordanian point of view to have the Security Council call for a cease-fire, even if it was not adhered to completely. Rifai also said that in his opinion Egypt and Syria would not respond to a cease-fire call which required them to return to their positions of October 5. (Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box CL 168, Geopolitical File, Jordan, Chronological File, 4 June 73–5 Nov 73)

6. King said he agreed with all this but sometimes events have a way of getting out of control and carrying national leaders with them. He thought he could hang on for a few days more.[3]

7. I said we should take it a day at a time. I hoped to have a better idea tomorrow (from Washington) as to how the situation looks. Let's not make any decisions tonight.

8. At another point in conversation King said he thought the Egyptians could hang on. He said it was his understanding that Sadat would not advance far beyond the canal as he would want to keep under the SAM umbrella. The Israelis could do a lot of damage to the Egyptian forces and the SAM missile sites, but probably at great expense to the air force. Said Rifai disagreed; he thought the Egyptians would pause for a moment and then move on to attack Mitla, moving their SAM protection with them. I said the latter might be more difficult than he envisaged.

9. The King said that he had not been informed in advance of the Syrian-Egyptian attack. He reminded me that, however, after each talk he has had with the Egyptians in recent months he has told us that it was his considered view that Egypt would cross the canal, no matter what the odds. His estimate, he continued, had been more accurate than USG intelligence.

10. *Comment:* King was tired, somewhat confused but most friendly. He had done me favor by getting a Dove to Tobruk in Saudi Arabia so that I could get back here. When I thanked him, he said that all he wanted in return was the stabilization of the situation and an immediate start on a meaningful settlement for the ME. If it does not come, the Arabs will sit back for a short while, convince themselves that they could have won the war with a slightly greater effort, and then re-launch it. Who would be running what country then he could not guess. I think he is right.

Brown

---

[3] At 2041Z (4:41 p.m. Washington time), in telegram 5367 from Amman, October 8, Brown reported that Hussein told him that he had just received a message from Faisal asking for release of the Saudi forces stationed in Jordan so they could be sent immediately to the Syrian front to take part in the battle. The King said that Faisal's message was "semi-hysterical and very critical of Jordanian inaction at moment Syria and Egypt fighting the 'sacred battle'." Hussein had already replied, saying that the Saudi troops were needed in their present positions in Jordan, but told Brown that this was the sort of pressure he was increasingly subject to from virtually every Arab state and he begged for a prompt cease-fire. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973)

129. Memorandum From William B. Quandt and Donald Stukel of the National Security Council Staff to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 8, 1973.

SUBJECT

WSAG Meeting, October 8, 1973, 5:30 p.m.

The main items on the agenda for today's WSAG meeting will be the following:

—Situation Report

—Israeli Arms Requests

—Status of Libyan Contingency Study

—Status of Oil Contingency Study

—Jordan's Possible Involvement in the Fighting

The *Israeli arms requests* may be the most sensitive issue. They have apparently asked for 40 F–4s and 300 M 60 tanks, as well as some smaller equipment. Because of the signal it would give to the Soviets and Arabs, we will not want to make commitments on the larger items now. Even after the fighting, we will not want to be the first ones to engage in a massive resupply effort. There are some grounds for thinking the Soviets may be more restrained this time than in 1967.

The smaller Israeli requests—ammunition, CBUs, ECM, sidewinders—are in a different category, since they might be handled secretly and could actually affect the course of the battle. If we decide to grant these requests, we must try for total secrecy. This means Israeli aircraft landing at night at designated airfields to attract minimum attention.[2]

The tabs in this book[3] cover the main issues:

—Situation Report

—United Nations Activity

—Libya Contingency Paper

—Oil Contingency Paper

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, NSC Institutional Files (H–Files), Box H–93, Meeting Files (1969–1974), WSAG Meetings, WSAG Meeting, Middle East, 10/19/73 to WSAG Meeting, Middle East, 10/7/73, WSAG Meeting, Middle East, 10/8/73. Secret; Nodis.

[2] A handwritten notation next to these two paragraphs reads: "You probably will not wish to discuss this at the meeting."

[3] The tabs are attached, but not printed.

—Evacuation

—Cables

Situation Report

Attached is an early afternoon status report and a CIA situation report. They state that the Israelis have gone on the offensive on both the Egyptian and Syrian fronts; that Israeli casualties since the war started appear to have been substantial; that Jordanian entry into the war remains a strong possibility; and that there have been no new moves today by other Arab countries or by the Soviets toward active involvement. The Israeli Chief of Staff said this evening that Israeli forces have retaken most of the territory the Syrians had taken in the Golan Heights, and that the Israeli offensive on the Egyptian front was making good progress but had not yet crossed to the western bank of the Suez Canal.

Talking Points:

—Does everyone agree with the CIA/DIA estimate that the fighting will have turned decisively in the Israelis' favor very shortly?

—Does anyone see a serious possibility, for example, of prolonged indecisive fighting? Of Israeli forces getting trapped on the west bank of the Canal?

—Do we foresee involvement by the other Arab countries on a scale that could seriously prolong the war or affect the outcome?

—Will the chances of other Arab involvement increase or decrease with an Israeli rout of the Egyptians and Syrians?

—What can we do now to reduce the danger of Jordanian or Lebanese entry into the war?

United Nations Activity

Ambassador Scali's speech is included at this tab.

The key issues to be considered now are when and whether we will want to take a more specific position on the terms of a ceasefire and when we might want to table a resolution. The position of other parties appears to be as follows:

—*Egypt* continues to feel that a ceasefire must be linked to a settlement which results in Israel's withdrawal from from the occupied territories.

—*The Europeans* are meeting to develop a common position, but have not reached any conclusions yet.

—*The Israelis* will show little interest in a ceasefire unless it involves withdrawal to the previous lines.

Talking Points:

—Ambassador Scali has given a speech at the UN which is deliberately vague on terms of a ceasefire. Until the situation on the ground is

a bit clearer, we will stick to this position. It is possible that some minor changes in the ceasefire line, especially on the Syrian front, could be accepted by both sides, so we do not want to tie our hands in advance. Nonetheless, the general point of favoring the restoration of the status quo ante remains.

—We have not yet tabled a resolution. At what point in the fighting would it make most sense to do so?

—The British have just passed us language for a possible compromise resolution that they would table tomorrow. It would call for "immediate cessation of hostilities in order to create conditions in which rapid progress could be made toward a peaceful settlement in accordance with resolution 242." The British see this as a possible compromise between the position they assume we will take and what the Arabs with support from the non-aligned will go for. Could we work with this resolution to make it more acceptable?[4]

[4] Lord Cromer spoke to Kissinger at 11 a.m. on October 8 to tell him that the United Kingdom would not introduce a resolution but a "philosophical statement" in favor of a cease-fire and a return to the pre-October 6 positions. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22)

130. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, October 8, 1973, 5:40 p.m.

D: I want to tell you that they are expecting this information. We are not going to do anything at the Council. No kind of resolution in the Security Council. Our representative in the SC has instructions not to have any polemics with the American representative. Meanwhile we continue to consult urgently with the Arab side. In this connection, we would like and hope that you will do everything not to force the SC to accept any resolutions.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking. The blank underscore indicates an omission in the original. A notation indicates the transcript does not cover the first minute of the call.

K: You can count on that.[2]

D: Until we have finished our consultations with our allies.

K: May I make a suggestion to you. Your Arab friends are going around New York saying I am giving them an ultimatum.

D: In New York?

K: Yes. I thought we had an agreement specifically.

D: They are trying to delay the SC meeting.

K: It is not going on yet.

D: No?

K: It has been delayed. My own recommendation is we don't care whether it takes place or not much. Let's have it, get it over and adjourn it. I promise you we will not introduce a resolution.

D: I can give instructions along those lines. In Moscow it is now _____ hours.

K: Let's see what happens. You can promise Moscow flatly there will not be a resolution in the near future. There will not be a resolution. We are making a very mild statement.

D: I understand.

K: It states our general position in such a vague way. We are not saying there must be a return to the ceasefire line. Just saying one way to achieve peace.

D: I understand. We would like to have consultation.

K: I promise you we will not introduce a resolution. I would hope you would not spring one on us.

D: I have specific assurances on this.

K: Let's have an understanding that neither one of us will introduce a resolution without giving the other one notice.

D: Exactly my instructions from Moscow.

K: We will not do it I promise you without giving you time to consult with Moscow. You do the same for us.

D: Good.

K: Fine.

---

[2] At 3 p.m. earlier that day, Kissinger called Dobrynin and informed him that the United States would make a statement that it did not want to assess blame and offering some principles for a settlement in a very general way. He also promised that the U.S. Delegation would not propose a resolution and said he was counting on the Soviets not to come in with a resolution. Dobrynin responded that according to all of his information, there would be none. (Ibid.) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 131–133.

131. Minutes of Washington Special Actions Group Meeting[1]

Washington, October 8, 1973, 5:55–6:25 p.m.

SUBJECT

Middle East

PARTICIPANTS

Chairman—Henry A. Kissinger

State
Kenneth Rush
Joseph Sisco

Defense
James Schlesinger
William P. Clements, Jr.

JCS
Adm. Thomas H. Moorer
Vice Adm. John P. Weinel

CIA
William Colby

Treasury
William Simon

NSC Staff
Brig. Gen. Brent Scowcroft
William Quandt
Lt. Col. Donald Stukel
Jeanne W. Davis

Secretary Kissinger: These Egyptians! I've had a series of phone conversations with Zayyat on the Security Council action. He announced that I had given him an ultimatum. I called him again, went over what I said word for word, told him it was not an ultimatum, and he announced that I had withdrawn my ultimatum.[2] And we have been saying exactly the same thing all the time.

Bill (Colby), I've read your latest report (attached).[3] Has everyone?

All had.

Secretary Kissinger: Do you have anything to add?

Mr. Colby: Not really.

Secretary Kissinger: Tom (Moorer), what's your military assessment?

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, NSC Institutional Files (H–Files), Box H–117, Minutes Files, WSAG Meetings Minutes, Originals, 1973. Top Secret; Nodis; Codeword. The meeting took place in the White House Situation Room.

[2] See footnote 4, Document 123.

[3] A copy of Colby's briefing is in Central Intelligence Agency, OPI 16, Directorate of Intelligence, Office of Current Intelligence, Job 79–101023A, Box 1, Folder 1. In the briefing, Colby reported that Israel continued to press its counterattacks on both fronts, but that there was no evidence to confirm that Israeli units had crossed the canal. "This contradicts information passed earlier today by the Israeli defense mission in Washington to the effect that such crossing had taken place," he added. Colby concluded: "The Egyptians claim that they hold the entire east bank of the canal, but concede that their forces are under heavy attack. In fact, we believe that the Israelis have launched counterattacks that have reached the canal in some places."

Adm. Moorer: I agree with Bill Colby. Israel is moving on the Golan Heights. They are having a little more difficulty in the south. They're not across the Canal yet. But General Salan, with a reinforced armored division, is attacking all along the line, and the Corps Commander is leading another division attacking the Canal. There is a lot of Israeli helo activity. The momentum is reversing. Tomorrow will be a very active day. Today the Israelis flew over 400 sorties, which is quite an effort considering the number of aircraft they have. They seem to have suppressed the missile activity. They claim they've taken out about 80% of the missiles but I don't think it's quite that high.

Secretary Kissinger: They're losing a lot to the SA–6's.

Adm. Moorer: Yes, for two reasons. They're mobile and they can't find the launchers. Also, we have never been able to get sufficient information about them to develop any good countermeasures. They're low-level missiles and were first deployed around the Aswan Dam. The Russians gave the Syrians 1000 missiles—SA–2's, 3's and 6's. Egypt has 3600 missiles along the Canal and around Cairo and the airfields. They account for most of the Israeli losses. The Israelis are flying low for ground support of their troops. You remember they withdrew some air from the Golan Heights so as not to interfere with their ground forces and their tanks. The T–62 tanks have been committed but they were stopped by the Israelis. They are the latest tanks with the 115mm gun. The Israelis knocked them out.

Secretary Kissinger: How many tanks did the Syrians have?

Adm. Moorer: 270.

Secretary Kissinger: How many does Egypt have?

Mr. Colby: They add up to about 400.

Adm. Moorer: A little more than 100.

Mr. Schlesinger: The Soviets are going to see $2–3 billion worth of their equipment going up in smoke again. At the moment, they do not seem disposed to replace it. If they don't, Israel has military supremacy. If we replace Israeli equipment losses, it might trigger the Soviets to replace equipment lost by the Egyptians and Syrians. If they are deterred from replacing that equipment it might be desirable for us to hold off replacing the Israeli equipment.

Mr. Colby: This is the third time around for the Soviets.

Secretary Kissinger: You think they are going to lose it all?

Mr. Schlesinger: Yes. In ordinary battle they would lose 6–700 tanks. The Syrians are alleged to be in flight from Golan.

Mr. Colby: Yes, the Israelis have essentially reoccupied the Golan Heights.

Mr. Schlesinger: The Israelis will mop up the equipment tomorrow.

Secretary Kissinger: The Arab mind is hard for me to fathom. In any rational strategy, they would have asked for a ceasefire Saturday[4] night. To plead with us not to ask for a ceasefire is to ask for their total destruction. I don't understand them.

Adm. Moorer: They are lulled by their initial success and they think it will continue. Sadat has so much as said so.

Mr. Schlesinger: The Israelis are likely to cross the Canal and mop up the SAM's.

Adm. Moorer: They are saying the Egyptian and Syrian forces will be "totally destroyed."

Mr. Colby: They do have a good capability for commando raids.

Secretary Kissinger: We are well positioned. We have asked for a Security Council meeting. A return to the ceasefire lines will work for the Arabs. We won't change our position. We will stick with it and not leak it. That's all we can do at this moment.

Adm. Moorer: I might just review our own forces. The [*less than 1 line not declassified*] task group is south [*less than 1 line not declassified*]. We've directed the amphibious ships to a training anchorage at [*less than 1 line not declassified*]. They can just stay there; they're just as available there.

Secretary Kissinger: Fine.

Mr. Sisco: It looks better, too.

Adm. Moorer: The *Kennedy* is entering Edinburgh and will be there for four days.

Secretary Kissinger: Good. I can't go into detail, but we have had several very conciliatory messages from the Soviets today. As of now, I see no chance of its going like 1967 with the Soviets making threatening noises. There is better than a 50–50 chance that we will wind up jointly with the Soviets. That can only help us. I talked to Dobrynin just five minutes before this meeting[5] and we are keeping the atmosphere very calm.

Adm. Moorer: We stood down our reconnaissance flights in the Eastern Mediterranean. We are prepared [*2 lines not declassified*].

Secretary Kissinger: That's preferable to the U–2?

Mr. Colby: Yes, the U–2 isn't very good for this.

Secretary Kissinger: That's a helluva lot better than the U–2. Will that be picked up on radar?

Mr. Clements: Yes.

---

[4] October 6.

[5] See Document 130.

Secretary Kissinger: Will it fly over Israel?

Adm. Moorer: Yes. [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Clements: It won't be a secret. They'll pick it up on radar and hear the boom.

Adm. Moorer: No, there's no boom.

Mr. Schlesinger: We can put it on alert. It takes 48 hours to get ready. We can cancel within the 48 hours if we want to.

Secretary Kissinger: Yes, let's put it on alert. We have 48 hours to stand it down. Joe (Sisco) will you watch that for me?

Mr. Sisco: I'll alert you one way or the other.

Mr. Schlesinger: We have some supplies at Eskenderun which is within the Syrian "danger zone." We may not need to get anything from there, but if we do, we'll just go ahead and do it.

Secretary Kissinger: Don't pay any attention to the Syrian "danger zone."

Adm. Moorer: We had an exercise scheduled with the Turks around there but we cancelled it. But there's no reason why we can't go in for supplies if we need them.

Secretary Kissinger: No, go on in if you need to.

Mr. Schlesinger: I don't anticipate having to draw on these supplies, except as a contingency. If it were off-limits, we could supply from the Atlantic.

Secretary Kissinger: The Syrians are in no position to do anything about it. You say they have committed 5 divisions? If they lose them all, how many does that leave them?

Adm. Moorer: They have about 100,000 men in uniform.

Mr. Schlesinger: That approach from King Faisal to Hussein to release the Saudi troops in Jordan is troublesome.[6]

Secretary Kissinger: We're in contact with the Jordanians. We've sent them two messages. I also have another message making the point even stronger.

Mr. Schlesinger: If Saudi troops go against the Israelis and are chewed up, the reaction will be bad.

Mr. Sisco: I think it's right to take that seriously, but I don't think there is any reality that the Saudi troops will get in.

Secretary Kissinger: If our estimates are correct, by Wednesday[7] night at the latest, there will be a Security Council resolution. We may hear from the Soviets tomorrow.

---

[6] See footnote 3, Document 128.

[7] October 10.

Mr. Colby: The other Arab leaders may have some problems. They may consider this a piece of jackassery by Sadat and Asad, which doesn't necessarily have to involve all good Arabs.

Secretary Kissinger: So far their reaction has been very mild.

Mr. Colby: But if the Egyptians and Syrians get beat up and humiliated, there will be a reaction.

Secretary Kissinger: As soon as the ceasefire line is crossed, we will get a resolution. We have made every move Egypt has requested us to make.

Mr. Schlesinger: Even to withdrawing your ultimatum.

Secretary Kissinger: We have made no move that Egypt has objected to. As late as this afternoon, the New York contingent of Arabs still thought they were winning. I don't know what their capitals think or what their reporting procedures are.

Mr. Schlesinger: The Egyptian military is very concerned but they can't break through the euphoria of Sadat and his circle.

Mr. Clements: Someone said Egypt has a 10-day supply of ammunition, maximum. Is that reliable?

Adm. Moorer: It depends on their rate of expenditure. They have no staying power.

Mr. Colby: They have 10 days' supply with the unit across the Canal.

Adm. Moorer: Neither side can stay for very long. They will both run out. The Russians probably gave them about 10 days of ammo.

Secretary Kissinger: It will wind up by Wednesday or Thursday.

Mr. Colby: The Golan Heights developments are most important. If the Israelis are pushing them back already there, they're about 24 hours ahead of my schedule.

Adm. Moorer: A 10-day supply of ammo is not unusual.

Mr. Clements: To go to war with, it's unusual.

Adm. Moorer: If they want a short-war strategy, that's one way to get it.

Secretary Kissinger: Do we have any other problems?

Mr. Schlesinger: Hassan is the most worrisome. He has troops in Syria and he believes the US stance has been completely pro-Israel. We have those [*less than 1 line not declassified*] that he might try to knock out. He may need some special treatment.

Mr. Sisco: We've done two things. The Secretary has approved a message to Hassan, assuring him that the 6th Fleet movements are purely precautionary. Also we have suggested a brief message for the President to send to Hassan, which is up on the seventh floor for the

Secretary's approval.[8] I agree with you (Schlesinger) that some special treatment of Hassan is required.

Secretary Kissinger: We'll get the Presidential message out before tomorrow morning.

Mr. Colby: [*1½ lines not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: Go ahead.

Mr. Colby: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: I'll take that up with the President tonight.

Mr. Schlesinger: We're holding the *Roosevelt* at Barcelona. The press report that it was moving was wrong.

Secretary Kissinger: Right. Let's not do anything provocative. The Soviets are calm. It's quite different from 1967. They're making no threatening noises, no military moves, no noise in the Security Council, they have agreed to coordinate with us. If the Arabs start to scream, we can say that their friend asked us to hold off. I'll consult you Jim (Schlesinger) and Bill (Colby) early afternoon tomorrow to see if we need a meeting. Scowcroft will keep you all informed.

Mr. Colby: I spend a half-hour with the Senate Armed Services Committee this afternoon.

Mr. Schlesinger: By tomorrow, the Israelis will likely be across the ceasefire line at the Canal and they may move on Port Fuad.

Secretary Kissinger: The Egyptians have filed a formal complaint with the Secretary General saying that Port Said was being bombed. I asked the Secretary General on what principle, and he didn't know.

Mr. Sisco: They may be laying the basis for any bombing they may want to do in a civilian area. There may be activity in Fuad, but the Israelis won't stay there. There's a swamp there, and they don't want to be trapped. They did the same thing in 1967.

Secretary Kissinger: They want to trap what's on their side of the Canal.

Mr. Colby: They want to eliminate the force.

Mr. Schlesinger: They can let that force wither on the vine.

Secretary Kissinger: It depends on the timing. As soon as the Arabs wake up to what is happening, there will be no basis for resisting the ceasefire.

---

[8] In telegram 4620 from Rabat, October 9, Parker reported that he had given to the Secretary General of the Moroccan Foreign Ministry, Ali Skalli, and the Acting Director of the Cabinet, Ghali Benhima, the U.S. message contained in telegram 199755 to Rabat, October 8. The message stated that any moves of the U.S. Sixth Fleet were precautionary and pointed out that the fleet was responsible for protecting U.S. citizens in the area. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 660, Country Files, Middle East, Mideast War, October 1973)

Mr. Schlesinger: The Israelis want to get rid of that equipment west of the Canal. They may cross over before the East Bank is wiped up.

Secretary Kissinger: Do they have a parachute division they haven't used yet?

Mr. Colby: Yes.

Adm. Moorer: And helos. They haven't lost as many helos as the Egyptians have.

Secretary Kissinger: How many have the Egyptians lost?

Adm. Moorer: About 20. And we don't know how many the Israelis got on the ground.

Mr. Clements: The Hill will be asking questions tomorrow. Who will handle them?

Secretary Kissinger: We've been answering questions right along. There will be no briefing right now. Tell them to call the State Department Operations Center. Let's wait one day.

Mr. Colby: I only got one political question. Senator Jackson asked if it wasn't true that we had good intelligence on this operation and that Israel wanted to launch a preemptive strike and we prevented it. I said "no".

Secretary Kissinger: The Israelis volunteered to us that they would not undertake a preemptive strike.

Mr. Colby: I didn't get into that.

Secretary Kissinger: It's just not true.

Mr. Clements: You ought to think about the Hill. We'll be under lots of pressure.

Secretary Kissinger: Yes, but not tomorrow. So far things are going very well. We've kept both the Arabs and the Soviets from blowing at us. It's totally different from 1967. If we wind up with the Arabs and the Soviets stay with us, we'll be doing very well. If we brief the Hill, some jackass will run out and say something pro-Israel. Then we've had it. (Senator) Hugh Scott asked me if I had any objection to their resolution, and I said no. He then announced that I had endorsed it.

Mr. Sisco: The Secretary has talked to several Congressmen and the Operations Center has answered 50 or 60 calls.

Secretary Kissinger: But we are only drawing on the McCloskey briefings. We're giving them nothing that hasn't been said publicly and no military information at all. After Thursday,[9] you can brief all you want. But our biggest effort is to get this thing wrapped up without confrontation with the Arabs or the Soviets. We're okay on the Soviets, but it's still touch and go with the Arabs.

---

[9] October 11.

Mr. Sisco: You have the McCloskey briefings[10] and will have the Scali speech at the UN.[11] That gives you a half-dozen detailed public statements to draw on.

Secretary Kissinger: I think this has been a good team effort.

Mr. Schlesinger: I think it is going to turn into a duck-shooting contest.

---

[10] At a news conference on the afternoon of October 7, State Department spokesman Robert J. McCloskey announced that the United States was calling for a meeting of the Security Council with a view "to finding the most appropriate means for bringing the hostilities in the area to an end," and "to help find the means to restore conditions in the area conducive to a settlement of the longstanding disputes and differences in the Middle East." (*The New York Times*, October 8, 1973)

[11] See footnote 2, Document 127. In his speech, Scali called for an end to hostilities in the Middle East and a return to the cease-fire lines that had existed before fighting broke out. Scali also requested Council action "to reduce the prevailing tension in the Middle East and to prepare for a reinvigoration of the process of peacemaking." He added that the Nixon administration hoped the Council would use the "present tragedy" as a "new beginning rather than simply another lost opportunity." The speech was published ibid., October 9, 1973.

---

132. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 8, 1973, 7:08 p.m.

P: Hi, Henry. What's the latest news? I got the military news.

K: Yeah. Well, on the diplomatic front we had another message from Brezhnev asking us not to table a Resolution and promising us he would not table a Resolution without consulting with us, telling us they are using a great effort on the Arabs.[2]

P: Yeah.

K: First of all, if this turns out to be true—Well, first of all, we're in no hurry to table anything.

P: No.

K: We're making our record. We're the only ones that are pushing for anything.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking.

[2] See Document 130.

P: Yeah, yeah.

K: But if we bring it off—By Thursday[3] it will be over in my view.

P: Oh, sure.

K: If we bring it off, Mr. President, if this thing ends without a blowup with either the Arabs or the Soviets, it will be a miracle and a triumph.

P: Right. The one thing we have to be concerned about, which you and I know looking down the road, is that the Israelis when they finish clobbering the Egyptians and the Syrians, which they will do, will be even more impossible to deal with than before and you and I have got to determine in our own minds, we must have a diplomatic settlement there.

K: I agree with you.

P: We must have. We must not tell them that now but we have got to do it. You see, they could feel so strong as a result of this, they'd say: Well, why do we have to settle? Understand? We must not, we must not under any circumstances allow them because of the victory that they're going to win—and they'll win it, thank God, they should—but we must not get away with just having this thing hang over for another four years and have us at odds with the Arab world. We're not going to do it anymore.

K: I agree with that completely, Mr. President. But what we are doing this week is putting us in a position to do—

P: To do something, that's right.

K: To do something.

P: And to do something with the Russians too.

K: Exactly.

P: I'm not tough on the Israelis. Fortunately, the Israelis will beat these guys so badly I hope that we can make sort of a reasonable—You and I both know they can't go back to the other borders. But we must not, on the other hand, say that because the Israelis win this war as they won the '67 war, that we just go on with status quo. It can't be done.

K: I couldn't agree more. I think what we are doing this week will help us next month.

P: Maybe. I hope so. But in any event, on Brezhnev, he may be wanting—Of course, the other thing that Brezhnev may be thinking of, his clients are going to get clobbered. You know, that's the only reason Kosygin came to see Johnson.

K: Yeah, but in '67 they were slamming their fleet around, they were threatening war, they were castigating us at the Security Council

---

[3] October 11.

. . . breaking diplomatic relations with us, threatening our oil installations. And no one has made a peep against us yet.

P: That's great.

K: And that's a major triumph for our policy and we can use it in the MFN fight.

P: Thank God, yeah. You've got the Congress in good shape and you've got . . .

K: I had a good talk with Stennis.[4]

P: How good? Does he think we're doing the right thing?

K: Oh, he says he's marking it down on his calendar. He said it's a great day.

P: Because why?

K: Because he thinks we're in control and we're handling it well.

P: Right. Good, good, good. That's good. Actually though, the Israelis are really moving now, aren't they?

K: Well, they will be by tomorrow morning. I mean, they're in a position now from which they will—

P: They'll cut the Egyptians off. Poor dumb Egyptians getting across the Canal and all the bridges will be blown up. They'll cut them all off—30 or 40 thousand of them. Go over and destroy the SAM sites. The Syrians will probably go rushing back across now.

K: No, the Syrians—that will turn into a turkey shoot by Wednesday.[5]

P: Yeah, yeah . . . surrender.

K: Either surrender or a terrific shellacking.

P: Just so the Israelis don't get to the point where they say to us: We will not settle except on the basis of everything we got. They can't do that, Henry. They can't do that to us again. They've done it to us for four years but no more.

K: The first thing we've got to do is to get them back to their lines prior to the ceasefire.

P: I agree.

K: Which this they've promised us. But no one else knows we're going to manage it. And the next step then will be to start the diplomatic offensive.

---

[4] Kissinger and Stennis talked on the telephone at 10:20 a.m. on October 8. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, p. 116.

[5] October 10.

P: Right.

K: Right after the election, which is two weeks from now.

P: That's right. Oh, I know, you've got to wait until after that. The first of November.

K: Right.

P: Good. Let me know if anything comes along.

K: But if we can hold this present situation another 48 hours, Mr. President it will be a great triumph for you.

P: Maybe that's right.

K: No. Yeah, because we can brief the hell out of this one.

P: Why?

K: Just compare it to '67.

P: Yeah, I guess so. Well, we thought we could brief the #@*! out of Jordan. It didn't help much.

K: Jordan we never briefed much.

P: Never did, did we?

K: No.

P: That was really a good one though.

K: But there we couldn't tell the truth.

P: We really with no cards at all—just like India/Pakistan—played a hell of a game.

K: Exactly.

P: This time we don't have any cards either.

K: We're playing a pretty good game.

P: That's right. Okay, Henry, thank you.

K: Right.

---

133. Telegram From the Department of State to the Embassy in Lebanon[1]

Washington, October 9, 1973, 0010Z.

199794. Subject: Israeli Communication to Government of Lebanon. For Ambassador Buffum. Secretary has received following assur-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1173, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations File, 1973 War, 9 October, 1973, File No. 4 [2 of 2]. Secret; Niact; Immediate; Nodis. Drafted and approved by Sisco. Repeated Niact Immediate to Tel Aviv.

ance from the Israeli Government[2] which it asked that we communicate to GOL: Israel has no intention of violating Lebanese sovereignty provided Lebanon refrains from military activity against Israel.[3]

Kissinger

[2] Kissinger met with Dinitz from 6:40 to 7 p.m., October 8. Also in this meeting, Kissinger assured Dinitz that Israel could load electronic equipment on its plane. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL ISR–US)

[3] In telegram 11946 from Beirut, October 9, 1308Z, Buffum reported that he had transmitted the Israeli assurances to Secretary General Sadaqa of the Lebanese Foreign Office that morning and had drawn his attention to the rapidity with which the Secretary personally had taken up this matter with Israel. Sadaqa said he was most appreciative of what the U.S. Government had done. Buffum pointed out that these assurances clearly implied that Lebanon had the responsibility on its side to prevent military activity against Israel, and he noted the seriousness of the fedayeen actions. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 621, Country Files, Middle East, Lebanon, Vol. III, Jan. 71–Oct. 72)

134. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, October 9, 1973, 8:20–8:40 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Ambassador Simcha Dinitz of Israel
Military Attaché General Mordechai Gur
Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
General Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff

Secretary Kissinger: I need an accurate account of what the military situation is.

Ambassador Dinitz: I brought the General to do that. Let me say something and then we can have a few words alone.

Secretary Kissinger: All right.

Dinitz: We got a message which sums up our losses until 9 a.m. Israeli time. In planes, 14 Phantoms, 28 Skyhawks, 3 Mirages, 4 Supermy-

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Records of Henry Kissinger: Lot 91 D 414, Box 25, Arab-Israeli War. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting was held in the Map Room of the White House. Brackets are in the original.

steres—a total of 49 planes. Tanks—we lost something like 500 tanks. Some were lost on the way.

Secretary Kissinger: 500 tanks! How many do you have? [to Scowcroft:] We should get Haig here. Well, we can give him the figures.

Ambassador Dinitz: This includes those that were put out of commission for a week or more.

Secretary Kissinger: How many do you have?

Gur: 1800.

Dinitz: We lost 100 in the north and 400 in the south.

Kissinger: How did it happen?

Dinitz: It will become clear from the military situation.

Kissinger: So that's why the Egyptians are so cocky. Can I use these figures?

Dinitz: With the President.

Kissinger: Anyone else?

Dinitz: They were given to me for you.

Kissinger: How many have the Egyptians lost?

Gur: 4–500 in the Sinai, and the Syrians 400.

Kissinger: It is still about one-to-one with the Egyptians.

Gur: Yes.

Dinitz: Replacements to Syria are coming from Iraq. So far there are 16 Mig 21's and 32 Sukhoi–7's, all with pilots. As of yesterday, we observed an Iraqi armored division coming into Syria. There is also a request from Syria to Iraq for tanks. We have indications that they are on the way.

Egypt has received 18 Mig–21's from Algeria. There are also preparations for additional ones. Libya is giving hundreds of Strela missiles and a French anti-aircraft missile. Also there is an unknown number of planes. Another squadron of Hunters are coming from Iraq, and Me–6 helicopters. From the Sudan, an infantry brigade is expected.

Kissinger: Explain to me, how could 400 tanks be lost to the Egyptians?

Gur: We were in a very big hurry to bring them to the front line. That's why we say some were lost on the way to the battle.

Dinitz: Some got out of commission because of moving so fast.

Scowcroft: Do you know how many were battle losses?

Gur: Some were hit by artillery fire on the Suez Canal. They have heavy artillery fire. We don't know the exact numbers. I assume the biggest number were put completely out of action. [General Gur then pulls out a map and sits beside Kissinger.]

Let me show you the situation. They crossed the Canal all along here from Qantara to the Suez. Now they have a line 6 to 8 miles from the Canal.

Kissinger: Miles or kilometers?

Gur: Miles. They crossed with five infantry divisions. In each division they have tanks, a total of 6–700. So they have a narrow strip all along with their backs to the water. On the main axis, they have armored divisions that are ready to exploit if the infantry divisions can open the road to the east.

We have blocked the road. We have not allowed them through to exploit. We succeeded in this yesterday and it is the same today.

Kissinger: How many Syrian tanks have been lost?

Gur: 400, and we 100. On the Golan Heights, in most of the line they are now out, and we are back to the situation they were in before the war. But one armored brigade is still inside.

Dinitz: Encircled.

Gur: They still have a passage out.

Kissinger: But they have not broken inside. The army is intact, not running.

Gur: Many big units are very severely harmed.

Dinitz: They have brought up their last armored division from the Damascus area.

Gur: They wanted to assure we won't cross into Syria.

Kissinger: Will you?

Gur: That we will have to see. The Iraqi armored division may come. It will take 2 to 3 days for their tanks to come.

Kissinger: They won't be able to fight right away.

Gur: It depends on our air operations. On the Golan Heights, we're holding the same line, and will be able to straighten the line here without a big effort. And put them in the position where they will not be able to launch a big attack. This will help us concentrate on the south.

Kissinger: But when? That's the question.

Dinitz: I asked and have not received an answer.

Kissinger: On Saturday,[2] you said Tuesday or Wednesday.

Dinitz: Yes, two days from Monday noon. Obviously something went wrong. It comes down to their ability to cross the Canal with armor, and the success of their anti-aircraft missiles which weakened our air effort.

---

[2] October 6.

Gur: We have two possibilities. One is to concentrate to drive their forces to pieces by an offensive, would be very costly because of the anti-aircraft missiles. The other possibility is to straighten the lines and make an effort a little bit inside, without air support.

Kissinger: They won't move.

Gur: They might. We have information they may go to the Mitla.

Kissinger: I think there will be a ceasefire call tonight.

Dinitz: Based on a return to ceasefire lines?

Kissinger: No. If you ask me. I have no evidence.

Yesterday I thought we had it won—politically. Now with your bombing Damascus all hell will break loose in the UN.[3] But that's water over the dam. I don't know what the local situation is.

OK. Now what can we do?

Dinitz: The decision last night was to get all equipment and planes by air that we can.

[A call comes in for the Ambassador. He takes it and Gur continues the briefing.]

Gur: And we have mobilized all our El Al planes from here.

Kissinger: Where are you going to get it?

Gur: From here. All the equipment we asked for.

There was a problem with El Al markings flying in, and for security reasons.

Kissinger: That's a bigger problem now than we thought. I must tell you, don't go running around Defense. Scowcroft will handle it.

You can't get tanks from here.

Gur: We could get them from Europe and take them by ship. This will be helpful even if it is two to three weeks. We have crews ready for the planes and tanks. It's important; it's urgent. Your Air Force used to deliver it in civilian planes. Our pilots can get them.

Kissinger: But not in the middle of a war. [to Scowcroft:] See what we can do.

Gur: Planes we need.

Kissinger: You have to realize that to take planes from combat units will be in every newspaper in the world.

Gur: But we face fire.

Kissinger: I understand your problem.

---

[3] Israeli jets attacked Damascus on October 9, causing a reported 100 civilian casualties, including a UN employee and some Soviet citizens.

I don't understand how it could happen. Our strategy was to give you until Wednesday evening, by which time I thought the whole Egyptian army would be wrecked.

Gur: We were in the same position. We didn't know how many would cross. Another thing. We need general information. I asked for information about Iraqi forces moving.

Kissinger: [to Scowcroft:] Call Colby and tell him to give them every bit of intelligence we have.

Gur: Thank you.

Kissinger: We face massive problems. We expected a quick victory. Our whole strategy was to delay until Wednesday.

Dinitz: [Returning to discussion after finishing the call:] We now have another cable in. They say that 7–800 tanks are across the Canal of which 150 are in fighting condition.

We are concentrating now on a fast Syrian victory. With the Egyptians it will take longer.

The Soviets made a supreme effort of supply in the last minute before the war—we have caught FROG missiles that were sealed with the date April 1973.

They have anti-tank missiles operating in the Canal.

There are 30 SA–6 batteries in both fronts. We pushed [back] two armored divisions of Syrians this morning, with heavy casualties [inflicted]. It looks promising.

On the Egyptian front, we have deployed defensive positions to contain the pressure for advance.

Kissinger: Good. Can I talk to you alone?

[Kissinger and Dinitz confer alone from 8:43 to 8:48 a.m.][4]

[4] Kissinger recalled that Dinitz told him that Prime Minister Meir was prepared to come to the United States personally for an hour to plead with President Nixon for urgent arms aid. Kissinger rejected such a visit out of hand. He noted that such a proposal could "reflect only either hysteria or blackmail," and "would be a sign of such panic that it might bring in all the Arab states still on the sidelines." (Kissinger, *Years of Upheaval*, p. 493; *Crisis*, p. 145) Meir recalled that she telephoned Dinitz urgently and told him she was willing to fly to Washington incognito to meet with Nixon if the Ambassador thought it could be arranged. (Meir, *My Life*, pp. 430–431)

135. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, October 9, 1973, 9:40–10:25 a.m.; 11:55 a.m.–12:20 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State and Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Dr. James R. Schlesinger, Secretary of Defense
Ambassador Kenneth Rush, Deputy Secretary of State
Admiral Thomas Moorer, Chairman, JCS
William Colby, Director, Central Intelligence

SUBJECT

Special WSAG—Principals Only[2]

Kissinger: This will be a preliminary discussion. Later we will meet with the President. The Israelis have called all night asking for deliveries. This morning they said they bombed Damascus hoping for a quick victory.

At 0800 they told me their losses in aircraft and tanks.[3] Some of the tanks have broken down. The total of Arab resupply from other countries is 1,800.

They are desperate and they want help. They are willing to mobilize the aircraft and paint out the El Al signs. They especially need anti-tank ammunition.

Schlesinger: That is strange. Yesterday they said the 30th was okay.

Kissinger: I am just reporting what they said. Also Golda wants to come over here for one hour and return.[4] That is unusual for just 100 tanks.

Let me give the problems. You all can think about this and we then will meet with the President.

Battles in the desert are like naval battles; you either win or lose. Their lines could crack, or there could be a stalemate. That too would

---

[1] Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversation, Box 2. Secret; Nodis. The meeting was held in the Situation Room at the White House. Brackets are in the original.

[2] At 9:20 a.m., Kissinger called Rush and informed him that he had just received some very personal information from the Israelis for the President, which was not too good, but which he wanted to share with Rush but did not want to repeat on the telephone. He said that he was holding a principals only WSAG meeting, and suggested that Rush could be treated as a principal for this purpose. (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, p. 148.

[3] See Document 134.

[4] See footnote 4, Document 134.

give the Arabs a tremendous boost. If the Israelis can represent us as having screwed them in their hour of need, we lose any leverage we have.

Schlesinger: It also increases their need for us.

Kissinger: The best way would be for them to win without our help.

Schlesinger: That still may be okay.

Kissinger: We have to decide how to handle these requests—we can meet them, deny them, meet them partially, or obfuscate. To meet them would immediately drive the Arabs wild.

Moorer: It would trigger the Soviets also.

Rush: Also the Saudis.

Kissinger: They said they would do well with the Syrians today and hold against Egypt. They are scared that if their losses get out, all the Arabs would jump in.

Schlesinger: They still have a decisive edge in aircraft, and know that many can be repaired.

They are asking for two types of things. The ancillary equipment we can do, except some ECM with technicians. The major issue is tanks and aircraft. If we seem to turn around a battle that the Arabs are winning, we are in trouble. We should be willing to defend the Israeli borders ourselves, but not get involved now.

Their story has shifted in the last 24 hours. They either fibbed yesterday about the bridges down or today about the forces who got across.

Colby: They are doing okay in Syria. They have pushed them back.

Kissinger: But Syria didn't crack.

Moorer: The Israelis are out numbered four to one.

Colby: The Sinai is farther away and less accessible. Syria is an immediate threat.

According to the last reports they are doing well along the Canal. If the Egyptians have only gone 10–12 kilometers, that is not much.[5]

Rush: The Israeli objective is to get us locked in. We can break with the Soviet Union.

---

[5] At 6 p.m. that evening, the State Department's Middle East Task Force's Situation Report #15 reported that the Israelis were continuing to hold the line on both fronts, but that their counteroffensive appeared to be stalled. They had not broken through the new Syrian line nor breached the Egyptian bridgeheads east of the canal. The Embassy in Tel Aviv had reported that the IDF was low on tank and artillery ammunition, which might be inhibiting traditional Israeli hell-for-leather armor thrusts. The Israelis said they had lost 49 aircraft as well as 100 tanks on the Syrian front and 400 on the Egyptian front. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1173, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, 1973 War, 9 October 1973, File No. 4 [2 of 2])

Kissinger: As of last night we were in great shape.

Rush: This may be the Israeli scenario to lock us in.

Schlesinger: The situation has not changed that much. We want to see Syria and Egypt get their knuckles rapped. We have a chance that we may wind up with an Egyptian presence in the East Bank. We don't like it—but is that enough to risk our new stature with the Arabs?

Kissinger: There are two interpretations of Soviet behavior: First, that they have washed their hands of the Arabs and hope they get kicked. That gets it for us. The second possibility is they knew about it all along and strung us along.

By tonight we will face a ceasefire resolution which we can veto, abstain or vote for. The present instruction is we should abstain. I don't see how we can veto it unless the Arabs object.

Schlesinger: Maybe we should vote for it. Who can object to a vote for peace?

Kissinger: If we vote for it, how can we avoid sanctions? Because Israel won't accept it, they will feel betrayed.

Rush: I think we should abstain. If we vote for it, or if we abstain, Israel will do what it wants anyway. If we veto, we face massive problems.

Kissinger: It is possible the Arabs will couple a ceasefire with a return to the 1967 borders. We can probably start talking.

Colby: A couple of days would help.

Kissinger: That is a tactical problem. How about Golda coming? My judgment is that would be a mistake.

Rush: A mistake.

Kissinger: The President's first instruction is to give everything. I am leaning to give them as much of the consumables as possible that are of use in battle, and put the heavy equipment on a time schedule which would put it beyond the war. There are two F–4's this month, is that correct?

Schlesinger: They will be ready in a couple of days. We need to know about the bridges.

Kissinger: We should fly the SR–71.

Colby: The bridges can be put up and taken down.

Kissinger: They say they underestimated the Egyptians' capacity. They were cocky last night, pushing for aircraft, but I said yes, but after the battle.

Moorer: They underestimated the Syrians and had to divert their air.

Kissinger: Maybe they will turn it today. But for Golda to absent herself, that is not an easy decision.

Colby: The long-term Israeli strategy is to lock us in. Their time clock is ticking. If they wrap it up in a few days, they will lose their chances to lock us in.

Rush: I think they are trying to lock us in. She wouldn't leave if the situation was desperate. This would be the worst thing for them to do.

Kissinger: That may be, but we don't know their objectives.

Colby: To lock us in is their objective; they need many appropriations.

Schlesinger: We can't replace the tanks without using the C–5.

Kissinger: If we can figure a schedule which we could fulfill after the war, that is the way I am thinking. We can't ship the tanks and a large number of aircraft during the battle.

Kissinger: But are there two or three F–4's lying around which are not in units which we could offer and say that is all we can do?

Schlesinger: I will check. The problem is to keep things quiet.

Kissinger: Can we keep ammunition quiet?

Colby: Sending anti-tank ammunition is defensive and can be justified.

Rush: How accurate is the estimate the Arabs only have two days of ammunition?

Schlesinger: If Henry's second thesis is right, the Soviets may have jumped in.

Kissinger: Let's meet at 11:30. Pick out of this list what can be reasonably related to defense and on-going operations.

[The meeting adjourned at 10:25 and was convened again at 11:55.]

Moorer: This is the intelligence assessment from our Defense attaché. 48 hours ago there was gloom. 24 hours ago, they were euphoric. Now they have lost their air of exultation because of a change of attitude on inventories rather than tactically. They are pushing the Egyptians back. The DAO expects new requests for more consumables soon. The losses are stated as 150 tanks and 50 aircraft. He now feels the tank assessment is low and maybe the aircraft assessment is high. He says they will present their losses in a way as to put it in the best light.

Kissinger: There are two issues: supply and the indication the Soviet Union is stirring up the Arabs.

[He read out the Jordan and Algerian cables, and the Bhutto letter.][6]

---

[6] Telegram 5381 from Amman, October 9, reported that the Soviet Chargé had seen the King that morning and told him that the Soviet Union fully supported the Arabs in the conflict with Israel and thought that all Arab states should enter the battle now. The King took this as a Soviet request for him to send his army into action, and told the Chargé that Jordan was acting in accordance with its own national interests. (Ibid., Box

We can't let the Soviet Union get away with this. We have to talk tough to them.

The President will meet with us at 4:00. I told the Israelis they would hear from us about 6–6:30.[7]

Schlesinger: Option one [see attached paper] handles the request for consumables. It leaves out laser bombs—they can't use them. [Tab A][8]

Kissinger: How quickly can we move?

Schlesinger: This evening.

Kissinger: Can you set up a procedure for keeping it secret?

Schlesinger: We will do our best.

Kissinger: Are we using one airfield or many airfields?

Moorer: Maybe two—_____ and Robbins.[9]

Kissinger: I would promise them replacement without a firm promise on equipment with a schedule which would put deliveries after the battle.

Schlesinger: That is okay. If we don't, they may run out of ammo.

Colby: The Israelis have 14 days' supply for a whole army.

Kissinger: That's like the NATO assessments. If you run out of one item, you are out.

Moorer: Not really.

Kissinger: Option two is really option 1 plus lasers. You work out a schedule for the equipment.

Schlesinger: On the F–4, we can't give them any separately, but we can add to the delivery from McDonnell-Douglas. To give them 300 tanks, we would have to take them from the Army.

Kissinger: How can we do it over time?

Moorer: We can't do it without taking them out of inventory—the modern ones.

Kissinger: We have two things—get them over the crisis and set up a resupply schedule. We can't fly in tanks with a C–5. It would be a to-

---

618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973) On October 9, Scowcroft forwarded to Dobrynin a copy of a report from Algiers stating that the Soviet Ambassador had given Algerian President Boumedienne a Soviet message urging the leaders of Algeria to use all means at their disposal to support Syria and Egypt in their struggle against Israeli aggression for the liberation of Arab territories occupied in 1967. (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin and Kissinger, Vol. 7)

[7] See Documents 140 and 141.

[8] Attached, but not printed.

[9] Omission in the original.

tal disaster. If they think they will get replacements, they may be more free in expending them.

Schlesinger: Tactically they are not doing badly. They are worried about supply.

Kissinger: I am outraged by the Soviet behavior.

Colby: That is cheap. It is not costing them anything.

Kissinger: But it is not what they promised the President.

Schlesinger: What we are seeing is not a tactical change, but ammunition shortages . . .

Kissinger: Something started during the night, because he was cracking at 1900. Then he called at 2:00 upset.[10] Again at 3:00 and again at 6:35. The only information I have that you don't is these phone calls.

Moorer: I think they reassessed based on reports the Arabs are sending equipment and they are afraid of a war of attrition. The Arabs never before have been coordinated.

Schlesinger: They are crying wolf maybe because they want to lock us in.

Kissinger: I would agree, if they hadn't been euphoric yesterday. Why did they switch?

I think we should not surface anything in the UN and wait for someone else to do something.

Colby: Is there any kind of solution which would leave Egypt on the East Bank?

Kissinger: The best scenario is for Israel to push them across the Canal, but there would be severe strategic losses. We don't want an Arab debacle. Israel has suffered a strategic defeat no matter what happens. They can't take two-to-one losses.

Colby: But isn't that a reason they might agree to Egypt on the East?

Kissinger: The government couldn't survive that. The best would be a status quo. There are heavy Israeli losses.

Schlesinger: The Israelis don't have that faith. We have been giving them little, saying that if there is trouble we will pour equipment in.

Kissinger: My assessment is a costly victory without a disaster is the best.

---

[10] Dinitz spoke with Kissinger on the telephone at 1:45 a.m. on October 9 and requested a meeting with him first thing in the morning to discuss the military situation and resupply efforts. Kissinger was puzzled by the request, believing that by this point the battle should be turning toward a decisive victory in Israel's favor, but agreed to meet with Dinitz and his military attaché shortly after 8 a.m. in the Map Room of the White House. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Transcripts (Telcons), Box 22, Chronological File) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, p. 144. See Document 134.

Colby: Being thrown back across the Canal would be an Egyptian disaster.

Kissinger: Can you identify equipment now for movement after 4:00?

Schlesinger: We want to put the *Roosevelt* to sea.

Kissinger: Wait until 4:00.

Moorer: On the SR–71, can we get the paperwork done?

---

136. Telegram From the Embassy in Jordan to the Department of State[1]

Amman, October 9, 1973, 1355Z.

5380. Subj: Message From King to Secretary. Ref: State 199500.[2]

1. Delivered Secretary's message to King at 1100 local, after he had finally had seven hours of sleep.

2. He immediately drafted reply which is quoted below. This is a personal draft and unedited except for some spelling corrections. It is good representation of his stream-of-consciousness style. Zaid Rifai read letter and made no change in it other than to substitute words "as to the status quo ante" for words "on the present lines". This comes towards end of message.

3. King asked it be sent immediately. He and Zaid then talked of the necessity of a prompt, simple call for a cease-fire. They said that if the U.S. wanted to talk about the status quo ante it would be better to say status quo ante bellum 1967.

4. Following is King's message: "I do believe very firmly that all efforts should be made to bring to an end as rapidly as possible this madness that has caused and is causing with every hour more dear losses of life, and more misery and suffering. I know, sir, of the United States efforts and your good self towards this end.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret; Flash; Exdis.

[2] In telegram 199500 to Amman, October 9, 0529Z, Kissinger sent Hussein some "further thoughts." Kissinger commended Hussein for avoiding involvement in the fighting, assured the King that the United States was making every effort to end the conflict, and agreed that the Security Council meeting should "lay the groundwork for getting meaningful negotiations going on a fundamental settlement." (Ibid.)

"I believe, on the one hand, that what has come to be is a direct result of Israel's lack of contribution, since June 1967, towards the establishment of an honorable, just, and durable peace; Israel's military arrogance, expansionist demands, condescending attitude and over-confidence. They sadly seemed throughout to lack the courage or ability to believe in a real peace, which can only exist and last when two sides feel that it came to exist on honorable bases, causing them to build on it and safeguard it, as opposed to living within a fortress and with a fortress mentality in isolation from all around them and the will to try out another course. The only course worthy of consideration is that of peace. Israel has stated her belief in insulating her security otherwise by depending on outposts and positions on the ground and the reaction was inevitable and, regardless of the outcome, unless Israel's attitude basically changes in the future, inevitably reactions and responses will come again and again with more chaos, anarchy, suffering, loss of life, instability and misery.

"On the other hand, both Presidents Sadat and Assad have taken on their own, without any prior notification of plan or timing, the responsibility for this military action which in itself shows that a lesson was learned from the Israelis in terms of timing and the use of the element of surprise. They were under tremendous pressures, I have no doubt, to do something and I repeatedly warned of that but, on their shoulders, I feel, lies the heaviest of responsibilities now for the entire future of this area, as a result of their decision and chosen course. Forces are locked in mortal combat and neither side can afford to lose. Behind the scene, are many an interested party to turn this area into a real hell and reap the rewards. The Soviets have assured us of their support and indicated a favorable view to all and total Arab involvement as rapidly as possible, and there are many in the area who wish, either defensively, such as the Saudis and their desire to send their brigade to share in the 'honor' of fighting with those who have obviously that sense of honor—Syria. Iraq wishes us to send them our tank transporters to help them move via Jordan to Syria, which we refused in both cases since we need our own transporters and since there is a direct route into Syria from Iraq (incidentally there are 200 Iraqi tanks in Syria or on their way, with an initial two fighter squadrons and possibly four by now). There are eager elements that wish to thrive and will do so on ruin and disaster.

"And there are enormous pressures on us, for Palestine is more closely connected with our very existence than with any other Arab party involved. Until now we have taken such action, despite these pressures and Israeli aerial continued violations and provocations, as to maintain calm and self control. Militarily, this is sound at this stage and we have sufficient sound military arguments to maintain this

stance due to the situation to our north and in Sinai, but for how long can we exercise this self-control if fighting continues together with provocations and pressures?[3]

"Lastly there are your interests and ours at stake. I am saddened by the fact that the Soviets are identified with the Arab effort, whereas the United States is identified with Israel. A cease-fire, sir, must come as soon as possible to save so much which is at stake. A cease-fire without conditions as to the status quo ante and then a serious effort to bring this conflict to a final end. Whether this could come soon or whether it would be accepted by the fighting parties and others, I would not know, but it would certainly improve the image of the United States enormously to advocate such a course and do all possible to acheive it.

"With all my best wishes and regards, respects to the President and appreciation for your genuine sentiments, courtesy, and kindness. Hussein".

Brown

[3] In telegram 1542 from USDAO/Tel Aviv, October 9, the Defense Attaché reported that following an IDF briefing, Israeli Military Intelligence Chief Zeira had delivered a "well-rehearsed tirade" stating that if Hussein caused any waves, "Israel would dedicate the IDF to the task of completely destroying Jordan, its air force, army and infrastructure." (Ibid., Box 1173, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, 1973 Middle East War, File 4, October 9, 1973 [2 of 2]) In telegram 7882 from Tel Aviv, October 9, Keating expressed his concern and advised informing Hussein of the IDF threat. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files) In telegram 5373 from Amman, October 9, Brown reported that he had mentioned Zeira's threat to the King, who took it seriously. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973)

137. Memorandum From Secretary of State Kissinger to President Nixon[1]

Washington, October 9, 1973.

SUBJECT

Information Items

Middle East Situation: Israeli forces continued their offensive for the second straight day today, attempting to clear all Syrian forces from the Golan Heights and to reduce the Egyptian bridgeheads on the east bank of the Suez Canal. Israeli spokesmen have sounded a note of caution, stating that the initiative has not yet passed to their forces and that they are not dealing with an enemy that can be easily defeated.[2]

—*Syrian Front:* Despite Syrian counterattacks throughout the night of October 8, the Israelis claim to have maintained their positions. This morning Israeli forces again took the offensive to clear the remaining Syrian troops from positions on the Golan Heights. Large numbers of Israeli aircraft have been in the air over the region. The Israelis also claim to have destroyed from one-fifth to one-third of the Syrian armored inventory of about 1,500 medium tanks. Fighting on the front may drag on for several more days, depending on the Israeli objectives and Syrian resistance.

—*Egyptian Front:* On the Suez Canal, the Israelis do not appear to have yet launched a major ground offensive but are continuing with large-scale air attacks. During the night of October 8, the Egyptians continued to reinforce their units on the east bank and claim to be driving further inland. The Israelis say they have sunk three Egyptian missile boats in the Mediterranean and several other boats in the Red Sea. Meanwhile, [*less than 1 line not declassified*] the Israelis may have begun heliborne commando raids against targets as far west as Bilbays Airfield near Cairo. Cairo claims to have raided the Bala'im oil fields on the east side of the Gulf of Suez, setting some wells on fire and sinking an oil rig.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 55, President's Daily Briefings, President's Daily Briefs, Oct. 1–15 Oct., 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Contains Codeword. A stamped note on the memorandum reads: "The President has seen."

[2] A note in the margin in Nixon's handwriting reads: "K—Sound a note of caution re expecting an early end. Indicate—because of huge Arab buildup fighting could go on for a month or so."

Last night's special session of the UN Security Council adjourned without reaching any decision.[3] The U.S. split with the Soviet Union and China on how to stop the fighting, proposing that Israel, Egypt, and Syria halt military operations and return to the old cease-fire lines. China demanded that the Council condemn Israeli acts of aggression and called for Israeli withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories. Soviet Ambassador Malik said the Security Council could not make a decision without a clear-cut statement from Israel of its readiness to withdraw all of its troops from occupied territories.

[*1 paragraph (1½ lines) not declassified*]

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

[3] See footnote 2, Document 127.

138. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail)[1]

Washington, October 9, 1973.

Dr. Kissinger expresses his appreciation to Mr. Ismail for his prompt reply and friendly words in his message of 9 October 1973.[2]

The U.S. side trusts that the Egyptian side understands that what the United States has done thus far in the current crisis is the absolute minimum action it could take in view of the public pressure to which the U.S. Government is exposed. As a result of the explanation in Mr. Ismail's message, the U.S. side now understands clearly the Egyptian position with respect to a peace settlement.

The U.S. side is less clear, however, as to the views of the Egyptian side on how the present fighting can be brought to an end. These views

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. No classification marking. The date is handwritten. The message is attached to an October 9 transmittal memorandum from Scowcroft instructing that the message be delivered as soon as possible. Scowcroft's memorandum is marked Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only.

[2] In this backchannel message to Kissinger, October 9, Ismail confirmed that Israel should withdraw to the 1967 lines and return Egyptian territory to Egypt, not international control; and that there could be an international presence at Sharm el-Sheik to supervise free navigation of the Straits of Tiran. (Ibid.)

would be very useful to the U.S. side in formulating its position in the current debate in the Security Council. In the hope of hearing the views of the Egyptian side, the U.S. side will hold off as long as possible in presenting a definitive U.S. position in the Security Council.

The U.S. side wishes to reiterate its willingness to consult urgently with the parties concerned in order to achieve a just peace settlement in the Middle East. In these difficult times, it is important to keep this long-term perspective in mind and to avoid confrontations and bitter debate as we seek to resolve the present crisis.

This will be the guiding principle of the U.S. side, and we hope that it likewise will motivate the actions of the Egyptian side

Warm personal regards.

---

139. Memorandum From William B. Quandt of the National Security Council Staff to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 9, 1973.

SUBJECT

Middle Eastern Issues

Today's developments suggest that our generally optimistic estimates of the outcome of the fighting could be wrong in several key areas. I mention these only because I sense that we have been caught by surprise too often in the last few days and we may now be at the point of having to face up to some difficult decisions.

The important facts that seem to emerge from today's fighting are the following:[2]

—*Israel, while generally regaining the initiative, is taking heavy losses* and fighting seems likely to drag on for several more days.

—*Threats to American citizens, which previously have not been noted in the Arab countries, have surfaced in Lebanon.* If Israel bombs civilian areas

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 664, Country Files, Middle East, Middle East War, Memos & Misc., Oct. 6, 1973–Oct. 17, 1973. Secret; Sensitive. Sent for information. Scowcroft's handwritten notation at the top of the page reads: "Thanks." All brackets are in the original.

[2] Scowcroft's handwritten notation in the left margin reads: "Good prognostication."

in Damascus and Cairo, anti-American sentiment could flare up rapidly. [See Ambassador Buffum's cable at Tab A.][3]

—*Oil from Iraq and Saudi Arabia* that is normally shipped by pipeline across Lebanon and Syria is blocked. Kuwait is calling for the use of oil as part of the battle.

—*Reports that Israeli bombing has caused Soviet casualties in Damascus* raise the possibility that Soviet moderation could rapidly shift to a policy of military support via arms shipment to Syria and Egypt. [See Tab C.][4]

—*Urgent Israeli arms requests* raise an acute dilemma of acting either too soon or too late in terms of our later ability to deal with either Arabs or Israelis in any future peace settlement effort.

—*Jordan seems to be drawing closer to possible involvement in the fighting*, to judge from the highly emotional tone of King Hussein's reply to your message. [Tab B][5]

In light of these possible developments, the following decisions may have to be faced soon:

1. *Evacuation of American citizens from Lebanon*. This could probably still be done by commercial carriers in a relatively orderly manner. Timing is obviously of critical importance.

—On the one hand this would signal heightened US concern at a time when we may want to present a more confident image. If a ceasefire is achieved tomorrow, there may be no need for such a move.

—On the other hand, if the Arabs face a massive defeat in the next few days, it may be better to begin to get Americans out of Lebanon tomorrow, before attacks on them begin.

2. *Ceasefire*

—As fighting goes on indecisively, our own interests become increasingly exposed and Jordan runs the risk of being drawn in. Most of our Ambassadors in the Arab world seem to feel the best outcome we can hope for now is an immediate ceasefire.

—Until the Israelis have recovered lost territory, there may not be much we can do to stop them, even if we chose to do so. The balance of gains and losses on this issue is increasingly close. If we call for an im-

---

[3] In telegram 11953 from Beirut, October 9, attached at Tab A, Buffum described the situation as growing more tense as fighting continued and noted that Lebanese Government officials were uneasy about the threat of Israeli military action in response to fedayeen attacks against Israel. A copy of the telegram is in the National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files.

[4] At Tab C is an October 9 CBS report that stated that Israeli planes scored a direct hit on the Soviet Embassy in Damascus and quoted a Soviet diplomat as saying that 30 Russians, including women and children, had been killed.

[5] Tab B is Document 136.

mediate end to the fighting, we will irritate the Israelis, which may mean a loss of influence in future negotiations.[6] If we do not manage to end the fighting soon, however, our relations with the Arabs and possibly even the Soviets could suffer.

3. *Israeli Arms Requests*

—If we act too early or too visibly on this key issue, we will insure attacks on US citizens and an oil embargo in key Arab states.

—If we refrain from action at a time of genuine Israeli need, we cannot expect much Israeli confidence in us after the fighting is over.

4. *The Soviet Role*

If the Israelis inflict casualties on Soviet citizens in Syria or deal a devastating blow to the Arabs, the Soviets will be under strong pressure to react by resupplying arms to their clients and generally striking a more militant posture.

5. *Oil*

If oil exports to Western Europe from Arab countries are cut by 1.6 m.b.p.d. as reported, we must expect an announcement of export controls on oil products from Europe. This will create shortages in the US this winter. We should be prepared to issue a statement on rationing if necessary in the next few days.

The key problem that emerges from this analysis is whether we should consider altering our position on a ceasefire. In favor of doing so in the direction of simply stopping the fighting as soon as possible are the prospects for increasingly serious threats to US interests if the fighting is prolonged many more days. The price of pushing for a ceasefire in place would probably be an agreement with the Israelis on strong military and diplomatic support after the ceasefire, which may complicate later efforts at an overall settlement. On balance, however, this might be judged worth the cost, unless tomorrow the Israelis can recover lost territory. By Thursday,[7] we may need to consider a shift in our policy on this key issue. As painful as it might be, the alternatives may not look all that attractive.

---

[6] In telegram 7878 from Tel Aviv, October 9, Keating wrote that the "optimum scenario, as I see it, from point of view of U.S. interests, would be for Israel to declare forthwith, before end of war, that (A) Israel wishes only to drive back Egyptian and Syrian forces to pre-October 6 lines, not to crush Egypt and Syria; (B) Israel will stop shooting once this is accomplished if other side also stops; (C) Israel intends to occupy no additional territory; and (D) Israel will continue after war to seek peace settlement with Egypt, Syria, and Jordan under which, among other things, Israel would withdraw its forces from territories occupied in June 1967 war to secure and recognized boundaries." He admitted that the chances of getting Israel to make such a declaration were probably not good, but thought the United States should try. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

[7] October 11.

140. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, October 9, 1973, 4:45 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

President Nixon
Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Alexander M. Haig, Jr., Assistant to the President
Ron Ziegler, Press Secretary
Maj. Gen. Brent Scowcroft, Dept. Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

The President: Give no background—especially to that jackass Jackson.[2]

Kissinger: The information we had prior to the outbreak was this. We had been receiving information about the buildup. I asked Dinitz for an assessment. He said there was no chance of an attack and they had adopted defensive positions as a result of the Syrian air battle of last month.[3]

The President: Dinitz has to keep the pro-Israel group off our back.

Ziegler: The *Guadalcanal* is moving. What is that for?

Kissinger: It's for the evacuation of Libya. It should be by helicopter, not the 82nd.

The President: How about Dobrynin?

Kissinger: I told him if they are playing games, it risked the whole relationship.[4]

Up to Saturday[5] there was unanimity that the Arab buildup was defensive. Friday night we got an Israeli message, disturbed about events that day. Saturday morning they told Keating they wouldn't attack.[6]

---

[1] Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversation, Box 2. Secret; Nodis. The meeting was held in the Oval Office.

[2] Kissinger and Nixon were planning to meet with the Congressional leadership the following morning. See Document 143.

[3] See Document 134.

[4] Kissinger spoke with Dobrynin on the telephone at 11:29 a.m. and told him that the Soviet Chargé in Amman was encouraging Hussein to join the fight. Dobrynin said that it was unbelievable, but agreed to check with Moscow. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Anatoli[y] Dobrynin File, Box 28)

[5] October 6.

[6] See Documents 95 and 99.

Never once did we tell the Israelis not to attack. After the war started, I approached the Soviets; the British were for a joint approach in the Security Council. The Soviets refused; the British wanted a simple ceasefire, but then decided not to submit any resolution. The Chinese had no instructions.

Golda said they would have victory by Wednesday night and not to table a resolution before Tuesday.[7]

Egypt is opposed to a resolution also.

The Soviet Union has asked for us to hold off on a resolution while they work with the Arabs.[8]

For us to table a resolution would be a disaster right now. If the Russians come in with a simple ceasefire, we are in trouble. We can't veto it. We either vote yes or abstain.

We are still in good shape. We are the only ones that both sides are talking to. We have two messages from Ismail;[9] we kept Jordan out; we have a message of thanks from Lebanon;[10] and we are in touch with the Russians.

The President: How many Americans are there in Israel?

Kissinger: If the Arabs sense that the Israelis have lost more than they have admitted, they might rush in.

The President: Why do we have such lousy tanks?

Let's give them some M–60 tanks. It would give them great assurance if we could eventually give them laser bombs.

Let's go ahead on the consumables. But the quid pro quo is to tell Golda to call off the Jewish Community in this country. If it gets hairy, we may need to do more.

Kissinger: But not today.

The President: The Israelis must not be allowed to lose. How about sneaking in planes and tanks?

Kissinger: We can wait until Thursday.[11] If the Israelis for the first time were pushed back by Arabs . . .

The President: Let's identify the tanks and planes on a contingency basis—in Europe.

Kissinger: We want to stick by Israel now so they won't turn on you during the diplomatic phase.

For the leadership meeting. They'll ask: Will we replace the equipment?

---

[7] October 9. See Document 115.

[8] See Document 130.

[9] See Document 118 and footnote 2, Document 138.

[10] Not further identified.

[11] October 11.

Keep it as cool as possible at the leadership meeting. It will keep the Arabs quiet and the Israelis know what we will be doing.

The Israelis will face a new problem. They have lost their invincibility and the Arabs have lost their sense of inferiority.

---

141. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, October 9, 1973, 6:10–6:35 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Ambassador Simcha Dinitz of Israel
Minister Mordechai Shalev of Israel

Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
General Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff

Secretary Kissinger: On your special requests, the President has approved the entire list of consumables, that is, ordnance, electronic equipment—everything on the list except laser bombs. The President has agreed—and let me repeat this formally—that all your aircraft and tank losses will be replaced. Of the tanks you will be getting, a substantial number will be M–60's, our newest. As for the planes, for immediate delivery; you will be getting 5 F–4's, 2 plus 3. For the rest, you will work out a schedule.

Ambassador Dinitz: It's a question of days, Dr. Kissinger.

Secretary Kissinger: It will be a matter of days. On the anti-tank ammunition and anti-tank weapons, Schlesinger is all set. You know whom to get in touch with at Defense. If there is any trouble, contact Scowcroft. This is everything else on the list, except the laser bombs and aircraft. On tanks, you will have to work out a schedule.

At the end of the week we can see what is urgent.

Ambassador Dinitz: We will take it all by plane.

Secretary Kissinger: That's agreed. But you have to paint El Al out. This is for maximum security.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL ISR–US. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting was held in the Map Room of the White House. Brackets are in the original.

Ambassador Dinitz: Our people who I just spoke to said General Sumner said you wouldn't accept our planes even with El Al painted out.

Secretary Kissinger: Oh baloney. You will see a rapid change.

If the need is acute, you'll see a speedup of tanks.

Dinitz: Can you get some through from Europe?

Secretary Kissinger: There is some possibility. We have some at Leghorn. At the end of the week we can see where we stand. The problem of tanks isn't what you need in this battle, but the situation after this battle. You have assurances that you will have replacements. You have the additional assurance that if it should go very badly and there is an emergency, we will get the tanks in even if we have to do it with American planes.[2]

It is absolutely essential also that Senators and Congressmen don't go around attacking the President. Ribicoff called me to say there is a story going around that I kept you from preempting.

Ambassador Dinitz: That's ridiculous.

Secretary Kissinger: That is the story that is going around. They say I kept you from preempting.

Ambassador Dinitz: I know the source. I'll handle it.

Secretary Kissinger: You don't need to say that something is going on—we don't need that—but just keep people from going around attacking us.

Now what is the military situation?

Ambassador Dinitz: The military situation is more encouraging. On the Golan Heights, we have pushed the Syrian forces almost off all the Heights, except at the very edge of the ceasefire line. There are some forces that are not destroyed. Today we destroyed hundreds of Syrian tanks. The missile setup of the Syrians was quiet today, most probably a result of airstrikes yesterday. Also it is possible that they don't want to reveal themselves.

Secretary Kissinger: From the strike on Damascus?

Ambassador Dinitz: That was strategically important because of direct hits on the targets I listed to you. About the other casualties, I don't know.

On the Suez front, we are at five to eight kilometers all along the Canal. Compared to yesterday, this is two to three kilometers nearer.

---

[2] In an October 10 backchannel message to Keating, Kissinger informed the Ambassador of the decision to supply arms and that he had told Dinitz, who would inform Meir. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Dinitz, June 4–October 31, 1973)

Today we operated carefully and contact was limited. We took out the tanks but suffered hits.

In the afternoon, 50 Egyptian tanks began to move south to Abu Rudeis. Our Air Force liquidated thirty and the rest were finished off by our armor.

So this is encouraging news, and with the new equipment we'll be able to strike.

Secretary Kissinger: OK. You get in touch with our military people. They shouldn't talk all over the Pentagon.

Ambassador Dinitz: We'll deal with General Sumner, not Noyes.

Secretary Kissinger: Scowcroft is here in my office to coordinate.[3]

Ambassador Dinitz: He was very helpful to us last night.

Secretary Kissinger: I'm glad he's helpful to somebody! [Laughter]

Ambassador Dinitz: I shouldn't tell tales out of school but I tell people that you only yell at people you trust.

Secretary Kissinger: Only at people I know can do better work. I never yell at Scowcroft. [Laughter]

OK, can I speak to you alone for five minutes?

[Secretary Kissinger and Ambassador Dinitz spoke alone from 6:25 to 6:35 p.m.]

[3] At 7:25 p.m., Kissinger called Dinitz and told him that he had talked with Schlesinger and that Dinitz could go ahead with resupply. He added that a situation was developing in which it would be very hard for the United States to resist a cease-fire in place proposal at the United Nations. Therefore, they needed to be aware in Jerusalem of how the tactical situation was developing. The United States could drag it out, but there was a limit to what could be done. (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 154–155.

142. Memorandum From Helmut Sonnenfeldt of the National Security Council Staff to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 10, 1973.

SUBJECT

The Soviet Role in the Middle East War

Soviet conduct is increasingly worrisome, both in retrospect and as it unfolds now.

That there was Soviet foreknowledge of the imminence of military action seems beyond dispute. Whether there was active encouragement of the Arabs may be questionable—though there may well have been advance assurance of assistance. Whether there was any effort at restraint is equally questionable; conceivably Arab preparations were so far advanced by the time the Soviets became properly aware of them that efforts at restraint would have been ineffectual. Moreover, the Soviets are not known for their readiness to expend political capital with people bent on a course of action.

Speculation that the evacuation from Syria bespoke active Soviet opposition to Arab plans and perhaps even an intent to break relations is pretty persuasively contradicted by indications that the aircraft that went to fetch Soviet nationals carried hardware deliveries of some kind. In addition, a rough comparison with the startup of the 1967 airlift will almost certainly show that the current operation is of greater initial intensity, i.e., that there had to be advance planning, probably going back before October 6.

The airlift itself must be seen against the background of Soviet diplomatic activity. This now plainly involves incitement of other Arabs to join in the fighting, including even Jordan whose history of agony in these situations is well known.[2]

The Soviet press itself remains relatively restrained. But what is crucial at this moment is not what the Soviets say to their own people but what they say to Arabs. And that, together with their evidently deliberate stalling tactics at the UN (even discounting Chinese mischief-making in claiming actual knowledge of these tactics), is calculated to prolong the fighting.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 68, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 19, [July 13, 1973–Oct. 11, 1973]. Secret; Sensitive. Sent for urgent attention. Kissinger initialed the memorandum.

[2] See footnote 6, Document 135.

Whatever one's hypothesis concerning Soviet pre-hostility conduct (foreknowledge is clear, but precisely where on the scale between open incitement and active opposition the actual Soviet position was, is not clear), it seems likely that the Soviets were somewhat surprised by the extent of Arab successes once the fighting started. The Brezhnev round-robin messages to Arabs and the air supply operation got going when the odds for a status quo plus end to the war for the Arabs were rising. The Soviets may even have become infected with the optimism of the Egyptians and begun to feel by early this week that a real Israeli defeat was in the making.[3] In this situation, the explanations of Soviet conduct in 1967 are hardly applicable this time. Then, the Soviets could be said to be engaging in a salvage operation, an effort to restore some bargaining leverage for their clients, a warning to Israel to stop at the Canal and on the Golan Heights, and an effort to retain influence, and Brezhnev may have had to move quickly to save his political neck. In the end, the Soviets did at least contribute to ending the fighting.

In the present case, they may smell victory and the credit that comes with it. They may see an opportunity to participate in a settlement far more palatable to the Arabs than one based on the 1967 cease-fire lines. They cannot be indifferent to the advantages accruing to their power position and image from the humiliation of a US client. (Incidentally, apparent Soviet violations of the Greek and maybe Turkish air control zones will sooner or later become general knowledge, if that is what actually is happening. They are NATO countries.) There is bound to be some connection between Soviet conduct in the war and the Jewish emigration problem; quite possibly the regime may judge that a humiliated, defeated Israel will have less appeal to Soviet Jews. In any event, extended warfare serves as a not implausible pretext for the regime's shutting off the flow, whatever the reaction in the US Congress.

There is in the present situation a haunting possibility of Soviet miscalculation of our reactions. Watergate, Agnew, energy jitters, the President's stake in détente—all of this and more may lead the Soviets to judge that their room for maneuver is considerable, not to mention the limited US military capacity in the region of conflict. One should not of course assume unanimity in Moscow. But though there are no telltale signs of internal argument and maneuvering as in 1967, Brezhnev may see an opportunity to disarm many of his critics on the

[3] In telegram 3031 from Cairo, October 10, the Embassy reported that Soviet Ambassador Vinogradov, who had been meeting with Sadat every day since the outbreak of war, had said that the Soviet Union would deliver whatever was necessary for resupply of the Egyptian forces, just as it had to North Vietnam. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1174, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, 1973 Middle East War, 10 October 1973, File No. 5)

right by publicly aligning himself with the Arab cause. At any rate he is firmly on the side of war in his messages to the Arabs, whatever he may say privately in other channels. He does not seem to be reluctantly acquiescing to hawks.

There is also some slight indication of a Soviet effort to lull us, apart from what may be coming to you in the special channel. Semyonov in Geneva seems to have telescoped his schedule in presenting the new Soviet SALT proposal. What had looked like a drawn-out series of preparatory speeches was suddenly terminated yesterday with the tabling of the Soviet draft which, while clearly unacceptable, does constitute a reply to our last proposal and thus an effort to keep the SALT game active.

It is of course true that Soviet conduct before and during the war does not necessarily provide a clue of what role the Soviets may eventually play in bringing the fighting to a close and in working for some sort of settlement. Without speculating about that in detail now, it seems unlikely that the Soviets will be more inclined than before to pressure the Arabs for concessions if the latter should end up flushed with success. But the prospect of even the most helpful Soviet attitude on these matters at some future time must be weighed against the character of Soviet conduct before and during the war. And that, to me, suggests a judgment either that the US commitment to détente is such that the Soviets have substantial leeway in the Middle East or that the stakes of actively supporting the Arabs override any losses due to the disruption of relations with us. In either case, the time is approaching that the Soviets should be proven wrong. Even if the Administration does not take the steps to do so, Congress almost certainly will.

143. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, October 10, 1973, 9:05–10:36 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

President Richard Nixon
Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State and Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Lt. General Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Congressional Leadership

The President: There is a serious situation in the Middle East. It has developed into something tougher than the Israelis anticipated.

An early decision on the battlefield appears unlikely. Henry will talk very freely, so let's decide what we will say at the end of the meeting, so we don't spook anyone.

The Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence are not here so as not to give a U.S. Government complexion to it. So Henry is talking as Assistant to the President, not Secretary of State.

Kissinger: I will begin with a chronology.

For ten days before the war, we received reports of increased military activity on the Syrian and Egyptian fronts. They were evaluated by everyone as Egyptian maneuvers and Syrian defensive moves after the shoot-down of the 13 aircraft.[2] We get these all the time. In May we had specific dates for an offensive, which never occurred.[3]

On the Sunday prior to the war, I asked the Israelis for their appraisal, and they said they thought it was purely defensive.[4] Our intelligence continuously told us that it was purely defensive and there was no chance for an offensive.

---

[1] Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversation, Box 2. Confidential. The meeting was held in the Cabinet Room at the White House. Brackets are in the original. A list of attendees at the meeting is in the President's Daily Diary. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Central Files) Attending were, among others, Senators Robert C. Byrd (D–West Virginia), J. William Fulbright, and John L. McClellan (D–Arkansas); and Speaker of the House Carl Albert and Congressman George H. Mahon (D–Texas).

[2] See footnote 2, Document 93.

[3] See Document 59.

[4] September 30. See footnote 2, Document 94.

I spoke to Eban on Thursday[5] and he said the Arabs had neither the capability nor the intention.

There was no scrap of evidence that there was more than ten percent chance of war.

On Friday, the Israelis said we could tell the Soviet Union and the Arabs they had no intention of attack.[6]

On Saturday, the Israelis called and asked us for help. So I called Dobrynin. I called the Egyptian Foreign Minister. I called the Syrian Foreign Minister. I called the Secretary-General, and I urged them all to stand down. At the Israeli suggestion, I informed the Soviet Union and Egypt that Israel did not attack.[7]

The Israelis were caught with their pants down—unmobilized.

The military estimate of the state of the attack is that the Golan Heights are back to the ceasefire line, except for two points. The Syrians have lost 700 tanks, but have re-formed along the ceasefire line. So Israel cannot move its forces to the Sinai. On the Egyptian front . . .

The President: The Israeli tank losses have been extremely heavy. We won't violate the confidence by giving you figures, but they are far heavier than anticipated.

Kissinger: So, the situation is different from the previous wars, where the decision was how to end the war in two or three days. Jordan is under heavy pressure to attack. If the Arabs start to win, all the Arabs will jump in. Israel has suffered the equivalent of 100,000 killed.

Let me say a word about the diplomacy: We wanted to command the largest possible international support. The war has produced an explosion in the Middle East, and we want to keep the Soviet Union and Europeans out. If there is an oil cutoff to Europe, they would press for us to do something.

We also wanted to avoid a situation where we could be made a scapegoat. Every day we are talking to the permanent members of the

---

[5] October 4. In his memoirs, Eban recounted that during his October 4 conversation with Kissinger at the Waldorf Towers in New York, he told the Secretary of State that "our experts confirmed that the concentrations in the north and south were very heavy, but they gave no drastic interpretation of their purpose. They spoke of 'annual maneuvers' on the Egyptian front, and of a hypochondriac Syrian mood, which might have made Damascus apprehensive of an Israeli raid . . . Our military advisers believed that without the prospect of aerial advantage, Egypt would not risk storming the Suez Canal and Barlev fortifications. It seemed that American intelligence experts confirmed the Israeli view, and Kissinger was tranquill." (Eban, Personal Witness, pp. 522–523)

[6] October 5. See Document 97.

[7] October 6. See Documents 99, 100, and 101. Kissinger spoke to Waldheim several times during the day; transcripts are in the National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. The meeting with Syrian Foreign Minister Khaddam has not been identified.

Security Council, and the Soviet Union and Egypt. So far there is no one who thinks we have turned against them. On Saturday we explored the idea of joint action with the Soviet Union and the British. There was no interest in a resolution, and putting one in would have been pure grandstanding. We are the only country to have taken diplomatic initiatives.

McIntyre also took soundings with the Security Council members. Nothing.

Now, as to our relations with the Soviets. Did the Soviet Union take us in? Was there anything we would have done had we not had our present relations with the Soviet Union? No. The difference with the war in '67 is the Soviet Union is not massively involved and Israel is not getting a quick victory.

If we conduct ourselves so as to lose Israeli confidence, we will lose our ability to get them to accept a peace. We must also conduct relations with the Arabs so that they don't see me as congenitally opposed to them.

In our relations with Europe, China, and the Soviet Union, we must indicate we understand their concerns. With the Europeans, they must know that we know their concern for oil. With the Soviet Union—that we are not seeking a confrontation. With China—that the Soviet Union will not emerge as the victor in the Middle East.

So we don't want to move until we have a consensus. The situation will change when one or both parties realize they have reached the end of their military capability or when some of the Security Council members join with us in action. But we must not act in a way so as to jeopardize the prospects for a peace settlement.

The President: As the war ends our role must be such that we can play a constructive role in diplomatic initiatives to get a real settlement.

Kissinger: If we can keep our posture, we will be in the best position that we have ever been to contribute to a settlement.

The President: Our goal is not domination of anyone, but to be a peacemaker. So the United States must retain the strength to play a peacemaker role. We must, when the war ends, be in a position to talk to both sides—unlike 1967.

Kissinger: We are attempting to turn this crisis not just back to where we were but to improve the situation to the general advantage.

As for the Soviet Union, they have complex problems. They have urged the other Arabs to join the war. We remonstrated, but they may be just posturing. But they have not actively intervened as they did in 1967.

The President: In 1972, the Soviet Union stood back in Vietnam because they knew they stood to lose other things they wanted more. It's

the same situation now—they may decide to jump in, but they must weigh it against the cost to them in U.S.–Soviet relations.

Kissinger: It's a tough situation. Someone could go crazy—the Soviets, etc. Or it could move quickly to peace.

And so, in conclusion, I have explained why we have not jumped in and what we are after.

Senator _____:[8] Do I understand you are not in contact with the Syrians?

Kissinger: They are talking to no one.

Byrd: Three questions: Are we being asked to replace their arms? Where are the Israelis getting oil? And are we in danger of a cutoff?

Kissinger: We are in touch with the Israelis on that.

The President: We can't comment on that; every state in the area has a right to its independence. The Israelis are not dissatisfied with what we are doing.

Kissinger: We are on a tightrope and can't jeopardize our position by statements.

The President: For the press, you can say this is under discussion and it is not appropriate to comment. If we say yes, we break it off with the Arabs and give the Soviet Union an incentive.

Kissinger: This is relevant to your other question. So far there is no threat to the oil.

The President: We can't afford now to tilt either way.

If something develops on a resolution before the battlefield result, we will consult with the leadership because this is an important decision.

Fulbright: What is our UN position?

Kissinger: [Described the Scali speech and explained why the part about the status quo.][9]

Fulbright: Is this the Rogers plan?

Kissinger: No. The Rogers plan is related to the 1967 lines.[10] We are just talking about the military arrangements and activation of UN Resolution 242, the refugee resolution, etc. In this sense we have gone a little further than we have before.

Before the fighting we had started feelers to start negotiations after the Israeli elections. But we think that to give a concrete plan would have each side sniping at it. We prefer constructive ambiguity.

---

[8] Omission in the original.

[9] See footnote 11, Document 131.

[10] See footnote 4, Document 7.

The President: This unfortunate war is one which might bear fruits toward negotiations.

Kissinger: The objective conditions for a settlement are better than last Friday, but the present situation is very dangerous. We must not tilt, but we must retain the confidence of the Israelis. Whatever the outcome, it will not be an overwhelming victory.

The President: Without being specific, let me say that the Israelis have confidence in us.

Byrd: How about Iran?

Kissinger: If you are worried about oil, there is no chance of the Shah cutting off oil. He is being a useful intermediary.

Fulbright: Why did they bomb the Soviet embassy?

Kissinger: It was a screwup, and was not helpful.

The President: Now, as to what we say. Henry?

Kissinger: Say we explained the military and diplomatic situation. You can say you are confident we are working toward an end of conflict and a just peace in the Middle East. We are in contact with all the parties.

The less said about details, the better.

The President: We will not let Israel go down the tube.

McClellan: Can't we say the situation has not reached the stage where replacements are needed?

Stennis: This is a highly important meeting. Let's just rest with a simple statement.

Mahon: I agree.

Albert: I will say just what Dr. Kissinger asks.

Kissinger: It would be helpful if you say you support those efforts.

Albert: I will.[11]

Fulbright: I do. How about the Mansfield Resolution?[12]

The President: I would ask the House to do nothing provocative.

---

[11] Members of the bipartisan group spoke to the press after the meeting ended. See *The New York Times*, October 11, 1973.

[12] See footnote 4, Document 127.

144. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of Defense Schlesinger and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (Moorer)[1]

Washington, October 10, 1973, 10:02 a.m.

CJCS—I know that you are aware of part of this but I just wanted to tell you that we have a Spot Report[2] coming out which states that it's beginning to appear that the Soviets are about to commence a massive airlift to the Middle East with 15 flights of AN–12s and they can carry about 22 tons each, into Syria and it appears that they have another 20 which are AN–22s which can carry up to around 40 tons or so into Cairo and they'll be overflying Libya which means they are trying to avoid the combat area to get in there. I think they have already sent in enough planes before the present hostilities to lift out all the civilians, so I am trying to get De Poix to find out for sure. I would think they are carrying supplies.

Def—*Okay, you are just watching the collapse of U.S. foreign policy, Tom.*

CJCS—It's just disastrous and we are getting painted right into a corner.

Def—Right, okay.

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 218, Records of Admiral Thomas Moorer, Diary, October 1973. Secret. The original is an entry in Moorer's Diary.

[2] Not found.

145. Diary Entry by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (Moorer)[1]

Washington, October 10, 1973.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

I told Bud the Russians are starting a big airlift into Egypt.

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 218, Records of Admiral Thomas Moorer, Diary, October 1973. Secret. The entry summarizes Moorer's 10:48 a.m. telephone conversation with the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Elmo R. "Bud" Zumwalt.

The Saudis are saying that all the Arab countries are in this thing for the first time now, they are even urging Jordan into it. I said Brezhnev is purring about the détente on one hand and saying "lets you and him fight" on the other. They are going around to all of the Arab States and egging them on. We wondered if HAK is really focusing in on the fact that we are about to lose our ass in the MidEast. The Israelis are trying to paint us into a corner as their sponsor and the more they can paint us with a brush the more secure they feel. The Russians are posing as the Arabs' sponsor which puts them in the cat bird seat. One big difference this time was that the Israelis were not mobilized and did not preempt the strike. Also the other side is better prepared this time than before. It is at best a disaster and at worst a catastrophe. We can not win this one no matter what. I told HAK that this airlift is going to break sooner or later, some sailor that has worked all night is going to squeal.

Bud said the Secretary knew about it and I said he is the one that authorized it when it turned up last night that they had not painted out the insignia, they said to go ahead anyway.

I said one thing I will do is certainly talk to the Chiefs this afternoon about it. Also I told no one on the Joint Staff to talk to the Israelis direct. *ISA* is their contact point. Bud said that his Service Attachés have been in touch and he is going to tell them to knock it off. I said that it is allright for your intelligence people to talk to them, but not about matériel policy.

Bud said that my request is to get the word to HAK from him in a smooth way that he has cut his Navy in half, created impossible foreign policy situation and he needs a bigger Navy to do it. I told him that the President knows that. The sad part is that the Administration has torn us asunder. Congress wants the authority without the responsibility. There is no question we are in a real pickle on being tied to the Israelis in a disaster.

---

146. Memorandum for the Record

Washington, October 10, 1973.

[Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, June 4–October 31, 1973. Secret; Sensitive. 2 pages not declassified.]

147. Telegram From the Embassy in Jordan to the Department of State[1]

Amman, October 10, 1973, 1440Z.

5404. Subject: Jordan's Future.

1. In long noon-time talk, which preceded discussion in Amman's 5398 (Notal),[2] King said he is in real trouble. No matter how the war goes he will be the goat and probably the pariah of the Arab world. If he is to keep out of the war, he must know and be able to convince his people that he has taken the right course. He needs solid reassurances from the U.S., not vague ones. He expects us to obtain a cease-fire and prompt progress towards (a) implementation of 242 and (b) return of Arab Jerusalem to the Arabs. He also needs to know that he will get the military equipment and financial assistance he will require if the Arab states cut him off.

3. [*sic*] I told him to look at the alternatives. The Israeli generals are in a bitter, nasty mood. Any military action by Jordan will not be merely a tank battle in the Valley wherein, if extremely lucky, Jordan will pick up a few square miles of West Bank territory. It will be the total destruction of Jordan's undefended infrastructure: its port, refinery, power stations, irrigation projects.[3] The Israelis will look on him as a Mussolini who stabbed them in back and the retribution will be unbearable.

4. Hassan entered in this to support me strongly, saying Jordan could not even dare contemplate military action against the West Bank.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret; Flash; Exdis. Repeated Immediate to Jerusalem, Jidda, London, Tel Aviv, and USUN.

[2] In telegram 5398 from Amman, October 10, Brown reported that the King had just told him that he was about to authorize dispatch of a Jordanian armored brigade to Syria, saying that this was the least he could do under the circumstances. The Ambassador commented that he had not repeated this "devastating" news elsewhere because he hoped that the United States might be able to deter, or at least defer the decision. (Ibid., Box 1174, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, 1973 Middle East War, File 5, October 10, 1973) The CIA White House Support Staff's report on this cable to the Director of the White House Situation Room noted that Hussein was desperately looking for some way out of his present dilemma short of becoming directly involved in the fighting. The King apparently still hoped that the Israelis would not attack Jordan in reprisal, but he had ordered a general mobilization of the Jordanian army just in case. (Ibid.)

[3] In telegram 7938 from Tel Aviv, October 10, Keating reported that Allon had emphasized in a conversation earlier in the day that Israel would crush Jordan if Hussein was foolish enough to intervene in the war. Allon noted that Hussein had lost a good deal of his Kingdom the last time he had relieved the Syrians and that there would be little to reign over if he made the same mistake again. Keating reported that he had pointed out to Allon that it was in their mutual interests that Hussein not only not intervene, but that he survive the current hostilities. (Ibid., Box 610, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 12, Mar.–Oct. 1973)

But he too said Jordan had to know where it was going and what the U.S. saw as the outcome.[4]

5. *Comment*: The King is getting in deeper and deeper. Get me a prompt message, urging him again to hold off. If he gets in even a little, we are on the downward patch. His army can do a lot of damage even if the Israelis leave little left of the country behind it.[5]

Brown

[4] An October 10 memorandum to Kissinger conveyed information from Crown Prince Hassan, who said he had suggested to Hussein that the Jordanians inform the Israelis of the deployment if it occurred, and that they provide the Israelis with exact coordinates, underscoring to the Israelis that Jordan had no intention of having the Jordanian unit come into contact with Israeli forces. (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 137, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan/Rifai, January 3, 1973)

[5] Telegram 200671 to Amman, October 10, expressed appreciation for what the Ambassador was doing to get Hussein to hold off sending Jordanian troops to Syria and instructed him to continue to make every effort to calm the King down while the U.S. Government looked urgently at what immediate steps it could take to relieve the pressures on him. (Ibid., Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973)

148. Minutes of the Secretary of State's Staff Meeting[1]

Washington, October 10, 1973, 3:15 p.m.

PRESENT

The Secretary of State, Henry A. Kissinger

Kenneth Rush, Deputy Secretary of State
William J. Porter, Under Secretary for Political Affairs
Curtis W. Tarr, Under Secretary for Security Assistance
Walter J. Stoessel, Jr., Assistant Secretary, EUR
Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary, NEA
David D. Newsom, Assistant Secretary, AF
Jack B. Kubisch, Assistant Secretary, ARA/LA
Arthur W. Hummel, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary, EA
Robert J. McCloskey, Ambassador
Thomas R. Pickering, Special Assistant to the Secretary and Executive Secretary of the Department

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Transcripts of Secretary of State Kissinger's Staff Meetings, 1973–77: Lot 78 D 443, Box 1, Secretary's Analytical Staff Meetings. Secret.

PROCEEDINGS

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

[Secretary Kissinger:] I thought I would say something for a very few minutes about the Middle East situation. Then Bill, if you want to say something for five minutes about your trip.

Mr. Casey: I spent a half-hour dictating a memorandum, just to give the highlights.

Secretary Kissinger: Let me talk first about the Middle East situation—just to summarize.

On the Middle East, we learned about an imminent military operation about six o'clock Saturday morning.[2] And I had tried to stop it from happening. Since there will be all sorts of legends when this is over, one legend that has absolutely no foundation in fact is that we prevented an Israeli pre-emptive attack. We were authorized by the Israelis to inform the Arabs and the Soviets that they were not planning a pre-emptive attack, in order to comply with their wish that we prevent the war. But we made no recommendation to the Israelis about any course of action. And indeed by the time we learned about it, it was too late to affect the action. Indeed, in retrospect, it is perfectly clear that at no time could we have prevented the action within the last twelve hours. All our intelligence and all Israeli intelligence indicated that there would be no conflict. In fact, the CIA gave an intelligence report to the President on the morning of the attack, pointing out that there would not be any action.[3] This was confirmed to us by the Israelis separately.

So while the Israeli Prime Minister for her own reasons will have to say that she knew about it for several days ahead of time, if she did, she did nothing about it, did not inform us of her knowledge, nor ask us for our advice.

Since then we have been attempting to get the fighting stopped. I must say getting increasingly hysterical advice from our Ambassadors in various Arab countries.

The difficulty we have been facing—our basic objective is to keep in mind that as we settle this, that we have two problems. One is to get a cessation of hostilities. The second is to create conditions from which we can conduct the diplomacy in the Middle East designed to bring about a more permanent peace after the cessation of hostilities has been brought about. And therefore we have attempted to maintain a situation where we remain in contact both with the parties to the fighting,

---

[2] October 6. See Document 99.

[3] Document 98.

with the Soviet Union and other permanent members of the Security Council, and not to crystallize the situation just for public relations effects the inevitable consequence of which has to be to get us into confrontation with one or more of these elements.

Various newspapers, for example, have proposed that we propose a cease-fire. They don't realize that, first of all, we have every day checked every permanent member of the Security Council, in addition to special consultations with the Soviets. Nor has a day gone by that we have not been in exchange with the chief Arab countries, including Egypt, and the Soviet Union—although you should not refer to contacts with Egypt.

Up to now the situation has been that the only resolution that could command support in the Security Council is a resolution that couples a call for a cease-fire with a return by Israel to the borders before the '67 war started, a resolution which we would have to veto. And what has to be considered is where we would be if we vetoed a resolution calling on Israel to vacate occupied territories. And up to now it has not proved possible to get a simple cease-fire resolution, apart from the fact that the Israelis won't accept a simple cease-fire resolution as long as the Arabs hold territory on their side of the pre-hostilities line. And that if, therefore, such a resolution were pushed precipitously, we would soon be faced with a subsequent resolution of sanctions against Israel which we would then have to veto, or have a domestic uproar that we are voting for sanctions against a country which has been the victim of aggression.

I just want to give you a feel for the complexity of the situation in which we are attempting to navigate.

So we will not make any public moves until we have crystallized the consensus on which we are working extremely actively. And after we have that, then we may make a move.

Now, the new element in the situation compared to the previous two wars is that the Israeli military operations have simply not been so successful as they believed when the war started, and of course not proximately as successful as in the previous wars. They are approaching the situation of Germany and the two world wars, where they can win victories, but they can never knock out one of their principal opponents, and failing that, they can never concentrate enough forces against the other opponent to knock him out. And it is the first time that they have to deal with a two-front war over, for what is for them, an extended period of time.

If the intelligence reports are correct that they have lost a thousand dead, that would be the equivalent in American terms of 100,000 dead, or twice as many in five days as we suffered in eight years of the Viet-Nam war.

So however the war ends, it is going to be a profoundly shocking experience to Israel, even if they roll up the Arabs tomorrow, which could happen. We don't expect it, but in desert war, you can have a very sudden turn of events. But even if it ends tomorrow, the strategic and therefore the political situation in the Middle East has changed radically, and therefore our current moves have to be assessed not in terms of short-term publicity, but in terms of where we want to go after this is over. And that has been our principal objective.

You know, we are dealing with a volatile situation, and any one of those maniacs that is involved could kick over the traces. But if we can hold it together another forty-eight or seventy-two hours, I think we may be able to crystallize the consensus that is needed to begin moving it to a conclusion. When I say holding together, I don't mean for a particular military outcome. My definition of a successful outcome is one which both parties accept, though grudgingly, that does not get us into a confrontation with the Soviets, and it doesn't radicalize the moderate Arab countries. And if we can navigate between all these shoals, we may then be in a condition after the Israeli elections to face the issue of a more permanent settlement, which I think has been improved by these events.

Joe, do you want to add anything?

Mr. Sisco: No, sir—other than I think perhaps you didn't see that report that the election has been postponed indefinitely in Israel. I just wondered if you were aware of that.

Secretary Kissinger: No, I have not seen that report.

Mr. Sisco: It was scheduled, as you remember, on the 29th.

Secretary Kissinger: Well, all right. Then we have to proceed with what we have got. I mean then there is no deadline.

Mr. Sisco: None. And we never felt, as you remember, that the government would be basically any different after the election than it was before, in any event.

Secretary Kissinger: No—I was not aware of the fact that it had been postponed. Well, that just means we can start whenever we think conditions are right, which in any event won't be before two weeks. I think timing is everything in these matters. And we now have to end the hostilities at the right moment. When I say "the right moment" it doesn't mean we are holding up ending the hostilities. We first have to discern a willingness to end them by at least one of the parties, and after that we have to find a method to end them in such a way that the ending does not break more china. And if we can get all of that achieved, then we have to pick the time for a diplomatic move, which will have to be after the Israelis have had a chance for the consequences of this to sink in.

I don't know whether it has been yet, but this will turn out to be a shattering event for the Israelis—because if the Arabs can fight and if the Arabs can sustain a war of attrition, then the Israelis face a totally different strategic situation. In fact, one could make a very good case for the proposition that the Israelis would have been more secure with a demilitarized Sinai, with no sand belt, than they were with a militarized—with being right up against the sand belt on the Suez Canal. But that is for later, and that is not to be said publicly ever. And this is for our own reflection.

We will still have a hairy three or four days of juggling to do. We will know in another thirty-six hours how the thing is jelling.

[Omitted here are material related to discussion in the United Nations and material unrelated to the Middle East.]

---

149. Message From Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev to President Nixon[1]

Moscow, undated.

Acting in the spirit of an understanding reached with the President on this matter we were consulting during the last several days with the leaders of Egypt and Syria on the question of termination of hostilities which renewed in the Middle East.

Frankly speaking, the conversations with the Arabs were protracted and not easy ones. But nevertheless we are now able to say to the President that the Soviet Union is ready not to block adoption of a cease-fire resolution in the Security Council.

The President of course, understands that in the present situation the Soviet Union cannot vote in the Security Council in favour of a cease-fire resolution, but the main thing is that we will not vote against it; our representative will abstain during the vote.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 68, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 19, [July 13, 1973–Oct. 11, 1973]. Top Secret. The message is attached to an October 10 note from Vorontsov to Scowcroft. A handwritten notation on Vorontsov's note reads: "Delivered to Gen. S. from Min. Vorontsov, 11:15 a.m., 10/10/73." Dobrynin telephoned Kissinger at 8:13 a.m. that morning and read to him Brezhnev's message. Kissinger responded that the United States needed a few hours to consider it and that he would contact him later that day. (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Anatoli[y] Dobrynin File, Box 28) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 162–163.

It was not easy for us to come to this decision. The determinant factor was that we are being guided in this matter by broad interests of the maintenance of peace, by the interests of maintaining and developing of all the positive which has taken place in the recent years in the Soviet-American relations and in the international situation as a whole.

We would like to draw the attention of the President to one more thing. It is necessary, of course, to limit the task at this moment to adoption of a cease-fire decision. If one begins to broaden this task, to attach to it all kinds of conditions—like withdrawal of the troops to the initial lines, creation of some fact-finding commission and so on,—then it will in advance doom to failure the good thing for the sake of which we have agreed to act jointly.

We mention this because the hints of such an approach were contained in the speech of the US representative in the Security Council. If such proposals were put forward, this would place us in a position where our representative will be forced to object and to vote against.

We hope that this will not be the case and that coordinated actions of the USSR and the US will facilitate the cease-fire in the Middle East and the immediate renewal of active efforts towards getting a political settlement there on the basis of liberation of all Arab lands occupied by Israel.

This would be really a one more major step in improvement of the whole international situation, toward which goal we have already put together with the President so much effort.

The Soviet representative in the Security Council is getting from us appropriate instruction.

We expect that the President will also instruct the US representative in the Security Council to act accordingly. We hope to see positive results of our joint efforts.[2]

---

[2] At 8:39 a.m., Kissinger called Dobrynin and said they would not have a chance for a systematic examination of the Soviet proposal until after 11:30 a.m. He added that the United States had noticed that there was a very substantial airlift of Soviet supplies going into Egypt and Syria and warned that this was going to force the United States to do at least as much. Dobrynin said that he would "flash" to Moscow on this. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Anatoli[y] Dobrynin File, Box 28) At 11:45 a.m., Kissinger telephoned Dobrynin and told him that a major domestic problem concerning Vice President Agnew was coming to a head that afternoon, which would further postpone a decision. He promised that Dobrynin would have a formal answer by the end of the day. (Ibid.) When Dobrynin called him at 9:45 p.m. that evening, however, Kissinger said that because of all of that day's events, he would not be able to give him an answer until the next day. (Ibid.) All transcripts are printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 163–169.

150. Telegram From the Embassy in Jordan to the Department of State[1]

Amman, October 10, 1973, 1815Z.

5410. Subject: Jordanian Intervention. Ref: A. Amman 5398.[2] [*reference telegram number not declassified*].

1. I went back to King tonight, using Amb Keating's talk with Allon as key.[3] Said that I had no instructions nor response to the questions he has asked, but that on my own I wanted to ask again about possible Jordanian intervention in Syria. I said that King should examine his decision very carefully to see if his action would give a casus belli to Israel. I said that if I judge the frustration and anger of the Israeli military rightly he might well be doing that by sending a brigade to Syria even if he stood fast on the Jordan–Israel line.

2. King reflected a bit. He said that what he is really thinking about is the future. He will not take any action immediately. He will keep in touch with us and talk to us in advance.

3. I said give us real notice. I know Washington is working on his problem. But it takes time.

4. What he will do is put the 40th Brigade on alert. This amused him greatly. It was the 40th that stood the brunt of the Syrian attack in 1970.

5. What he plans to do is, should conditions worsen so far as the Syrians are concerned, is offer the 40th to take over duties east of Golan and on the Jordanian border, now carried out by Syrian reserve, thus freeing Syrian units for combat. He said it is not looking for combat with the Israelis. He is just trying to cover himself with the Arabs if the situation deteriorates rapidly. If the present stalemate continues, he will not move.

6. I said in any case it could lead to Jordanian confrontation with the Israelis. He should look out.

7. We agreed to re-discuss.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret; Flash; Nodis.

[2] See footnote 3, Document 147.

[3] Reported in telegram 7938 from Tel Aviv; see footnote 3, Document 147. In telegram 5409 from Amman, October 10, 1720Z, Brown reported that he had given Allon's warning to the King and Rifai that Israel would crush Jordan if it intervened in the war. Rifai said that he had heard the same warnings given to Egypt and Syria in the past and noted that Israel did not seem able to carry out those threats as rapidly as people supposed. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973)

8. All this was in friendly fashion. Zaid Rifai, who was present, backed me up. At one moment he said that, while Iraq has no common border with Israel, if things went bad, it might soon have one.

9. During talk King said that Iraqis had now asked for 14 tank transporters after Syrians had said they would do no good. He is sending them (let's protect this carefully).

10. *Comment:* State 200671[4] received after my talk. Thanks. Doing best possible. Give me a hand. But for God's sake don't give me instructions to tell the King at this moment that because of Cambodia there will be no FY 74 Military Assistance Program for Jordan as Defense is threatening me with.[5]

Brown

[4] See footnote 5, Document 147.

[5] In telegram 5414 from Amman, October 10, 2035Z, Brown reported that the King had telephoned him at 10 p.m. saying that he had just received a call from Sadat asking him to intervene militarily. Hussein said that Sadat told him the fate of the Arab world depended on his decision, and that he had responded that Jordan was studying the situation. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973) In telegram 201118 to Amman, October 10, 2205Z, Kissinger asked the Ambassador to convey immediately to the King a personal message from him which reads: "I have just learned from Ambassador Brown's latest message that you have been asked by President Sadat to intervene militarily. I urge you to delay such a decision as long as possible, and at least for another 36–48 hours. I am making a major effort through quiet diplomatic channels to bring about an end to the fighting. I do not say this lightly—I need time and your help. It is imperative you keep this in strict confidence." (Ibid.)

151. Memorandum From Helmut Sonnenfeldt of the National Security Council Staff to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 11, 1973.

SUBJECT

Soviets and the Middle East—Gromyko's Talk with the President of September 28, 1973

I did not in my earlier memo on this subject refer to Gromyko's conversation with the President.[2] There are two aspects to it which with hindsight are troubling.

My own reaction, at the time, to Gromyko's rather flat warning that we might wake up one morning and find that another Arab-Israeli war had broken out was that it was a not unusual piece of rhetoric designed to underline the Soviet contention that there is a need for urgency in seeking a settlement and for US efforts to induce a more flexible Israeli position. Now, however, this warning must be seen against the background of both Egyptian and Syrian military moves in that very period of time. In the Syrian case this seems to have gone back at least to the air battle of September 13. In both the Egyptian and Syrian cases—leaving aside general statements of Egyptian intent to liberate the Sinai during the non-aligned conference—the military preparations seemed consistent with major maneuvers. However, there was the unusual codeword employed by the Egyptians early on September 28, Egyptian time, which one must assume was picked up by the Soviets as well as ourselves. Whether Gromyko was aware of this, and other unusual aspects of the Egyptian and Syrian alerts, is of course an open question.

The second aspect of the conversation relates to Gromyko's effort to elicit from the President an indication of the timing of any new US negotiating initiative or at least readiness to enter into further diplomatic exchanges with the USSR. Again, at the time, this seemed consistent with past Soviet efforts to urge us to take diplomatic action. Yet it may be possible that Gromyko was in fact seeking assurance that we did *not* plan any early diplomatic initiative. When the President intimated that your proposed Soviet trip, which would be the next occasion for further high-level exchanges on the Middle East, could probably not take place until late December–early January (though before

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 68, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Map Room—D [1 of 2]. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only.

[2] Document 142. Regarding the September 28 discussion, see Document 92.

February), this may have been interpreted in Moscow as meaning that there would be no promising diplomatic activity in the interim. If conveyed to the Arabs, this view could have produced at least these conclusions: (1) that early military action would not seem to be sabotaging diplomatic efforts, (2) conversely, that there would be no US initiative that might make military action awkward, and (3) that, however, there was an incentive to seek a more advantageous military position before the negotiating season would resume around New Year.

Whether the Soviets themselves reached these conclusions and then would have positively acted upon them to encourage the Arabs is quite another matter. The Soviets were plainly aware of the serious difficulties the President was encountering in Congress with regard to MFN and "détente" generally. Although assured of the President's determination to maintain his course, Gromyko could have had little question that the President's Congressional problem would be greatly compounded by a Middle Eastern war. Dobrynin certainly would have made that judgement. But how that judgement might have been weighed in Moscow and figured in Soviet pre-hostility contacts with the Arabs will probably never be known.

---

152. Telegram From the Embassy in Jordan to the Department of State[1]

Amman, October 11, 1973, 0830Z.

5419. Subj: Secretary's Message to King. Ref: State 201118.[2]

1. In view exhaustion King did not awaken him to deliver reftel. Gave it to Zaid Rifai. Will see King later this a.m.

2. At first Rifai said delay requested is too much. After a lengthy argument of about an hour he agreed to recommend to King that he delay final decision as requested. He thinks King will cuncur.

3. King received another plea from Syrians last night for immediate despatch of armored division. Jordanians are temporizing by sending liaison officers to Syria.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1174, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, 1973 Middle East War, 11 October 1973, File No. 6. Secret; Flash; Exdis.

[2] See footnote 5, Document 150.

4. Munim Rifai and Khammash are due back from Cairo shortly. If they bring further urgent request for immediate military action, King will be in even tougher position.

5. Rifai is very apprehensive about the future. Messages from Jidda keep asking when the Jordanians will move. If Saudis get into action and take casualties while Jordanians stay out, he expects prompt cut-off Saudi aid and creation of an anti-Jordanian bloc in Arab world. He warns existence of Hashemite regime is at stake and that U.S. should have this in mind.

6. I told him that Hashemite regime has withstood bravely equally grave crises in past, that he should not give in to pessimism, and that we stand by our friends.

Brown

---

153. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 11, 1973, 11 a.m.

N: Are you back at State?

K: Yes.

N: The thing I wanted to say was this. In following this strategy I want you to lean very hard on the Israeli Ambassador that I am very distressed about these stories and I have information—I am talking to the press people—it is not coming from him but from lower level people who are putting out the line that we are not supporting Israel. I will not tolerate this and if I hear any more of this I will hold him responsible. Will you tell him?

K: Yes.

N: You and I know that Israel is not going to lose this war but we cannot fight both sides. If we hear any more stuff like this I will have no choice domestically except to turn on them. I can get the names of these people.

K: These fellows that are writing . . .

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking.

N: I know but these people go over there. They think it helps the Israelis but it does not. The Embassy people should have them cool it.

K: I will have them do it immediately.

N: We are helping them; he knows that doesn't he?

K: Yes.

N: It is like the Agnew thing. He talked all right but his lower level people did not. The Israelis have to trust us or there is no game.

K: I will call him immediately.

---

154. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Minister of the Israeli Embassy (Shalev)[1]

Washington, October 11, 1973, 11:10 a.m.

K: What is the Ambassador doing in a Synagogue on Thursday.

S: It is the first day of [Sukkot] and a bar mitzvah and for morale he went for a few minutes.

K: For my morale, it is not very good for you on the one hand to ask me to slow down the UN and you get Dayan to say on radio and TV that you are heading for Damascus.[2] How can we get the UN to slow down when you make this kind of announcement by your Defense Minister.

S: You have a point.

K: With the greatest difficulty I got the President to slow things down and now I am confronted with that news item. What will I tell the Soviets now?

S: I will get on to Israel.

K: Point two. The President is beside himself with what he considers inspired newspaper articles and I urge you to keep your people under control in what they say to the press. If it gets back to the White House that someone has talked to Israeli personnel there will be hell to pay.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking.

[2] Dayan made the statement during a visit to the front in the Golan Heights. See *The New York Times*, October 12, 1973.

S: Do you have anything specific?

K: I have nothing but he said he has. I was going to wait and call you about this after I had something else to talk to you about. If you want to cooperate with us diplomatically you must cooperate with us on this. We cannot ask the UN to slow down with this announcement that is out. I am sitting here with my associates now working on this 36 hour delay when we get this ticker. Second, what in the hell am I now going to tell the Russians. This looks like the most extreme form of collusion and bad faith. You would have had the 8 hours for the reality of this to become apparent if you had kept quiet. See what you can do to quiet things down in Israel and for God's sake stay off the radio and TV. Will you let me know?

S: I will.[3]

[3] At 3:05 p.m., Dinitz telephoned Kissinger and said that he had just received a cable from Meir, who said she was doing everything in her power to urge restraint. Kissinger told the Ambassador that he had just ordered the military to charter 20 aircraft for the Israelis to transport the military equipment. He noted that he could delay the Security Council meeting through that night, but could not avoid doing something with the Russians, saying he had been avoiding Dobrynin all morning. The Secretary said he thought that by the following night the United States would have to move in the United Nations. Dinitz asked if a standstill resolution was what Kissinger had in mind, and the Secretary replied that it was. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 185–186.

155. Telegram From the Embassy in Jordan to the Department of State[1]

Amman, October 11, 1973, 1515Z.

5435. Subject: Jordanian Intervention—Part II. Ref: Amman 5434.[2]

1. King's thinking goes as follows: He has had urgent plea from Sadat (which Khammash has just delivered) for Jordan to take one of two actions to ensure Syrian survival: Let fedayeen back to attack Israel

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret; Flash; Nodis.

[2] In telegram 5434 from Amman, October 11, 1455Z, Brown reported that he had just met with the King and that the "gut issue" was the King's statement that "before Syrian war ends, Jordan has to be in." The Ambassador stated that Hussein said he could delay matters for 36 hours unless there was an imminent possible collapse of Syria and that he hoped that the Secretary could work miracles. (Ibid.)

from Jordan or send units to Syria to bolster Syrian forces. King cannot accept first. Sadat's plea adds to urgency of Assad's continual calls for assistance. Thus the first pressure on King is appeal from Arab brothers for help.[3]

2. Second pressure is belief that Jordan cannot stand aside when all of Arab world becoming involved. If it does, it will be pariah and target. It is long-term continued existence of Hashemite regime that preoccupies King.

3. Third pressure—or rationalization—is belief that presence of Western-oriented Jordan together with Saudis in battle area will prevent complete radicalization of Arab world in direction of Soviets.

4. Next cable[4] will discuss planned deployment of Jordan force, which will hopefully not be in battle area but on left flank.

Brown

[3] In telegram 7982 from Tel Aviv, October 11, 2340Z, Keating reported that he had met with Allon, who wanted to share with him his "elation" over developments on the Syrian front where the Israelis had broken through in two areas, were consolidating and resting during the night, and would press on early the next day. He emphasized, however, that the Israeli Government had no intention of taking Damascus. Israel would continue to hit military targets in Syria with the primary aim of knocking out what remained of the Syrian air force and military equipment. After Syrian military effectiveness was destroyed, Israeli forces would be sent to Sinai. Allon also expressed the hope that Israeli success in the north would deter Hussein from joining in on the Syrian side. (Ibid. Box 610, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 12, March–October 1973)

[4] In telegram 5436 from Amman, October 11, 1515Z, Brown reported that the Jordanians had replied to the Syrians and Sadat that they could not afford to send a division. Instead they were talking about sending a brigade, which they wanted to station on the left flank of Golan, using supply routes through desert and open country just to the west. This also would be the easiest place from which they could get back to Jordan, if necessary, and it would keep them out of direct contact with Israeli forces. (Ibid., Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973)

156. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

Washington, October 11, 1973, 7:55 p.m.

K. Hello.

S. This is . . . , Henry. The switchboard just got a call from 10 Downing Street to inquire whether the President would be available for a call within 30 minutes from the Prime Minister. The subject would be the Middle East.

K. Can we tell them no? When I talked to the President he was loaded.

S. We could tell him the President is not available and perhaps he can call you.

K. I will be at Mr. Braden's and the President will be available tomorrow morning our time.

S. Are you coming over here at all this evening?

K. No, first thing in the morning.

S. Did you talk to Schlesinger about the F–4s scheduled for tomorrow?

K. I think two a day is fine.

S. Two a day can . . .

K. Throw in another one and make it six.

S. They have in mind keeping a two a day schedule. Send two from here and two from Europe and then two from here again.

K. For an indefinite period?

S. At least through six.

K. Then tell Dinitz he is getting at least six but that we may keep it going.

S. Right, ok. I will say the President will not be available until first thing in the morning but you will be this evening.

K. In fact, I would welcome it.

S. Very good.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking.

157. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, October 11, 1973, 8:25 p.m.

K. We think we should move with the British and we have had a call from the Prime Minister to that effect.[2] I told him we will talk first thing in the morning.

D. The Security Council will meet in the morning.

K. In the morning? Just let me set it up first.

D. As to now, what exactly can I say about the British?

K. I do not have a . . . now but I have started my discussions with them.

D. The first impression was all right?

K. The first impression was positive.

D. As of now the first reaction was favorable but the final reply will be given tomorrow.

K. That is right but I have not told them about your involvement. I don't want an overzealous man in your Embassy staff in London to go running . . . Let me handle it. I will be back to you tomorrow around noon at the latest. I will tell you by one. Nothing will happen at the Security Council meeting that isn't fully coordinated with you. We are arranging that only after you approve will we proceed so there will be no call to meeting unless you approve. We will try to work out some resolution and if you approve it we will get someone to call a meeting. We will get the British to call the meeting.

D. That is all right. I think it is maybe good to tell our people.

K. I can't let Scali into this until I have the British lined up.

D. Tomorrow you will call. In the meanwhile I will explain to Moscow that they need to think it over.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Anatoli[y] Dobrynin File, Box 28. No classification marking.

[2] Heath called Kissinger at 8 p.m. on October 11 to ask him to urge the Israelis not to attack if Hussein moved a brigade to the west of the Golan Heights. Heath said: "I think that this is the best arrangement really. Let him appear to be doing something when he really isn't." Kissinger agreed. They also discussed coordinating a position at the Security Council. (Ibid.) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 189–190.

158. Memorandum to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger)[1]

Washington, October 11, 1973.

SUBJECT

Jordanian Effort to Coordinate with the Israelis the Movement into Syria of a Jordanian Armored Brigade

On 11 October 1973 Jordanian Prime Minister Zayd Rifa'i advised [*less than 1 line not declassified*] that King Husayn was in the process of sending a five-page message to Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir explaining his reasons for moving one Jordanian armored brigade into the northern front. The King's message will ask the Israelis to refrain from attacking this unit if at all possible.[2] [2 *lines not declassified*]

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 137, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan/Rifai, January 3, 1973. Secret; Sensitive.

[2] In his message to Meir, the King stated that Jordan was in an impossible position. He refused to commit his armed forces to a senseless war against Israel, but, on the other hand, if Jordan did not participate in some form, it would be castigated in the Arab world. Thus, "with a heavy heart," he had found a third alternative, which was to send a relatively small force into Syria to an area adjacent to Jordan's frontiers with Syria. This would not affect the outcome of the fighting there and would give Jordan the political cover it needed for remaining outside of the present conflict. Hussein emphasized that, most importantly, it would prevent Jordan and Israel from going to war against each other. (Ibid.) In an 8:10 p.m. telephone conversation with Dinitz on October 11, Kissinger told the Ambassador that Hussein, who was under enormous pressure, wanted to move a brigade into Syria "out of harms way." He said the Jordanians did not care what the Israelis did, but wanted to make sure that Israeli forces did not attack them. Dinitz asked if this was an infantry brigade, to which Kissinger replied that it was an armored brigade. Dinitz asked if they would fight or just stand there, and the Secretary responded that they would just stand there. The Ambassador said he would have to pass this on to his government. (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 190–192.

159. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 12, 1973, 8:38 a.m.

K: Mr. President.

P: The morning report.

K: Mr. President, I was just checking ours and just talking to the Israelis to find out what was going on. The Israelis are still advancing into Syria, although they are now getting heavy counter-attacks and the Iraqi armor division is beginning to fight them.

P: The thing we have here from CIA indicates that it was pretty tough up there in the Golan Heights and that sort of thing. So apparently they are having a pretty good fight up there.

K: That's right. But they claim to be advancing and they claim to be reaching their objective. Of course it is obvious that all the fighting is tougher for the Israelis than it has ever been before.

P: Of course.

K: We had a call from Heath yesterday,[2] transferring a request from Jordan which we received already directly that if he is forced to move an armored unit into Syria, whether he could get an assurance from the Israelis that they wouldn't attack him.

P: From Jordan?

K: That was a hell of a question to ask.

P: Of course they'll attack.

K: Well, I asked, I put it to the Israelis and they said they are not trying to add to the divisions facing them from Syria, but they're not looking for an excuse to attack Jordan.[3]

P: No, they don't want to fight another country. Well, it's really going on, isn't it?

K: Oh, yeah, we've had an appeal from Sadat to prevent Israeli attacks on civilian targets and we're sending a reply back saying we've

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] See footnote 2, Document 157.

[3] See footnote 2, Document 158. In an 8:35 a.m. telephone conversation that morning, Dinitz told Kissinger that the answer was no on the "Jordanian thing." The Secretary asked if that meant that Israel would attack Jordan, to which Dinitz responded no; it just meant that Israel was advising Jordan not to move the unit. (Ibid.) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 194–195.

made that appeal to the Israelis.[4] Then we've had an appeal from King Hussein. Today diplomacy is going to begin moving. I'm seeing the press at noon, to see whether they can put up a simple cease-fire.[5]

P: With the idea that the Soviets really would abstain?

K: That's right. That would still pass it.

P: The Soviets certainly wouldn't, unless the Chinese . . . But the Soviets why would they abstain from such a thing? I mean . . .

K: Well, they just, because right now there's a sort of a balance in the sense that the Israelis gained in Syria and lost in Egypt.

P: Although they haven't gained in Syria quite as much as we'd hoped apparently.

K: I can't get a clear report of that.

P: Now what about our own activities with regard to resupply, etc. Has anything gone forward in that respect?

K: Well, last night we finally told Schlesinger just to charter some of these civilian air lines, airplanes from civilian air lines for the Defense Department and then turn them over to the Israelis.

P: Good.

K: We've tried everything else and these civilian airlines just wouldn't charter to the Israelis directly.

P: That's alright.

K: So that's going to start moving later today.

P: But they have not yet actually run short of equipment?

K: No. And of course the most important assurance you gave them was that you'd replace the equipment.

P: The planes and tanks, right?

K: Right. So that they can expend what they've got, knowing they'll get more.

P: The lines that be, it seems to me, if you're . . . simply that we're not going to discuss what's going to be done, but the President has always said that it is essential to maintain the balance of power in that area.

K: I'm giving a press conference today.

P: But maintaining the balance of power, do you think that's too provocative?

K: No, we've always said that we . . .

P: That's what I mean. That's a signal to the Israelis, etc.

---

[4] See Document 160 and footnote 2 thereto.

[5] For a report of Kissinger's October 12 press conference, see *The New York Times*, October 13, 1973.

K: I'm giving a press conference today. I've got to navigate that one.

P: Yeah. Well, there's no more to be done. Of course I don't know anybody that's got a better idea as to what we're doing.

K: There's nothing else to be done, Mr. President. After all . . .

P: In terms of intervention, that's out of the question.

K: Impossible.

P: In terms of massive open support for Israel, that will just bring massive open support by the Russians.

K: And it wouldn't change the situation in the next two or three days, which is what we're talking about.

P: . . . the Israelis are not looking at two or three days. That's our problem, isn't it? They may be looking at two or three weeks before they can really start clobbering these people.

K: In two or three weeks the international pressures will become unmanageable.

P: I see. Well then, if it's two or three days then the Israelis have just got to win something on the Syrian front. Right?

K: That's right.

P: That's the point.

K: That's exactly it.

P: Do the Israelis know that the international pressure will become impossible?

K: Well, you know, they keep telling us to take care of them but that's great for them.

P: That's right. No way. Well, anyway, good luck. Call me back.

K: I'll call you back.

160. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail)[1]

Washington, undated.

Thank you for your message of 11 October 1973.[2] The comments from President Sadat were, of course, immediately passed to President Nixon.

You are aware, of course, of the fact that the United States is not familiar with the details of any Israeli military operations and is not informed in advance of those operations.

However, the United States will use its maximum influence to prevent any attack on civilian targets. Strong representations to that effect have been made to the Israeli Government.

In this connection, it is important to point out that falsification and outright lies with regard to U.S. activities in the present crisis make matters very difficult. Cairo press reports that United States forces are involved in military operations are totally and outrageously false. No United States forces are involved in military operations. No United States forces will be involved in any way unless other powers intervene from outside the area with direct military action.

The United States wishes to emphasize again that it will do its utmost to conduct itself so as to be able to play a useful role in the resolution of the problems of the Middle East, both in ending current hostilities as well as in bringing a permanent peace based on justice. The United States stands ready to consider any Egyptian proposal for ending hostilities with understanding and good will. It will attempt to be helpful when hostilities are ended. Whatever the inevitable pressures of the moment, the U.S. hopes that both sides will not lose sight of this objective.

Warm personal regards.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. No classification marking. A handwritten notation indicates that the message was transmitted to Cairo on October 12 at 9:30 a.m.

[2] In this backchannel message to Kissinger, Ismail laid out Egypt's "qualifications": return to the 1967 lines under UN supervision; UN guarantee of freedom of navigation of the Tiran Straits for a specific time; upon complete Israeli withdrawal, an end to the state of belligerency; after Israeli withdrawal, the Gaza Strip under UN supervision pending exercise by its population of their right of self-determination; and a UN peace conference of all interested powers after the termination of belligerency. (Ibid.)

161. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (Moorer) and the Deputy Secretary of Defense (Clements)[1]

Washington, October 12, 1973, 10:55 a.m.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

DSD—I talked to Ken Rush a few minutes ago (are you by yourself)?

CJCS—Yes.

DSD—I also told Ken Rush that I thought that it was wrong for us not to have a WSAG Meeting.

CJCS—I do, too, because I just can't find out anything.

DSD—That's right and I am in the same position and God dammit, Tom, I don't like this a bit with Jim and he's not running the CIA and you have certain responsibilities and they are clearly established and in several different directives. And, I also feel that I have certain responsibilities that come right from the President himself and, at the time I took this appointment, God dammit, Tom, I want to know what is going on. And, not only do I want to know what is going on I also feel I have the right of expression, as I know you do and if I make these expressions and they don't like my ideas that's fine—but dammit, Tom, I want to express them and that's the basis on which I came up here!

CJCS—I agree with you. We haven't had a WSAG Meeting since . . .

DSD—Monday.[2]

CJCS—And I can't get, you know, any decision and then yet when something happens they call over here raising hell because they didn't like it. Yet we never get a chance to talk about it.

DSD—I told Ken Rush that I wanted to know how he felt about this before I started anything moving or made any inquiries as I have here. And you know, yesterday I called Brent and got them to schedule a WSAG meeting and the God damned thing got cancelled and I'm going to call Brent again and tell him that what I'd like to do, Tom, is to tell Brent that you and I want a WSAG Meeting today—is that a fair statement?

CJCS—Sure.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 218, Records of Admiral Thomas Moorer, Diary, October 1973. Secret. The original is an entry in Moorer's Diary.

[2] October 8. See Documents 129 and 131.

DSD—Because I am absolutely going to tell him that it has to happen and that you and I also feel the same way; but, if you don't, that's all right too, but I'm going to do it.

CJCS—I think it's crucial to have a WSAG meeting; that way we we can bring everything up-to-date and take a new point of departure here.

DSD—I think that's absolutely right. We're entering a critical period here this weekend and, in the next three days, could really be the turning point of what we do and how we do it and in what the Israelis are going to do and I'd like to have a WSAG so that everybody could express their feelings as to where this thing sits and to know what we are doing.

CJCS—I couldn't agree with you more. I am in the dark.

DSD—One last word, then I am through, I don't like (and I told Ken and he agrees) I am going to come back in a moment to this, but I don't like the idea of Jim and HAK informally meeting whether it be in the Men's Room, or the White House, or on a Street Corner and those two people are informally making decisions which affect anything as important as what we are involved in here and that is not right and I don't like it a damn bit and I'm sure you don't either.

CJCS—No, because we are going to have to testify on this some day and it wouldn't be good if we had to tell them "like it is."

DSD—That's right and Ken came back and said, "I couldn't agree with you more. I don't want HAK, on these kind of issues, I don't want HAK speaking for me." And, I know that and in the same sense that you feel responsible to what you are doing and the charter you have and that you have a responsibility to the President and you don't want Jim speaking for you. He may be in complete accord with what you agree to but, on the other hand, it may not be true and you don't know what he is saying and, under these circumstances, we do need to have a meeting. His final point being that, for the protection of the President himself we need to have a meeting. That the President needs to have this documented that there was a meeting and, generally we agreed to do this and this and that. But, on the other hand, if it is not generally agreed, he needs to know about that, too.

CJCS—Absolutely and I couldn't agree with you more.

DSD—I wanted you to know what I am going to do.

CJCS—Right. And, sure as hell, what they'll do is when the thing comes down to a "crunch" that they'll want us to bail them out by saying, "Yes, we supported that and it was a wonderful thing to do." When, in fact, we didn't know a thing about it.

DSD—Exactly right, Tom, and you and I (for one) am overly sensitive to this after having gone through the Menu Exercise[3] and Freedom Deal Exercise.[4] If anything points out that we needed to inform those involved and formalize some of these things, that's just the kind of deal that shows it.

CJCS—Absolutely, I couldn't agree with you more.

DSD—Ken agrees with everything and he said I'm absolutely right, etc., but then he finally ended up by saying, "Of course, you know what my position is. I can't say these things to HAK." Shoot, you know that anyway.

CJCS—All right, sure I have been trying and hoping that they'd have one every day now.

DSD—That's fine, Tom. I'm going to call Brent and tell him again that is the way I feel about it and that we should have a WSAG Meeting this afternoon and, if I have to—in the final analysis—I am going to tell him something else and that is if we don't have a WSAG that I'm going over to talk to Al Haig and tell him what I think about this in not having a WSAG Meeting and that it is important for the President himself this is absolutely a requirement—we must do this and get it on the record as to where we stand. Tom, how do you feel about that?

CJCS—Good.

DSD—Do you agree with this?

CJCS—I sure do.

DSD—That position is well-taken?

CJCS—I think it's reasonable, I think logical, and the way to do business.

DSD—That's fine. I'll let you know what happens. I am going to come down in a few minutes and see what the board looks like.

CJCS—Have Janey give me a call and I'll join you.

DSD—That'll be fine, thank you, bye.[5]

---

[3] Clements is referring to Operation Menu, the secret bombing of North Vietnamese and Viet Cong bases within Cambodia, which was authorized by President Nixon in February 1969.

[4] In response to reports in late 1971 that the North Vietnamese were planning an invasion of the South, President Nixon authorized in the spring of 1972 "Operation Freedom Deal," which called for the renewal of air strikes throughout North Vietnam above the 20th parallel for the first time since 1968.

[5] Moorer wrote the following note at the end of the transcript: "The events of the last weeks indicate that in a crisis situation the SecState finds it almost impossible to also act as Director of the National Security Staff and preside at WSAG meetings."

162. Message From the Soviet Leadership to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Moscow, undated.

It was received with surprise in Moscow what the Secretary of State said to the Soviet Ambassador concerning the reports about our messages to the leaders of some Arab states in connection with the renewal of hostilities in the Middle East.[2]

Whether we did not say on numerous occasions—both publically, including the statement of the Soviet Government of October 7,[3] and in confidential contacts with the President—that we support the just struggle of the Arab peoples against Israeli aggression?

The President knows full well that we were not advocates of resumption of hostilities, but in the circumstances of a continuous occupation by Israel of the Arab lands it could have been expected at any moment, what we have also not once told the President.

And now, when it happened, when the war goes on, what shall we call for—may be for the support of the aggressor who seized and is keeping foreign lands during already six years, who ignores all the decisions of the United Nations and violates norms of the international law?

If Dr. Kissinger has touched upon this subject, then we can also ask—and with much more reason—isn't there an abundance of the US statements—including those on the high level—in support of Israel who persists in its aggressive strivings?

Moreover, it is not only statements in political support of aggressor that we have in mind. How, for example, should we under-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 68, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 19, [July 13, 1973-Oct. 11, 1973]. Top Secret. A handwritten notation at the top of the page reads: "Handed to HAK by D, 1:15 p.m., 10/12/73."

[2] See footnote 6, Document 135. Kissinger raised the issue with Dobrynin on October 9 in telephone conversations at 11:29 a.m. and 12:32 p.m. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22) Telegram 12634 from Moscow, October 12, reported that during an October 10 meeting between Gromyko and five Arab Ambassadors, the Ambassadors had expressed Arab appreciation for Soviet support in the war. Gromyko had responded with two points: 1) the Middle East conflict was one that the Arab states had to prosecute themselves; and 2) it would be 2 to 3 days before any decisive turn would allow for meaningful UN action on the war. (Ibid., NSC Files, Box 1174, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, 1973 Middle East War, 12 October 1973, File No. 7)

[3] The Soviet Government statement, issued on October 7, blamed Israeli expansionism for the conflict and asserted Soviet support for the Arab cause. See *The New York Times,* October 8, 1973.

stand the demonstrative movements of the US Sixth fleet these days in the eastern Mediterranean? And this is being done at a time when there is an exchange of views between the Soviet leadership and the President on the cessation of hostilities in the Middle East. But the US side itself did not say a word in contacts with us about the actions of its fleet.

We would like to reiterate that we have been and remain to be firm advocates of a political settlement in the Middle East, the main, basic condition of which is the liberation of all Arab territories occupied by Israel. Unfortunately despite all our efforts up to this moment there is no progress in this question. We have had a lot of talk on this subject between us, but as you know the whole thing did not progress beyond talking.

We continue to exert efforts to find common basis for effective steps in establishing a lasting and just peace in the Middle East.

We are of the opinion that with the degree of confidence which has been achieved between the Soviet leaders and the President, it is necessary to exercise a more weighed approach to the questions that arise.

As to the substance of our position on a cease-fire and on turning to active steps towards a political settlement in the Middle East, we have already informed the President on these aspects.[4] We repeat that it would be very good if our countries acted jointly in this whole question until its complete solution.

[4] See Document 149.

163. Telegram From the Embassy in Jordan to the Department of State[1]

Amman, October 12, 1973, 2005Z.

5457. Subject: Delivery of Secretary's Letter.[2]

1. Gave the Secretary's letter to the King at 2100 hours local. Others present, who read it, were Zaid Rifai and Crown Prince Hassan. Rifai spoke first saying he was very disappointed. He had listened to press conference reports[3] on radio and had read this letter. Neither one copes with problem that Jordan has: how to get a cessation of hostilities and start on settlement before the ME crumbles.

2. King then changed subject. Said he can go on no longer. He cannot see himself creating another country and another army out of the rubble. He is leaving for the front with the 40th Brigade. He will be the first volunteer and then feel no shame in front of his men.

3. Thereafter ensued long debate, in Arabic and English well-mixed, as Hassan (who said it would be better to cancel the whole business than to take such a risk), Rifai (who said the King is the country and has to be in the country), and me (saying commanders don't get out in front of a brigade if they want to control a whole army) arguing against such a course of action.

4. *Comment:* King calmed down a bit and we talked about Saudi forces (septel).[4] But then he reverted to subject saying that he neither mad nor sick but he would rather die with his soldiers than live in a dishonored, ruined country under the thumb of the Soviets. I left as Zaid and Hassan continued to plead with him.

Brown

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret; Flash; Nodis.

[2] In telegram 4901 to Amman, Kissinger sent the following "personal message" to Brown to "convey immediately" to King Hussein: "I have just learned from Ambassador Brown's latest message that you have been asked by President Sadat to intervene militarily. I urge you to delay such a decision as long as possible, and at least for another 36–48 hours. I am making a major effort through quiet diplomatic channels to bring about an end to the fighting. I do not say this lightly—and I need time and your help. It is imperative you keep this in strict confidence." (Ibid)

[3] See footnote 5, Document 159.

[4] In telegram 5458 from Amman, October 12, the Embassy reported that the King had met and discussed the logistics of the movement of Saudi forces through Jordan with the Saudi commander. He told the commander to have the unit travel by night using back roads to Azraq and from there to Syria. Hussein said he expected the force to reach Syria by the night of October 13. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973)

164. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Minister of the Israeli Embassy (Shalev)[1]

Washington, October 12, 1973, 3:15 p.m.

K: I wanted to check your message to Eagleburger.

S: Yes.

K: Does that mean we can move any time? Because so far we have been delaying.

S: That means that the latest proposal you made us about time table which would sort of bring us up to tomorrow evening I thought.

K: Is that what you accept.

S: We accept that. We are not urging you for any further . . .

K: Good. That is the course on which I will stay. Thank you. I have some information for you.

S: Yes.

K: We have information that the Soviets have mobilized three airborne divisions and when I called this to the attention of the Soviet Ambassador he made some extremely threatening noises. I told him we would not tolerate it.

S: Yes sir.

K: I wanted you to be aware of this development. If they intervene we will be forced to do something drastic. But you should know it. He also wants you to know they are against your getting close to Damascus. I am just passing this on to you for information. If you want to pass anything on to me for them I will do it. I told him it would lead to severe deterioration of relations with us and we would take action if they put in combat units.

S: Let me get that.

K: Look, I have to run to see the President, now.

S: Bye.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

165. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the British Ambassador (Cromer)[1]

Washington, October 12, 1973, 9:33 p.m.

C: Ah, look, have you got anything from Dobrynin?

K: Yes, I've had a word with Dobrynin. And he says this, he said your information is correct, but irrelevant.[2]

C: What does he mean by that?

K: He means that, he asked me to say that they had no right to say flatly that the Egyptians will accept it, but they do say that if you put it forward on the assumption that the Egyptians will accept it it would be a very good gamble.[3]

C: A very good gamble?

K: Yeah. But what he was really trying to tell me is, now I know the Israeli attitude which will be yes, but. They may raise one or two . . .

C: Well, yes, we've been explaining this to our Ambassador in Tel Aviv. I certainly didn't tell him what was going on, but he had seen the Director General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Kidron earlier in the day. And they were just playing hard to get. They said, of course, they were under great pressure from the military as they were expected to be. They should go through with it.

K: What you people have to assume is that we wouldn't ask you to do this if we didn't think there was a reasonable possibility.

C: No, no, no, that I take 100 percent. I mean there's no problem with that at all. We have to take a little bit. I don't mean this with any mistrust of your information.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] At 7:45 p.m., Dobrynin had handed Kissinger two notes from the Soviet leadership. The first protested U.S. military assistance to Israel and mentioned reports that in addition to bombs, missiles, planes, and tanks, 150 U.S. pilots were going to Israel as "tourists." The second note charged Israel with "gangster-type" and "barbaric" actions of attacking civilian population centers in Syria and Egypt and killing innocent civilians including Soviet citizens. (Ibid., NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 68, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 19, July 13–October 11, 1973)

[3] In an 8:15 p.m. conversation earlier that evening, Cromer told Kissinger that the British impression was that Egypt would only be interested in a cease-fire resolution if they were to regain their 1967 position under its terms. Kissinger agreed that that would be their formal position, but said he thought they would accept a British-sponsored cease-fire. Cromer said he was seeking some ideas on Sadat's thinking from the British Ambassador in Egypt. Kissinger said he would discuss this with Dobrynin and get back to him. (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

K: No, no, it's entirely up to you. I'm just giving you the answers I receive.

C: Yes, sure. When you say the information is correct but irrelevant, I'm a little bit perplexed by that.

K: They seemed to be convinced that the Egyptians do not want to be in the position of, they do not want to . . .

C: They do not want to be . . .

K: They do not want to be in the position of having asked for it. But they apparently would accept it if the Security Council passed it without their indicating that they wanted it.

C: Yes. Imposed by the Security Council. I mean, without their asking for it.

K: That is correct.

C: I get the sense of that and they wouldn't come out in refutation of it in other words, obviously. I mean they might make a bad public demonstration but in reality they wouldn't.

K: Eventually they will accept it.

C: You still feel this is right Henry, don't you?

K: I would not have . . .

C: I mean in your own judgment.

K: My own judgment is that it is the right thing to do. I believe it is the way to peace or at least a good gamble on it and I think it would be a useful role to play and the reason we have asked you is because we thought you were the most trustworthy of the members of the Security Council.

C: I thank you Sir.

K: No, I am serious.

C: But, no, I take that in all seriousness too.

K: We have no interest in playing games with this.

C: I realize that now but there will be a pretty difficult balance, you will see. The balance on the issues and the balance on the timing and the timing on the ground is something that is really going to be the decision isn't it. That neither party on the ground wants to take it any further.

K: My judgment is . . . I've had very extensive conversations with the Israelis. They are aware of this scenario. They authorized me to trigger it.[4] They did not say they would accept it.

C: No, they wouldn't.

K: But they wouldn't.

---

[4] See Document 164.

C: Naturally not.

K: But I would obviously not move if I thought this would get us into a total confrontation with the Israelis.

C: But I have from our people in Tel Aviv from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, from Kidron, is that they would be prepared to look at it unless they could do some sort of trade between the North and the South.

K: First of all . . .

C: This is generalistic.

K: First of all Rollie I don't believe that the Ministry would know it as well as the Prime Minister with whom I am in close contact almost 3 or 4 times a day. Secondly, I don't want to mislead you. I'm not saying that the Israelis are in fact going to accept it but we believe it may start a negotiation.

C: I think that's right. In reading this telegram from Tel Aviv of what the Ministry said it is what you expect a Ministry official to say.

K: Especially a Ministry official who to my certain knowledge, since the Foreign Minister isn't being kept fully informed, the Ministry isn't.

C: It's a democratic answer again. That I agree with. Alright Henry, let me get back to London on this.

K: Let me see whether I can find the piece of paper from the Soviets that I can read to you and I'll call you right back.[5]

C: Alright. Fine Henry.

[5] At 9:43 p.m., Kissinger called Cromer back and read to him the language of the October 10 Soviet message from Brezhnev offering to abstain during a Security Council vote on a cease-fire resolution (Document 149).

166. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, October 12–13, 1973, 11:20 p.m.–12:23 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Simcha Dinitz, Israeli Ambassador to the U.S.
Mordechai Shalev, Minister of the Israeli Embassy

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Major General Brent Scowcroft, NSC Staff
Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff (notetaker)

Dinitz: On the military side, I'll give you just the most important things. From the most recent cable, which I received one hour ago, they tell me this: "On the Egyptian front, there is only one significant thing—they continued organizing themselves on the eastern side and defending themselves. But they moved 24 batteries of artillery on the eastern side." With this there, they can protect the tanks. The game is that the artillery protects the tanks, and the missiles protect the artillery. It is the first sign that they might be moving the missiles across.

Our losses in the air were five Israeli aircraft, all on the Syrian front: two Phantoms, two Skyhawks, one Mirage, and one helicopter, probably hit by a Strela. The total figure—it is only rough—is 70, plus 40 grounded, which makes 110.

Kissinger: How deep are you in there?

Dinitz: Thirty kilometers from Damascus, or twenty miles.

Kissinger: How far is that from the border?

Dinitz: Damascus is sixty kilometers from the border.

Shalev: So half way.

Kissinger: [to Shalev]: Have you heard from your family?

Shalev: Yes, all of them. They are all right. Thank you for asking.

Dinitz: But the brother of one of the secretaries in the Embassy was killed.

Kissinger: How many casualties total?

Dinitz: I asked the Prime Minister on the phone; she wouldn't say.

We have detected one Iraqi armored division in Syria, and one militarized armored regiment. We suspect that parts of them have al-

[1] Source: Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box TS 33, Geopolitical File, Middle East, Middle East War Chronological File, 9–15 Oct. 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting was held in Kissinger's office at the White House. All brackets are in the original.

ready taken part in the battle. A Jordanian regiment is about to enter Dar'a.

Kissinger: We told you that.

Dinitz: We heard it from him through our own channel.

We shot down 29 Syrian planes today. The Syrian Air Force evidently is on its way out.

Now, in the framework of the Soviet airlift, there are five additional AN–22's, four AN–12's, and on the way to Egypt are an additional ten AN–12's. Tonight an additional 21 AN's are departing—six to Syria, and at least four additional ones to Egypt.

Now to the political scenario, or I can tell you about my conversation with Schlesinger?[2]

Shalev: [reading from cable]: "And Syria suffers from an oil shortage."

Kissinger: Let's talk about Schlesinger first, briefly, because he already spoke to me.

Dinitz: On the political scenario, I'm instructed by the Prime Minister to say that we are prepared to stick with it. We told you we would be in a certain situation by Friday night,[3] and we are there.

Kissinger: It won't actually start now until tomorrow night.

Dinitz: The Prime Minister also thought that in your contact with the Russians on the political situation, you shouldn't right away promise that we won't take Damascus.

Kissinger: I agree. I haven't promised anything.

Dinitz: But you should keep it as a card.

Kissinger: I agree with her.

Dinitz: But from our point of view, it can start now.

Kissinger: If the Russians hadn't made threats today, it might have started today.

Dinitz: I will communicate that to her. You made a wise move.

Kissinger: Do you want us to start it tonight? Did you make the offensive today? I have the impression no.

Dinitz: No.

Kissinger: If we could synchronize our moves better—I think the urgency will disappear if there are no military moves tomorrow. If I knew there was no offensive today, I would have started earlier.

Dinitz: I must tell you: Our decision whether to start a new offensive or not depends on our power. We thought we would have by now in Israel the implements to do it—the bombs, the missiles, etc.

---

[2] No record of this conversation was found.

[3] October 12.

Kissinger: So did I. What exactly is the obstacle?

Dinitz: It is not I.

Kissinger: [picks up phone]: Brent, come in. [General Scowcroft enters]

Dinitz: I had one of my most difficult conversations with Schlesinger. He said I could bring my military attaché. Everybody was there—Clements, Sumner, all the generals. I came alone because my military aide is a military man and not a political man.

Schlesinger gave a briefing, showed charts and maps, and then asked me if I wanted to say something. I gave him a piece of my mind, to use a simple expression.

Kissinger: Brent, do you think they are dragging their feet?

Scowcroft: Until last night, yes. But now there are real difficulties.

Dinitz: He told me, "We have to keep a low profile—this is the President's decision. There are two planes a day, but then we have to watch every day for the Arab reaction. So it is not necessarily two every day. It comes to an average of one and a half a day."

On the things we needed—missiles, bombs—we lost four days.

Kissinger: I know. Why?

Dinitz: We had seven El Al planes, and we have the equipment for fifty plane loads. Then we worked to get charters. We worked with State.

Kissinger: Did State drag their feet? I'm responsible for State.

Dinitz: No. For a day or so we worked through Sisco. Then Schlesinger. Schlesinger said he first allowed El Al in, but we had to get charters. Then he was surprised to see that the U.S. Government couldn't get charters. The companies didn't want to fly to the Middle East. Then the Defense Department planes wanted to but couldn't. So then they told us they could go to the Azores and we had to pick them up.

So I have to tell you, on the authority of the Prime Minister, that the reason we change our strategy is that we are depleted.

Kissinger: [pauses] It's a disgrace.

Dinitz: The Prime Minister wanted to telephone the President.

Kissinger: It would be senseless.

Dinitz: I know. I stopped her.

Kissinger: I heard the President tell Schlesinger to get it moving. [to Brent]: Do you think it's sabotage or objective difficulty?

Dinitz: If I may interrupt, it is not objective difficulty. Objective difficulties can be found out in half a day, not four days.

Scowcroft: I think there was no enthusiasm until yesterday.

Dinitz: But we misled our people. If I had any dignity, I would leave here. We misled them. We cabled them that the President had decided on immediate supply.

Kissinger: That was the decision.

Dinitz: We cabled it back, and there was great jubilation.

Kissinger: I had Haig call Schlesinger every night. Scowcroft did too.[4]

Dinitz: I must say I raised this with you twenty-five times.

I am duty bound to inform you we need twenty planes in two to three days or we are subject to an Egyptian attack in Sinai.

Kissinger: We authorized the C–130's to which you are entitled to carry the stuff. I told Schlesinger all this.

Dinitz: The thing is to get the damn stuff into Israel, rather than wait for seven planes to fly ten times to and from Israel, or to pick it up in the Azores.

Kissinger: Since Tuesday morning I had no reason to think it wasn't moving. Every day I go to bed knowing twenty planes are authorized, and the next morning I find they're not moving.

Dinitz: I'm not blaming you, God forbid, but I'm bound to report to you.

Scowcroft: I called you last night, too, and told you the planes would move.

Dinitz: The Prime Minister asked me to tell you we have based our operations on this basis, and as well as what we . . .

Kissinger: Can I tell this to Schlesinger now?

[Picks up phone]: Get me Schlesinger.

Dinitz: Yes.

To save a little of the situation—I'm not talking about an initiative, but about saving the situation—the planes must fly directly to Israel.

Kissinger: There will be a mutiny here. That's impossible.

Dinitz: So help me, I must tell you, there will be a mutiny here if there are no planes. The Jewish community, and many friends, and the labor movement and the press. I've been making no comment. I can't do it. I have no right, no historical right; we are dealing with the destiny of people.

Kissinger: [talks to Schlesinger on phone] Hello Jim.

[Schlesinger: Hi Henry.]

Kissinger: I've just been meeting on an urgent basis with Dinitz, who says they are running out substantially of ammunition. They based their strategy on the assumption that they would get the ammunition replaced this week, as the President had promised them on

[4] No records of these telephone calls were found.

Tuesday,[5] and that they are stopping their offensive in Syria because they can't move because of lack of supplies. And the Egyptians have transferred artillery over and now they are saying there is a problem of a major thrust into the Sinai. And it is true we gave them our assurances.

[Schlesinger: Well, what do you want to do?]

Kissinger: Well, I don't know what I want to do. I just feel that we did make some undertaking—you know it would help us. I was raising hell with them for not keeping their offensive going for a day while we were setting up the scenario on diplomacy. And now they have got to stop it.

[Schlesinger: Well, we can . . .]

Kissinger: Are you sure that your people—I know that you are serious, but I frankly have no confidence that Clements and Hill and Company aren't sabotaging this every step of the way. If you want my candid opinion.

[Schlesinger: Well . . .]

Kissinger: I just don't find the initiative. If they wanted something to happen, then it would happen.

[Schlesinger: You mean on the obtaining of charter flights?]

Kissinger: Well, on just getting—you know some way in four days could have been found. I don't know what it is, it isn't my job. I just don't see. Except for you I don't know anyone over there who has any intention of making this happen. You know that Clements would just as soon move them the other way.

[Schlesinger: Well, he will do what the President wants.]

Kissinger: Yeah, but the way he interprets what the President wants is not necessarily what the President wants.

[Schlesinger: Well, we have the possibility of just telling the US aircraft to go on whatever they need.]

Kissinger: I just find it hard to believe that every company would refuse to charter unless somebody sort of told them in a half-assed way.

[Schlesinger: Well, the problem with that is that they have good business outside. Unlike other circumstances, back during the Vietnamese war when they agreed to charter, they were going around with their feet—equivalent half empty on the charter flights.]

Kissinger: For example, did anyone talk to—you know I never objected to the question by the fella I had—who is head of Continental Airlines? Six?

---

[5] October 9. See Document 141.

[Schlesinger: Six, right.]

Kissinger: Bob Six. Now I know Goddamn well he is a great patriot, and if somebody told him we needed airplanes, I just can't believe that he wouldn't do it, unless you winked at him and said but if it doesn't happen until next week my heart won't be broken.

[Schlesinger: Well, it is—what is—when are they going to start running out of reserves?]

Kissinger: They are out now. They have stopped their offensive. And they are now in deep trouble in the Sinai. I am basing this on a message from the Prime Minister to the President.[6] And you know maybe it is not true, but it is a hell of a responsibility to take.

Dinitz [interrupting]: It's a helluva responsibility to . . . [Kissinger motions him to be quiet].

[Schlesinger: Well, if we started now and really turned the screws on these guys, I suspect that we can collect a few aircraft for tomorrow. But I think if you want to do something about it, you better let a US aircraft fly all the way in.]

Kissinger: That I would have to discuss with the President.

[Schlesinger: Or another thing we could do . . .]

Kissinger: But can't we turn the screws on these charter companies? I am just convinced that if the screws were turned, they would have produced.

[Schlesinger: I think that may be right. We never went back at them again because of the decision to go with the Military Airlift Command.]

Kissinger: Well, then, they could then pick it up in the Azores if they wanted to. It is already there.

[Schlesinger: The stuff's in the Azores. What do you mean they? Are you talking about the charters?]

Kissinger: Well, if the charters picked it up here and the Israelis picked up what is already in the Azores, that would at least put some steam behind it.

[Schlesinger: Well, how much do they need?]

Kissinger: I have no estimates of that.

[Schlesinger: OK, let me see what I can do. One thing we could do we could take these ten or twelve C–130s that we are planning to give them and load them up and let them go all the way.]

Kissinger: Well, let's do that. Well, I will call Dinitz and tell him to have his military guy get in touch with you.

[Schlesinger: OK.]

---

[6] Not further identified.

Kissinger: But will you tell Sumner, for Christ's sake, to get off his ass, because if a catastrophe happens there is going to be some accounting. For our scenario we needed the Israeli offensive moving and if the Israelis are on their knees tomorrow night, we are not going to . . .

[Schlesinger: Well, Henry it would have been desirable for them to tell us that they were going to run out of ammunition.]

Kissinger: Well, on the other hand I must tell you we told them every day that this stuff was coming. There wasn't a day that we didn't tell them that they would have 20 aircraft in the morning and then they didn't have them in the evening.

[Schlesinger: I really can't say that that was the case. Until the night before last it was assumed that these guys were going to be able to haul them themselves along with the aircraft that they would round up. It wasn't until yesterday that we—the night before—that we started this search for aircraft on their behalf. So, ah, the situation . . .]

Kissinger: We can reconstruct what went wrong later, but now can we see what we can get going there?

[Schlesinger: OK.]

Kissinger: Because this whole diplomacy is going to come apart if they look impotent. It can only work if they look as if they were gaining, not if they look as if they were losing.

[Schlesinger: OK. The first thing to do is to have those C–130s that we turn over carrying ammo. Do you want US pilots to fly in those C–130s? I don't see any reason why not.]

Kissinger: I've never thought this thing through from that point of view. Why don't you work that out with their military attaché?

[Schlesinger: OK, very good.]

Kissinger: OK, good.

[Schlesinger: OK.]

Kissinger: Thank you.

[Schlesinger: You bet.]

Kissinger: [hangs up, turns to Dinitz]: They'll give you ten C–130's immediately, and will load them with ammunition. And probably fly them with American pilots.

[To Scowcroft:] Now he admits it; we could have gotten the charters if we'd put the screws on. You know what Clements did.

[Picks up phone:] Get me Haig.

Scowcroft: I spent all morning and all afternoon on it.

Kissinger: Who negotiated it?

Dinitz: Sisco, Atherton, Stackhouse.

Scowcroft: Then Brinegar. I think he was in good faith.

Kissinger: These air companies wouldn't dare turn it down if we said we had to have it and they wouldn't get the next rate change if we didn't.

Kissinger [picking up phone to talk to Haig]: Hello?

[Haig: Hi, Henry.]

Kissinger: Al, you know we are now having massive problems with the Israelis because the sons of bitches in Defense have been stalling for four days and not one airplane has moved.

[Haig: Oh no.]

Kissinger: Oh yes. After the decision on Tuesday, not one Goddamn shipload—not one—has moved. And they are now out of ammunition. They are stopping their Syrian offensive. The Egyptians have transferred artillery to the other side of the Canal.

[Haig: Oh boy.]

Kissinger: And may start an offensive tomorrow. So now the question is whether they are going to collapse in the Sinai, and you know what this does to the diplomatic scenario I described to you.

[Haig: Yes, yeah.]

Kissinger: Which absolutely required an Israeli offensive.

[Haig: Yep.]

Kissinger: And they told us they were running out of ammunition. They conducted the operation on the assumption that it would be replenished by the end of this week. That is a combination of Clements, Hill and Noyes. Now my orders apparently just aren't carried out over there.

[Haig: All right. Do you want me to call Jim right away?]

Kissinger: Well, I have called Jim. Will you call Clements and throw the fear of God into him?

[Haig: Yes, sure.]

Kissinger: And also throw the fear of God into Schlesinger.

[Haig: Right, I will do that.]

Kissinger: You know that doesn't mean they should now pour American airplanes directly into, but they should do something now. They can round up charters. I do not believe for one minute that they can't get charters if they tell these charter companies that the next time they need a rate change they won't get it.

[Haig: Charter aircraft.]

Kissinger: Yes.

[Haig: Yes. OK. Let me do that right now Henry.]

Kissinger: Good.

[Haig: All right.]

Kissinger: Good.

Dinitz: Even with the charter, it won't make it. The only thing now is to get American planes in, without markings. Even with the charter tonight, it won't make it in time. I warn you again, and I want it on the record.

Kissinger: [pauses] Okay. What other problems?

Dinitz: We need 40 planes, in two to three days. We can't wait for two planes in six days. There may be a misunderstanding; maybe I'm to be blamed.

Kissinger: Our basic misunderstanding was that you were going to win.

Shalev: We would have, with the equipment.

Dinitz: Our strategy was to hit Syria, then go against Egypt.

Kissinger: Now, we never promised you a large number of aircraft; we promised replacements.

[Shalev starts to speak]

Dinitz: Mordechai, stop.

Kissinger: You want to discuss the political thing? It will start tomorrow night. It depended on your having the offensive tomorrow.

Dinitz: There won't be an offensive.

Kissinger: That may be true.

Dinitz: We won't have the offensive if we won't have the equipment. I never dreamed we would get two planes in six days.

Kissinger: I told you Tuesday you'd get five F–4's and all the consumables.[7] Now they dragged us through the charters, which was a disaster.

I put out the Soviet figures on Wednesday because I assumed our stuff would cover it Wednesday.

How many planes have gone?

Dinitz: The seven El Al.

Kissinger: Weren't there six the other day?

Dinitz: There couldn't have been. El Al doesn't have more planes.

[silence]

Kissinger: Do you want to speak to me alone for five minutes?

Dinitz: Okay.

[Dr. Kissinger and Ambassador Dinitz confer alone 12:03–12:23.]

---

[7] See Document 141.

167. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and Secretary of Defense Schlesinger[1]

Washington, October 13, 1973, 12:49 a.m.

K: Jim.

JS: What is this telegram that you have, what—

K: Look, I don't want it spread all over the bloody Defense Department, that is the problem. They claim they have now stopped offensive on the Syrian front because they are out of ammunition.[2] They claim further that I had told them that they could keep going because they were getting—that their ammo replenished and in relying on that they've kept going and they didn't get them. Now what this does to the diplomacy I described to you yesterday is near disaster because they were supposed to be triggered yesterday, diplomacy was supposed to be triggered tonight—tomorrow night, Saturday[3] night, but that diplomacy requires Israeli pressure—

JS: I understand that.

K: Which will now not be forthcoming. On the other hand, the Israelis will now hoard the stuff we rush in and then they'll strike when the diplomacy was supposed to have been concluded. That's water over the dam now, we'll have to discuss that some other time. But I just think there was massive sabotage.[4]

JS: It's just not true, Henry.

K: Well, let's not get into that. One thing we cannot have now given our relations with the Soviets is American planes flying in there. Anything else is acceptable.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking. The blank underscores indicate omissions in the original.

[2] See Document 166.

[3] October 13.

[4] In a 9:35 a.m. telephone conversation later that morning, Haig told Kissinger that Schlesinger had admitted to him that he had investigated and that his people did drag their feet and that he was "goddamned upset about it." Kissinger said that Haig had to tell the President that this would "sort of wreck things a bit." There were now three Egyptian airborne units that might land in the Sinai overnight and the Egyptians had moved artillery across the canal. Kissinger noted that things were "getting rough" and the Egyptians still had a whole air force, whereas if the United States could have gotten the ammunition to Israel, it would have broken the Syrian front. The Secretary added that this had the "whole diplomacy thing screwed up." The Israelis were slackening off now when the United States needed their pressure, and later when it wanted them to slacken off, the ammunition and equipment would be there and they would want to fight again. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

JS: Okay, now they claim Henry it's only five hours ago we talked to these people, we've been asking them what their daily supply is, they have exhibited no uneasiness about it at all.

K: Because they don't trust the people in the room

JS: You mean to say that when General Gur is alone with General Sumner that he doesn't trust him?

K: No, with Gur with Sumner, he should trust him.

JS: Sumner has been trying to get it out of Gur for five days and Gur has been perfectly relaxed about the day supply.

K: Because Gur claims that—I mean Dinitz—I don't know Gur—Dinitz claims that was because every day we told them, which is true, that they were going to get 20 planes moving. And every day it didn't happen.

If it had been moved, they would have been all right. So they say.

JS: Every day goes back one night—

K: Now I told them Tuesday night based on an assurance of Sisco, about which you have nothing to do—said they were going to get 20 charters the next day.[5] And we told them Wednesday night if everything else failed, we were going to requisition it through MAC. Then we told them Thursday night it would now be requisitioned through MAC and then we told them Friday morning that this wasn't working.

JS: That's right. It's two days—

K: It's about 48 hours, but you're responsible for 24 hours, I'm responsible for—be that as it may, let's not worry about what happens. It seems to me we have these options. We've got the 10 C–130's which we could load.

JS: Right. We've got ammo in the _____ now.

K: Yeh, but we don't know when that's going to be released.

JS: How about your negotiations with the Portuguese?

K: We just sent a telegram two hours ago.

JS: Okay. Well they simply cannot be that short of ammo, Henry. It is impossible that they didn't know what their supply was—and suddenly they've run out of it.

K: Look, they have obviously screwed up every offensive they've conducted. And they are not about to take the responsibility themselves. I have no doubt whatever that they are blaming us for their own failures.

JS: Right.

---

[5] October 9. See Document 141.

K: But you try to make that case here and above all, I really think we have this thing 90% licked. And you tell the madman you have of a deputy who is spreading the word that I'm driving the Saudis crazy, that I have a promise from the foreign minister of Saudi Arabia—

JS: I told them at about 6:00 this evening—he seems to be somewhat relieved. You mentioned this to me earlier to tell him. He said he hoped it worked out that way.

K: It may not work out that way, but the only way it is going to work out if we are going to get a quick end of the war. Of which we nearly have all pieces in place, but we need an Israeli offensive.

JS: Okay, now Henry if they have enough ammo to carry them tomorrow we can get the ammo in by tomorrow evening. But first of all we have to find out what their supply situation is.

K: I would give a hell of a lot if I could keep them going through tomorrow so that they are not sitting there when this goes into the Security Council.

JS: The only way to do that is to move ammunition in tonight. And it's almost—it must be damn near dawn there.

K: It is dawn in Israel. It's 8:00 in the morning.

JS: Are they out of ammo or aren't they?

K: How the hell would I know. They said they were stopping their offensive. I was meeting with them tonight to synchronize the diplomacy for tomorrow. And I said where are you going to be tomorrow night, I was getting leery when they called me after having pleaded with me to give them another day they called me at 4:00 this afternoon and said you can trigger everything tonight. And I couldn't do it because I didn't have—I had geared my timing in such a way that I couldn't recover all the pieces. I could have done it yesterday—I need 24 hours to get it going.

JS: It's amazing to me—I sat with them from 5:30–6:30 and they simply did not mention ammunition problems—they didn't indicate any issue in that area. All they talked about was the re-equipment and to get it in within two days.

K: They are so terrified now—or claim to be terrified of Israeli thrust into the Sinai—I mean Egyptian thrust.

JS: That's incredible planning on their part.

K: Look, they fucked-it up.

JS: Hm huh. Okay, let me try to find out what the hell their status of supplies situation is. We had the impression that they had 15 days of supply.

K: I bet you they counted their supply on the experience of the six-day war.

JS: Could well be.

K: I bet you they didn't expend as much in the whole six-day war as they do in one day of this offensive.

JS: That might very well be, Henry. I think that is very likely. Sooner or later they could have come back and told us what their problem was.

K: Well, because they would have had to face themselves and I must say in their defense—not on the airplanes on which they and we never agreed—but on the other one, we told them time and again that they were getting all the consumables and they should fight as if they were coming.

JS: Right. But they never told us they were running short.

K: Because you know what happened—as well as I do. These guys got the whole thing screwed up—every time. They are living in 1967. All day long yesterday they were telling me they were heading for Damascus and they were going to stop on the outskirts. This morning they told me they would stop _____ public transportations if they can. Now they obviously can't make it.

JS: Okay.

K: No question in mind that 80% of the blame is theirs. But that doesn't help me tomorrow night. And you know I just have to have them going as a fierce force while this is going on.

JS: If they are out of ammo now, there is nothing we can do to get it there for today's offensive. The nearest step is in the Azores and you know that's kind of screwed up unless we take the US aircraft off and fly it in. It won't be in for 5 hours—

K: How about at least C–130's. I think what we have to do is to get them the 10 C–130's. We have to twist the arm of the charters by telling them they will never get another defense contract—that's going to produce.

JS: That's right, but we can get that stuff out all right, but we are not going to get it out there for Saturday.

K: No, but that at least will get it moving. So let's do it—a combination of the Azores _____, the 10 C–130's and forced charters. And that I think will be it if we put Sumner working on it tonight

JS: He's there now. We've got John Wickham there—look we have a group that is working this 24 hours a day.

K: Jim, you and I have no problem because we are in complete agreement on the strategy, as far as I can see. You have to delegate it and I have and you have a few people down the line who were put there to sabotage that stuff not by you.

JS: I think it's . . .

K: I think on the other hand you have the goddamn Israelis screwing up everything they are doing.

JS: If only they had said they had a problem. Four days, they've been sitting there. Three days ago they were telling us how happy they were about the consumable situation.[6]

K: Let's you and I try to work it out as quickly as possible.

JS: Okay, very good.

K: Good.

---

[6] In telegram 8040 from Tel Aviv, October 13, Keating reported that the Defense Attaché had received an extensive IDF briefing that day regarding Israel's urgent need for a quick, large-scale resupply of aircraft and armor. The Ambassador said he knew the United States had already begun to resupply some categories of weapons, ammo, and planes, but he did not have any feel for current U.S. Government views on such a large-scale resupply of aircraft or tanks. He noted that most Arabs were already thinking the worst of the United States in this respect, so they were already damned to some extent even if they didn't do anything. He added that if, based on all the available information, the U.S. Government believed that Israel was likely to be in serious military trouble, he recommended without qualification that the United States be responsive on an urgent basis to the latest Israeli Government request. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 610, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 12, March–October 1973)

---

168. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Israeli Ambassador (Dinitz)[1]

Washington, October 13, 1973, 1:03 a.m.

D: My military attaché is just standing next to me. He just came into my office and said that General Sumner called him and General Sumner told him that because we cannot _____. The Golan Heights tonight or tomorrow he has an order to send some ammunition immediately that we need badly just now.

K: That's what you wanted isn't it?

D: Yeh, we wanted ammunition but we want Sumner to _____. So what is exactly—you have any idea how many planes or anything?

K: We are going to do three separate things. We are going to give you the ten C–130's immediately.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking. The blank underscores indicate omissions in the original.

D: Ten C–130. Directly.

K: Immediately. Now you have to work out with Defense—we would prefer it if you place Israeli pilots in the Azores.

D: We understand.

K: If at all possible.

D: I would like to find out.

K: Well you find that out. Second we are going to force some charters out of the airlines. And thirdly, we are going to use the Azores with your El Al so you have three different operational—

D: Just to be sure I understand. The ten C–130 which will approach either directly to Israel or through the Azores depends on the availability of the Israeli pilots to continue to take—

K: Yeh, but make a big effort to put Israeli pilots.

D: Of course we will, we will need Israeli pilots for—the charter will go all the way to Israel?

K: Yes.

D: You have any idea how many?

K: No, but we are going to force them out—we will try to force 20 of them.

D: I see. And now we'll have to fly from the Azores. So what we have to see is—

K: You will have all three of them going simultaneously.

D: We'll have to try and see whether we have enough pilots for El Al and for the ten C–130—we'll check on it and will tell Defense. We have to deal with Defense, right?

K: Right, because—but if there's any problem call General Scowcroft.

D: Okay, at this point I'll call Scowcroft. All right, thank you Doctor.

K: Now, wait a minute, since I'm interested in the diplomacy of this, I can't tell you how to conduct military operations but I think it would be a disaster for you just to stop tomorrow.

D: Right. I will pass this information immediately to the Prime Minister including these items you just told me.

K: Because if you are seen to be weak, there's no telling what will happen.

D: Hm huh. I know. I know. That is why I was a bit concerned that [omission in the original] Sumner of this weakness.

K: I'm dealing with a bunch of idiots.

D: Yeh. Yeh. From Sumner, God knows where it will go.

K: Okay, let me get Schlesinger again.

D: To tell his aides to set up—

K: Right.

D: All right. And I will pass the information on as soon as my military attaché will get timetable. Because that is crucial.

K: That's right.

D: I don't want to mislead the government again. So I'll get the timetable first before I cable the Prime Minister.

K: This time if you don't get action I'll quit.

D: Well, it will be a double ring ceremony.

K: You know it is an unbelievable situation.

D: I know. I will put them to work right away and I will inform Scowcroft of the details.

K: Good. Thank you.[2]

[2] In a 1:06 a.m. telephone call with Schlesinger, Kissinger reported that Dinitz had called him "saying Sumner was yelling at his [Dinitz's] military attaché that they were stopped because they're out of ammunition and he said their whole security depends on that fact not getting out." Kissinger then asked Schlesinger, who was on his way to the Pentagon, to "make sure that they don't blab around the Pentagon with this because that really would kill everything." Schlesinger agreed. (Ibid.)

169. Memorandum From William B. Quandt of the National Security Council Staff to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 13, 1973.

SUBJECT

Options in the Middle East

It appears to be increasingly likely that no formal ceasefire will be reached in the Middle East in the near future. Instead, fighting on the Syrian front will subside, but not stop entirely, with Israel in control of a line somewhat to the east of the previous ceasefire lines. Israel would probably be glad to have a ceasefire on the Syrian front in order to turn attention to the more important task of dislodging the Egyptians from

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 664, Country Files, Middle East, Middle East War, Memos & Misc., Oct. 6–Oct. 17, 1973. Secret. Sent for information. A handwritten notation at the top of the page reads: "HAK has seen. BS."

Sinai. But there are no reasons for the Syrians to accept such terms unless the alternative is total destruction. Israel might achieve this latter objective, but only at an extraordinarily high price and at a cost in time, which by now is a serious problem for Israel. Each day the war goes on it costs Israel over $250 million. Within one month, this adds up to Israel's entire annual GNP.

Consequently, the prospect is for a standoff on the Syrian front, with Israel in control of additional, but not very valuable, territory. Within a few days, Israel will have to consider dealing seriously with the Egyptian front. A massive onslaught might succeed, but at heavy cost. Outflanking tactics will not easily work. Airpower cannot alone do the job, and in any event risks heavy losses. The Egyptians seem determined to fight, but on their own terms, which means they will not easily be drawn from the SAM-protected area they now occupy unless Israel's forces are obviously weakened.

Soviet supplies to the Egyptians and Syrians assure that fighting will not stop on the Arab side for lack of equipment. Nor is manpower or financing likely to be a problem. The Arabs are well positioned to fight a prolonged, low-intensity war of attrition that will force the Israelis to remain mobilized and alert. The longer the war goes on, the better their chances.

If the Israelis do manage to force the Egyptian forces back across the Canal, this will not assure a ceasefire. Israel will be reluctant to cross to the west bank to destroy the Egyptian army. Consequently, some form of hostilities, perhaps reminiscent of the first half of 1970, could go on even after Israel gets back to the ceasefire lines. Israeli casualties will mount and the costs of such a war will be very great.

As the war drags on, several important developments could occur:

—Greater Soviet involvement, such as flying defensive fighter patrols to protect Damascus and Cairo.

—Provision of more advanced Soviet equipment, such as SCUD missiles and TU–22 bombers to the combatants.

—A decrease in Arab oil production, causing serious shortages in Europe, Japan and the United States.

—Attempt to close Bab al-Mandab at the southern entrance of the Red Sea to oil tankers from Iran to Israel.

—Moroccan closure of our communications facilities, thereby degrading the effectiveness of the Sixth Fleet.

—Virtual isolation of the United States as the sole supporter of Israel, thereby complicating diplomatic and military resupply efforts.

—Jordanian involvement in the hostilities will become inevitable.

U.S. Alternatives

1. *Continue efforts to build consensus for ceasefire and negotiated peace settlement.* Unless the situation on the ground or the costs of the war for

both sides change dramatically in the next few days, this alternative seems unlikely to succeed. The Egyptians will resist any proposal requiring them to withdraw from territory they have reoccupied. The Israelis will not willingly stop fighting until they have at least tried an all-out counter-offensive on the Egyptian forces in Sinai. While this approach may eventually succeed, it is bound to take considerable time during which U.S. interests in the Middle East are likely to suffer and Soviet influence to grow.

2. *Try for a ceasefire in place and agreement on the first stage of an overall settlement.* This effort would try to end the fighting as soon as possible by offering something to both sides. The key issues would involve the Egyptian-Israeli front. If fighting were to stop, Egypt would be in control of an area comparable to what they could have expected to regain in the first stage of any peace settlement. They have now acquired this by force, but no one contests that it is Egyptian territory. The problem is to get the Israelis to accept this outcome of the fighting and to link it to a more general settlement. This would require strong efforts to persuade the Egyptians and Syrians to accept face-to-face negotiations on a phased settlement, complete with arrangements for demilitarization and separation of forces in key areas. Egypt would have to accept the principle that Israeli withdrawal will not be automatic, but rather will take place over time, as Egypt takes actions consistent with a full peace agreement. On the Syrian front, no progress would be expected until the Egyptians had begun negotiating. In short, this formula would favor the Egyptians at the outset by letting them keep recaptured territory, but would set the stage for subsequent peace negotiations on terms acceptable to the Israelis. Considerable European, and perhaps even some moderate Arab, support might be generated for such an alternative.

3. *Take no action for a ceasefire or a peace settlement at present.* U.S. efforts would shift from trying to end the fighting immediately to providing Israel with sufficient economic and military support to insure that a war of attrition will not succeed. The objective, as in 1970, would be to demonstrate that force cannot settle the conflict, that Soviet help to their clients will be met by our efforts to help Israel, whatever the costs to our interests in the Arab world. In the short term the chances for peace would be dim and US–Arab relations would be seriously weakened, but in time one could hope to work again for a negotiated peace once the balance of power in the area had been restored. One would have to anticipate and accept radical changes in the Middle East if we were to adopt this strategy, but vital U.S. interests would probably not suffer excessively. It would however, be several years before we could expect to rebuild the regional network of relations we have been fostering in the Middle East in the past few years.

170. Memorandum From Helmut Sonnenfeldt of the National Security Council Staff to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 13, 1973.

SUBJECT

Aspects of the Middle East War

In several important ways the Soviets have been more irresponsible in this war than in 1967: their behavior this time must be measured against the standards established at our summits in 1972/73 which did not exist in 1967. The only two elements that are not evident in their conduct this time are (1) that they did not actually trigger the crisis as their false alarm did in 1967, and (2) that they are not openly anti-American in their public position, because they want to preserve the fruits of détente. But their failure to act on clear foreknowledge (at least by October 3, but probably in late September), their subsequent incitement of other Arab states to join the fighting and broaden the war, their initiation of resupply while the Arabs were still on the offensive against the background of six years of massive infusions of materiel and technology, their assurances to the Arabs that the U.S. would not intervene and that U.S. actions could be discounted—all these are steps that go beyond the mere protection of their interests.[2]

Sometime around October 10/11, as I noted in my memo to you of October 12,[3] the Soviets evidently decided it was time to maneuver toward a cease-fire that maximized Egyptian gains and minimized Syrian losses.

Within certain limits that ought to be the basis on which we should also proceed, largely because any prolongation of the war carries

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 69, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 20 [October 12–November 21, 1973]. Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only.

[2] In an October 13 memorandum to Kissinger, INR Director Ray Cline stated that 4 days after the war began, the Soviet Union had mounted a substantial airlift to the beleaguered Syrians. This, Cline argued, was an indication of the pressures the Soviet Union was under to protect its investment when an Arab client was threatened with defeat. INR's assumption was that the Soviets had decided to help the Arabs in every way, short of the commitment of ground troops. Cline thought the Soviets had not yet made any fundamental decision about how to avoid a collision with the United States, but that they were likely to become increasingly anxious to see an end to the fighting. Because it was not in the Soviets' interest to have either a massive Arab defeat or the destruction of Israel, the preferred end would probably be some sort of stalemate, if possible with Arab gains. (Ibid., NSC Institutional Files (H–Files), Box H–93, Meeting Files, WSAG Meetings, WSAG Meeting, Middle East, 10/19/73 to WSAG Meeting, Middle East, 10/14/73)

[3] Not found.

serious risks to our interests. Without going into detail, we suffer from vulnerabilities this time that did not exist in 1967, at least not to the same extent. These result, whether objectively justified or not, from the oil situation and the far-reaching changes in European attitudes which could easily lead to major turbulence in US–European relations.[4] Moreover, we do not have the diplomatic asset of rapid Israeli military success. On the contrary, we face this time real Israeli weaknesses and urgent requirements which only we can meet and then only in an environment notably more adverse than six years ago.

Our task is to increase the Soviet stake in a cease-fire and to build on whatever tendencies toward a cease-fire that have already been discernible in Soviet policy. As usual, this requires both incentives and sanctions.

Leaving aside the drastic sanction of possible direct US–Soviet confrontations (for which we are not particularly well prepared), our basic area for maneuver is in the various aspects of détente in which the Soviets have stood to gain more than we in the short run. Brezhnev's own stake in his relations with us presents us with a certain leverage inside the Kremlin but it must be used with the greatest care since Brezhnev will go only so far to protect his U.S. policy. We should also bear in mind that extravagant Israeli gains in Syria will make a cease-fire in place politically unacceptable for the Soviets even though the Egyptians hold territory in the Sinai. On this score, therefore, the Israelis must be firmly restrained, especially once our replenishment operations are underway, from going a reasonable distance beyond the Golan Heights. Hard as it may be, Israel must also accept the Egyptian bridgeheads in Sinai.

Before we actively use pressures against the Soviets, we must continue our diplomatic efforts to enlist their cooperation in seeking a cease-fire. We should not assume that the Security Council is the only forum for this purpose. Indeed, the probability of a Chinese veto makes it almost essential that the Arabs and Israelis are brought to signal their readiness to stop shooting before any formal arrangement is attempted in the Security Council. Moreover, it is probably illusory to tie the terms of a cease-fire explicitly to the terms of an eventual settlement since any effort to do so will merely land us in the same deadlock that has prevented progress toward a settlement in the first place. No matter how

[4] Telegram 12022 from London, October 16, reported that the Prime Minister's general view on the Middle East situation was that it was "essential that the United Kingdom not be involved or appear to be involved in any way with Israel nor with any actions in support of Israel or the Arabs might think were in support of Israel." (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

much in pain, the Israelis will probably use an atomic bomb before they concede the 1967 borders—not to mention what Senator Jackson will use here at home if we attempt to extract such a concession at this time. On the other hand, the Arabs will never yield on the 1967 borders, or the Palestinians.

So, to repeat, we must seek a simple cease-fire in place, without ifs and buts and regardless of what we may have in our minds as to where it might later lead. (We might consider a Joint Resolution in Congress to buttress the President's position).

If we have not done so, we must seek explicit Israeli agreement to a cease-fire and, if necessary, tie our supply operations to it. By the same token, we must explicitly get the Soviets to work toward the same end with the Arabs. They must understand that an end to the shooting is the pre-condition for any possible negotiation later. (Incidentally, I think the search for a "settlement" is illusory and we must think in terms of a demilitarized Sinai with an international force including the U.S.)

Once our clear support for a cease-fire in place has been signaled, it should be made clear to Brezhnev that the President has already spent enormous capital here at home to obtain the implementation of last year's economic agreements. This plainly cannot continue if the U.S. and the Soviet Union are waging proxy war in the Middle East. And this applies even more to the area of EXIM and CCC credits. Not until we can demonstrate that the 1972 Principles and the 1973 nuclear war agreement[5] have real practical meaning in a real-life international crisis can we hope to fend off those who want to condition economic relations on changes in the Soviet domestic system. Our economic relations were always predicated on crisis-free political relations. If we do not want to convey this message directly, there should be little difficulty in getting Administration supporters in Congress to make these points.

We should also find a way to convey to the Soviets the point that if we are to suffer Arab economic sanctions, we will have to pass the costs on to the Soviets as long as they sustain Arab warmaking.

Similar connections to economic relations should be established with the Yugoslavs and Hungarians who have been instrumental in facilitating the Soviet airlift.

Although I assume we have had our own contacts with Arabs, at least with the Egyptians, we should do what we can not to let the Soviets have a monopoly of such contacts in the future. Our problems in this regard will undoubtedly become tougher as our supply operations

[5] See footnote 12, Document 70, and footnote 3, Document 58.

to Israel pick up, but we should never let the Arabs forget that in the end only we, not the Russians, can influence the Israelis. The British and French should be enlisted for this also.

In sum, in the present phase we should:

—tie our resupply of the Israelis to restraints on their Syrian campaign; and their acceptance of a cease-fire in place;

—work on the Russians to get them to support a cease-fire in place;

—begin to make more explicit connections between the economic aspects of détente and Soviet support for a cease-fire and general restraint;

—put pressure on Hungary and Yugoslavia;

—maintain our own contacts with the Egyptians and get the British and French to work on them in regard to a cease-fire;

—take the position that a cease-fire should stand on its own rather than be tied to eventual terms of a settlement;

—make clear to the Russians that Arab oil sanctions against us will have adverse consequences for US–Soviet relations.

You have a separate set of papers on the urgent need to get together with the Europeans in regard to possible oil supply problems.[6] This is a matter of the utmost political urgency, since U.S.–European relations could come under the most severe strain quite rapidly, thereby giving the Soviets added incentives to support a protracted war.

[6] An October 13 memorandum to Kissinger from NSC staff member Charles Cooper recommended that the United States try to negotiate on an urgent basis a joint public statement with major European countries, Japan, and Canada that there was mutual agreement that no country or countries should suffer a disproportionate hardship as a result of a disruption of supplies of Middle Eastern oil associated with the fighting in the Middle East. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Institutional Files (H–Files), Box H–92, Meeting Files, WSAG Meetings, Middle East, 10/16/73) For text of the memorandum, see *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXXVI, Energy Crisis, 1969–1974, Document 213.

171. Telegram From the Embassy in Jordan to the Department of State[1]

Amman, October 13, 1973, 1335Z.

5476. Subject: Message from King Hussein to Secretary Kissinger. Following message received for Secretary from King Hussein:

"Sir: After receiving your message[2] and precisely at the end of the 48 hours you requested me to provide in helping your intensive efforts for a rapid solution to this tragic dilemma of madness and continued shedding of dear blood, our 40th Armored Brigade began to move and has arrived this morning at the Jordanian-Syrian border. Its moves from then on are to be slow and deliberate. I had no other option and had used them all. God give you the ability to play the vital role and bring these tragic developments to a rapid end.[3]

Sincerely, Hussein."

Brown

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret; Flash; Nodis, Received at 9:55 a.m.

[2] See footnote 5, Document 150.

[3] On October 13, Hussein also sent a message to Meir informing her that he was holding back as best he could and that Jordanian military moves in the north were cautious and restrained. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 137, Country Files, Jordan/Rifai, January 3, 1973)

172. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, October 13, 1973, 9:50 a.m.

D. Hello.

K. I just talked to Hume [*Home*].[2] They have been talking to Sadat and Sadat says they will never accept a straight ceasefire.

D. They discussed directly with Sadat? I must send a telegram to Moscow right away . . .

K. I am pressing them and they will call me back in three hours.

D. Both our countries will abstain. Even in this case it is my firm decision . . .

K. We will still press the British to . . .

D. If Sadat even told them so, we will definitely abstain and will keep our word in this case. If we both abstain it will be of political significance. What is now the problem? The British are not decided?

K. The British are reluctant because they think that Sadat will not agree to it. If Moscow could talk to him.

D. In three hours I will not get an answer unless I go by ordinary telephone.

K. No, that is too dangerous.

D. I think so. Really, even if he said so . . .

K. Because the British are afraid of Sadat saying no and going ahead . . .

D. Maybe we should go with Australia.

K. That is what we will do. Australia has nothing to lose with Egypt. I will be in touch with you in three hours. I will try to do something by tonight.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] The transcript is ibid. Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 222–225.

173. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, October 13, 1973, 10:45 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State and Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Dr. James R. Schlesinger, Secretary of Defense
Amb. Kenneth Rush, Deputy Secretary of State
William Clements, Deputy Secretary of Defense
Adm. Thomas Moorer, Chairman, JCS
William E. Colby, Director of Central Intelligence

SUBJECT

Special WSAG—Principals Only

Kissinger: The President said if there are any further delays in carrying out orders, we want the resignation of the officials involved.

We had two objectives in the war; to maintain contact with both sides. For this the best outcome would be an Israeli victory but it would come at a high price, so we could insist that they ensure their security through negotiations, not through military power. Second, we attempted to produce a situation where the Arabs would conclude the only way to peace was through us. But during the war we had to show the Israelis they had to depend on us to win and couldn't win if we were too recalcitrant.

On Tuesday, we told the Israelis that we would give them the consumables they needed.[2]

Schlesinger: That's wrong. We said they'd get the consumables that were available and they'd attempt to get charters.

Kissinger: Okay, but we needed to get the stuff in when we needed an offensive. Now it is going in afterwards, when we want the diplomacy to work. We are in active diplomacy with all of them. Our thinking is that the bureaucracy is dragging its feet on the grounds that we are going in on the Israeli side. Now we are being forced to take actions which do run a risk.

Israel has been hurt. But can we hold the Arabs still, and can we cover our present high-profile operation?

---

[1] Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversation, Box 2. Secret; Nodis. The meeting was held in the White House Situation Room. Brackets are in the original.

[2] October 9. See Document 141.

Schlesinger: Where did we screw up?

Kissinger: We should have forced the charters.

Clements: I agree. But we didn't know it was urgent.

Kissinger: The Arabs may even be smelling a victory, not a stalemate. That means the Soviet Union has won. For us to have gone in to have saved the Arabs' ass would have been perfect. The Saudis, for example, want a situation where the Soviet Union is humiliated and the Arabs turn to the United States. An Arab victory, even with American acquiescence, will look like American weakness. The Israelis have now slowed because of the shortages; now they might crank up when we want them to stop.

Schlesinger: We weren't asked to get in until Thursday[3] night. The Israelis never told us they had shortages.

Kissinger: I am sure the history books will show Israel was defeated by poor planning and lousy tactics. But right now, I have the diplomacy going, and I can't make it work unless the Arabs are sweating. It took me two days to line up Israel, and they are now starting to drag their feet. We might lose the Soviets. We hoped to have the Syrians and Egyptians at each other's throats because Israel would have captured Syrian territory.

Clements: How can we help now?

Kissinger: Let's fly in some US planes. Let's get the charter going.

I want the Arabs to think the Israelis may go wild when they get equipment.

Schlesinger: We are 5,000 miles away. For refueling, we are using Torrejon, and we can't do that massively without the Spanish.

Kissinger: How bad off are the Israelis?

Colby: They are slowing down. They are telling their pilots to conserve fuel and ammo.

Schlesinger: There is ammo on the way.[4]

Kissinger: Golda was coming on Tuesday. I turned her off by providing the consumables.[5]

---

[3] October 11.

[4] JCS message 8473 to COMUSFORAZ Terceira, Azores Islands and other posts, October 12, sent at 2153Z, ordered the immediate commencement via U.S. military or MAC charter aircraft of movement of all available Israel-bound cargo for offloading at Lajes Air Force Base, Azores. It stated that arrangements were being made for pickup of the cargo at Lajes by Israeli aircraft for onward movement. (National Archives, RG 218, Official Records of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (Moorer), Box 70, Oct. 73, JSC Out Genser Msgs)

[5] See footnote 3, Document 154.

What I am afraid of is if I kick off the diplomacy, and the Egyptians take the Mitla pass, we are in a mess.

Our problem is to get the war over in a way the Arabs have to come to us, and then turn on the Israelis. If Israel feels we have let them down and the Arabs think they have done it themselves, we are sunk.

Colby: Israel wanted to wipe out Syria and then turn on Egypt, and this can still work on the Arabs.

Clements: We should now go in with a massive airlift.

Kissinger: No, we will lose all our Arab friends.

Schlesinger: How much different is a US airlift from commandeered charter flights.

Clements: We are already pregnant with the C–5's.

Moorer: They have gotten 7,500 rounds of 105 mm ammo. Also 175's, chaff, LAW's.

Schlesinger: We can just use Lajes and let the Portuguese protest to us.[6]

Kissinger: It has taken a week to get us to the point where this was jelling. I don't want to blow it all in a spasm. Doesn't it make a difference if it's charter versus an American airlift?

Colby: It gives them a face-saving device if they want to.

Kissinger: I agree. If they want to blow it up, they will. If they don't want to, this gives them the hope.

Moorer: The F–4's will blow them more than an airlift.

Colby: I think we should just use Lajes.

Kissinger: They want Hawk missiles. We can't lose all the Africans for Israel.

Schlesinger: We need a base. Either Lajes, Spain, or Italy.

Kissinger: In the next three days, Israel should be on the attack but without rupturing it with the Arabs.

Clements: That means consumables.

---

[6] Telegram 203571 to Lisbon, October 13, 1250Z, transmitted a personal letter from President Nixon to Portuguese Prime Minister Caetano stating that the United States needed Portugal's cooperation to support ending hostilities and bring a durable peace to the Middle East. He noted that if Portugal were threatened by terrorism or an oil boycott as a result of its help, the United States would be willing to consult on what steps they could jointly take. Nixon warned Caetano "in all frankness" that if the U.S. Government were forced to look to alternative routes due to Portugal's failure to help at this critical time, the United States would be forced to adopt measures that could not but hurt their relationship. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

Schlesinger: The F–4's are moving.[7] They will have 10 by Sunday[8] night and 14 by Monday.

Kissinger: Our interests are not identical with Israel's. We want Israel to win so the Arabs will turn to us. Israel wants us locked in.

Let's use the C–5's to go in until we can get a charter going. That is at least fewer planes.

Schlesinger: The Chicago convention requires prior approval.[9]

Colby: I think we should get some ships, too, so the Israelis will know we are working on it.

Kissinger: With luck we may have a ceasefire by Monday night. [He outlined the scenario.] I've got three Arab Foreign Ministers coming Tuesday[10] to see the President.

Schlesinger: We have to have Lajes for a charter. We have the 141's at Lajes now. Let's move it in.

Kissinger: Okay.

Clements: The C–5's could have a salutary effect by going in.

Schlesinger: It is more complex. Henry's leverage with the Arabs depends on showing he can keep . . .

Kissinger: I need the flight times when they will get there. I will tell Ismail after they get there. Bill, will you organize the charter?

Schlesinger: We've got to get Lajes.

Kissinger: That is my problem. Get two ships loaded, too. Let Brent know when everything will arrive. I will send a note to Egypt that we have been restrained.[11] If the Arabs see that things will get worse if they don't get a ceasefire, we may be okay. How bad off are the Israelis?

Colby: They are not too bad but they are rationing ammo.

Moorer: Israel seems to be turning south in Syria.

Clements: There are four divisions there. That will take time. Iran.

Kissinger: We'll tell them we have been restrained for four days in the face of a massive Soviet resupply. We are now providing only

---

[7] JCS message 8611 to COMUSFORAZ Terceira, Azores Islands and other posts, October 12, sent at 2336Z, was an "execute message" ordering the immediate movement of two USAF F–4E aircraft by USAF crews to Lajes for pickup by McDonnell pilots for subsequent delivery to the Israeli air force. The message emphasized that there was to be no unauthorized announcement of this movement. (Ibid., RG 218, Official Records of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (Moorer), Box 70, Oct. 73, JSC Out Genser Msgs)

[8] October 14

[9] The Convention on International Civil Aviation, also known as the Chicago Convention, signed in 1944, established rules and detailed rights in relation to air travel.

[10] October 16. The meeting was held on October 17; see Document 195.

[11] See Document 189.

emergency items and we continue to seek the earliest possible ceasefire.[12]

[12] At 12:32 p.m., Kissinger telephoned Dinitz and informed him that the United States was going to fly three C–5As that day through the U.S. base in Portugal and fly at least three of the C–141s that were already in the Azores to Israel. Also, the number of Phantoms that would be supplied was increased to 14 and these would be in Israel by the night of October 15. The Secretary then asked Dinitz to tell his Congressional critics like Senator Henry Jackson, who was threatening an investigation of Kissinger's crisis management, what was going on. He emphasized that the administration's whole foreign policy position depended on its not being represented as having "screwed up" in a crisis. Dinitz said he would call Jackson and explain what the situation was, adding that he had told the Senator 3 days earlier that Israel had never had a better friend than Kissinger. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

174. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and United Nations Secretary General Waldheim[1]

October 13, 1973, 1:13 p.m.

W: I was calling to congratulate you on your press conference,[2] I think it was really well handled, the way you answered all these delicate questions.

K: Thank you.

W: And I wanted to thank you for the way you dealt with the UN.

K: Well, I think you are very nice.

W: It was very helpful—Dr. Kissinger, but what I wanted to tell you is the following. I had a long talk yesterday with El Zayyat after the Security Council meeting—and they decided the following which I wanted to let you know—apparently they feel very strong militarily, whether it is justified or not, at any rate, he put to me the following points. He said they are ready to accept a ceasefire, if the Israelis give a commitment to withdraw to the 1967 lines.

K: Yeh, well that's out of the question.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking. Kissinger was in Washington; Waldheim was in New York.

[2] See footnote 5, Document 159.

W: I told them this. I said I don't think there is any chance to get this. But I thought I should tell you because he mentioned quite a number of points, point one, commitment to withdraw to the 6th of June lines, point two—this commitment—the help could be done indeed by the United States, then three, he would give an Egyptian commitment to international forces in Sharm ash Shaykh and also to international buffer zones these international troops in the Golan Heights—not in the whole area but in an area along Syrian border and then he said we would accept an international conference to negotiate details, etc., but some sort of arrangement for the Palestinians would be found and the Palestinians would have—participate in such a conference.[3] I thought I should let you know this. I am of course fully aware that especially the first point is not acceptable to Israel because I have spoken to Abba Eban the day before. And I told him this first point is as far as I can judge, definitely not acceptable to Israel. He said but why should we not be more flexible since we have military advantages before.

K: Right.

W: They apparently feel militarily strong now and believe they are able to keep what they got under East Bank and don't want to be more flexible.

K: Right. Well I appreciate this very much, Mr. Secretary General and if I have anything to report to you I will take the liberty of calling you.

W: Well thank you very much. Do you have the impression that it sounds a major progress in your talks with the Russians.

K: I'll have a little better judgment of that later this afternoon and I'll call you if there is anything to report.

W: Thank you very much. I'm sorry that I have—

K: No, no it is important for you and me to keep in touch.

W: Thank you very much.

K: Goodbye.

W: Goodbye, Dr. Kissinger.

[3] Ismail communicated these points directly to Kissinger in his October 10 backchannel message; see footnote 2, Document 160.

175. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, October 13, 1973, 4 p.m.

K: Anatoly, I have just heard from the British and they do not feel they can proceed.[2] They were told by Sadat 1) he did not want a resolution and 2) if such a resolution were put in he would call the Chinese to veto it. He would consider any . . .

That leaves two possibilities. Either you tricked us—

D. It was always easy to check with us. After all it was very clear . . . all the day before yesterday when our answer came. It was very easy to be approved two days ago when we came to the General Assembly but . . .

K. First we have to get somebody to put it in.

D. I understand that. If it came to the floor we would abstain.

K. I don't doubt that you would abstain. What is the sense of such a maneuver if you thought the Egyptians wouldn't accept it. You engaged in our discussions with the Israelis . . . At any rate the British won't introduce it and you don't want the Australians to introduce it.

D. . . . give our instruction. I am now waiting for instructions . . .

K. We are not going to do anything. We are now going to wash our hands of it and let nature take its course.

D. I will be in touch.

K. I was until an hour ago operating under the instructions . . . and I interpreted your airlift as a show of good will to the Egyptians . . . It looks as if you want this war to continue and let us go through three days of meetings with the Israelis and British in the meantime.

D. Before then how could we know that the British would wait to give a firm decision. I am sure that the British would tell you we were not in touch with them at all.

K. You might have known what Sadat would do . . .

D. I am just telling you that it is a very wrong assumption.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] In a 3:35 p.m. telephone conversation, Foreign Secretary Douglas-Home told Kissinger that he had repeatedly discussed Kissinger's suggestion for a cease-fire resolution with the Prime Minister and that the U.K. Government "did not think the time was right for this initiative." In their view, the Soviets would have no chance of forcing Sadat to accept a simple cease-fire resolution. In fact, Douglas-Home believed that Sadat would "reject it vehemently." Douglas-Home added that he had also told the Soviets this. (Ibid.) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 232–234.

K. We operated on the assumption when you told us you had discussed with Egypt that they would accept it. There is no reason . . .

D. At this very moment . . . would held under the pressure so to speak.

K. Now when they say they are going to ask the Chinese to veto . . .

D. Maybe Sadat changed his mind and . . .

K. And they told the British they had said the same thing to you. That is . . .

D. No.

K. To gain time.

D. For whom, for them?

K. That's right.

D. For Israel to . . . the Syrians. It was a very interesting presumption.

K. There is no sense discussing it.

D. I was waiting for the reply. What they wanted to tell us.

K. Of course now we have to look at your airlift as a continuing thing and consider the possibility that we will be . . .

D. Let us wait. Maybe in an hour or two. You . . .

K. You might as well tell Moscow that nothing is going to happen today.

D. Will you call me when you have something?

176. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (Moorer) and the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

Washington, October 13, 1973, 4:14 p.m.

CJCS—Just what exactly did we get authorized by the Portuguese?

MG [Scowcroft]—We were authorized just about anything we wanted. I have not yet seen the cable.[2]

CJCS—Okay, we got 15 C141s and 3 C5s loaded and ready to go. The problem right now is that we have very severe crosswinds but by dark they should be satisfactory, and so we have (no one is dragging their feet) do have a weather problem with a 60° crosswind but we'll catch up. One other thing (which I haven't told the Secretary this yet) but the C141s have heavy loads on them which need a special unloading device and so we are going to put in an airplane, of course, the point is there that there is going to be some crewmen working on the ground loading the Israeli aircraft because the Israelis can't manipulate this piece of machine but they can haul it away but there will be US people working around the plane. This thing tilts and it is a big sophisticated forklift is what it is but, if you are going to have any kind of steady flow or peak that we can make with the C5 I think with the flatbeds, this is the only way with the heavy loads on some of the C141s.

MG—I don't see that we have any choice.

CJCS—They will be in civilian clothes.

MG—I was going to say and, maybe, in civilian clothes they'll look like Israelis.

CJCS—I don't think there is any choice if you are going to use the C141s. The other thing is that you could take the 141s as far as the Azores and then transfer.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 218, Records of Admiral Thomas Moorer, Diary, October 1973. Top Secret. The original is an entry in Moorer's Diary.

[2] Telegram 203651 to Lisbon, October 13, 0352Z, transmitted a personal letter from Prime Minister Caetano to President Nixon, October 13, stating that the Government of Portugal had authorized the United States "the transit of American aircraft, relying on your word that my country will not remain defenseless should this decision bring about grave consequences. (Ibid.) In a conversation with Stoessel, October 13, Portuguese Ambassador Themido emphasized that allowing the United States use of Lajes as a transit point in the resupply operation for Israel was the largest risk in their history and had only been agreed upon in response to President Nixon's direct appeal to Prime Minister Caetano. Themido also stressed that the Portuguese were going to expect "greater understanding and more friendly attitude on part of the United States," including shipments of surface-to-air missiles. (Ibid.) Telegram 3782 from Lisbon, October 13, 2053Z, reported Prime Minister Caetano's agreement. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

MG—We'll probably want to do both for awhile now, anyway.

CJCS—We got, it's like being "a little bit pregnant" once the first ones go in it is partly . . . it is a matter of whether you call it heavy airlift, constant resupply, . . .

MG—You're right, it's like being a little big pregnant.

CJCS—I think if we are going to do this we have had so much information; first we could only get there at night; and a lot of orders and counter-orders about how far we could go and what time it was supposed to arrive and whether to use C5s, etc.

MG—The trouble is all those first orders were desirable but when nothing happens we've got to throw that away one after another and as a precaution and that is what we are going through now.

CJCS—You've got to realize that MAC works like an airline and once they get . . . you have crew rest time . . . and they don't operate like the Israelis do up in the Golan Heights; but anyway we're about to get it on track. We have had a hard time keeping up with what is wanted, frankly.

MG—I understand that.

CJCS—I think we are going to have to let those people go over initially, at least, or otherwise, we'd have to hold this up.

---

177. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and Secretary of Defense Schlesinger[1]

Washington, October 13, 1973, 4:15 p.m.

K: Portuguese have agreed to use of the airfield.[2]

S: For charters?

K: For anything.

S: Jesus Christ, that's a surprise. What did you tell them?

K: I just told them we wouldn't bargain. If they reject we will remember when the crisis against which they want to protect themselves occurs.[3] This is for your own personal information.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] See footnote 2, Document 176.

[3] See footnote 6, Document 173.

S: That means we can go over to charter by Monday . . . continue to fly the stuff into the Azores.

K: One problem you have to remember . . . looks like our diplomatic initiative is coming apart. The British won't play because Egypt won't play according to the British. We may be getting into a confrontation posture with the Soviets. Soviets may just figure that if they have the whole Arab world against us . . . you know the 21st armoured division crossed the Canal, we just got the word from the Israelis.

S: . . . leave them alone in the . . . part of the Sinai. When they get out the Israelis will look better.

K: Israelis lined it up. Russians assured me Egypt was lined up.

S: I don't get the Brits. Why not tell them we are not going to give them any Poseidons or Polaris?

K: No, they're going to get them anyway, these things have to be done in cold blood. No, don't share your information yet, do it tomorrow morning.

S: Well, I'm going to tell Clements about the Portuguese. Can I tell you something funny. One hell of a lot of stuff ready to move. We've got it on the planes in case we got the word to fly it direct to Israel. Then we found out the stuff was still sitting right here in the United States. We didn't get a clearance from the State Department. We've moved the stuff off to the Azores now, 15 C141s and 3 C58s will be airborne at noon.

K: Moving in to Tel Aviv?

S: Yes, Henry.

---

178. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, October 13, 1973, 4:25 p.m.

K. Anatoly, I just talked to the President and he asked me to tell you that under these circumstances he can no longer observe any restrictions that I gave you yesterday on flying American planes.

D. Under what circumstances?

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking. Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, p. 238.

K. The plan we worked out is not being implemented because we didn't know the Egyptians' real feelings. We are prepared to stop when you are.

D. What?

K. We are prepared to stop our aerial supplies when you are willing to stop.

D. I will send that right now.

K. So what I told you yesterday as of an hour from now will not be accurate.

D. You don't want to wait even an hour?

K. We can always stop it. It will not be that massive that quickly.

D. Ok.

---

179. Telegram From the Embassy in Jordan to the Department of State[1]

Amman, October 13, 1973, 2040Z.

5486. Subject: Jordanian Intervention. Ref: State 203591.[2]

1. Cannot deliver reftel to King. He has already gone to the front. Have just spoken to Hassan on phone. He says some of forces are already in Syria. He will be back in touch with me soon.

2. Before reftel came I was with King together with the British Ambassador. Events have progressed considerably. Ambassador gave message to King from Kidron, representing still unofficial views of Israelis. Message states, in substance, (1) Tell us where your troops will be (2) Give us the best assurances possible that you will not open fire. Implication is that if two questions answered favorably Israelis will avoid fight with Jordanian forces.

3. We spent considerable time negotiating exactly what the answers would be. In midst of talk message came that Idi Amin would be

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret; Flash; Nodis. Received at 5:02 p.m.

[2] In telegram 203591 to Amman, October 13, 1726Z, the Department transmitted a message from the Secretary that reads: "You should immediately inform the King we have just received assurances from Israelis that, if he does not move Jordanian military forces into Syria, Israel will take no military action against Jordan." (Ibid.)

arriving in Amman any minute. King immediately left for front with Bin Shaker, leaving Rifai and Hassan to deal with Amin.

4. Basically, what British Ambassador will reply to UK Embassy Tel Aviv for transmission to the Israelis is that Jordanian line will start from Jordanian border east of Wadi Ruggad northward towards Sheikh Miskin, with northern anchor not yet defined but probably definable by dawn. As to question of firing, that remains moot. After King left, leaving answer to this still up in air but implying that Jordanians would be in defensive position. Hassan and Rifai argued in long and confused fashion as to who would fire, at what, and under what circumstances. In order to come to read reftel, I left British Ambassador to sort out exactly what he would reply. The questions were put to the British and not to us. He will do his best to put best possible light on Jordanian reply.

5. What is the confusion? It is simple. Hassan wants to avoid bloodshed but have Jordanian presence on the front now that King has so decided. Rifai told me privately on doorstep that what is required is that there be Jordanian martyrs.

6. What does the King think? He seems to share both viewpoints. Tonight he is Bayard on the white horse.

7. *Comment.* What we do? Nothing. The British are the go-between on this one so far as I know. Maybe the US also in the act but I am not. It looks like reftel is OBE as the Jordanians are in Syria and will not retreat. What we are now trying to avoid is a Jordanian-Israeli confrontation that will add new dimensions to this bloody business.[3]

Brown

[3] In telegram 5487 from Amman, October 13, 2330Z, Brown reported that he had given the Secretary's message to Crown Prince Hassan and subsequently had a long talk with him, during which Hassan attempted to define on the map exactly where the Jordanian forces would be in the morning. The Ambassador noted that both Hassan and the King's uncle, Sherif Nasr, were frankly and openly opposed to the Syrian venture. (Ibid.)

180. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

October 14, 1973, 9:04 a.m.

N: Hi, Henry, how are you?

K: Okay.

N: Anything new this morning?

K: Yes, the Egyptians have launched a big offensive and it's hard to know exactly what is going on in an early stage of an offensive.

N: Of course.

K: The Israelis have claimed that they've knocked out 150 tanks and that they've lost about 15 of their own. But that in itself would not prove anything—it depends where they get to. The last information we have that is not absolutely firm is that they may have reached close to the Mitla pass which is about 30 kilometers from the Canal, and which would be the key Israeli defensive position—it's about a ⅓rd of the way into Sinai and it would be a rather—

N: As a matter of fact though at this point—the main thing is who wins this damn battle—it isn't the territory you know—that is what we must remember about WW I and II—you can give up gobs of territory, the question is do you beat the enemy. Now if the Israelis let them—I think they ought to let them in there and kill them.

K: That's right. The Israelis—there are two possibilities, one that the Israelis are trying to draw them beyond the SAM belt in order to knock out a lot of their forces and in that case, the battle could be fairly decisive—the other is that the Israelis are really in trouble and we should know that by tonight in any event—I think that makes clear why that peace move couldn't work yesterday. I don't think the Egyptians were ready until they launched an attack.

N: That's right. And basically they told—the Russians might have wanted—we haven't heard anything more from the Russians?

K: No, but that's a little early. I'm certain we will before the end of the day.

N: What then—we have in effect told the Russians to—

K: The issue now is this, Mr. President. As of yesterday, we started out with the idea of cease-fire and a return to the pre-hostilities lines.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking. The blank underscores indicate omissions in the original. President Nixon was at Camp David; Kissinger was in Washington.

Incidentally should the Israelis clobber the Egyptians that will turn out to be a pretty good position. Then we move to a simple ceasefire. The Egyptians may have been ready to accept that before the Israelis got into Syria. Now the Egyptians are demanding a return to 67 borders, now that's absolutely out of the question, short of a huge defeat as a result of the war. That has to come as a result of the subsequent negotiations that follow the war. So now what we are trying to do is, I've talked to Dobrynin about that last night after you and I talked,[2] is to see whether we can find a formula that links the cease-fire to the peace settlement—

N: I think we've got to get some way—look we've got to face this—that as far as the Russians are concerned, they have a pretty good beef insofar as everything we have offered on the Mid-East, you know what I mean, that meeting in San Clemente,[3] we were stringing them along and they know it. We've got to come off with something on the diplomatic front, because if we go the cease-fire, they'll figure that we get the cease-fire and then the Israelis will dig in and we'll back them, as we always have. That's putting it quite bluntly, but it's quite true Henry, isn't it?

K: There's a lot in that.

N: They can't be in that position, so we have got to be in a position to offer something.

K: Well I—

N: Because we've got to squeeze the Israelis when this is over and the Russians have got to know it. We've got to squeeze them goddamn hard. And that's the way it is going to be done. But I don't know how we can get across now, we told them before we'd squeeze them and we didn't.

K: Well we were going to squeeze them, we were going to start a diplomacy in November right after the Israeli—

---

[2] Kissinger and Dobrynin spoke at 7:55 p.m. on October 13. Kissinger indicated that the United States would not accept the Egyptian position to return to the 1967 borders. "We will not under any circumstances let détente be used for unilateral advantage. [You must have] no illusions about that . . . You can tell Moscow to save itself the effort, we are not going to accept the Egyptian position. Only exacerbate the situation by proposing it to us . . . Until this afternoon I believed—had possibility of pressing for a settlement, pressing for a cease-fire. Now [that] hasn't happened, you are . . . unable or unwilling to produce cease-fire—[U.S. and Soviets] are obviously on collision course no matter how many [protestations]—What do you think we can say to the people on Monday, had them quieted down on the weekend—so the utility of détente—to both of us [is called into doubt]. You don't think we will accept a military setback in the Middle East. You can't believe it." (Ibid.) Kissinger had spoken to President Nixon, who was at Camp David, from 4:57 to 5:16 p.m. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Central Files, President's Daily Diary)

[3] See Document 73.

N: I know we were, but

K: And we have made all the preparations for that but that's now water over the dam, I think what we need now—if we can find a resolution that doesn't flatly say the 67 borders, but leaves it open—something that invokes the Security Council resolution 242 that speaks of withdrawals and that's something everybody has already agreed to once. Plus a conference or something like that. Then perhaps by tomorrow we can move it to a vote in the Security Council.

N: Yeh, yeh. Certainly a conference would be fine.

K: And I know the British are working on something like that and I'm going to be meeting with Cromer later—

N: The British then are not just standing aside—that'd be terrible.

K: There are two things, Mr. President. The British basic attitude is lousy because they are trying—I put it to Cromer yesterday,[4] I said what have you got to _____ in Egypt that's compared to what you will lose in Saudi Arabia if this thing gets worse and worse. In—on the immediately specific issue, where the British are behaving badly—they are just passively sitting there picking up the pieces, they are not shaping anything, but on the very immediate one, Sadat did take a negative attitude, but they made no attempt to persuade him nor did they want to run any risks, see we might have done what you suggested yesterday of _____ for a cease-fire, if we could have gotten Britain and, and France to go along with it. But to go into the Security Council with a resolution that has only two members supporting it, one other member possibly supporting it, is suicidal.

N: Yeh, I understand.

K: But by the end of the day, this thing will become a lot clearer because the battle now in Sinai, whatever happens in Syria and Sinai, the battles just cannot be extremely protracted because supplies from both sides have to come a fairly long distance.

N: Desert battles are not protracted, we know that—that they move quickly. The other point I was going to make—what are we doing on the supply side?

---

[4] Kissinger and Lord Cromer spoke on the telephone at 4:35 p.m. on October 13. Kissinger stated that Nixon took the British decision not to introduce a cease-fire resolution in the Security Council "extremely ill." He added: "When we look over the crises of the last three years we just don't seem to be able to get together . . . We wanted to tell you we are starting an airlift into Israel. There will probably be a confrontation." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 238–239.

K: If I could call you in an hour,[5] I have a meeting which is going to start now.

N: All right.

K: In which I can give you an accurate report. Basically what we are trying to do is stop the military planes after today and put commercial charters in.

N: Yes, yes. As I say though, it's got to be the works. What I meant is—we are going to get blamed just as much for three planes as for 300. . . . not going to let the Russians come in there for—with a free hand. On the other hand, this is a deadly course, I know, but what I meant is, Henry, I have no patience with view that we send in a couple of planes, even though they carry 60 some—

K: Mr. President, I remember in 1970, when we went into Cambodia, you wanted to do Haiphong at the same time, and you were right.

N: At least we did all the sanctuaries, which you remember—was petrified with even doing more than Parrot's Beak.

K: No one wanted to do that—

N: Laird, and Westmoreland, the whole bunch once didn't want to do COSVN remember?

K: I remember very well.

N: My point is if—when we are going to make a move, it's going to cost us, in terms of our—out there. I don't think it's going to cost us a damn bit more to send in more and—I have to emphasize to you that I think the way it's been handled in terms of our things—I want in any future statements out of McCloskey—we are sending supplies, but only for the purpose of maintaining the balance so that we can create the conditions that will lead to an equitable settlement. The point is if you don't say it that way, it looks as though we are sending in supplies to have the war go on indefinitely, and that is not a tenable position.

K: Right. Right. If it hasn't been said before, we'll say it certainly today.

N: The thought is basically—the purpose of supplies is not simply to fuel the war, the purpose to to maintain the balance which is quite accurate incidentally and then—because only with the balance in that area, can there be an equitable settlement that doesn't do in one side or other. That's really what we are talking about.

K: Right, Mr. President.

N: But now on the Russians—

---

[5] See Document 182.

K: I expect formally to hear from the Russians. I didn't get through talking to the Russians till 10:00 last night.[6] And I gave them really a terrific—

N: We can't have this business of defending them all over the place—

K: If they don't do anything.

N: If they don't do anything. Now basically that's what they said. I think that they like the condominium business, the British have stood aside, what ought to happen is that even though the Israelis will squeal like struck pigs—we ought to tell Dobrynin—we ought to say that the Russians—that Brezhnev and Nixon will settle this damn thing. That ought to be done. You know that.

K: Exactly. Exactly right.

N: If he gets that through, I think maybe he'd like it. I'll call you in an hour—you call me in a hour.

K: As soon as the WSAG is over. Right, Mr. President.

N: Bye. Right.

[6] Kissinger's last conversation with Dobrynin on October 13 was at 9:50 p.m. The transcript is in the National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23.

181. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, October 14, 1973, 9:16–11 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger, Chairman, WSAG
Deputy Secretary of State, Kenneth Rush
Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, Joseph Sisco
Ambassador Robert McCloskey
Secretary of Defense, James Schlesinger
Deputy Secretary of Defense, William Clements
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Thomas H. Moorer
Director, Central Intelligence, William Colby
Assistant to the President for Energy, Governor John Love
Consultant to the President for Energy, Charles DiBona
Assistant to the President, General Alexander M. Haig, Jr.
Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, Major General Brent Scowcroft
Commander Jonathan T. Howe, NSC Staff

SUBJECT

WSAG Meeting—Middle East

The meeting was called at the last minute on Sunday morning.

Dr. Kissinger: Let us begin with a briefing on the situation. We will then discuss the oil business, and will turn to other aspects after that.

Director Colby: [Read prepared briefing which was similar to the 6:30 a.m. CIA situation report attached at Tab A.[2]] Director Colby stated that action was picking up on the Egyptian front. There was more air action around the Canal area, and Egypt appeared to be more willing to commit its air force. It appeared that the Egyptians had begun a general offensive in the Sinai, and that some units might have reached the Mitla Pass.

Dr. Kissinger: I think both sides are lying like Arabs now.

Secretary Sisco: At least one is.

Dr. Kissinger: How far in is the Mitla Pass?

Secretary Sisco: It is about thirty to thirty-five kilometers. I was on it last year. It is really just a foothill but in sharp contrast with the very flat land around it. It runs vertical to the Canal itself.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, NSC Institutional Files (H–Files), Box H–117, WSAG Meetings Minutes, Originals, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive. The meeting took place in the White House Situation Room. All brackets except those that indicate omitted material are in the original.

[2] Attached, but not printed.

[Director Colby then explained that on the Syrian front [*less than 1 line not declassified*] the Israelis were about 22 miles from Damascus. The Israelis had, however, really moved only a few miles beyond their previous positions. The slowness might indicate a change in the direction of the Israeli advance. It appeared that they might be trying to envelop forces in the Golan Heights area by turning to the South. This move could take the Israelis into the path of the Jordanians who are about 12 kilometers inside the border and east of Da'ra. [*1½ lines not declassified*]

Director Colby then noted that the Soviet force posture had not changed but that the airlift continued at a high level. There had been some 200 flights to date, including one IL–76.]

Dr. Kissinger: What is an IL–76?

Director Colby: It is a new airplane which can carry 44 tons of people or cargo.

Admiral Moorer: It is a very big aircraft. They displayed it at the Paris Air Show.

Director Colby: We don't know what it is carrying. We have noted that tanks are being loaded on cargo ships, but we have no confirmation of reports that Russian ships are unloading tanks at Tartus and Latikia in Syria.

Dr. Kissinger: Tom, can you give us an assessment of the military situation?

Admiral Moorer: It seems clear to me that the slowdown in Israeli air action was due to the need for crew rest and maintenance. Yesterday they had 300 sorties, 150 over Syria and 150 over the Sinai. So their air activity appears to be picking up again.

Dr. Kissinger: They are just like the Americans, with an equal division of sorties.

Admiral Moorer: Is that so? I don't think the Jordanians will be a factor. They will make a gesture but not commit their forces.

Dr. Kissinger: That is more or less what they have told us.[3]

Admiral Moorer: The Egyptians seem to be moving south in the Sinai, but their primary objective is to hold the western part of the Sinai. They are not ambitious to go all the way across. The Israelis should be able to withstand the Egyptian probes.

Dr. Kissinger: What is the Egyptian strategic objective to the south?

Director Colby: There are oil wells further along the Suez.

Admiral Moorer: They may be trying to take Sharm el-Sheikh.

---

[3] See Document 171.

Dr. Kissinger: But for that much of the Sinai?

Admiral Moorer: They knocked off an Israeli radar at Sharm el-Sheikh. If the Israelis grind it out at the rate they are going, they will make slow progress in the north. Whether they have enough strength to push the Egyptians back into the Sinai is doubtful.

Secretary Sisco: Can they continue to hold?

Admiral Moorer: Yes. As the Egyptians move farther to the East, they will become more vulnerable. The missiles limit it. It is difficult to maintain themselves.

Dr. Kissinger: Outside the SAM belt.

Secretary Rush: Aren't they moving it with them?

Admiral Moorer: It would take a long time.

Secretary Sisco: If the Israelis decide they have done enough in Syria, where do you think they will dig in, given their resources? Where will they establish a holding posture?

Admiral Moorer: They will hold a position where they can shell Damascus.

Dr. Kissinger: That's where they are.

Director Colby: But the forces they have bypassed are substantial.

Dr. Kissinger: But from their closest point they can shell Damascus.

Secretary Schlesinger: We have evidence that Syrian troop morale has become low. According to French and British correspondents they have abandoned substantial quantities of equipment.

Admiral Moorer: The question is whether the Israelis will have enough strength to push across the Canal. I think they can hold and contain the Egyptians, but not push them back.

Secretary Sisco: That is a very crucial judgment.

Admiral Moorer: Once the Egyptians are out in the open, on the sand, it will be very hard for them to defend themselves.

Dr. Kissinger: Even if they move SAMs with them?

Admiral Moorer: They have to protect their lines as well as their forces. As the space grows larger their problem becomes greater.

Secretary Rush: Because of Israeli air superiority.

Admiral Moorer: The Israelis shot at some Soviet Aeroflot planes at Aleppo.

Secretary Schlesinger: How many Soviet personnel were taken out in the airlift?

Director Colby: Before the war we believe there were 200 Soviets in Egypt, and about 1,400 in Syria. A goodly part of those in Egypt have now left, and certainly some of those in Syria.

Dr. Kissinger: A week ago we were asking the question whether the Egyptians could hold. Now we are asking if the Israelis can hold. I'm not blaming anyone mind you.

Admiral Moorer: We underestimated the Syrians as well as the Egyptians.

Director Colby: The basic assumption applies on both sides.

Dr. Kissinger: That explains why it took longer to defeat both. That was only a matter of timing. Now the judgment is being made that the Israelis can't push the Egyptians back.

Secretary Schlesinger: That is probably a little premature.

Director Colby: It will be a longer fight. They might or might not be able to push them back.

Secretary Rush: What about casualties?

Admiral Moorer: That's what I'm talking about.

Director Colby: When the Israelis turn toward the Sinai they will be able to apply considerable pressure. Whether they can push the Egyptians back, I don't know.

Admiral Moorer: They have already lost 478 as prisoners and an even larger number have been killed. It is an attrition war. They have lost more up here (pointing to Syria). It is a question of staying power.

Dr. Kissinger: How long would it take them to shift, three to four days? They will have to fight in Syria for two or three more days so they will not be in the Sinai before next week.

Secretary Schlesinger: We thought they would be there on Wednesday[4] and now it is Sunday.

Admiral Moorer: And now the Israelis are weaker.

Dr. Kissinger: On Saturday we thought it would be Tuesday. On Monday, Wednesday was predicted and on Thursday it was to be by Friday. It has not been a series of victories followed by a knockout.

What do we do if the oil is cut off? What kinds of problems will we have?

[Governor Love distributed a draft contingency paper on the oil problem.] (Tab B)[5]

Governor Love: There are a number of ways to cut off the supply. First of all, we have to consider direct imports and then indirect imports.

Dr. Kissinger: What assumptions are you making when you talk about a total cutoff?

---

[4] October 10.

[5] Attached, but not printed.

Governor Love: We are not talking about Iranian oil, but we are assuming the rest of the Persian Gulf states, Libya and Algeria join in the cutoff. (Reading from paper), we figure a 100,000 barrels a day indirect with an anticipated growth all the way up to 500,000. Over a six-month period we might be able to save the following amounts. We would be able to surge our own oil production and get 100,000 to 200,000 barrels a day.[6] From coal we could get 200,000 to 300,000 more barrels a day but this would take a major effort which has legal constraints. By cutting demand we could save from 150,000 to 300,000 barrels a day. By changing the speed limit we could get another 100,000 barrels a day and reduce the level further by gasoline tax. That would require drastic action and we would have to take immediate and affirmative action. (Explains summary table of paper.)

Dr. Kissinger: What is low-low and high-high (referring to table)?

Mr. DiBona: The principal factor is weather—that is whether it is cold or hot.

Dr. Kissinger: But what does the phrase low-low mean?

Mr. DiBona: That means low estimate, low demand.

Secretary Schlesinger: How much could the Iranians increase? Five-and-a-half to eight million?

Mr. DiBona: Our calculations are for this winter.

Governor Love: Iran could perhaps get 200,000 barrels a day more but they have already kicked it up.

Dr. Kissinger: Do you assume a cutoff to the US or Europe?

Governor Love: If Japan and Europe are thrown into the balance, that gives it a different dimension. We have looked at the effect on import levels. It is not realistic to consider the US alone. We also have to look at the effect of the US emergency surplus. We have limited refinery capacity and that is why we have to import.

Secretary Rush: Do we import?

Dr. Kissinger: If it happens, it will happen next week. We are going to need a plan. It should consider a cutoff in the US and a cutoff to Japan and Europe as well.

Governor Love: To do so, we also have to consider consultations on the hill, putting the President on TV, and the timing of what we do now. We have to be ready.

Dr. Kissinger: We don't want to push the button now and cause a panic. We need to have the program ready for the day when they do it.

---

[6] and also get 100,000 barrels per day from our Elk Hills naval reserve. [Footnote in the original.]

Governor Love: Faisal is talking about a cut of five percent a month.

Dr. Kissinger: What about the long term? Suppose the Egyptians are badly defeated. I don't think they will be, but it is not beyond the realm of the possible. We might lose all outlets and get cut off. What if they limit production over the long term and we can't handle it with diplomacy and other pressures?

Governor Love: We can identify areas to increase supply and limit demand but we would have to make some statutory changes. If it happened now, by Tuesday or Wednesday[7] I would expect the President to say and do something.

Secretary Clements: I think the prediction of picking up 100,000 barrels a day in the southwest is questionable. They think they are at capacity now. It is also questionable whether we should count on Elk Hills. It is not a matter of just turning the tap on. We may get there in time but it is not a significant amount. This is a mega problem in which we must measure in millions.

Governor Love: They have two million.

Director Colby: Our estimate on how sharply the oil would be cut has to be related to the Arab position on the ground. If the Israelis move slower, then the Arabs should be equally slower in their reaction.

Secretary Schlesinger: On timing we must weigh the advantage of getting something out on the problem. If it is indicated this will happen, we will want to consider the deterrent impact.

Dr. Kissinger: So far no one has threatened us, but we have no program.

Governor Love: We could announce something quickly.

Secetary Kissinger: I wouldn't provoke it or threaten them. An oil cut-off was not mentioned in any of the conversations I have had in the last three weeks. All I have received are hysterical calls from oil companies. The Saudis have been better than any. We have good commercial relations. Some idiot says we shouldn't have said that but I don't want to challenge the Arabs to a test of their manhood.

Secretary Rush: When we resupply to Israel at that point we will have a problem.

Secretary Schlesinger: The Saudis don't care about the Syrians. The Egyptians could urge the Saudis to be prudent.

Secretary Clements: It will cause restrictions on the domestic economy.

---

[7] October 16 or 17.

Governor Love: We would have to make some shifts and close down some factories.

Secretary Clements: There are no other short-term answers.

Dr. Kissinger: I have no preconceived ideas on this.

Secretary Rush: The industrial aspect bears watching.

Dr. Kissinger: We need a task force to begin today to study this problem. John (to Love) and Bill (to Clements) will you work with State on this.

Secretary Sisco: We can get George Benson and one member of the NSC staff.

Dr. Kissinger: We need concrete programs. We need to pin point this for the President. Here are the two or three major things that you can do. He has got to know what he can do if the oil is cut off. We also need to know what to do with regard to Europe and Japan.

Governor Love: The cut in Europe will be 75 percent and Japan gets 50 percent of its oil from Arab countries.

Secretary Schlesinger: They have sixty days of stocks.

Dr. Kissinger: How much do we have?

Secretary Clements: I don't know.

Dr. Kissinger: Is it sixty days of key things or of everything.

Mr. DiBona: Europe has sixty days of everything.

Dr. Kissinger: And the U.S.?

Mr. DiBona: We have a few weeks of total consumption or 200 days of European consumption.

Secretary Rush: There is a great difference between the two.

Governor Love: In a short time there would be shortages in everything—perhaps a month.

Dr. Kissinger: Let's have a meeting tomorrow at 9:00 or 11:00 and get a detailed program on the oil cutoff. Would we share with the Europeans?

Mr. DiBona: It is not clear that they can cut off the US. We are having trouble, for example, following Libyan oil production.

Dr. Kissinger: Would they have to cut off all oil production?

Secretary Schlesinger: That is right, to be effective.

Dr. Kissinger: (to Secretary Rush): Can we have another group at State and Defense look at what would be the political impact?

Secretary Schlesinger: If we Americanize El Al the Arabs will note it.

Dr. Kissinger: It would be tough enough to go through this for a worthy cause. We should make approaches all over the world. We will need a working group. (To Scowcroft) Is Sonnenfeldt working?

General Scowcroft: Yes.

Dr. Kissinger: We will get Sonnenfeldt working on this with Stoessel and we will need a DOD representative as well. So when we meet tomorrow we will need two things:

—a technical program on what the President has to do, and secondly,
—a political program on what we face with regard to Western Europe and Japan.

Secretary Sisco: I will try my hand at a Presidential statement.

Dr. Kissinger: Let's see the program first.

Secretary Rush: The world can't live with it.

Dr. Kissinger: Let's not talk about consequences. We don't want to make it happen. We should be low key.

Mr. DiBona: Who should get involved with regard to the legal questions?

Dr. Kissinger: Just tell us what we need to get done.

Secretary Schlesinger: The mood of the House is not very forthcoming. The House is as opposed as the Senate, and it extends from "doves" to "hawks."

Governor Love: There will be a hearing before the Albert Committee.[8] They will open it for 12 months for 160,000 barrels a day, if we can guarantee that will take care of the problem.

Secretary Sisco: I detect the opposite view. Some 203 House members signed the petition. Because of the Israeli aspect, there is a certain ambivalence.

Dr. Kissinger: We don't want to provoke it. If there is a fait accompli, we want to know what to do.

Governor Love: We will have to move on an allocation program.

Dr. Kissinger: Consider that on Tuesday or Wednesday or Thursday the Arabs announce a cutoff. What do we do? The President has to know what he would do and announce it. If Europe and Japan are included, we have to know what we can do in concert.

Secretary Clements: I agree, it is a problem both internationally and domestically.

Dr. Kissinger: Yes, we would move with contacts that day or the next day. We need to get a list of what our needs would be and our alternatives if we can't get oil. The question is whether we think it through now or then. Assuming an oil cutoff, John (to Love), I would

[8] Albert was Chairman of the House Democratic Steering and Policy Committee.

like you to chart it. Perhaps we can get together later today. We will get together later today.

[Governor Love and Mr. DiBona left the meeting.]

Dr. Kissinger: Turning to the supply situation let me give you a few minutes on the diplomacy. Obviously, we are not on schedule at this point. The British have refused to sponsor a resolution and the Egyptians changed their minds on Friday at midnight and didn't tell the Russians. The Egyptians decided not to accept a straight ceasefire. They want the Israelis to return to the 1967 borders.[9] That is insane. They made the Russians withdraw their agreement to abstention. With Britain and Russia losing out, we are working to link the ceasefire to a political outcome, without saying specifically what the political outcome will be. It is impossible to get the Israelis to return to its 1967 borders. They certainly will not do it as a result of war, but only as a result of negotiation.

Director Colby: I am convinced of the necessity of buffers.

Dr. Kissinger: We can't argue that now. It took 48 hours in 1967, but you can only do that if one party is totally defeated. What we are trying to do is link a call for a ceasefire and a political statement along the lines of reaffirming Resolution 242 and immediate negotiations. The Egyptians must know that they cannot go back to the 1967 borders. Their operations were not conducted to get back land. They don't have the capability.

Director Colby: Not in the short term.

Admiral Moorer: The problem is attrition over a period of time. It is not done over there in my view.

Secretary Rush: It may take years or months to pull into that thing.

Admiral Moorer: They may have to if the Egyptians press and they take more losses. Their problem is principally one of manpower.

Director Colby: There was land between them in 1967.

Dr. Kissinger: If we try to draw lines, we are going to have trouble. We need something like 1967 which is sufficiently vague so that both sides can claim success. But it should involve withdrawal. If we talk about the precise boundary now, it will mean endless negotiations. I don't exclude a simple ceasefire if the Israelis turn against the Egyptians.

Director Colby: But not within a week.

Dr. Kissinger: I think we will have an outcome this week. Not much longer. The British are rooting around and so are the Russians. We can put pressure on the Russians particularly since they have joined

[9] Friday, October 12. See Document 172.

the exercise. We can put it to them about attrition and fighting by proxy and where they stand diplomatically. It is essential that we not talk about it.

Secretary Schlesinger: We will have the supplies flowing by this evening. Six C–5s and 22 C–141s.

Dr. Kissinger: Will they be in?

Secretary Schlesinger: They will be in or on the way in. It will be on the order of 1,600 tons of supplies.

Secretary Sisco: How much will be in by tonight?

Secretary Schlesinger: About 15 C–141s and three C–5s.

Admiral Moorer: We can fly in about 50 tons an hour once we get going.

Director Colby: The total Soviet airlift is about 3,000 tons. Jim says we have 1,600 tons on the way already.

Dr. Kissinger: Is that because our planes hold more?

Secretary Schlesinger: Yes.

Admiral Moorer: They have very few large planes and we can step it up.

Dr. Kissinger: No, don't step it up. Our interests are not the same. Ideally, Israel would win without exorbitant costs and quickly. But we don't want Israel totally intractable.

Secretary Schlesinger: I don't see how they can be. They have complete dependence on the US and that will be visible.

Admiral Moorer: The fighters should be wheels down.

Secretary Schlesinger: It amounts to ten Phantoms.

Admiral Moorer: They are over in Israel now. I think that will cause a reaction. The Phantom is a symbol to the Arabs. I think we are more likely to have a reaction from that rather than the C–141.

Secretary Clements: They are going in like clock work, it will make a hell of an impact.

Dr. Kissinger: Also it is a warning to the Russians to worry about, we could pour it in all out. Our problem is the Arab countries.

Secretary Schlesinger: We have got to pour it on. Otherwise it lengthens the time and doesn't reverse their appreciation of the problem. We should strive for a major impact in the shortest period of time.

Director Colby: Should we make it larger?

Secretary Rush: It is a demonstration of real power.

Dr. Kissinger: I substantially agree. Are we doing any chartering?

Secretary Schlesinger: There is a communications unit that will have to go into Israel. I wanted to call that to your attention. Other bystanders will probably notice. They will be speaking English.

Dr. Kissinger: Don't you have any that speak Hebrew. I am kidding, it is not a bad idea.

Secretary Sisco: We should be doing it quietly.

Secretary Rush: How many US citizens are over there now?

Secretary Schlesinger: There is no way to tell.

Secretary Kissinger: I have given the assurance to Dobrynin that there are no US military fighting or being discharged from the service for that purpose. The only people who ought to be getting there are technically civilians. The only exception might be an individual who once served in the military.

Secretary Rush: Are they leaving the service?

Secretary Schlesinger: The only US there are the pilots of the F–4s and transports plus the communications outfit. There will be US voices on the air.

Dr. Kissinger: We should keep that to a minimum.

Admiral Moorer: They will be coordinating the arrivals.

Dr. Kissinger: Can we keep them on the base?

Admiral Moorer: Yes.

Secretary Schlesinger: We do not have an identity of interests. They may be trying to suck us in. I wouldn't put it past them to take photos of our people.

Dr. Kissinger: Such a thing can't happen by accident.

Secretary Schlesinger: This is the most dramatic airlift since 1948. There is no way to avoid attracting attention.

Admiral Moorer: We are sort of flying in a straight line with a stop at Lajes. The Russians are overflying Turkey, but we are flying a narrow corridor. If the Portuguese flame out we will be left with nothing.

Dr. Kissinger: In the Lebanon situation, weren't we staging from Turkey?

Admiral Moorer: We became more vulnerable when Qadhafi took over.

Director Colby: It will be a dramatic thing. It will be no secret.

Secretary Sisco: We should make an effort to keep it quiet. We have no interest in building this up.

Secretary Schlesinger: When we decide to move we can run the Russians into the ground.

Director Colby: We can say 200 Russian planes landed first.

Dr. Kissinger: We can take the position that they fouled us up on negotiations and brought in airplanes. We had to open up the pipeline ourselves.

Secretary Clements: I don't think a charter would be worth it at this point.

Secretary Schlesinger: It would mean non-involvement of the US military.

Secretary Clements: But we have lots of airplanes to throw in the breach and get the job done.

Secretary Kissinger: We want support for the airlift. We don't want them to point to the US military. Are we getting C–5As in there?

Secretary Clements: Yes, we are getting C–5As in there. Our problem is we are getting two planes in one.

Admiral Moorer: We can carry it in faster than the Israelis can unload it.

Secretary Clements: The real problem in charters is commercial. They are afraid that helping us will incite terrorist activities and that there will be attacks on their commercial facilities. It is a real problem. And it is a problem for Air Force planes as well.

Dr. Kissinger: If it is commercial, it is more definable and much less well protected. Bill (to Clements), can we get by with Air Force aircraft?

Secretary Clements: We will start today with US putting things in. There eventually will be a reaction. The worst thing would be an Air Force charter.

Secretary Schlesinger: It will depend upon the outcome of the war. If the Arabs are crushed, there will be lots of terrorists.

Dr. Kissinger: The worst outcome would be if the Arabs appear to be impotent. The best outcome would be if the Arabs come to believe that we are the only ones who can solve the problem. It is a test of whether we can really deliver.

Secretary Schlesinger: The Israelis are making continuous progress in Syria.

Dr. Kissinger: It is still going on.

Admiral Moorer: There is a steady grind.

Director Colby: They may have changed direction.

Secretary Clements: When they do, it will chew up far more people. There are four Egyptian divisions there. It will be a bloody affair if the Egyptians don't run.

Secretary Schlesinger: As I said, there are some tentative signs that the Syrians may be cracking.

Secretary Rush: Would they run into Jordan?

Secretary Sisco: The King won't permit that.

Secretary Rush: Then it may be an organized retreat.

Admiral Moorer: There is no such thing.

Secretary Rush: We can organize one anytime. They may decide to hit Americans. Why charter? Who would pay the indemnity for losses?

Secretary Schlesinger: DOD would have to?

Dr. Kissinger: What about the Israelis?

Secretary Clements: The Israelis can't. The Treasury can't make good either. Only DOD.

Secretary Rush: Isn't it much more costly.

Secretary Clements: Yes, but it is just money.

Secretary Schlesinger: I am glad the Comptroller can't hear that.

Dr. Kissinger: What is really different is the terrorist aspect.

Secretary Schlesinger: I believe we should play this opportunistically. We can pull the US out and organize the civilians later.

Dr. Kissinger: What are the benefits?

Secretary Schlesinger: They may not realize how well we can do with charters and the Russians may cut off their military airlift.

Dr. Kissinger: If the Russians cut off theirs, would we cut off ours?

Secretary Schlesinger: Yes.

Secretary Sisco: It would be injurious to the Israelis versus the Arabs. The word will get around in the Arab world that it is time for a ceasefire. At such a time we would be well to stop it.

Secretary Schlesinger: I believe it helps diplomatically. We can resupply and hold out replacement as a way to increase our leverage. We can ship in equipment after the ceasefire. Why don't we go this way.

Dr. Kissinger: We would equip only after a ceasefire.

Secretary Schlesinger: That is not much incentive for the Israelis.

Director Colby: Israel has critical shortages.

Dr. Kissinger: When are you going to let me know who is hurt more. I need an assessment today.

Secretary Schlesinger: We can take the military aircraft out of the supply business. We can offer to take MAC out.

Dr. Kissinger: But if we then go back with a civilian airlift of equal size, we will have a massive problem with the Soviets or they may paint Aeroflot on their military planes. I need concrete answers on the question of a ceasefire with a cutoff to both sides. Who has the worst problem? We also have to consider the British and French.

Secretary Schlesinger: One can't make the case.

Secretary Clements: It is a matter of judgment. No one knows.

[Colby and Rush agree.]

Dr. Kissinger: If both sides stopped the airlift, it doesn't stop regular air. With a ceasefire, we could both stop the airlift and not have a cutoff of supplies.

Admiral Moorer: At Lajes civilian planes would be a problem. Even with nothing in the planes it gives them problems.

Dr. Kissinger: The strategy now diplomatically is to go for a ceasefire and maneuver to link it loosely to a permanent settlement. For pressure, we will begin a massive supply effort and stop it only with a ceasefire.

Secretary Schlesinger: We have a large potential for resupply although it is expensive to air lift tanks, etc.

Dr. Kissinger: If that is so, we had better say something to Egypt and friendly governments.

Secretary Clements: Do we want to get the civilians out?

Dr. Kissinger: Do they want to bring out 40,000? We do have empty airplanes.

Secretary Schlesinger: If we want to get them out we can set the planes up.

General Scowcroft: We could get a few on each now.

Dr. Kissinger: I wouldn't have any objection . . .

Did anyone tell Keating what is going on? We should also tell the Ambassadors in Arab countries.

General Scowcroft: And we need public affairs guidance.

Dr. Kissinger: You can start telling some Congressional people today. But do it as late as you can. I want to see what the Russians come back with. We can say that we waited until Saturday[10] afternoon and made a big diplomatic effort. But our peace moves were delayed while the Soviets brought in 200 aircraft. We are prepared to stop the airlift as soon as a ceasefire is achieved.

Secretary Schlesinger: Good.

Dr. Kissinger: And we should give DOD credit.

Secretary Schlesinger: We can call it an act of Russian treachery.

Dr. Kissinger: I don't want to tackle the Russians until as late as possible. I have had a general talk with Fulbright[11] and he is quite content.

Secretary Clements: We talked to 17 people yesterday and there were no adverse reactions.

Dr. Kissinger: Should we offer a cutoff of the airlift on ceasefire?

Secretary Clements: Or without ceasefire.

Secretary Schlesinger: You can't offer that. It is your trump card. You would diminish the impact of what you have done. The threat re-

[10] October 13.

[11] No record was found.

mains that the Israelis will sweep all before them. There is no one reason for the Egyptians to negotiate.

Secretary Clements: We will be able to get a ship there and unloaded in about three to four weeks.

Dr. Kissinger: If we cut off the airlift for the ceasefire, we can go back to the normal arrangement. After the ceasefire we can gauge our actions according to the pace of buildup.

Admiral Moorer: Nothing lifted to Israel last week had an immediate impact.

Dr. Kissinger: If the diplomacy had worked yesterday, we might have been able to avoid it. But today we are better off. We can now say there was Russian treachery on negotiations. They have made an abortion of our peace move and have sent in 200 flights.

Secretary Schlesinger: We had anticipated that! [Laughter]

Admiral Moorer: What we do Wednesday will not change the situation today. The only real help is being provided by the Soviets. For example, with their SA–6. We have seen a drop off in the rate that the Egyptians are throwing missiles up.

Dr. Kissinger: Do we know what the Soviets are bringing in?

Director Colby: Missiles, we think.

Dr. Kissinger: How about aircraft?

General Scowcroft: Probably about 32.

Admiral Moorer: The Syrians have serious deficiencies in pilots.

Dr. Kissinger: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Director Colby: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Dr. Kissinger: I don't want to hear it.

Secretary Schlesinger: Mansfield doesn't want to hear about it.

Dr. Kissinger: Then it is our judgment that we should not go to charter. It looks tricky to shift and the only advantage would be that we could say that we have reduced US military involvement. What is Jack Marsh saying?[12]

Secretary Schlesinger: I don't know precisely.

Secretary Clements: Damn little.

Secretary Schlesinger: He is a low key man. I think he just said we are starting the airlift.

Secretary Rush: Marshall Wright[13] called about it. He is worried that our Congressmen haven't been told anything.

Secretary Sisco: We had better do something.

---

[12] John O. Marsh, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs.

[13] Marshall Wright was a member of the National Security Council staff.

Dr. Kissinger (to Colby): Have you told your people to let Congress know?

Secretary Clements: I believe we have just told a few in the House and Senate.

Secretary Rush: My information is that the Committee members have been told and there may be a few more.

Dr. Kissinger: Can we get a list. Can we agree on what we are saying? The Russians have begun a massive airlift and we are responding in kind.

Secretary Sisco: It will get out publicly.

Dr. Kissinger: But not today.

Secretary Rush: The Russians will detect it today and it will get out.

Dr. Kissinger: But we don't have to explain it. I told them we would blame them.[14]

Secretary Schlesinger: And what do we say to the press?

Dr. Kissinger: Just say that the Soviets started it on Wednesday. We waited four days. We made several appeals to them to stop but they have sent in 200 planes. On top of that we had hoped they would cooperate diplomatically and had some expectations in that regard. We are willing to stop the air lift when the ceasefire is achieved and both sides stop.

Did the F–4s go in?

Admiral Moorer: We are the only ones never in trouble.

Dr. Kissinger: I am sorry for you country boys. Did the F–4s go in. We need to put major emphasis on consumables.

Admiral Moorer: Yes, a small number went in. But they were part of the original order.

Dr. Kissinger: Are the F–4s flown by the military?

Admiral Moorer: A combination of civilians and military.

Secretary Sisco: We will be asked if they receive combat pay?

Secretary Schlesinger: Just shift that to DOD.

Ambassador McCloskey: We have a message here ready to go out on the question of press guidance on reconnaissance. We would acknowledge it. We would say, yes, we carried out a non-combat effort so that our actions would be guided on the most intelligent basis.

Dr. Kissinger: I hope that guidance was not approved. We should have learned from the U–2 incident that honesty may kill you.

---

[14] Kissinger spoke with Dobrynin at 7:55 p.m. on October 13. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

Secretary Rush: [*1 line not declassified*]

Secretary Sisco: We should say it is for our government.

Director Colby: We can't just no comment.

Dr. Kissinger: We can say we carry out regular reconnaissance activities on which we do not comment. If the Egyptians raise it, we can say we will investigate.

Secretary Rush: We can't stop it when it is started.

Dr. Kissinger: We can't say we didn't.

Admiral Moorer: In 1970 we announced it.

Dr. Kissinger: That was a different situation. At that time there was a crisis over the missile violations. The Israelis asked us.

Secretary Sisco: But we will have a public problem. The question is whether if we fuzz it up, we can avoid our man being kicked out.

Dr. Kissinger: If we say we did recon over their territory in wartime, he will get kicked out.

Admiral Moorer: They will know just by going on the performance of the aircraft.

Director Colby: We could say no comment.

Secretary Sisco: In 24 hours it will be reported. We could say that we are looking into it but we have SR–71s operating all around the world. We are checking and making a full investigation.

Admiral Moorer: But tomorrow there will be another question.

Dr. Kissinger: I don't think I get the point about why we admit it.

Secretary Schlesinger: This is a watershed point with regard to US activities.

Dr. Kissinger: As a signal it is OK. Maybe we should have done it.

Director Colby: [*1½ lines not declassified*]

Secretary Schlesinger: The Israelis have made two or three augmented requests. They want three times the number of the TOWs in our inventory. How far are we to go in tearing down the US force structure?

Dr. Kissinger: Our basic strategy is to emphasize consumables. On the heavy stuff, we will stop short of it being a preponderance.

Secretary Clements: The TOW missile could be critical.

Dr. Kissinger: That I would give them.

Secretary Schlesinger: We have already sent a plane load of LAWs.

Dr. Kissinger: How many TOWs can we give?

Secretary Schlesinger: We have given them ten. We only have 140 in our inventory.

Admiral Moorer: We are looking into stepping up production.

Secretary Clements: That is the point.

Dr. Kissinger: Now that we are mounting an airlift, we should . . .

Secretary Clements: They should get what they need and they need TOWs or something comparable.

Dr. Kissinger: If we can replace them fairly quickly, I would give them more. We should increase production.

Secretary Schlesinger: We have given them 2,000 TOW missiles.

Dr. Kissinger: But how can they provide good coverage without the launchers?

[On this note the lengthy meeting terminated.]

---

182. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 14, 1973, 11:10 a.m.

K: Hello, Mr. President.

P: Hi, Henry. I talked to Al and got a little fill-in because I had to go over some other things with him.

K: Right.

P: And I am glad to hear that we are going all out on this.

K: Oh it is a massive airlift Mr. President. The planes are going to land every 50 (15?) minutes.[2]

P: That right. Get them in there. And the only addition that I said—I told them to check the European theater to see if there were some of those smaller planes that they need and fly them detailed down there so that they can replace their aircraft losses. And the other thing is that these big planes you can put some of those good tanks—those M 60 tanks on if necessary if that would have some good effect and put a few of them in there too.

K: Right, Mr. President.

P: So in other words don't—if we are going to do it, don't spare the horses, just let . . .

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking. The blank underscores indicate omissions in the original. President Nixon returned to the White House from Camp David at 10 a.m.

[2] The revision in parentheses is correct.

K: Actually with the big planes Mr. President we have also flexibility. We can fly the Skyhawks in.

P: Put them on the plane you mean.

K: Yes. I don't think there is a [*another*] way—no country will let them overfly.

P: All right. How many can a big plane take?

K: It can take five or six.

P: All right—put some Skyhawks, do that too. You understand what I mean. If we are going to take heat for this well let's go.

K: I think that is right. And I think Mr. President we discussed this in the group—I think after Al left.[3] We can offer to stop the airlift if the Russians do after a ceasefire is signed.

P: Exactly. I think we should say—I think a personal message now should go. I mean you have been sending messages, but one should go from me to Brezhnev saying . . .

K: Everything I am sending too goes in your name.

P: Good. But I think he should know now look here. The peace of not only this area but the whole future relationship is at stake here and we are prepared to stop if you are and we are prepared—you know what I mean. I don't know—have you got anything developed along those lines so that we just don't have . . .

K: I have—I am developing it now and I think I could call Dobrynin and point it out to him.

P: Right, right. Put it in a very conciliatory but very tough way that I do this with great regret because—great reluctance but that we cannot have a situation that has now developed and we are prepared to _____ tit for tat. The situation which regard to nothing on the battle so far. [*sic*]

K: On the battle—it is the Israelis _____ no, that hasn't been announced yet that they have knocked out 150.

P: And lost 15. Yes I heard that this morning.

K: Something like at 10:30 this morning.

P: The Egyptians . . .

K: Again seem to be heading more south than east and are not really trying to break into the Sinai at this point. So they are just keeping their defensive position of _____ down the coast. And they may be going for _____. But ah . . .

P: Nothing new in Syria.

K: In Syria the Israelis have told us this morning they have stopped their advance on Damascus. They stopped about 20 kilometers short.

---

[3] See Document 181.

And they are now heading south for Syrian infantry divisions. There is a report from some foreign correspondents that went up to the front from Damascus on this Syrian side and indicated the Syrian army now was getting to be demoralized and were abandoning equipment. But still Mr. President they are the reason why the Egyptians are holding. Much of the Israeli army is still tied up down there. The estimate of our group was that it would take the Israelis three more days to knock out the Syrians and that they couldn't really turn to the Egyptians for another four days to five days.

P: What then do we plan then.

K: Well what we plan is to try to get it wound up this week.

P: _____

K: Yes.

P: Well, I know you are going to get it until someone is knocked out. That is the problem. Well at least I feel better. The airlift thing is—as I told Al if I contribute anything to discussion it is the business that don't fool around with three planes. By golly no matter how big they are. Just go gungho.

K: One of the lessons I have learned from you is that if you do something you might as well do it completely.

P: Do it completely and . . .

K: You never have the choice to do it half out right.

P: Even Jackson will support this. OK. Best of luck.

---

183. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, October 14, 1973, 12:36 p.m.

K: Hello, Anatol.

D: Hello Henry. How are you?

K: How are you?

D: Yes.

K: I just talked to the President.[2]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking. The blank underscores indicate omissions in the original.

[2] See Document 182.

D: Yes.

K: And he wanted me for the benefit of your leadership to know two things—to tell you two things. One, we are now engaged in an airlift as you know of equipment to Israel.

D: Is it heavy equipment or consumables?

K: It is mostly at this point consumables and we are keeping some restraints at the moment on heavy equipment. Considerable restraints on heavy equipment and a little but very little. We are prepared to stop the airlift immediately after a cease-fire if you are prepared to stop your airlift. But if not we can first of all increase it considerably and include heavy equipment. I mean we are not going at our maximum capacity or anywhere near.

D: No, I understand. It is not that you will continue intermittently.

K: Well, if it goes on we will be forced into it sooner or later. As you know, we are already as you know under massive pressure on the Phantoms. We are sending a few but not like anything that we are asked to do.

D: Yes, I understand. Yes.

K: You know those were the major items he wanted me to . . .

D: At the beginning you said you begin an airlift, yes?

K: Beginning—it is in process. It is beginning now. Yes.

D: Well, that is a matter of information.

K: Well, it is a matter of information _____ proposal. If you are prepared to stop your airlift after a cease-fire, we are prepared to stop ours immediately.

D: Alright, but it is connected with the cease-fire you mentioned, yes.

K: In connection with the cease-fire, yes.

D: O.K. I'll pass it on right away.

K: You know, Anatol, we all know now what is at stake because if this goes on much longer, . . .

D: Well, _____ if you had a chance to read my telegram what I sent yesterday it was exactly what I am told.

K: No, no I . . .

D: I make my own reservations of course, but it was a direct quotation everything you said. It is not only fair, but it is important for them to know the mood. At a certain point of our usual thing, I don't do direct quotations, but a summary, I make it. But yesterday I was rather in a detail of what you said because this is what I feel and . . .

K: But also I give you advice. I have kept press guidance for today to an absolute minimum and we will say nothing but . . .

D: For press, you mean.

K: Well, we will just say we are doing something but starting tomorrow as I have already explained to you we'll be forced to say something.

D: Yes, I understand. I am already make it clear for tomorrow after this you might say something unless maybe there are some other things.

K: Well, unless we know where we are going.

D: Yes, I understand. I will telephone tomorrow.

K: O.K., good.

D: O.K. Tell me, do you expect _____ 4:00, for 4 hours?

K: I don't expect we will do anything between 4 and 8.

D: Nothing. Yes, because I just wanted to see you—to go and then come back.

K: No, no.

D: O.K.

K: Good.

D: Bye, bye.

---

184. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and Secretary of Defense Schlesinger[1]

Washington, October 15, 1973, 9:08 a.m.

K: Hello.

S: Hi Henry.

K: Just for your information but not—I won't use it at the WSAG—the Soviets came in around 3:00 o'clock this morning with a proposal for a new move which we are now exploring.[2]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] In his memoirs, Kissinger wrote that on the morning of October 15, Dobrynin informed him that "Moscow was studying our proposal to link a cease-fire not to Israel's withdrawal to the 1967 borders but to a general reaffirmation of Resolution 242, which—at least in Israel's interpretation, not challenged by us—was ambiguous on that point. If such a formulation were fianlly accepted, this would lead to rapid progress in the Security Council. (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 524)

S: Very good.

K: Which would go back to the ceasefire idea of Saturday[3] and just link it to Resolution 242 which we can live with.

S: Good.

K: You know—but that we want to keep very quiet yet. I think we—the thing obviously they are sweating out is the—I think we should just keep going all out now on the supplies.

S: OK. You want to move in those additional six . . .

K: I would move them tomorrow.

S: OK. Now there is one little leery(?) [*area*?] I am worrying about and that is the resupply of 175 mm ammo. As you know they have got their self-propelled 175 threatening Damascus and we ought to think very carefully about supplying ammo for the destruction of Damascus. I don't want an answer from you now but I ah . . .

K: OK. Well, let me see whether I can make sure that they won't shell Damascus.

S: OK. They are also pressing for bridging equipment and the bridges equipment in view of the dearth of rivers, obviously is directed towards the move into Afghan(?) crossing this canal. Well, think about those and . . .

K: Let me think about that.

S: OK.

K: Good.

S: Anything else?

K: No, I just wanted to give you that latest reading which I won't—I'll just mention at the WSAG(? ? ?).[4]

S: Splendid.

K: That the diplomacy is going along.

S: Good.

K: Good. Bye.

S: Bye.

---

[3] October 13.

[4] The question marks are in the original. See Document 186.

185. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (Moorer) and the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe (Goodpaster)[1]

October 15, 1973, 9:20 a.m.

Gen—Can you hear me?

CJCS—Yes, can you hear me okay?

Gen—I can hear you not too clearly, but I think if we talk slowly we can make it.

CJCS—Well, we got this message from Jim Eade about information that he needed. I just wanted you to know that we had instructed the people at Lajes—both at MAC and TAC—to make USCINCEUR information addee on every movement and, I think, that the problem has probably been a communications saturation. But, in any event, the plan now for this week (unless it is changed and, I am telling you, things are changing back here every one or three hours). First I was told not to land anybody in Israel except at night; then we were told to take the material as far as Lajes and then the commercial air would pick it up and then we were finally told that all restraints were off and to start a stream of supplies to Israel. So, now, the plan is every 24 hours you will have four C5As and 12 C141s, every 24 hours. We'll send you the exact schedule. It is generally speaking, there are times when they have got these planes going off at 30-minute intervals. Now we are having another meeting at 1000[2] which is in forty minutes from now, and an NSC Meeting this afternoon at 1600[3] and, if anything comes out of it that has anything to do with policy, I'll send you a message. As a matter of fact, I can (or else) call you in the morning, would, perhaps be better the first thing in the morning to call you. What they are trying to do now, of course and *the rationale for making this supply is* we are saying *that the Russians did it first when they got up to 3,000 tons* about *then we started supplies ourselves.* That is the public statement that is being made. Also, there are 8 F4 Phantoms already arrived in Israel and there are 6 airborne right now; that should get there within the next two hours. That will make a total of 14 F4s and we have 8 more standing by in the Azores and that decision hasn't been made yet. We are looking also at the possibility of "leapfrogging" some A4s through the carriers begin-

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 218, Records of Admiral Thomas Moorer, Diary, October 1973. Top Secret. The transcript is an entry in Moorer's Diary. Moorer was in Washington; Goodpaster was in Brussels.

[2] See Document 186.

[3] No NSC meeting was held.

ning with *Kennedy* and, then, to *Roosevelt* and then to *Independence* and then to Israel.

Gen—That's probably good. You are getting the static, I am sure, about and the concern about making use of any of the bases in the NATO countries.

CJCS—Yes, the only one we are using is the Portuguese.

Gen—Or, in Spain.

CJCS—Yes.

Gen—The Europeans, NATO, I think the Italians or even the Greeks and, certainly the Turks. In fact there is, an awful lot of sensitivity over here about doing anything—supporting anything out of Europe and, even, to the extent of sensitivity over pulling any equipment out of here to go down there. I might just say that, my own feeling is that our Allies are being given pretty much of a free ride on that. I guess we'll get it straightened out later or it will have to be straightened out by somebody if we really come to need to take that kind of action.

CJCS—You ought to know that (yes) Senator Jackson has been pressing us hard to take equipment out of Europe to show the NATO allies that this is their responsibility, too.

Gen—Who has been pushing you on that, Tom?

CJCS—Scoop Jackson, Senator Jackson. But, we have, as you know, haven't taken any equipment out of Europe, yet.

Gen—I don't disagree in principle; I think it is a practical question but whether you want to take on that much more grief because it'll be a lot of pain and noises about that. On the other hand, I have to sympathize with his standpoint because these people sure are taking a free ride by coughing up to the Arabs while the US takes care of Israel.

CJCS—Exactly and it kind of makes HAK mad as hell you know. Anyway, right now, we haven't given any consideration to any augmentation. We might send *(we're giving serious thought) to sending another nuclear-powered submarine into the Mediterranean; and* we have that *request from Jim Eade to move two destroyers further East* and I'll take that up this morning.

Gen—You have *also* got Jim Eade's message *(attached)*[4] there that should (he discussed it with me) on *starting to get some of the Americans out of these countries* if the temperatures (which may go up pretty fast) when the extent of this resupply . . . aerial resupply becomes known.

CJCS—Yes, you're right. That is about all I have now, Andy, because the rules of the game have been changing almost hourly.

---

[4] Attached, but not printed. General George J. Eade, USAF, was Deputy Commander in Chief of the U.S. European Command.

Gen—I can understand that. I'll pass this on to Jim right away.
[Omitted here is discussion unrelated to the Middle East war.]

---

186. Minutes of Washington Special Actions Group Meeting[1]

Washington, October 15, 1973, 10:08–11:08 a.m.

SUBJECT

Middle East

PARTICIPANTS

Chairman—Henry A. Kissinger

State
Kenneth Rush
Joseph Sisco
Robert McCloskey

Defense
James Schlesinger
William P. Clements, Jr.

JCS
Adm. Thomas H. Moorer
V/Adm. John Weinel

CIA
William Colby
Sam Hoskinson

Special Assistant to the President for Energy
Gov. John Love
Charles DiBona

NSC
Gen. Brent Scowcroft
William Quandt
Jeanne W. Davis

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

It was agreed that:

1) CIA will prepare an estimate as to the amount of advance knowledge the Soviets had of the Arab move against Israel.

2) Governor Love, in cooperation with Deputy Secretary Clements, will prepare by tomorrow a detailed implementing scenario for U.S. actions in the event of an Arab cut-off of oil from the U.S., to include public statements.[2]

3) Defense, in cooperation with State, will prepare within twenty-four hours a package for the Congress requesting additional funds for foreign military assistance, to include Cambodia and other pressing requirements.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Institutional Files (H–Files), Box H–117, WSAG Meetings Minutes, Originals, 1973. Top Secret; Nodis; Codeword. The meeting took place in the White House Situation Room.

[2] Love submitted the action plan to Kissinger on October 15. (Ibid., Box H–93, WSAG Meeting, Middle East, 10/14/73)

4) The State Department (Bob McCloskey) will take the lead on public statements on the resupply effort, which will be in a low key and will avoid super-criticism of the Soviets.

5) Defense will supply a list of all the equipment that the U.S. has moved or is moving to Israel.

Secretary Kissinger: Bill (Colby), could we have your briefing, then we'll look at the oil picture.

Mr. Colby: briefed from the paper at Tab A.[3]

Secretary Kissinger: What is the total number of Soviet supply flights?

Mr. Colby: 264.

Mr. Sisco: Did they send more to Syria yesterday than to Egypt? Has there been a shift?

Mr. Colby: Shipments were heavier to Iraq yesterday.

Secretary Kissinger: How does that work out in tonnage?

Mr. Colby: Roughly 3000 tons by yesterday. With an additional 178 flights, that may mean another 1000 tons. These are rough-cut answers.

Secretary Kissinger: Tom (Moorer), what do you have?

Adm. Moorer: My military estimate is the same as yesterday. I think the Egyptians are clearly trying to establish a solid defense line east of Suez. They have begun to bring civilian construction people over now. They are also establishing permanent SA–2 and –3 missile sites in addition to the SA–6s. We believe Israeli ship losses have been about 1–6 in favor of the Israelis; aircraft losses, 1–3 in Israel's favor; but tank losses have been only 1–2 in Israel's favor. Also, [*2 lines not declassified*].

Secretary Kissinger: They're giving it to them now or they have given it to them?

Adm. Moorer: It's on the dock in Alexandria. They are introducing it now; we haven't seen it before.

Mr. Clements: But they came in on ships.

Adm. Moorer: Which means the decision was made a month ago.

Secretary Kissinger: (to Colby) Could we now get an analysis of how far ahead the Soviets knew about this?

Mr. Colby: I'm not convinced they knew before October 3. Then I think there was a frantic reaction.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's take a reading on it. Did you read Joe Alsop's column this morning, drawing a parallel to Korea? Do you think this is valid?

---

[3] Attached, but not printed.

Mr. Colby: No, Korea was much more premeditated.

Secretary Kissinger: On what basis? Let's look at the question. Now, John (Love), let's turn to oil.

Mr. Colby: I have a little briefing on oil if you would like to have it now.

Secretary Kissinger: Yes.

Mr. Colby briefed on the paper at Tab B.[4]

Secretary Kissinger: (commenting on the slow-down of oil flow through Tapline) Was this a decision of the companies?

Mr. Clements: No, the Israelis requested it.

Secretary Kissinger: Why?

Mr. Sisco: They were fearful that damage to the pipeline from the fighting might be such that a lot of their oil would be lost.

Mr. Clements: That was a valid point.

Mr. Kissinger: I don't question it.

Mr. Schlesinger: Are there any tankers going through the Gulf of Aqaba?

Mr. Colby: We don't know.

Adm. Moorer: No, there's an Egyptian submarine there.

Mr. Colby: Yes, it fired three torpedos at a tanker in the first days of the war and missed.

Secretary Kissinger: It's a good thing Governor Love has all of these problems solved.

Governor Love briefed from the paper at Tab C.[5]

Secretary Kissinger: (referring to Governor Love's comment that a rationing program need not be announced at the time the other US actions are announced) But an announcement of what we are doing might induce the Arabs to call off any cut-off of oil. If we were licking the problem, they might have an incentive to resume shipments.

Gov. Love: There may be a trade-off. But an announcement of rationing might bring on hoarding.

Mr. Clements: That's a political decision. It's for the President and you to decide.

Secretary Kissinger: How urgently is it needed?

Mr. Clements: It's a must.

---

[4] Attached, but not printed. Among the papers at Tab B is a CIA paper entitled "The Arab-Israeli War and Oil," which had been requested at the October 6 WSAG meeting; see Document 103.

[5] Attached, but not printed.

Secretary Kissinger: But you believe it should not be announced with the other decisions? Suppose the Arabs cut off the supply tomorrow?

Gov. Love: Subject to your decision on the effect on the Gulf countries, I do not suggest announcing a rationing program now. But I would go ahead with the rest of the program.

Mr. Clements: We might hint at rationing.

Secretary Kissinger: Let me be sure I understand what you're saying. Incidentally, this paper is an amazing job considering the amount of time you had.

Gov. Love: Part of it is the Treasury paper that you had asked Bill Simon to do earlier.

Secretary Kissinger: You believe that, if there is an actual cut-off of oil, all of these things in the paper, except for rationing, should be done together?

Gov. Love: Yes.

Secretary Kissinger: I can't speak for the President, but I will talk to him right after this meeting. But, judging from the way the President has reacted, in the past, I would think he would think so too. He believes we pay the same price if we do a lot as if we do a little.

Mr. Clements: We could tell the public that rationing is the next step. This might be a rallying point and have a cohesive effect in getting people together.

Secretary Kissinger: And if these things fail, we would go to rationing. Are you saying rationing is inevitable? What would the President say?

Mr. DiBona: That we can lick the problem if everyone cooperates.

Secretary Kissinger: If everyone cooperates, we could avoid rationing?

Mr. DiBona: Yes.

Secretary Kissinger: But if we threaten rationing, that might create hoarding. How would it be done?

Mr. Rush: By everyone keeping his tanks filled.

Mr. DiBona: There's a lot of secondary storage already full. People filled up in August.

Secretary Kissinger: Isn't that a good cushion?

Mr. DiBona: Yes.

Gov. Love: Our task force on the political implications of the effect on Japan and Western Europe of an Arab oil cut-off has considered the possibility of a sharing agreement of up to 5 million barrels per day. There would be no way out of this for the US without utter chaos.

Secretary Kissinger: The other paper indicates that there are two roads—bilateral and multilateral. Do we have enough leverage with the oil companies to win the bilateral battle? Could we force them to divert to us?

Mr. Colby: It would be the other way around.

Mr. DiBona: There are two possibilities. One, the Arabs cut off oil supplies from the Arab sources to the US alone. We could handle this, with some strain. Second, a total cut-off of Arab oil to all recipients. If we should try to equalize the burden, this would mean the US would be shipping oil out to Western Europe and Japan. This would require 5 or 6 million barrels per day from the US—one-third of the US consumption.

Mr. Rush: The economic impact in this country would be so striking that it couldn't be done.

Secretary Kissinger: What about the impact of a cut-off in Europe and Japan? They would go crazy.

Mr. DiBona: It would affect their attitude toward the war.

Secretary Kissinger: To say the least!

Adm. Moorer: They have already made their attitude clear. They expect the US to carry the entire burden.

Secretary Kissinger: And they have been goddamned unhelpful in the diplomacy.

Mr. Sisco: The pressures would increase from Europe, but they haven't lifted a finger to help us with the Arabs as it is. It cuts both ways.

Gov. Love: You would see an almost automatic flow of French and German technicians to the Arab countries if there were an oil cut-off. We would lose out in the area.

Mr. Rush: It's unrealistic to think they would be willing to suffer economically for us.

Secretary Kissinger: How can they avoid it?

Mr. Rush: By staying with the Arabs and keeping the oil flowing.

Secretary Kissinger: If they do this, they would be doing us a favor. What more could they do for the Arabs than they have already done? There is a limit beyond which they can't push us without losing their NATO relationship. There are two alternatives: (1) the Arabs may cut off oil to the US only; there would be some resolutions in the Security Council we would have to veto, but we wouldn't be that badly hurt; (2) the Arabs cut off oil to Europe. The Europeans would gain nothing, and they couldn't be doing anything worse to us than they are already doing. And if the Europeans try to do to us what we did to them at Suez, we could do more to them in retaliation. They can't afford to go into open opposition to us. Is that a fair statement?

All agreed.

Gov. Love: Any approach to rational thinking on the part of the Saudis will show them that a complete cut-off is not in their self-interest.

Secretary Kissinger: We have had no indication up to now that they intend a cut-off. They have been extremely circumspect. They have never threatened an oil cut-off in any official channel. Officially, they have taken exactly the opposite tack.

Mr. Colby: We have an indication that the Saudis are being very cautious about this oil country meeting tomorrow.[6]

Secretary Kissinger: I sent them a letter yesterday telling them about our sending supplies to Israel. They replied that we should keep it in a low key and blame it on the Soviets.[7]

Mr. Sisco: This was not from the King, but we think it is official.

Secretary Kissinger: I've been dealing with the oil guy. We have no indication that there will be a cut-off. But if there is, I think the President will go for the whole program, minus rationing. That would be the best way to bring maximum pressure on the Arabs. John (Love), will you develop implementing programs for these things? Bill (Clements), will you work with him? Work out who does what and when, from D-Day plus. Also what we say publicly—the whole scenario.

Mr. Rush: We don't have Governor Love's memo.

Mr. DiBona handed out copies of the memorandum at Tab C, without the attachments.

Secretary Kissinger: We need a contingency plan now for D-Day plus. Now, it would be in our interests to make the Soviets pay for this. I have seen in one paper, possibly an internal State paper, some of the pressures we have available, such as holding back some wheat shipments. If we get into a test of this kind, we have to win it.

Mr. Clements: We are all in agreement that there are some mechanical and technical things we could do, but it would require an

---

[6] The OPEC Ministers met in Vienna October 16–17.

[7] The text of the letter was transmitted in telegram 203672 to Jidda, October 14. Kissinger asked for the King's understanding that the U.S. airlift to Israel was not intended as anti-Arab, noting that it "became inevitable when the Soviets moved to take advantage of the situation instead of using their influence to work for a ceasefire which would end the fighting and it became necessary if we are to remain in a position to use our influence to work for a just and lasting peace." Kissinger concluded: "I want to assure you that as soon as an effictive ceasefire has been achieved, we are prepared to stop our airlift promptly provided the Soviets do the same." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 630, Country Files, Saudi Arabia, Vol. IV) The initial reply to the Secretary's letter came in telegram 4517 from Jidda, October 15. (Ibid., Box 1174, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, 1973 Middle East War, 15–16 October 1973, File No. 9)

all-out effort with the oil companies and the pipeline companies. The first thing we would have to do is to get that Prudhoe Bay pipeline immediately. We could get another one million barrels a day if we go all-out, but we can't dilly-dally.

Secretary Kissinger: We have some real problems. The events of this summer have led to a belief all around the world that our authority has been weakened. If we get into a confrontation, we have to show that we are a giant! We have to win! I don't expect us to get into a confrontation, but we should look at everything we could do if we did. It may help us next time. Let's get that implementation plan for tomorrow's WSAG meeting. What each agency can do, including the public statements.

Gov. Love: But the President wouldn't move short of an Arab move to cut off oil?

Secretary Kissinger: No, and we haven't been threatened. No Arab radio has picked up what we're actually doing. We'll keep it in a low key. We shouldn't hypo it but we should be ready if someone else does.

Mr. Schlesinger: It will be hypoed today when they see US planes coming over every half-hour.

Gov. Love: I was scheduled for a Press Club appearance tomorrow, but I will cancel it so I don't fumble around.

Secretary Kissinger: You won't fumble around. You can just say we don't expect an oil cut-off but we have contingency planning ready if there is one. You should be restrained but very confident. I think it would be a mistake to cancel your appearance. You should make no reference to the Middle East, but if you are asked, just say we are working on it and we can handle it. We'll meet again tomorrow; we'll let you know the time.

(Governor Love and Mr. DiBona left the meeting.)

Secretary Kissinger: In the area of diplomacy, the most noteworthy aspect has been the total Arab restraint. It has gone on longer than I thought possible. It's close to the end of the working day there. They must know by now what we're doing. We've told the Saudis and Egyptians.[8]

Adm. Moorer: We've got 14 Phantoms in, without counting the airlift.

Secretary Kissinger: Also, without going into detail, the diplomacy opened up again last night, so let's mute our anti-Soviet statements.[9] We can refer to the Soviet airlift and its size, but there should be no ref-

[8] See Document 189.

[9] See Document 184.

erence to our diplomacy and no super-criticism of the Soviets. I believe they are making an effort with the Arabs. We are working with the Arabs, too. I will see the Egyptian Foreign Minister tomorrow and the President will be meeting with various Arab leaders on Wednesday.[10] These things aren't to be trumpeted about. The next three or four days are crucial. Bill Clements is the greatest diplomat of all time. He has arranged this airlift for the greatest possible diplomatic effect. What about our air supply?

Mr. Schlesinger: We have 3000 tons plus on the way.

Secretary Kissinger: Already?

Adm. Moorer: Loaded out from the US.

Mr. Schlesinger: 1800 tons have arrived.

Secretary Kissinger: Not that it's earned us any gratitude.

Mr. Schlesinger: We can do more.

Secretary Kissinger: It doesn't matter what the Israelis think about it. If the Soviets see that we can get material in to Israel, which can still fight, they will see that it would be better for them to get the thing wrapped up.

Adm. Moorer: We have eight Phantoms in the Azores.

Mr. Schlesinger: We'll get six more in tomorrow, which will make 20.

Adm. Moorer: And the C–130s are arriving. Also we have four C–5s and 12 C–141s every 24 hours.

Mr. Schlesinger: I hope we are looking at the tank shipments as largely symbolic. It's like moving platinum to fly them in.

Secretary Kissinger: We're doing it just to show we can. We can stop after that. What about Skyhawks?

Mr. Schlesinger: They will start to move on the 20th (of October). They can leapfrog from carrier, to Lajes, to carrier, to carrier—right down the Mediterranean.

Secretary Kissinger: I must say when you want to work, you're terrific. You are equally awe-inspiring when you don't.

Mr. Schlesinger: We follow our directions in either case. We will have all the Skyhawks in on October 25 or 26. We can hold some back from the Israelis as a piece of capital if you wish.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's give them our plan, then we can use actual deliveries as a ploy if we need to.

Mr. Schlesinger: We're giving them more Phantoms than they have lost.

---

[10] See Document 195.

Secretary Kissinger: They say they need Phantoms to replace Skyhawks.

Mr. Schlesinger: Some of the Phantoms will replace Mirages and Mysteres that have been lost.

Adm. Moorer: If we ship A–4s by ship, they have to be preserved and de-preserved at the other end. The Egyptians might just torpedo the ship.

Secretary Kissinger: In ten days they will have everything.

Mr. Schlesinger: If there is a ceasefire and Israel is disinclined to go along, we can terminate the deliveries.

Secretary Kissinger: Exactly. We'll just hold out.

Mr. Schlesinger: The Army plan shows that it takes 21 days to prepare a tank for shipment, but we compressed that time to 36 hours for the four M–6s.

Secretary Kissinger: What is your assessment now? Can the Israelis knock off the Egyptians at the Canal? I assume they can't do it quickly. Not this week, no matter what we do.

Adm. Moorer: No. It will take them three or four days once they turn them back, and they haven't done that yet.

Mr. Schlesinger: Our level of confidence in how quickly Israel can move should be limited. It depends on the ability of the Egyptians to stand up against pressure. We're moving TOWs in tomorrow or the next day. If one sector of the front collapses, things might change.

Adm. Moorer: But the Egyptians have 100,000 men across the Canal.

Mr. Schlesinger: But they can retreat fast, too. They lost 250 tanks yesterday.

Secretary Kissinger: Do you believe that figure? Has anyone seen the 800 Syrian tanks reportedly knocked out? The photography doesn't confirm it.

Adm. Moorer: The figures are probably inflated.

Mr. Schlesinger: Israel is asking for bridging equipment.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's wait a couple of days, to put it mildly!

Mr. Colby: [*1½ lines not declassified*]

Mr. Sisco: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Colby: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Schlesinger: State has been saying we fly worldwide reconnaissance missions. This could mean the USSR and the PRC. It would be better to say "selectively worldwide."

Mr. Sisco: That's a good point. We'll watch that.

Adm. Moorer: Do you want the [*less than 1 line not declassified*] to go tomorrow?

Secretary Kissinger: I don't think so. What would we get out of it that would make it worthwhile?

Adm. Moorer: An update.

Mr. Clements: [*2 lines not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: How late can we let you know?

Mr. Schlesinger: We can cancel it up to the last minute.

Adm. Moorer: After take-off, if you wish.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's keep the flight on standby and see what happens today. It would take off when?

Adm. Moorer: About 2:00 a.m. tomorrow. We're also considering moving two destroyers east to monitor the Soviet supply planes coming in. The [*less than 1 line not declassified*] the other carrier is in the Tyrhenian Sea and the *Kennedy* is moving down toward Gibraltar, but it will stay in the Atlantic near Rota.

Secretary Kissinger: Good!

(Secretary Schlesinger and Adm. Moorer left the meeting to attend the Medal of Honor ceremony.)

Mr. Colby: [*2 lines not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Colby: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Clements: Is anyone thinking about quote foreign military sales unquote? What are we going to do about this volume.

Mr. Rush: We have a serious problem.

Mr. Clements: We will need a supplemental.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's get the Jewish lobby to get us the money. And let's wrap some other things in it too. Go see (Senator) Ribicoff.

Mr. Sisco: Let's get a Congressional package and get it moving in the next 24 hours.

Secretary Kissinger: Yes, and don't be modest. They have been screaming for it—let (Senator) Jackson put it through. And get Cambodia taken care of in the package. It's an absurdity that we have to lose our war. If we had put one F–4 into Cambodia they would have screamed bloody murder.

Mr. Sisco: (to Clements) Curtis Tarr and Sy Weiss will work with you on this.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's get it today.

Mr. Rush: I'll get it started as soon as I get back.

Secretary Kissinger: On the public relations side, Bob McCloskey will take the lead. We'll keep the anti-Soviet remarks low key. Say 280 Soviet planes have flown in with 4000 tons of equipment. We waited for four days while we attempted to get the supply flow shut off through diplomacy. When this failed, we had no choice except to begin resupplying Israel. We have offered to stop if there is a ceasefire and if the Soviets stop. We urge all parties to show restraint and to move toward a settlement as rapidly as possible.[11] Bill (Clements), you keep your people down on the scale of our effort. The Soviets will pick it up anyway.

Mr. Colby: Absolutely.

Secretary Kissinger: In 24 hours we have put as much material in as they have done in four days?

Mr. Clements: More.

Mr. Colby: But don't say that. Let the Soviets figure it out.

Mr. Rush: Don't let's get into a public race.

Mr. Clements: They will lose any race.

Secretary Kissinger: And our clients can use the equipment better.

Mr. Clements: We're putting in 50 tons per hour. There has never been an airlift like this one.

Secretary Kissinger: It is awe-inspiring.

Mr. Clements: We could double it within 24 hours if the airfields were there at the other end.

Secretary Kissinger: Don't tell (Senator) Ribicoff that. Is everything going in to Tel Aviv airport? Is there no other airfield?

Mr. Clements: No.

Secretary Kissinger: What about the military airfield south of Tel Aviv?

Mr. Clements: I'm told Tel Aviv is the only one now, without moving in a lot of air control and other equipment. If we want to open up the tap further, we'll move in the equipment and open up another airfield.

Secretary Kissinger: Our strategy is to convince the Arabs and the Soviets that they will be pushed against the wall and that time is on our side. What the Israelis want is less important.

Mr. Sisco: They can't absorb any more.

---

[11] On October 15, McCloskey announced the decision to replace Israeli equipment lost in the war, in addition to the regular military aid program, in order to prevent the Soviet supply of arms to the Arabs from unsettling the military balance in the area. He emphasized that diplomatic efforts were continuing. See *The New York Times*, October 16, 1973.

Mr. Clements: Do you want to move any tanks out of Europe? We have a great stockpile of tanks there—105s and 155s, which are critical to the Israelis. We could move them quickly to Rotterdam. The Dutch wouldn't mind. That would cut our shipping time in half. Should we do it?

Secretary Kissinger: Yes. Could you give us today a list of everything that is moving. We want to have as much on the ships as possible, in case we decide to cut back on the airlift.

Mr. Clements: There are 11 ships [*less than 1 line not declassified*] that are either in US ports or will be soon that we can use.

Secretary Kissinger: Do the Israelis know that?

Mr. Clements: No. I suggest we put one ship out of Rotterdam as a signal.

Mr. Sisco: That's a good idea.

Secretary Kissinger: The only way we can wind this up is if the Soviets see we won't quit and won't panic; if the Europeans see that they are pushed between losing their NATO relationship and lining up with us.

Mr. Clements: This will have a helluva effect on the Europeans.

Secretary Kissinger: It will help with the PRC and will limit adventurism in the Soviet Union. When the Europeans are restored to balance, they will realize that we help our friends.

187. Minutes of the Secretary of State's Staff Meeting[1]

Washington, October 15, 1973, 3:15 p.m.

PRESENT

Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Kenneth Rush
William Casey
William J. Porter
Curtis W. Tarr
Walter J. Stoessel, Jr.
Jack B. Kubisch
Joseph J. Sisco
Arthur W. Hummel, Jr.
David D. Newsom
Robert J. McCloskey
George S. Vest
Thomas R. Pickering
Willis Armstrong

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East war.]

[Secretary Kissinger:] Let me say one word about where we stand in the Middle East right now.

We did not put anything into the Middle East from Tuesday to Saturday night, except to permit El Al to pick up I think six planeloads of stuff here that was carried in converted Boeings, and was very minor. The Soviets put in 284 planeloads between Wednesday morning and yesterday evening, amounting to about 4,000 tons. And moreover, they dragged their feet on negotiations to bring about a cease-fire. Under those conditions we felt—first, the Israelis were facing an acute shortage, and actually running out of ammunition to a point where they were asking pilots to land their planes loaded—if they did not hit their targets, their pilots were required not to jettison their bombs, but to conserve them and land the planes loaded, which as you know is an extremely risky procedure.

So we felt we had no alternative except to start an airlift of our own, which is a risky operation.

But the only hope we saw for a cease-fire was to convince the Soviets that we could put in things faster than they could, and into hands perhaps able to use it more rapidly than their clients. And judging by the relative restraint that has been shown in the Arab world up to now and by some other signals we have, there may be a chance that this is working.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Transcripts of Secretary of State Kissinger's Staff Meetings, 1973–77: Lot 78 D 443, Box 1, Secretary's Analytical Staff Meetings. Secret.

What is essential is that we all keep discipline here and not wring our hands. Because basically we have only two choices—either to do something or to do nothing. If we do something half-heartedly, it doesn't take the risk away; it compounds it.

We are trying to force the Soviets now into a more moderate stand, and we are trying to convince the Arabs that if there is to be a settlement, they have to deal with us, and that they cannot jeopardize their relationships with us beyond a certain point.

We think that is a better protection for our supplies, than to be caught between both sides, of not doing enough for the Israelis, and in the final analysis getting no credit from the Arabs, who have the Soviet supplies.

Partly due to the Soviets it has reached this point. But now that it has reached this point, we really have no choice. There was nothing that presented us with another choice, except to proceed.

I must say the Department has behaved extraordinarily well. We have had absolutely a unified position in the field and here.

So I am saying this for your information—not in any way a request to change anything.

We will find out in the next two or three days. The Soviets and to some extent the radical Arabs have it in their power to kick it one way or the other and to turn it into a confrontation or into a watershed towards a settlement.

After the cessation of hostilities, it is obvious that we will then have to move towards a more permanent solution. The conditions that existed between 1967 and 1973 cannot be permitted to be repeated. But for us to have an influence on that settlement, we must be perceived by the Israelis to be the source of almost their survival, by the Arabs as strong enough to be a major factor, and yet openminded enough not have gone beyond what was imposed on us. And that is a tricky operation, that we have managed to maintain for eight days.

Joe, do you have anything to add to that?

Mr. Sisco: No. I think it will be interesting to see, now, over the next forty-eight hours, Mr. Secretary, just whether the intensity of the propaganda aspect really escalates or not.

Secretary Kissinger: So far they have not said anything. If we could keep the intensity of the propaganda effort down on our side, it would help a bit, too.

[Omitted here is material on the press policy on the airlift and issues unrelated to the Middle East war.]

Attachment[2]

Washington, October 16, 1973.

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS

The Secretary decided:

p. 4, 5 1. That we should *begin negotiations with the Portuguese on the Azores Bases* and also *inform them of PL–480 grain* we are providing.

p. 10, 11 2. That *Marshall Wright should inform key Members* of both the House and Senate *of the relationship between the resupply of Israel and our relations with Portugal.*

p. 14, 15 3. That we should make *strong statements* at a high level *to our NATO allies* on the Middle East situation specifically asking them *whether they think it is in their interest to encourage an adventurist Soviet foreign policy.*

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

Thomas R. Pickering
Executive Secretary

[2] Secret; Nodis.

188. Telegram From the Department of State to the Embassy in Jordan[1]

Washington, October 15, 1973, 1815Z.

203885. Subject: Middle East Situation. For Ambassador From Secretary.

1. We have been informed by Israeli Amb. Dinitz that King Hussein has informed PM Meir that after examining location of various forces, Israel should consider the Jordanian expeditionary force of the 40th Armored Brigade as hostile as of yesterday morning.

2. Israelis have also been informed that the King and his headquarters have been under pressure directly from Assad to either withdraw the brigade or have it carry out its military duties at what was then the 8th day of the war. The brigade on the 8th day is within the danger zone but had not yet taken any action. King has informed PM that brigade will inevitably be in action. Moreover, King has also informed PM that as to the probable future location of the brigade, it has been given so many contradictory orders that it is impossible to predict where it will be at any given moment.

3. Dinitz says that the Israeli understanding is that the Jordanian brigade will be working in coordination with the Iraqi forces: in effect, it is becoming part of the Iraqi movement in the area.

4. In these circumstances, according to Israeli Amb., "the least harm would be done if in addition to this force, no additional force was sent into action in this region or any other region of the front with Jordan, and that the existing Jordanian force there would receive instructions not to engage heavily in battle. This is said with the hope that the engagement should it occur will be limited."

5. Israeli Ambassador went on to say that naturally Israel will be forced to fight when they are attacked. Ambassador then asked us whether we would do everything within our power to impress upon the Jordanians the objectives stated above.

6. Ambassador should see King immediately and weigh in in the above sense.

7. FYI: Dinitz says he knows we carry unit as 40th Armored Brigade, although his own people insist on calling it the 4th Brigade. He

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret; Flash; Nodis. Drafted by Sisco and approved by Kissinger.

and we both curious about the difference, but assume that reference is unmistakably to the single Jordan brigade thus far deployed to Syria.[2]

Kissinger

[2] In telegram 5527 from Amman, October 16, Brown responded that he had discussed the telegram with Crown Prince Hassan and Sherif Nasr, who understood the problem completely. Hassan said he wanted to wake the King and talk to him alone. Brown indicated that he was standing by in case the King called and, in any event, would see him in the morning. Brown reported that both Hassan and Nasr agreed that it would be madness for Jordan to commit more troops to Syria. The Ambassador told them that what was at stake was the future of Jordan. It could remain, with luck, a moderate state with an Arab window to the West or, with bad luck, could be a minor Arab state, vassal to the rich, oil-producing states. (Ibid.)

189. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail)[1]

Washington, undated.

As Dr. Kissinger has pointed out to Mr. Ismail, the United States has reacted with great restraint to the recent events in the Middle East. Mr. Ismail is aware that the United States has voiced no criticism of Arab actions, either in the United Nations or in public statements of senior government officials. In addition, no resupply action to Israel was undertaken for a week, despite insistent Israeli demands for supplies and equipment. This restraint was observed by the United States even in the face of a massive Soviet airlift of military equipment to the Arab combatants.

However, the United States has now been forced to reconsider its position with respect to aerial resupply for two principal reasons.

(1) The United States was informed by the Soviet Union on October 11 that Egypt was prepared for a ceasefire in-place if it were to be voted by the Security Council, and that the Soviet Union would abstain from voting on such a resolution. The United States then spent two

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. No classification marking. The message is attached to a transmittal memorandum from Scowcroft instructing that it should be delivered to Ismail at the opening of business on Monday, October 15, Cairo time.

days in diplomatic efforts attempting to arrange a ceasefire vote and a sponsor and at great domestic cost. With enormous difficulty the U.S. achieved Israeli acquiescence to this course, only to be informed at the last minute through Great Britain and finally through the Soviet Union that no such ceasefire proposal would be accepted by Egypt.

(2) The massive Soviet airlift which has been underway for more than four days now. This has forced the United States to start its own resupply emphasizing mostly consumable items.

The U.S. side wishes to inform the Egyptian side that it is prepared to cease its own airlift resupply efforts immediately after a ceasefire is reached.

The United States wishes to emphasize again that it recognizes the unacceptability to the Egyptian side of the conditions which existed prior to the outbreak of recent hostilities. The U.S. side will make a major effort as soon as hostilities are terminated to assist in bringing a just and lasting peace to the Middle East. It continues to hope that the channel to Egypt established with so much difficulty will be maintained even under the pressure of events.

The U.S. will do all it can in this sense.[2]

[2] An October 15 reply from Ismail reaffirmed Egypt's determination to keep open this special channel of contact, and emphasized that no other party spoke in Egypt's name. Ismail expressed appreciation for U.S. efforts for a cease-fire as a preliminary to a political settlement, but doubted that this was achievable. Peace could not be achieved while Egyptian territories were occupied. Ismail urged Kissinger to renew his efforts to get Israel to accept a cease-fire coupled with complete withdrawal and the end of the state of belligerency when the last Israeli left Egyptian territory. Ismail concluded that Egypt would welcome Kissinger in appreciation for his efforts and would be prepared to discuss any subject. (Ibid.) Kissinger cites this message in *Crisis*, pp. 260–261.

190. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail)[1]

Washington, October 16, 1973, 9:07 a.m.

Dr. Kissinger appreciates the message of Mr. Ismail of October 15[2] and welcomes the fact that the Egyptian side attaches importance, as does the U.S. side, to maintaining this special channel of contact. The U.S. therefore wishes to maintain the greatest possible contact with Arab Governments, especially Egypt's.

Dr. Kissinger wishes to present his frank assessment of the present situation.

The objective of the U.S. side continues to be to terminate the present fighting in circumstances that will facilitate progress toward a final settlement. Egyptian forces have already accomplished much. The humiliation which Egyptians and, indeed, the Arab world felt after 1967 has been erased. A new strategic situation has been established in which reliance by any country on permanent military supremacy has become illusory. Hence, the necessity of a political settlement is becoming much clearer to all parties.

What can the U.S. do in these circumstances? Dr. Kissinger has often said that he would promise only what he could deliver but deliver everything he promised. With its five-point proposal contained in Mr. Ismail's message of October 10, the Egyptian side is asking, in effect, for Israeli agreement, as part of a ceasefire, to Egyptian terms for a total settlement.[3] In Dr. Kissinger's judgment, this is not achievable ex-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. Secret; Sensitive. A handwritten note at the top of the page reads: "Sent Oct. 16 1973, 9:07 a.m."

[2] See footnote 2, Document 189.

[3] See footnote 2, Document 160. Telegram 3136 from Cairo, October 16, conveyed an open message from Sadat to Nixon, read aloud in his speech that day. Sadat said Egypt was fighting to liberate its lands, which had been occupied by Israel in 1967, and to find the means to restore the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. He said Egypt was ready to accept a cease-fire based on Israel's immediate withdrawal from all the occupied territories to the pre-June 1967 borders. It would then be ready to attend an international peace conference at the United Nations, and he would try to convince other Arab leaders to attend. Sadat warned that Egypt was not ready to accept ambiguous promises or elastic phrases subject to all kinds of interpretation, which would only return the situation to stalemate. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

cept by protracted war. No U.S. influence can bring this goal about in present circumstances.[4]

What the U.S. side can promise and will fulfill is to make every effort to assist in achieving a final, just settlement once a ceasefire is reached. Dr. Kissinger believes that recent events may well serve to make it less difficult for the U.S. side in the future to exercise its influence constructively and effectively on behalf of such a settlement. This is said in the full knowledge and awareness of attitudes which Dr. Kissinger found in connection with his efforts on October 11.

The Egyptian side therefore has an important decision to make. To insist on its maximum program means continuation of the war and the possible jeopardy of all that has been achieved. The outcome will then be decided by military measures. The U.S. side will not speculate on this outcome but doubts whether it will be clear-cut. In any event, circumstances for a U.S. diplomatic effort would not be propitious.

If diplomacy is to be given a full opportunity, a ceasefire must precede it. Only in these circumstances can the promised U.S. diplomatic effort be developed. Egypt will find the guarantee for the seriousness of this effort in the formal promise of the U.S. side to engage itself fully as well as in the objective situation.

The goal must be to achieve a ceasefire and turn it rapidly into a real and just peace which reconciles the principles of sovereignty and security.

The U.S. side believes that progress could be made on the basis of a ceasefire in place, accompanied by an undertaking by the parties to start talks under the aegis of the Secretary General with a view to achieving a settlement in accordance with Security Council Resolution 242 in all of its parts, including withdrawal of forces envisaged by that resolution.

Dr. Kissinger greatly appreciates the thoughtful invitation of the Egyptian side to visit Egypt. Once a ceasefire has been achieved, he would be glad to give that invitation the most serious and sympathetic consideration as part of a serious effort to bring a lasting peace to the Middle East.

With warmest regards.

---

[4] In telegram 8217 from Tel Aviv, October 16, the Embassy reported that Meir had said in a speech before the Knesset that day that Israel would never agree to a cease-fire based on Israeli withdrawal to the June 4, 1967, lines. (Ibid.)

191. Minutes of Washington Special Actions Group Meeting[1]

Washington, October 16, 1973, 10:08–11:06 a.m.

SUBJECT

Middle East

PARTICIPANTS

Chairman—Henry A. Kissinger

State
Kenneth Rush
Joseph Sisco

Defense
William P. Clements, Jr.

JCS
Adm. Thomas H. Moorer
V/Adm. John Weinel

CIA
William Colby
Sam Hoskinson

Assistant to the President for Energy Policy
Governor John Love
Charles DiBona

NSC
Gen. Brent Scowcroft
William Quandt
Jeanne W. Davis

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

It was agreed that:

1) The oil contingency plan, including the draft Presidential speech, should be revised to include some intermediate and longer-term steps required to prevent this emergency situation from arising again.

2) The second SR–71 photography flight would be put on hold.

3) The airlift of equipment to Israel should be increased until the rate of delivery is 25% ahead of Soviet deliveries to the Arabs.

4) A sealift pipeline of equipment should begin immediately and be scheduled over the next six weeks.

5) A program should be prepared to go to the Congress in the next day or two requesting additional funds for military assistance to Israel, Cambodia and selected other high-priority countries.

Secretary Kissinger: Bill (Colby), will you brief?

Mr. Colby briefed from the text at Tab A.[2]

Secretary Kissinger: (remarking on the current fighting) Are the Israelis really trying?

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, NSC Institutional Files (H–Files), Box H–117, Minutes Files (1969–1974), WSAG Meetings Minutes, Originals, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Codeword. The meeting took place in the White House Situation Room. Brackets are in the original.

[2] Attached, but not printed.

Mr. Colby: To some extent in Golan and Al Harrah. They claim shortage of equipment is one reason they are not more active.

Secretary Kissinger: And this is our fault, of course. I used to think the Vietnamese were the most obnoxious to deal with.

Mr. Colby: Now you have a new candidate.

Secretary Kissinger: (referring to indicated troop movements on the map) Is this the Israeli flanking movement you mentioned?

Mr. Colby: Yes. Jordan is coming up here, and the Saudi Arabians are just over the border.

Adm. Moorer: The Iraqi are up north on the road and they also have some troops down south.

Secretary Kissinger: (referring to the possibility that the VIP aircraft which left Moscow for Cairo was going to pick up a high-ranking Egyptian for a trip to Moscow) But this wouldn't explain the VIP handling of the departure from Moscow.

Mr. Colby: The procedures might be the same.

Secretary Kissinger: (referring to Egyptian President Sadat's statement that the Egyptians have a missile that can penetrate deep into Israel)[3] How deep into Israel?

Mr. Colby: If they have the Soviet SCUD missile, its range is 160 miles with an 1100 pound bomb. Depending on where it was fired from, it is possible that it could reach Tel Aviv. They could also use the KELT missile which is a 2000 pound air-to-ground missile that could be fired from the TU–16.

Secretary Kissinger: (referring to President Sadat's call for a peace conference of all the parties) And with Palestinian participation and representatives from all the other Arab countries. That would be a happy forum for us, not to mention for the Israelis.

Mr. Colby: I have some of the SR–71 photos here if you are interested in them. (displaying series of photographs) They flew right down the Canal.

Secretary Kissinger: Is there anything here to support the claims of huge tank losses?

Mr. Colby: No, quite the contrary. I should stress that this is only a preliminary scan and there may be more here than we think.

Adm. Moorer: These photos wouldn't necessarily show whether or not a tank had been destroyed. A shell through the engine wouldn't show in photography.

---

[3] Telegram 3137 from Cairo, October 16, reported Sadat's speech that day in the Egyptian Peoples Assembly in which he made the statement. He then read his open message to President Nixon (see footnote 3, Document 190). (National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

Mr. Colby: (referring to the photos) One significant thing is that it shows the narrow penetration all along the Canal. It shows the Egyptians across to about 8 kilometers, which was what the Israelis claimed. However, these photos were on Saturday[4] and there was considerable fighting on Sunday in which the Egyptians claim they advanced deeper. Our very preliminary estimate of the tank situation is that, along the Canal, there were 444 Israeli tanks with 52 destroyed, and 835 Egyptian tanks with 16 destroyed. Around the Golan Heights, there were 419 Israeli tanks with 36 destroyed and 339 Syrian tanks with 7 destroyed.

Secretary Kissinger: There must be more than 7. I don't believe the Israeli claim of 800 tanks destroyed, but there must be more than 7.

Mr. Colby: I agree—I'm sure there are more.

Secretary Kissinger: I like our precise intelligence—somewhere between 7 and 800!

Mr. Colby: (referring to the photos) You can see here the Egyptians moving over a pontoon bridge—look at the numbers of tanks, trucks and artillery moving up.

Secretary Kissinger: I'm amazed the Israelis don't bomb these.

Mr. Colby: They're within the SAM envelope. Also you can see the pipeline here.

Mr. Sisco: Have the Israelis detected the Egyptian pipeline across the Canal?

Mr. Clements: They're bound to know about it.

Mr. Colby: This shows the bomb damage to some of the airfields.

Secretary Kissinger: What is it about airforces that they always bomb at 90° to a runway? They never seem to bomb along a runway.

Mr. Colby: (referring to photo) Here is a SA–6 launcher with its transport moving north along the road to Damascus.

Secretary Kissinger: Can the SA–6 operate alone without SA–2s and –3s?

Mr. Colby: Not as well, although it is an independent system.

Adm. Moorer: They need the radar. The Israelis now say it's the SA–7 and the 23mm gun that is doing the damage. The SA–7 is that Strella missile we've been worried about. And they are firing them in clusters.

Mr. Colby: We have another unpleasant report on that. Some Fedayeen have been ordered to Aleppo to receive some SA–7s and be

[4] October 13.

trained to operate them by some Soviet technicians who are accompanying the shipment. These are those shoulder-mounted weapons. You could sit on the bank of the Potomac and knock out any plane going into the airport. If we had had these in Vietnam we wouldn't have needed helicopters.

Secretary Kissinger: How can they fire busses with a shoulder-held weapon?

Mr. Colby: They have some kind of mount to hold a group of them together.

Secretary Kissinger: And they don't need radar?

Mr. Colby: No, they're heat-seeking.

Adm. Moorer: They are a hand-held Sidewinder.

Mr. Colby: (referring to photo) This is Alexandria harbour and you can see those APCs Tom (Moorer) was talking about.

Mr. Clements: These are the ones that arrived coincidentally with the outbreak of the war.

Mr. Colby: They are the newest Soviet APC. (referring to photo) They are here in a depot in Egypt not far from Cairo.

Adm. Moorer: This is the Soviets' latest weapon. Not even all their own forces have them.

Mr. Clements: It's got everything on it.

Mr. Sisco: Do the Israelis have anything to counter it?

Mr. Clements: No.

Mr. Colby: King Faisal is upset by the American air supply, but this is only temporary.[5]

Secretary Kissinger: How do you know it's temporary?

Mr. Colby: He is inclined to blow off emotionally about things, but he usually calms down.

Secretary Kissinger: Did we make a mistake in informing him?

Mr. Sisco: No.

Adm. Moorer: It was better that way.

Secretary Kissinger: May we turn to oil, now.

Governor Love: I have a paper here.

(Mr. DiBona handed out copies of the paper at Tab B[6] to the principals)

---

[5] The King's response to the Secretary's letter (see footnote 7, Document 186) is in telegram 4543 from Jidda, October 16. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 630, Country Files, Middle East, Saudi Arabia, Vol. IV)

[6] Attached, but not printed.

Secretary Kissinger: (to Gov. Love) You've already learned how to defeat the bureacracy. You hand out a 100-page paper at a meeting when no one has had a chance to look at it.

Gen. Love: Is there any intelligence I don't know about on the oil companies' report on Yamani's statements about a progressive cut-back in oil shipments?

Secretary Kissinger: The oil companies have caused us more trouble than the Arabs. When this is over I am really going out to get the oil companies.

Mr. DiBona: Their report seems to be accurate.

Secretary Kissinger: But did they go out and ask Yamani if they were going to cut back?

Mr. DiBona: This happened in the context of the OPEC meeting.

Governor Love: This is nothing new. It came out of the Vienna meeting.

Secretary Kissinger: Can't we do something about the oil companies?

Mr. Rush: The oil people are calling me every day. I'll call them and calm them down.

Secretary Kissinger: The Israelis have told us they have crossed the Canal with 25 tanks at Bitter Lake and are operating within the Egyptian missile fields.

Mr. Colby: It could be a raid.

Secretary Kissinger: Can they knock out the missiles with this kind of operation?

Mr. Colby: It depends on what's around.

Adm. Moorer: On how many tanks the Egyptians use to oppose them.

Secretary Kissinger: We have no reports of any substantial break-through. Let's go ahead on oil.

Governor Love briefed from the paper at Tab B.

Secretary Kissinger: (to Mr. Clements) Were you involved in this too?

Mr. Clements: Superficially; I hadn't seen the final draft. When the Governor is finished I want to comment on some aspects.

Governor Love: If any of this is going to work, we have to create the feeling that there is a real problem—a crisis. The President has to take the lead and he and some of the rest of us have to take some actions to lead the way. We are proposing a Presidential speech.

Mr. Clements: The only shade of difference between us on this is the degree of emphasis we put on rationing. I don't think the President can rally the country and bring about any real response on a voluntary

basis without saying that we are doing these things now, we are hopeful that they will help, but rationing is inevitable.

Secretary Kissinger: What would we gain by saying that?

Mr. Clements: You would prepare the people for what's coming later.

Secretary Kissinger: Could we say that rationing is inevitable unless people cooperate with the other steps?

Mr. Clements: That might do the trick.

Secretary Kissinger: Is the State Department on board on this?

Mr. Sisco: Yes, our people have been working with Governor Love.

Mr. Clements: We should also stress the intermediate steps—things we should do over the next one, two or three years. We must start these things *now*. Within this intermediate timeframe, we need to start new pipelines, stimulate exploration and development—

Gov. Love: This paper is designed to respond to the immediate problem within a time frame of this winter.

Secretary Kissinger: On rationing, I lean more toward not biting the bullet in the first speech. But he should use the crisis and say we must work all-out so that we never get ourselves in this position again.

Mr. Clements: That's my point.

Mr. Rush: We need a strong, affirmative program so as to avoid it happening again.

Gov. Love: Also, it's good for the President to have something to rally people around with. We need to get a sense of urgency.

Secretary Kissinger: We will all study the paper by tomorrow. This looks to be a good first approximation, but we will give it formal consideration tomorrow.

Mr. Clements: May we ask John (Love) to include some intermediate things.

Secretary Kissinger: Aren't they here? They should be. The speech should make four points: 1) what is the crisis? 2) what do we do now? 3) what are our next steps? 4) what as a nation can we do to be sure we are never blackmailed in this fashion again? Then we'll go to the Congress and ask for what we need and we would have a chance of getting it.

Mr. DiBona: Most of the intermediate things are already up with the Congress.

Secretary Kissinger: Then we'll get them to speed up.

Gov. Love: We might even need something almost like War Board controls plus an energy bank so we can look at our capital bank.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's draft a speech. Let's use this crisis creatively—use it to say "never again." (to Gov. Love) Can you draft it?

Gov. Love: Yes.

Mr. Rush: Completely aside from the Middle East crisis, we should have these programs going.

Gov. Love: The present situation aside, we would never have gotten enough more oil out of Saudi Arabia.

Secretary Kissinger: You put a man in a monopoly position and he will squeeze you. The Saudis would still squeeze us if Israel disappeared tomorrow. Under these circumstances, when they don't need the money, they're better off to keep their oil in the ground. With inflation it will be worth more later.

Gov. Love: I have to be on the Hill at 11:00 tomorrow morning to meet with (Congressman) Hebert on the Elk Hills matter, so if the WSAG meeting could be at another time.

Mr. Colby: I have to be on the Hill tomorrow morning too, to get our budget.

Secretary Kissinger: We'll meet in the afternoon.

(Governor Love and Mr. DiBona left the meeting)

Secretary Kissinger: On the diplomatic front, I expect that plane is carrying Kosygin to Cairo. He cancelled all his meetings with the Danish Prime Minister, who was in Moscow, without explanation. When you read the Egyptian public demands and compare them with what is obtainable, someone has to bring them back to reality. There is no way to get the Israelis back beyond the 1967 line short of complete military defeat. The newspaper campaign in this country against the Soviets is outrageous. They are trapped in this situation just as we are. We must keep this whole thing low key today no matter what happens. There should be no backgrounders. If we can finish this off without a confrontation with the Soviets and without ripping our relations with the Arabs we will have earned our money. Everything else is grandstanding. We will take a very hard line on substance and keep the stuff going into Israel. I'm in touch with the Egyptians and they have been very restrained. Even the Sadat speech wasn't bad.

Mr. Sisco: His ceasefire proposal could be seen as a sign of weakness.

Secretary Kissinger: The diplomacy is still active and until it is ripped I don't want anything to snarl it. There's nothing much more we can do anyhow.

Mr. Colby: Do you want to hold up the SR–71 photo flight? If there is any diplomatic reason against it, I wouldn't do it.

Secretary Kissinger: I don't see what we would gain. I'm not for it. The Egyptians have been very restrained about it.

Mr. Sisco: We haven't heard another word from them after we said we would investigate. It was a limited response. They could have kicked our man out.

Mr. Colby: It could fly over Israel only. But that would be so close that they could argue about it.

Secretary Kissinger: If anything decisive depended on it . . . Put the flight on hold.

Mr. Colby: We've been talking to State about the possibility of some voluntary evacuation.

Mr. Sisco: I sent out another cable to our Embassies asking them to give us a reading. They are all quite calm and no one has requested any evacuation. (to Sec. Kissinger) I would also like to send out a telegram on your circular to the NATO countries. We could tell them to take no initiative, but if they were queried by the governments, they could draw on your circular. Incidentally I told our staff meeting today that your addition to the European message was magnificent.

Secretary Kissinger: Did they agree? (explaining to others) Luns held a meeting and said the US had been fooled by détente. We sent a message saying that anything we signed, they had signed first, so if we were fooled, they were fooled. We told them this was a test of the Alliance—that they couldn't sit on the sidelines and wring their hands. It was a tough message.[7]

Mr. Clements: Fine. They needed to be told.

Secretary Kissinger: What is the resupply situation? I notice we're only bringing in 650 tons a day. At that rate won't we fall behind the Soviets? What is the Soviet rate?

Mr. Colby: 7–800 tons a day.

Adm. Moorer: We have 1000 tons on the ground in Israel and 1000 tons en route.

Secretary Kissinger: But that means the Arabs are getting more than the Israelis.

Adm. Moorer: We have 4 C5As and 12 C141s going in every day. The Israelis have lifted 646 tons.

Secretary Kissinger: I was referring to the rate in the paper.

Gen. Scowcroft: The C5As carry 80 tons each and the C141s carry 25 tons each.

---

[7] On October 15, NATO Secretary General Luns called a North Atlantic Council meeting for the next day to discuss the implications for NATO of the fighting in the Middle East. (Telegram 4919 from USNATO, October 15, National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files) Kissinger's instructions to Rumsfeld on his statement are in telegram 204565 to USNATO, October 16. (Ibid.) The texts of Rumsfeld's statements are in telegram 4936 from USNATO, and a report on the meeting is in telegram 4937 from USNATO, both October 16. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1174, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations File, 1973 Middle East War, 16 October 1973, File No. 11 [1 of 2])

Adm. Moorer: The 141s are carrying 30 tons.

Secretary Kissinger: The major thing is to bring home to the Soviets that they are in a losing game. I want our input to be more than theirs.

Mr. Clements: We can boost it up times four. How much do you want?

Secretary Kissinger: I want to be 25% ahead of them.

Adm. Moorer: We are set up to meet Israel's requirements—we haven't been set up to beat the Soviets. You must remember that every ton of equipment we fly in, we fly out one ton of fuel to get the plane back.

Secretary Kissinger: What can we do about it?

Adm. Moorer: Nothing. It's a long flight from Israel to Lajes.

Mr. Clements: It would be terrific if we could use Adana in Turkey. Or somewhere in Greece. Could we ask?

Secretary Kissinger: We'd be wasting our time. It's out of the question. They would turn us down publicly and we would just be giving them a shot at being pro-Arab. Our only interest in this semi-confrontation situation is to run the Soviets into the ground fast. Give them the maximum incentive for a quick settlement. Bring in more each day than they do.

Mr. Colby: Our first impact should be with the Soviets.

Secretary Kissinger: It should look to the Soviets unambiguously that we are putting in more than they. That's our only interest with the Soviets.

Mr. Sisco: Our rate should be stepped up immediately.

Mr. Colby: I'd like to scrub these Soviet input figures carefully.

Secretary Kissinger: Just make sure the Soviet planners see that we're getting in more equipment than they are to people who are better able to handle it than their clients.

Mr. Colby: The problem is Soviet shipping. We're three weeks behind them on shipping.

Adm. Moorer: We're not so far behind.

Secretary Kissinger: I have no interest in a step-up of the rate of deliveries beyond that of impressing the Soviets. Can you compute what it would take to get 25% ahead of them and stay there?

Mr. Clements: Sure. I didn't realize that was the criterion.

Secretary Kissinger: Our initial criterion was to pay the minimum price with the Arabs. Having paid the price, now we want to face down the Soviets.

Mr. Sisco: Within the shortest time.

Adm. Moorer: They're pretty well saturated on the other end. The Soviets are flying this stuff in to four or five countries at 17 different airfields. We have only one or two airfields.

Mr. Rush: But the big impact will be that we stepped in and in a very short time brought in more than the Soviets had.

[The meeting was interrupted by the ticker announcement that Secretary Kissinger and Le Duc Tho had been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. The Secretary received the congratulations of those in the meeting.]

Secretary Kissinger: The real impact will be if we can catch up in two days with what they did in a week. We must show we can do whatever we want.

Mr. Clements: We can do it on a maximum of times four.

Secretary Kissinger: We don't need to do the maximum. I don't think the Soviets planned this, but they may be too stupid to stop it. If we have the Jewish pressure in this country, they must be having a helluva time in Moscow. They started their airlift last Wednesday,[8] simultaneous with a diplomatic initiative that didn't quite come off. We have to be ahead on supplies. They can see the calculations and they will realize that they are in a month's game.

Adm. Moorer: They may not have known about this in advance but they were suspicious. They had all kinds of ELINT going and they launched a satellite one hour before it started.

Mr. Colby: You asked about parallels with Korea; there is a world of difference.

Secretary Kissinger: You can't support the theory that the Soviets control the Egyptians. And it doesn't make sense as trickery since they stopped us from nothing that we were doing.

Mr. Sisco: It is interesting that in 1967 our proposal was first accepted by the Egyptians then the Soviets came along.

Secretary Kissinger: What about shipping?

Mr. Clements: One ship is loading in Boston and we are prepared to take a shipload of tanks out through Rotterdam.

Secretary Kissinger: You said there were 11 ships. Let's start them moving.

Mr. Clements: Yes, they're available. The question is what does Israel want?

Secretary Kissinger: Don't fill all 11 ships, but let's have a pipeline going. We want to get maximum credit with the Israelis now because we will be making a maximum diplomatic effort afterwards which they won't like.

Mr. Clements: We need some guidance on the money. State and Defense are working on a supplemental, but we now have $1.7 billion in credit sales to Israel and we're about out of soap.

---

[8] October 10.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's use the next two days to get Congressional authorization for a program—and wrap Cambodia in it.

Mr. Clements: We were planning $200 million for Cambodia.

Secretary Kissinger: I'll be goddamned if I'll let them vote only on Israel. And we should do it before the diplomacy works.

Mr. Clements: We have $1.7 billion debt in military credit sales to Israel. That doesn't include the $600 million we're now passing to them. That means $2.3 billion right now. It's important for you all to understand these numbers and have them in mind. And I don't think there's a chance they can repay this.

Secretary Kissinger: The Jewish community should fork up something.

Mr. Sisco: They're talking about a substantial figure.

Adm. Moorer: But not $2.3 billion.

Mr. Sisco: Nothing like that.

Mr. Clements: But we're talking about $2.3 billion.

Secretary Kissinger: There are two problems: What if the war continues? The only way to prevent this is to make it clear that attrition won't pay. Second, what kind of handle will this give us afterwards? If we have an open pipeline we can get our hands on the situation in a way that's not too noticeable. Let's figure out a ship-loading schedule over the next six weeks.

Mr. Clements: I would go for $3 billion for Israel and $200 million for Cambodia.

Adm. Moorer: We're in terrible shape.

Secretary Kissinger: Throw in another few hundred million. How could we get just $3 billion for Israel and not $500 million for something else. I'd like to see some of these great patriots put to the test. I will support such a request and I'm sure the President will support it. But I want it in the Senate before the diplomacy breaks—in 48 hours.

Mr. Clements: You're talking about a full-blown MAP.

Secretary Kissinger: Not necessarily. Let's focus on a few high-priority items. $3 billion for Israel and $500 million for one or two other crisis situations. We can use the regular money for the other countries.

Adm. Moorer: We have broken promises all over the world.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's use this to rectify that situation.

Mr. Clements: Then if we need it, it will be there.

Mr. Sisco: We have Thailand, Korea, Cambodia.

Secretary Kissinger: I'll tell (Israeli Ambassador) Dinitz to turn loose his Senators. I'll tell him it's a package deal. If we can't get something for the others, we will drag our feet on Israel.

Mr. Clements: (to Mr. Rush) Can you get us some better figures?

Secretary Kissinger: Speed is more important than anything else. Get it up to the Hill tomorrow. There is a Congressional Resolution on the situation and we are responding to it. I'll tell Dinitz to rush it through as a package. That we need it for our diplomacy—to show the Russians that they are in a losing supply game.

Mr. Rush: (to Mr. Clements) We'll give you the figures.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's go for $3.5 billion. You can scrub down those figures. If we can get something for these emergencies, we can use the MAP money in Ethiopia and Turkey. On the Saudi Arabians coming to West Point, I favor letting them come ahead. Let's notify them now.

---

192. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

October 17, 1973, 8:44 a.m.

P: Hello.

K: Mr. President.

P: What's new on the diplomatic and military front this morning.[2]

K: On the military front it looks still like a stalemate. On the diplomatic front—all the intelligence analysts who don't know what is going on are now analyzing that something is going on simply because of the Russian visit, the low-key comments from Arab countries, and so forth. I don't think anything will go off until Kosygin has left Cairo.[3]

P: Yeah, yeah.

K: And that's the big . . .

P: The question is whether—what he is there for—whether to gin it up or cool it down.

K: It's inconceivable—well, either way, Mr. President, we are not slowing anything down just because he is there. We are pouring in

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking. Nixon was at Camp David; Kissinger was in Washington.

[2] The President and Secretary discussed the diplomatic and military situation at the end of the day on October 16. (Ibid.) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 271–273.

[3] Kosygin arrived in Cairo the afternoon of October 16.

arms at a rate about 30% greater than they do. Our total tonnage today should start exceeding theirs. We are not—as I said—we are not slowing anything down but it's inconceivable to me that he is going to gin it up.

P: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

K: And there is still . . .

P: You haven't received any message from him?

K: We won't until he gets back, I am sure. But their press is still mute and I think they are trying to work something out. Now whether that is possible with the Egyptians, I don't know. All the information we have is that the Egyptians have been taking a tougher line than they have.

P: This Israeli raid was not that big, huh?

K: Apparently not.

P: I gathered that.

K: There is a tank battle going on now in the Sinai and we don't have any report of its outcome yet. Now, with these four Foreign Ministers,[4] Mr. President, I . . .

P: I have read the talking points.[5]

K: You have?

P: Yeah.

K: The major point, remember, is that meeting was set before we did anything. They are not coming here to protest.

P: Yes.

K: And I would not float any particular idea on them because they are not the ones that are going to be able negotiate it and the particular ideas are already before the Egyptians and Russians.

P: Yeah. Well, when they come down to say Israel must withdraw to the '67 border, what do you say.

K: You say that should be negotiated after a ceasefire.

P: Well, to be negotiated—does it mean—do we agree to that goal?

K: Well, I think it is unattainable, Mr. President, and in my conversations I have always fudged it and said that is an issue that should be addressed within the context of the Security Council Resolution 242 and the major point to make to these people is to separate the ceasefire from the post-ceasefire and the argument that I found very effective

---

[4] On October 17, at 11:10 am, the President met for an hour with the Foreign Ministers of Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Morocco, and Algeria. See Document 195.

[5] Kissinger's talking paper for the meeting is in the National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 664, Country Files, Middle East, Middle East War, Memos and Miscellaneous, October 6–17, 1973.

is—they want America to engage itself in the diplomacy afterwards—that you promised to do. But that means also now that the war has to be brought to an end under conditions which enable us to be in touch with all of the parties. And secondly that if we now try to settle it as the result of the war it will be an endless negotiation with the war going on.

P: That's right. Well if we aren't there to work on the settlement, it leaves them with no other option—just beat the hell out of the Israelis.

K: To have an endless war to push them back.

P: We are the only ones who can influence the Israelis.

K: And that is a point to make. Another point to make is that the military situation has already changed as a result of the war.

P: Oh, it's changed. How do you mean?

K: Well, they will say how do we know that after a ceasefire there won't be a stalemate. And one point to make to them is that the situation has changed strategically. That no country now can claim supremacy in the area anymore and therefore they have to rely on . . .

P: In other words, basically, that Israel can no longer claim supremacy.

K: Right. I wouldn't phrase it that way because . . .

P: I understand. All right, I've got the word.

K: I talked to the Foreign Minister of Saudi Arabia yesterday extending your invitation to the King[6] and he was very pleased. In fact, you can hold him back for a few minutes when the others leave.

P: Yeah.

K: And do two things—thank him for the very moderate and constructive role he has played all week and secondly saying you hope to see the King as soon as a ceasefire is achieved as can be mutually arranged. I would tie it to the ceasefire, Mr. President, because otherwise they'll have another reason for delay.

P: Yeah.

K: And we don't want him—it's not in his interest to be in the forefront of the diplomacy because he will be stuck with all the problems.

P: After the ceasefire . . .

K: After a ceasefire—they may want to get him over here before.

P: We don't want that.

K: No. That would not be advantageous.

---

[6] Kissinger and Saudi Foreign Minister Saqqaf spoke on the telephone at 4:35 p.m. on October 16. Kissinger stated: "I am calling on behalf of the President to tell you that after the end of hostilities the President would be very pleased if His Majesty would accept an invitation to visit the United States." (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

P: We don't want anybody.

K: I think by tomorrow this thing is going to break one way or the other. It may break unfavorably but then Kosygin goes back to Moscow . . . Have you seen *The New York Times* blasting the Nobel Prize?[7]

P: Why have the blasted it?

K: Because they can't bear the thought the war in Vietnam has ended.

P: That's amusing.

K: They should call it the war prize. All the liberals all screaming their heads off.

P: Really?

K: George Ball.

P: Why is he screaming?

K: He just made a snide comment.

P: What—that the war is not over—or what?

K: That the Nobel Prize Committee has a sense of humor.

P: Uh-huh.

K: They can't bear the thought—you know, Mr. President, when they said the détente didn't work. They never say the détente enabled us to settle the Vietnam war because that is the thing they cannot bear—with honor.

P: Yeah, that's right. When we stick to the honor—that's the last straw.

K: Yeah.

P: All right.

---

[7] On October 17, *The New York Times* editorialized that the awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize to Henry Kissinger and Le Duc Tho of North Vietnam for concluding a pact ending the Vietnam war was "at the very least, premature. The truce agreements they achieved in months of tortuous negotiations and mutual recrimination was promptly met by intensive new combat in Laos and Cambodia; North Vietnam embarked on a military build-up which continues to the present day. United States combat forces have at long last been pulled out of South Vietnam, but this de-escalation of a long war has not yet brought Southeast Asia to a state that can conceivably be called peace . . . The will of Alfred Nobel established the procedures for honoring those who have 'done the most or the best work for fraternity among nations, for the abolition or reduction of standing armies and for the holding and promotion of peace congresses.' The appropriateness of this year's awards under this mandate is, unfortunately, far from demonstrable." (*The New York Times*, October 17, 1973, p. 46)

193. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, October 17, 1973, 9:42 a.m.

K: Hello.

D: How are you?

K: Okay.

D: Three things, first this is a—Mr. Brezhnev and Mr. Gromyko asked me to congratulate you heartily with the Nobel Prize.

K: Thank you, I appreciate that.

D: And they would really like to congratulate you. Second, I have instructions to tell you on a very strictly confidential basis for you and for President Nixon, I am to mention to him and you that we are now having consultations with Arab Leaders.

K: Yes, and Kosygin is in Cairo.

D: Yeah, this is exactly what they asked me to tell you. But you already know.

K: No, no we know a Soviet VIP is in Cairo, we've told the Israelis to stay away from Cairo and the Cairo airport.

D: This is Kosygin.

K: We didn't have it confirmed.

D: But they specifically asked to tell you and to the President—

K: I hope you have noticed that we have tried to keep things very quiet here.

D: No, I know. I noticed that it is on low key under the circumstances. But this is really for your information.

K: You know we cannot help if there is speculation because—

D: No, no, I understand.

K: Frankly, we know a Soviet VIP plane is there. And therefore a lot of people know something.

D: No, I understand.

K: But you can be sure that we will not confirm it in any official way or leak it.

D: Yeh, I understand. This is just they asked me specifically to tell—he is there in connection with this consultation and including a consult about formula issue proposal—

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Anatoli[y] Dobrynin File, Box 28. No classification marking. The blank underscores indicate omissions in the original.

K: Anatol, you should understand because I don't want to mislead you, the ceasefire formula—the one on Saturday,[2] we had discussed with the Israelis—this formula, we have not yet discussed with the Israelis.

D: About the 242?

K: Yes.

D: 242.

K: Yes. But we think they will accept it, but we didn't want frankly our press to be agitated against us.

D: Yeh, no, no.

K: So there may be 24 hours after if you come back with something.

D: Yes, I understand.

K: I just—don't want you people to be misled.

D: Yes.

K: You can be sure that what we said to you we will stand by.

D: Hm huh. And the last one, Henry, here is some oral considerations by Mr. Brezhnev to the President. It is not immediate in the sense of proposals, but so to speak of our relations in really good terms, I should say in a quiet way, it is on four pages—probably—it's oral however, maybe I will send it to you—nothing really—

K: Can you send it over within the next hour.

D: I could send it right away.

K: Send it over, just for our records.

D: Just for your own. And if you have some comments or other, please let me know.

K: Okay.

D: I could come to you anytime—or by telephone.

K: You know our policy as I have told you, is to try to really to the utmost to not only keep the détente going, but to strengthen it.

D: Yeh, this is really what—this too—this oral consideration—by Brezhnev. I think it is rather helpful, just for the whole background—there is nothing immediate or specifically new, but in general how it is presented, I think you will find it interesting.

K: Good.

D: Okay. Nothing else for the time being, no?

K: No, we are waiting for you.

D: I understand. This foreign minister not yet—in your office. The foreign ministers of _____

---

[2] October 13.

K: No, they are coming in at 11:30,[3] but we don't think we should give them this formula do you?

D: No—well it's up to you, but I don't know I doubt very much if their reaction will _____ but you may have better indications than we have, but this is my impression, because they are under the pressure from _____

K: No, no we will wait for you before we make an open initiative.

D: Okay. Be in touch.

K: Bye.

[3] See Document 195.

194. Message From Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev to President Nixon[1]

Moscow, undated.

As we have already informed the President we are now engaged in consultations with the leaders of Arab countries concerning the formula suggested by the US side for the decision by the Security Council on the questions of ceasefire and withdrawal of the Israeli forces.[2] For the completion of these consultations we will need some more time.

Meanwhile L.I. Brezhnev would like to share with the President his thoughts of a broader scope in connection with the latest events in the Middle East.

What is going on now in the Middle East is in his view, in some degree, also a test of the determination of both our powers to strictly adhere to the course they took in their relations and in international affairs.

The situation is, no doubt, a complex one. It is clear to both the Soviet leadership and the President. The United States and the Soviet

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 69, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 20, October 12–November 21, 1973. No classification marking. The message is attached to a note from Dobrynin to Kissinger that reads: "Dear Henry, I am sending you herewith the oral message I have told you about this morning over the telephone. Sincerely, A. Dobrynin." A handwritten notation at the top of the page reads: "Handcarried to Peter Burke by Yuri Babenko at approx. 10:30 a.m., 10–17–73."

[2] See Document 193.

Union, to put it straight, have certain established relations with Israel and with the Arab countries correspondingly, and their positions on the questions of a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict differ in many ways.

However, the trouble is not only in that—and may be not so much because of the fact—that the Soviet Union and the United States are of different positions on the Middle East problem. The main thing in this case is that they differently evaluate the situation in the Middle East in the absence of a political settlement there.

The Soviet leaders constantly—and quite recently as well—have drawn the attention of the President to the danger of this situation which threatened with a new explosion at any time. We do not want to allow the thought that the United States desired such an explosion. This would not correspond to the obvious interests of the US itself, as we understand them, and this has been repeatedly said to us by the American side. However it remains the fact that the American side quite indifferently treated our warnings.

The differences in our evaluations of the danger in the lack of settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict can be, of course, the matter of regret. But now this is not what really matters and we shall deal not with this. Now we should look for the ways to unwind the situation. In other words—it is necessary to talk about the future.

While thinking about the present situation and searching for a way out of it one inevitably comes to a thought which may be not a new one but deals with the heart of the problem. Whatever is the outcome of the present hostilities—and it is difficult to foretell it—one thing remains clear: there will be no stable peace in the Middle East unless Israel withdraws from the occupied Arab lands. This is the crust of the matter—and we are deeply convinced in it.

And no matter what wording after all the Security Council adopts, the real meaning of it will be in an immediate turning—using it as a starting point—to the solution of the substance of the problem, and not in dealing with a search of palliative measures. And the substance of the problem—and we would like to definitely emphasize that once again—is in the very necessity of the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967. Naturally, at the same time with that, the security of all states of the area, including Israel, and their borders would be guaranteed—either by the decision of the Security Council or by the great powers; with the withdrawal of the Israeli troops the state of war would be discontinued and the freedom of navigation for Israeli ships as well in the Suez canal and in the straits would be ensured. And other questions of interest to Israel could be also solved, but of course, there may be no question of satisfying Israel's territorial claims.

What may be unacceptable here for Israel and those supporting it? And indeed, all those measures would strengthen the security and the very existence of Israel as a sovereign state. It is known that both our countries—the USSR and the USA—contributed a quarter-century ago to the creation of that state. And consequently the Soviet Union has never been and is not for the liquidation of Israel as a state, although in Israel—and not only there—there are people who slander the Soviet Union, forgetting those facts as well as the gratitude which they expressed to us in the past for saving millions of Jews from bloody massacres by Hitler hangmen. There was a time when those, who are now fulminating an anathema against us in the US and other countries, held thanksgiving church services in honor of the Soviet arms that saved many peoples, including Jewish people, from extermination in the years of joint USSR–US fighting against the fascist plague.

The above stated position regarding the ways of settling the Middle East crisis seems to us, we repeat, as both being just and ensuring the legitimate interests of all states and peoples of that region.

It should not be difficult, as it seems, for the US Government as well to take a similar position, since President Nixon in his speech in the White House on October 15[3] also spoke for the right of each state in the Middle East to preserve its independence and sovereignty, for the discontinuance of military actions there on such a basis, which a lasting peace could be built upon.

True, it was noticed in Moscow that in the same speech of the President of October 15, there appeared a motif of a quite different order. We have in mind his words to the effect that the US policy in connection with the current events in the Middle East is similar to the policy pursued by the US in 1958 when Lebanon was the case. Statements of this kind which recreate in the memory the intervention of the American marines in Lebanon are in no way consistent with the above-mentioned and cannot but cause concern.

In this connection L.I. Brezhnev would like to stress specifically the following thought and he hopes that the President will consider it with due attention: however far the current events have gone they have not passed the point of no return. Therefore the leaders of both the Soviet Union and the United States should exercise restraint.

We are aware that there exist influential circles in the US which would like to destroy what has been already built at a price of great efforts. That should not be allowed.

Those circles have fanned up a real hysteria, and this definition is not ours, the Americans themselves say that. But, let's put it straight,

---

[3] For the text of Nixon's remarks on the Middle East during his October 15 speech, see *Public Papers: Nixon, 1973,* p. 871.

this hysteria aimed against the Arab countries strengthens distrust of the US policy.

The opinion is being formed that the US supports only one policy of Israel, the policy of expansion and annexation of foreign lands. You may disagree with that. But we would like to let you know our appraisal if both we and you want to look into future.

We, on our part, have been doing and will do everything in order not to allow such a turn. We would like to hope that the American side would act in the same way.

If both sides strictly adhere to such a measured approach, despite the difficulties which each side faces, the future course of events will undoubtedly bring forth only positive results. And we shall be able to continue the construction of edifice which we have started to build.

---

195. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, October 17, 1973, 11:10 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

The President
Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Omar Saqqaf, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs from Saudi Arabia
Ahmed Taibi Benhima, Minister of Foreign Affairs from Morocco
Sabah al-Ahmad al-Jabir al-Sabah, Minister of Foreign Affairs from Kuwait
Abdelaziz Bouteflika, Minister of Foreign Affairs from Algeria
Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs
William B. Quandt, NSC Staff
Alec Toumayan, Department of State Interpreter

President: There is great interest in this visit. We haven't had this many photographers since Brezhnev was here.

F. M. Saqqaf: Your Excellency, Mr. President, I am speaking for all four of the Foreign Ministers here and we in turn are speaking for eighteen Arab countries. Our views are approved by all concerned. We are very thankful to you for the chance to meet with Your Excellency to exchange views on the conditions in the Middle East. The main point

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 664, Country Files, Middle East, Middle East War, Memos and Miscellaneous, October 6–17, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Nodis. Drafted by Quandt. The meeting took place in the Oval Office. Kissinger met with the Foreign Ministers at 10:15 in his White House office. (Memorandum of conversation, October 17; ibid.)

that I would like to make clear is that we are not asking for this meeting to engage in a long discussion which will lead nowhere. Nor are we here to challenge anyone. Nor are we here to ask for charity from anyone. All we want is to open the door of discussion to exchange views and to improve our bilateral understanding by discussing the objective situation. When we speak with you, we know that you understand this question. The United States is a great country with a great history and it has fought too much for dignity and independence not to understand us. We are proud to mention when you were Vice President of the United States you contributed to the solution of the Israeli, British and French aggression of 1956. We have no doubt about your efforts to work for peace all over the world, to solve the Vietnam question, and to make the world safe for peace and progress. We look with admiration on what you have done. We hope that you will do with the Middle East question what you have done in Vietnam and in your relations with China. The Middle East is a very sensitive area.

The main issues I wish to raise are the following. We want only to stay within the principles of the UN Charter which allows for self-defense under Article 51. I can assure you that the Arabs have no ill feelings; they are not your enemy, but they do not accept the occupation of their land. Now they are defending their own land, to get back what was taken by force. All we want is for the United States to consider the UN Charter principles, as it has done in the past. Land cannot be taken by force. The continuation of the Israeli occupation would cause difficulty and would make the balance of power shaky and put us under the control of the arrogant enemy we are facing. Also the principle of adding territory by force should be seen in the light of the right of self-determination.

The Arabs are keen to have very good relations with the United States, with all the western countries, but especially the United States. We are keen and we believe that Your Excellency is also keen to continue these good relations. These could be strengthened by stopping Israel from holding the post-1967 lands by force. We believe the world has never seen a more reasonable offer than that offered by President Sadat yesterday.[2] This provides a good chance for the United States to start taking steps to do what is right for the Arabs.

Israel is now being helped by the United States by force. Israel is not being threatened by the Arabs with annihilation. Your help to Israel is seen as hostile to the Arab world. We want no more than a return to the 1967 borders and respect for the rights of refugees to return to their lands or be compensated for what they have lost. This would be enough to guarantee the stability and integrity of Israel.

---

[2] See footnote 3, Document 190.

As we said to Secretary Kissinger, who is doing a great job, the United States has to guarantee the stability and integrity of the Middle Eastern countries. This should apply not just to Israel, but to the Arabs as well. The occupied areas should go back to the Arabs. If you stick to the principle of integrity, that is all we ask. We are very thankful to you, whatever your answer will be. We are trying to have the United States as a good friend in the Middle East and as a good friend with Islamic countries. We believe the United States is the leader in the world. We know there is a great burden on the United States and we need you for everything—for technology, etc. You could be of great help to us. Thank you, Mr. President.

President: Mr. Foreign Minister, Your Excellencies, I appreciate first your moderation and your generous appraisal of our policy. I realize that there are many elements in the Middle East who view the US supply of Israel and current airlift as being pro-Israeli, and therefore they attack the United States. Since your statement aims at a solution, not a confrontation, I particularly appreciate it. I want to be candid with friends—some of you know me personally—I talk straight. I don't promise what I can't deliver. Usually I deliver more than I promise. In any negotiations which may take place in the future, the important factor is one of trust. In this case, I don't ask for your trust on the basis of my past record, but rather on the basis of what I say today. We will provide all of you with a transcript of this conversation.

Now, let's talk politics. First, you've been too polite. Most of you believe that US administrations are politically influenced too much on the side of Israel. That is what you think. As far as I'm concerned, I am not now, nor have I ever been, nor will I ever be affected by domestic politics in my search for peace in the world. I'll give you an example. When Pakistan was being raped by India, I ordered support for Pakistan at a time when opinion in this country was ten to one against us, especially in Congress. Why did I do it, especially in an election year? I did it because it was right. It was not right for India to destroy Pakistan. Today Pakistan still survives. When I make a decision, such as today, it will never be influenced by US domestic political concerns.

When Dr. Kissinger became Secretary of State, I said to him that we had had major successes in China and in our relations with the Soviet Union. I told him that in the next four years it was of greatest importance that we obtain a just and fair peace in the Middle East. I told him to start the machinery going.

Secretary Kissinger: I told some of the Foreign Ministers in New York of our intentions.

President: I have also informed Arab leaders of this. My goal is a just, equitable settlement in the Middle East. I have a more personal point to make. I have said that I will not be affected by domestic consid-

erations. I also want to say that I know the Middle East and the Arab world. I have seen the promise and the problems of Egypt, the little children, how much they need, and it pains me to think that we do not have relations with Egypt, or with Algeria, let alone with Syria and Iraq. I have visited Morocco twice; I have visited Tunisia, Sudan and Libya. Also when I was out of office I visited Egypt and I visited Israel once. I haven't been to Saudi Arabia, but I hope to visit it some day. I would also like to visit Algeria in my second term, as I told Dr. Kissinger yesterday. I also hope to visit Kuwait. Jordan has asked me to pay a visit. Of course, visits alone do not mean much. They would only make sense if a peace were concluded in the Middle East. One of my fervent hopes is that in my last four years as President I can have an active program with the governments of the Middle East working for technological progress and economic development. We can't do this until there is peace. Peace is our goal.

You haven't mentioned the airlift. Let me explain that to you. We tried to avoid war before it started. Also we tried once it began to avoid fueling the war, especially in our contacts with the Soviet Union. The Soviet leaders, and I'm not condemning them, felt they should mount a massive airlift. Only after one week had passed, and over 300 planes had gone in, I decided that we must maintain a balance. This is all we're doing. As soon as we can reach an agreement with the Soviet Union, we will cut off the arms. Sending arms to the Middle East does not contribute to economic progress.

Now, where do we go from here. I know you and the nations that you represent sometimes speak in terms of a take-it-or-leave-it settlement. You say a settlement must include Israeli withdrawal from the 1967 borders. I could say sure, we accept that, but there is no use making commitments we can't deliver on. We don't want any more broken hopes. What has happened in this tragic war, and some good usually comes out of tragedy, is that the military-security situation in the Middle East has been changed. This means that now conditions have been created where we can use our influence to get negotiations off dead center in moving toward a permanent, just and equitable peace such as you want.

Rather than being specific about the terms of a settlement, I want to describe the principles to which we are dedicated. We can then work on implementing them.

And when I say implementing them I mean implementing Resolution 242. With regard to how we do this, as Foreign Ministers you know that it will require talk and negotiations. I totally support Resolution 242. It won't be easy for us to persuade Israel.

Both sides seem to want all or nothing. But as the result of the military situation, things have changed. Things seem dark now because of

the war, but chances for real peace and real movement are better than at any time since 1967. I would like you to convey to your colleagues and to your Chiefs of State that, first, we will work for a ceasefire, but second, our position is not that of getting a ceasefire and then leaving things as they are. Four wars in the Middle East are too many. One was too many. This has hurt progress. A ceasefire is our first goal. I pledge to you that after the ceasefire we will work for negotiations in which we will use our influence—and we will work to get others to use their influence also—for a settlement within the parameters of Resolution 242. Not only will Secretary Kissinger work for this, I'll do so also, particularly in my contacts with the Soviet leadership, and with your governments, and with President Sadat, despite the absence of diplomatic relations. Even with Syria, which is hard for us to communicate with, we can try. We, of course, have a primary responsibility in working with Israel. I have told Prime Minister Meir—and she is a very able, very strong leader—I have told her that my goal is a negotiation leading to a permanent settlement, which would be just and which would require a settlement of the territorial issue. This has fallen on deaf ears. But it will not now. I can't say this for sure since I have not heard from her. But the realities of the situation require movement.

I will close by saying first that my decision will not be affected by US political considerations—ever! My decisions will be affected by my knowledge of the area and my commitment to the independence and integrity of all the states there, as we have demonstrated in Lebanon and in Jordan. I will work for a ceasefire, not in order to trick you into stopping at the ceasefire lines, but to use it as a basis to go on from there for a settlement on the basis of Resolution 242. I make this commitment to you. It is very important to use restraint now. I know how people feel, I understand. We will use restraint, and we hope you will. This has been a tragedy. Since 1956, with the exception of countries like Jordan, Morocco, and Saudi Arabia, our relations with the Arab world have not been as close as we would have wanted. What we want are good relations with countries such as Egypt, Algeria, and others represented here, but we can't do this unless there is a settlement in the Middle East. You have my pledge. I can't say that we can categorically move Israel back to the 1967 borders, but we will work within the framework for Resolution 242. Dr. Kissinger, do you have anything to add?

Secretary Kissinger: I have talked to the Foreign Ministers of Morocco and Saudi Arabia previously and we have all had a talk before coming here. I have made two points, Mr. President. We must end the hostilities now so that we don't submerge the chances for peace by continuation of the conflict or by greater involvement by the United States and the Soviet Union. After the ceasefire we will make a major effort.

President: We will make a major and *successful* effort.

Secretary Kissinger: I can't add to what the President has said. This is the basis of our policy. It is important in such matters that the relations of trust remain. We want to move with a parallel strategy toward the objective of peace.

F. M. Sabah: There is this problem of the arms resupply of Israel. We have seen pictures of the planes, of the ships. Is it so essential that you do this?

President: The problem is that, with the Soviets airlifting in so much before we began to act, we had to take these measures in order to set the stage for a settlement and in order to have influence with Israel in future negotiations. We have no intention of having the airlift do anything more than keep the balance. We are not going to give Israel an offensive capability.

F. M. Sabah: The Arabs pay for the arms that they get.

Secretary Kissinger: That does not seem to me to be the key point. The problem is that if the balance tilts to one side or the other, this raises the chances of great power involvement. This is why we are in urgent need of a ceasefire, against great domestic opposition.

President: You have seen our press and what they are saying in the Senate. I have done less than what the majority of the Senate wants me to do. I will continue on the course we are on, however.

F. M. Saqqaf: Our goal is the implementation of UN resolutions. Israel is opposed to this. The British draft resolution is ambiguous and allows the victors to explain its meaning. We want to hear from the Israelis that they are willing to go back.

President: The key words are secure and guaranteed boundaries.

Secretary Kissinger: These are practical matters to be dealt with. What is important is that a negotiating process begin in order to crystallize views. Neither side can force the other against the wall. We can't get a flat commitment from Israel before negotiations begin. That would risk the indefinite prolongation of the war. Once a negotiating process has begun, our influence can operate. The situation is totally different now from what it was between 1967 and 1973. Then it was assumed that Israel had total superiority. We had no argument to use with Israel for pulling back from the occupied areas. If the war ends soon, they will not be able to use the same arguments. We can use more influence now with them. We see the need for a resolution of the conflict, but we can't ask for everything all at once.

President: The direction is what's important. When I spoke to King Faisal—and I know he feels strongly about this, and I admire him for he is a strong man—the point to be made is that we must face the reality of our being able to influence the Israelis. We haven't had many arguments to use. Now the military balance has changed. Under these cir-

cumstances, there can be constructive negotiations. This is my opinion and I have told you what we will do. You may ask, "Can you guarantee that they will go back?" What we hope for is a ceasefire now. Diplomacy requires movement and agreement on principles of direction. Details can then be negotiated. I have made a commitment to see that things move. You can hold me responsible. I don't break my word. I didn't break my word to Pakistan or to South Vietnam, nor will I break my word to you. You have a commitment from us. A commitment not just to obtain a ceasefire; what we are saying is that the ceasefire will be linked with a diplomatic initiative in which we will use our full weight.

F. M. Saqqaf: Thank you, Mr. President.

President: I want to say candidly to you that my friend, Dr. Kissinger, is a refugee from the Nazis and he is Jewish. But I assure you that he will not be moved by domestic pressures in this country. He has the same goal as I have—a fair and just settlement to all. He hasn't visited the area as I have, but he is committed to a fair settlement. Some of my Arab friends, I know, have asked how they can trust Dr. Kissinger. But I can say that above all he wants a fair and just peace.

F. M. Sabah: We are happy to have Secretary Kissinger as a colleague. I want you to know that we are not anti-Jewish. We are all Semites together.

President: Your attitudes are very reasonable in the Arab world. I admired President Nasser—not when he stirred up trouble among his neighbors—but he was a strong and patriotic man, and I admired him. He went too far when he said that Israel had to be thrown into the sea, because Israel is there, it is fact of life. You gentlemen appear to accept that. All states in the area have a right to exist. Jordan has that right, as do the others.

William B. Quandt[3]

[3] Quandt signed "WBQ" above his typed signature.

196. Note From the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 17, 1973.

Henry,

I met with Dinitz at 12:45 and passed on the message regarding ceasefire linked to Resolution 242.[2] He said he would pass it immediately to the Prime Minister and get back to us as quickly as possible.

Dinitz said that the Prime Minister had asked him to express to the President and to you her appreciation and enthusiasm, and that of Israel, for what the United States is doing.[3] Mrs. Meir says that she is sure the President is mindful of the political and strategic implications of the U.S. action but she is not sure that he fully appreciates how much the U.S. actions have done for the morale of the fighting forces in Israel.

Regarding the military situation, Dinitz said that the force west of the Canal was still operating and that "several scores" of tanks were in the force. He says there is a heavy tank battle on the east bank of the Canal opposite the Israeli strike force on the west bank. The Israelis hope to clear this area near Deversoir and are planning to put a pontoon bridge across the Canal at that point.

The Syrian front is relatively quiet although they anticipate that the Iraqis are preparing to mount an attack.

Dinitz had several questions regarding resupply. He requested to know what the delivery policy on F4's over the next few days would be and also when and how many A4's we were planning to deliver. He reiterated an urgent need for bridging material, especially in light of

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, June 4–October 31, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive. Sent for information.

[2] During their conversation, Scowcroft informed Dinitz that the Soviet Union had sent a message (Document 194) asking the United States what its attitude would be toward a proposed resolution linking a cease-fire to Resolution 242. He told Dinitz that the U.S. response was that the United States was not opposed in principle, but would have to see the specific language. Dinitz asked if this meant a standstill and Scowcroft replied that it did, which is why the U.S. response had been "very vague." He noted that the United States would like Israel's views on this and Dinitz said that he would have to cable home. (Memorandum of conversation, October 17; National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL ISR–US)

[3] In telegram 826 from Tel Aviv, October 17, Keating reported on his conversation with Meir, during which she had expressed "Israel's deep gratitude" for U.S. support. She said that Israel well recognized the difficult issues facing the President when he decided to come to Israel's aid, and noted that the entire free world should realize that an important byproduct of this would be to preclude Soviet domination of the Middle East. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 610, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 12, March–October 1973)

the battle report which he had just presented. He reminded that they had requested 50 helicopters, but said they would take any number they could get in a hurry. He expressed appreciation for the TOW missiles being provided, but asked if there were any more available anywhere, either off the production line or perhaps going to the FRG (in this case, he said that Golda would ask Willy Brandt to acquiesce in their diversion.) He said that Israel is attempting to destroy Egyptian armored forces and that the TOW is urgently needed for that.

Latest cumulative losses: 27 F–4, 48 A–4, 11 Mirage, 6 Super-Mystere, 2 helicopters.

Brent[4]

[4] Printed from a copy that bears this typed signature.

197. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 17, 1973, 1:40 p.m.

K: I wanted to let you know, these Arabs are floating on air, they say you are a great man and that you spoke to them[2] with a sincerity they knew you would, then we went into a lot of detail on how to do it, assurances they would do it. I think we are going to get it, a cease fire within three or four days.

N: Main thing is Sadat said, the press, here's the guy who could cut off the oil for all of the world . . . very constructive.

K: I also talked to Joe Sisco. He also said when traveling with Rogers, he never knew what he was talking about . . . with you you always know what you're talking about.

N: Well . . . I thought it went well.

K: Thought it was spectacular.

N: That's good.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] See Document 195.

K: Just saw telegram from El-Zayyat, got the Arabs, quite important. Had a big argument with the Algerian, how can we be sure we can believe the President. I told him, look here, for years I told him the President was harassed. They wanted to know were we willing to bring pressure on Thieu. Let the other side make a proposal and we will see whether we will bring pressure. I am not drawing a parallel, but you can figure out for yourself.

N: Well, I left a lot of things . . . but I said I wanted to visit their countries, loved all of them, which was true.

K: Mr. President, I think it was a most successful morning. What's more important, they were happy . . . very successful morning.

N: Now, on to the Russians. When do you expect to hear from Kosygin.

K: We've got long message from Brezhnev,[3] now in itself doesn't say anything, he skirts the issue . . . matters have not reached the point of no return and in détente . . . we will hear from them by tomorrow night.

N: Meantime, you might pick up Senator Mansfield's brilliant suggestion.[4]

K: Mr. President, when have they not failed us.

N: Really something.

K: When have they ever stood behind the President?

N: No, but come up with a cockeyed scheme of going to the United Nations, having a six power conference . . .

K: Never support what we are doing.

N: This meeting with the Arabs just about killed the damn press people. They expected all hell to blow up.

K: Of course.

N: There was a huge number out there today.

K: Well, trotted out the poor Foreign Ministers.

N: At a time when we are supplying Israel.

K: At a time when American planes are landing in Tel Aviv every half an hour. People take everything for granted, no minor feat.

N: Anything doing with battle?

K: Seems to be a tank battle going on. . . .

N: I think it's a stalemate, I really do.

---

[3] Document 194.

[4] On October 16, Senator Mike Mansfield called on President Nixon to take the lead in convening a six-nation summit conference—the United States, the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, the Soviet Union, and Japan—to end the war in the Middle East.

K: I do too.

N: Both sides sort of bled.

K: I suppose the Israelis can barely win, but not at any price that's worthwhile.

N: OK, have a good rest.

---

198. Minutes of Washington Special Actions Group Meeting[1]

Washington, October 17, 1973, 3:05–4:04 p.m.

SUBJECT

Middle East

PARTICIPANTS

Chairman—Henry A. Kissinger

State
Kenneth Rush
Joseph Sisco
Robert McCloskey

DOD
William Clements
Robert Hill

JCS
Adm. Thomas H. Moorer
Vice Adm. John P. Weinel

CIA
William Colby
Samuel Hoskinson

Assistant to the President for Energy Policy
John Love
Charles DiBona

NSC Staff
Major Gen. Brent Scowcroft
William Quandt
Jeanne W. Davis

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

It was agreed that:

1) Assuming the present situation can be settled soon, the President should proceed with the proposed emergency oil program approximately two weeks after settlement.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, NSC Institutional Files (H–Files), Box H–117, WSAG Meetings Minutes, WSAG Minutes, Originals, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Codeword. The meeting took place in the White House Situation Room.

2) The air lift should be maintained at the highest level and some equipment should be moved from resources in Germany through Rotterdam.

3) A decision on additional A-4s and F-4s will be made tomorrow to take advantage of the present refueling arrangements.

4) A sealift of equipment should be begun immediately with the maximum number of ships loaded and on their way.

5) A decision on a request for a supplemental for military assistance to Israel, Cambodia and selected other countries will be made following discussion in a LIG meeting Thursday morning at 9:30 a.m.

Secretary Kissinger: May we have the briefing?

Mr. Colby: briefed from the text at Tab A.[2]

Secretary Kissinger: Tom (Moorer), do you have anything?

Adm. Moorer: I think the Canal crossing of those Israeli tanks is nothing more than a raid on the Egyptian air defenses. I don't think they can survive long.

Secretary Kissinger: Can they knock out anything?

Adm. Moorer: Yes, they already have knocked out three of the SA–2s.

Mr. Sisco: I've got a crazy idea that they might be trying to draw in some Egyptian aircraft.

Adm. Moorer: Yes, I think they're trying to clear some of the SAM area, with a view to sucking in some of the Egyptian aircraft, engage them in dogfights and knock some of them off.

Mr. Colby: Can't we find out what they have in mind?

Adm. Moorer: Yes, we'll ask them. Also, I think the Israeli attacks on Port Said are in response to Sadat's remarks about the missiles.[3] I don't think the Egyptians have any Egyptian missiles. The Israelis think the Soviets have given them some SCUDs, and we have seen some on the docks at Nicolai, but we have no proof that there are any in Egypt.

Mr. Clements: Did I see a report that the Israelis had put a commando force into Port Said?

Adm. Moorer: There has been some naval action; they have shelled and bombed it, but I haven't heard of any commando raid.

Gov. Love: How serious is it if the Russians have given the Egyptians the SCUD?

---

[2] Not attached.

[3] See footnote 3, Document 191.

Adm. Moorer: It's a terror vehicle. The effect would be similar to the use of the V–2 rockets against England in WW II. It would have no really serious effect but it would scare hell out of the Israelis. It's an expensive way to deliver a 1000-pound bomb. Israel can play that game too.

Gov. Love: But it would be an expansion of activity and would probably invite a bombing of Cairo?

Mr. Colby: Yes.

Secretary Kissinger: Could we turn to oil.

Gov. Love: We have added some of the medium and longer-term actions you asked us for.

(Mr. DiBona handed around the paper at Tab B and Governor Love briefed from the paper)[4]

Gov. Love: We have put all of these things in a proposed speech by the President. In addition, I think we are all in general agreement on identifying the kinds of things that need to be done. The problem is not identification. We need a timing and goals discussion and a structure to allow the things to get done. That's why I convened last week the Cabinet-level Energy Policy Committee. We need to set out some five-to-seven-year goals, with some "man-on-the-moon" type urgency. I have set up a series of interdepartmental Task Forces to work out some incremental movements: what we need by the end of 1973, end of 1974, etc.; what needs to be done and the constraints. I think we are on the way to a coherent, feasible program.

Secretary Kissinger: We don't expect an oil cut-off now in the light of the discussions with the Arab Foreign Ministers this morning. What is the temperature of the oil companies? Did you see the Saudi Foreign Minister come out like a good little boy and say they had had very fruitful talks with us?[5] (to Mr. Clements) Despite what your colleagues have done to screw us up with their messages, we don't expect a cut-off in the next few days.

Mr. Clements: They're not my colleagues. My colleagues are in this room.

Secretary Kissinger: (to Gov. Love) Have you redone the speech to take into account the longer-term things?

Gov. Love: Yes. As you said yesterday, this presents us with an opportunity to get some things done. I think we should proceed even after this is over.

---

[4] Attached, but not printed.

[5] Foreign Minister Saqqaf spoke to the press after the meeting with Nixon. See *The New York Times*, October 18, 1973.

Secretary Kissinger: I agree. Two weeks after this thing comes to an end, I think the President should send a message to the Congress. He should point out that this situation has brought home our vulnerability and that we can't stay in this position. He should press for urgent action on the things that are before the Congress now, plus some other things. We have been doing a tight-rope act and we can't pull it off again. We have been threatening the Arabs with pulling out of the diplomacy. If the diplomacy fails, we're in a helluva spot. We have to get ready.

Mr. DiBona: The European markets are in complete disarray. European shipments to the U.S. are already off. We have to be particularly careful about what we say, and have to watch very carefully this winter, even if there is no cut-off.

Mr. Clements: If we get by without this extreme emergency, we will still have problems. In the Mediterranean there has already been a cut-back by about 12% in the amount of crude available. We'll feel it in the fleet—we'll have to seek alternate sources for our ships there.

Secretary Kissinger: Also, we must see to it that the Europeans can never again behave as they are behaving now.

Gov. Love: Some European countries are getting anxious about the idea of sharing agreements. If there is any sharing, it will be all one way.

Mr. Sisco: Your study shows that clearly.

Mr. Rush: I've been in touch with the oil companies. They said they were not the source of the article in the *Times* yesterday: that the State Department was.[6] They have agreed to play in a low key.

Secretary Kissinger: They shouldn't be playing at all. They have an unparallelled record of being wrong.

Mr. Rush: I didn't tell them that.

Mr. Sisco: I think Governor Love's people have done a good job. It's good to see the entire thing laid out in one speech.

Secretary Kissinger: Assuming we can bring this thing to a conclusion in a short time, two weeks later we should start this program. The Arabs have to know that blackmail is a losing game.

Mr. Rush: If we get that Alaska pipeline that will bring in more than we get from the Middle East.

Mr. DiBona: The Alaska oil at its peak will equal the total lifting and production from the Arab countries. But by the time that is flowing, our demand will have increased.

---

[6] The October 16 article in *The New York Times* reported that Saudi Oil Minister Yamani told Western oil executives that Saudi Arabia would cut oil production if the United States began overtly to supply Israeli forces.

Mr. Clements: We need two pipelines.

Mr. Sisco: What do we need to get that out of the Hill?

Mr. DiBona: I'm told they're down to the last wire.

Mr. Clements: We've been hearing that for a long time. They have no sense of urgency.

Gov. Love: If the President goes on TV and lays out a whole program, that will create a sense of urgency.

Secretary Kissinger: We'll get it done in two weeks after this is over. (Referring to the Love paper) This is a superb job.

(Governor Love and Mr. DiBona left the meeting.)

Secretary Kissinger: In our diplomacy, there's not too much that is new. The Arabs left their meetings with us in an extremely conciliatory frame of mind. They had an hour with me before they saw the President for an hour; then another hour with me.[7] They are putting the pieces in place. But we have to keep the stuff going into Israel. We have to pour it in until someone quits.

Mr. Clements: How do you propose to break the logjam in the Security Council?

Secretary Kissinger: The worst thing that would happen would be for some eager beaver to start moving in the Security Council until the pieces are in place. When everyone is lined up, it will break in the Council quickly. We want it this way.

Mr. Sisco: If someone makes a move before everyone is prepared, we will get a Security Council resolution demanding withdrawal to the 1967 lines which we would have to veto.

Secretary Kissinger: There would be confrontation and someone would have to back down. If our diplomacy works, it will crystallize into a Security Council resolution. Until Kosygin gets back to Moscow, nothing will happen. I think things are moving along all right.

Mr. Clements: Who was the senior Arab in the group?

Secretary Kissinger: The Saudi Foreign Minister was the spokesman. The Algerian Foreign Minister made his revolutionary speech but even he left in a calm frame of mind.

Mr. Sisco: And he is normally more negative, more radical than his President.

Secretary Kissinger: What about resupply?

Adm. Moorer: (using a series of charts) In the last 24 hours, we have brought in 21 aircraft with 775 tons. The Soviets have brought in

---

[7] See Document 195 and footnote 1 thereto.

69 aircraft with 740–912 tons. The Soviets are flying in some of their aircraft and it's difficult to get an exact equivalent in terms of tonnage. They started first, but now we are lifting more than they are. And we're working on the ship problem.

Secretary Kissinger: The President wants us to push both the air and sea lift. He also wants us to start moving things out of Rotterdam and Germany.

Adm. Moorer: We have here a flow chart by type of aircraft, and a graph of our programmed flight schedule. We were a little behind, but we have caught up now and we are right on schedule.

Mr. Clements: We've upped the number of planes. We flew 5 C5As and 15 C141s today, as opposed to 4 and 12 before.

Secretary Kissinger: Can we stay ahead?

Mr. Clements: We want to talk about that here. We are now up 25% as you asked.

Adm. Moorer: You asked about the safety of our aircraft. (referring to map) Here is their route from Gibraltar to Tel Aviv. We have our carriers and some destroyers with radar spotted in the Mediterranean. The planes check as they go by. We have surveyed the areas where the Arab nations might control fighters and there is only one airfield that could give us trouble. We have one ship watching that airfield. The Israelis pick them up 190 miles from Tel Aviv and escort them in. The only real hazard is that the airfield might be bombed, and we couldn't do much about that.

Mr. Clements: We have two emergency airfields.

Adm. Moorer: I think we have them covered with adequate safety.

Secretary Kissinger: What are the rules of engagement?

Adm. Moorer: These planes are not armed. The transports could be warned in plenty of time to turn north. They couldn't be overtaken. We have 4 A4s on the ship, and we will fly in 26 more beginning October 19. They will go from Norfolk to Lajes, refuel, refuel again over the *Kennedy*, overnight on the *Roosevelt*, refuel over the *Independence*, then to Tel Aviv. If we are going to put in more than the 30 of these aircraft, we should tack the rest on the end of this line so we don't have to set up this elaborate refueling arrangement again.

Secretary Kissinger: When do you have to know?

Adm. Moorer: We should know in three or four days. Now we have a tanker problem. The Spaniards have said they want to be certain we're not using Spain in any way for this activity. We have the same problem with the Italians. In Liverno, they wanted assurances that we were not taking out ammunition to ship to the Middle East before the stevedores would go to work. I put out a message to our aircraft as to what they should do in an emergency if the airfield were

knocked out. Our Ambassador to Portugal came in with a message saying "don't land in Portugal—go back to Lajes." Well, if they could have gone back to Lajes I wouldn't have sent the message in the first place. I was just trying to give them some alternatives in case of an emergency.

We have refuelers at Lajes and Torrejon. Lajes provides the fuel for the first and second fuelings and Torrejon for the rest. Sigonella would be the ideal place to refuel. Access to Mindenhall [Mildenhall?] doesn't help us any. If we are denied the use of Spain and can't use Sigonella, we will have to put additional tankers in the Azores—10 instead of 6 or 7. Then a tanker could follow the fighters across, fuel them, and go back. Of course, the farther they have to go from their base, the less fuel they can carry for the other aircraft. Also, we're vulnerable on Lajes. They have frequent heavy cross-winds and they would stop the operation. I just want to emphasize what a thin thread this is. It's the same for the F–4s and for the A–4s. If we are going to send in more than 28, let's do it now. We'll be squeezed tighter and tighter on our capability.

Secretary Kissinger: I'll let you know tomorrow.

Adm. Moorer: With the A–4s we could put another carrier out of Norfolk, but that wouldn't take care of the F–4s.

Mr. Clements: All the Services are doing a beautiful job on this.

Secretary Kissinger: It is very impressive.

Adm. Moorer: Lisbon is complaining about my message, but this was an emergency message. If they could go back to Lajes, I wouldn't have sent the message. If that pilot has an aircraft full of fuel he is going to land it somewhere—even Cairo, if necessary. I was just trying to give them the best of some bad choices.

Mr. Clements: There's not one thing the Services have been asked to do that they haven't done beautifully.

Secretary Kissinger: Yes, it's a good job. As the Soviets analyze it, it must look to them as though we're ahead and growing.

Adm. Moorer: Then we'll have to go to the ships.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's get it done.

Mr. Clements: We are loading one ship and there are several more available. They're all lined up. We just want to know what to put on them.

Secretary Kissinger: We'll be much better off if we have things on ships and on their way when there is a ceasefire. Otherwise we will have to fight over every goddamned ship. We've paid our entry fee to the Arabs. If we get a ceasefire and then we load the ships, there will be hell to pay. Let's get the maximum number of ships loaded now, then we can play with the delivery schedule if there is a ceasefire and we

want to. The President has promised the Israelis we will replace their losses.

Mr. Sisco: But we shouldn't go to the ships at the expense of the airlift.

Mr. Clements: I understand. But for the ships to work, it will take a 30-day run from right now. We will have to keep the flow moving by air until the ships get there. Once the ships begin to arrive, then we can have a pipeline.

Secretary Kissinger: We have promised the Soviets that we will cut off the airlift after a ceasefire. What if they have a sealift underway and we don't, and someone breaks the ceasefire?

Mr. Clements: We're just waiting for someone to say 'go' on the ships.

Secretary Kissinger: The President has said it and I have said it. We are now in a war of attrition. Without our airlift, Israel would be dead now. We have a dual problem with Israel: we have to keep the stuff going to them for the sake of our reliability, but we must have the option to turn it off after a ceasefire if we want to. We will pay less with the Arabs for anything that is already at sea.

Mr. Sisco: I want to underscore the word "additionally". We don't want to weaken the impact of the airlift by loading the sealift.

Mr. Clements: We won't.

Mr. Colby: Also, the President wants to go with the material from European sources.

Mr. Clements: We have 25 or 26 tanks on railroad cars right now about to go to port.

Secretary Kissinger: I think our sealift is about where our airlift was last Wednesday or Thursday. Let's get it to where our airlift was on Saturday.

Mr. Clements: I did not understand that you wanted to get that 30-day pipeline underway.

Secretary Kissinger: I want to see ships popping out of harbours. Bill (Clements) is the greatest expert I know at procrastination and he's also the greatest expert on speeding things up.

Mr. Clements: (to Secretary Kissinger) If you'll wear your State Department hat for a minute, those railroad cars can't leave Germany without clearance. State will have to get that.

Mr. Rush: We'll tell them we're practicing moving the tanks out so the Russians can't capture them.

Secretary Kissinger: Tell them it's our evacuation exercise.

Adm. Moorer: Israel gave us a list of high-priority items of about 10,000 tons. We've already hauled 4000 tons. Within a week we will have delivered everything they have asked for.

Secretary Kissinger: The whole structure has changed. We thought Israel was so preponderant that we had to hold things back from them. Any war now is one of attrition. Our veto is in supply, not what they have when it starts. To get a ceasefire, we have to become engaged; and when we are engaged, the Arabs will scream bloody murder. Now that we have paid the price, let's be sure everything is at sea.

Mr. Colby: You will see the greatest reserve stocks on record in Israel for the next couple of years.

Secretary Kissinger: We can assess that after the ceasefire.

Mr. Colby: Yes, we shouldn't worry about it now.

Secretary Kissinger: What about the supplemental?

Mr. Clements: We have all agreed the lead is with State. Defense will support them all the way.

Mr. Rush: We believe the best course is to ask for supplemental grant military assistance for Israel of $2.2. billion, with $200 million for Cambodia and $500 million for the others.

Secretary Kissinger: Our Congressional people here think that you might get the grant for Israel but they think the $200 million for Cambodia would be hard to defend. We have a MAP bill in conference right now, and they are afraid this would jeopardize the MAP bill.

Mr. Rush: It may work to bring the MAP bill out.

Secretary Kissinger: We are having a LIG meeting at 9:30 tomorrow morning. You will all be represented. Listen to what the White House legislative experts say, then we can make the decision afterwards. We'll get a Presidential decision by noon tomorrow. But we should give a hearing to the White House legislative people who say it will jeopardize the MAP effort.

Adm. Moorer: It already has.

Secretary Kissinger: At the worst, you think it will force the present MAP bill out?

Mr. Rush: Yes.

Mr. Sisco: We can get some help from the Jewish community on this.

Secretary Kissinger: I have to go up to see the President. He may want to see all of you, if you could wait here for a few minutes. (Secretary Kissinger left the meeting)

(During his absence AP–116 was brought in reporting that the Arab oil producer countries had agreed to cut production not less than

5% immediately, with an additional 5% cut each month until Israel withdraws to the 1967 lines.)[8]

Mr. Rush: Who does that mean—Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Algeria, Libya, the Emirates . . .

Mr. Colby: This really hurts the Europeans pretty badly. But they don't say they're cutting down deliveries, and the Europeans do have some reserves.

Mr. Rush: They have enough in storage for about a week.

Mr. Clements: There is one thing about (Saudi petroleum official) Yamani—he won't say boo if he hasn't cleared it with the King.

Mr. Sisco: That's right—the King may authorize him to do things at a lower level rather than engage himself in them.

Mr. Rush: But it could be that what he says is not what the King will actually do.[9]

(Mr. Kissinger returned to the meeting)

Secretary Kissinger: The President would like to see you for a few minutes.

(The four principals, plus Mr. Sisco and General Scowcroft, accompanied Secretary Kissinger to see the President.

[8] Telegram 3784 from Kuwait, October 17, reported that the Persian Gulf Oil Ministers at the October 16 OPEC meeting in Kuwait decided to present the oil companies with a "take it or leave it" demand for a 70 percent increase in posted prices. Meanwhile, the Oil Ministers were meeting at OAPEC headquarters to discuss the role of oil in the current Middle East crisis. The Embassy believed that the Ministers would feel the need to make a "symbolic gesture" limiting the crude oil available, but also expected that they would place more emphasis on using their financial resources to support Egypt and Syria. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

[9] Telegram 4591 from Jidda, October 18, transmitted a letter from King Faisal to President Nixon in which Faisal urged the United States to pressure Israel to accept Resolution 242, to withdraw from the territories occupied in 1967, and to grant the Palestinian people their rights. The King warned that if this was not done and the war was allowed to continue, Communism would spread and U.S. interests in the region would be liquidated because of U.S. support for Israel. Saudi Arabia sincerely wished to continue its friendship with the United States, the King said, but if it continued to stand by the side of Israel, then this friendship risked being diminished. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1175, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, 1973 Middle East War, October 18, 1973)

199. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, October 17, 1973, 4 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

President Nixon
Henry A. Kissinger, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Amb. Kenneth Rush, Deputy Secretary of State
William Clements, Deputy Secretary of Defense
William Colby, Director, CIA
Admiral Thomas Moorer, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs
Major General Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

SUBJECT

WSAG Principals: Middle East War

President: I want to thank you all for your efforts.

No one is more keenly aware of the stakes: Oil and our strategic position.

We can't go down the road to a ceasefire without a negotiating effort which will succeed. The purpose of the meeting this morning [with four Arab Foreign Ministers][2] was to contribute to this. Some of these—not the Algerians—are desperately afraid of being left at the mercy of the Soviet Union. The Saudis, Moroccans, and even the Algerians, fear this. The other aspect is our relations with the Soviet Union. This is bigger than the Middle East. We can't allow a Soviet-supported operation to succeed against an American-supported operations. If it does, our credibility everywhere is severely shaken.

We went through this with India and Pakistan. I told the Foreign Ministers that Israel can play the press, but they should know that in the India–Pakistan war, the public was pro-Indian and I supported Pakistan not because it was popular but because it was right.

In order to have the influence we need to bring Israel to a settlement, we have to have their confidence. That is why this airlift. You remember, Tom [Moorer], that before Cambodia, Westy said we need only go for Parrot's Beak, and I said take it all.

I know the sealift is controversial but we must be credible. I want it to go forward. Our diplomacy will probably work before it gets there,

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, NSC Institutional Files (H-Files), Box H–92, Meeting Files, WSAG Meetings, Middle East, 10/17/73 [1 of 2]. Secret. All brackets are in the original.

[2] See Document 195.

but we must get the message to Israel and to the Soviet Union. We can't get so much to them that they will be arrogant, but we can't be in the position where Israel puts pressure on Congress for us to do more.

Kissinger: They have a good plan.

President: Then do it.

Kissinger: Mr. President, this has been the best-run crisis since you have been in the White House. We have launched a massive airlift yet we have gotten only a small bitch in TASS and you stand here getting Arab compliments in the Rose Garden.

President: There is still lots of danger. There are lots of units in that area. The Soviets have got to choose: Will they risk our whole relationship in order to test us in the Middle East? They have got to know we won't be pushed around in our support of any nation anywhere. The second point is that we have to do enough to have a bargaining position to bring Israel kicking and screaming to the table.

Kissinger: As the Soviet Union is doing now with Egypt.

President: I know one problem is our NATO friends. We are going to go ahead and do it. It is very important that DOD be just as effective on the sealift as on the airlift.

Moorer: Portugal is the only place to land and the crosswind can halt everything. Ten years ago we had bases everywhere.

President: We have to rethink that, and we won't forget the Portuguese.

We are not out of the woods, but we should know in a few days.

Clements: Your military services have just reacted in an outstanding fashion, Mr. President.

President: So have you all. Thank you very much.

---

200. Editorial Note

In response to the decision by the United States to resupply key weapons to Israel, on October 17, 1973, the 11 members of the Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries (OAPEC) announced an immediate cutback of oil production by 5 percent, to be followed by successive monthly cutbacks of 5 percent until Israel withdrew to the 1967 frontiers and the "legal rights" of the Palestinians were restored. In a separate development, the six Persian Gulf members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) unilaterally increased the price of oil by 70 percent, from $3.01 to $5.12 a barrel. Several coun-

tries, including Libya, Abu Dhabi, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia either announced or threatened a total embargo against the United States. As the Kuwaiti Minister of Oil and Finance, Abdul Rahman al-Atiqi, explained to the Ambassador to Kuwait, William A. Stoltzfus, the following day, the cumulative effect of the initial reduction of oil production of each OAPEC state was intended to result in a "complete embargo on oil to the United States" and to demonstrate that the Arab oil producers were serious "Front Line Fighters" in the war against Israel. (Telegram 3790; National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1175, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, 1973 Middle East War, October 18, 1973)

Secretary of State Henry Kissinger recalled that at the beginning of the Arab oil boycott, the Nixon administration believed the embargo was merely "a symbolic gesture of limited practical importance." (Kissinger, *Years of Upheaval*, page 873) According to a paper prepared in the Central Intelligence Agency on October 19, the effect of the oil embargo on the United States "would be relatively small, and after the first month, the brunt of the cutback would fall on Europe and Japan." The CIA also believed that U.S. companies that produced most of the Middle East oil would be able to shift supplies among themselves to avoid the embargo. From the point of view of U.S. vulnerability, the CIA paper concluded: "it is perhaps fortunate that this particular crisis occurred now rather than a few years hence," since by that time it was predicted that the United States would be importing nearly 5 million barrels per day of Arab oil or 21–22 percent of U.S. consumption. (Central Intelligence Agency, DI/OER Files, Job 80–T01315A, Box 36, Folder 2)

After October 19, however, the crisis began to worsen when President Nixon asked the Congress for a $2.2 billion package of assistance to Israel to pay for equipment sent during the airlift. On October 23, Prince Fahd of Saudi Arabia sent Kissinger a backchannel message informing him that his country would maintain a total embargo on oil exports to the United States until Israel withdrew to its borders as they existed before the June 1967 war. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 139, Country Files, Middle East, Saudi Arabia, Nov/Dec 1973) In his memoirs, Kissinger maintained that "the true impact of the embargo was psychological" (Kissinger, *Years of Upheaval*, page 873), but the administration was determined to end it before the crisis spun out of control. "We will break it," he said at his staff meeting on October 23. "We will not provide auspices for the negotiations until they end it." Kissinger added: "We will not participate in any joint auspices until the oil boycott ends." He concluded: "And also, we will start an emergency oil program in this country, which is more symbolic than substantive." (National Archives, RG

59, Transcripts of Secretary of State Kissinger's Staff Meetings, 1973–77: Lot 78 D 443, Box 1, Secretary's Staff Meetings)

Extensive documentation on the oil embargo and the U.S. response is in *Foreign Relations,* 1969–1976, volume XXXVI, Energy Crisis, 1969–1974.

---

201. Minutes of Cabinet Meeting[1]

Washington, October 18, 1973.

Shultz: Brezhnev and Kosygin were genuinely puzzled about things going on in the United States.[2] They seemed genuinely sincere about détente. Brezhnev asked me: "Is the problem really about Jewish emigration, or does the United States want to go back to the Cold War." They seemed to be saying that if this is the way people think Jews will get out of the Soviet Union, they are mistaken.

President: The significant thing is that Brezhnev has staked his leadership on better relations with the United States. He needs us for European détente, for trade, and to keep the United States from tilting toward the Chinese. This puts the Middle East into perspective—what will they do. Last May—in May of '72—they didn't chuck us for the mining of Haiphong. Of course they must support their clients, but the question is whether they will do it at the jeopardy to all the other fish they have to fry. Henry, you expand.

Kissinger: In 1969, the President announced the concept that came to be known as linkage—the idea that there was a connection between their behavior in Vietnam, Berlin, the Caribbean and general policy. We were violently attacked for this idea. We were told that trade was beneficial in itself and shouldn't be linked to the political sphere. We were accused of an outmoded Cold War policy. It took us two years to get the Soviet Union to look at things this way. Then we had simultaneous crises in 1970 on the autobahn, in the Caribbean, and in Jordan. Since then the Soviet Union has delivered on every political condition and on lend-lease and we have done nothing. The wheat deal had nothing to

---

[1] Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversation, Box 2. Secret. The meeting was held at 3:09 p.m. in the Cabinet Room. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Central Files, President's Daily Diary) Quandt provided talking points for the President for this meeting. (Ibid., NSC Files, Box 664, Country Files, Middle East, Middle East War, Memos and Misc., Oct 6–17, 1973)

[2] Shultz had just returned from Moscow.

do with détente—we thought that was a good deal. They have given assurances on the Jews and we keep raising the ante. It must be looked on by them as a deliberate attempt to scuttle détente. One of the riskiest things is to try to play around with the domestic structure of a revolutionary government.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

President: Henry will brief you now on the Middle East. This is for guidance, not quotation.

Kissinger: First, let me talk about the situation before the war, then the military situation, then our negotiating strategy. There is a story going around that we held Israel back from a preemptive attack. All our intelligence said there would be no attack. Why did Israel not figure there would be an attack? Because we for four years had been telling them they had to make diplomatic moves. Therefore they developed the posture that there was no need to move, there was no threat, the Arabs are too weak, so they interpreted the intelligence this way. We did the same, but we figured that because they were so good, the Arabs wouldn't dare to attack.

The war showed that Israeli tactics are out of date. The fact is that Israel can no longer score victories like they did in 1967. Their strategy has been to fight on one front at a time. This time they couldn't do it, so we are in a war of attrition. That is very serious for Israel.

President: Before this war Israel felt it had no incentive to negotiate; now they have to make an agonizing reappraisal of that position. They can't take another war.

Kissinger: Now Israel has to consider how they can enhance their position by diplomacy, not just by military means.

We are in a position now where if we can keep the war from escalating and from turning into a confrontation with the Arabs, we have the best chance for settlement.

At the President's very first Cabinet meeting, he said that the greatest danger in the Middle East would be that local powers would draw the super powers in, as happened in World War I. We have resisted letting the local clients dictate the pace of events. Both the U.S. and the Soviet Union have friends to support. The test is whether we can support them and still retain our balance with each other.

We could have grandstanded. A Security Council resolution would just have lined people up and brought acrimony. We are trying to get a consensus before we move. When you ask whether the Soviet Union is snookering us, you have to ask what we haven't done which we would otherwise have done. In practice we have been extremely tough—in massing a great airlift, with no bases except for the Azores from the Portuguese—whom we have kicked around.

President: No more.

Kissinger: We have told the Soviet Union this is a test of détente, but we have not thrown down the gantlet. We have our communication lines out to the Arabs. The President met with them yesterday. We are trying to use diplomacy as a bridge to a decent settlement.[3] We will make our case to the public after the diplomacy has concluded.

What you should know is we are trying to conclude in a way to lead to a settlement; we responded to the challenge of the Soviet airlift. Soviet behavior is ambiguous. We are not trying to confront them; we believe they will be working something out.

President: The Soviet Union has a problem with the Arabs. They have done well and don't want to negotiate except on terms Israel can never buy. We are working on a cease fire with a connection to 242.

Kissinger: 242 is not a new proposal. It is very dangerous to speculate about any particular formula. The major problem now is to get the parties into a negotiation with a formula so vague that each party can save face.

Clements: The military services have performed magnificently. It is a complex, beautiful operation.

President: The key point is to try to keep the Soviet Union from sending in their own personnel. Do we want to push the Soviet Union—this is what I hear from the "new hawks"—so far that they do this and confront us with a terrible choice?

Kissinger: We are taking tough action but speaking softly. We should not escalate until we see how the diplomacy can work out. We are being very quiet and we have put in massive material, with only a modest reaction from the Arabs.

[3] See Document 195.

202. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, October 18, 1973, 8:45 p.m.

D. Mr. Brezhnev asked you to convince the President of the following: This is not exactly the text of the message but I'm reading . . . "We continue to carry on very expansive consultations with the Arab leaders. For its consideration we need a little bit more time. At the same time we—the Soviet Union, the Soviet leaders—want to think of what kind of formulation should be included in the text of the draft resolution of the Security Council. In our opinion this resolution should include the following main provisions:

1. A call to the sides to immediately cease fire and all military action on the positions where the troops actually are.
2. A demand to start immediately after the ceasefire phased withdrawal of the Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories to the line in accordance with Res. 242 of the Security Council, with completion of this withdrawal in the shortest period of time.
3. A decision to start immediately and concurrently with the ceasefire appropriate consultations aimed at establishing a just and honorable peace in the Middle East.

This is the main point. I will repeat it. (Repeated the above three provisions).

K. Appropriate consultations with whom?

D. Our commentary involves the following conclusions. We feel that the best thing would be to have limited number of participants in these consultations. We, the Soviet Union, are prepared, if it suits you and the immediately involved participants and Israelis, for this kind of consultation on the part of the Soviet Union and the U.S.

K. Why are you so hard on your allies?

D. On what allies. We have many allies. I would like a clarification.

K. The one ally you have as a permanent member of the Security Council.

D. For the sake of conversation, why not drop them.

K. Actually we are no more eager to have your allies there than you are. We are not much more eager to have our own allies there.

D . . . Let's have these conclusions between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. The question arises about a guarantee if the resolution is to be

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

adopted. I agreed together with you, if it is acceptable to both of our clients, that the U.S. and the Soviet Union in a recent forum guarantee the fulfillment of this resolution. We also are prepared to guarantee the territorial integrity, security and inviolability of the borders and the frontiers of all, including Israel, taking into consideration at the same time its right to sovereignty and independent existence. With these kinds of guarantees from the U.S. and the Soviet Union we feel that hardly anybody will have a doubt about the viability of the guarantee. So Mr. Brezhnev would like to share his thoughts along those lines with the President and he would like to receive the reaction of the White House. On my own there are two basic things: the Middle East and our relationship to cement with you.

K. I understand. You will see in the message that the President will send to you at about 10:00 or 10:30 (this he has and wants to work on it personally)—which is not an answer to this—that he makes exactly the same point without going into details. Should I still send the message of the President's to you?

D. Yes, I will mention that it was received before this.

K. Because we won't have an answer in two hours. Thinking out loud without having talked to the President, the most difficult point here is point number two about immediately after ceasefire that the Israelis should withdraw to a line under Res. 242 which really isn't established yet. First let me say I realize you're making a very constructive effort . . .

D. Yes, I'm being very constructive.

K. Why don't we consider it later rather than debate it out now and if we have a counter-proposal we will get back to you.

D. Did you get it all down.

K. Yes, the FBI, CIA and we all have taken it down and your KGB man too.

D. Send the President's message to me between 10 and 11, all right?

K. Yes, and on the other you will get our response before the end of tomorrow.

203. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 18, 1973, 9:35 p.m.

K. Hello Mr. President. I just wanted to tell you we have had a preliminary message from the Russians.[2] They are moving in our direction but are not quite there yet.

N. I see.

K. It is from Brezhnev. It is their preliminary observations. Kosygin hasn't left Cairo yet. They are moving definitely towards the position you outlined yesterday. We have to stay very cool and not let on to anyone.

N. Yes, we don't want . . .

K. I have the impression the Israelis may be doing very well in the tank battle. They don't tell us.

N. That will move the Russians.

K. I think—well we shouldn't count our chickens but I think you have pulled it off again.

N. That is good news.

K. It will take us another 48–72 hours. I'm sending, on your behalf, Brezhnev a response to his message yesterday[3] which says nothing except you are holding things together here and want to . . . and that a constructive outcome is highly desirable.

N. Just assure him we are prepared to follow through. We don't want them to think we'll get in cement . . . Thank you.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] See Document 202.

[3] Document 194.

204. Message From President Nixon to Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev[1]

Moscow, October 18, 1973.

The President has received with appreciation the oral message from General Secretary Brezhnev[2] containing his reflections about the situation in the Middle East. We also appreciated being informed about the trip of Premier Kosygin to Cairo. We hope soon to hear his conclusions.

As the General Secretary is aware, the President and the Secretary of State have used all their influence to prevent the destruction of what has been achieved with so much effort. I agree that it is "necessary to talk about the future." Let me do so candidly.

I am convinced that the Soviet proposal of October 10[3] calling for a cease-fire in place was a very statesmanlike act. It provided the basis for a reasonable solution to the fighting while at the same time giving the greatest possibility for negotiations to follow. I only hope that Egypt will not come to regret having failed to seize the opportunity to secure its gains by its refusal to go along on October 13.[4]

We share the General Secretary's view that what is going on in the Middle East is "a test of the determination of both our powers to strictly adhere to the course they took in their relations and in international affairs." For our part, we want to continue to build on the important understandings that have been achieved between us as a result of the two meetings at the Summit. This crisis can and must lead to cementing the relationship between us.

The situation in the Middle East is indeed complex, as the General Secretary indicates. We each have special relationships with various states in the area and both of us are in a position to influence the situation. We say this particularly mindful of the fact that, provided we are able to achieve a ceasefire that brings with it the beginning of a process towards a fundamental settlement, there will exist new opportunities for bringing about a durable and just peace.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin & Kissinger, Vol. 7. No classification marking. The message is attached to a note marked Exclusively Eyes Only from Eagleburger to Scowcroft. A handwritten notation at the top of the message reads: "Joe Pizzano (Sit Rm) delivered original to Soviet Embassy, 10:30 p.m., 10–18–73."

[2] See Document 202.

[3] See Document 149.

[4] See Document 175.

A new situation will have developed in the area, not based on the supremacy of one party over the other. We expect this new reality to erase the humiliation which the Arabs felt over the defeat of 1967. It will also bring about a more reasonable attitude on the part of the parties and offer hope that more than a respite between two wars can be achieved.

The President wishes to stress that he will engage himself fully to help produce a just and honorable settlement. The détente between the United States and the Soviet Union will remain incomplete unless peace is achieved in the Middle East and both of us have played a cooperative role in achieving it.

In the days ahead we will be doing a good deal of thinking about the substance of this matter, and we will wish to exchange further views with you. We expect that once this conflict has been brought to an end, the need for a durable settlement will have become more firmly rooted with both sides. We will bend every effort in this direction. In the context of the new realities, our influence will be both constructive and effective. The concrete content to be given to these efforts should be the subject of further exchanges in this channel.

The President wishes to stress the great importance he attaches to the further improvement of US–Soviet relations.

---

205. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

Washington, October 18, 1973, 10:45 p.m.

K. When Dinitz mentioned 20 helicopters . . .

S. They have asked for a total of 50, 25 of two kinds. Defense is now sending eight. It's a big kind.

K. Will you let Dinitz know that tomorrow. We were supposed to tell them when we shipped the whole complement of Sky hawks.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 22. No classification marking.

S. They were talking about it and whether we should ship ten more.

K. Can you get that done?

S. I will get that done right away and . . .

K. The Soviets have sent us a three-point plan[2] which I will get over to you, of which points one and three are highly acceptable. Point two is not acceptable, however. It calls for a withdrawal to the line in Res. 242 which they will not accept. As to the frontiers . . . I called Dinitz and left out point three so I will have something to use as an incentive tomorrow. They are as obnoxious as the Vietnamese.

S. I think you have it started just right. By the time we get something down we can live with they will be relatively pleased.

K. They also told me they are going across with more tanks. I am afraid it will turn into a turkey shoot. If they keep going across somebody is going to get killed, that's for sure.

S. The real danger is the Egyptian army is going to panic.

K. Once they get across in division strength that means the SAM belt is gone. When they see the army from top and bottom they are going to disintegrate. They are not that good. They won't be able to get supplies. They'll die of starvation. What I can't understand is how they broke through the Canal.

S. That is a mystery to me. They had this new defense position. They broke through two divisions, one infantry and one armor.

K. Is that the detailed report?

S. Yes, they attacked through a strong point because if they went through a weak point they would have two strong divisions surrounding them.

K. They broke through a strong point and went across the Canal. They are a good army or the Egyptians are very bad.

S. The Israelis are very smart and audacious and willing to take chances and back them very strongly.

K. It is going to turn into a nightmare. I wonder if and when I should go to China. The Russians suggested negotiations be conducted between them and us and not have any other UN members, together with the Arabs and Israelis. You can imagine what Chou En Lai is going to say to this. Of course, the Europeans will go right up the wall.

S. Of course, the trick of trying to get negotiations with permanent members of the Security Council . . .

---

[2] See Document 202.

K. I am going to get a message out to Ismail.[3] Do you think that is all right? I thought I would say this will remain my position regardless of the military outcome but it might make them suspicious.

S. I like it and you should send off a message but telling them that might tip them and antagonize them.

K. I am afraid they will all get hung. I think this is the end of Sadat.

S. I think you are right. They might just run them out.

K. They have to be careful. The fact of the matter is when all is said and done it is a Soviet defeat. The same reasons why we could not accept an Israeli defeat will operate against them and even if they say the supplies did it, that should make them realize they better get on our side.

S. In that sense it couldn't have been better.

K. When should I go to China? Next week has the advantage . . . Larry said the President will start a peace initiative when I am gone. I can't think he will do too much without me.

S. I will want to reflect a bit. My first reaction is that he would.

K. You think he wants to give up a winning compromise. He will be up to his eyes in alligators with Cox next week.

S. He wants to be out in front with this one.

K. Supposing I go in two weeks. He can move even more easily then. I have three choices; to go next week, to go in two weeks, or to go in four weeks. Which do you think is best?

S. Honestly I don't see how you can go next week. I think it would look bizarre now that we are at this point under almost any circumstances.

K. Should I delay two weeks or five weeks?

S. Five weeks would bring you up to November . . .

K. I then move up against the Nobel prize and NATO. My instincts are two weeks.

---

[3] In his memoirs, Kissinger wrote that at midnight on October 18, he sent "a conciliatory message" to Ismail for Sadat. Kissinger added: "Its basic point was to reaffirm the offer made two days earlier of a cease-fire linked to a reaffirmation of Resolution 242. To make clear that we respected Egypt's dignity, I paid special attention to the fact 'that Egypt and its Arab allies have brought about important changes in the situation as a result of the strength and the valor demonstrated on the battlefield. None of this should be jeopardized by further prolongation of the fighting.'" Kissinger concluded the message by reiterating the United States' appeal for a cease-fire even in the changed military conditions: "'Mr. Ismail knows the importance we attach to a prompt end to the hostilities and conditions that make possible a serious effort toward a fundamental settlement. This remains our view. To this end, it is important that both sides maintain a restrained attitude, keeping in mind the imperative need for a long-term relationship.'" (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 541)

S. If things move we may be at the point of a ceasefire and the meetings or something started.

K. I will have a ceasefire by Monday.[4] I promise.

S. I agree there will be a ceasefire but I mean all the . . . will have quieted to the point it should be under control. That is probably too early to anticipate any real negotiations will be underway.

K. Have you heard about the Egyptians. They have already prepared for my arrival there.

S. That is probably that draft public announcement. That's beautiful! They are something else.

K. In the nutty Arab world I am sort of a mythical figure. The Arabs think I am a magician.

S. That's right. Might not be possible right now.

K. But I probably would have had an unbelievable welcome.

S. I think it would have been unbelievable. They have been so far. It has to be against all their instincts. They underestimated their military capacity.

K. If they had accepted our proposition last Saturday[5] they would have been in a superb position.

S. They really would have. They just wanted a little more I guess. It just doesn't make sense.

K. I will send those three points over to you.

S. Ok. Goodbye.

[4] October 22.

[5] October 13.

206. Message From the Israeli Ambassador (Dinitz) to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 18, 1973.

Following are preliminary remarks which I was instructed by the Prime Minister to bring to your personal attention as her first reflections on the conversation I had with General Scowcroft[2] and the subsequent telephone conversation I had with you:

The Prime Minister appreciates your remark that we can be sure that the United States will not accept any proposal which refers to the '67 lines. But she has to call your attention that any mention of 242 in connection with the cease-fire can be interpreted by the Egyptians and the Arabs as a reference to the '67 lines.

The battle is not over yet and the Soviets are already trying to dictate to Israel political moves designed not only to save their client States but also to reward them. We will not be a party to such a move. This was a terrible war. Our casualties in dead, if we calculate them in terms of the population of the United States, are in the magnitude of the losses that the United States suffered in Korea or Vietnam, wars that lasted, of course, a much longer time. It was a very cruel war and it is not over yet. The Prime Minister is sure that K. will understand and believe her when she says to him again what she told him on several occasions in the past, that during a serious peace negotiation she will have no hesitation to bring before the Government, the Knesset and the people, any difficult decision that will be necessary. But as long as there is not even a serious proposal on a cease-fire, and as long as we are far from peace negotiations—she does not see any justification for the mention of 242.

It is important to remember that the decision on the cease-fire in '67 did not mention the Armistice Agreements of 1949. Just as the cease-fire resolution of '67 did not mention or refer to previous documents or resolutions but stood on its own, so also now a resolution on cease-fire in '73 (after an additional war initiated by the Arabs and backed by the Soviets) must stand on its own feet.

Moreover, Resolution 242 refers explicitly to the conflict of '67 and now we are discussing ceasefire resulting from the war of '73.

We never believed that Resolution 242 is a panacea.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, June 4–October 31, 1973. No classification marking.

[2] See Document 196.

We agreed to accept it in specific circumstances prevailing at the time, circumstances which do not exist any more.

For further clarification: We do not object that a resolution on cease-fire there will also include a call for negotiation for peace. But we object to the mention of a specific resolution which refers to circumstances which do not exist any more.

She will not go into detail on the pitfalls and difficulties of Resolution 242, difficulties which are not confined only to the question of withdrawal and borders.

The Prime Minister is anxious that K. understands that she says these things before a final position of Israel has been formulated. She is sharing her thoughts with him. She will have to consult with the Government. (There is a specific Government decision that the Cabinet must be convened and consulted before a policy on the cease-fire is fixed). Since we do not have yet any specific draft of a Soviet proposal, the discussions in Jerusalem at this stage must of necessity, be of a general nature and deal with matters of principle only. But the Prime Minister found it necessary to bring to his attention that the very possibility of a mention of 242 lights up a red light for us.

The Prime Minister has instructed me to tell you that she has invited the Foreign Minister, Mr. Eban, to return promptly to Jerusalem in order to take part in these discussions and in the discussions on the situation in the front.

From the point of view of the time-table, we see no reason for undue haste. So far there are only feelers from the Soviet side. As far as the situation in the front is concerned, we have no reason for any speed-up of the diplomatic moves.

---

207. Telegram From the Department of State to the Embassy in Jordan[1]

Washington, October 19, 1973, 0211Z.

207370. Subject: Message From King. Ref: Amman's 5568.[2] For Ambassador From Secretary.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret; Flash; Nodis; Cherokee. Drafted and approved by Kissinger.

[2] Not found.

1. Please convey following personal message to King Hussein from Secretary Kissinger:

"I am responding to your letter of 18 October promptly at a most delicate and crucial moment in our efforts to end hostilities and lay the groundwork for a just and durable settlement in the Middle East. As you know, we have been engaged in intensive discussions with the Soviets and the Egyptians with a view to bringing about a prompt ceasefire in conditions conducive to a fundamental settlement.

Your Majesty, I know the dilemmas you face are surely greater than those of any other Arab leader. The President and I both know this, and we have drawn great reassurance from the strength of your leadership and the clarity of your vision of our common interests. War can cloud men's reason and weaken their grasp. You have proved equal to the task. You have our admiration, and I am convinced that history will confirm a crucial role in any fair settlement to Jordan's prudence and restraint in these difficult times. As difficult as it is, I am confident that His Majesty will maintain his position of statesmanship.

2. Second, our desires and hopes for a peaceful settlement are stronger today than ever before. In all the many consultations I have had in recent days the interests of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan have been very much in the fore. I realize, as your message indicates, your special responsibilities to the Palestinian people. We seek for Jordan and for you permanent and honorable expression of these responsibilities.

3. I know Your Majesty with all of your experience and wisdom that you will appreciate that I am engaged in delicate and complex discussions. I want you to know specifically what I am doing. We are talking to the Soviets with a view to agreeing to a SC resolution which calls for a ceasefire in place to be followed promptly by negotiations between the parties on a fundamental settlement. In such a settlement, Your Majesty, it is inconceivable that the interests of Jordan, which you so eloquently explained to me, would not be fully protected. I give you a formal assurance to this effect.

4. Your Majesty, we believe that a new strategic situation has been created—a situation in which the necessity of a political settlement is becoming clearer to all parties and in which it will be less difficult for the U.S. to exercise effective and constructive influence.

5. Your Majesty, the U.S. knows who its friends are. There can and will be no settlement without the fullest consultation between us. Your views will, I can assure you, be given the full weight they deserve.

6. During this difficult period in which our intensive diplomatic efforts are continuing, I urge you to maintain the confidence in what we are seeking to accomplish. I need that confidence and Your Majesty's

steady support more than ever in the days ahead. With warmest regards.[3]

HAK".

Kissinger

[3] In telegram 5574 from Amman, October 19, Brown reported that he had delivered the Secretary's letter to the King, who had been very appreciative and said that he knew his American friends understood his problems. Hussein said that he saw no signs of an improving situation in Syria and was concerned about the widening Israeli bridgehead west of Suez. He believed this would generate great pressures on him to open a Jordanian-Israeli front, which he knew would be suicide. (Ibid.) Telegram 208155 to Amman, October 19, transmitted a message from Kissinger to Hussein, saying that he was leaving that night for talks in Moscow on the current situation in the Middle East. Kissinger stated that he would seek an immediate end to the fighting on a basis that would make possible early progress toward a final, just, and lasting peace and he reiterated that Jordan's interests would be fully protected. (Ibid.)

208. Minutes of Washington Special Actions Group Meeting[1]

Washington, October 19, 1973, 10:04–10:57 a.m.

SUBJECT

Middle East

PARTICIPANTS

Chairman—Henry A. Kissinger

State
Kenneth Rush
Joseph Sisco

Defense
William P. Clements, Jr.
Robert C. Hill

JCS
Adm. Thomas H. Moorer
Vice Adm. John P. Weinel

CIA
William Colby
Sam Hoskinson

Assistant to President for Energy Policy
Gov. John Love
Charles DiBona

NSC Staff
Gen. Brent Scowcroft
William Quandt
Jeanne W. Davis

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, NSC Institutional Files (H–Files), Box H–117, WSAG Meetings Minutes, Originals, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Codeword. The meeting took place in the White House Situation Room.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

It was agreed that:

1) Governor Love, with State, Defense and the NSC Staff, will turn the draft Presidential speech on the oil program into a message to the Congress;

2) [*1½ line not declassified*]

3) CIA will prepare a paper on the impact of an oil cut-off—where it will start showing up and when;

4) State will prepare a paper today on possible oil talks with the OECD;

5) we will agree to Prime Minister Heath's request for US–UK talks on Middle East oil next week;

6) Defense will supply General Scowcroft with status reports on all ships loading US military supplies for Israel;

7) Defense would send a civilian team of technical representatives and a photo interpreter to Israel;

8) the JCS will furnish Secretary Kissinger with a paper on [*less than 1 line not declassified*].

Secretary Kissinger: (to Gov. Love) Do we have any oil business today?

Gov. Love: I was asked to come to the meeting. I would like to say that I consider the Arab oil moves relatively moderate. We need to do these things we're proposing anyway. It's just a matter of timing, but I don't believe it is the right time yet.

Secretary Kissinger: We'll go with the program as soon as a ceasefire is concluded. What do you all think?

Mr. Clements: I agree.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's aim for the end of next week.

Mr. Sisco: If you think we will get a ceasefire within the week, then the end of next week would be fine. If we conclude that the fighting will be much more protracted, we might consider going with the oil program before next Friday.[2] If we get a ceasefire by next week, that will help ease the Saudi position.

Gov. Love: Even after a ceasefire, if the negotiations are protracted, the Arab use of oil as a pressure point may continue or increase.

Mr. Sisco: That argues for the timing Henry (Kissinger) suggests. It would help deflate the pressure.

---

[2] October 26.

Secretary Kissinger: There will either be a ceasefire, in which case we want to be ready for the post-ceasefire period, or there won't be a ceasefire and we will need it for our diplomacy.

Gov. Love: I'm going to Canada on Tuesday[3] to talk to them.

Secretary Kissinger: Once we have a program ready for Presidential announcement, how do we trigger it? Can we do it as a message to Congress if the President doesn't want to make a speech?

Mr. Sisco: A message would be better than a speech. It obviously involves Congressional action.

Secretary Kissinger: Have we at State gone over the speech?

Mr. Sisco: In draft.

Mr. Colby: The immediate impact of the cut-back will not be very large. But the longer term impact will be greater and will place a greater degree of power in Arab hands down over the years. It will only affect 1% of US consumption.

Mr. DiBona: It depends on whether the Europeans cut back their exports to us. If they do, it will mean 3–4% of the US consumption, but only 1–2% if you're just talking about Arab shipments.

Secretary Kissinger: At what point will it affect the Europeans?

Gov. Love: It already has. They're 1–2 million barrels per day down to the Europeans already.

Mr. Clements: They're off 12–14%.

Mr. Colby: European consumption is 15 million barrels a day, 11 million of which comes from the Arabs. That's 72%. They have already chewed into that by the 2 million barrel a day cut.

Gov. Love: If there are further European export controls, we will have less import and our shortfall will be even greater than already anticipated.

Mr. DiBona: The Italians and Spaniards have already cut back exports. But I have talked to some European Community people and, as long as the EC doesn't act, they think they can move around it.

Mr. Sisco: I think the Secretary needs a paper which will analyze in depth the impact and implications of our moving with the oil program quickly. Both the practical impact and the effect on our diplomacy. Also, the impact of waiting to move with the program, both as to the time lag and the effect on the diplomacy.

Gov. Love: It's just a matter of good policy to use the crisis to do what we have to do domestically anyhow.

Secretary Kissinger: We have to do it. The only question is timing.

---

[3] October 23.

Mr. Sisco: It should be a message to the Congress so as to get the thing as far down the line as possible.

Mr. Clements: Regardless of timing, it can only help the negotiating track. These are *must* steps—it's just a question of how soon. The problem will only get worse.

Secretary Kissinger: John (Love), could you, working with Bill Clements and State, turn your draft Presidential speech into a message to the Congress over the weekend? We may want to go with it early next week.

Gov. Love: Yes.

Secretary Kissinger: Get State and the NSC Staff involved. You've done a great job.

(Governor Love and Mr. DiBona left the meeting.)

Secretary Kissinger: Bill (Colby), let's have your briefing.

Mr. Colby briefed from the attached text.[4]

Secretary Kissinger: (referring to the Israeli force on the west bank of the Canal) How did they get there? Did they punch through the Egyptian defense line?

Adm. Moorer: They put a bridge across the Canal. The Egyptians didn't have a solid defense line. The Israelis just went between two Egyptian strong points, then used the terrain to the best advantage.

Secretary Kissinger: They're using that lake to cover their flank?

Adm. Moorer: Yes. The Egyptians can't get coordinated. They're letting the Israelis nibble them off piecemeal.

Secretary Kissinger: I thought the Israelis were waiting until all the Egyptian armor was on the East Bank. Why can't those Egyptian tanks come back over the Canal?

Adm. Moorer: The Israelis are bombing hell out of the bridges. The Egyptians' main problem is indecision.

Mr. Rush: Why can't the Egyptians outflank the Israelis from the East?

Mr. Colby: They're trying to do that now—that's what all that fighting was about.

Secretary Kissinger: The Israelis must be in the SAM belt now.

Adm. Moorer: They are and have knocked out some of them.

Secretary Kissinger: So they can use their air force?

Adm. Moorer: Better and better.

Secretary Kissinger: We may have a massacre.

---

[4] Not attached.

Mr. Colby: It's possible. It began as a raid, but when it went well the Israelis began to reinforce it.

Adm. Moorer: The commander of the original force wanted to withdraw, but they wouldn't let him. They said "we're coming to join you." It was a raid originally, but when it began to go well they ran the tanks up from the original 20–25 to 200.

Adm. Moorer: (commenting on the briefing item concerning King Hussein's annoyance at the Arab disorganization) The Saudis got lost in the desert and the Jordanians had to send camels out to find them.

Mr. Colby: (following the briefing) The Soviets sent four new amphibious ships, with marine infantry aboard, to the Mediterranean on October 17. That gives them 73 units in the Med which is an all-time high.

Adm. Moorer: They have 36 ships with combat capability and 37 support ships.

Mr. Colby: There are also 18 Soviet subs there—two echelons, where they usually have only one with nine ships.

Mr. Clements: That's that double submarine thing I talked about right at the beginning when we thought they were replacing one group with another. They kept them both there.

Adm. Moorer: [*1 line not declassified*] We could send that into the Med if you think this thing will last. [*1 line not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: Will they see it?

Adm. Moorer: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: Would it be useful?

Adm. Moorer: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: We have no objection; it's up to you.

Adm. Moorer: I think we should do it.

Secretary Kissinger: Then go ahead. Let's go back to oil. Could CIA give me a paper on the impact of a cut-off—when it will start showing up and where.

Mr. Rush: How much storage do they have?

Mr. Colby: The Europeans have about 60 days.

Mr. Rush: I mean the Arab States. They'll still be shipping out of their storage.

Mr. Colby: We're talking about actual tanker movements.

Mr. Clements: This is an extremely complicated picture. You can't reach quick judgments. The Europeans are already affected. That two million barrels a day curtailed out of the Eastern Mediterranean is a European supply factor. They have already started conserving their oil. The effect will be almost immediate. When one end cuts off production or shipments, the other end starts conserving its supply.

Secretary Kissinger: I want to know what the situation is. I want a judgment as to when the pressure will start building up on us. When are the Europeans going to come screaming to us?

Mr. Colby: They have already cut their exports.

Secretary Kissinger: I have no preconceived idea about this. But we need a forecast—a range of how and when it will happen. Bill (Clements), would you help CIA on this?

Mr. Clements: I'll talk with Bill Colby. It's already started.

Mr. Sisco: My visceral reaction is that we may want to go with Governor Love's oil program on Monday or Tuesday.[5]

Secretary Kissinger: I haven't read the draft statement yet. Someone in State and Bill Quandt look at it and give me a one-page analysis. (to Scowcroft) Get our Program Analysis people on it, too.

Mr. Clements: When you read in the papers that the major oil companies are advising their clients that there will be a shortage, they are talking about refined products from Europe.

Mr. Rush: The Europeans will start conserving anyway.

Adm. Moorer: The pipelines into the Eastern Mediterranean at Sidon and Latakia are practically stopped.

Mr. Clements: That's where the loss is, but it's a damned tough message to get across.

Secretary Kissinger: I want some estimate of what this does to the Europeans. (to Rush) Also, I understand (Under Secretary of State) Casey is going to the OECD. He can't fly blind. Any talk about sharing will come out with something of maximum benefit to the Europeans. We want something of maximum benefit to the US.

Mr. Rush: Casey may not go to the meeting; we're thinking of sending someone else.

Secretary Kissinger: Whoever it is, we have to know what he will say. Let's get a paper today on what he thinks he will be doing.

Mr. Clements: Sharing only goes from us to them.

Secretary Kissinger: As long as they are screwing us in the Middle East, we shouldn't go around financing them. Also, (British Prime Minister) Heath wants some US–UK talks on Middle East oil. He wants to send someone over this week. We'd better let him do it. Who would talk to them?

Mr. Rush: Bill Casey and I.

Secretary Kissinger: Good; but we have to know what we're saying.

---

[5] October 22 or 23.

On the diplomacy, with Kosygin coming back, we expect we will hear something by tomorrow. We had one intelligence report [*less than 1 line not declassified*] saying that the Soviets were putting the Egyptians under great pressure for a ceasefire. Their minds are beginning to work. I think within 48 or 72 hours we will have some movement in the diplomacy. We'll talk about it at our meeting tomorrow.

Mr. Clements: When do you want to meet tomorrow?

Secretary Kissinger: How about 9:30 a.m.? We should have a clearer picture of where the diplomacy is going.

How are we doing on supplies?

Adm. Moorer: The 28 F–4s are there in Israel. I talked to the lead pilot of the first group. He said the Israelis met them 150 miles out and escorted them in. The escort pilot had just shot down a MIG and had been diverted to escort our planes in. Once our planes were on the ground he did his victory roll over the field. We have 8 more F–4s standing by at Lajes if we want to use them. Also, we have 10 A–4s in the air. We will be sending 40 A–4s altogether. That will complete our aircraft delivery. We have 12 C–130s already there. We're stepping up the airlift to 5 C–5As and 18 C–141s a day. And we're getting ready to load the ships. Incidentally, our tonnage figures are affected by the fact that the Soviets are flying aircraft down inside the transports.

Secretary Kissinger: How are we getting the A–4s there? By hopping across the carriers?

Adm. Moorer: Yes. But we have to include the weight of the planes we're flying down there if we're going to compare tonnage with the Soviets. We've got an extra 750 tons in those planes we're flying over. The Israeli Air Force has almost everything they asked for as their first priority. We've also sent them some Maverick missiles and we hope they use them today. We want to see how they work. That's an optical guided missile fired from fighter aircraft against tanks. It's new and we are anxious to see it in action. Also they have been using the TOWs; they have been very effective and the Israelis are pleased with them.

Mr. Clements: King Hussein said they were great when they were used against the Jordanians.

Secretary Kissinger: He's really bleeding about those M–60 tanks, isn't he?

Mr. Sisco: Also, Hussein thinks the Israelis have solved the SA–6 problem. Have they?

Adm. Moorer: They've degraded it. They don't have the same hit probability, but they haven't solved it. I've talked to some of the pilots. They say an SA–6 can hit an aircraft at 50 feet. They must have a different guidance system. But the pilots say they can maneuver away from it. It has both a booster and a ram-jet. They say when they see the

booster, they can go down on the deck. They're concerned about the SA–7s, though. They are really an arrogant bunch.

Secretary Kissinger: They are as obnoxious as they are courageous. I wish we could fight with someone who is not just unbearable. I remember the South Vietnamese.

Adm. Moorer: Up north, the Israelis are holding the best ground and I think will stay essentially where they are.

Secretary Kissinger: How far beyond the ceasefire line are they?

Mr. Colby: About 20 miles.

Adm. Moorer: The bulge is about 14 miles deep. I don't think they'll expend any more effort except in a holding action.

Mr. Clements: Israel is leaving about 35,000 men and 2–300 tanks there. The JCS people are satisfied that they can hold with what they have there.

Secretary Kissinger: Everything else is in the Sinai?

Adm. Moorer: Or moving down. They have about 9000 men in reserve in case the Syrians break through. Of course there are Soviet ships coming into Latakia loaded with tanks and there will be a flow of material to the Syrians.

Secretary Kissinger: Enough to make a difference?

Adm. Moorer: Not right away. Their problem is trained personnel. They might be able to run the tanks down the road but they can't fight them. The Russians now have embarked about 16,000 tons on the ships.

Mr. Colby: We think it's more—about 23,000 tons.

Mr. Clements: The Soviet materiel enhancement represented by those ships is significant. There are tanks and armored cars. The question is whether the Syrians have sufficient organized units to use the equipment effectively.

Adm. Moorer: Of course that material will be attrited by Israeli action along the road.

Secretary Kissinger: How long would it take the Syrians to train new units?

Adm. Moorer: It will take them months to get back where they were when they attacked. Particularly pilots. I told the Senators yesterday there are no such things as instant aviators.

Mr. Sisco: But the Syrian forces aren't broken?

Adm. Moorer: No, but they can't push. They can harass the Israelis with artillery fire but they can't break them. They have about 60,000 men up there against the Israelis.

Mr. Clements: Hussein says they're not organized—that there is chaos.

Mr. Rush: Doesn't that mean the pressure on Hussein has been removed?

Secretary Kissinger: According to his side. The more chaos there is, the better his alibi.

Adm. Moorer: He says the Iraqis had 80 tanks there and only 8 are operating now.

Secretary Kissinger: I sent Hussein a letter last night.[6] (to Scowcroft) Be sure CIA gets a copy.

Mr. Clements: Apparently the Jordanians got in a real mess. The Iraqi and Syrians started shooting at each other and the Jordanians were chewed up by the Israelis.

Secretary Kissinger: What about the sealift? We want that for two reasons: (1) to discourage the Soviets from a war of attrition, and (2) when we get into the diplomacy, so we won't be accused of wrecking it by moving supplies.

Mr. Clements: We have located and identified 20 ships. One in Boston is loaded and will be underway soon. The next one will be ready on October 25. The first ships will arrive in Israel on November 12. That will be the start of the sealift. From then on, the ships will arrive at regular intervals. These are all Israeli flag ships or charters. They will move up to 50,000 tons.

Secretary Kissinger: Over what period?

Mr. Clements: Forty-five days from November 12.

Secretary Kissinger: What about loading?

Mr. Clements: Move it back two or three weeks.

Secretary Kissinger: I'm talking about departures. You mean 45 days back to October 25?

Adm. Moorer: Yes.

Secretary Kissinger: Will you give Brent (Scowcroft) a list of the ships?

Mr. Clements: I will. Now remember, these are partial cargoes as far as our supplies are concerned. Part of the cargoes are military supplies, commingled with food, hospital supplies, etc.

Adm. Moorer: Supplies the Israelis have purchased on their own.

Mr. Clements: So don't be too optimistic about your ability to turn these ships around in mid-ocean.

Secretary Kissinger: I'm not optimistic about turning them around. But I'm optimistic about keeping them from being loaded, as long as

[6] See Document 207.

we know when they are due to leave. Turning them around at sea only gets us two weeks. We can start slowing up their departures if we want to. We will use Bill Clements in his role as procrastinator instead of his role as expediter. As long as we know when and where to turn them off. Stopping them in mid-ocean is a drastic step. If we can slow up the loading, that's okay. Give Brent (Scowcroft) an up-to-date list of what's in the pipeline and where. Let's not talk too much about a peace offensive. The Israelis have already started putting the pressure on us. Let's do one thing at a time. I don't believe in shooting before we're ready to hit the guy.

Mr. Clements: Defense would like to have some technical people in Israel, particularly on these electronic techniques. The Israelis want them too. They could be civilians—technical representatives.

Adm. Moorer: I have a five or six-man team of civilians. They could give the Israelis the benefit of our technical know-how, and we would learn something from it, too. They could be attached to the Embassy.

Secretary Kissinger: Could it be with the lowest possible visibility? Civilian clothes?

Mr. Clements: Yes.

Secretary Kissinger: Okay.

Mr. Sisco: But tell them not to be tempted when the Israelis ask them if they wouldn't like to go up to the front and look things over. They are to stay in Tel Aviv only.

Secretary Kissinger: Yes, Israeli interests are not the same as ours here. They would like to get us involved.

Mr. Clements: They would be attached to the Embassy and under the tight control of the Ambassador and our military man there.

Adm. Moorer: After the ceasefire I might want to augment them.

Secretary Kissinger: It will be a different problem after the ceasefire.

Mr. Clements: [*1½ lines not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: Would it be for us, or would it give them a capability to identify targets?

Mr. Colby: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Sisco: I suggest Defense prepare a joint message [*less than 1 line not declassified*] to Ambassador Keating and the senior military man making it clear what the restraints are. I'd like to take a look at it. (to Kissinger) Incidentally, (Ambassador) Keating's sister died. He may want to leave.

Mr. Clements: What about the legislative thing?

Secretary Kissinger: The message is going to the Hill today.[7]

Mr. Colby: We may want another SR–71 flight around ceasefire time.

Secretary Kissinger: Okay. Once the ceasefire is agreed, you can do it.

Mr. Colby: We need a baseline so we can measure major changes against it.

Mr. Sisco: Remember what happened on the missile thing?

Secretary Kissinger: I remember. And we thought the Egyptians had buried their missiles in the sand. Another of our intelligence triumphs.

Mr. Colby: We could run an SR–71 flight tomorrow or Sunday. Would that mess up your diplomacy?

Secretary Kissinger: Don't get too eager. Suppose that Israeli bridgehead explodes. We don't want to be blamed. We shouldn't excite the atmosphere.

Mr. Rush: I agree.

Adm. Moorer: They're on 24 hours notice.

Secretary Kissinger: (to Colby) Bring it up again tomorrow.

Mr. Clements: Tom (Moorer) and I went up to the Senate yesterday. Both (Senators) Stennis and Symington[8] asked why in hell we didn't have more than one base in the Azores. I passed the buck to State.

Secretary Kissinger: You used to pass it to the White House. One more year and we may get you to assume some responsibility!

Adm. Moorer: (Senator) Symington went into a tirade against Spain. I tried to explain to him that Spain works with the Egyptians for our interest.

Secretary Kissinger: Do they want us to get more bases in the Azores or elsewhere?

Mr. Clements: In Europe; they mentioned Greece, Italy and Turkey specifically.

Secretary Kissinger: Those SOBs cut our aid budget, attack every ally of the US and make it as difficult as possible for anyone to be friendly with us, and now they're surprised we don't have more bases! For years the State Department conducted a political science course for

[7] For the text of the President's October 19 Special Message to the Congress requesting $2.2. billion in emergency security assistance funding for Israel and $200 million for Cambodia, see *Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, pp. 884–886.

[8] Senator Stuart Symington (D–Missouri).

the Greeks, telling them how to run their country. Why should they do anything for us?

Mr. Clements: I'm just telling you what happened. It went very well in the end. (Senator) Scott of Virginia was the only one opposed.

Adm. Moorer: I was closely question by (Senator) Symington about [*less than 1 line not declassified*]. What did they have? What would they do in extremis?

Secretary Kissinger: He hit me on that at a dinner party.

Mr. Clements: I just told him I was dodging that question.

Mr. Colby: [*1½ lines not declassified*]

Adm. Moorer: I have a paper[9] telling everything we know about that.

Secretary Kissinger: I'd like to see it. Give it to Brent (Scowcroft), will you?

Adm. Moorer: Sure.

Mr. Clements: The House has asked us to come up on Tuesday.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's mute any talk of a peace offensive until we have a ceasefire.

Adm. Moorer: You would have been proud of us on the Hill yesterday.

Secretary Kissinger: I think this crisis is the best run one we've had since we came here. The next 96 hours will tell the tale.

[9] Not found.

209. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, October 19, 1973, 11:04 a.m.

K: Hello Anatol.

D: Hello. I received a short message from Brezhnev to the President. The text I will read you. OK?

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

K: Yes.

D: "Dear Mr. President:

The events in the Middle East become more and more dangerous. Our two powers, as we both have agreed, must do the utmost in order to keep the events from going beyond the limits, when they could take even more dangerous turn.

K: Right.

D: If they develop along this way there is a danger that harm could be done even to the immediate relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. We believe that neither you, nor we want to see it. If it is so then prompt and effective political decisions are needed. We have conviction that with due willingness our two powers can facilitate the finding of such decisions.

K: Right.

D: Since time is essential and now not only every day but every hour counts.

K: Right.

D: My colleagues and I suggest that the US Secretary of State and your closest associate Dr. Kissinger comes in an urgent manner to Moscow to conduct appropriate negotiations with him as with your authorized personal representative. It would be good if he could come tomorrow, October 20. I will appreciate your speedy reply.

Sincerely, L. Brezhnev, October 19, 1973"

K: You are friendly, aren't you?

D: Hum?

K: That's a friendly suggestion.

D: Of course it is.

K: Well, I will have to get to the President and call you back.

D: Okay.

K: Okay, bye.[2]

[2] At 11:10 a.m., Kissinger called Dobrynin back and asked him to send a copy of the message so he had something to show the President. (Ibid.) Dobrynin gave the Secretary a written copy of the message at 11:45 a.m. (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin and Kissinger, Vol. 7)

210. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, October 19, 1973, 11:38 a.m.

D: Yes.

K: Anatol, I have had a preliminary talk with the President and we agree in principle to a high level contact.[2]

D: Yes.

K: And you give me your quick reaction, why should Gromyko not come over here?

D: Because I think my reaction is because Kosygin is back from there so they would like to discuss, I guess, the three of them. Brezhnev, Kosygin and Gromyko.

K: I see.

D: This is really the idea—not to send a telegram telling what was said by Sadat or what was said back and forth. They would like you for one day to come there and then I am sure Kosygin will [brief?] everybody. This is my real impression why they are asking this one because he is fresh so to speak in what he was thinking and they could discuss with you.

K: Will you come back there with me?

D: Yes, if you don't mind I would like to go both ways.

K: With me?

D: Yes.

K: Well, as long as you sit in the front compartment.

D: (Laughter) All right. I would rather be in the tail but nevertheless.

K: Now what are we going to do about navigators and so forth?

D: There is no problem. We will give you a navigator and we will take care about this.

K: Well all right. I will call you back—oh, what is it now, a quarter to 12:00?

D: Yeah.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Anatoli[y] Dobrynin File, Box 28. No classification marking.

[2] According to the President's Daily Diary, Kissinger and Nixon met from 11:24 to 11:32 a.m. (Ibid., White House Central Files) No other record of the discussion has been found.

K: No later than two.

D: No later than two. Okay.

K: We are very sympathetic to the proposal.

D: I think this is really important, Henry.

K: Anatol, when the Soviet Government makes such a proposal on the basis of urgency it is not a matter we take lightly.

D: Yes. And leave tomorrow because they really feel it is urgent.

K: Well they want me to arrive—well I can't leave now until about midnight tonight.

D: No, I understand. So you will arrive tomorrow but . . .

K: I will arrive tomorrow but—I will arrive tomorrow night and we could talk Sunday.[3]

D: Sunday, yes.

K: You know I would like to get a few hours sleep before your three men starting working me over.

D: (Laughter) Oh you are a beautiful fellow. Yuri saw it in Moscow.

K: One night please I think I am entitled to.

D: No, because . . .

K: My present thinking is that I leave around midnight tonight.

D: As it was last time.

K: As it was when we went on the secret trip.[4]

D: I think it is right. So you will arrive approximately around in the evening.

K: Around 8:00 or 9:00.

D: Yes and then you go to bed and fresh in the morning on Sunday—you will be as fresh as you usually are.

K: That's right. Just tell Antanov not to offer me his diversions because I need a night's sleep.

D: Okay. He will do it afterwards.

K: Okay.

D: Then we will wait a call . . .

K: It is not yet approved.

D: No, no, I will not say anything until you finally say to me okay.

---

[3] October 21.

[4] Kissinger is referring to his trip to Moscow in April 1972. For the records of Kissinger's meeting, see *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XIV, Soviet Union, October 1971–May 1972.

K: Okay, fine.

D: Bye.[5]

[5] Kissinger wrote in his memoirs that the Soviet invitation "solved most of our problems. It would keep the issue out of the United Nations until we had shaped an acceptable outcome. It would discourage Soviet bluster while I was in transit and negotiating. It would gain at least another seventy-two hours for military pressures to build. Nixon and I talked in this vein together with Haig and Scowcroft. We concluded that a trip to Moscow would advance our strategy." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 542)

211. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, October 19, 1973, 1:35 p.m.

K: You can talk to the Chinese Ambassador. He is your ally but leave our allies alone.

D: What happens now?

K: I understand you are having lunch with the British Ambassador. I want to make sure your being … of you … Ambassador Huang Chen told me he is very fond of you. He says if you give him half of Siberia and the Mauritanian … he will sign a non-aggression treaty.

D: Will this say something?

K: Anatoly, about that letter.[2] The President agrees that I should go to Moscow. You understand this will present us with enormous domestic difficulties.

D: Well …

K: Oh, never mind. I think it's important that we say publicly it was done at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

D: I see no difficulty in that.

K: In our interests to announce it about 1:00 this morning our time.

D: 1:00 am.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] See Document 209.

K: Yes, I think we should leave about 12:30.

D: This is acceptable.

K: Then we should say it is the invitation of the Soviet Government. I am going on urgent consultations. Of course we will be delighted to have you come with us and . . . we are assuming that no unilateral actions will be taken while I am in transit.

D: What do you mean?

K: No military threats. And I am assuming both of us will keep the situation calm . . . I don't believe while I am there I will be able to negotiate a final settlement. I will be able to negotiate a cease-fire.

D: A cease-fire?

K: But we can't expect to settle it in one day.

D: OK.

K: Is there anyway you could get in touch with someone over there. We may be able to get an airplane that could fly non-stop.

D: I will talk to Moscow.

K: The other possibility is to stop in Copenhagen.

D: I will get on it.

K: If we want to ask for the right to stop in Copenhagen . . . it will then get out.

D: They won't know what plane is stopping.

K: I am not sure.

D: So, two possibilities . . . non-stop and stopping in Copenhagen. OK, everything is settled and you leave at 1:00.

K: Let's say 1:00 to be safe.

D: And announce at 2:00.

K: We will announce at 2:00. That way no Soviet military . . . I would like that I get a nights sleep before they jump on me. And we're going to Leningrad, right?

D: One night sleep. I put on menu. You want to . . . I will put it this way—that you demand it be in Leningrad.

K: Say that I insist I get to go to Leningrad. I will not go unless I can meet in Leningrad. Look we appreciate the letter and we gladly accept the invitation. I am going to see if we can bring about a cease-fire. All we want is to say it is the invitation of the Soviet Government.

D: I understand.

K: We have not even told the Israelis.

D: You want a small . . .

K: I will have to tell them later . . . Now you leave Cromer in NATO and until we get this thing settled.

D: I will not say anything.

K: Good. Bye.[3]

[3] At 4:30 p.m., Dobrynin telephoned Kissinger to tell him that he had received a short telegram from Brezhnev, who thanked the President and Secretary for their positive answer to his proposal. The General Secretary also said he had no objection to a public statement concerning Kissinger's trip. Kissinger reminded Dobrynin that they would be discussing this within the framework that the two of them had been discussing, not a final settlement. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

212. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Israeli Ambassador (Dinitz)[1]

Washington, October 19, 1973, 7:09 p.m.

K. Mr. Ambassador, I am assuming that I can just announce myself to Israel if I think it is a useful way to get your views.

D. Sure. At any time. Would you let me know so I can go with you.

K. If I want to go from where I am going now I will do that and let Scowcroft know and you can get over there.

D. I have not told the Prime Minister, but I am sure it is all right.

K. I have no desire to do it. It is just a possible delaying move.

D. I will call her right now and give you an answer within ten minutes.

K. I have the President's approval, which I didn't have earlier, to begin with your proposal instead of his. I will begin to sell _____ our proposal. . . . That presumes that if they accept your proposal you will accept it immediately.

D. You mean by Sunday[2] night?

K. I don't give you a time because I don't think they will, but I don't know how desperate the problem will be.

D. Very. The last report we have taken a town 35 miles from Cairo, which is halfway between the Canal and Cairo. It is 70 miles between the Canal and Cairo and this is halfway.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking. The blank underscore indicates an omission in the original.

[2] October 21.

K. It took you a little longer. I just like to give you a tough time.

D. We have gone together with very tough times so we are allowed a little relaxation.

K. You understand my strategy as we have discussed it. To sell the other condition to (Veetre)[3] and to refer it back to Washington. The discussions will not start before Sunday morning Moscow time and cannot conclude before Sunday afternoon Moscow time and depending on the outcome cannot be implemented before we have discussed it with you. This I tell you for your own planning. May I make one request? The importance of maintaining the President's good will for diplomatic performances that must follow. Because the outcome you have achieved is the destruction of the Egyptian army . . . you lived six years with 242 and I didn't . . .

D. We won't go into this again.

K. I am not asking you to change the position of your government which you cannot do. If the matters reach that point, which they will reach and which I cannot avoid, please keep in mind that after ceasefire it is important for your sake that the President look good and is not accused of having sold anybody out. You will need him very much in the diplomacy that follows.

D. Sure, I understand. You mean while . . .

K. Supposing the worst happens from your point of view. That resolution that I gave you will not happen. Nevertheless praise him for his statesmanlike achievements.

D. You don't even imagine that any of the linkage . . .

K. No phrase of section 2[4] will be incorporated.

D. What I understand you to say is that you want some linkage with 242 . . . negotiation in order to implement 242.

K. Exactly. I am not saying you can count on it being refused in all its parts. It is the sort of link I give you . . . should it turn out to be the best possible after long consultation you should . . . in your head to thank the President. You will need it. They may be so disp . . .[3] that they are . . .

D. I will call the Prime Minister on your proposal. Your trip to Moscow is secret?

K. Until it is announced at 2:00 this morning here.

---

[3] As on the original.

[4] Paragraph 2 of the Soviet draft resolution demanded immediate phased Israeli withdrawal based on Resolution 242; see Document 202.

D. I will try to give General Scowcroft the full situation in the field.[5]

[5] At 7:40 p.m., Dinitz telephoned Kissinger and said that the Prime Minister would welcome him with open arms if he decided to visit Israel. Kissinger asked what the Israeli position would be if the Soviets wanted to go back to a cease-fire at the October 6 lines with no linkage to anything. The Ambassador said he would have to ask the Prime Minister. Kissinger noted that the greater flexibility he had, the better the negotiations would go, and suggested that Dinitz ask about any other combination he could think of. He said that he would open with the Israeli position in any event. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

213. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, October 19, 1973, 7:17–7:28 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State and Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Dr. James Schlesinger, Secretary of Defense
William Colby, Director of Central Intelligence
Admiral Thomas Moorer, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
Major General Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

Secretary Kissinger: Dobrynin called last night with a resolution he wanted to kick around. It included a demand to return to the 1967 lines, and possible negotiations.[2] I said we would call back. This morning we got a message from Brezhnev proposing that the President send me to Moscow.[3]

[To Scowcroft:] Make sure that Jerry Warren gets out that we let the Chinese know about the Kissinger trip before their dinner [the dinner for Secretary Kissinger that evening at the PRCLO at the Mayflower Hotel].

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1027, Presidential/HAK Memcons, Memcons, HAK & Presidential, April–Nov. 1973 [2 of 5]. Secret. The meeting took place in the Secretary's office at the State Department. Brackets are in the original.

[2] See Document 202.

[3] See Document 209.

Sending me would delay it a few days, give them a face-saver, and avoid Gromyko coming here with tough instructions. Brent will keep you informed. I will work for a simple ceasefire, with maybe a call for negotiations. The trouble is Israel doesn't want anything, but I may have to include a reference to 242. I may have to go back to our original status quo ante.

Everyone knows in the Middle East that if they want a peace they have to go through us. Three times they tried through the Soviet Union, and three times they failed.

Please give me your best intelligence estimate.

Keep the aircraft going to Israel so Israel will be grateful and can't say we screwed them in their hour of triumph. Give them the other eight F–4's.

Last Thursday I arranged with the Soviet Union for abstaining from a ceasefire.[4] I then beat Israel into agreeing, but Sadat turned it down.[5] On Monday we offered a ceasefire again with a tie to 242.[6]

We can't humiliate the Soviet Union too much.

The A–4's should go at ten a day; the F–4's at four a day.

I have long postponed this Chinese trip and have to go.

Colby: It's only two weeks. Then put it off again if necessary.

[4] October 11. See Document 157.

[5] See Document 175.

[6] October 15. See Document 190.

214. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail)[1]

Washington, undated.

1. Secretary Kissinger wants to inform you that he has accepted an invitation from the Soviet Government to come to Moscow immediately to continue the discussions which have been carried on through diplomatic channels with the Soviet Government, of which you are

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. Secret; Sensitive. The original is marked "Draft."

fully informed. He will be leaving at midnight Washington time October 19. He will want to stay in touch with you throughout the period, and if you wish to communicate with him, the fastest and most effective way would be by means of this special channel. Any such messages will be transmitted to Dr. Kissinger promptly in Moscow.

2. Dr. Kissinger wants to stress that our objective continues to be the one previously expressed to you: to help bring about an immediate ceasefire and to begin promptly a diplomatic process to move toward fundamental settlement.[2]

3. Dr. Kissinger's trip will be announced after he has left Washington.[3]

With warmest regards.

[2] Telegram Tohak 46/WH32577 to Kissinger, October 21, transmitted the text of an October 20 reply from Ismail. Ismail noted that Egyptian experience was not encouraging, but agreed that a linkage between a cease-fire and a final settlement might be assured if the two superpowers guaranteed the speedy conclusion of such a settlement. On that basis, he stated the Egyptian Government's position: "(A) a cease fire on the present lines, (B) convening a peace conference with the object of reaching a fundamental settlement, and (C) a guarantee by the United States and the Soviet Union of the ceasefire and the withdrawal of Israeli troops." Ismail wrote that he believed Kissinger's presence in Moscow would be helpful in reaching an agreement along these lines. (Ibid.)

[3] White House Deputy Press Secretary Gerald L. Warren announced on the evening of October 19 that President Nixon was sending Kissinger to Moscow at the request of the Soviet Government. See *The New York Times*, October 20, 1973. The President wanted to announce Kissinger's trip along with Senator Stennis' compromise on release of the Presidential tape recordings. Kissinger told Haig it was a "cheap stunt" and "poor tactics" and would "look as if he is using foreign policy to cover up a domestic thing." Kissinger told Haig: "I will not link foreign policy with Watergate. You will regret it for the rest of your life." (Transcript of telephone conversation between Kissinger and Haig, October 19, 3:20 p.m.; National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23) Nixon agreed to separate the announcements, but insisted they both come from the White House. (Transcript of telephone conversation between Kissinger and Haig, October 19, 3:35 p.m.; ibid.) Both transcripts are printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 296–299.

215. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

En route to Moscow, October 20, 1973, 1315Z.

Hakto 1. In thinking through what is ahead for me in Moscow, I have decided that it is essential that we stick to the resupply schedule we have agreed upon. In fact, it should be stepped up slightly, along the lines of the plan described by Schlesinger in our meeting yesterday.[2] As I understand the plan it was to go to 18 C–141s and at least 5 C5A's today. We should stay at that level.

The negotiations I am about to undertake will be tough, and I will need to have some bargaining chips to give up should the occasion warrant. We can use it to get the Soviets to stop their airlift.

Thus, I want you to be extremely careful that Defense does not now begin cutting back on our effort. If the Israelis win, what we do on resupply in the next few days will make no difference; if the Israelis cannot pull it off and bog down I will need all the bargaining leverage I can muster.[3]

Specifically, while I am negotiating, I want:

—The F–4s to continue at a rate of four to six a day;
—Resupply of the A–4s at the rate I gave you;
—Ammunition as requested by the Israelis;
—A little movement in helicopters.

This will give me some leverage I can use while in Moscow.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, HAKTO, SECTO, TOSEC, Misc., Oct. 20–23, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Immediate.

[2] See Document 208.

[3] In telegram Tohak 28/WH32557, October 20, 1957Z, the White House transmitted a situation report that had just been given to Scowcroft by Dinitz. The forward thrust of Israeli forces west of the canal continued and they were engaged in the destruction of large parts of the two Egyptian armies holding the canal as well as the missile sites protecting those armies from air attack. Israeli forces had seized the initiative, causing confusion and dislocation to the enemy. A wedge had been introduced in the Egyptian front and the two armies were practically separated from each other. The report said that when the cease-fire came into force, it should find Israel holding a line that made sense from a politico-military point of view. The Syrian front had been essentially static throughout the past week, but Israeli forces had inflicted serious damage on the various contingents making up the multinational forces reinforcing the Syrian army. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, TOHAK 1–60, Oct. 20–23, 1973)

216. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

En route to Moscow, October 20, 1973, 1545Z.

Hakto 2. 1. Please report to the President that, on the basis of my conversations with Dobrynin aboard the plane, it appears that the Soviet aims will be:

—A joint U.S.–Soviet Security Council resolution
—Peace negotiations under the auspices of the U.S. and the USSR.

2. On the basis of this conversation, I expect that our work in Moscow will focus principally on drafting of the Security Council resolution.

3. As Eagleburger told you last night, I cannot overemphasize the urgent need to keep me fully informed of the military situation. I need exact assessments, and I need them quickly and frequently.

4. Dinitz must, repeat must, report to you at least three times a day, and I must then have those reports immediately. Tell him to get his communications set up now if he has not yet done so. These reports must be clearly identified.

5. I cannot avoid mistakes if I am not kept fully up to date and know exactly what the situation on the ground is. I look to you to see that I am given what I need quickly and frequently.

Warm regards.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, HAKTO, SECTO, TOSEC, Misc., Oct. 20–23, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Immediate.

217. Message From President Nixon to Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev[1]

Moscow, October 20, 1973.

Dear Mr. General Secretary:

As you know, I have dispatched Secretary Kissinger urgently to Moscow to consult with you regarding the termination of the current conflict in the Middle East.

The purpose of this brief note[2] is to emphasize to you that Dr. Kissinger speaks with my full authority and that the commitments that he may make in the course of your discussions have my complete support.[3]

I am confident that if you and I work together on this explosive problem, we can find a solution which will bring a lasting peace to the area. It will, however, require a firm commitment from both of us to devote our personal efforts toward achieving that goal and to provide the strong leadership which our respective friends in the area will find persuasive.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin & Kissinger, Vol. 7. No classification marking. A handwritten notation at the top of the page reads: "[illegible] by Gen. Scowcroft, 10/20/73, 11:25 a.m." A note in Nixon's handwriting at the bottom of the page reads: "Mrs. Nixon joins me in sending our best personal regards to Mrs. Brezhnev and to you."

[2] In telegram Tohak 14/WH32541, October 20, 1449Z, Scowcroft sent Kissinger the text of the note to Brezhnev and wrote of the President's motivation for this personal message. (Ibid., Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, TOHAK 1–60, Oct. 20–23, 1973)

[3] In telegram Hakto 3, October 20, 1610Z, Kissinger stressed that the message should not contain the phrase "speaks with my full authority" since he needed to be in a position to insist to the Russians that he had to pass proposals back to the President for his consideration. (Ibid., HAKTO, SECTO, TOSEC, Misc., Oct. 20–23, 1973) In telegram Tohak 24/WH32553, October 20, 1807Z, Scowcroft wrote that the Secretary's modifications in Hakto 3 did not arrive in time given Nixon's insistence that the message go out. (Ibid., TOHAK 1–60 October 20–23, 1973) Kissinger recalled: "I was horrified. The letter meant that I would be deprived of any capacity to stall. Moreover, the letter implied that the Soviets and we would impose an overall Mideast settlement on the parties and that I was empowered to discuss that subject as well—a concession totally contrary to our strategy until now, which sought to separate the cease-fire from a political settlement." He added: "Undoubtedly, Nixon's eager involvement reflected a desire to be identified with something more elevating than the interminable and sordid legal disputes over the Watergate tapes." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 547)

I am sending a message to Dr. Kissinger which he will convey orally to you, of my strong personal commitment in this regard.[4]

Sincerely,

Richard Nixon

[4] At 10:30 p.m. on October 20, Vorontsov delivered Brezhnev's reply, which thanked the President for his "kind letter" and stated that he understood that Dr. Kissinger, Nixon's "closest associate," would speak on the President's behalf and that any commitments he might make during their discussions would have Nixon's complete support. Brezhnev added that he agreed that "the present explosive situation in the Middle East" demanded their serious attention and believed that their great personal efforts would be needed to work out a "cardinal solution that would bring a lasting peace corresponding to the interests of all the peoples of the Middle East." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin and Kissinger, Vol. 7)

218. Telegram From the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 20, 1973, 1755Z.

Tohak 22/WH32552. The President called me in again to talk about a message he wanted to send you in line with the statement to Brezhnev (Tohak 14)[2] that he was doing. He talked at considerable length about what he wanted in the cable and asked me to draft something up for him to look at. The cable quoted below is my draft of his thoughts, which he has looked over and approved for dispatch. I cite all this background so that you will understand the message basically represents his thoughts with some of the rougher edges rounded off.

To: Secretary Kissinger

From: The President

1. I have just written a note to Brezhnev[3] emphasizing to him that you speak with my full authority and the commitments you may make in the course of your discussions with him have my complete support. I

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, TOHAK 1–60, Oct. 20–23, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Eyes Only; Flash. Sent to Peter Rodman with instructions to deliver in a sealed envelope to Eagleburger.

[2] See footnote 2, Document 217.

[3] Document 217.

also told him that you would be conveying to him my strong commitment to devote my personal efforts toward bringing a lasting peace to the area.

2. I believe that, beyond a doubt, we are now facing the best opportunity we have had in 15 years to build a lasting peace in the Middle East. I am convinced that history will hold us responsible if we let this opportunity slip by.

3. The current Israeli successes at Suez must not deflect us from going all out to achieve a just settlement now. There is no reason to believe that Israel will not win this war now, as it has won all the previous ones, but you and I know that, in the long run the Israelis will not be able to stand the continuing attrition which, in the absence of a settlement, they will be destined to suffer.

4. It is therefore even in Israel's best interests for us to use whatever pressures may be required in order to gain acceptance of a settlement which is reasonable and which we can ask the Soviets to press on the Arabs.

5. Our greatest foreign policy weakness over the past four and a half years has been our failure to deal decisively with the Middle East crisis. This is due to three reasons:

(A) The intransigence of the Israelis.
(B) The unwillingness of the Arabs to engage themselves in discussions on a realistic basis.
(C) Our preoccupation with other initiatives, preventing us from devoting the time required to the issue.

6. I now consider a permanent Middle East settlement to be the most important final goal to which we must devote ourselves. U.S. political considerations will have absolutely no, repeat no, influence whatever on our decisions in this regard. I want you to know that I am prepared to pressure the Israelis to the extent required, regardless of the domestic political consequences.

7. Please convey to Brezhnev the following:

(A) Tell him that this is an area, as distinguished from MFN, where I can deliver on commitments without the requirement for Congressional approval. Point out to him that if he and I together can be reasonable and achieve a Middle East settlement it will be without question one of the brightest stars in which we hope will be a galaxy for peace stemming from the Nixon–Brezhnev relationship.

(B) Tell him that each of us have very difficult clients and that we must therefore keep our commitments in as general terms as possible. Assure him, however, that our reluctance to be specific is not the result of any intention to avoid reaching a settlement but that it is based on

our conviction that this is the only way he and I will be able to get our clients in line and thereby achieve a settlement.

(C) You can also inform him that I remember our discussions on the Middle East in my home at San Clemente[4] and that I realize now that he was right in his concern about the danger of an imminent explosion in the Middle East. One war in the Middle East in 20 years would have been too much. To have had four wars during this period is intolerable, and we must now take decisive action to resolve the problem. Only the U.S. and the Soviet Union have the power and influence to create the permanent conditions necessary to avoid another war. If we fail, history and the thousands of brave men who die in the next war, as well as their widows and children, will hold us accountable.

(D) Now is the time for both of us to face up to the hard choices which we have not confronted in the past. Neither of us, nor any of those nations which we support can have a solution fully to its satisfaction. There must be give on both sides. The Israelis and Arabs will never be able to approach this subject by themselves in a rational manner. That is why Nixon and Brezhnev, looking at the problem more dispassionately, must step in, determine the proper course of action to a just settlement, and then bring the necessary pressure on our respective friends for a settlement which will at last bring peace to this troubled area.[5]

Warm regards,

[4] See Documents 73 and 74.

[5] In telegram Tohak 35/WH32566, October 20, 2343Z, Scowcroft informed Kissinger that during one lengthy meeting that day, after philosophizing about the Middle East in general and the course of the war, Nixon had directed sending this cable (Tohak 22) to the Secretary, which Scowcroft said had already been sent. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, TOHAK 1–60, Oct. 20–23, 1973)

219. Memorandum From the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, October 21, 1973.

SUBJECT

Secretary Kissinger's Initial Report From Moscow

The following is Secretary Kissinger's first report from Moscow which he requested that I forward to you:

Brezhnev and I held a preliminary two hour meeting this evening in the Kremlin on the Middle East,[2] and we will get down to negotiations tomorrow.

He began by underlining in glowing terms his relationship with you and the importance of U.S.–Soviet relations. Your letter to him[3] today clearly had a positive effect, although he is construing it to mean that I have full power and no right to refer back to you. Your other message to me[4] on what to say arrived too late for this meeting. The major theme of his presentations was that our two countries have a responsibility to maintain the peace, specifically now in the Middle East, by implication on a broader scale. In this regard he was very sensitive to our domestic critics of détente, reacting strongly to the mention of Senator Jackson, and pointing out the irresponsibility of the opponents of our policy. He also took his customary jabs at the Chinese, citing their slandering of the two super powers. I in turn played on his concern for our bilateral relationship by stressing the importance of a quick Middle East settlement so as to demonstrate to our critics the concrete benefits of détente.

He moved immediately to the Middle East situation saying that it had reached a "very acute" stage. He stressed that our discussions should not be affected by the tactical military situation, perhaps reflecting apprehension of the Israeli advances. He noted the deep differences between the Arabs and Israelis but said that this should be no obstacle to our two countries' finding a solution. He then invited my

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 69, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 20, [October 12–November 21, 1973]. Secret. Sent for information. A notation by Scowcroft reads: "Pres has seen."

[2] The memorandum of conversation of this October 20 meeting is ibid., Box 76, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Kissinger Trip to Moscow, Tel Aviv, and London, October 20–22, 1973.

[3] Document 217.

[4] See Document 218.

comments on their three part resolution which we received on Thursday[5] night.

I gave him our preliminary reactions, saying that we would be prepared to negotiate specific language tomorrow (Sunday). The first point was basically acceptable and was only a drafting problem. The third point was also generally acceptable with a somewhat more complex drafting problem. I said that our major difficulty was with point two; however, with a constructive attitude on both sides, I thought it might be possible to make progress. I also made a sharp reference to their massive supplies to the Arabs.

Brezhnev showed great interest in their proposed side understanding on U.S.–Soviet guarantees. He explained that they meant guaranteeing both the negotiating process and the actual settlement, the United Nations being powerless. I said that we were prepared to consider this approach.

Brezhnev agreed to begin concrete negotiations tomorrow. We will meet at 11:00 Moscow time and continue without interruption. I see very tough negotiations ahead of us, particularly on point two of their draft resolution. It is therefore too early to tell whether we can reach a resolution, although his attitude on our bilateral relations suggests we may have an even chance.[6]

---

[5] October 18. See Document 202.

[6] In telegram Tohak 56/WH32586, October 21, Scowcroft informed Kissinger that he had passed his report to the President, who "was in a much more subdued mood than yesterday and appeared very relaxed with respect to the Middle East issue." Nixon remarked that if anyone could handle Brezhnev it was Kissinger and noted that his message to Brezhnev was designed to be helpful and certainly did not inhibit the Secretary from saying that he had to consult with the President prior to making a commitment. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, TOHAK 1–60, Oct. 20–23, 1973)

220. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

Moscow, October 21, 1973, 0600Z.

Hakto 6. 1. I did not see the President's message to me[2] or the press release (AP–V168) relating to his instructions on letter to Brezhnev until I had returned from my first session with the Soviets. I was shocked at the tone of the instructions, the poor judgement in the content of the Brezhnev letter and the failure to let me know in advance that a press statement be issued.[3]

2. Did you, as I asked, take these matters up with Haig before final decisions were made?

3. The letter to Brezhnev has already been used against me; the General Secretary refused to accept it when I told him I would have to refer any scheme back to Washington for consideration, citing the fact that I already had full powers granted me by the President.

4. As a result, my position here is almost insoluble. If I carry out the letter of the President's instructions it will totally wreck what little bargaining leverage I still have. Our first objective must be a cease-fire, that will be tough enough to get the Israelis to accept; it will be impossible as part of a global deal. If the war continues the consequences will be incalculable. We can pursue the course the President has in mind after a cease-fire made with Israeli acquiescence, but not before. In the meantime, a continuation of public comment can only ruin us all around.

5. It will be a near miracle if we bring off a cease-fire, but I think it can be done if we stay disciplined. The President can then work as he wishes.

6. I want you to know that I consider the tone and substance of his instructions to me to be unacceptable. We have brought foreign conduct to the point we have by avoiding gimmicks and holding to measured steps. I intend to continue with this approach, which I believe to be the appropriate course.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, HAKTO, SECTO, TOSEC, Misc., Oct. 20–23, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Immediate.

[2] See Document 218.

[3] The letter to Brezhnev is Document 217. Regarding the President's instructions, see footnote 2 thereto. The press release is not printed; but see Document 223.

7. I want to ensure that nothing I have said here or that is reported in other messages detailing my meetings is used in press meetings.

8. Please show this message to Haig.[4]

[4] Kissinger recalled in his memoirs that when he returned to the guest house after his first session with Brezhnev, there was "another unnerving surprise"—the instructions from Nixon along with a White House announcement of the fact that the instructions had been sent. He commented that "the message, dictated personally by Nixon, was, however much I disagreed with it, an acute discussion of the Middle East problem, a remarkable feat of concentration considering the Watergate storm raging about him." Kissinger noted that the instructions expressed Nixon's conviction that the Soviet Union and the United States should jointly use the end of the war to impose a comprehensive peace in the Middle East. He remarked that it had been a blessing that he had been ignorant of this message during his session with Brezhnev since "American strategy so far had been to *separate* the cease-fire from a postwar political settlement and to reduce the Soviet role in the negotiations that would follow the cease-fire." (*Years of Upheaval*, pp. 550–551)

221. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Moscow, October 21, 1973, noon–4 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

USSR
General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev
Foreign Minister A.A. Gromyko
Deputy Foreign Minister V.V. Kuznetsov
Mr. G.M. Kornienko, Chief, USA Division
Ambassador A. Dobrynin
Mr. A.M. Alexandrov-Agentov, Aide to CPSU General Secretary Brezhnev
Mr. V.M. Sukhodrev, Interpreter

US
Secretary Kissinger
Assistant Secretary Joseph J. Sisco
Deputy Assistant Secretary Alfred L. Atherton
Director of Planning and Coordination Winston Lord
Mr. Helmut Sonnenfeldt, NSC Staff
Mr. William Hyland, NSC Staff

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 76, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Kissinger Trip to Moscow, Tel Aviv & London, October 20–22, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting was held in the General Secretary's office in the Kremlin.

B: My voice situation is that my doctors keep treating me and I keep . . .

K: That's good for my nerves.

B: In that case I shall do my best to cure my voice. I have been thinking about how we should proceed today, and I have the following suggestions to make. Yesterday in general terms you expressed your attitude in principle to points raised in our latest document.[2] Now to speak in the same general terms to you as yesterday, let me say I and my colleagues have formed the impression that you regard that document as a good and constructive basis for our work and for possible agreement between us.

As I understand it, in the latest letter I have received from the President,[3] he feels that if we act in the spirit of accord, in the spirit of attempting to find an acceptable solution, and in the spirit of seeking to take concerted actions after the cease fire, we can find a good way out of the present situation. I want to be sure I understood the President's message correctly. Therefore, if you have no doubts as to my having correctly understood the theme of the President's message, I would suggest—I'm sure this goes for diplomats as for ordinary people—less words and more deeds.

I therefore suggest we begin the process of practically ironing out acceptable formulas, that is, we should immediately proceed point by point to what was stated in the document. Take point one, for instance, reach agreement on that; then we could inform President Nixon we reached agreement on that, and subsequent points under discussion are in the process of being concerted. In general, I should like to keep President Nixon informed on all steps we take here; inform him quickly as possible. I feel he would like that. I want this to be so because the President himself has reacted very promptly to all of my messages and I should like to respond in kind. If you agree, we could take up point one and endeavor to reach agreement on it. We feel this would bring us closer to adoption of a constructive decision and if such a decision is arrived at, Dr. Kissinger could take two days off and go to Leningrad before going home.

Seriously, we should proceed from the assumption that we have spent quite enough time discussing the general proposals of our talks and that, as I see it, we have reached a measure of accord on that score. Therefore, we should now turn to concrete work, and I believe we should take up the three points rather than relegating them to some kind of commission. It is better for us to bear the responsibility for deci-

---

[2] See Document 202.

[3] Document 217.

sions of such vital importance rather than to relegate the decisions to someone else. If we did that, there would be no need to meet face to face, relegating it to a committee, instead of meeting face to face across the table, and in a very good atmosphere.

And, also, I proceed from the assumption that we certainly understand and realize you have certain difficulties as regards bringing your allies and friends to accept this or that decision. I trust you will realize we too have difficulties of the same sort, and particularly since we have more states to deal with than you. You have just Israel. We have the entire Arab world. We feel we are such major states we can, as President Nixon says, we can have decisive influence on decisions and a joint decision taken by us could prevail. What President Nixon said, I certainly agree with. Getting down to specific points, perhaps we can reach agreement quite quickly for something constructive to suggest to President Nixon and to finding an end to the conflict.

And, I also proceed from another assumption. That is, that I have noticed in my three years of experience conducting discussions with Dr. Kissinger that I turn out to be the man who makes all the concessions. You know that is true, that is why you are smiling. What about my position? I have to do all the crying.

I would then suggest that perhaps, Dr. Kissinger, if you agree, that you might give me the benefit of your comments on all three points of the resolution, of the document. We could then get down to concrete discussion and do away with abstractions.

K: If we do away with abstractions, we will have nothing left to say.

B: But I do think we ought . . .

K: Mr. General Secretary, you have correctly understood the letter of President Nixon, and I agree we should proceed with the attitude you described.

B: That is the only way we can act in order to get down to business.

K: I also agree we should go point by point. Could I ask one procedural question, because it is not clear from our discussion what we are attempting to do. Is it our intention to do something that, with the concurrence of the parties, we submit to the Security Council, or something simply we submit to the parties? I wasn't fully clear yesterday what you had in mind. We are open minded.

B: While we have no pride in this respect, as I understood it yesterday, we seemed to reach an accord on a general approach. We could reach agreement on a certain proposal which we could, with the concurrence of the sides, present to the Security Council, and that would be acceptable to both sides—this is one possible method of action. If we feel it would be more expedient for our two states to bring influence to

bear on the Arabs on the hand, and Israel on the other, and induce them to move forward to a peaceful settlement, that is another possibility I would agree with equally. In that event, too, we should start now by discussing the specific points, point by point. So if you have a certain preference, I would be glad if you told me.

If we proceed from the premise that we cannot do anything at all, you cannot influence the Israelis and we cannot influence the Arabs, or proceed from the premise that we can do nothing through the Security Council in the sense of bringing about a resolution aimed at a settlement, first a cease fire and then a settlement, then the question arises why is our meeting necessary at all. Certainly I agreed to it in the sincere hope this meeting would proceed from the point towards a final acceptable solution that would serve the cause of reaching a peaceful settlement. How can we do that? By discussing the proposals. I'm not claiming the proposals are ideal or can be accepted as they stand right now. Certainly various amendments can be made to the proposals, but let us right now begin a calm and friendly discussion of those proposals, just as we did at San Clemente[4] in a truly friendly spirit.

Now our conversation may present a few ideas. Some of the world's greatest discoveries and inventions were made by the greatest scientists sort of off the cuff. Therefore, I believe in this case it is another thing we must take into account. The Security Council was convened at the initiative of the United States, and is still in session. As I now see it, if we start trying to work out a set of proposals bypassing the Security Council, that would not be the best way of acting. So I think we should endeavor not to violate the UN Charter, those provisions of the Security Council should be maintained.

We should give preference to the following method. Make an effort to elaborate proposals which could in a form that had been agreed by us be submitted to the Security Council in the hope that the Security Council will vote in favor of those proposals. I believe if we do succeed in elaborating such proposals, any point we agreed on should be mutually acceptable. Give no one a unilateral advantage, the Arabs, Israelis, the Soviet Union or the United States. They should be couched in such terms as to promote the good relations established between our countries, in such terms as would enable us to go further forward along the path we have chosen for development of our relations and the good will existing between us. And that also would be absolutely correct from our point of view for in international practice our two sides will have to take a constructive decision on these matters. If we just acted alone, we might have to face questions from various quarters and they

[4] See Documents 73 and 74.

might be so numerous that a full year would not be enough to cope with them.

K: I think we should follow the plan outlined by the General Secretary. I think we should attempt to come to some understanding here, then discuss it with the parties, and if we agree, have the possibility to exercise great influence on the parties, and then submit it to the Security Council. And, then after the cease fire, our two sides can continue exchanges on how to move towards peace, towards the final solution.

B: I have one substantial comment to make regarding this. I will be quite frank. I will not conceal. Let us endeavor to reach a constructive solution. You know as well as we do how contradictory the views and attitudes of the two sides are regarding the present situation, especially today, when there is a war on in the area. If we reach agreement here between us, and I am sure we can do that, and if we then start talking, we with the Arab world and you with the Israelis, the Israelis will confront you with so many questions as the Arabs will with us, our agreement will be worth nothing. We will not be able to act jointly in the Security Council. It will mean all we have talked about, about being able to influence the sides, agreeing to reach solutions, all that will hang suspended. We will lose our prestige, and they will say we were only pretending we can influence the parties, and in fact we cannot. As soon as we reach agreement, let us submit it to the Security Council. Then another matter arises, informing the sides. We can say this is what we have agreed to and are submitting to the Security Council. That is what we are going to do and you can do whatever you like. It is the only way to proceed.

K: Mr. General Secretary, I propose we try to reach agreement. We can then decide on tactics. In principle, if we reach agreement, then we should submit it soon after to the Security Council to bring about an end to the hostilities.

B: Let us indeed take that method. Let us then proceed to a point by point discussion. Let us take up all these things. We are prepared to hear you.

K: How do we do it? Let me read yours and then give you our suggestions. Would that be acceptable? First point, as I have it from your Ambassador was, "A call to the sides to immediately cease fire and all military action on the positions where the troops actually are."

B: That's correct.

K: Let me read the redraft I have. It is very similar to yours, only a little more precise.

B: Please. I am sharpening my knives for peaceful purposes. (Picking up a knife to eat an apple.)

K: "Calls upon all parties to the present fighting, including those who are not directly involved but have sent military units to the area of

combat, to cease all fighting and terminate all military activity immediately in the positions they now occupy." It is really only a little more precise.

B: Is that all of point one?

K: The only difference is that we just want an equal commitment from other Arab countries, that's the only difference. Should I go on?

B: Please.

K: I'll read your point, then our point. "Call upon parties to start immediately after the ceasefire a phased withdrawal of the Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories to the line in accordance with Resolution 242 of the Security Council, with completion of this withdrawal in the shortest period of time."

B: Yes, I have it before me.

K: Ours is much shorter. "Calls upon parties concerned to start immediately after the ceasefire . . .

B: Would you write it?

K: It's very short, yes, we will give it to you in writing. "Calls upon parties concerned to start immediately after cease fire the implementation of Security Council Resolution 242 in all of its parts." I must say this—just for your information—it has not been at all discussed with Israel. In fact, they have told us that they do not accept any linkage with 242. I just wanted to tell you. We are submitting this as an indication of our willingness to proceed in the spirit the General Secretary outlined.

B: We will get a translation. I will then look into it in greater detail. It is very difficult to get all the details by ear. I trust you will give it in writing.

K: Point three. I will read yours, just as a check, then I will read our point three. "A decision to start immediately and concurrently with the ceasefire appropriate consultations aimed at establishing a just and honorable peace in the Middle East." Just for checking.

B: Durable peace.

K: I was wondering, I have never seen the word "honorable" before . . .

B: It is durable.

K: I didn't hear it correctly on the phone.

B: It is wrongly translated in this paper.

K: We have for point three. "Call upon parties concerned to start immediately and concurrently with a cease fire appropriate negotiations under appropriate auspices aimed at achieving paragraph two above and aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East."

Sisco: "appropriate auspices to establish . . . "

K: "Aimed at establishing . . . aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East." And if you wanted—we don't insist on it—what we mean by just and durable peace—"in conditions of mutual security and respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area within secure and recognized borders." We will write it out and give you a text.

B: What a hard time I have with you.

K: It is basically the words of your proposal.

B: After this discussion I am going to file an application. We have a higher diplomatic school. I'm going to take that course. It may be easier to talk to you.

K: We have never failed yet, Mr. General Secretary, in our negotiations and we won't fail in this one.

B: That seems to be a promising prospect. I have a feeling we are going to have a nice dinner together tonight, starting off much earlier than we did yesterday, which will be a prize for us.

[Omitted here is material on the detailed negotiation between Kissinger and Brezhnev on the language of the Security Council resolution.]

K: Let me sum up so we are very sure. Our understanding of "auspices" is that at the opening of negotiations and at some critical moments the U.S. and Soviet Union will be participants in the process of negotiations.

B: We will participate.

K: Right, not at every session, but at key points. This is our understanding. The actual implementation we will have to work out afterwards, because we cannot get it accepted tonight.

B: In short, the US and the Soviet Union are active participants in the negotiations.

K: Not in every detail, but in the opening phase and at critical points throughout.

B: Perhaps we could formulate it in this way. The Soviet Union and the United States are active participants in the negotiations which shall be conducted under their auspices. Details of what particular moments will be worked out in the process of the actual negotiations, but also with a view to not letting the process of negotiations slip out of our hands.

K: I must tell you honestly the Israelis will violently object to Soviet participation.

B: Then, other side might object to American participation.

K: Therefore, for us to guarantee 100% would be unrealistic, but we will use our maximum influence. That I can honestly promise. We

have no interest in a relationship with you, Mr. General Secretary, in which we break an understanding with you.

B: But that is something which I would like to have laid down as an understanding jointly reached, on our interpretation of the meaning of the word "auspices."

K: What I have written out is that the negotiations will be conducted under our auspices and we will participate in them at crucial moments.

B: In other words in the solution of all the key issues.

K: Yes.

B: In the interests of achieving a durable and reliable peace in the area.

K: Right. But it must be brought about after the cease fire. We cannot do that tonight.

B: I agree. First implement the first part, i.e., the draft resolution to be submitted to the Security Council.

K: Our understanding is what we have given to you. I will write it out to make sure we understand exactly what is given to you. I don't want to be impolite, but the most useful thing I can do in the time frame we have is to get in touch with the President. The understanding is exactly what I have given you.

B: Right. Then you can get with Gromyko.

K: If we can meet three or four hours after we have sent out our messages. One other technical thing. Could our people set up open telephone lines between me and Scali?

B: Yes.

K: During the Security Council meeting tonight, we will get our people to work together.

[Omitted here is material on the technicalities of Kissinger's communication with New York.]

K: We should also have agreement that neither Malik nor Scali will accept amendments except by mutual agreement.

B: Absolutely, and we consider that we have reached agreement.

K: I technically have to ask the President's approval.

B: I am very sincere. I am not saying goodbye.

K: The President could overrule me. It could happen, but I tell you as a friend, it won't happen.

(There was a brief discussion of a possible preamble. Gromyko pointed out this would take time and suggested simply leading in with "The Security Council." The Secretary agreed.)

222. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

Moscow, October 21, 1973, 1530Z.

Hakto 9. 1. Please pass the following to the President and Haig only. There should be no further communications with anyone—especially Dinitz—until you are specifically instructed to do so.

2. I am relying upon you to see that absolute silence is maintained in Washington until the appropriate hour. Leaks, hints, or jubilation will ruin everything.

3. Message for the President follows:

A. After five hours I have agreed with Secretary General Brezhnev on a Security Council resolution which:

(1) Calls for a cease fire in place to be carried out within 12 hours of the adopting of the Security [Council Resolution?]

(2) Includes a call that Security Council Resolution 242 be implemented in all its parts and

(3) Contains the provision that, concurrently with the cease fire, negotiations between the parties would be started under appropriate auspices looking towards a final settlement.

B. We have also agreed that Malik and Scali at 6:00 p.m. New York time Sunday will call for a meeting of the Security Council to be held at 9:00 p.m. We agreed that the above resolution (text at paragraph I) would be jointly sponsored by the U.S. and the USSR. I will be informing the UK, French and Australian ambassadors here in a few hours[2] so that we can get their full cooperation in the Security Council.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, HAKTO, SECTO, TOSEC, Misc., Oct. 20–23, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only; Flash. Sent to Scowcroft for President Nixon.

[2] At 6:30 p.m., Kissinger met with the British, French, and Australian Ambassadors to the Soviet Union and informed them that he had met with the Soviet leaders for several hours since his arrival. He said that they had agreed to the text of a UN resolution which would be introduced in the Security Council at 9 p.m. (New York time) that night and that the United States and the Soviet Union would jointly call for a meeting of the Security Council at 6 p.m. New York time (1 a.m. Moscow time). The Secretary stated that he obviously could not tell their governments what to do, but he stressed that "anyone who was interested in a quick end to the fighting would presumably desist from trying to make amendments to this Resolution." The memorandum of conversation, October 21, is ibid., Box 76, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Kissinger Trip to Moscow, Tel Aviv & London, October 20–22, 1973.

C. In addition, two important understandings were agreed to between the Secretary General and myself:

1. That the negotiations between the parties would be under joint U.S.–USSR auspices as you instructed me to accomplish.

2. That the U.S. and the USSR will press for an immediate exchange of all prisoners of war.

D. This is a major accomplishment for the policy which you initiated a week ago. I hope the Israelis will, as they should, take this as a major victory. The settlement makes clear beyond any question that the U.S. is the dominant influence in the area without which nothing can be accomplished. It will stop the fighting with Israeli forces both in Syrian and Egyptian territory; there is absolutely no reference to 242; most important, we have finally achieved direct negotiations between the parties; we have Brezhnev's pledge that he will produce the Arabs on a prisoner exchange; and most importantly, we have faced down the Soviets for all the world to see.

E. I suggest that simultaneously with the 6:00 p.m. joint U.S.–USSR request for a Security Council meeting, Ziegler make an announcement as follows:

"As a result of talks between Secretary General Brezhnev and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, I have directed Ambassador Scali to join with the Soviet UN representative, Mr. Malik, in requesting an immediate meeting of the Security Council this evening. The United States and the USSR have agreed on a resolution which will be submitted jointly to the Council this evening."

F. Beyond this announcement, nothing should be said or hinted or the whole thing will come apart.

G. Gromyko and I will draft joint instructions to Scali and Malik.

H. Congratulations on your steadfastness.

I. Text of Security Council resolution we have agreed upon is as follows:

"The Security Council:

1. Calls upon all parties to the present fighting to cease all firing and terminate all military activity immediately, no later than 12 hours after the moment of the adoption of this decision, in the positions they now occupy.

2. Calls upon the parties concerned to start immediately after the cease fire the implementation of SC Resolution 242 in all of its parts.

3. Decides that immediately and concurrently with the cease fire, negotiations start between the parties concerned under appropriate

auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East."[3]

[3] In telegram Tohak 63/WH32592, October 21, Scowcroft responded that the President had received Kissinger's report and asked that he be given the following message immediately: "My warmest congratulations on yet another superb diplomatic achievement." Scowcroft added his own "admiring congratulations." (Ibid., Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, TOHAK 61–123, Oct. 20–23, 1973)

223. Telegram From the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 21, 1973, 1538Z.

Tohak 55. Ref: Hakto 6.[2]

1. To put the activities of yesterday morning, referred to in Hakto 6, in perspective, you must understand that the President was demonstrating his leadership in the crisis. All the actions which took place were designed to illustrate that he was personally in charge. I am sure that you are fully aware of all the motivations behind this activity and we discussed some of them before your departure.

2. The tape issue and the Richardson/Ruckelshaus/Cox affair is now dominating the news and activities here. Initial media reaction has appeared quite negative. The development of this domestic crisis gave additional impetus to efforts Saturday to show that the President's ability to govern was unaffected by the Watergate related turmoil. In that regard, I should point out that there was no special press statement issued yesterday. The "statement" to which you refer came out as a part of Jerry's normal briefing.[3] As I have reported, the specifics of that statement were added at the last minute and obviously for the reasons just mentioned.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, TOHAK 1–60, Oct. 20–23, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Eyes Only; Immediate. Sent with instructions to deliver in a sealed envelope to Eagleburger and to retain no file copies.

[2] Document 220.

[3] See footnote 3, Document 214.

3. I have already discussed the letter to Brezhnev. It and the instructions to you[4] I showed and discussed with Haig. I was not surprised by your reaction to the message of instructions but, as you have frequently said, you need to know the President's mood and what he is thinking. That message of instructions conveyed far better than any description I could have given his mood of the moment, as I tried to indicate in the introductory paragraph with which I forwarded the instructions. Had I substantially modified the instructions, that whole flavor would have been lost. No one, repeat no one, has a copy and only Haig has seen them.

4. Believe me, we are doing our best.

Warm regards.

[4] Documents 217 and 218.

224. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Embassy in Jordan[1]

Moscow, October 21, 1973, 1716Z.

Secto 11/13137. Eyes Only for the Ambassador.

1. Please pass following message to King Hussein from the Secretary.

2. *Begin text*.

Your Majesty: As a result of my meetings last evening and today with General Secretary Brezhnev, we and the Soviets have reached agreement on the text of a Security Council resolution which our representatives will present to the Council this evening.

3. The resolution does three things:

A. It calls for a cease-fire in place no later than 12 hours following adoption;

B. It calls upon the parties to start immediately after the cease-fire the implementation of SC 242 in all its parts; and

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 722, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Vol. XXIX, [May 1973–22 Oct., 1973]. Secret; Flash; Cherokee; Nodis. Repeated Immediate to the Department of State.

C. It provides that negotiations start immediately between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East.

4. This resolution meets the objectives for which we have been working so tirelessly since the outbreak of the present fighting, as I have described them to Your Majesty in earlier messages. Let me say again that your steadfastness and courage have been a source of support to us in our efforts to bring the present crisis to an end and lay the basis for new efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement. I will value Your Majesty's continued support as those efforts go forward.[2]

Sincerely, Henry A. Kissinger

Kissinger

[2] In telegram 5624 from Amman, October 21, Brown reported that Hussein was sending elements of the 99th Brigade into Syria to establish a "phantom division" so as to be able to say Jordan sent major forces to Syria before the cease-fire. Also in the telegram was Hussein's reply to this message in which Hussein shared his hopes for the joint resolution and explained his decision to establish a tactical command in Syria. (Ibid., Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973)

225. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the United States Mission to the United Nations[1]

Moscow, October 21, 1973, 1813Z.

Secto 13/13139. Strictly Eyes Only for Scali From the Secretary. Subj: M. E. UNSC Res.

1. This is a private message just for you. It has not been discussed with Soviets. Your joint instruction[2] says we would like resolution adopted by midnight if possible.

2. You should proceed at a deliberate pace in Security Council. I do not mean delaying matter or appearing to delay matter. If resolution is

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, HAKTO, SECTO, TOSEC, Misc., Oct. 20–23, 1973. Top Secret; Nodis; Cherokee. Repeated Flash to the Department of State.

[2] Telegram Secto 8/13134 from Moscow to USUN, October 21, conveyed to Scali the joint instructions and the text of the resolution agreed upon in Moscow and instructed him to work closely with Malik in seeking the support of other Security Council members. (Ibid.)

not adopted by Security Council by midnight as a result of speakers and other moves, that is all right with us. We agreed with the Soviets to midnight as a target for adoption of the resolution because of stress Soviets have put on speed. We do not have same interest in such speed.

Kissinger

---

226. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Department of State[1]

Moscow, October 21, 1973, 1955Z.

Hakto 12/13145. Deliver to General Scowcroft by fastest possible means. Eyes Only Sensitive General Scowcroft.

To General Scowcroft

From Secretary Kissinger

1. Pass the following message from me to Hafiz Ismail:

2. *Begin text of message:*

I deeply appreciate your message of October 20,[2] which reached me a few hours ago in Moscow. We have reached agreement with General Secretary Brezhnev that our governments will introduce a joint Security Council resolution this evening calling for an immediate cease fire no later than 12 hours from the adoption of the resolution, the implementation of Resolution 242 in all of its parts, and a decision to start negotiations under appropriate auspices aimed at achieving a just and durable peace. On this basis, I believe we can look toward a settlement satisfactory to all parties. To this end, we have agreed with the Soviet Government that the United States together with the USSR will be prepared to use their good offices and participate as required to facilitate a fundamental settlement. Thus, the three parts of your message to me are taken into account in the joint resolution. I can assure you that as the fighting ceases, the United States will use its influence to secure a lasting peace in the Middle East on a basis just for all parties.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, HAKTO, SECTO, TOSEC, Misc., Oct. 20–23, 1973. Secret; Flash; Nodis; Cherokee.

[2] See footnote 2, Document 214.

I want to add my personal hope that we can continue to use the special contact we have established, and which has proved so useful in recent days.

Warm regards.

End text

---

227. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, October 21, 1973.

PARTICIPANTS

Ambassador Simcha Dinitz
General Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Commander Jonathan T. Howe, NSC Staff

General Scowcroft began the meeting by reading the agreed text of a resolution which the U.S. and the Soviet Union had jointly agreed to submit to the Security Council that evening. General Scowcroft pointed out that the resolution:

—Leaves all Israeli forces in-place.
—Contains no reference to withdrawal, only a general reference to Resolution 242.
—Calls for direct negotiations between parties with joint U.S./Soviet auspices to facilitate.
—Includes a joint U.S./Soviet commitment to use maximum influence to bring about an exchange of prisoners.

General Scowcroft indicated that a call for a Security Council meeting would be initiated at 6:00 p.m. that evening. The only response made by the Ambassador was that the timetable was very tight.[2]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, June 4–October 31, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive. The meeting took place in Kissinger's office in the White House.

[2] In telegram Hakto 14/Secto 18/13148 from Moscow, October 21, 2105Z, Kissinger instructed Scowcroft to urgently call in Dinitz and extend the Secretary's profoundest apologies for the "four hour communications breakdown, which resulted in telescoping of advance notice Israelis got of Security Council initiative." He added that under the circumstances, the United States would understand if the Israelis felt they required some additional time for military dispositions before the cease-fire took effect, although they were still shooting for a 12-hour time span between the Security Council decision and the beginning of the cease-fire. (Ibid., Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, HAKTO, SECTO, TOSEC, Misc. Oct. 20–23, 1973)

228. Letter From President Nixon to Israeli Prime Minister Meir[1]

Washington, October 21, 1973.

Dear Madame Prime Minister:

Since the attack on your forces on October 6, we have worked tirelessly for an end to the fighting and bloodshed on terms that would enable you and your neighbors to make a new beginning towards peace.

Today, we have concluded discussions with the Soviet Union, the results of which I want to communicate to you urgently for the concurrence and support of your Government.[2]

Secretary Kissinger whom I sent to Moscow in response to an urgent Soviet request, has reached agreement with Mr. Brezhnev on a resolution which we and the Soviets would plan to introduce this evening in the Security Council. This resolution has only three operative paragraphs and nothing else which: (a) calls for an immediate ceasefire in place, the ceasefire to come into effect no later than 12 hours after the Security Council decision has been taken; (b) a second paragraph makes a general call upon the parties to implement Security Council Resolution 242 in all of its parts after the ceasefire; and (c) it is linked to a third paragraph which calls for negotiations between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East. In addition, the Soviets have agreed to join us in strongly urging an immediate exchange of prisoners of war.

Madame Prime Minister, we believe that this is a major achievement for you and for us and supportive of the brave fighting of your forces. It would leave your forces right where they are: There is absolutely no mention whatsoever of the word "withdrawal" in the resolution; third, for the first time, we have achieved the agreement of the So-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, June 4–October 31, 1973. No classification marking. A handwritten notation reads: "Hand delivered to Amb. Dinitz, 11:00 a.m., 10/22/73.

[2] The text of the letter was transmitted by Kissinger to Scowcroft in telegram Hakto 10/13147 from Moscow, October 21. Kissinger instructed Scowcroft when presenting the President's letter to Dinitz, to make the following points orally from him personally. The resolution achieved what the Israelis had sought for 25 years—direct negotiations with the Arabs without preconditions. It made no reference to Israeli withdrawal and left Israeli forces in place in their present positions in Egypt and Syria. Reference to Resolution 242 was minimal. Agreement that "appropriate auspices" meant U.S.–Soviet auspices guarded against the risk that outsiders would be injected into the negotiating process. The Soviets had also agreed to work for a POW exchange. The Secretary stressed that it was essential that Israel express unqualified support for the resolution. (Ibid., Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, HAKTO, SECTO, TOSEC, Misc., Oct. 20–23, 1973)

viet Union to a resolution that calls for direct negotiation without conditions or qualifications between the parties under appropriate auspices. At the same time we and the Soviets have agreed privately to make our joint auspices available to you and to the Arabs to facilitate this process, if this is agreeable to the parties.

I wish there had been time for fuller consultations but with the bloodshed continuing, with Israel in such a favorable position on the ground, with the risks increasing by the hour as substantial supplies are being poured in by both major powers, we felt it was imperative that an understanding be reached promptly.

We are planning to ask Ambassador Scali to call for a meeting of the Security Council at 9:00 p.m. this evening. The Soviet Union will join us in this request as well as in the submission of the resolution.

Finally, Madame Prime Minister, I want to say a word about the Arab reaction. We do not know whether this proposal will be accepted by the other side because among other things it is a far distance indeed from the five-point Sadat program announced the other day.[3]

I hope, therefore, that you and your colleagues will reply promptly to this message and that we have your full support in this matter.[4]

With my best wishes,

Sincerely,

Richard Nixon

---

[3] See footnote 3, Document 190.

[4] Telegram Tohak 70, October 22, 0338Z, informed Kissinger that Israel had accepted the resolution, but needed clarification on a number of questions. Tohak 68, October 22, 0316Z, informed Kissinger that Meir asked that he stop in Israel on his way home from Moscow. In Secto 21 from Moscow, October 22, Kissinger informed the Embassy in Tel Aviv he would briefly visit Israel. (Respectively, National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, HAKTO, SECTO, TOSEC, Misc., October 20–23, 1973; ibid., Box 722, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Vol. XXIV; and ibid., Box 610, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 12, March–October 1973)

229. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Moscow, October 22, 1973, 8:45–9:45 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

USSR	*USA*
Andrei A. Gromyko, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR	Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Vasili V. Kuznetsov, First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR	Joseph Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State for NEA
Georgi M. Kornienko, Member of Collegium of Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Helmut Sonnenfeldt, NSC Senior Staff
Anatoli F. Dobrynin, Ambassador to the United States	Ambassador Robert McCloskey
Victor M. Sukhodrev, First Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	William Hyland, NSC Senior Staff
	Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff

The Secretary and the Foreign Minister began by initialing the agreed US-Soviet understanding on the meaning of the phrase "under appropriate auspices" in paragraph 3 of Security Council Resolution 338. The text [at Tab A][2] was initialed in English and Russian copies.

The Secretary offered a second written understanding [Tab B] to confirm the agreement to use maximum influence with the parties to ensure an exchange of prisoners of war within 72 hours of the ceasefire. "This will help me in Israel," the Secretary said. After a brief private conversation, it was agreed that a formal written understanding was not necessary. The Foreign Minister assured the Secretary that we had the personal commitment of Brezhnev. "I'll take the word of the General Secretary," Dr. Kissinger stated. "There is no need to sign."

The group was then seated at the table, and breakfast was served.

Gromyko: At this breakfast you are the host.

Kissinger: I told you I once gave Brandt a lunch in his own house.

Gromyko: The next lunch I will give for you.

Kissinger: Good.

Gromyko: Another agreement reached!

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 76, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Kissinger Trip to Moscow, Tel Aviv & London, October 20–22, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting was held at the Guest House of the U.S. Delegation in Lenin Hills, Moscow. All brackets except those that indicate omitted material are in the original.

[2] Tabs A and B are attached, but not printed.

Sisco: Did you hear about Scali's phone call about "practical fulfillment?" I had to explain it to him in the middle of the night. He said, "Did you discuss it?" I said, "We discussed it fully."

Kissinger: One other question: Can I tell newsmen at the airport that I'm going [to Israel]? Would it be embarrassing?

Gromyko: Psychologically . . . It would be preferable if you not tell your destination from Moscow [laughing].

Kissinger: Then we do it from Washington.

Gromyko: I think it's rather [better] psychologically.

Kissinger: Good.

Gromyko: All right.

Kissinger: Then I won't say anything at the airport. Otherwise I'd be lying.

Gromyko: You should be enigmatic. [Laughing]

Dobrynin: Like a sphinx.

Kissinger: They will ask me, "Where are you going?" I'll say, "It remains to be decided!"

The Chinese, when they were informed of this resolution by the President of the Security Council, McIntyre, were very angry. He [Huang Hua] pounded the table, I heard.

Gromyko: [rises] I offer a toast to what we accomplished yesterday and the day before and to all who accompanied you. [drinks toast]

Kissinger: [rises] Mr. Foreign Minister, we've negotiated many agreements. But even more than agreements, we've negotiated a relationship between our countries which is fundamental to peace in the world. What we've done in the last two days is important not only to the Middle East but to US–Soviet relations and our whole foreign policy. I therefore offer a toast to the Foreign Minister and all he has done for the friendship between our two countries and the peace of the world.

I also want to offer a toast of a personal nature. What we've accomplished couldn't have been done without the contribution of your Ambassador in Washington, who—if it doesn't ruin his position here—I must say is not only a distinguished Ambassador but a great personal friend.

Gromyko: We call him the Russian American. [Laughter]

[toast]

Twenty years ago there was an interpreter at the UN named Sherry, who repeated every gesture of the speaker. If the speaker stretched his hand out like this [shakes his fist] he did it too. [Laughter]

Dobrynin: Once during a UN debate on the Congo . . .

Kuznetsov: It must be ten years ago.

Dobrynin: A speaker gave a quote from Hamlet, "Everything is rotten in Denmark." And the representative from Denmark got up and said, "He may know something about the Congo but he knows nothing about Denmark." [Laughter]

Gromyko: I offer a toast to the President. [toast]

Kissinger: This isn't strictly protocol, but I offer a toast to the General Secretary, who has done so much for US–Soviet relations.

Gromyko: Sometimes protocol must be subordinated to something substantial.

Kuznetsov: To something substantive.

Kissinger: To affection.

Gromyko: In Russia we keep the main toast to the last.

Kuznetsov: There is a difference between drinking and a toast. [Laughter]

Gromyko: When do you get back to Washington?

Kissinger: Midnight Washington time.

It [the visit to Israel] will be very important for the guarantee question. If we did it in Washington, there would be many exchanges. When it's done I will let your Ambassador know in Washington.

Kuznetsov: It's very important.

Kissinger: It's also our preferred way of doing it.

[Phone call comes in for Sisco from Scali, Sisco goes out to receive it.]

The meeting [of the UN Security Council] started one hour late, but it finished in exactly three hours as we had planned. It was excellent example of cooperation.[3]

Gromyko: The French and Chinese were absent.

Kissinger: No, just China. The French voted for it.

---

[3] In telegram 4119 from USUN, October 22, Scali reported that the Security Council had adopted the U.S.–Soviet draft as Resolution 338 without modification at 12:50 a.m. EDT by a vote of 14 to 0 with no abstentions. (China did not participate in the vote.) He added that the United Nations was cabling the resolution immediately to Egypt, Syria, and Israel and would communicate it shortly to the other combatant states. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1175, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, 1973 Middle East War, 22 October, 1973, File No. 17) For a summary of the proceedings in the Security Council, see *Yearbook of the United Nations, 1973*, pp. 196–198. The text of the resolution reads in full: "The Security Council, 1. Calls upon all parties to the present fighting to cease all firing and terminate all military activity immediately, no later than 12 hours after the moment of the adoption of this decision, in the positions they now occupy; 2. Calls upon the parties concerned to start immediately after the cease-fire the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in all of its parts; 3. Decides that, immediately and concurrently with the cease-fire, negotiations shall start between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East." (Ibid., p. 213)

Sonnenfeldt: The French made a speech saying "auspices" meant the Security Council.

Kissinger: A number of countries offered their interpretation that it meant that.

Sisco: [comes back:] Malik and Scali have agreed that the UN Secretariat will send the resolution to Israel, Syria, and Egypt and as note verbale to others related to 242, such as Iraq, Syria, etc. as a matter of information. I think it's a good idea. Doesn't make any difference.

Gromyko: Right.

Kissinger: You should know that when we agreed to go to Israel, there were two conditions—they had to accept the resolution and there had to be substantial compliance with the resolution.

Gromyko: And they accepted.

Kissinger: They accepted. Because I didn't want to be there if there was a violation going on.

Gromyko: Did any Arab representatives speak?

Kissinger: Zayyat spoke. We understand that Huang Hua was very angry until Zayyat told him that the non-committed wanted it adopted. He had been very angry.

You must have been in very active touch with your Arab friends yesterday.

Gromyko: We were in touch. We were in touch with some of them. With several of them.

Kissinger: Knowing how the Foreign Minister operates, I didn't think he was entirely ignorant of their probable reaction. And so were we, but not with so many. Australia, Britain, France.

Gromyko: And you were in touch with the nonaligned bloc countries.

Dobrynin: The nonaligned bloc!

Kissinger: We told the Yugoslavs we would rather deal with hostile countries, who were less critical than the nonaligned. [Laughter] We should form a bloc of our own. [Laughter] Has there ever been a joint US–Soviet resolution at the Security Council before?

Sisco: I think there was on the non-proliferation treaty.

Sonnenfeldt: And General Assembly resolution Number 1 in 1946.

Kissinger: But it must be the first time that during a crisis the US and the Soviet Union joined in a resolution.

Gromyko: You are right.

Dobrynin: The United Nations was puzzled yesterday. They couldn't find a way to oppose it!

Kissinger: I don't know what the American press will say. When we were meeting, they were writing about détente being ruined.

Gromyko: Are they good boys or bad boys?

Sisco: Today they're good. [Laughter]

Kissinger: Tomorrow I'll have a press conference and I have a certain ability to handle them.

Gromyko: We will have time to negotiate one more resolution.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

---

230. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Tel Aviv, October 22, 1973, 1:35–2:15 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Prime Minister Golda Meir
Mordechai Gazit, Director of Prime Minister's Office
Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff

[The Prime Minister and Dr. Kissinger conferred alone for about 15 minutes after Dr. Kissinger's arrival. Mr. Gazit and Mr. Rodman were then invited in to take notes.]

The Prime Minister: This is the guest house for particular guests. I'm always here, or at my daughter's kibbutz, when something starts. I was away when the Libyan plane incident happened,[2] and then this.

Dr. Kissinger: Madame Prime Minister, you have to understand the situation with 242. This conversation stays only . . .

The Prime Minister: Yes.

Dr. Kissinger: First, during the summit, one method we used to avoid agreement was to refer to 242, and we succeeded. So in the President's mind, getting a reference to 242 is a success. And you have to remember that the war is not seen in the same way in the United States. Secondly, he has been under tremendous pressure from the Arabs and from the oil people for a return to the 1967 borders. For two weeks I kept him from doing this by saying simply 242.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 76, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Kissinger Trip to Moscow, Tel Aviv & London, October 20–22, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting was held in the Guest House in Herzliyya near Tel Aviv. All brackets are in the original.

[2] See footnote 2, Document 22.

So, to refuse a reference to 242 would have been absolutely impossible in those conditions. And the reference to 242 gives you reference to secure and recognized borders, which is in 242.

In Moscow we started with two parts of the resolution, 242 plus the cease-fire.

I want to tell you there are no side understandings on 242. I'll be prepared to show Dinitz when we get back the verbatim protocols of the meeting of the day we negotiated that.

If you compare the Egyptian position of last Tuesday[3] . . .

The Prime Minister: Sadat.

Dr. Kissinger: Sadat's demands. Plus we got a message every two days from Ismail. Plus the Saudis.

When I gave a luncheon for the Arab diplomats in New York, I said I thought the 242 language was a joke. It talks about "just and lasting peace," and "secure and recognized borders." That is still my view. Because the phrases mean nothing. What it means is what is to be negotiated.

In the debate in the Security Council in July, the Arabs refused even 242.

When I negotiated on the Summit with Gromyko, they kept refusing our proposals, which had references to 242—including the proposals you gave us.

So for us to reject a reference to 242 would have been impossible. He [the President] saw the text we started with.

I think your problem is not 242, but what I will talk to you about alone. But you have gotten a tremendous point: more Arab territory, and direct negotiations.

Brezhnev screamed for more than 242; he wanted "full implementation of all UN resolutions."

The Prime Minister: But the resolution doesn't say "direct negotiations." [She reads text:] "negotiations . . . between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace." That's what bothers us. What does this mean?

Dr. Kissinger: Nothing. Until there are negotiations.

The Prime Minister: That's it. But what's the relation between paragraphs 2 and 3? It says full implementation of 242 as well.

Dr. Kissinger: But it's for negotiation.

The Prime Minister: Do the Russians know that is your interpretation?

---

[3] October 16. See footnote 3, Document 190.

Dr. Kissinger: Yes. In fact I wanted it in the text and the Russians said it was not necessary because it was already there.

The Prime Minister: Scali said that, and that was good.

Dr. Kissinger: I drafted it.

The Prime Minister: I thought so.

Dr. Kissinger: I'll give a press conference when I get back, probably Wednesday.[4]

The Prime Minister: Wednesday?

Dr. Kissinger: Maybe tomorrow.

The Prime Minister: We have an all-party meeting of the Knesset tomorrow. We will be asked about that.

Dr. Kissinger: I will give you our formal assurance, which I will repeat publicly, that there are no side understandings on 242.

The Prime Minister: I need your assurance. I believe you.

One other thing we can't live with, that is the POW's.

Also, Malik used the words "practical fulfillment" of 242.

Dr. Kissinger: Let me tell you how this came about. They said there is no Russian word for "implementation." So we said, if the English word is "implementation" you can use "practical fulfillment" in Russian.

The Prime Minister: On the prisoners. We have over 1,000 Egyptians and Syrians, among them pilots and officers.

Dr. Kissinger: I have the word of honor of Brezhnev. That is not worth much, but we can use it. I made clear to him that we couldn't possibly get your concurrence without that. He said he couldn't get agreement in twelve hours. He gave me his solemn word as the leader of the Soviet Union that they would get it. I said, could we bring it about in seventy-two hours? He said he would use his maximum influence.

This morning, I had breakfast with Gromyko and I presented a written understanding. He said he couldn't initial it without the Politburo—which I actually believe—but he repeated the solemn assurance. If they don't live up to it, we will call it to public attention.[5]

---

[4] October 24. Kissinger held a press conference on October 25. The transcript is printed in *The New York Times*, October 26, 1973.

[5] At 8:30 a.m. EDT, October 22, Scowcroft conveyed a message to Vorontsov by telephone that reads: "The only way we were able to get our friends to agree to the cease fire order was on the assurance of an early exchange of POWs. We are therefore counting on the Soviet Government to deliver their friends and early (as soon as possible)." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin and Kissinger, Vol. 7)

The Prime Minister: This means a great deal to us. And no one has greater experience with prisoners of war than you.

Dr. Kissinger: If I were you—I'm not advising you—I would not begin negotiations until it happens. You'd be entitled to do nothing.

The Prime Minister: I can't live with it.

Dr. Kissinger: You don't have to live with it.

The Prime Minister: How can I face the mothers and wives of these men? The Cabinet and I decided to make it a condition of any ceasefire. The Arabs, they couldn't care less. We've given them a list of the prisoners we hold, and they have never even given us a list. They just don't care about human lives. Sadat doesn't have to meet the wives; I do.

Dr. Kissinger: My strategy in this crisis, as I explained to Dinitz several times, was to keep the Arabs down and the Russians down.

The Prime Minister: I know what you did. Without you, I don't know where we would have been.

I went to the airfield the other day and I watched the planes come in. It was more than I could ever have dreamed.

Dr. Kissinger: We have had many exchanges with the Egyptians—as a part of this—and I think they're a little shaky.

The Prime Minister: The Egyptians?

Dr. Kissinger: Yes. I showed Dinitz. At the very beginning, they sent us a message in which they stated all their maximum terms. I said, "These are your ultimate aims. What is your present position?" He then gave me the same line.

I told Zayyat, "In a few days you will think our proposal of October 8 to return to the ceasefire lines was the best possible terms."

The Prime Minister: We would have been in a better position in a few days. But that doesn't matter so much.

We have a trauma about a standstill ceasefire. From the August 1970 experience, when we agreed to a standstill and they moved their missiles up.

Dr. Kissinger: Did you get our message that if you needed a few hours at the other end . . .[6] Did you get it?

Gazit: We did but it was garbled. It was in the context of the Security Council debate, and we thought it meant we could filibuster. But we couldn't.

Dr. Kissinger: The message we intended—but we had to say it carefully because we were using State Department channels and we had had a communications breakdown . . .

---

[6] See footnote 2, Document 227.

The Prime Minister: What does a standstill ceasefire mean?

Dr. Kissinger: Frankly we haven't thought it through.

The Prime Minister: The Soviets will give him all the equipment they need and don't need.

Dr. Kissinger: I asked Gromyko after the war was over, what does Sadat think of this? He said, "It makes no difference, he is a paper camel."

The Prime Minister: But he doesn't live in the world of fact. He thinks he won. We have a source there who has told us that when Sadat talks about getting territories back even if it costs a million men, he really means it.

Dr. Kissinger: How can he think he has won?

The Prime Minister: The other day, the turning point . . .

Dr. Kissinger: Sunday.[7]

The Prime Minister: Bar-Lev told me we had nothing to worry about.

Dr. Kissinger: Let me tell you the objective fact, what I think it is. You have won the war, though at a very high cost. The objective reality is that for six years the Egyptians have been given the most modern weapons, communications, everything, and have achieved nothing. Now you have the West Bank of the Canal. They and the Syrians lost many thousands of missiles.

The Prime Minister: The Russians will resupply them.

Dr. Kissinger: But it doesn't change the basic situation.

The Prime Minister: We're on the road to Damascus. But we didn't want to go there. I told you that.

Dr. Kissinger: Yes. I didn't communicate it to anybody.

The Prime Minister: The Egyptians and Syrians haven't said anything. They have said that the fighting continues.

Dr. Kissinger: You won't get violent protests from Washington if something happens during the night, while I'm flying. Nothing can happen in Washington until noon tomorrow.

The Prime Minister: If they don't stop, we won't.

Dr. Kissinger: Even if they do. . . .

The Prime Minister: There is one other matter I want to ask you about. There are 4,000 Jews left in Damascus, who are living in terrible conditions. We would like the Red Cross to come in and take them out.

Dr. Kissinger: I would raise that publicly.

---

[7] October 21.

The Prime Minister: Scali said the ceasefire means not only Egypt and Syria but all the others involved in the area.

Dr. Kissinger: Yes. We have an understanding with the Russians, and I will say that publicly.

There are two things I will raise with the Russians: the prisoners of war and that.

The Prime Minister: When the war began, they made a blockade of the Straits of Bab Al-Mandab. It has Egyptian destroyers, but it is a Yemeni command.

Dr. Kissinger: I'll raise it with the Soviets. I didn't know that.

You can state it publicly as a demand. It is important that I not appear as your spokesman. It is better if I state it first, than if you do. I can't give it tomorrow.

The Prime Minister: Let us turn to something very basic. What happens to the airlift?

Dr. Kissinger: I have given orders that it is to continue. It will be justified because of what the Soviets are doing. Because if we offered, they wouldn't stop it.

There are twenty ships now being loaded. Forty A–4's—that is definite—will arrive. I have ordered 44 Phantoms. The airlift as of now is continuing. I'll be under tremendous pressure. There is no unanimity—to put it mildly. But as long as the Soviets do it, I may be able to do it.

The President last Thursday ordered the sealift to go on at high speed.[8] We submitted that military request Friday for $2.2 billion, which has established a certain momentum.[9]

The Prime Minister: But there is a phrase in there about "if the war ceases, the funds won't be expended."

Dr. Kissinger: But you have a commitment from the President to replace all your losses. That you have.

I haven't talked with the President about it. It will be very difficult. It will basically be settled between General Haig, General Scowcroft, and those Senators. As long as those maniac Senators don't start attacking me. Which isn't the smartest thing. We can handle it.

Keating is unhappy about being excluded from this. If I may suggest, if you could talk to Keating alone while I talk to Dayan.

The Prime Minister: I can talk to him about what we have discussed.

It is interesting that they haven't said anything, Egypt and Syria. What did the Russians say?

---

[8] See Document 198.

[9] See footnote 7, Document 208.

Dr. Kissinger: The Russians really were very nasty about the Arabs. They said they hadn't asked them. They said they only talked to Cairo. Brezhnev went like this [made a dismissing gesture] every time he mentioned the Arabs. One of my colleagues said to me, how would you like to have the Russians as an ally?

A word about the objective situation. I believe you have won, and I believe we have won. Every Arab now knows, whether they hate us or not . . . I met Bouteflika last week.[10] He told me a long lecture about guerrilla war. He said we had to get involved. I said I was flattered, but if they didn't settle soon the Israelis would beat them, and then they would have to come to me because no one else can do anything. I said the Soviets can give them equipment, but not a settlement. I will get involved but not until objective reality makes it possible. So, whether they hate us or not, they have to talk to us.

I will send a note to the oil-producing countries Thursday, stating that we don't conduct diplomacy under pressure.[11] So unless we get our oil shipments back we'll do nothing.

I don't think Sadat can survive this, do you?

The Prime Minister: I do. Because he is the hero; he dared. The people in command, on the spot, are afraid to report the truth. Like with Nasser. So in Egypt they think they won.

Dr. Kissinger: Gromyko took me aside and said the only danger in Egypt is panic, that your force across the canal isn't very large. This is what they told me. He said that if some steadiness could be produced, maybe your force would collapse.

The Prime Minister: They [the Egyptian forces] didn't collapse. But they're in disorder. But it is not like 1967.

[10] See footnote 1, Document 195.

[11] October 25. No such letter has been found.

231. Telegram From the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) to Secretary of State Kissinger in Tel Aviv[1]

Washington, October 22, 1973, 1222Z.

Tohak 88/WH32622. Have just received the following reply from Ismail:

"1. Mr. Ismail wishes to thank Dr. Kissinger for his message of October 22[2] and to express his appreciation for the major efforts he has exerted and which it is hoped will lead to a speedy, just and lasting solution.

"2. Mr. Ismail wishes to draw Dr. Kissinger's attention to the following:

"(A) That Egypt is fixing 1700 hours local time on October 22 for the beginning of the implementation of the ceasefire in accordance with the Security Council resolution.

"(B) That we earnestly hope that the Israeli side will not in any way try to benefit from the prevailing situation."[3]

While this message was being typed, Vorontsov called with the following message from Moscow:

"President Sadat has informed us that in accordance with the latest resolution of the Security Council, the armed forces of Egypt are ready to cease all the firing at 1700 hours Cairo time if Israel does the same. President Sadat has expressed the wish that Israel make appropriate statement to this effect."

Warm regards.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, TOHAK 61–123, Oct. 20–23, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only; Flash. Sent to Rodman for Kissinger.

[2] In telegram Hakto 15, October 22, 0616Z, Kissinger asked Scowcroft to transmit a personal message to Ismail that reads: "1. Secretary Kissinger wanted you to know that he will in the next few hours be leaving for Israel. We want your government to understand clearly the purpose of this trip. It is to help assure that the Security Council resolution submitted by the US and the USSR will be implemented promptly and to arrange for US–Soviet auspices of the subsequent peace effort. I hope that we can count on the full cooperation of the Egyptian Government in this regard. I look forward to maintaining our contacts." (Ibid., HAKTO, SECTO, TOSEC, Misc., Oct. 20–23, 1973)

[3] Kissinger's response to Ismail (received in Washington from Tel Aviv at 9:33 a.m. on October 22) reads: "Your message to me is greatly appreciated. The information concerning a ceasefire has been conveyed to the Israelis and their response is as follows: 'The orders have been issued for a ceasefire in place at 1852 hours Tel Aviv time. Those orders will be carried out if the other side carries out the orders they reportedly have issued.'" (Ibid., Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973)

232. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Tel Aviv, October 22, 1973, 2:30–4 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Golda Meir, Prime Minister of Israel
Yigal Allon, Deputy Prime Minister
Abba Eban, Foreign Minister
Moshe Dayan, Defense Minister
Mordechai Gazit, Director of the Prime Minister's Office
Yitzhak Rabin, Former Ambassador to the United States
Ephraim Evron, Director General, Foreign Ministry
Avraham Kidron, Deputy Director General, Foreign Ministry

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Ambassador Kenneth Keating, US Ambassador to Israel
Joseph Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State for Near East and South Asian Affairs
Ambassador Robert McCloskey
Alfred L. Atherton, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State
Winston Lord, Director, Planning and Coordination Staff, State Department
Lawrence S. Eagleburger, Executive Assistant to the Secretary
Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff

Following are substantive excerpts of the luncheon conversation.

Dayan: We received information that Sadat is willing to stop firing at 6 p.m. our time. And he asks whether Israel is doing the same.

Kissinger: We have a message, which I meant to tell the Prime Minister: They want an official statement from you.[2] But you make it. It's not for us to be the intermediary.

Allon: Didn't we make an official statement?

Dayan: I issued an order that we will stop if we hear a formal announcement from them and practical steps to do it. We've informed our forces of that.

Kissinger: Should we notify someone?

Rabin: What about Syria?

Kissinger: We have an official communication which we've been asked to transmit to you.

Eban: Our transmission to them.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 76, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Kissinger Trip to Moscow, Tel Aviv & London, October 20–22, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting was held in the Guest House in Herzliyya near Tel Aviv. All brackets except those that indicate a correction are in the original.

[2] See Document 231.

Kissinger: Why don't we tell them we've received communications from you and you're prepared to issue similar orders provided they do so?

Keating: The Iraqis haven't agreed and the Syrians haven't.

Eban: Nobel made his money out of high explosives and the prize was his conscience money. It is like cigarette manufacturers subsidizing cancer research.

Dayan: There is no difference between Egypt and Israeli time, so it means 1700 hours, or 11 hours from the Security Council resolution. So what should we do? I'd not like to stop.

Kissinger: That's in your domestic jurisdiction.

Dayan: And it's only Egypt. We have nothing from Syria.

Kissinger: I'll be on an airplane. Just say you'll stop at 1800, provided they do. What we're communicating to the Russians is that we've been informed you'll stop at 1800 provided they stop. We're responding to the Russians and Egyptians, to two messages. I told the Prime Minister about them.

Madame Prime Minister, I have told you more information than my present colleagues used to get.

Prime Minister: We're subsidizing the Russians—by paying more for our grain.

Eban: I see Meany[3] made a nasty statement about détente.

Kissinger: That's not too smart. Well, it's all right for him to say it. I don't think détente has worked to your disadvantage.

The Prime Minister: Who decides the ceasefire lines?

Dayan: Is there any mechanism?

Kissinger: No. I think reality will determine them. UNTSO personnel could help do it.

Sisco: UNTSO. If your commanders could get in touch with the UN people.

Kissinger: Why don't you propose it?

Sisco: I think the Secretary General has the authority.

Allon: What do we have on prisoners?

Kissinger: I told the Prime Minister there is a firm understanding with the Soviets on this. We have an understanding that both sides will use their maximum influence with both sides to release prisoners immediately. And since we're now using our maximum influence with you, which you're willing to do—after a desperate argument. I will say publicly in my press conference that there is an understanding.

---

[3] George Meany, President of the AFL–CIO.

Peter [Rodman], make sure I notify the Soviets from the plane that the Israelis have agreed to this.

[to Dayan]: Why don't you say at your press conference that I was assured—that I have been given reason to believe there will be an early release?

Dayan: Because we told our people that it was a condition of the ceasefire.

Kissinger: Don't say "assurance"; say we've informed you that you can expect an early exchange.

Dayan: "Expect" isn't enough.

Kissinger: I haven't been told there will be but that the Soviets will use their influence. Can you say that there should be, rather than will be?

When I give my press conference, I can give my understanding easily. What I'm worried about is that you'll say something that will get a negative reaction before I have a chance to say anything.

Prime Minister: A week ago I said in Knesset that there would be no ceasefire without it. Tomorrow there will be a Knesset meeting. Can I say that we're assured there will be?

Dayan: If we can't say it, we'll be in trouble. We can't open [*cease*-] fire if they don't release the prisoners. Can we say we've been assured?

McCloskey: Then you'll be asked, "By whom?"

Dayan: We don't have to answer.

Kissinger: Can you do that?

Dinitz: Yes.

Kissinger: Then you can do it. Maybe I can have McCloskey say it tomorrow and you can quote him.

Eban: We'd like it on the wires before the Knesset. It meets at 3:00 p.m.

Kissinger: We're sending a message to the Soviets now.[4]

Dayan: Our maneuvers on the Egyptian front were very risky but very successful. You came too early.

I'm very curious to see on the Egyptian front whether they come back. The farmers, they went off and left livestock there, which need irrigation every day.

Eban: Will the government let them back?

Dayan: Will the Egyptians really mean to maintain it, and allow normal life there?

---

[4] See footnote 5, Document 230.

Kissinger: I can't see the Arabs starting war so quickly again. It was very costly for Israel, but worse for them.

Dayan: There are five million.

Kissinger: But it's trained manpower that counts.

Dayan: They have a lot of forces—not efficient forces but a lot. Even the Kuwaitis and the Palestinians.

Kissinger: They fought better than in 1967.

Dayan: I'm sorry to say they did. They kept fighting.

Prime Minister: Our people said they did about right as long as it went by the book. But as soon as it changed . . .

Kissinger: Did the Syrians do better?

Dayan: They were determined, fanatic. It was a sort of jihad. They fought not professionally well, but emotionally well.

Prime Minister: There are rumors that many Jordanian tanks were hit by the Iraqis.

Gazit: What time do you have for the ceasefire in the message to the Russians?

Kissinger: As long as you make an official statement for the record, we don't have to manage it. [to Eagleburger]: Tell Scowcroft 1852 hours.

Dayan: Is there any mechanism for managing it on the ground?

Sisco: You can contact the UN or you could take the initiative to contact the Egyptian commanders directly.

Rabin: Is there any way of having direct Egypt–Israel contacts?

Dayan: They could try it with a white flag or something.

Rabin: Maybe we could arrange it.

Sisco: I think they would prefer to contact the UNTSO.

Eban: Wasn't there direct contact in 1948?

Dayan: It started with the UN.

Eban: In 1957?

Dayan: Then we had hardly any contact with the Egyptian troops. There were British and French between us. We didn't get to the Canal.

Allon: Because of Anglo-French stupidity.

Eban: The final pullback was March 1957.

Kissinger: Your Ambassador, when he gets a message from the Prime Minister, calls me even if it is 3:00 a.m.

Eban: You got our message at 6:00 a.m.?

Kissinger: Yes. All my key people were luckily there, at the UN, for my bilateral meetings.

Eban: I reread our memcon—you said nothing would happen until November.

Kissinger: Diplomatically. I was trying to reassure you!

Dayan: There will be problems now with no line between the forces.

Kissinger: In Vietnam, everybody said it would be unmanageable—but it shook itself out very easily.

Dayan: On the eastern side of the Canal it's relatively clear where they are. I suppose to some extent on the western side it is true. But on the western side, I don't know if there is a standstill. If they move all the SAM's up, all the work we did in the last days to destroy them. . . .

Rabin: There is no standstill.

Kissinger: We didn't think we should negotiate this in Moscow.

Keating: It will create a problem.

Kissinger: More important is whether they want to have real talks, I mean real talks, not just stating abstract demands.

Eban: You mean privately in the room?

Kissinger: It will start out publicly, and I don't have much confidence in that.

Paragraph three means direct talks. The legislative history is clear with the Soviets—I'll show your Ambassador the record—that it means direct talks. It's indissolubly linked to 242. Nothing can be implemented without the direct talks in three.

Once we get talks started, we're not going to float an American plan. That's not my plan or my method. I've been telling this to every Arab minister. They ask me, "Will you use your influence with Israel?" And I say, "There is nothing to use our influence about."

The beginning of the process will be an historic event, even if it totally stalemates—which I expect, frankly.

Allon: Will it be another Jarring round?

Kissinger: I told the Prime Minister that that's not how we see it.

Prime Minister: Scali said 242 is linked to number 3.

Kissinger: We don't think Jarring or Waldheim is "appropriate auspices."[5]

[5] At 4:15 p.m., the participants in this meeting received a military briefing from the following Israeli military officers: Lieutenant General David Elazar, Chief of Staff; Major General Binyamin Peled, Chief of the Air Force; and Major General Eliyahu Zeira, Director of Military Intelligence. (Memorandum of conversation; National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 76, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Kissinger Trip to Moscow, Tel Aviv & London, October 20–22, 1973)

233. Telegram From the Embassy in Jordan to the Department of State[1]

Amman, October 22, 1973, 1645Z.

5635. Subject: Cease-Fire.

1. Have just talked to King, urging him to accept cease-fire completely in Syria and in Jordan.[2] His present position is that at 1900 (one hour from now) Jordan announces that it accepts SC resolution and cease-fire in Jordan and that so far as its forces in Syria are concerned they are under Syrian command.[3] I argued long with King that this is not acceptable; what he is doing is letting his policy be determined by Syria which, in turn could be basing its policy on (a) non-acceptance in past of 242 and (2) presence of Iraqi forces. It would be ironic and non-understandable in history for Jordan to enter Syria with its forces in order to thwart Iraqis and then have its policy on ME peace determined by those Iraqis. I also said that I understood that military plans of Syrians called for Syrian-Iraqi-Jordanian attack at dawn. Said Jordanian participation in such attack, a few hours after cease-fire, could be disaster for us all.

2. I asked King to phone Assad once more and try to get better understanding from him. Said I assumed that Soviets in touch with Assad in as much as Sadat has already announced that Soviets had contacted him. Seemed to me that Assad owed King some info.

3. Cannot tell what effect this had. King (and later Hassan) took it all in. They both feel like pawns in an immensely large chess game where no one has told them what the rules are.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret; Flash; Exdis. Also sent Flash to Tel Aviv and USUN, and Immediate to Cairo, Beirut, London, and Jidda.

[2] In telegram 5632 from Amman, October 22, 0939Z, Brown reported that he had asked the King if Jordan accepted the Security Council resolution in full and Hussein confirmed that it did. (Ibid.)

[3] In telegram Tohak 102, October 22, 1812Z, Scowcroft informed Kissinger that he had just received a memorandum concerning Hussein's dilemma over Syrian and Iraqi reactions to the cease-fire. The King said that he was deeply concerned over Iraq's continued deployment of troops into Syria and its announcement that it would not accept a cease-fire. He stated that he was determined that the Iraqis would not be allowed to pass through Jordanian lines at the front or through Jordanian territory. Hussein felt, however, that he could not pull his troops out of Syria at that time nor remove them from Syrian command. Therefore, if Asad did not accept the cease-fire, he would announce that although Jordan itself supported the cease-fire, the Jordanian troops in Syria would remain under Syrian command. (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, TOHAK 61–123, Oct. 20–23, 1973)

4. I suspect King will do nothing at this moment but await Syrian Government's announcement. He suggested we get in touch later this evening.

5. As I left, I reiterated one point: for God's sake, do not let your army get into a fruitless attack tomorrow morning and have the wrath of the world descend on you.

Brown

---

234. Telegram From the White House Chief of Staff (Haig) to Secretary of State Kissinger in Tel Aviv[1]

Washington, October 22, 1973, 1754Z.

Tohak 100/WH32636. We are all very proud of your Herculean accomplishment. Unfortunately, you will be returning to an environment of major national crisis which has resulted from the firing of Cox and the resulting resignation of Richardson and Ruckelshaus. Because the situation is at a stage of white heat, the ramifications of the accomplishments in Moscow have been somewhat eclipsed and their true significance underplayed. For this reason, it is essential that you participate fully in maintaining the national perspective and that a major effort be made to refocus national attention on the President's role in the Middle East settlement. An impeachment stampede could well develop in the Congress tomorrow although we are confident that cooler heads will prevail if the President's assets are properly applied.

As of now, the President believes that it is essential that we have a bipartisan leadership meeting tomorrow at the White House during which you can report in detail on the Middle East situation, lacing this report with heavy emphasis on the President's accomplishments thus far and the need for national unity and a steady hand in the critical days ahead. Following this, it is equally essential that you brief on-camera the White House press corps on the results of the Moscow discussions. I cannot overemphasize the importance of this, recog-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, TOHAK 61–123, Oct. 20–23, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only; Flash. Sent through Scowcroft to Rodman for Kissinger.

nizing full well the burden on you personally and the risks that may be associated with hyping the Middle East at a critical juncture in the negotiations. In this one instance, it is most important that some effort be made to refocus national attention on the critical events in the Middle East and to emphasize above all the crucial role of the Presidential leadership.

We plan to have the bipartisan leaders at either 9:00 AM or 3:00 PM tomorrow. Please advise which time you prefer by Flash return message.

Warm personal regards,

---

235. Telegram From the Embassy in Jordan to the Department of State[1]

Amman, October 22, 1973, 1950Z.

5639. Subject: Cease-Fire. Ref: State 208864.[2]

1. Talked to King at 21:30 local. He has no news whatsoever from Damascus. He knows from intercept that Iraqis are pressuring Syrians not to accept cease-fire. He has tried to phone Assad several times and is told Assad is "in meeting." He is told Sadat also trying contact Assad to get him to agree to ceasefire.

2. Meanwhile, plans for tomorrow's operation still underway. I told him that I'd like him to tell me that Jordanians will only be in defensive position. He asked who wanted this info. I said U.S. He said he could not answer honestly at this time.

3. I told him to think it over again. He should not be cease-fire breaker.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret; Flash; Exdis. Also sent Flash to London, USUN, and Tel Aviv.

[2] Telegram 208864 to Amman, October 22, stated that if the King felt it was essential to leave his forces in place, the Embassy should suggest that he pass his assurances to the Israelis that his forces would adopt a strictly defensive posture if the Syrians continued to fight. (Ibid.)

4. *Comment:* It is not over yet. I will bug the King later this evening. But as of now I cannot give the answers that reftel requests.[3]

5. *Second comment:* Last four words of reftel came out here "if Syrians decide continue flight." Too bad it is not that.

Brown

[3] In telegram 5640 from Amman, October 22, 2010Z, the Ambassador reported that he had talked to Hussein and stressed that the main issue was that the United Nations had called for a cease-fire and Jordan should not be in violation. The King responded that "with God's will it will not be." He added that he was trapped by the Syrians. (Ibid.) In telegram 5641 from Amman, October 22, 2048Z, Brown reported that the King had just phoned to say that he had talked with Assad and told him that the superpowers had warned him that any action tomorrow would be in violation of the cease-fire. Assad said he would go back to his group and discuss this. Asked if this meant that Assad still had not formally accepted the cease-fire, Hussein responded that this was the fact but that he thought Assad was moving in the right direction. (Ibid.)

236. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail)[1]

Tel Aviv, undated.

Secretary Kissinger wishes to thank Mr. Ismail for his most recent two messages.[2]

As Mr. Ismail knows, Secretary Kissinger was able to obtain Israeli acceptance of a speedy ceasefire on conditions that would not give an advantage to either side.

Secretary Kissinger reaffirms the U.S. willingness to engage itself in the diplomatic process that should follow the ceasefire. However, providing U.S. auspices requires that the proper atmosphere be

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Eyes Only. The message is attached to a 4:31 p.m. note, October 22, by Scowcroft asking that it be transmitted as soon as possible.

[2] A message from Ismail to Kissinger was received in Cairo at 1200Z, 2 p.m. Cairo time, on October 22. In this, Ismail stated that the Egyptian Government understood the purpose of Kissinger's visit to Israel and considered that it would serve the same purpose if Kissinger were to visit Cairo as well. (Ibid.) A subsequent message from Ismail to Kissinger sent at 1545Z, 5:45 p.m. Cairo time, stated that orders had been issued for a cease-fire in place at 1852 hours Cairo time and that these orders would be carried out if the other side respected the cease-fire. (Ibid.)

created. He believes it essential that the informal understanding regarding an immediate POW exchange which was envisaged in Moscow be implemented as rapidly as possible.

Secretary Kissinger thanks Mr. Ismail for his kindness in inviting him to visit Cairo. Unfortunately, the invitation was received only after the Secretary had left the area and was well enroute to London. However, now that the ceasefire has been achieved, he accepts with pleasure Mr. Ismail's kind invitation to visit Cairo at an early date. He looks forward to fixing a mutually convenient time in the very near future, and to the continuation of exchanges with Mr. Ismail, using this channel.

---

237. Telegram From the Embassy in Jordan to the Department of State[1]

Amman, October 22, 1973, 2345Z.

5642. Subject: Cease-fire.

1. I need a Flash return message from Secretary for the King telling him that any military action by Jordanian forces later this morning will be a violation of ceasefire and viewed most seriously by world community which has just agreed to SC resolution. Such a message may be turning point.

2. I have done my best, [*less than 1 line not declassified*], to convince Jordan's leaders that they are on the wrong course after having done well by themselves up to now. But certain ones are claiming that we are talking for ourselves and not for USG and that Jordan has clashed with Israel at other times during this war and has not paid for it.

3. Hate to ask this at this time of night but it may be the only way to stop this foolishness.[2]

Brown

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret; Flash; Exdis. Also sent Flash to London, USUN, and Tel Aviv.

[2] An October 22 memorandum to Kissinger reported that a telegram received from Amman at 0115Z, 9:15 p.m. EDT, October 23, conveyed a brief message from Hussein that the Jordanian Army and the Iraqi forces in Syria had received instructions from the Syrians to stand down in connection with that day's offensive. The King added that if he received any further messages to the contrary, he would stall until he heard from Kissinger. (Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box CL 168, Geopolitical File, Jordan, Chronological File, 4 June 73–5 Nov. 73)

238. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Embassy in Jordan[1]

En route, October 23, 1973, 0455Z.

Secto 33. Refer Amman 5642.[2] Subject: Ceasefire. For Ambassador Brown from Secretary.

1. Please deliver following message to King from Secretary.

2. "Your Majesty:

Ambassador Brown has just advised me of the pressures you are under for your units to continue fighting on the Syrian front.

I am at this moment in the air enroute to Washington to report personally to President Nixon on my talks in Moscow, which achieved the resolution passed last night by the Security Council. Egypt and Israel have accepted the ceasefire. I very much hope I can report to him that Jordan has done the same, with regard to its forces everywhere. The Security Council resolution is unambiguous in this regard.

It would be tragic, Your Majesty, after the fortitude you have shown during these difficult weeks in resisting a widening of the war, if Jordan should be in violation of the ceasefire for which we have all striven so hard.[3]

Sincerely

Henry A Kissinger"

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 39, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Moscow, Tel Aviv, London, HAKTO, SECTO, TOSEC, Misc., Oct. 20–23, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Flash. Repeated to the Department of State. Sent also as telegram 208875 to Amman. (Ibid., Box 1175, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, 1973 Middle East War, 23 October 1973)

[2] Document 237.

[3] In telegram 5647 from Amman, October 23, 1030Z, Brown reported that he had delivered the message to Rifai that morning. Rifai had argued that Jordan would have to fight if the Syrians and Iraqis went into battle, since the Jordanians were under Syrian command. The Ambassador had pointed out that Jordan had ultimate responsibility for the actions of its forces and if they violated the cease-fire, it could not plead non-responsibility. He stressed that the Jordanians had to make sure that their role in Syria was one of pushing Assad toward acceptance of the cease-fire and not as bystanders. Rifai finally said that it looked as if the fighting was dying down on the Syrian front and he would make sure that Jordanian forces were not drawn into anything. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1175, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, 1973 Middle East War, 23 October 1973, File No. 18)

239. Telegram From the Embassy in Jordan to the Department of State[1]

Amman, October 23, 1973, 1344Z.

5653. Subject: Jordanian Forces in Syria.

1. King said at 1330 local that he deeply concerned with deteriorating situation in Syria. Says that Baath Party and leadership has been in continual conference for past twenty-four hours and nothing has come out of it yet. He continues push for official attitude on cease-fire but gets no response. He will send a delegation tonight to Damascus, carrying letter to Assad. Letter will say that Jordanians will withdraw from Syria unless decision forthcoming.

2. King believes that Syrians under pressure from Iraqis and that Syrian Baath Party hesitant to accept cease-fire in fear of being outdistanced on left by Iraqi Baath. As time goes on, he is more and more concerned about Assad, fearing that his evident inability to impose decisions indicates his weakness and presages possible coup.

3. King believes that Soviets are not carrying out the Moscow bargain. He assumes that Soviets were supposed to get Damascus and Baghdad to agree to cease-fire. Baghdad, which has closest links with Moscow, is the real trouble-maker.

4. He sends following oral message to Secretary "Please get in touch with Brezhnev and tell him that it is essential that Syrians and Iraqis accede to cease-fire and that Soviets must make this point strongly in Baghdad and Damascus."[2]

5. King has sent message to Sadat, expressing his concern about Syrian position and asking Sadat to do something. He is awaiting a reply.

Brown

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1175, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, 1973 Middle East War, 23 October 1973. Secret; Flash; Exdis.

[2] Telegram 208919 to Amman, October 23, 1540Z, instructed the Embassy to tell the King that the United States was in touch with the Soviets on this matter. (Ibid.) In telegram 5659 from Amman, October 23, 1824Z, Brown responded that the King was appreciative of this message and that he had a delegation on its way to Cairo. When it returned, he would send another to Damascus. Currently all was quiet on the Syrian front and he planned to keep it that way. (Ibid., Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973)

240. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Minister of the Soviet Embassy (Vorontsov)[1]

Washington, October 23, 1973, 9:45 a.m.

V: Hello.

K: Yuly?

V: Yes, Henry. Good morning.

K: How are you? First of all, many thanks for the great kindness with which we were treated.

V: Oh, that's wonderful.

K: And we think, and I've just come from the President, we think we did a historic work.

V: That's exactly the case.

K: And now we have to build on it.

V: Right.

K: Now I have two problems. One, I'm sending you a note which you can play with, which you can weigh, which I inform you as I have already done your Ambassador in London.[2]

V: Yes.

K: That the Israelis have agreed in principle to the guarantee that's used, subject to a few modifications.

V: Right.

K: So I hope by the end of this week we will have that on the way.

V: Yes, yes, that's good.

K: Also, for your information, I mean your leadership's information, we have told the British that the only sponsorship we are interested in is joint sponsorship with the Soviet Union. And that we don't want any larger group, which I understand is our understanding.

V: Right.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking. The blank underscore indicates an omission in the original.

[2] Kissinger stopped in London on his return from Tel Aviv.

K: Now, we have the immediate problem of the allegations by both sides that the other side has broken the cease-fire.[3]

V: Yes.

K: And I recommend that at the Security Council we do our utmost to act together, if that's possible. Our judgment, but we're willing to listen to you, it's just our best judgment, is that we have the Security Council ask the Secretary General to call on all parties to observe the cease-fire immediately.

V: Yep, right.

K: And, if you are willing to have the Security Council call on the UN observers to make their services available to the two parties. You know, the observers that are there. We are also willing to consider the proposal of the Scandinavian countries to send a force there, but we're not proposing it, we're telling you what we are willing to consider. But I think the meeting today at 12:15, the easiest is, rather than a new resolution, to have the President of the Security Council be asked to appeal to both parties, and to all parties, and to offer the services of the UN observers. I want to tell you that we are urgently in touch with the Israelis. Above all, I think we should not have controversy between our two delegations today.

V: Right.

K: And I have instructed Scali not to say anything critical or attacking the Soviet Union.

V: Yeah, that's good. Yeah, I'm just writing down all this to report immediately to Moscow.

K: Now if you have problems getting through to Moscow we can get you a phone line opened up.

V: No, no. It's o.k., we can manage it. I'll do it in no time.

K: Good. Will you call me back?

V: Yes, I'll call you back whenever I have something from them.

K: When is the Ambassador coming back?

V: Well, he's _____ down somewhere in Frankfurt to get here on time and something happened to the plane. So he took another plane and will be here around 4:00.

---

[3] At 9:32 a.m. on October 23, Secretary General Waldheim telephoned Kissinger and informed him that he had talked with the Egyptian Representative to the United Nations, who had complained bitterly that Israel had broken the cease-fire. Egypt was requesting a Security Council meeting for noon. Kissinger responded that he had received the same call from the Israelis. Waldheim noted that the United Nations had 4,000–5,000 soldiers from the Nordic countries, Canada, and Austria who could serve as UN observers in the Middle East. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

K: O.K. Good. Fine. Many thanks. Bye.
V: Thank you. Bye.

---

241. Message From Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Moscow, October 23, 1973.

President Sadat has informed us that in the morning on the 23 of October Israeli forces in violation of the decision of the Security Council renewed firing on the West Coast of the Suez Canal and are moving into the southern direction. We would like to underline that Moscow has its own reliable information which proves that this is the fact and that the Israelis apparently decided to widen their bridgehead on the West Coast of the Canal. Thus Israel once again challenges the decision of the Security Council. This is absolutely unacceptable. All this looks like as a flagrant deceit on the part of the Israelis. We will express the confidence that the United States will use all the possibilities they have and its authority to bring the Israelis to order. It goes without saying that Israeli forces in this case should be withdrawn to the positions where they stayed during the acceptance of the ceasefire decision.[2]

President Sadat suggests that the Soviet Union and the United States agree among themselves about measures which would insure physical parting of Egyptian and Israeli forces with the help of the observers of the United Nations.

Sadat suggests in particular immediate use of the United Nations observers and first of all the personnel of the United Nations which was placed previously along side the Suez Canal and which is now in Cairo.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 69, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 20, [October 12–November 21, 1973]. No classification marking. A note on the message states that it was read by Minister Vorontsov to Secretary Kissinger on the telephone at 10:40 a.m. on October 23. Vorontsov spoke to Kissinger on the telephone at 9:47 a.m. and gave him the substance of Brezhnev's message. (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

[2] On October 23, Ismail sent Kissinger a "very urgent" message that warned that Israel was exploiting the situation and developing its positions on the western side of the Suez Canal to create a new military situation. Therefore, the Egyptian Government requested that the U.S. Government formally and immediately intervene to bring an end to this development in accordance with its firm commitments and to restore the situation to what it was at the time of the cease-fire. (Ibid., NSC Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973)

That is our point of view, Brezhnev says, that it would be really wise to do so since the personnel of the United Nations, which is in Cairo now, need only appropriate orders and they could be immediately dispatched to the place of conflict.

We suggest that the Soviet Union and the United States urgently submit to the Security Council a draft of appropriate resolution to this effect. If the United States side agrees to that the draft could look like that and follows the text of the draft:

The Security Council referring to its resolution 338 of October 22, 1973,

(1) Confirms to its decision about immediate cessation of all fire and all military activity and demands that the forces of the sides should be withdrawn to the position where they were at the moment of the adoption of the decision on ceasefire.

(2) Suggests to the Secretary General of the United Nations to immediately take steps for immediate dispatch of the UN observers to supervise the observation of ceasefire between the forces of Israel and Egypt, using for that purpose first of all the personnel of the United Nations which is at present in Cairo.[3]

Mr. Brezhnev would like to underline to Secretary Kissinger the urgency of these matters.[4]

---

[3] At 10:37 a.m., Kissinger and Vorontsov discussed the draft resolution. After Vorontsov asserted that the two sides agreed generally on the text, Kissinger countered that there were two things wrong with it. First, he had never been happy with the phrase "demands that the forces should be withdrawn to the position where they were at the moment." The other problem was with the phrase "of the adoption of the decision on the cease-fire" since that meant moving further back than they were at the time the cease-fire went into effect. He stressed that the United States could not possibly go along with this since they had specifically said 12 hours after the decision. Vorontsov agreed that the Secretary had a point on the latter phrase, but not on the one calling for withdrawal to the positions where the forces had been when the first cease-fire went into effect. Kissinger pointed out that this would be impossible to enforce because no one would know where they were. (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

[4] Following the reading of Brezhnev's message, Kissinger suggested to Vorontsov that they delay the start of the Security Council meeting until 2 p.m., and repeated his suggestion that they delete the phrase "withdraw to the line they occupied" because it would lead to endless debate. He said he didn't think anybody gained a hell of a lot. Vorontsov responded that obviously they had gained something or otherwise his side wouldn't have raised this question. Kissinger noted that they would never agree on where the forces were the previous night so it didn't make any difference. He said he would instruct Scali that the United States would agree to the resolution and that Vorontsov could inform Moscow. The United States would inform the Israelis and the Soviets would inform the Arabs. (Ibid., Anatoli[y] Dobrynin File, Box 28)

242. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Israeli Ambassador (Dinitz)[1]

Washington, October 23, 1973, 11:04 a.m.

D: Dr. Kissinger, welcome back.

K: Thank you.

D: How are you?

K: I'm fine, a little exhausted.

D: I can imagine. I got very good regards [*reports*] of your visit. The Prime Minister is very thankful for your stop. Dr. Kissinger, I got a message from her this morning to convey to you, the essence of which I conveyed to the General, but in one sentence she wants to assure you personally, confidentially and sincerely that none of the actions taken on the Egyptian front were initiated by us.[2]

K: Okay. Now, listen, let me ask you something.

D: Right.

K: The Russians have just come in and proposed a Resolution in which they ask for an immediate cessation of all fire and activity. You have no problem with that?

D: No, no.

K: And demands that forces should be withdrawn to the position—you have an ambiguous statement there—where they were at the time of the adoption of the ceasefire. Now we certainly can't say at the adoption of the ceasefire. We could say where they were at the time the ceasefire went into effect.

D: This I don't know, the second part, because I don't know what the situation this minute is in the field. Since they have initiated fighting, we have returned fighting.

K: All right. And then the rest is to get UN observers that are in Cairo into the field. That's no problem.

D: That I have to check but I understand that Tekoah has asked the same question. He didn't get a reply yet.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] The message from the Prime Minister stated that the situation at the front was that the Egyptians had not observed the cease-fire in the very beginning, except for a "very, very short" time. The cease-fire, which Israel had accepted and honestly observed, had to be reciprocal. The U.S. Military Attaché was being constantly brought up to date on every incident and already there had been 17 violations by the Egyptians. She wanted Dinitz to deliver her message personally to the Secretary and to state that the Egyptians were responsible for all the fighting. (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, June 4–October 31, 1973)

K: Well, would you call?

D: I will call the Prime Minister and I will let you know on the three points.

K: This is the Resolution: "Confirms its decision about immediate cessation of all fire and all military activity and demands that the forces of the sides should be withdrawn to the position where they were at the moment of the adoption of the decision on ceasefire."

D: Yeah.

K: That we can't accept because it would have to be when the ceasefire went into effect. (2) "Suggest to the Secretary General of the United Nations to immediately take steps for immediate dispatch of UN observers to supervise the observation between the forces of Israel and Egypt, using for that purpose first of all the personnel of the United Nations which is at present in Cairo." Now that we have to accept.

D: Yeah. You are for it?

K: For that, we are.

D: Right.

K: And we are for the first one. I have told the Russians that I'm having trouble with "where they were at the time of the ceasefire".

D: Right, right.

K: But could you let me know—

D: We'll let you know right away.

K: Can you do it within half an hour?

D: Yeah, sure.

K: Good. Thank you.

---

243. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Minister of the Soviet Embassy (Vorontsov)[1]

Washington, October 23, 1973, 11:25 a.m.

V: Hello.

K: Yuri [*Yuli*].

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Anatoli[y] Dobrynin File, Box 28. No classification marking.

V: Yes, Henry.

K: I just talked to the President.[2] Two things, (1) we would really like a delay if at all possible.

V: Oh, oh, that doesn't mean that the Israelis will take some more 50 miles of territory during the delay.

K: No, no; I don't believe—I don't know how fast they are moving—

V: I don't know either but—

K: At least an hour.

V: Well, the Security Council never meets on the dot but still maybe just to have it started at 12:00 but then the time for agreement on the Resolution and everything like that and you will have your time. But to postpone the meeting is not very good in the eyes of the Arab countries.

K: Can you see whether Malik and Scali can't get some delay?

V: Malik said he has already engaged himself on the 12 o'clock with the Arabs and with the First Chairman or President of the Security Council.

K: You can then get a delay in the vote or something?

V: But later on they can do it. Yes, I know it for sure.

K: Okay. Well, do that then. Secondly, we definitely cannot accept your phrase "withdrawn to the position where they were at the moment of the adoption of the decision on the ceasefire."

V: How are you suggesting to change it?

K: Well, we have not yet decided. I have just talked to the President. What we could consider is "where they were at the moment the ceasefire went into effect."

V: Went into effect. Well, okay, I just warn Moscow about this, that you'll have these changes and warn Malik. But, again, let Scali and Malik talk on this.

K: Sure.

V: Okay?

K: Good. But this is not yet definite.

V: I would rather not see definite. I would rather see it as it is in the text.

K: No, that is out of the question.

V: Out of the question.

K: That we will not accept.

---

[2] Kissinger met with the President from 10:15 to 10:32 a.m. and again from 11:18 to 11:21. (Ibid., White House Central Files, President's Daily Diary)

V: Okay, let's work on that.

K: Good.

V: Good.

---

244. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Minister of the Soviet Embassy (Vorontsov)[1]

Washington, October 23, 1973, 11:32 a.m.

V: Yes, Henry.

K: Yuri, I will let you know within half an hour, 45 minutes, but it must be where at the line established when the ceasefire went into effect.

V: It's firm now.

K: It's not yet firm but only one we're now considering.

V: Went into effect. Right, I've got it.

K: On the other one, now, there's only one other point we have, which I know is no problem—where you say you think for that purpose, first of all, the personnel of the United Nations which is at present in Cairo.

V: Right.

K: What we would like to say is "using for that purpose UN personnel now in the Middle East but first of all—

V: Now in the Middle East.

K: And first of all—

V: By this line, you mean—

K: The ones that are in Jerusalem, for example.

V: Uh-huh. Not Syrian situation you have in mind?

K: No.

V: Since we are talking about Egypt and—

K: No, no. What we have in mind is the Egyptian situation.

V: Yeah.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Anatoli[y] Dobrynin File, Box 28. No classification marking.

K: It applies specifically only to Egypt.

V: Yeah, I see. So you mean from that line, from the Israeli side, yes, to engage—

K: Just to have more personnel available.

V: Yeah, all the personnel available there. First of all which is in Cairo. Well, I don't think there will be any problem here. But, Henry, there is a problem about postponement. Scali suggested to Malik 3 o'clock. It's terrible of course.

K: No, no; I have just instructed that they should start the meeting and delay the vote.

V: Yeah. Okay.

K: Okay?

V: Yeah, it's okay so far as I'm concerned. I don't have time to consult with the government in Moscow, you understand.

K: But tell Malik what I suggested.

V: I'll tell Malik. I'm just contacting him now.

K: Good. Thank you.

V: Okay.

---

245. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Israeli Ambassador (Dinitz)[1]

Washington, October 23, 1973, noon.

K: Hello.

D: Dr. Kissinger. I just got a reply from the Foreign Minister. With regard to the first paragraph we have no difficulty. With regard to the third paragraph, that of the U.N. observers, we are prepared that they should appoint a liaison officer and we discuss the thing on the spot we have no objection. With regard to the second paragraph the return to the original place. The Prime Minister wants you to know that we have intelligence document which we can pass to you as well as signs in the field that they have opened an attack, which all of this they have communicated to their forces to improve their position. They have inflicted

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking. The blank underscores indicate omissions in the original.

on us _____ this both in tanks and personnel. And only then we have reacted and we can document it to you.

K: I understand that but that doesn't change the situation.

D: No, and therefore, as a result of this battle have developed, there has been no marching in the field of what the situation was when the ceasefire initiated. And therefore it is totally impossible for us or for anyone to accept that paragraph two because it is completely obsolete. It is no possibility, speaking in terms of responsibility, and it is in terms of fixing it. So that is why we would—not only we—nobody would be able to reascertain it.

K: That I agree with but supposing such a paragraph passes. What difference does it make?

D: It makes only a difference in the sense that it would allow the Russians and the Egyptians to demand withdrawal of our forces on some of the positions that they are right now as a result of the Egyptian violation. That is the point.

K: Because quite frankly, the President feels that if we don't agree. I mean, what they are proposing we will not agree to which is in a position . . .

D: That of course is ridiculous because that wasn't even asked by the resolution.

K: Since nobody will be able to tell where that was to begin with it cannot be given practical effect.

D: That is why it shouldn't be adopted this paragraph.

K: But it is important for any future attempt by the Egyptian side to try to grab some territory that we did not insist that the fait accompli is still . . .

D: That is why we accept the idea of observers. Because only when you have observers in the _____ mouth can you effectively tell whether movements have taken place so I think if I made the argument for the Russians in the discussions should be that now that there are observers a fixed position can be attained.

K: You know what will happen? There will be a majority for that position.

D: For the position of their attempt.

K: We have two choices. If we say withdraw to the position where they were at the moment of adoption of the decision on the ceasefire that's ridiculous. That's inconsistent with the resolution.

D: That shows that . . .

K: I know, let's not argue about it. The second point is supposing they amend it to say at the time of the ceasefire.

D: That is what we were discussing because the first one I dismissed right away and on this the Prime Minister and the Minister of Defense have a very documented development.

K: My problem is what do we do at the U.N.

D: That's what I said . . .

K: We can veto the fourth Russian draft. That we can do. We can abstain from when it says at the time of the decision of the ceasefire but we can't veto that.

D: I think the thing is very—if I may, I don't see what difficulty there is to say that before the Security Council can determine who was at fault they cannot demand of any side that we acted through the fighting.

K: Yes, but they could take the position, it doesn't make any difference who was at fault. The easy way to settle it is to go back to the line.

D: But who will determine this?

K: I think it is indeterminable.

D: That is why one should not accept a resolution that cannot be executed. Because that is what put us in our . . .

K: OK Fine. Bye.

---

246. Hotline Message From Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev to President Nixon[1]

Moscow, October 23, 1973.

Esteemed Mr. President:

Israel has flagrantly violated the Security Council decision on the cease fire in the Middle East. We in Moscow are shocked that the understanding which was reached only two days ago has in fact been ruptured by this action by the Israeli leaders. Why this treachery was allowed by Israel is more obvious to you.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 69, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 20, [October 12–November 21, 1973]. Top Secret; Sensitive; Spec Cat; Eyes Only. A notation indicates that this is a translation of USSR 01, 231600Z October 1973. Brackets are in the original. In his memoirs, Kissinger wrote that he received this message at 12:36 p.m. (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 572)

We see one possibility for correcting the situation and fulfilling the understanding . . . in forcing Israel to immediately obey the Security Council decision.[2] We vouch for the Arabs, since the leaders of Egypt and Syria have stated that they will implicitly fulfill the Security Council decision.

We pledged with you, jointly as guarantor-countries, to ensure the fulfillment of the Security Council resolution. In this connection, we propose that the most decisive measures be taken without delay by the Soviet Union and the United States of America to stop the violations of the understanding reached and of the Security Council resolution based on [this understanding]. We would like to believe that on your part, on the part of the United States Government, everything will be done in order that the Security Council decision and our understanding with you will be implemented. Too much is at stake, not only as concerns the situation in the Middle East, but in our relations as well.

We will be grateful for a speedy response.[3]

Respectfully,

L. Brezhnev[4]

---

[2] Kissinger recalled in his memoirs: "My assessment was that if a new cease-fire was all that was wanted, our task would be relatively easy; if an Israeli withdrawal was envisaged, we were in for a tempestuous time." (Ibid., p. 572)

[3] At 1:10 p.m. on October 23, the President's reply to Brezhnev was sent via the hotline. It reads: "I have just received your message regarding violations of the Security Council decision on the ceasefire in the Middle East. I want to assure you that we assume full responsibility to bring about a complete end of hostilities on the part of Israel. Our own information would indicate that the responsibility for the violation of the ceasefire belongs to the Egyptian side, but this is not the time to debate that particular issue. We have insisted with Israel that they take immediate steps to cease hostilities, and I urge that you take similar measures with respect to the Egyptian side. You and I have achieved an historic settlement over this past weekend and we will not permit it to be destroyed." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 69, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 20, October 12–November 21, 1973)

[4] The translation bears this typed signature.

247. Hotline Message From Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev to President Nixon[1]

Moscow, October 23, 1973.

Esteemed Mr. President:

I am notifying you that the Egyptian side is ready to cease fire immediately if the Israeli armed forces will cease fire. You can categorically notify the Israeli Government of this.

We hope that the understanding displayed by you of the urgency and acuteness of the task to immediately cease fire will be given to the Israelis in the most explicit form.

We propose that the cease fire be implemented immediately.

We also propose that the Security Council be convened most urgently. We are giving our representative in the Council corresponding instructions.

We will be grateful if you will urgently instruct your representative in the Security Council in such a way that our and your representatives act concertedly on the basis of the plan which was the subject of discussion between the USSR Chargé d'Affaires and Mr. Kissinger.[2]

Respectfully,

L. Brezhnev[3]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin & Kissinger, Vol. 7. Top Secret; Sensitive; Spec Cat; Eyes Only. A notation indicates that this is a translation of USSR 02, 231807Z October 1973. In his memoirs, Kissinger wrote that he received this message at 2:26 p.m. (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 573)

[2] See Document 240. At 1:35 p.m., Kissinger told Dobrynin, who had returned to Washington, that the United States would support a call for immediate cessation of all military action and for the return of the forces of the two sides to the positions they occupied at the time the cease-fire became effective, and was willing to make this a joint resolution if the Soviet Union agreed. He added that it was better to argue about where that line was and Dobrynin agreed that the two sides should be allowed to argue but not fight. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Anatoli[y] Dobrynin File, Box 28)

[3] The translation bears this typed signature.

248. Backchannel Message From Egyptian President Sadat to President Nixon[1]

Washington, October 23, 1973.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the October 1973 War.]

The following message is requested to be conveyed urgently from President Sadat to President Nixon: "In the light of the developments of the situation on the Egyptian-Israeli front, and the messages exchanged with the White House, I am formally asking you to intervene effectively, even if that necessitates the use of forces, in order to guarantee the full implementation of the ceasefire resolution in accordance with the joint US–USSR agreement.

We were asked to comply with the ceasefire resolution with the full understanding of the effectiveness of the joint guarantees. I hope that this intervention would be immediate and direct because Israel is taking advantage of the ceasefire to change completely the situation on the military front. The Egyptian Government will consider the U.S. Government fully responsible for what is happening at present, in spite of your guarantees and of the Security Council Resolution co-sponsored by the USA and the USSR, as well as of our acceptance of the Resolution on that basis.

I hope that you would also take the necessary measures with the President of the Security Council for the immediate implementation of the ceasefire in accordance with the Security Council Resolution of October 22, 1973. What is now happening on the military front cannot contribute to the efforts towards reaching the peace which we uphold. Moreover, what is happening now, in the light of your guarantees, does not induce confidence in any other future guarantees. With warmest regards."[2]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. Secret; Sensitive. Sent at 9:15 p.m. Cairo time.

[2] On October 23, Kissinger responded to an urgent message from Ismail regarding continued military activity. The message reads: "Prior to receiving that message, we had already taken the steps that the Egyptian Government has requested. The U.S. side would presume that the Egyptian side would, on its part, take similar immediate steps to cease hostilities. Immediate action by both sides in this regard will help to create the conditions necessary to move quickly toward a permanent settlement in the Middle East." (Ibid.) For Ismail's message, see footnote 2, Document 241.

249. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

Washington, October 23, 1973, 4:20 p.m.

K: I think we should have the WSAG tomorrow morning. Anything they can do tonight . . .

S: The natives will be restless.

K: What do you mean.

S: I understand you talked to Schlesinger. Every one wants to cut back on supplies.[2]

K: I will talk to them.

S: They need quieting down.

K: Why?

S: They have no idea of what is going on and now we have a cease-fire we should stop supplies.

K: At least tell them to stand by til I call. Why should we cut back on the Israelis when the Russians don't cut back on the Arabs?

S: This is another hand-holder. So we don't.

K: You don't slap them around enough.

S: True. They feel out of touch and know you had a big trip.

K: Tell them I am tied up with the Security Council and it will take place tomorrow at 10:00 without fail, if not tonight. I am sending over another hot line message.[3]

S: OK.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] During their 3:02 p.m. telephone conversation, Schlesinger asked Kissinger about the airlift. Kissinger responded that they had to keep it going until they got a "hand on the others," stressing that it would be bad if the United States cut it off unilaterally. (Ibid.) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 315–316.

[3] Presumably Document 247.

250. Minutes of the Secretary of State's Staff Meeting[1]

Washington, October 23, 1973, 4:35 p.m.

PROCEEDINGS

Secretary Kissinger: I thought I would bring you up to date briefly on what has happened—because the Middle East crisis is something in which the Department played a principal role and in which its members acquitted themselves extraordinarily well.

So I wanted to talk to you about the strategy, what has happened and where we now stand.

When the war broke out, the first time I heard about the imminence of the war was when Joe Sisco woke me up at six o'clock on Saturday morning, October 6, and told us that the Israelis believed that a war might be imminent and to use our influence to get it stopped.[2]

I mention this because there have been many stories that we prevented a pre-emptive attack by the Israelis and that their setbacks are due to our urging them not to engage in a pre-emptive attack. This is total nonsense. We did not urge them not to engage in a pre-emptive attack because we didn't believe that a war was coming. And we had no reason to tell them this. In fact, we can make a case for the proposition that we were more concerned about war than the Israelis were.

On the Sunday before the war started, I had Dinitz in here.[3] And that was at a time when the Department was not yet equipped for weekend work. But I had Dinitz in here and I asked him what he thought. He assured me that there was no possibility of an attack. And I was sufficiently uneasy about it to ask for intelligence estimates, producing a massive row between CIA and INR as to who was entitled to produce intelligence estimates for the Secretary. We got one estimate for the Secretary and another one for the Assistant to the President.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Transcripts of Secretary of State Kissinger's Staff Meetings, 1973–77: Lot 78 D 443, Box 1, Secretary's Staff Meetings. Secret; Nodis. The original bears numerous editorial marks—insertions and brackets marking text to be deleted—which have not been incorporated into the text printed here except where they correct mistakes or provide clarity. No revised text of the minutes has been found.

[2] See footnote 3, Document 99.

[3] September 30. In his memoirs, Kissinger recalled that Dinitz arrived at his office with instructions "to convey to our intelligence officials what Israel knew of Arab deployments but not to raise it at a 'political' level unless there was a specific query. Israel, especially as it was taking a relaxed view, did not want to stir up our diplomacy. Clearly it would have insisted on intense consultation at the highest levels if it saw a serious danger of war. Its judgment was that Arab deployments were maneuvers or psychological warfare. I remained uneasy, however, and asked Dinitz to review the assessment every forty-eight hours." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 464)

Both of which, however, agreed on the proposition that an Arab attack was highly improbable.[4] These intelligence reports were confirmed during the week. And indeed the morning of the attack, the President's daily brief, intelligence brief, still pointed out that there was no possibility of an attack.

For all these reasons, we had no incentive in the world to tell anyone not to engage in a pre-emptive attack.

When I saw Eban on Thursday afternoon[5] he explained to me at great length that there was no real need for a peace initiative, which I had urged on him, because the military situation was absolutely stable and could not be changed, and politically there was nothing to be gained by a peace offensive.

I don't want to go into great detail, except to point out that the only reason I mention this is because as the myth develops, it would be that our influence prevented the Israelis from forestalling the attack by a pre-emptive move. Secondly, the most important thing to remember is that whatever we had advised them, and even if they had made a pre-emptive attack, it would not have changed the outcome in any sense. And this is what the Israelis have to understand in the diplomacy after this war. It would not have changed the outcome, because a

---

[4] On October 26, Cline drafted a memorandum to Kissinger to "put on the record" his objection to Kissinger's public references to intelligence failures in the Mideast crisis: "You have repeatedly said that intelligence (INR and CIA) told you 'there was no possibility of hostilities' between Arabs and the Israelis. This is not true. The only analytical report INR gave you on the subject of 'Syrian Military Intentions' was dated 30 September, some six days before hostilities broke out and before some of the most alarming evidence had reached us [Document 93]. . . . While I confess this analysis did not say there would be an attack *at this time*, it was far from saying it was not at all likely. Actually, I had hoped that your efficient staff or Assistant Secretary Sisco would have called to your attention my earlier, more comprehensive memorandum on this subject dated 31 May, 1973 [see Document 65]. . . . Against the backdrop of this estimate, my belief on 30 September that an attack '*at this time*' could not be conclusively anticipated was hardly complacent or reassuring. I am frank to say INR did not warn you *when* the attack was to occur, but it is unfair to say we dismissed it as a possibility. In fact, the evidence which accumulated on 4 and 5 October convinced me that the chances of an attack at that time had become at least better than even. . . . All of this is not to say that INR was right but that it was not as wrong as you have said. Beyond that, and more significantly, our calculations would have crystallized earlier and had been more finely tuned to your needs if we had known about the exchanges you were having with the Russians. In retrospect, the evidence of Russian concern appears to have been the missing element in the picture. You did not tell me about it, or anyone who could have helped INR crank it into the equation." Cline revealed in a 1974 *Foreign Policy* article that he wanted to deliver the memorandum personally to Kissinger, rather than through the Secretary's "'palace guard' staff," but Kissinger "plunged immediately into many days of Arab-Israeli diplomacy and his travels to the Middle East and China. . . . I never had an opportunity to deliver it prior to my resignation toward the end of November 1973. So I simply kept it as a memorandum for the record." (Ray S. Cline, "Policy Without Intelligence," *Foreign Policy*, No. 17 (Winter 1974–1975), pp. 121–135)

[5] October 4. See footnote 5, Document 143.

new element in the situation has been the combination—I think it is safe to say that the Arabs have learned more from the war in '67 than the Israelis did.

The Israelis continue to adopt their tactics of '67. The Arabs developed tactics to thwart the tactics of '67. And there are three new elements in the Arab strategy.

One—the heavy reliance on SAM's which negated to a considerable extent the Israeli air force. The heavy reliance on anti-tank weapons, which exacted an exorbitant toll on Israeli tanks. And the better leadership and morale of the Arab forces, in which they would not surrender once they were surrounded. In fact, the Arabs used the same tactics which were eventually used to thwart the German thrusts in World War II, and the Israelis used exactly the same strategy as the Germans used, which is to use airplanes as artillery, to demoralize the enemy by lightning thrusts, which works beautifully as long as a surrounded enemy surrenders; it does not work well when the surrounded enemy does not surrender, and therefore exposes the fact that you are really operating with rather tenuous lines of communication and not very strong forces.

Therefore, even if the Israelis had launched a pre-emptive attack, the outcome of the initial battles would have been substantially the same.

For the first few days, the Israeli effort had to be expended on the SAM sites, and until the SAM's were suppressed, their classic pre-emptive weapon, the airplane, suffered losses that were exorbitant in relation to the objectives that could be achieved in any one day. This was the massive change in the situation, and a change which will affect in my view the entire post-war period.

Now, we had here a little crisis group, composed of Ken Rush, Joe Sisco, David Popper, Tom Pickering and Larry Eagleburger, with others brought in from time to time. In addition, we had daily meetings on an interdepartmental basis—with Bob McCloskey as part of this group—with WSAG.

From the beginning, our problem was this.

We could not tolerate an Israeli defeat. Apart from any sentimental attachment that may have existed to Israel and apart from any historic ties, the judgment was that if another American-armed country were defeated by Soviet-armed countries, the inevitable lesson that anybody around the world would have to draw is to rely increasingly on the Soviet Union. Secondly, it would undermine the position in the Middle East, even in countries that formerly were not formally opposing us, such as Saudi Arabia and Jordan, if the radical Arab states supported by the Soviet Union scored a great victory over the Israelis.

On the other hand, we could not make our policy hostage to the Israelis, because our interests, while parallel in respect to that I have outlined, are not identical in overall terms. From an Israeli point of view, it is no disaster to have the whole Arab world radicalized and anti-American, because this guarantees our continued support. From an American point of view, it is a disaster. And therefore throughout we went to extreme lengths to stay in close touch with all the key Arab participants and exchanged, in the totality, as many messages with the Arabs as we did with the Israelis. On the whole we kept the anti-Americanism in the Arab world, even though this war lasted much longer than the war in 1967, to a much lesser proportion than was the case in 1967.

And third was our relationship with the Soviet Union, and other great powers; the Europeans, Chinese.

But of the great powers, the key one was the Soviet Union.

The Europeans behaved like jackals. Their behavior was a total disgrace. They did everything to egg on the Arabs. They gave us no support when we needed it. They proclaimed loudly that the Russians had double-crossed us in the declaration of principles we had signed[6]—forgetting that the declaration of principles we had signed followed similar declarations of principles each one of them had signed with the Soviet Union. And none of them seemed prepared to invoke their own declarations of principles. They were ready enough for us to give up détente on the grounds of what had been done to us by the Russians. Nor were they willing to have any joint moves in the United Nations. And when this is over, as it will be in a few days, it is absolutely imperative for us—George and Win—to assess just where we are going in our relationship with the European allies—what exactly it means to talk about the indissolubility of our interests with respect to defense and the total indivisibility of our interests in every other respect that may come up.

I don't want to prejudge it, but I think it is an issue that can no longer be evaded.

The Chinese, I think, had only one interest in the situation, which was that the Soviets get creamed, both militarily and politically. And while they made minimum noises of support for the Arabs, they certainly did not object to any of the military moves they made.

So that leaves us with the Soviets.

---

[6] Kissinger is presumably referring to the "Basic Principles of Relations Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;" see footnote 12, Document 70.

Now, it has been a moving experience to see Joe Kraft[7] realize the aggressiveness of the Soviet Union, which had been neglected by this Administration, considering that for years we had been castigated by many of those who wanted to end détente for conducting the cold war beyond all reason. And we had many volunteers who wanted us to end détente and proclaim that the Soviet Union had started this.

Our judgment is—I don't know whether Ray Cline will disagree with this—that the Soviets did not start it, but they became aware—they started it in the sense perhaps of having given equipment. But they must have shared our judgment that the Israelis were so militarily preponderant, that no amount of equipment they could give to the Arabs would do more than enable them to give a slightly better account of themselves.

But I have never seen a military estimate by anybody, prior to the war, which indicated that the Arabs had any chance whatever of defeating the Israelis or of even staving off their own defeat for anything longer than six days.

There is no reason to believe that the Soviets made a different estimate.

Our estimate is that the Soviets became aware of it around October 3—maybe a little earlier. But it gave them a massive problem, because if they told us and the Israelis pre-empted, then they would not only have prevented the war, but they would have brought about the defeat of their friends. They evacuated some of their personnel—most of their personnel from Egypt. And they played militarily a rather neutral role until they started the airlift.

Now, then, what about the behavior during military operations?

First, they stayed conspicuously remote from any attack on the United States. Neither the Soviet press nor their UN behavior was in any way directed against the United States. And they could have made life extremely—certainly much more difficult had they gone into an all-out onslaught.

---

[7] Joseph Kraft, syndicated columnist with *The Washington Post*, among other American newspapers. On October 18, Kraft wrote: "One of the reasons the Arab position has emerged so clearly is that the true Soviet position has also emerged with clarity. There had been a fond notion that personal encounters between Soviet and American leaders had somewhat softened the Russian outlook. Even so wary a figure as Secretary of State Henry Kissinger was taken in. He spoke of a 'structure of peace' as if something deep had changed. For several days before finally acceding to Israel's frantic pleas for help, he searched vainly for signs of Soviet restraint.

"In fact, the Russians have behaved in a far more bellicose way this time than during the Six-Day War. They have sent planes and tanks to the Arabs during the very thick of the fighting, and Soviet pilots are apparently bringing equipment right up to the front lines. Far from showing self-restraint in the interests of détente with the United States, in other words, the Russians have played the jackal as never before." (*The Washington Post*, October 18, 1973, p. A17)

Secondly, their military units did not maneuver as provocatively as they did in 1967.

Thirdly, they did engage in a massive airlift into the Middle East.

For this you can have two explanations. Either that they expected their clients to lose and didn't want to be blamed for the loss, and poured in equipment which they thought probably didn't make any difference; or that they wanted to keep the war going. You can choose your own interpretation. The first is as logical as the second—that they thought their clients were going to lose, but that they did not want to be blamed for the defeat, and that they wanted to salvage what they could from the wreckage by having proved themselves loyal as allies, not only to the Arabs, but to other countries that relied on them.

I think of some of the considerations that we went through when we thought Israel was on the downgrade.

This is not implausible.

Anyway, no matter what is said in the press, we did not fail to do anything that we should have done or that we wanted to do because of détente.

What we wanted to do was use the détente as a means of using super-power influence to calm the situation. To some extent it was achieved even during the first week at the United Nations. During the first week, we engaged in a complex maneuver to try to get a cease-fire at the end of the first week. It is true that the Soviet eagerness to bring about a cease-fire was not as intense when they thought their side was winning than it grew to be later.

We pursued this until Saturday of the first week—that is to say until October 13. On October 13 it was clear that the Soviets could not deliver the Egyptians to what was in effect a cease-fire in place, and to which we had obtained Israeli acquiescence, more or less. When that occurred we felt we had no choice except to go another route, namely to prove to the Soviets that we could match strategically anything they could put in the Middle East, and that we could put it into more capable hands. And that therefore the longer the war would go on, the more likely would be a situation in which they would have to ask for a cease-fire rather than we. And this is the reason why we started the airlift on Saturday. It is the principal reason why we started the airlift on October 13.

Having failed to bring the war to a conclusion by diplomatic methods, we concluded that the only way to end the war would be to demonstrate to the Soviets and to the Arabs that the war could not be won by military methods.

Our calculation was that whatever price we would pay with the Arabs would be increased if the war went on for an appreciable length

of time. Since we could not permit Israel to lose, which is the only thing that would satisfy the Arabs, it was best to move massively and rapidly.

And this is what we did.

All during this period—I won't go into the details of diplomatic exchanges, but we were literally in daily touch with the principal Arab countries, except Syria; in frequent touch with the Soviet Union; in touch enough with the Chinese so that they knew what was going on. I suspect we were their only source of information. And in sporadic touch with the Europeans to beat off occasional jackal forays, to see whether they could pick up any loose pieces that might be lying around, which were never pressed very energetically.

The diplomacy began to—well, it never really ended, because on Monday night the Soviets tried out a proposal on us—Sunday night, Monday morning.[8]

Mr. Sisco: You called me midnight Sunday.

Secretary Kissinger: Sunday night they tried out a proposal on us which created a tentative link between the political and military provisions. And we continued this during the rest of the week.

Thursday night the Soviets put this into specific form. Friday they asked me to go to Moscow.[9] And we felt that since the military situation had turned drastically, and since we also believed that the Russians were on the verge of having to make the same fundamental decision we thought we might have to make the week before—what to do in the face of a complete collapse of their clients—we thought this was the strategic moment for moving fast. Until then, we had moved, shall we say, deliberately, and not speeded up any diplomatic exchange.

We have just come back from two days in the Soviet Union, and you have all seen the UN Resolution.[10]

Now, let me say a word about the UN Resolution.

First of all, it was significant that it was introduced by the United States and the Soviet Union jointly, so that by not ripping our relationship with the Soviet Union we could, when the strategic moment arose, move very rapidly to a conclusion.

We have never maintained—this Administration least of all—that we relied on good personal relations with the Soviet leaders. We have never believed that we could substitute charm for reality. All we have said is that we could add into the calculations of reality, as the Soviet

---

[8] October 14–15. See Document 183.

[9] October 18 and 19. See Documents 202 and 209.

[10] See footnote 3, Document 229.

leaders saw it, an element of their relationship with the United States to be used when objective conditions permitted it. And objective conditions permitted it on Saturday and Sunday.[11]

And I believe we have established a relationship which enabled us to move faster and at a higher level than would have otherwise been the case.

Now, what is the essence of the Resolution?

It establishes a cease-fire in place. The cease-fire in place means in effect, simply looked at strategically, that the Israelis will wind up with more territory than they possessed at the beginning of the war, and that the Arabs, who were not our principal antagonists with less—but the Soviets made no strategic gain, because with the Israelis now on both sides of the Canal, it is still impossible to open the Canal.

Secondly, we affirmed Security Council Resolution 242 which has been on the books since 1967—and while it asks for the immediate implementation, this is impossible even with good will, since no one knows, except Joe Sisco, what 242 means. (Laughter)

Mr. Sisco: And I won't tell. (Laughter)

Secretary Kissinger: That is like what Palmerston said about the Schleswig–Holstein question—that only three people ever understood it, and one was dead, the other was in an insane asylum, and he was the third, and he had forgotten it.

And the third, which is the most significant, is that for twenty-five years the Middle East issue has been hung up on the problem that the Arabs would not negotiate with the Israelis. Here we have a Security Council resolution asking for direct negotiations between the Arabs and the Israelis under appropriate auspices. The auspices, as we interpret it, and as we have agreed with the Soviets, will almost certainly be U.S.–Soviet, assuming this is acceptable to the other parties—though we do not want this generally put out until it emerges from the diplomacy that will develop.

Now, the essence of a good settlement is that everybody can feel he has gained something. And you cannot conduct a permanent relationship on the basis of unconditional surrender.

What the Arabs gained out of this is respectability. They did not surrender. They fought effectively. And while they were defeated, they were not crushed.

What the Arabs further gained out of it is undoubtedly that they will interpret the Security Council Resolution 242 to mean that Israel

---

[11] October 20 and 21. Kissinger is referring to his talks in Moscow. See Documents 219–222, 226, and 229.

has to return to its '67 boundaries. But they have claimed that ever since 1967. So this is not new.

But what they certainly should gain out of it is a realization on the part of the Israelis that this cockiness of supremacy is no longer possible; that like other countries in history, they now have to depend on a combination of security and diplomacy to achieve their security.

What Israel gained out of it is first that they avoided, literally avoided the precipice. And secondly that they won another war, though at heavy cost. That they gained recognition by the Arabs of direct negotiations. And that our support was validated.

What the Soviet Union gained out of it is largely negative. The Soviet Union cut its losses. I think basically what happened with the Soviet Union is that for the third time since 1953 they have lost much of the equipment they put into the Arab world. They were once again defeated. And their major contribution to their allies' cause was to cut the extent of the disaster, but not really to gain them anything very positive.

So that puts us into a position where if we behave wisely and with discipline in the months ahead, we are really in a central position.

The Israelis have learned that their original idea—that they could use the stockpiled equipment that they had from us to score a big victory over the Arabs if we pressed them too hard is no longer possible. If they get into another war, they must do it with our enthusiastic backing or they are lost. And therefore the Israelis, after they recover from the enormous shock of the tremendous casualties they have suffered—their total casualties are around 6,000, with about 2,000 dead, which if you adjust it to the American scale is something like 600,000 casualties in two weeks—that is World War I type casualties. So it will take them a couple or three weeks to absorb the impact of what has happened to them.

As far as Israel is concerned, we have to be taken even more seriously than we have been in the past. And our insistence on a more politically oriented policy cannot go unheeded.

As far as the Arabs are concerned, the situation seems to me reasonably simple. We are besieged now with oil company executives who tell us that we have thrown away everything in the Arab world. They will probably manage to do it. But if they don't succeed in throwing everything away—the fact of the matter is that any rational Arab leader now has to know that whether he hates us, loves us, despises us—is there is no way around us. If they want a settlement in the Middle East, it has to come through us. And that incidentally is the theme that I want us to adopt in a very friendly and conciliatory fashion; that it does not pay to antagonize us, that we cannot be pressured into doing things we do not want to do. So they better get us to want to do them.

And we absolutely will not apologize for our actions. We will tell them that we are prepared to make a major contribution to remove the conditions that produced this war; that we do not maintain that the conditions that produced this war are tolerable for the Arabs. But we will do it as an act of policy and not because somebody is blackmailing us. And this is how we handled at least the serious ones of them during this whole period, and why Egypt never launched a propaganda campaign during this whole period—because we told them the basic fact of the matter is that they would need us in the post-war diplomacy, and we would not play if they behaved in such a way.

So I think we now have a good opportunity to try to move towards a fundamental settlement. We have the forum which was established by the Security Council resolution. We have the reality which was established by the war. And I hope we can now in this building develop a policy, as I am sure we can—because I want to repeat again what I said at the beginning; that the behavior of the people, the performance of the people who worked on this was superlative.

When our first plan went awry, the group stayed up all night, from the 13th to the 14th, and wrote out a new strategy, which we then literally followed the rest of the way. It was one of the situations where for good or ill we can claim what we designed more or less came to pass.

Today there is a little flap because—who knows who started it, but the Israelis grabbed another—obviously they grabbed some more territory, because it is the Arabs and the Soviets who are screaming for another Security Council resolution. The Security Council is meeting now. And there will be another joint U.S.–Soviet resolution calling for an immediate cease-fire; a return to the positions which existed when the cease-fire went into effect; and thirdly, the establishment of UN observers. We have no excessive expectation that it is possible to determine where the lines were when the cease-fire went into effect. So that one and three are the most important ones.

But the major thing to remember is that, I think, the events of the last two weeks have been on the whole a major success for the United States. And not only a success for the United States; they were a success for the policy that had preceded it, because without the close relationship with the Soviet Union, this thing could have easily escalated. Not that I am saying the Soviet Union behaved in a friendly fashion, but that there was enough in that relationship to moderate them at critical points. Paradoxically, we are in a better long-term position in the Arab world than we had been before this started. And finally, we have a better position to bring about a permanent settlement than before.

And I think it also shows what we can do here if we think conceptually and lay out where we want to go, and then get all the resources

that exist here all working together, as I believe was essentially done, in this crisis.

Joe, do you want to add anything?

Mr. Sisco: Just a very short postscript, Mr. Secretary. I had only been to the Soviet Union once before. That was in 1969.[12] And after sitting there with Brezhnev for eight or nine hours, whatever it was we had, I carried away one impression very, very strongly. I knew that the Soviets attached importance to détente, but I think in these meetings that we had, the strength of that view even surprised me. It just comes out in every possible way.

Secretary Kissinger: And he didn't even kiss me on the mouth as he did in Camp David. You didn't see it in full flight. (Laughter)

Mr. Sisco: Well, I just want to say the leadership that you have given to this is very impressive indeed, Mr. Secretary, and I think I am in a very good position to say this.

Secretary Kissinger: Any questions? I know, Ken, you don't talk in my presence. (Laughter) You run your own meetings.

Mr. Rush: I would like to say that while on the one hand this does show what the State Department can do, the other side of the coin is it shows also what can be done when you and the State Department work very closely together. I should like to express my very high degree of satisfaction at the results that were achieved under your leadership in this very important situation.

Secretary Kissinger: Also the interdepartmental process, after a week of sabotage by some of the departments, worked extremely well.

Are there any questions?

Ray, what is your assessment?

Mr. Cline: The same as yours, Mr. Secretary. But since—

Secretary Kissinger: You will go far. (Laughter)

Mr. Cline: Since you commented on the intelligence support you got, I would like to make one observation about the intelligence. Our difficulty was partly that we were brainwashed by the Israelis, who brainwashed themselves, I think, in the same way. But much more important, we really did not have an adequate intelligence base to work on, as to what was going on day by day in the Middle East. I think our strategic framework was all right. But we did not have very good intelligence, and we didn't have nearly as much as the Russians had. And I think that is a very serious thing for the future. They had a great deal more to go on than we did.

---

[12] Sisco visited the Soviet Union July 14–17, 1969. Records of his meetings in Moscow are printed in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XII, Soviet Union, January 1969–October 1970, Documents 67 and 69.

Secretary Kissinger: I have asked everyone who was on the Middle East Task Force—we never called it that—people who met twice a day in my office, and I will ask anybody else who did something, who saw enough of the operation to have an opinion about it, to write a critique of, first, what was done well, and second, what was done badly; and thirdly, apart from whether what was done well or badly, what lessons we can learn from it to improve the operations of the Department as well as the operations of the government.

And finally, I would appreciate people's judgment if they think we got everything out of that crisis that we should have, and if in a few more days we could have come out even better.

Mr. Cline: There is no substitute for good information, as you know.

Secretary Kissinger: And the trick is to end these things in time, before one of the great powers feels it has to push in another batch of chips.

George.

Mr. Aldrich: Mr. Secretary, I was curious as to what is really the forum for the follow-on negotiations. Is it the UN, or U.S.-Soviet?

Secretary Kissinger: Probably U.S.-Soviet. The UN is not a good forum for us, nor for the Israelis. But not even for us.

Mr. Newsom: Mr. Secretary, do you have any thoughts at the moment on what we do about the Arab oil boycott? My own feeling is that here is a very good chance to show them that there is a common interest—

Secretary Kissinger: We will break it. We will not provide auspices for the negotiations until they end it.

Mr. Newsom: I think the question of their reliability as suppliers can also be emphasized to them.

Secretary Kissinger: We will not participate in any joint auspices until the oil boycott ends.

Mr. Newsom: Is this being made clear?

Secretary Kissinger: It will be. It has not been made clear yet. We want to get the war ended first. I don't think they will go through with it, not under these conditions. It may come back next year. And also we will start an emergency oil program in this country which is more symbolic than substantive.

Any other questions?

Good. Thank you.

(Whereupon at 5:00 p.m. the meeting was ended.)

251. Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev[1]

Washington, October 23, 1973.

Mr. General-Secretary:

You will have received word that we and you will once again be joining together in a proposal to the Security Council designed to make the cease-fire effective. We did so even though we had reservations regarding one part of the resolution. We felt that it was in our overall interests to maintain unity on this matter involving the first test of making the cease-fire effective. In this connection, I urge you to continue to press Syria to accept the cease-fire so that there will be greater assurance on both fronts that the shooting will in fact stop, and we can begin to move towards the next stage of our joint efforts toward a fundamental settlement.

You know, Mr. General-Secretary, that our principal reservation regarding today's resolution was that the parties were being asked to withdraw to the positions they occupied at the moment they accepted the cease-fire. Our difficulty with this is that the positions actually occupied by both sides at that time are unclear. As I said to Mr. Vorontsov, and as he confirmed, our willingness to accept the principle of your Security Council proposal was made possible when your government assured me that it will show moderation when differences ensue between the parties, as to the positions in dispute. Once the observers are in place, of course, this difficulty will be eliminated. Thus the most immediate goal must be to speed the work of the observers.

Secondly, we agreed to proceed together because of the understanding we have that you will press for the immediate release of prisoners of war. I cannot underscore enough how helpful an immediate exchange of prisoners would be to assure an effective cease-fire and to move rapidly to joint auspices for subsequent negotiations. I continue to believe that you and we have done a distinct service to the cause of peace.

Warm regards,[2]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 69, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 20, [October 12–November 21, 1973]. Secret. A handwritten notation at the top of the page reads: "Rec'd Moscow 0141Z, 10/23/73, dispatched from WH at 5:15 pm, 10/23."

[2] The original is unsigned.

252. Backchannel Message From President Nixon to Egyptian President Sadat[1]

Washington, October 23, 1973.

I appreciate your recent message[2] and the frankness with which you spoke. Let me be equally frank, so that there will be no misunderstanding between us. All we guaranteed—no matter what you may have been told from other sources—was to engage fully and constructively in promoting a political process designed to make possible a political settlement.

Nevertheless, as evidence of our earnest desire to promote a lasting settlement in the Middle East and to further the improvement of relations between our two countries, I have instructed Secretary Kissinger to make urgent representations to the Government of Israel requesting its full compliance with Security Council Resolution 338. It is, of course, equally essential that Egyptian forces scrupulously adhere to the ceasefire.

The use of the UNTSO personnel, authorized by the Security Council this afternoon,[3] should be helpful in assuring compliance by all sides.[4]

With warmest regards.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. No classification marking. Sent in a message from Kissinger to Ismail. In his memoirs, Kissinger wrote that the reply to Sadat was sent late Tuesday (October 23) afternoon. (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 574)

[2] Document 248.

[3] On October 23, by a vote of 14 to 0, the Security Council adopted the joint U.S.–Soviet draft as Resolution 339 (1973). It reads: "The Security Council, Referring to its resolution 338 (1973) of 22 October 1973, 1. Confirms its decision on an immediate cessation of all kinds of firing, and of all military action, and urges that the forces of the two sides be returned to the positions they occupied at the moment the cease-fire became effective; 2. Requests the Secretary-General to take measures for immediate dispatch of United Nations observers to supervise the observance of the cease-fire between the forces of Israel and the Arab Republic of Egypt, using for this purpose the personnel of the United Nations now in the Middle East and first of all the personnel now in Cairo." (*Yearbook of the United Nations, 1973*, p. 213)

[4] In a follow-up message to Ismail later that day, Kissinger wrote: "Dr. Kissinger wishes to inform Mr. Ismail that President Nixon has, as he promised Sadat in his most recent message, made urgent representations to the Israeli Government asking that it stop any offensive action and comply with Security Council Resolution 338. In response, the Israeli Government has told us that it will desist from any further action. Mr. Ismail should be aware, however, that the Government of Israel told President Nixon that it will not be able to maintain this stance should Egyptian forces elect to take offensive actions of their own. Thus, Dr. Kissinger would like to suggest that President Sadat may wish to issue a new ceasefire order to his forces." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973)

253. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, October 23, 1973, 8:35 p.m.

K. You really didn't want to sleep tonight.

D. I didn't know it myself but I was flying from Frankfurt on a plane that was going from Israel to New York. It was quite a coincidence.

K. After our call I called the Israelis and said the fighting must stop[2] and I have their pledge that if the Egyptians stop firing they will in any event stop any advance now and if the Egyptians obey the cease-fire they will obey the ceasefire. I now have the impression they will stop. Let's get it stopped. They are now in defensive position. They are not advancing. If you could get the Egyptians to give another order to stop firing—

D. The next step should be coming back to the resolution line.

K. That is the next question. All Sadat has asked us to do is stop the fighting.

D. To stop and go back where they were.

K. The first step is to get the fighting stopped.

D. There is nothing else I want.

K. Right now they will still advance as I understand it.

D. I will get to Moscow about this.

K. Then we will see about the next step.

D. All right, Henry. Good night.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Anatoli[y] Dobrynin File, Box 28. No classification marking.

[2] Kissinger spoke with Dobrynin at 7:10 p.m. and with Dinitz at 8:30 p.m. (Ibid.) Both transcripts are printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 318–321 and 322–323, respectively.

254. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Israeli Ambassador (Dinitz)[1]

Washington, October 24, 1973, 9:22 a.m.

K: Mr. Ambassador, now we have got another message that you are attacking the third army.[2]

D: No, that is exactly what I told Eagleburger that I was running to the office because I had a direct line from Israel and I just got the message from Israel what is happening and I will get in detail to . . .

K: Just tell me in one sentence.

D: Right. I will give it to Eagleburger but I will give it to you in one sentence. The ceasefire went into effect and then the third army has tried to make efforts to break out of the siege. And started attacking and even advancing toward Mitla—on the east and even break through in the west as well as in the north with three divisions. It is a big power. When they returned fighting they have brought 30 Egyptian planes over to support the action and fifteen of them were shot down by us. A big battle has developed over which we are just blocking the third army from getting out of the siege. We are not advancing. We are returning the fight. And the whole thing that has happened now is their attack to try to break out of the siege. Both northward, westward and eastward at the same time.

K: Northward . . .

D: Northward, eastward toward the Mitla Pass . . .

K: Westward would put them across the Canal, you can't . . .

D: To the Mitla Pass and westward—in three directions.

K: Well, now, wait a minute—westward means they are going across the Canal. Are they drowning themselves?

D: No, they are trying to break through the north of Suez, the bridgehead that we have closed.

K: Look, Mr. Ambassador, we have been a strong support for you.

D: Right.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] An October 24 message from Ismail to Kissinger, received in Cairo at 2 p.m. local time, stated that the Israelis had resumed their attacks against the Third Army to gain new positions on its lines of communications. Ismail wrote that it was hoped that "Dr. Kissinger will see to it that practical and effective measures are taken to oblige Israel to comply with the ceasefire resolution." (Ibid., NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973)

K: But we cannot make Brezhnev look like a Goddamn fool in front of his own colleagues.

D: But, but, Mr. Secretary, I am telling you exactly what is happening there. As I was on the way to phone you they told me that you were looking for me and I will give it to Eagleburger in a very orderly form.

K: Okay, will you do that.

D: Right away.

K: Okay.

D: Thank you.

K: Now, are you prepared to stop if they stop?

D: Yes. Not only this. Even now the message is that we are not shooting except in self-defense. Except in return. We are not initiating any action. We stopped right away.

K: Okay, now you know Dayan performed another one of his genius acts.

D: What did he do?

K: Well, by announcing everything you took yesterday.

D: I talked to them about this, too, and they said if was a situation of the correspondents, but I will check. Did he talk himself, or . . .

K: Well, no, the Defense Ministry announced the strategy which I had proposed is now impossible.

D: I told them this. I told them . . .

K: It still could have worked, which you could have withdrawn somewhat . . .

D: Yes. I will talk to them again about this. I did this morning already.

K: Well, you know, I am having trouble enough keeping the supply going as it is.

D: I understand this, Mr. Secretary. I told them this, too.

K: Okay, fine.

D: Thank you.

K: Bye.

255. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Israeli Ambassador (Dinitz)[1]

Washington, October 24, 1973, 9:32 a.m.

K: Hello.

D: Yes, Dr. Kissinger.

K: Mr. Ambassador, the message of Sadat to us[2] asked us to intervene with forces on the ground.

D: The message of Sadat asked you to intervene?

K: With forces on the ground. Now if he asks the same thing of the Soviets and if the Soviets put some divisions in there then you will have outsmarted yourselves.

D: But Dr. Kissinger . . .

K: Foreign policy is to _____ your victories where you've got them. You had a tremendous victory . . .

D: Yeah, but we are not. But you have to believe me, we are not doing anything. I mean they are _____ try to break out of the cease-[fire] and I have the solemn word, we are now only reacting trying to block them from advancing, and we are prepared to stop the fight any minute. I don't know how I can get it to you.

K: But will you please behave with circumspection and will you please stop bragging.

D: That I have already told them this morning.

K: You know, there's a limit beyond which we can't go and one of them is we cannot make Brezhnev look like an idiot.

D: I understand it.

K: Last night I already had a call from Dobrynin[3] in which they are accusing me of having gone from Moscow to Tel Aviv to plot with them the overthrow of the whole arrangement we've made.

D: Well, that's ridiculous.

K: Well, it may be ridiculous, but that's how war starts.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking. The blank underscores indicate omissions in the original.

[2] In this message, received at 1145Z, October 24, Sadat informed Nixon that the Israelis had resumed their attacks on the Third Army positions on both the eastern and western sides of the canal. Sadat asked Nixon to assure that Israel abide by the cease-fire resolution even to the point of U.S. intervention on the ground. (Ibid., NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973)

[3] See footnote 2, Document 253.

D: Yeah, I understand. I will talk about the announcements again to them but I was just in the process of reading to Eagleburger the situation there and when you will see . . .

K: Don't tell me you're taking Cairo in order to prevent the breakout of the Third Army.

D: Mr. Kissinger, they're absolute quiet on the West Side of the Canal because there there is no fighting. All the fighting is going on on this side of the Canal.

K: If you wind up tonight having captured 20,000 Egyptians you won't be able to tell us that they started the fighting.

D: May I suggest something, Dr. Kissinger? Why don't you have your military attaché in Tel Aviv go into the area with our Command and see the situation?

K: O.K. Can we do that?

D: Yes, I think it's a good idea.

K: O.K. Will you arrange that?

D: I will phone right away.

K: O.K. good.

D: Thank you.

---

256. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, October 24, 1973, 9:45 a.m.

K: Hello.

D: Hello, Henry.

K: Anatol, the madmen in the Middle East seem to be at it again. We got a message this time on the East Bank. The West Bank is quiet now. We just had a message [from] the Israelis[2] claim[ing] they're being attacked. The Egyptians don't say who's doing the attacking. I want you to know what we have done. We've sent first a message to the Israelis telling them it had to stop and we had their assurance that they're

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Anatoli[y] Dobrynin File, Box 28. No classification marking.

[2] Kissinger is apparently referring to Document 254.

staying in defensive positions.[3] We sent a message to the Egyptians of which I'll send you a copy,[4] telling them that we will totally oppose any further military offensive military actions by the Israelis and recommending that they, too, stop offensive actions. And that is our impressions which we have no independent proof, that this time the Egyptians may have started it but we are not sure. We have no real basis for judgment. I just want you to know what we are doing. And I'm sending you the message we sent to the Egyptians but we have made a very violent representation to the Israelis.

D: Alright.

K: But one thing that Moscow is to understand we are not playing any games here. We made an agreement and it's now going to be enforced.

D: This is the point.

K: Well, you have our assurance.

D: I will send a telegram to Moscow.

K: I'll send you the message to send out immediately.

D: O.K. Thank you very much. Bye. Bye.

K: Bye.

---

[3] Kissinger is apparently referring to Document 255.

[4] A copy of Nixon's message to Sadat (Document 252) was delivered to Ambassador Dinitz at 10 a.m. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin and Kissinger, Vol. 8)

---

257. Backchannel Message From President Nixon to Egyptian President Sadat[1]

Washington, undated.

We have just been informed by the Israeli Prime Minister that strict instructions have been issued to Israeli armed forces to stay in defensive positions and not to fire unless they are fired upon.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. Secret; Sensitive. A handwritten note at the top of the page indicates that it was LDXed at 10:17 a.m.

In response to your proposal for U.S. ground observers,[2] the Israeli Government has also agreed to permit U.S. military attachés to proceed immediately to the area of the conflict in order to observe that these orders are being carried out.[3]

It would be very helpful at this time if you could instruct your own forces accordingly.[4]

---

[2] See footnote 2, Document 255.

[3] See Document 255.

[4] A copy of this message was delivered to Dobrynin at 10:40 a.m. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 69, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 20, [October 12–November 21, 1973])

---

258. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, October 24, 1973, 10:19 a.m.

K: Hello.

D: Henry, we have the following message from Brezhnev to President Nixon.

Mr. President:

We have precise information that the Israeli troops are attacking now with tanks and military ships on Egyptian forces on the western part of the Suez Canal. They are trying to capture this port by violating the UN Security Council decision on the Middle East ceasefire. At the same time Israel's military forces are attacking on the Eastern part of the Suez Canal and again Egyptian troops to the south of the Canal. These violent actions of the Israelis were taken only a few hours after the Security Council once again confirmed their decision on a mutual ceasefire and after your very firm statement made to us that the United States would take the full responsibility to assure the full ceasefire from the part of Israel.

Mr. President, we are sure that you have responsibility to make clear to Israel that the troops should immediately stop their actions of provocation. We would like to hope that you and we would be loyal to

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Anatoli[y] Dobrynin File, Box 28. No classification marking. The blank underscores indicate omissions in the original.

our words which were given to each other and to the agreement we have reached with you. We would very much appreciate your message about the steps which are taken by you in order to insure that Israel will obey the second Security Council decision. Respectfully,

K: Thank you, Anatol. Now we will send you a message within a couple of hours on the substance[2] but you can already tell him the following: We have told the Israelis that a continuation of these operations will mean a total reevaluation of our relations including supplies. Secondly, we have demanded that they stop the action. Thirdly, we have demanded that our own observers see that they are not on offensive operations until the UN is in the _____. Fourthly, the President has personally called, in the last five minutes, the Israeli ambassador and has made the same point to him.[3]

D: OK.

K: Now could you transmit this to Brezhnev and tell him that the spirit which _____ us over the weekend continues and we are not in a game of escorting five mile advantages which mean nothing to you or us.

D: Yes, this is exactly true. OK, Henry.

K: Thank you.

---

[2] The message from Nixon to Brezhnev, October 24, was delivered to the Soviet Embassy at 1 p.m. (Ibid., NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 59, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 20)

[3] Kissinger wrote in his memoirs that he needed to impress on Israel the gravity of the crisis. He noted that whenever he needed to enhance a message or avoid a personal confrontation with the Israeli Cabinet, he would ask Haig to call Dinitz on behalf of Nixon. He had done so on this occasion, and Haig had demanded an end to offensive Israeli military operations. (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 578)

259. Minutes of Washington Special Actions Group Meeting[1]

Washington, October 24, 1973, 10:21–11:11 a.m.

SUBJECT

Middle East

PARTICIPANTS

Chairman: Henry A. Kissinger

State
Kenneth Rush
Joseph Sisco

Defense
William Clements
Robert C. Hill

JCS
Adm. Thomas Moorer
V/Adm. John Weinel

CIA
William Colby
Samuel Hoskinson

NSC
Gen. Brent Scowcroft
Harold Saunders
Jeanne W. Davis

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

It was agreed that:

1) a team of U.S. military officers from our Defense Attaché's office in Embassy Tel Aviv would be sent immediately to the East bank of the Canal as ground observers;

2) the resupply sealift to Israel should be accelerated; once the sealift is underway the airlift may be terminated;

3) each WSAG member should prepare a critique of the handling of the current crisis substantively and procedurally;

4) a U.S. team should proceed to Israel to confirm the extent of their equipment losses for purposes of replacement;

5) an SR 71 photo mission should be flown down the Canal and over Egypt.

Secretary Kissinger: (to Mr. Colby) Go ahead with your briefing.

Mr. Colby: briefed from the attached text.[2]

Secretary Kissinger: (commenting on briefing) I'm a specialist on ceasefires that never happen. The Israelis are not only obnoxious, they're also boastful. If they had kept their mouths shut, no one would have known where the ceasefire line was (in the south). Why did they

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, NSC Institutional Files (H–Files), Box H–117, WSAG Meetings Minutes, Originals, 1973. Top Secret; Nodis; Codeword. The meeting took place in the White House Situation Room.

[2] Attached, but not printed.

announce it? On the north, are the Israelis claiming they are up to the Lebanese border?

Adm. Moorer: Yes, they're on the mountain (Mount Hermon).

Secretary Kissinger: Didn't they have the mountain when the fighting started?

Mr. Colby: They had a slice of it; it's a long mountain.

Secretary Kissinger: And now they have the whole mountain?

Mr. Colby: Yes, they're on the summit.

Secretary Kissinger: Is that significant?

Mr. Colby: Yes, it gives them both electronic and artillery coverage.

Mr. Sisco: Will it have an effect on fedayeen infiltration into Lebanon?

Mr. Colby: It could have. We have this report from our DAO that the Israelis say an Egyptian force has attacked to the east, but I'm suspicious of that.

Secretary Kissinger: We've made an arrangement with the Israelis. They have agreed to stay in defensive positions on the east bank and we will send some US military personnel from the attaché's office in our Embassy in Tel Aviv there as observers. Can Defense arrange that as soon as we get out of this meeting? Send about ten—or as many as you can. The Egyptians also asked us to send some US ground people. They wanted US military units, but we said we would send US ground observers. We have told the Soviets, and everyone is delighted.

Adm. Moorer: Along the entire east bank?

Secretary Kissinger: No, on the 3rd Army front. Just for 48 hours to make sure the Israelis are in a defensive position.

Mr. Sisco: (to Adm. Moorer) Make sure Ambassador Keating is a recipient of any message you send. He's had some problems.

Secretary Kissinger: He hasn't been on the losing side of a war yet and he's getting nasty.

Mr. Colby: We also have a report that three formations of Israeli aircraft attacked Port Tawfiq.

Secretary Kissinger: I'd like to arrange a meeting between Thieu and Golda and Duc and Dayan. They deserve each other.

(Commenting on a late report of an Israeli-Egyptian air engagement southwest of the Bitter Lakes in which Egyptian pilots jumped from their aircraft prior to being engaged) The *Iliad* was certainly not written about the Egyptian Air Force.

What about the UN observer teams on the Syrian front? Aren't they behind the lines now?

Mr. Colby: They're in place and can move ahead easily.

Secretary Kissinger: (commenting on the briefing report of criticism among Egyptian military and government officials of the cease-fire) Do those maniacs think they were winning?

Mr. Colby: Yes, probably; they weren't told very much.

Secretary Kissinger: They would have lost their whole army, wouldn't they? Couldn't the Israelis have repeated in the north what they did in the south?

Mr. Colby: Yes.

Secretary Kissinger: Where's Port Fuad? Mrs. Meir claims we kept them from taking that.

Mr. Colby: They didn't make a serious effort.

Adm. Moorer: If I may add to Bill's (Colby) briefing, the Israelis yesterday initiated high-tempo air activity in both the north and south. They claim they have now destroyed all of Syria's oil storage capacity. On the Soviet ship supply, 25 ships have either left or are scheduled to go. They have brought in 19,000 tons to the Egyptians and 14,000 tons to Syria, with 28,000 tons en route, destination unknown. That's a total of 61,000 tons, added to their airlift, for a grand total of 70–75,000 tons. Also, those Soviet reconnaissance satellites are concentrating on the Israeli airfields and the Egyptian missile belt. Brezhnev has expressed curiousity about the Egyptian use of the missiles they gave them—both their utility and their survivability.

Mr. Colby: The Israelis got a dud SA–6 missile.

Adm. Moorer: They got an SA–2, –2C, –3 and a dud –6.

Secretary Kissinger: How did they fail to capture an SA–6 launcher?

Adm. Moorer: They're mobile.

Secretary Kissinger: I'm amazed they didn't overrun any launchers.

Mr. Colby: They're well aware of our interest. We pound it into them every day.

Secretary Kissinger: I have a feeling the Egyptian commanders don't report the truth to Cairo.

Adm. Moorer: Of course, the Russians are putting them under the same kind of pressure, telling them under no circumstances must they let one of those things be captured.

Mr. Clements: The missiles are far more important to us than the launchers.

Adm. Moorer: We need the missile and the radar.

Secretary Kissinger: Does the dud missile have the radar?

Adm. Moorer: No, that's separate, in a van.

Mr. Clements: We may be able to work back from the missile to the radar.

Secretary Kissinger: Will they give us the missile?

Mr. Colby: Oh, yes.

Secretary Kissinger: Do we need the SA–2 and –3 too?

Adm. Moorer: Yes.

Mr. Clements: And the –7.

Secretary Kissinger: Do the Israelis have the –7?

Mr. Clements: Yes.

Secretary Kissinger: The Israelis said the SA–6 was the bad one. They said the –7 hurt them only at low altitudes.

Adm. Moorer: Both of them hurt them, and the 23 mm machine gun. We'll get all of these from them.

Secretary Kissinger: The Israeli Air Force Chief told us that in the first two days they needed the close ground support, regardless of the consequences, which gave the SAMs a free ride. (Referring to a telegram handed into the meeting)[3] Here's an Israeli sitrep which swears that the Egyptians have tried to break out both north and west across the Canal. There have been a few attacks to the east, and now they have moved some miles toward the east. This should be determinable by our people as soon as they get there. We were very tough with the Israelis this morning. We told them this had to stop.[4]

Let me explain where we stand diplomatically. I think we have come out in the catbird seat. Everyone has to come to us since we are the only ones who can deliver. I think this will be true in the diplomacy, too. This is for the information of the people in this room, not for debriefing. We have made some real gains in the last few weeks, since everyone has learned that the US is the essential ingredient. Israel has learned that they can't fight a war without an open American supply line—they can't stockpile enough to do it. That is the lesson they have learned. Their casualties are enormous. Mrs. Meir told us they have 1500–2000 dead and 5–7000 wounded. That's comparable to 500,000 for us. She said there is not a family in Israel that has not been hit directly or indirectly, and that must be true in such a small country.

The Arabs may despise us, or hate us, or loathe us, but they have learned that if they want a settlement, they have to come to us. No one else can deliver. Three times they have relied on Russian equipment, and three times they have lost it. So, strategically, we have a very good

[3] Not further identified.

[4] See Documents 254 and 255.

hand if we know how to play it. All the Arabs have approached us, from the most radical to the most conservative.

Our strategy is to hold these cards and to get a settlement. We cannot tolerate continuation of the status quo. On the other hand, we want to keep the supplies going in until we have a concrete proposal to put before the Israelis. It would be premature to start nit-picking them now. Although we were brutal today with the Israelis in stopping the military activity.

The next phase will be direct negotiation between the Israelis and the Arabs under joint US-Soviet auspices. We and the Soviets will participate, at least in the early stages, but the US is the key element. The Egyptians have been more than circumspect in their dealings with us.

You will begin to see the pattern of our dealings with the Arabs in the next few days. We will be as hard as nails on oil. We will tell them that if they want our auspices they have to stop their oil threats—that we will do nothing under pressure. We won't do it in a provocative way, but we will be firm. I think we will even get Egyptian support if the ceasefire is not broken. That's our strategy.

Mr. Clements: You want to keep the resupply going as is?

Secretary Kissinger: Right.

Mr. Clements: We'll do it.

Secretary Kissinger: We will offer the Soviets a mutual agreement on resupply. If they cut theirs, we will cut ours. But I don't want to give that away in advance. I want the Arabs to see that there is no hope in relying on the Soviets.

Mr. Clements: We are in a transitional period of moving from an airlift to a sealift.

Secretary Kissinger: Once the sealift is organized we can start cutting back on the airlift. The airlift is not an end in itself.

Mr. Clements: We will proceed as we are going unless we are told otherwise.

Secretary Kissinger: (referring to a message handed into the meeting)[5] The Egyptians are nuts! They say there are "some enemy splinter units scattered in some areas west of the Canal." But "our forces control the east bank except for a seven kilometer gap." Is that true?

Mr. Colby: It's 30 kilometers.

Adm. Moorer: And they didn't mention that the roads from Cairo to Suez and to Israel have been cut by the Israelis.

---

[5] Not further identified.

Mr. Colby: The situation is the exact reverse. The Israeli presence here is thin, but it is the Egyptians who have splinter units scattered along here.

Mr. Sisco: And the Israelis put fresh troops in last night.

Adm. Moorer: The Israelis are astride the two main roads and the Egyptians' water and supplies have been interdicted. I don't think they have more than three days' supplies.

Secretary Kissinger: As soon as the sealift gets going, we can drop the airlift. When will that be? Where is the first ship?

Mr. Clements: The first ship will arrive on November 12.

Adm. Moorer: (referring to charts)[6] There are 13 ships involved.

Mr. Rush: What is our total tonnage as compared to the 61,000 tons of Soviet supplies going by ship?

Adm. Weinel: So far it's very small in comparison.

Mr. Clements: It doesn't really compare at this point.

Secretary Kissinger: What happened to the 50,000 tons you promised us?

Mr. Clements: Remember that we are continuing our airlift tonnage—that's cumulative. Also, we have a new shopping list from the Israelis and we have to talk about what you want to send them.

Secretary Kissinger: The President promised the Israelis two weeks ago that we would replace their losses. He also promised that at least 40% of their tank losses would be replaced with M–60 tanks.[7]

Adm. Moorer: How fast should this be done? Does he want to take them out of new production or out of operating units.

Secretary Kissinger: He didn't say.

Mr. Clements: We need to think about this in terms of the urgency. That will determine where they come from.

Secretary Kissinger: From the diplomatic point of view, anything that is already under way is easier to handle than something that is done in the middle of the diplomatic maneuvering.

Mr. Clements: That means soonest.

Mr. Rush: There are two considerations: (1) the quicker they get in, the less chance that they will be stopped by a diplomatic agreement with the Russians; but (2) the slower they arrive, the more leverage that gives us on Israel.

---

[6] Attached, but not printed.

[7] See Document 140.

Secretary Kissinger: (referring to a message handed into the meeting)[8] We've got the firing stopped. (General) Haig called (Israeli Ambassador) Dinitz.[9] Israel knows they cannot survive without us. They know they would have lost this war except for us. They were on their knees on October 13 and they couldn't have recovered. If we cut our diplomatic support, they're dead. They can't survive a joint US-Soviet position in the Security Council. So we have basically all the leverage we need. I'm worried about the impact on the Arabs. In looking back over the last two weeks, the major mistake we made was in asking for that supplemental.[10] We didn't need it. Incidentally, I want every WSAG member to write a critique of our handling of this situation by the end of the week: what was done well, what badly, both substantively and procedurally. And I don't want you to give it to the press!

Mr. Colby: (to Secretary Kissinger) (Congressman) Hebert[11] was most complimentary about you yesterday. He said he had had a session with you and that everything had happened just as you said it would.

Secretary Kissinger: I think this is the best-run crisis we have ever had. I want to compliment everyone here.

Mr. Sisco: Let's assume for the moment that we had not asked for the $2.2 billion. Would we have been better off in the context of our diplomacy?

Secretary Kissinger: If we needed to do it, it was better to do it now. The question is whether we needed to do it.

Mr. Clements: In the session with the House Armed Services Committee, with about 26 members, they made it clear they would have preferred not to have to pass on the supplemental. They didn't think we needed it. They took the attitude that if we had gone ahead and handled it as FMS sales, then the Israelis' credit went sour, okay, so their credit went sour. It has happened before.

Secretary Kissinger: (to Mr. Clements) That wasn't your feeling last week.

Mr. Clements: No, and it's not my feeling now. I'm just reporting the sentiment of the members of the Committee.

Secretary Kissinger: Having paid the price, the worst thing we could do is pull away from it now. There's no sense worrying about it. It's done. And I think we can bring the Saudis back.

---

[8] Not further identified.

[9] See footnote 3, Document 258.

[10] See footnote 7, Document 208.

[11] F. Edward Hébert (D–Louisiana).

Mr. Clements: We need to know how soon you want us to move out on the resupply. Should we push out or string along? Also, we should get a team in there to confirm these losses. We shouldn't just accept what their attaché here is telling us about their losses.

Adm. Moorer: They're asking for 1000 tanks and 1000 trucks.

Mr. Clements: The President said we would replace their losses, but we have a right to determine what they were.

Secretary Kissinger: I agree, we should do that. But can we agree on a minimum figure and start shipping something, even before our team can get a judgement?

Mr. Clements: Yes, we can do that.

Secretary Kissinger: It would be best from the diplomatic point of view to bulge now, then we can taper off. The tapering off can be a concession in the diplomatic process.

Mr. Sisco: I think that's what the Russians will do.

Secretary Kissinger: The way it is now designed, we won't be in high gear until November 15. I want more to go in quickly so that our contribution will be the tapering off, even though we were planning to taper off anyway.

Mr. Clements: We can do it.

Mr. Colby: Do you want to use non-Israeli ships?

Secretary Kissinger: Absolutely.

Mr. Clements: That's no problem.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's get more ships, then taper off in the second half of November. This will make some money with the Arabs as our diplomacy requires it.

Mr. Rush: (to Mr. Clements) How are you handling these shipments legally?

Mr. Clements: We're okay until the end of the year. It's being done under existing authority and the Israelis can say they need time to work out the payment. We can delay payment for three months.

Mr. Colby: (to Secretary Kissinger) How about an SR71 flight down the Suez and over Egypt?

Secretary Kissinger: Can you avoid Cairo? Oh, go ahead and do it.

(Secretary Kissinger left the room to take a phone call.)

Mr. Hill: On the supplemental, I think it was a good thing we asked for it. It gave the Russians a signal. And if we hadn't done something dramatic, the Jewish leaders would have come right down the gun barrel at us. And we showed the Congress. There are 85 Senators in the Jewish pocket, and they would have taken the lead on it. Only about 15 Senators are critical. We shouldn't apologize for asking for the supplemental.

Mr. Sisco: The Administration preempted the Senators.

Mr. Rush: He (Secretary Kissinger) was talking about the price we paid with the Arabs. But I'm not sure there wasn't some good effect on them. It showed the Arabs we mean business.

Mr. Clements: I was just reporting the mood of the House Armed Services Committee.

(Sec. Kissinger returned)

Secretary Kissinger: I will meet with Jim (Schlesinger), Tom (Moorer) and Bill (Colby) at lunch, and we will talk more about this. I'll see Bill (Clements) and Tom (Moorer) now. Let's have another WSAG meeting on Friday,[12] assuming there isn't some emergency. I want to thank everyone here—this has been very well done.

Mr. Colby: (to Secretary Kissinger) Had you heard Brezhnev is going to Cuba?

Secretary Kissinger: Yes, in December.

Mr. Colby: No, tomorrow—day after tomorrow.

Secretary Kissinger: Tomorrow? I hadn't heard of it.

Mr. Colby: The Soviet Embassy has requested overflight clearance from Halifax. October 26–28.

Secretary Kissinger: He told us he was going in December. Why do you suppose he's going now?

Mr. Sisco: I would have thought he would have told you about it.

Secretary Kissinger: I didn't know it.

[12] October 26.

260. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail)[1]

Washington, October 24, 1973.

Dr. Kissinger wishes to inform Mr. Ismail of the urgent steps which the U.S. side has taken to stop the renewed outbreak of fighting in the Middle East:

(1) The Israeli Government was informed that any further offensive operations would lead to a severe deterioration of relations between the Israeli and the U.S. Governments.
(2) The United States requested that its own military attaché personnel from the U.S. Embassy in Tel Aviv personally observe Israeli military activity in the area of renewed fighting to insure that no offensive action was taken by Israeli forces.
(3) The President personally intervened with the Prime Minister of Israel to halt the fighting.

The United States has since received the following formal assurances:

—The U.S. military attaché has been invited to the front.
—At no place since the beginning of the ceasefire at 7:00 a.m. today have the Israelis tried to advance. They will not try to do so.
—At 7:00 a.m. local time today the Israelis asked the UN observers to move into place on all roads leading from the Canal westward so that they would ascertain that there were no troop movements.
—The Israelis have no intention of moving their force on the West Bank across to the East Bank to attack Egyptian forces on that side of the Canal. The Israelis are trying "to absorb fire without answer." There has been no activity on the northern sector of the Egyptian front, nor on the Syrian front.[2]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. No classification marking. A handwritten note on the message indicates that it was transmitted on October 24 at 1:05 p.m.

[2] In his memoirs, Kissinger wrote that his message to Ismail crossed with a "climactic new message from Sadat to Nixon." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 579) Sadat's message, which was received at the Embassy in Cairo at 1730Z, 7:30 p.m. local time, reads: "I have received your two messages of October 24, 1973. I would like to reaffirm the fact that the Israeli forces on the west side of the Canal were responsible for violating the cease fire and mounting offensive operations in an attempt to isolate the Third Egyptian Army east of the Canal. I would like to inform you that we agreed to the immediate dispatch of American observers or troops for the implementation of the Security Council Resolutions of October 22 and 23, 1973. I have informed the USSR about the messages exchanged between us and I am also formally asking the Soviet Union to take similar action." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973)

—Those observers stationed in Cairo have not yet arrived at the front, possibly because the Egyptians are detaining them. Any influence which could be exerted on Cairo to permit them to come to the front would be appreciated.

At the same time, Dr. Kissinger wishes to point out to Mr. Ismail the following information which it has received:

—The Israelis are in possession of a message from the Egyptian Minister of War issued during the height of the fighting which: (1) calls on the forces to continue fighting; (2) promises air support; (3) says that 250 tanks are being sent from Cairo to break through Israeli forces on the West Bank.

—The Israelis know there is movement in the armored division stationed near Cairo but they do not know whether the division is moving toward the West Bank nor do they know how many tanks the division has.

In light of these assurances and actions on the part of the U.S. Government, it is requested that the Egyptian side also scrupulously observe the ceasefire agreement.[3]

[3] Kissinger noted that Sadat in his message "agreed to what we had *not* offered: the immediate dispatch of American observers or troops for the implementation of the Security Council cease-fire resolution on the *Egyptian* side." What was new was that Sadat was "formally" issuing the same request to the Soviets. Kissinger wrote that shortly after receiving Sadat's message, he learned that Egypt had announced that it was calling for a Security Council meeting to ask that U.S. and Soviet forces be sent to the Middle East. The "makings of a crisis were appearing," since the United States was not prepared to send U.S. troops to Egypt, nor to accept the dispatch of Soviet forces. Nor would it participate in a joint force with the Soviets, which would legitimize their role in the area. Anti-Soviet moderates in the region such as Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Kuwait might panic, and the Soviet forces might prove impossible to remove. (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 579)

261. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, October 24, 1973, 1:05–2:42 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State and Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Dr. James R. Schlesinger, Secretary of Defense
Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
William E. Colby, Director, Central Intelligence Agency
Major General Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

Kissinger: I will bring you up-to-date.

We told the Soviets we would stop the resupply if there was a cease-fire, and they did. Also we said that détente would suffer if they persisted.

Dobrynin says they are at a crossroads. He called it the greatest crisis since the Cuban crisis. He called me on Sunday—he asked if we could explore a ceasefire plus a reference to 242.[2] He said they understood the airlift but could we not be provocative? On Tuesday[3] they sent Kosygin to Cairo. On Thursday the Soviets sent a proposal for withdrawal to the '67 borders, etc.[4] I said we would reply within 24 hours. Dobrynin thought the military situation was a stalemate.

On Friday, Brezhnev said they were heading for an irreversible decision[5] and wanted me to come there. I agreed for the reasons you know.

Let me tell you about the meetings there.

I told them I was too tired to meet on Saturday, but we met anyway and had a 5-hour meeting.[6] Brezhnev said détente was the

---

[1] Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversation, Box 2. Secret; Nodis. The luncheon meeting was held in the White House Map Room.

[2] Kissinger is referring to his 7:55 p.m. conversation with Dobrynin on Saturday, October 15. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

[3] October 16.

[4] October 18. See Document 202.

[5] October 19. See Document 209.

[6] Kissinger is presumably referring to his lengthy meeting on Sunday, October 21; see Document 221.

most important thing and he wouldn't give it up for the Middle East. What difference does 5 or 10 miles make?

I filibustered on Friday night.

Colby: Did he seem to be under pressure?

Kissinger: Grechko had briefed him each day. I got the impression they were considering doing something.

Moorer: I think that answers the airborne alert questions. They were taking the first steps.

Kissinger: They were grim on Friday night—not hostile.

I criticized their proposal. I said: "We can haggle over every point, and maybe you can make a few points. I will tell you tomorrow what we can live with, and we should do it quickly."

I sent them a critique. Brezhnev conducted the meeting—usually he just introduces it. I gave him a counterproposal. It led to a screaming match.

Schlesinger: On what?

Kissinger: Israeli withdrawal, etc.

They finally agreed on the resolution, and we made a side agreement—(1) on release of the POWs, and (2) the phrase "appropriate auspices" in the resolution means U.S.–Soviet auspices. This means the U.S. and the Soviet Union are in at the beginning of the negotiation and they consult and stay close thereafter. The Secretary General is on our ass; the Security Council is loaded against us. So the best auspices is what we got. But we will have extensive bilateral talks with the Arabs, to say to them that if they want a deal, they deal with us.

Colby: Who are the "parties?"

Kissinger: Syria, Jordan and Egypt.

We had a message from the Saudis—"get us off the hook." We got three messages from Sadat and three from Hafiz Ismail.

Egypt asked me to visit while I was in Israel. I couldn't arrange it but I will do it on the China trip next month.[7]

My theme is to remove the causes of conflict but we can't do it while the Arabs are blackmailing us.

Colby: They can't blackmail.

---

[7] At 11:22 a.m. that morning, Kissinger sent a message to Ismail suggesting that he might accept "the kind invitation of the Egyptian side to visit Cairo" on his way to China in November. The message stressed: "The U.S. side believes it essential that prior to Dr. Kissinger's visit, U.S.–Egyptian relations be conducted in such a manner as to maintain an atmosphere conducive to constructive discussions." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973)

Kissinger: The British are jackals. They have said they will intervene if asked. I said, "Don't show your impotence, because we won't pay any attention." They said the UN should do it because they would be unhappy otherwise. The Europeans have been shits.

We have shown (1) that the Soviet Union can't deliver when the chips are down, and (2) that the arms they buy won't do it, and (3) the Arabs now know they must deal through us if they want results.

If you all would work out your ideas for a reasonable settlement.

I think Egypt is looking for a way to solve the Israeli security concerns. The problem is to reconcile Israel's security and Egyptian sovereignty. I have been asked: "Would I pressure Israel?" I said if there is a reasonable proposal.

Schlesinger: The biggest problem is Jerusalem.

Kissinger: Jordan is ready to accept the Allon plan[8] if he can get a street and the mosques in Jerusalem. The goddamn Israelis won't give them a thing.

Colby: They'll have to now.

Kissinger: The Israelis now know they depend on us. They were hurting on the 12th–13th. They were ready for a ceasefire in place. We were ready but the British bastards wouldn't do it.

Colby: The Europeans are the first clients for oil—they're supplicants.

Schlesinger: What shall we do with the British?

Kissinger: In this room I think we must reconsider our European policy.

Colby: I think they can't have a special relationship with us and do what they are.

Schlesinger: I agree we must all think about our European relations.

I begin to see your views on the French. They at least have self-assurance.

The Germans are pitiful—they say our moving tanks will upset the Arabs.

Kissinger: After two weeks, our position with the Arabs is better than that of the Europeans who are kissing their ass.

The only other subject was SALT. Gromyko said they are rethinking SALT and it is tough for them. Therefore, I don't think we should move on Alex's proposal. It would confuse them. It is a move to more toughness. It gives a checklist of our fall-off.

---

[8] See footnote 4, Document 8.

Colby: How well informed were they on the Middle East?

Kissinger: They were grim on Saturday. I tried to downplay Israel's success, not to humiliate them. They said the roads were cut—this was Sunday morning. They knew quite a bit.

Their disdain for the Arabs is complete. They said if the Arabs would stand and fight, they could wear down the Israelis.

Colby: The problem, in a way, is covering the activities of your friends.

We are geared to the opposite. They are right not to tell us too much. They were very weak in Syria.

Kissinger: The leaders appeared to me very chastened.

The incursion was a fluke which worked.

They may get cocky again, but they'll never be the same.

I have learned something. You either do something or you don't. If you do it, do it massively—you take the same heat.

Schlesinger: How long will the airlift continue?

Kissinger: Until it melds into the sealift.

Colby: How about the deal with the Soviet Union?

Kissinger: Right now we have no deal. What I'd like to see is a bulge now and then a cutback after my trip so as to look like it is my outcome.

Schlesinger: Our problem is we don't know what to do. Should we replace as the President said, or fill their wish list?

Kissinger: It must be geared to two things: What they lost and what the Soviet Union is doing. Whatever we put in, Israel will not go to war again without opening a supply line to us.

Schlesinger: One problem is our arms inventories: Tanks, TOW, 105, Sparrow—we are deep into inventories.

Kissinger: I want a bulge now, over the next three weeks, and then a level thing that we can space out.

Colby: We shouldn't nit-pick them now.

Kissinger: By December we will turn on them, but up to then we don't want to have the Jewish community on us for not being generous now.

The deadlines are my trip, and the Israeli election.

We can get through one more winter, but we have got to have a settlement next year.

Schlesinger: What about aircraft?

Kissinger: Replace what they have lost and replace the Mirages and Mysteres.

Schlesinger: How about two per month?

Kissinger: Let's call the 40 Committee on an emergency and keep on with the two per month.

Schlesinger: O.K. We will cover the losses.

Kissinger: We have been using DPRC to get the foreign policy considerations. I don't think that is a good forum. If you will let Sy Weiss in on what you plan.

Colby: NSCIC. The President made me Vice Chairman. I would work it like the 40 Committee.

Schlesinger: We need to straighten out the recce in the Middle East.

Kissinger: Let's do it at the next WSAG.

Schlesinger: We must decide whether to use the U–2 or the SR–71. The U–2 has a better camera.

Colby: We could run a joint recce with the Soviets.

Schlesinger: Should we look at Latakia, etc? We have our troubles with Qaddafi. I suspect shipments are going to Egypt through Libya. The SR–71 could fly down to Libya on the coast on its return.

Kissinger: O.K. We got away pretty well with the last one.

If they complain about tomorrow, we could say it's to fix the cease-fire lines.

Colby: If we could get the assurance that Egypt wouldn't fire at the U–2, we could fly it from [*less than 1 line not declassified*].

Kissinger: I don't think they would.

Colby: The only important coverage is the Canal.

Schlesinger: Right now we can't put out a picture.

Colby: If you would approve the paper.

Kissinger: Give me one page on how to handle the picture.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

Schlesinger: What did you get from the Saudis?

Kissinger: I told them we will take care of their problems but we can't do it under pressure.

I don't want a military man with me. We can have one go later.

Schlesinger: Take Clements and leave him in Riyadh.

Kissinger: I'd rather do it later. I don't want Simon, or anyone else clamoring. I'll send him later.

I just want to establish a mood. I won't spend more than three hours anywhere except in Cairo.

I don't think we want the Saudis involved in a settlement—we should hang it on Egypt and Syria.

Schlesinger: These people need Tender Loving Care.

Kissinger: But not the wrong kind. I want it but in a disciplined way.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

---

262. Message From Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev to President Nixon[1]

Moscow, October 24, 1973.

Dear Mr. President,

We have hard information that the Israeli forces are now fiercely attacking by tanks and naval crafts the Egyptian port of Adabei on the Western bank of the Suez Canal with obvious intention to capture this port in gross violation of also a new cease-fire decision of the Security Council.

At the same time the Israeli armed forces are fiercely fighting Egyptian forces on the Eastern bank of the Southern Suez Canal.

These defiant actions have been taken by the presumptuous leaders of Israel only several hours after the last confirmation by the Security Council of its decision about an immediate cease-fire and after your firm statement that the United States takes full responsibility for implementation by Israel of a complete termination of hostilities.

So what is happening—hardly have we reached an understanding and received from you very solemn assurances concerning its implementation, when gross defiance occurs of both this understanding of ours and of decisions of the Security Council.

We, naturally, have questions as to what is behind all this. I wish to say it frankly, Mr. President, that we are confident that you have possibilities to influence Israel with the aim of putting an end to such a provocative behaviour of Tel Aviv.

We would like to hope that we both will be true to our word and to the understanding we have reached.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 69, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 20, [October 12–November 21, 1973]. No classification marking. A notation on the message states that it was delivered from the Soviet Embassy at 1:15 p.m. The message is attached to a note from Dobrynin to Kissinger stating that he was sending him the message he told him about that morning over the telephone. See Document 258.

I will appreciate information on your steps towards Israel's strict and immediate compliance with the decisions of the Security Council of this October 22 and 23.[2]

Respectfully,

L. Brezhnev[3]

[2] Regarding Nixon's reply to Brezhnev's message, see footnote 2, Document 258.

[3] The original bears this typed signature.

263. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Israeli Ambassador (Dinitz)[1]

Washington, October 24, 1973, 3:40 p.m.

K: We have just been told by the Soviets; I'm not saying this is true; but I want to bring you up to date—that your forces are still continuing to attack.[2]

D: I have just talked to Israel about 5 mins. ago and they told me all is quiet and we cancelled the blackout in Israel today.

K: I want to inform you of our strategy at the UN. If the meeting is called we will take the following position: 1) We will support the strongest call for an observance of the ceasefire; 2) we will totally oppose introduction of American and Soviet forces (unless you are for it).[3]

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] At 3:35 p.m., Dobrynin telephoned Kissinger and passed on a message received from Gromyko stating that Moscow had just received very reliable information from the leadership of Egypt and from its own sources that Israeli military actions were continuing. Therefore, the information given by Israel to the White House was false. Gromyko instructed Dobrynin to immediately inform Kissinger and the President of the false information. (Ibid.)

[3] In his memoirs, Kissinger wrote: "We were determined to resist by force if necessary the introduction of Soviet troops into the Middle East regardless of the pretext under which they arrived. When Dobrynin called on me shortly after 4:00 p.m., I told him that we would veto any UN resolution calling for the sending of troops by permanent members of the Security Council—both a delicate way of phrasing the issue and a face-saving formula for the Soviets to back down." He noted that Dobrynin, who was without new instructions, spoke in a most conciliatory fashion and suggested not bothering with a new formal resolution, but having the President of the Security Council express a "consensus" favoring an appeal for another cease-fire. Kissinger said he agreed "with some relief, that this was a good way to defuse the crisis." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 580) According

D: No. No. No.

K: 3) We will strongly favor strengthening of UN observers by bringing people in like the Scandinavians and elsewhere. 4) On the question of return to the original line we strongly support the principle but have no thoughts on how to apply it. Scali will be instructed to delay and confuse it. O.K.?

D: Fine. Do you have any idea if anyone is going to propose a resolution.

K: No. I have no word. I have seen that the Egyptians and Syrians are calling a meeting. I am seeing Dobrynin at 4:00 on another matter and I will tell them not to propose it because we will oppose it. Give us as much assurance as you can that you are not taking any military action.

D: I called 5 minutes ago. I will tell the Prime Minister about the strategy and repeat the concern that the Russians expressed to you.

K: Thank you.

D: Thank you.

---

to Kissinger's Record of Schedule, he met with Dobrynin in the White House at 4:12 p.m. (Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box 438, Miscellany, 1968–76) No other record of this meeting has been found.

---

264. Briefing Memorandum From the Director of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research (Cline) to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 24, 1973.

Cease-fire Problems

Even if the major combatants stop shooting, this cease-fire appears much more precarious than its predecessors.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 27–14 ARAB–ISR. Secret; Exdis. Drafted by Director of the Office of Research and Analysis for Near East and South Asia Curtis F. Jones; concurred in by INR Deputy Director David E. Mark.

Difficult Geography. With two Egyptian salients east of the Canal and one Israeli salient west of the Canal, in addition to possible Egyptian enclaves inside the Israeli salient, the cease-fire on the Suez front will be extremely difficult to police. Israeli violations of the October 23 cease-fire—and possibly the October 24 cease-fire—appear to have reflected an effort definitively to isolate the Egyptians' southern salient. With their forces on the east bank reportedly running short of supplies, the Egyptians will be under acute pressure to reopen their two main supply lines from the Nile Delta region to Suez and Isma'iliyyah through Israeli lines.

Insufficient Observers. To police the chaotic situation on the Suez and Golan fronts, UNTSO can muster about 200 observers. This force will have great difficulty in preventing a breakdown of the cease-fire unless all parties act in good faith. Given the political pressures in Cairo and Tel Aviv, efforts to encroach at strategic points may well continue.

Differing Motivations for Accepting the Cease-fire. The cease-fire intervened just as Israel appeared to be well on the way to fragmenting the Egyptian forces on the west bank and isolating those on the east bank. Apparently, Israel halted its victory drive only out of deference to Washington and has no real interest in letting Cairo get off "so lightly." With his army on the ropes, Sadat seems to have grasped at the cease-fire as a chance for his forces to catch their breath, to reorganize, and to integrate the materiel delivered by the Soviet resupply effort, so that he will be in better shape for the next round.

The Syrians did not seem so eager for the truce, probably because Sadat acted without consulting them and because they enjoy a stronger defensive position than the Egyptians. However, the Syrian leadership is going along, even though a special problem is posed by its Iraqi "allies." Although the Iraqis performed poorly in the fighting, they have political designs on Syria, and their home territory is far enough from Israel so that they may toy with the idea of trying to embarrass Asad by sabotaging the cease-fire. Sabotage is certainly to be expected from the Palestinian fedayeen, who have nothing to gain from an end to the fighting.

Contradictory Interpretations of the Cease-fire. Having turned the tide of battle, Israel seems determined to hold its present positions until all prisoners are exchanged, and until the Arabs have embarked on direct negotiations. Meanwhile, Sadat is telling his allies and his own people that he has Soviet assurances that the cease-fire is tied to early Israeli moves toward total withdrawal, prior to any diplomatic negotiations. Although his propaganda has concealed the magnitude of Israel's recent military successes, his armed forces already know the truth of the

military situation, and reports suggest that they suspect the real nature of the cease-fire. The Arab world will soon realize that there will be no automatic Israeli withdrawal, and that Sadat's and Asad's glorious reassertion of Arab dignity has suddenly turned into another crushing defeat. Iraq, the fedayeen, and probably Qadhafi will not be shy about driving this message home.

At this point, Sadat at least will be in a very difficult political position. His alternatives may be reduced to resuming hostilities or stepping down, although he might have a way out if he can argue credibly that the imposition of irrestible pressure by the two superpowers produced the new situation.

---

265. Paper Prepared in the Defense Intelligence Agency[1]

Washington, undated.

LONG-RANGE OUTLOOK FOR ISRAELI SECURITY

1. (S) In the event that hostilities are terminated in such a way that both the Arab states and Israel remain viable and roughly equal in military capabilities, the long-range outlook for the Middle East would be for continued political hostility and sporadic outbreaks of armed conflict. The Arabs are devoted to the ultimate objective of destroying the Israeli state. Only substantially superior Israeli military capabilities can adequately deter continued Arab efforts to accomplish that objective by force. The present course of hostilities suggests that the Israelis no longer possess the requisite degree of superiority.

2. (S) In fact, a significant change may be taking place in the balance of power between the Arabs and Israel. However well they come out of the present conflict, the Israelis can no longer be confident of quick, decisive victories in the future. And yet, in the present scheme of things, the capability to achieve such victories appears essential for

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 218, Official Records of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Moorer, FRC 218–92–0029, Box 16, Israel. Secret. Enclosure 1 to S–1153/DE. The paper is attached to an October 24 memorandum from Vice Admiral V.P. de Poix, Director of DIA, to Admiral Moorer, which noted that the balance of power between Israel and the Arab states might be undergoing a shift in favor of the latter, and that in this changed situation a number of possible means other than conventional military force might offer a chance of insuring Israeli security.

Israeli survival against a determined foe with a far greater population, increasing wealth, and apparently unending Soviet military support.

3. (S) Even if Israel were to enjoy a favorable position in conventional military terms over the Arabs in the initial post-hostilities period, the logic of the overall situation leads to the conclusion that some measure or measures beyond conventional military self-help will be necessary to insure Israel's future security. Among the options are: an international guarantee of Israel's borders; a unilateral US military guarantee of those borders; or a public declaration of Israeli determination to employ nuclear weapons to guarantee its territorial integrity. None of these, however, appear to offer an effective solution.

a. *International Guarantee.* The chances for a meaningful international guarantee are not good. The US is probably the only outside power that would have a clear interest in such an agreement. The Arab states quite certainly would not enter into it except under excessive external pressure. Only the Soviets would be in a position to exert such pressure. They are unlikely to do so and the Arabs would not feel bound by the agreement in any case. The kind of mutually agreed international action needed to force Arab compliance would be unavailable in most conceivable circumstances.

b. *US Military Guarantee.* A US military guarantee of Israel's borders, while feasible, would be fraught with undesirable strategic and political consequences. Even the present scale of our involvement is opposed by many of our allies. Our military/political posture in Europe and elsewhere would be degraded by a commitment to Israel that would be only indirectly related to the Soviet threat to our interests in other areas. Such a guarantee would completely alienate all Arab states and could have serious consequences in light of our growing dependence on them for oil.

c. *Israeli Nuclear Threat.* Assuming that Israel has or is soon to acquire nuclear weapons, their threatened use against such targets as Arab forces, cities, ports, holy places, and the Aswan High Dam could serve to deter future armed attacks. Such an avowed Israeli policy would occasion world-wide opposition. The US would, therefore, find it extremely difficult to associate itself with such an Israeli policy. Meanwhile, the Arabs might be willing to attack, despite the deterrent threat. They might assume that (1) Israel will not carry out the threat, (2) they could succeed even if the Israelis used nuclear weapons, perhaps with the aid of other unconventional means of their own such as chemical or biological weapons, or (3) they would reap important benefits from the resultant international reaction should Israel carry out its threat. Any deterrent effect of such an Israeli threat would, of course, be diminished should the Arab states themselves acquire nuclear weapons.

4. (S) One contingency not discussed above is a US–USSR agreement to curtail and even cease military aid to all Mid-East states. Such an agreement is conceivable under a far-reaching détente arrangement. Its initial effect would be to render Israel secure because of its superior military-industrial capacity. In the longer run, however, the foreign exchange available to the Arab states from oil sales alone would permit the purchase of arms on the international market on a scale even exceeding previous Soviet assistance.

---

266. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, October 24, 1973, 7:15 p.m.

K. Anatol, I was talking to the President.[2] As I understand it Malik has instructions to vote for the resolution if we go along with it, even to send over troops. We won't go along with it.

D. If a draft resolution will be introduced which will contain the appeal towards the Soviet Union and the United States—

K. If the Egyptians introduce it.

D. —to take urgent necessary measures, including our sending over military contingents to insure the fulfillment of the resolution of the Security Council about ceasefire then he is instructed to vote for such a resolution.

K. We will vote against it.

D. I would like you to know . . . when I talked to you I was wrong.

K. I think we should both discourage such a resolution.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Anatoli[y] Dobrynin File, Box 28. No classification marking.

[2] In a 7:10 p.m. conversation, which was mostly about Watergate, Nixon complained that although Kissinger had come back with a diplomatic triumph of the first order, *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* had paid no attention. Kissinger responded that it had been the administration's biggest triumph in many ways. It had been a very difficult situation and the President had pulled it off. He said that although he, Kissinger, had done a lot of finessing, it had been Nixon's decision "to push in the chips." (Ibid., Chronological File, Box 23)

D. He has already received instructions. I think it only fair for me to tell you because of our discussions this afternoon.

K. Well, we will vote against it.[3]

[3] At 7:25 p.m., Kissinger telephoned Ambassador Scali and instructed him to veto any resolution calling on the United States and the Soviet Union to take urgent measures to enforce the cease-fire, including sending military contingents. He noted Malik had been instructed to vote for such a resolution. The Secretary also instructed Scali to veto any condemnation of Israel. (Ibid.) Kissinger informed Dinitz by telephone at 7:35 p.m. that he and Nixon agreed the United States would veto a resolution that called for sending military forces instead of observers. (Ibid.) Both printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 336–338. Kissinger also sent a message to Ismail with a message from Nixon to Sadat explaining why the United States would veto any resolution asking for an outside military force (including U.S. and Soviet troops) to enforce the cease-fire. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. III, October 1–31, 1973)

267. Message From Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev to President Nixon[1]

Moscow, undated.

Mr. President:

I have received your letter in which you inform me that Israel ceased fighting.[2] The facts, however, testify that Israel continues drastically to ignore the ceasefire decision of the Security Council. Thus, it is brazenly challenging both the Soviet Union and the United States since it is our agreement with you which constitutes the basis of the Security Council decision. In short, Israel simply embarked on the road to defeat.

It continues to seize new and new territory. As you know, the Israeli forces have already fought their way into Suez. It is impossible to allow such to continue. Let us together, the Soviet Union and the United States urgently dispatch to Egypt Soviet and American military contigents, with their mission the implementation of the decision of the Security Council of August [*October*] 22 and 23 concerning the cessation

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 69, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 20 [October 12–November 21, 1973]. No classification marking. A note on the message states that it was received at 10 p.m. on October 24.

[2] See footnote 2, Document 258.

of fire and of all military activities and also of the understanding with you on the guarantee of the implementation of the decisions of the Security Council.

It is necessary to adhere without delay. I will say it straight that if you find it impossible to act jointly with us in this matter, we should be faced with the necessity urgently to consider the question of taking appropriate steps unilaterally. We cannot allow arbitrariness on the part of Israel.

We have an understanding with you which we value highly—that is to act jointly. Let us implement this understanding on a concrete case in this complex situation. It will be a good example of our agreed actions in the interest of peace. We have no doubt that all those who are in favor of détente, of peace, of good relations between the Soviet Union and the United States will only welcome such joint action of ours. I will appreciate immediate and clear reply from you.[3]

Respectfully,

L. Brezhnev[4]

---

[3] According to Kissinger's memoirs, Brezhnev's letter "was one of the most serious challenges to an American President by a Soviet leader, from its peremptory salutation, 'Mr. President,' to its equally peremptory conclusion demanding an 'immediate and clear reply.'" He added that "there was no question in my mind that we would have to reject the Soviet proposal. And we would have to do so in a manner that shocked the Soviets into abandoning the unilateral move they were threatening." (*Years of Upheaval*, pp. 583–584) Nixon similarly wrote in his memoirs that Brezhnev's message represented "perhaps the most serious threat to U.S.–Soviet relations since the Cuban missile crisis eleven years before." He recalled that he asked Kissinger and Haig to have a meeting at the White House "to formulate plans for a firm reaction to what amounted to a scarcely veiled threat of unilateral Soviet intervention. Words were not making our point—we needed action, even the shock of a military alert." (*RN: The Memoirs of Richard Nixon*, p. 938) Prior to the meeting of the WSAG principals (see Document 269), Kissinger spoke with Haig on the telephone at 10:20 p.m. to discuss the implication of the introduction of Soviet troops into the region. Both Haig and Kissinger agreed that Soviets were taking advantage of the domestic crisis regarding Nixon's involvement in the Watergate investigation. "I don't think they would have taken on a functioning President," said Kissinger. "Don't forget that is what the Soviets are playing on. They find a cripple facing impeachment and why shouldn't they go in there." Haig replied: "If they do and start fighting, that is a serious thing. They go in there and that . . . They genuinely believe Israelis are . . . I am sure the Soviets are on the ground all over the place." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 346–347.

[4] The original bears this typed signature.

268. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the White House Chief of Staff (Haig)[1]

Washington, October 24, 1973, 9:50 p.m.

K. I just had a letter from Brezhnev asking us to send forces in together or he would send them in alone.[2]

H. I was afraid of that.

K. I think we have to go to the mat on this one.

H. This is a reaction to your tough response?[3]

K. No, we just said we would veto any UN resolution. What they said is they would join if someone else proposed it.

H. Where are the Israelis at this point?

K. They've got the 3rd Army surrounded.

H. I think they're playing chicken. They're not going to put in forces at the end of the war. I don't believe that.[4]

K. I don't know . . . What's going to keep them from flying paratroopers in?

H. Just think of what it will do for them. Of course, their argument is that Israel is not complying.

K. I think the Israelis should offer to back up. That is dangerous for they might insist they back up beyond the point where they were.

H. We don't expect the Israelis to take that sort of thing. Do the Israelis know. I mean, have you brought them along?

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] Document 267. According to Kissinger's memoirs, Dobrynin called him at 9:35 p.m. with a letter from Brezhnev so urgent that he had to read it to him on the phone. Kissinger wrote that he could see why: "It was an ultimatum." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 583) No other record of the telephone conversation has been found.

[3] After their 7:15 conversation (see Document 266), Kissinger and Dobrynin spoke again at 7:25 p.m. Speaking of the vote in the United Nations, Kissinger told Dobrynin: "if you want confrontation we will have to have one," and he concluded: "We are going to veto and it would be a pity to be in a confrontation." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

[4] Kissinger recalled later that he did not see it as a bluff, but that it made no difference because the United States could not afford to run the risk. If it remained passive in the face of the threat, the Soviet leadership would see no obstacle to turning it into a reality. (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 585)

K. I've kept them informed.[5] Should I wake up the President?
H. No.[6]

[5] Kissinger called Dinitz at 10 p.m. to inform him: "The Soviets say if we don't put forces in jointly they will go in unilaterally." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 343–344.

[6] Kissinger wrote that he decided to call immediately for a WSAG meeting to convene that night at 10:30 p.m. (Ibid.) At 10:15 p.m., he called Dobrynin and warned: " We are assembling our people to consider your letter. I just want you to know if any unilateral action is taken before we have had a chance to reply that will be very serious." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Anatoli[y] Dobrynin File, Box 28) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, p. 365. See Document 269.

269. Memorandum for the Record[1]

CJCS Memo M–88–73 Washington, October 24/25, 1973, 10:30 p.m.–3:30 a.m.

SUBJ

NSC/JCS Meeting, Wednesday/Thursday, 24/25 October 1973, 2230-0330 (U)

ENCL

(1) Ltr fm Leonid Brezhnev to President Nixon[2]
(2) Ltr to Leonid Brezhnev fm President Nixon[3]
(3) Ltr to His Majesty Faisal[4]

1. At 2230 I received a call from Larry Eagleburger advising me that we had just received a real piss-swisher from Brezhnev regarding

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 218, Records of Admiral Thomas Moorer, Diary, October 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive—Hold Close. Prepared by Moorer on October 26. According to Kissinger's Record of Schedule the following attended the meeting: Kissinger, Schlesinger, Colby, Moorer, Scowcroft, Haig, and Jonathan Howe. (Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box 438, Miscellany, 1968–76) Kissinger later noted that the White House described this as an NSC meeting, while State Department records called it a WSAG "meeting of principals." (*Years of Upheaval*, pp. 586–587) Cline called it a "curious little rump NSC meeting," to which Colby was invited to "give a semblance of regularity to decision-making." (Cline, "Policy Without Intelligence," *Foreign Policy*, No. 17 (Winter 1974–1975), p. 128)

[2] Document 267.

[3] Document 274.

[4] See footnote 7, Document 186.

the Arab/Israeli Conflict. SecDef Schlesinger, CIA Colby and myself were requested to assemble in the Situation Room. When we arrived, HAK seemed to be quite upset and he passed around the exchanges that had occurred between Brezhnev and PresUS during the last two or three days.

2. The Brezhnev letter proposed that the USSR/US urgently dispatch to Egypt Soviet and American military contingents to ensure implementation of the Ceasefire and, further, containing the threatening sentence: ". . . it is necessary to adhere without delay. I'll say it straight. If you find it impossible to act jointly with us in this matter we should be faced with the necessity urgently to consider the question of taking appropriate steps unilaterally . . ."

3. HAK reviewed the progress of the diplomatic route pointing out that, as late as 1630 today (Wednesday, 24 October) he had been discussing with Dobrynin the modalities of the forthcoming negotiations and, at that point, everything seemed to be on track.[5] The big question then became *"Why did the Soviets suddenly reverse themselves and without any warning all day then 'bang' we receive the Brezhnev threat?"* HAK advanced the following possibilities:

a. The Soviets had this in mind all along beginning with the time when the Egyptians collapsed, about 13 October, and went through the charade of inviting HAK to Moscow with the intention of seizing on any opportunity offered by the Israelis in violation of the Ceasefire, first.

b. The Soviets did not have this action in mind but have gradually had sunk in the consequences of the outcome of the war wherein the Soviet client was the loser and the Arab world could see that the supporter of the US usually went to the winner.

c. The Soviets felt they had been tricked by the Israelis who, when viewed from Moscow, were guilty of gross violations of the Ceasefire Agreement.

4. If the Soviets were playing a game with us, it is clear that they have decided to throw all US relationships down the drain and, hence, the possibility.

5. (a) is questionable—the Soviet motivation probably comes from possibly (b) and (c). The discussion continued with Haig joining in (Brent Scowcroft was also present).

6. I pointed out that the military indicators which *might* lead one to believe that this was a premeditated action on the part of the Soviets were:

---

[5] See footnote 3, Document 263.

—The continuous alert under which they had placed their seven Airborne Divisions;

—The abrupt stand-down of the airlift which could now be re-oriented to lift troops to Cairo; and

—The heavy sealift which possibly could have been delivering weapons to be used in Egypt by the Airborne forces when they arrived in that area.

I also pointed out that, in view of the fact that this would not be a NATO war—but would be a unilateral action by the US—who now has access to but one Airfield (Lajes) between the US and Israel, that any direct confrontation on the ground with the Soviets would be very difficult. In short, *the Middle East is the worst place in the world for the US to get engaged in a war with the Soviets.*

7. Haig seemed to be convinced that the Soviets were going to move at daylight—which was just a few hours away. He said the question was whether or not this was a rational plan or a move of desperation as the Soviets watched their influence in the Middle East go down the drain. Haig went on to say that the Soviets realized that they were losing and that they are now trying to capitalize on what has happened this weekend in Washington which has served to weaken the President. He said (Haig) that the Soviets then invited HAK when they noted that the Arabs were beginning to lose and went on to note that the only hope lay in the fact that this involved Israel because if we were trying to support some other country other than Israel we would have a public outcry of large proportions.

8. I noted that it appeared to me that the Israelis had, in fact, violated the Ceasefire and that, as they turned South to encircle Suez City and block off the Third Egyptian Army across the Canal, that they simply continued this operation until it was completed and they established a holding point on the Red Sea. Consequently, *the Soviets were correct in saying that the Israelis had violated the Ceasefire.*

9. SecDef said he thought the Soviets were using this to put pressure on the US or to develop an excuse to move in their own forces in the Middle East. HAK then, thinking out loud, pointed up that he had never forced détente and he also thought *the Soviets were influenced by the current situation the President finds himself in.* The Soviets can now move into Egypt with 5,000–6,000 men and take credit for stopping the Israelis and regaining their status in the Arab world and that, if they could do this, we should consider telling the Israelis to hit the Third Egyptian Army. I said this might be counter-productive because, then, the Soviets would have all the excuse they needed.

10. HAK commented on the thin margin in the Politburo and said that it appears now that the Hawks prevailed over Brezhnev and that it

was clear that they changed their course of action on Tuesday[6] and then he recalled (as I have said many times before) *if the Democrats and the US public do not stop laying seige to their government that, sooner or later, someone will take a run at us.* Friday the PresUS was in good shape domestically. Now the Soviets see that he is, in their mind, non-functional.[7]

11. HAK then noted that he would brief the Congressional Leadership at 0830 the following morning (25 October, Thursday).[8] He said the Leadership must take action and that we should get a vote for a Supplemental. *So far the Congress has had a great time enjoying détente, wrecking Defense and destroying the President.* He was still puzzled by the action taken by the Soviets noting that if the Soviets wanted a Ceasefire they could have gotten an Agreement which forced the Israelis back to the 6 October line. He said he has been very hard on the Israelis and that he told them *"We are not going to war for you."* He said this morning he gave the Israelis unscathed hell because he thought they were at fault.[9] However, today, he thought the Egyptians were at fault in violating the second Ceasefire. *(HAK is wrong here, it was the Israelis on both counts).*

12. Colby noted that the Soviets can recoup with the Arabs if they placed a major force in Cairo which could be used essentially to establish a bridgehead. *HAK asked "What does 5,000 men in Cairo really mean?"* It means that the Soviets want a challenge and that, if they get in, they'll never get out. He repeated that we cannot go without a commitment from Congress and we must tell the Congressional Leaders the gravity of the situation *if we do put Marines or troops into the Middle East it will amount to scrapping Détente and cutting off all relations with the Soviet Union. HAK asked "What did we do wrong?* Certainly *we will be criticized for being too soft by the Liberals and too tough by the Conservatives."*

13. HAK then tabled a proposed reply to the Brezhnev letter. It was a tough one and, in effect, said that the US would in no event accept unilateral action on the part of the Soviets since this would be a viola-

---

[6] October 16.

[7] Reaction to the October 20 "Saturday Night Massacre," when Nixon ordered the resignations of Attorney General Richardson and Assistant Attorney General Ruckelshaus, was intense and raised public calls for Nixon's impeachment.

[8] According to Kissinger's Record of Schedule, he met with the Congressional Leadership in the Cabinet Room of the White House at 8:40 a.m. (Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box 438, Miscellany, 1968–76) Kissinger recalled that the leaders were enthusiastic about the refusal to accept a joint U.S.–Soviet force, but he believed that their support reflected more the Vietnam-era isolation than a strategic assessment. "The American component of the proposed forced bothered them a great deal more than the Soviet one," he wrote. "By the same token, they would object to the dispatch of American forces even if, in our view, they were needed to resist a unilateral Soviet move." (*Crisis*, p. 356)

[9] See Document 254.

tion of our Understandings of the agreed opinions we signed in Moscow in 1972, and of Article II of the Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War. Such action would produce incalculable consequences . . .

14. After some discussion concerning the wording of the reply, it was generally agreed that the reply should be a tough one and that if the Soviets answered it right away it means that their reply was prepositioned and they are going to move their forces (Haig's estimate). I pointed out that it would be a tremendous effort to move all of their Airborne Divisions by airlift since they only had 28 AN22s and about 23 AN12s available—at least 400 AN12s sorties were required per division.

15. HAK noted that, yesterday, the Israeli violation of the Agreement "broke the camel's back". Then the Soviets decided to move. Today, they only made one proposal to us and this proposal escalated the dialogue to a threat. *The overall strategy of the Soviets now appears to be one of throwing détente on the table since we have no functional President,* in their eyes, and, consequently, *we must prevent them from getting away with this.*

16. We then agreed on several actions designed to indicate to the Soviets that, while they may have thought they picked a moment of maximum US weakness, that we can still make responsible decisions concerning the use of force. *HAK said he had learned, finally, that when you decide to use force you must use plenty of it.*

17. We took the following actions:

—Set DEFCON III;[10]
—Moved *John F. Kennedy* from West of Gibraltar into the Med;
—Moved *Roosevelt* from the vicinity of Sicily to join *Independence* South of Crete;
—Got the Amphibious Ready Force underway from Suda Bay;
—Alerted European Forces;
—Alerted the 82d Airborne Division;
—Recalled 75 B52s from Guam.

---

[10] Kissinger recalled that immediately after they instituted DEFCON III, he instructed Scowcroft to call Dobrynin to tell him to desist from all action until there was a U.S. reply, and to warn him that any unilateral actions by the Soviet Union would have the most serious consequences. He recalled that Dobrynin made no reassuring comment, saying only that he would transmit the U.S. message to Moscow. Kissinger added that the group's sense of impending crisis increased when they learned that eight Soviet AN–22 transport planes—each capable of carrying 200 or more troops—were slated to fly from Budapest to Egypt in the next few hours. The group decided that going to DEFCON III would not be noted quickly enough by Soviet decisionmakers, and that something more was necessary. At 12:20 a.m., they alerted the 82d Airborne Division for possible movement, and at 12:25 a.m., they ordered the carriers *Franklin Delano Roosevelt* and *John F. Kennedy* to the Mediterranean. (*Years of Upheaval,* pp. 588–589)

18. HAK wanted to know if DEFCON III would result in the recall of personnel? I told him, in some cases it would and that it would be immediately leaked (which it did about 0300, Thursday, 25 October). After taking the above actions I then proceeded with SecDef to the Pentagon where I had called the Joint Chiefs in for a meeting. I reviewed the situation as it stood and took several additional actions which were called for as a result of the DEFCON III decision. I also advised the Joint Chiefs of the contents of the Brezhnev letter as well as the contents of the proposed reply. I also called Gen Goodpaster (CINCEUR) and gave him a run-down on the situation and prepared a summary to forward to all the CINCs.[11]

19. At 0400 we went to bed to await the Soviet response.

T. H. Moorer[12]

P.S. During the discussions we kept coming back to the $64.00 question: *"If the Soviets put in 10,000 troops into Egypt what do we do?"* During the meeting HAK called Ambassador Cromer to advise him of our actions and which, undoubtedly, shook him up![13]

---

[11] In Cline's October 26 memorandum to Kissinger (quoted in his 1974 *Foreign Policy* article), he commented: "In view of some of the unwarranted criticism of the government for its decision [on the military alert], I regret that you never advised your State Department intelligence arm that you had a problem nor asked us for an opinion on the evidence of Soviet intention to intervene with troops in the Mideast. Certainly the technical intelligence evidence available in INR did not support such a Soviet intention. I presume your alarm was based, again, on your exchanges with Moscow. If so, it would have been useful to you, in my opinion, to consult some experts in Soviet political strategy and some experts in evidence of Soviet military capabilities and intentions."

[12] The original bears this typed signature.

[13] At 1:03 a.m. on October 25, Kissinger informed Cromer that the United States was moving to a DEFCON III alert and asked for the United Kingdom's "very strong support" in this "grave situation." When Cromer asked him what he wanted Britain to do, Kissinger replied: "Well, don't say the Americans have gone crazy." He explained: "We feel that the only chance we now have which will be . . . is defense readiness around the world." Kissinger concluded: "What they [the Soviets] are asking us to do is join forces . . . forcing Israel to comply." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23) The ellipses are in the original transcript.

270. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Israeli Ambassador (Dinitz)[1]

Washington, October 24, 1973, 11:25 p.m.

D: I had the Prime Minister on the line and she asked me to suggest to you the following course of action. She thinks that maybe the President can suggest to Brezhnev that we will be prepared to exchange the forces and all the forces of Israel that are east of the Canal will be taken back to the west of the Canal and the Egyptian forces which to a large extent are encircled now on the east of the Canal, will all be moving to the west of the Canal; that there would be two demilitarized strips along the Canal on both sides of the Canal throughout the area in which there would be international observers or international supervisors—

K: They'll never agree to that, I'll tell you that right away.

D: Well, the Prime Minister—if I may just finish—said that she is proposing it so that the President could say that he will get Israel to do this but she has not even brought it to the Cabinet but she will put her weight behind such a proposal.

K: Okay. Well, let me discuss that with my colleagues.[2]

D: Fine. And I'll wait for it.

K: But I am assuming you are not prepared to offer to go back to where you started from.

D: You mean before the ceasefire started? I mean, before the war started?

K: No, no, no.

D: Oh, before the ceasefire started? No, that she said is even impossible to determine. And you see, if I may—if I'm allowed, she said what [pushes Brezhnev][3] is the disconnection of the 3rd Army and therefore any proposal that will open up— That's why he wants us to return back to the line because that will open up the hole to the 3rd Army.

K: That's right.

D: That is why she says this proposal will both offer the hole to the 3rd Army; will save all this 3rd Army; and also have an ingredient for normalization.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] Kissinger wrote in his memoirs that the Israeli proposal was in effect a variant of the 1971 Israeli disengagement proposal, and that although he told Dinitz he would discuss it with his colleagues, he knew it would not work. (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 588)

[3] Brackets in the original.

K: You want them also to withdraw the forces that are in the northern part.

D: All over the Canal of course. We are holding a much bigger territory in Egypt than they do.

K: Well, I don't think that will do us much good but we will try it.

D: Okay.

K: Good. Thank you.

D: Sure. Bye, bye.

---

271. Backchannel Message From President Nixon to Egyptian President Sadat[1]

Washington, October 24, 1973.

Secretary Kissinger requests that Mr. Ismail pass the following urgent communication from President Nixon to President Sadat:

We have received a proposal from the Soviet Union to dispatch a joint contingent of American and Soviet forces to the Middle East to enforce the ceasefire.[2] This is a proposal to which we will not be able to agree for the reasons outlined in my earlier message.[3] Forces to be effective would have to be so large that they could overpower on both sides.

I ask you to consider the consequences for your country if the two great nuclear countries were thus to confront each other on your soil. I ask you further to consider the impossibility for us for undertaking the diplomatic initiative which was to start with Dr. Kissinger's visit to Cairo on November 7 if the forces of one of the great nuclear powers were to be involved militarily on Egyptian soil.

We are at the beginning of a new period in the Middle East. Let us not destroy it at this moment. In the meantime, as we have pointed out

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. No classification marking. A handwritten note on the message indicates that it was dispatched at 11:55 p.m. on October 24. It was sent in a message from Kissinger to Ismail. In his memoirs, Kissinger wrote that this message, approved during the 10:30 meeting, was an attempt to close off Soviet diplomatic options by inducing Cairo to withdraw its invitation to Moscow to send in Soviet troops. (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 588)

[2] Document 267.

[3] See footnote 3, Document 266.

to you, we will use our influence with Israel to bring about the strictest observance of the Security Council Resolution.[4]

[4] A reply from Sadat to Nixon was received at the Embassy in Cairo at 0815Z, 10:15 a.m. Cairo time, on October 25. The message reads: "I have received your two messages of October 25 (Cairo time—24 October Washington time). I understand the considerations you have put forward with respect to the use of a joint US–USSR force, and we have already asked the Security Council for the speedy dispatch of an international force to the area to review the implementation of the Security Council Resolutions. This we hope will pave the way toward further measures as envisaged in the October 22 Resolution of the Security Council aimed at establishing a joint peace in the area." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973)

272. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Israeli Ambassador (Dinitz)[1]

Washington, October 25, 1973, 2:09 a.m.

K: Hello Mr. Ambassador.

D: Yes, Dr. Kissinger.

K: We are drafting a very tough reply and we are sending a copy of it, they are delivering it at 5:30 in the morning to keep Dobrynin up all night.

D: He is keeping us up why not him too.

K: If you want to come over and pick up a copy you can have it. We will not make you a proposal because we don't think this is the time to offer any complicated solutions. Besides they will never accept it. They won't accept the demilitarized zone. What we should consider is ... What I'd like from you is your military assessment, your assessment of your military capabilities if the Soviets come in whether you can clean up that pocket quickly.

D: Clean up what Dr. Kissinger?

K: Get an Army quickly. And for God sakes be honest with me.

D: I have always been.

K: Get that to me in the morning.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

D: Then I come now and pick it up. To which office, Scowcroft?

K: Yes, and you'll see we're not offering anything. All we are offering is that if they want to send up service in there we are willing to join together with them an observer force. As long as they are not combat troops and as long as there is a very small force. But we are not, and we're very threatening and in addition we are moving the second carrier in the Mediterranean East, the one that was near Sicily is moving to Crete, the one that was in the Atlantic is moving into the Mediterranean. And we have increased, we are alerting our 82nd Airborne Division and our forces in Europe and we are moving things into a worldwide readiness posture and we'll see now what happens.

D: Fine. So I'll be coming now.

---

273. Backchannel Message From the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail) to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 25, 1973.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the October 1973 War.]

Mr. Isma'il has received Dr. Kissinger's message detailing the urgent steps which the U.S. side has taken to stop the renewed outbreak of fighting in the Suez area throughout 22–25 October.[2] While noting with appreciation those efforts, Mr. Isma'il would like to comment for the record on some of the formal Israeli assurances received by the U.S. side.

1. As for inviting the U.S. military attachés to the front, it is our view that this is not sufficient. We had asked for joint U.S.–Soviet presence to guarantee the ceasefire. Since the U.S. refuses to take such a measure, Egypt is asking the Security Council to provide an international force.

2. After the time fixed for the carrying into effect of the ceasefire at 0700 hours local time on October 24, the Israelis pursued their military operation, particularly in the southern front and are still continuing their offensive against the city of Suez.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Ismail/Egypt, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. Secret; Sensitive.

[2] See footnote 3, Document 266.

3. Mr. Isma'il does not wish to be drawn into a futile exercise of detailed rebuttal of Israeli obvious fabrications. Instead, the Egyptian Government is formally asking the Secretary General to submit an official report detailing all the specifics and timings of all contacts and orders issued to or received by the UN observers. Such a record will undoubtedly unmask once and for all the Israeli fabrications which are obviously designed to help create and establish an intolerable situation in flagrant violation of the Security Council Resolution of the 23rd of October.[3]

[3] At Egypt's request, the Security Council met October 24–26 to consider Egyptian charges of Israeli violations of the cease-fire. See *Yearbook of the United Nations, 1973,* pp. 200–203.

274. Message From President Nixon to Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev[1]

Washington, October 25, 1973.

Mr. General Secretary:

I have carefully studied your important message of this evening.[2] I agree with you that our understanding to act jointly for peace is of the highest value and that we should implement that understanding in this complex situation.

I must tell you, however, that your proposal for a particular kind of joint action, that of sending Soviet and American military contingents to Egypt is not appropriate in the present circumstances.

We have no information which would indicate that the ceasefire is now being violated on any significant scale. Such violations as are taking place can be dealt with most effectively by increased numbers of

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin & Kissinger, Vol. 8. No classification marking. A handwritten notation on the message indicates that it was delivered to the Soviet Embassy at 5:40 a.m. on October 25.

[2] Document 267. In his memoirs, Kissinger wrote that after the President's formal reply to Brezhnev was drafted, the WSAG principals decided it should be delivered at around 5:30 a.m. Washington time. He noted that this gave the U.S. Government additional time to complete its preparations and that by that time the Soviets would have noticed the U.S. troop movements. Kissinger added that this message, which rejected all Soviet demands, was sent by messenger, thus avoiding any softening via an explanation. (*Years of Upheaval,* pp. 588–591)

observer teams to inform the Security Council of the true responsibility for violations.

We are prepared to take every effective step to guarantee the implementation of the ceasefire and are already in close touch with the Government of Israel to ensure that it abides fully by the terms of the Security Council decisions. I assume that you are taking similar steps with Egypt.

In these circumstances, we must view your suggestion of unilateral action as a matter of the gravest concern involving incalculable consequences.

It is clear that the forces necessary to impose the ceasefire terms on the two sides would be massive and would require closest coordination so as to avoid bloodshed. This is not only clearly infeasible but is not appropriate to the situation. In this situation the Security Council requires accurate information about what is occurring so that it as well as each of us can exert maximum influence in Cairo and Tel-Aviv, respectively, to ensure compliance with the terms of the ceasefire.

To this end, I am prepared to join with you at once to augment the present truce supervisory force by additional men and equipment. I would be prepared to see included in such augmented truce supervisory units a number of American and Soviet personnel, though not combat forces. It would be understood that this is an extraordinary and temporary step, solely for the purpose of providing adequate information concerning compliance by both sides with the terms of the ceasefire. If this is what you mean by contingents, we will consider it.

Mr. General Secretary, in the spirit of our agreement this is the time for acting not unilaterally but in harmony and with cool heads. I believe my proposal is consonant with the letter and spirit of our understandings and would ensure a prompt implementation of the ceasefire. This would establish a base from which we could move into the negotiations foreseen by Security Council Resolution 338 which we shall jointly sponsor.

I will await a prompt and positive reply from you on these proposals. Meanwhile, I will order the necessary preparations for the steps I have outlined. Upon receipt of your agreement, I will immediately designate representatives to work out the modalities with your representatives.

You must know, however, that we could in no event accept unilateral action. This would be in violation of our understandings, of the agreed Principles we signed in Moscow in 1972[3] and of Article II of the Agreement on Prevention of Nuclear War. As I stated above, such ac-

[3] See footnote 7, Document 250.

tion would produce incalculable consequences which would be in the interest of neither of our countries and which would end all we have striven so hard to achieve.

---

275. Backchannel Message From the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail) to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, October 25, 1973.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the October 1973 War.]

President Sadat has received President Nixon's message conveyed through Dr. Kissinger[2] and thanks him for it.

1. We would like to inform the United States that we agree to the presence of an international force composed of units from non-permanent members of the Security Council as long as it is backed by the full support of the permanent members and in particular the U.S. and the USSR.

2. We consider that the immediate and most urgent task of this force is to supervise and observe the implementation of the Security Council Resolution of 23 October 1973, i.e., the pull back of Israeli troops to the positions they held on the coming into effect of 22 October resolution.

3. We expect the force to be immediately dispatched to the area to assume its function before any delay results in incalculable and far reaching consequences.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Ismail/Egypt, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. Secret; Sensitive. A handwritten notation on the message indicates that it was received in Washington at 1:10 p.m. on October 25.

[2] In this message, sent at 8:51 a.m. on October 25, Kissinger asked that Ismail inform Sadat that Nixon believed "the introduction of US–Soviet combat forces would have incalculable consequences." The United States was, however, "prepared to support an international force from other than permanent members of the Security Council, for dispatch to the Middle East to observe the implementation of the Security Council Resolution." (Ibid.)

276. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and United Nations Secretary General Waldheim[1]

October 25, 1973, 1:18 p.m.

K: Mr. Secretary General, how are you?

W: Thank you, well, quite busy. I am very grateful for returning the call. I have, of course, spoken to Joe Sisco and informed him, but I wanted to keep you informed of the situation here. The situation is that as you know, the Russians got instructions to accept the new American amendment. Only the French position is reluctant. The French Ambassador was just here and he said they would ask for a separate vote on the amendment . . . excludes the permanent members. They will vote for the resolution, but ask for separate vote on the amendment in order to show they are not in agreement with this.

K: You are in no doubt, Mr. Secretary General, that we will veto any resolution which doesn't have it in it?[2]

W: Yes, I was informed of this by Joe Sisco.

K: We will not compromise on this.

W: Yes, that is understood. No problem. Any more, non-aligned . . . change and the Russians, only the French want a separate vote

K: Well, that's their privilege.

W: But, after that, the French will vote for the resolution as it stands.

K: Excellent. There is one other thing that concerns me, Mr. Secretary General. We are fundamentally opposed to the introduction of any East European contingents, any communist countries. There must be enough neutrals in the world to do it. If there were Eastern European countries it would produce a crisis of confidence here, if any contingents from communist countries were included.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking. Kissinger was in Washington; Waldheim was in New York.

[2] Eight non-aligned nations submitted a resolution to the Security Council on October 24. Three amendments were proposed the next day. Kissinger is referring to the amendment to paragraph 3 of the resolution on the makeup of the UN Emergency Force. The final text of paragraph 3 of Security Council Resolution 340 (1973) reads: "Decides to set up immediately, under its authority, a United Nations Emergency Force to be composed of personnel drawn from States Members of the United Nations except the permanent members of the Security Council, and requests the Secretary-General to report within 24 hours on the steps taken to this effect." The resolution was adopted by the Security Council on October 25 by a vote of 14 to 0. (*Yearbook of the United Nations, 1973*, p. 213)

W: Well, there is a strong trend to have in addition to the Nordic countries one African, one Asian like Malaysia, African like Nigeria.

K: Well, we have no objection to that as long as it isn't an East European country.

W: There is an idea of including Poland.

K: We think it's a great concession to permit Sweden.

W: How is it with the Russians?

K: . . . can't accept any Eastern Europeans.

W: Could lead to situation where we would have a problem with Canada.

K: Canada?

W: Yes, because of NATO.

K: That's all right with us.

W: Neutral countries.

K: We will trade Canada. Also won't accept Yugoslavia.

W: There was no question of taking them . . . but I take note of your information and I hope we can proceed on that line.

K: Mr. Secretary General, when this is all over, and I hope it will be soon, you and I must have a drink together and reminisce.

W: Certainly look forward to that.

K: Now, if you think it necessary to obtain airlift and logistic support, you can call on us.

W: I am very grateful. That will be particularly needed. The latest development which I discussed with Scali here. Egypt wanted another meeting after the resolution was adopted, which should be in the next hour, to discuss my role in implementation of the resolution. I agree with Scali that it's not a very good idea to have this evening another meeting. Instead, I intend to write an interim report, in the form of a letter to McIntyre and . . . , proposing as an immediate . . . measure, I could send . . . to the Middle East, Cairo . . . dispatch quickly to the area three contingents, three neutral contingents from Cyprus, that is the Finnish, Austrian and Swedish, each battalion has about 200–280 people.

K: That sounds reasonable to me, if they're from Cyprus, and that's on the regular budget.

W: That's right. . . . unique operation, paid out of the regular budget and since the Russians and French also voted for it, there will be no excuse and we will proceed on those lines.

277. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and President Nixon[1]

Washington, October 25, 1973, 3:05 p.m.

K: Mr. President, you have won again.

N: You think so?

K: The Soviets have joined our resolution at the UN barring permanent members after screaming like banshees and we have had a reply from Brezhnev.[2]

N: What does it say?

K: It accepts your proposal and says he is sending 70 observers and we should send 70 observers also and that is it.

N: That is easy. We will send 170 if they want.

K: That is it. It is done.

N: You think it is?

K: Yes. We should stay on alert until midnight and start standing down in Alaska at midnight and so on.

N: How should we handle the press tomorrow?

K: I will be glad to step out in the press room tomorrow and explain it.

N: Not until tomorrow? Will the evening news carry the UN resolution?

K: They will carry it. I will explain it at the press conference.[3] The @#$% are saying we did all of this for political purposes.

N: I know. Like Kalb and who else?

K: Kalb, McCarthy. Reston called here with a similar question.[4]

N: In other words we set this up.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] Dobrynin read the reply to Kissinger during a telephone conversation at 2:40 p.m. In the message, Brezhnev also informed Nixon that the Soviet Union was sending 70 observers to the Egyptian–Israeli front. (Ibid.) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 360–361. The letter was delivered by Dobrynin at 3:40 p.m. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Exchange of Notes Between Kissinger and Dobrynin, Vol. 8)

[3] Kissinger held a news conference at noon on October 25. The transcript is printed in *The New York Times*, October 26, 1973.

[4] Marvin Kalb, Colman McCarthy, and James ("Scotty") Reston were American journalists. Reston and Kissinger spoke at 3 p.m. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

K: At 4:00 in the morning.

N: And that we created a crisis. I hope you told him strongly.

K: I treated Kalb contemptible at the press conference.

N: What about Scotty?

K: I gave him a few facts. I said what would you do if 7 of 8 airborne divisions were put on alert. I did not tell him about the Brezhnev letter.

N: Why does he think the President is up until 3:00 this morning.

K: I said, you think we staged all of this. He said no but we had to give all of the information.

N: I thought you had.

K: I had but I did not tell them about the Brezhnev letter and the air alert. We don't want to force him to hit you back. What you did was just another one of these moves.

N: Just as well I will not be doing the press conference. I am not in the mood to do it tonight.

K: Absolutely not. I think I would do it tomorrow or Monday.

N: I don't think I can wait until Monday.

K: Do it tomorrow night.[5] I would treat the bastards with contempt, Mr. President. They asked me about Watergate. I said you cannot play with the central authority of the country without paying a price.

N: You are rather confident that this is going to do it.

K: Mr. President, you were prepared to put forces in as you were prepared to go to nuclear war in Pakistan and that was way before you knew what was going to happen. I told Kalb that the President is attempting to conduct foreign policy of the US regardless . . . that it would be suggested that the US would alert its forces for domestic reasons. . . .

N: Good. Al told me you slaughtered the bastards. Keep it up.

K: That is what I am here for.

N: Keep it up. We will survive.

K: No question.

[5] See footnote 2, Document 285.

278. Note From the Secretary of State's Executive Assistant (Eagleburger) to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Tel Aviv, October 25, 1973.

HAK:

The following is a message to you from the Prime Minister through Dinitz:

1) I am sorry to hear that the US does not find it possible to object to the paragraph which calls for a return to the October 22 lines.[2] This more specific demand is more serious than the similar statement in the previous resolution.

2) I appreciate the situation in which the US finds itself in the face of Soviet moves. I do not want the Secretary to think that I belittle the seriousness of the situation.

3) I have taken note of the Secretary's words that he would "do his best to support Israel on the interpretation of the paragraph." The Secretary knows that there is no possibility to fix the location of the previous line; it has never been verified and it has never been demarcated. Therefore, I expect serious discussions will evolve as to the location of the previous lines. I ask the Secretary to be prepared for such discussions and to be helpful to Israel in them.

4) I place great importance on the composition of the international force. It is an obvious point that it must not be composed of nations with no diplomatic relations with Israel. A number of important points will have to be worked out relating to the international force and its terms of reference, including for example authority to dismiss the force. Therefore I ask the Secretary that no finalizing of arrangements be made before Israel is given ample time by the US to review the situation. I ask that Ambassador Scali and Ambassador Tekoah discuss the details in New York, but that finalization be between Ambassador Dinitz and the Secretary so that I may have a direct influence on the final decision.

LSE[3]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, June 4–October 31, 1973. Secret. A handwritten note on the message indicates that it was received at 3:05 p.m.

[2] Paragraph 1 of Security Council Resolution 340 (1973) reads: "Demands that immediate and complete cease-fire be observed and that the parties return to the positions occupied by them at 1650 hours GMT on 22 October 1973." (*Yearbook of the United Nations, 1973*, p. 213)

[3] The original bears these typed initials.

279. Backchannel Message From President Nixon to Egyptian President Sadat[1]

Washington, undated.

I appreciated very much receiving your message No. 6.[2]

We are at this very moment in urgent communication with the Israeli Government[3] to establish precise conditions for the operation of United Nations truce supervisory personnel in the area between Israeli and Egyptian Third Army forces and to allow the introduction of non-military supplies to the Egyptian Third Army.[4] It will of necessity require several hours to get a definitive response on these points. It is our earnest hope that in the interim you can avoid taking any irrevocable actions.

I am very encouraged by your substantive preparations for discussions during Secretary Kissinger's upcoming visit.[5] You can be sure he

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. No classification marking. Sent in a message from Kissinger to Ismail. A handwritten notation on the message states that it was sent for delivery on October 26 at 10:38 a.m. The message is attached to a note from Scowcroft to Eagleburger asking him to bring this to the Secretary's attention as soon as possible.

[2] In this message, 2 p.m. Cairo time, October 26, Sadat informed Nixon that the Israelis were attempting "to isolate and oblige" the Egyptian Third Army "to surrender in humiliation." Sadat stated he had to consider measures to reopen lines of communication with the Third Army and that Israel was preventing UN observers from reaching the area. (Ibid.)

[3] At 9:38 a.m. on October 26, Kissinger telephoned Dinitz to inform him of Sadat's message to Nixon (see footnote 2 above). (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

[4] The Department of State's Middle East Task Force issued a situation report as of noon stating that on the morning of October 26, the Egyptian Third Army had attempted to break through the surrounding Israeli forces, thereby creating a new strain on the cease-fire. The U.S. Defense Attaché in Tel Aviv reported that the Egyptian attack had been repulsed by the Israelis, who were supported by Israeli Air Force units. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1175, Harold H. Saunders File, Middle East Negotiations File, 1973 Middle East War, 26 October 1973, File No. 21)

[5] See footnote 7, Document 261.

will adopt a constructive attitude. We hope that his visit may represent a milestone on the road toward a permanent and just settlement.[6]

[6] At 2:34 p.m. on October 26, Egyptian message No. 8 from Ismail reached the Department of State. Kissinger was asked to transmit a message from Sadat to Nixon which reads: "At that moment when I am receiving your encouraging message with respect to the future of peace, the Israelis are launching air and ground attacks against the Third Army under the false pretext that it has initiated the attack. I wish to advise you that the moment is critical and that the future of peace is in danger. Your guarantee of the Security Council Resolution is being defied under false pretenses. I hope that we can act swiftly to stop that deterioration of the situation immediately." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973)

280. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and President Nixon[1]

Washington, October 26, 1973, 11:58 a.m.

N: Hello Henry.

K: Mr. President.

N: What, ah, how are things going. Still the same?

K: Still about the same. Some back and forth on whether the Soviets and Americans can be in the observer force. We have taken the position that on the whole we prefer the observers be obtained as the same type of people as the military force. But if the Secretary-General requests Americans and Soviets we will accept. The Soviets have sent in 70 people they call observers.[2] We are saying they can send anyone they want but they have no status as far as we are concerned, except for what the Secretary-General recognizes. You had another message from Sadat about the 3rd Army.[3] A lot of technical stuff and needn't be brought to your attention. We should get the Egyptians to check this with the UN. We will pass it on to the Israelis.

N: I want it passed to the Israelis . . . strongly. Let's keep our side of the bargain.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] See footnote 2, Document 277.

[3] See footnote 2, Document 279.

K: When we can determine that the Israelis are doing something wrong we are leaning on them very hard.

N: I understand.

K: The Egyptians have made a proposal and they have sent this message about a comprehensive proposal on my visit.[4] And we have sent a warm message to Sadat from you saying you have instructed me to take a constructive and positive attitude.[5]

N: Good, good. How about the reviews? . . . still getting positive reviews?

K: Oh, yes. The *Post* was supportive of you on the editorial page, I haven't read the other. On the whole the news play was very positive.

N: Good, Henry.

K: Right, Mr. President.

---

[4] In Sadat's message, he promised that in preparation for Kissinger's visit to Cairo, the Egyptians were working out "comprehensive proposals" for a final peace settlement.

[5] Document 279.

---

281. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Israeli Ambassador (Dinitz)[1]

Washington, October 26, 1973, 1:17 p.m.

D: Food and Water . . .[2]

K: It is my strong advice to enable us to say something, we can say we have achieved . . . enable us to pay less later.

D: You recommend food and water.

K: You offered to let food and water through . . . could cause very serious consequences with Russians.

D: I want to ask you about something that has been on my mind, not my Government's mind. Suppose we offer to return all the people free without equipment, wouldn't take prisoners, let them have food

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking. The blank underscore indicates an omission in the original. Also printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 374–376.

[2] For the Egyptian Third Army.

and water and let them return home safely if they wanted, open the road.

K: In my view the best thing to offer food and water, non-military supplies.

D: OK, I will pass that on. That also will not solve the problem, though. Will delay confrontation we are going to have with Egypt.

K: You will wind up in my judgment, we will end up on the wrong side of the confrontation. It would be a whole hell of a lot better to establish the principle of limited supply now.

D: I'm not negating this.

K: In addition, and to offer that anybody who wants to leave will be permitted to leave, the Egyptians will consider that insulting.

D: We don't want to insult Egypt, but there must be a solution to the problem, we don't want to allow them to become fighting forces again.

K: I understand, eventual solution will be to open the road to non-military supplies.

D: Yes, I understand.

K: You will get under irresistible pressure if you keep it up.

D: Not keeping it up, we started with nonmilitary, humanitarian things, and I think the possibility . . .

K: My personal advice, you understand it's not an official position yet, but it is my usual tactic of anticipating in order to gain time.

D: As I said last night.

K: You will not be permitted to capture that army. I am certain.

D: It's not first priority. We would rather have them go home.

K: I don't think that will be possible either. Unless you withdraw your forces.

D: Well. That comes back to your suggestion, that we suggested to you that [*last*] night.

K: You won't _____ [withdraw?] in the North.

D: Don't want both sides of the canal in the North.

K: I frankly think you will make a mistake if you push into a total confrontation.

D: We're not trying for a confrontation, just want to find the best way to solve it.

K: Well, I have given you my views, it would be helpful if we could get an answer in the early part of the afternoon. Oh, something I have meant to tell you earlier and have neglected to twice, what I talked with Dobrynin about the conference was very minor, whether the site would be in New York or Geneva. that the site would not be in New York, but

Geneva which is what the Foreign Minister told me. Why he wanted that I don't know.

D: I will find out.

K: I think it has some remoteness from here and from the UN and that American and Soviet person of appropriate rank would sit in on the first few sessions and that's as much as we discussed.

D: OK, I will pass it on.

K: No substantive discussion whatever.

D: Fine.

K: Do tell them because the President has been bugging me to do it.

---

282. Backchannel Message From President Nixon to Egyptian President Sadat[1]

Washington, October 26, 1973.

I have received your message number 8.[2] You should know that the Israeli Government has told us:

—that UN truce observation posts are now at the following points: 1) Qantara; 2) on the Mitla Road; 3) on the Gidi Road; 4) on the Tasa Road.

—that it has permitted a medical supply convoy to enter Suez City. Further, it has transferred blood and plasma directly to the Third Army.

—that the military situation in the Egyptian Third Army area is exactly the reverse of what you have described to me, with Egyptian forces attacking across the Canal from East to West against Israeli units on the West bank of the Canal.

With regard to this last point, you must recognize that it is impossible for us to make proper judgments on who is keeping and who is violating the ceasefire.

I urgently suggest that the best way to assure proper compliance with the ceasefire is for you to move UN observers to the place where

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. No classification marking. Sent in a message from Kissinger to Ismail. A handwritten notation on the message states that it was sent for delivery at 4 p.m.

[2] See footnote 6, Document 279.

the attacks are taking place so that they can confirm your claims. I can assure you that should these impartial observers confirm ceasefire violations the United States will be prepared to: 1) join in further Security Council calls for observance of the ceasefire; 2) oppose those who have violated the ceasefire; 3) publicly condemn those who have violated the ceasefire.

---

283. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and President Nixon[1]

Washington, October 26, 1973, 4:05 p.m.

K: Mr. President.

N: It is necessary to be somewhat precise on this now. What can we say that the United States will participate in providing observers if requested by the Sec. Gen.[2] I don't want to be behind the news. I would like to be ahead of it.

K: If requested by the Sec. Gen.

N: Fine. The Soviet Union is sending unilaterally. Are we going to object?

K: They cannot do anything until the Sec. Gen. asks for them.

N: Henry, I am getting at this. It is already in the news. To the effect that Soviet Union is sending observers and has asked us to.

K: We have responded to that—We have to avoid, Mr. President,—they are pouring people in there and calling them observers and they have to be observed.

N: I am trying to see what we say tonight.

K: The US is—we think a small number of US observers—we are prepared if the Sec. Gen. asks for them and we have every reason to believe this is what will happen.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] In a telephone conversation with Nixon at 3:45 p.m. on October 26, Kissinger stated: "We don't want to get sucked into a separate UN observer force. . . . we are working out this afternoon a situation where the Secretary General will request 20 American and Soviet observers, so the question you raise will be hypothetical, Mr. President. . . . Also should be no self-appointed forces of any one nation. We believe there will be small numbers of Soviet and US personnel requested." (Ibid.) Printed in *Crisis*, p. 376.

N: This is being discussed now and we think it will be worked out this way. And that can be said.

K: Yes Mr. President.

N: Thanks, Henry.

---

284. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Israeli Ambassador (Dinitz)[1]

Washington, October 26, 1973, 4:15 p.m.

D: You wanted me.

K: The Egyptians have asked for a SC meeting tonight. They have now made another appeal to us from Sadat[2] and from New York—El Zayyat through Waldheim in which they say the Third Army will never surrender no matter what you do and that they will take drastic measures if you continue blockading them.[3] They don't care what line you go back to. They won't quibble about that and they are willing to talk about prisoner release and other matters. It seems to me you are going to come to a crossing point tonight of either making concrete proposals or . . . I tell you this as a friend, I have kept this from the President who is preparing for a Press Conference. I don't want him to say something you will regret. I have no doubt what he will do when it gets there. We also have a hot line message coming in from Moscow.

D: Can I tell you what the military situation is. I will not elaborate.

K: Our own information is that you did not start it.

D: Thank God.

K: But that does not make any difference. What produces the fighting is that they are desperate.

D: Absolutely correct. They are attempting to break out.

K: Why don't you let them break out and get out of there.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] See footnote 6, Document 279.

[3] Waldheim informed Kissinger of Zayyat's warning in a telephone conversation that day. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

D: We would be willing to let them break out and go home but they are not trying to break out and run. They are shooting at our forces and . . .

K: Why can you not let them take the tanks with them. The Russians will replace them anyway.

D: We will not open up the pocket and release an army that came to destroy us. It has never happened in a history of war.

K: Also it has never happened that a small country is producing a world war in this manner. There is a limit beyond which you cannot push the President. I have been trying to tell you that for a week.

D: We are not trying to push the President.

K: You play your game and you will see what happens.

D: The PM is sitting now on suggestions on what to do.

K: I am suggesting to you to make a constructive suggestion.

D: I understand and I asked you if you have any thing in mind.

K: I gave you what I have in mind.

D: About the food.

K: That while talks are going on you permit non-military supplies to go in there and perhaps you can establish the principle that no military supplies can come in from the road and you pull back from it.

D: One of the suggestions from the PM as I left the phone to come to you is that she thought she would send to you Gen. (Riva?) with a complete proposal of how to solve the situation.

K: That would take ten hours.

D: At least. She thought he could convey that would mean either swapping people, territories. Things that would solve the question. We cannot let them out without getting something in return.

K: That is right but you have to buy time for this discussion. We will be glad to propose that there will be immediate discussions between you and the Egyptians to solve this problem. We are willing to be cooperative but I tell you what will happen is another maximum Soviet demand and you cannot put the President in confrontation day after day.

D: We don't want to.

K: Always has happened that after ceasefire one country traps the army of another.

D: It is not exactly what we want to do. I will pass your urgent message to the PM.

K: I am telling you as personal advice. I guarantee if you want me to take it to the President you will get a much worse answer.

D: I am completely confident in accepting your advice. Believe me.

K: I have got to see the German Ambassador now and raise hell with him about your ships.[4]

D: Yes. O.K. I will talk to the PM and I will tell her may be . . .

K: I think you have a bargaining situation and I think you can get something for it. There has to be a bargain.

D: How do we go about it?

K: By at least getting talks started on that narrow issue.

D: On the food.

K: By getting a certain standstill enough so they don't get so desperate you do not get constant fighting.

D: Our people say at least 2–3 days of food and water. We hear talk from the commander they say in 2–3 days the UN will get us out of here. That is the situation there. We must strike some sort of a bargain out of it.

K: Make a proposal.

D: All right, so that is what I was trying to ask you. I will tell the PM that if she does not think . . .

K: But before 9:00 tonight make a proposal to confuse the issue. Or you will get a condemnation on you.

D: I will talk to her again.

---

[4] Telegram 212618 to Bonn, October 27, recorded that Kissinger met with FRG Ambassador Von Staden on October 26. After a brief exchange concerning FRG Foreign Minister Scheel's forthcoming visit to Moscow, Soviet observers in Egypt, and the possibility of West Germany transporting UN peacekeeping force personnel to the Middle East, the discussion turned to the FRG attitude toward the military resupply of Israel from US stocks in Germany. Kissinger stated that he was "astonished" at the FRG position on this matter. "We have no interest in a pro-Israeli policy per se. Once the ceasefire has been fully established, we intend to promote a political settlement and in the process we will take positions which will not be fully acceptable to the Israelis." Kissinger also emphasized that what was at issue was not the question of Israeli ships or individual arm shipments. "We think our actions in the Near East are in defense of Western interests generally," he said. Kissinger later repeated that the ships were themselves not an Alliance issue, but he was concerned about "the general attitude our European allies have adopted on this issue. It is one that profoundly concerns us. It has happened with too much consistency, too many times." Kissinger said that the Ambassador "might deem him arrogant," but he asked that Von Staden understand the background from which he spoke, as one who had long favored European integration. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL US/Kissinger)

285. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the White House Chief of Staff (Haig)[1]

Washington, October 26, 1973, 7:55 p.m.

K. The crazy bastard really made a mess with the Russians.

H. What?

K. Didn't you listen to his press statement.[2] First we had information of massive movement of Soviet forces. That is a lie. Second, this was the worst crisis since the Cuban missile crisis. True, but why rub their faces in it. Third, Brezhnev and I exchanged brutal messages. That has never been acknowledged before. Four, Brezhnev respects me because I was the man who bombed Viet-Nam on _____ 18 [May 8?] and mined the harbors on May 18.[3]

H. I don't think that is a third of the problem. He just let fly. He got all he had about the Middle East from you. I assumed you had cleared that. I was surprised.

K. Compare it with my press conference when I said there was no confrontation with the Russians.[4] . . . He has turned it into a massive Soviet backdown. Brezhnev is known to his Politburo as a man with a special relationship with Nixon and he is being publicly humiliated.

H. How about the rest of it. Disaster.

K. Yes, a disaster of something that is already a disaster. We are getting a hot line message tonight. Would you call Dobrynin. It doesn't do me any good to call him. You better call in the name of the President and say he wanted to stress his close personal relationship with the President. In a replay on television it may look like he is taunting Brezhnev. He wants him to know he places the greatest stress on the personal relationship. This is inadvertent and will be corrected. This guy will not take this. This guy over there is a maniac also.

H. I will take care of him. The rest is just as bad. We are off to the races.

K. I don't know what significance the other answers have. He just looked awful.

H. He took on the press like I have never heard.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking. The blank underscore indicates an omission in the original.

[2] For text of the President's October 26 press conference at 7:01 p.m. in the East Room of the White House, see *Public Papers: Nixon, 1973,* pp. 896–906.

[3] Kissinger is referring to Nixon's decision to bomb Hanoi and mine Haiphong harbor in May 1972.

[4] See footnote 3, Document 277.

K. They treated him in an unbelievable way.

H. I will get to Dobrynin right away.[5] If you talk to him tonight, take it easy. He is right on the verge.

K. The UN observers. Everything is nuts. There was no reason to make a special . . .

H. They understand. They are having trouble with their leader also.

K. They cannot stand public humiliation.

H. I will get back to you.

[5] Haig spoke with Dobrynin at 8:04 p.m. He stated: "I just came back from the President and I told him that his remarks tonight were I thought overdrawn and would be interpreted improperly . . . And I wanted you to know that he did not in any way have the intention of drawing the situation as sharply as he did. What he was trying to do—and I don't think it came across—he thought he was doing it but as being a member of the audience, I didn't think he did it, was trying to emphasize his strong personal relationship with Mr. Brezhnev and it not come across that way to me at all . . . And he is quite upset about it because he did not intend it to be that way." Dobrynin replied: "General, I would like to say only one private observation . . . they [Soviet leadership] are very angry because they consider that you created all these things by reasons we don't know—we don't want to discuss it—but artificial crisis, why? And when you compare it with the even Cuban crisis, it is really—excuse me—but it is going beyond any comparison." Dobrynin also objected to not being informed in advance of the U.S. decision to move to a military alert, having learned of the decision on the radio, and stated that the crisis would damage relations between Washington and Moscow. "I'm telling you without anger, without specific emotions, but I'm really feel sorry about this episode because it damaged very much of what was done, by what reason we don't know really. It was so good trip of Henry to Moscow. Brezhnev spend with him so many hours that the President never spends with Gromyko, by the way. And it looked so it was quite all right. But then he created this [unclear] crisis that you are real and we are just weaker partners standing looking against braver United States. Really, we have our people too around Moscow." Haig replied: "Well, Mr. Ambassador, that worries me, I don't think it's a reflection of the attitudes here at all." (Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 384–387)

286. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail)[1]

Washington, October 26, 1973.

As you know from my previous messages, I have been in urgent contact with the Israeli Government about the situation of the Egyptian Third Army. I have just received the following message from the Israeli Prime Minister:

"We are prepared immediately to enter into discussions with the Egyptians on how to solve this situation. The Egyptians should suggest the place, time, and rank of their representative. We are prepared to send the chief of staff, the minister of defense, or any other general or other representative for the discussion. We believe we have something to offer to them—something which is neither surrender nor humiliation, but an honorable way out of the situation. All the Egyptians have to do is suggest the time, place, and rank of their representative."

We are passing on this message as intermediary not as a recommendation. For its part, the US will use all its influence to produce an honorable solution to this problem.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. No classification marking. A handwritten note on the message states that it was received at 8:12 p.m. on October 26. According to Kissinger's memoirs, it was sent at 7:55 p.m. (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 605)

287. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Israeli Ambassador (Dinitz)[1]

Washington, October 26, 1973, 8:45 p.m.

K. Mr. Ambassador, this is a call not as Secretary but as a friend.

D. I understand.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

K. We are going to get a hot line message within an hour.[2] I just wanted to tell you it is my honest judgment if you don't move in some direction to get serious mention on the enclave you will lose everything.

D. Maybe I don't know what your suggestion is.

K. My suggestion this morning was to offer some time . . . You should know once the President is involved he will order that we should join the others because we have nothing to hold on to. It is water over the dam at this point.

D. The supply business? That is what you mean?

K. The supply business or something else Israeli ingenuity could produce. His suggestion is a negotiation.

D. I told you that is what we intended to offer them.

K. You told me it might be. I didn't know you wanted us to pass it on to them.

D. We don't want to reveal all of the cards. Maybe I didn't make myself very clear. I did not mean for you to withhold it from them.

K. That would be considered humiliating and it's just as well. I know what you are trying to do. Maybe you should play it your way for awhile and they may buy it.

D. We have a mutual friend and he just called me on the direct line and he said something that I wasn't going to tell you. But since you called, he said tell my friend, Henry, that if Golda Meir or any other government opens this route he will not survive 24 hours in Israel. I didn't. . . .

K. The tragedy is that my judgment is that Israel will lose everything on this route but it is better for them to be raped and forced than to make it as a decision.

D. In this embassy we have three girls who lost either a brother or a cousin in this fighting. This is an example of what it has done to our country. In the closing of this route we have lost scores and scores of lives. If we open the route, we vitalize two or three divisions that will be a threat to our bridgeheads. We know what their intention is as of this evening. They are threatening us and the President of the U.S. We cannot let them execute these plans. We are not trying to . . . We cannot afford to have this army revitalized and they will be. They have the missiles and tanks ready for reloading. We saw them and we have tapes as of this afternoon.

K. I am trying to tell you it doesn't make a bit of difference. You will be forced if it reaches that point.

---

[2] Document 288.

D. The Prime Minister asked if she should write a message to the President.

K. Write if it makes you feel good. It is almost totally impossible . . .

D. We are prepared to release them but should we . . . them. Should Israel take these enemies . . .

K. There is one . . . that you can hold the road after the ceasefire.

D. It is not a realistic argument here. The Soviet Union decided they cannot have the Egyptian army humiliated so we are trying to . . .

K. Let's see what the hot line message says. We don't know what it says yet. We may not have a problem. I am honestly very pessimistic. At least there should have been a proposal that is being considered.

D. By the way, now we have allowed the Red Cross to go in for the wounded. This evening.

K. You know I am on your side. If that 3rd Army could disappear tonight nobody would be happier than I. I have no interest in the 3rd Army, but this thing is going to get too big for us. It is my judgment but in no official capacity whatever. What I advised you this morning I advise you as a tactic for what I was sure would happen. It hasn't happened yet. Let's not worry about it now.

D. We will wait and face the situation as it comes. I don't think we have any other choice.

K. I think you have practically . . . If you turn out to be right I will celebrate with you.

D. In any event we will celebrate that you were wrong.

K. Never have I more wanted to be wrong.

D. This is the only thing that keeps me believing is that we can work together with this.

K. You won't be pressured one second before it becomes inevitable.

D. I appreciate it.

288. Hotline Message From Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev to President Nixon[1]

Moscow, October 26, 1973.

Dear Mr. President:

President Sadat has just informed us that he requested you to take categorical measures for an unconditional cessation of hostilities by Israel, who in violation of all the decisions adopted by the Security Council is waging fierce battles against the Egyptian Third Army.

I must tell you that such actions by Israel jeopardize the interests of universal peace and are detrimental to the prestige of the Soviet Union and the United States of America as powers which have assumed definite obligations to restore peace in the Middle East.

We also know that President Sadat, in addition to his appeal to you to seek to obtain a cessation of hostilities from Israel, also requested that Egyptian aircraft, helicopters or other means of transportation be granted an opportunity to deliver non-military cargo unimpeded—cargo such as food supplies, medications, and blood for the wounded in the Third Egyptian Army, located on the eastern bank of the Suez Canal.

President Sadat has also informed us that your answer to him was that you will need several hours to take appropriate measures. Now, when I appeal to you, several hours have already passed. Unfortunately, however, we have information that the Egyptian President's request has still not met with a favorable decision.

I must tell you frankly, that if the next few hours do not bring news that necessary measures have been taken to resolve the question raised by President Sadat, then we will have the most serious doubts regarding the intentions of the American side, concerning the understanding recently reached by us on an immediate cease fire, and also concerning a confidential portion pertaining to the normalization of the situation and the restoration of peace in the Middle East.

We still hope that at this difficult hour our responsibility for the outcome of all events will be discharged in the next few hours. We

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 69, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 20, [October 12–November 21, 1973]. Top Secret; Sensitive; Specat. Received in the White House Situation Room at 11:35 p.m. In his memoirs, Kissinger noted that this message started to arrive shortly after 9 p.m. (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 607)

hope, in particular, that on your part, effective and immediate influence will be brought to bear on Israel concerning President Sadat's request.

Now I want to touch on another matter, Mr. President. For two days, we have not reacted to your unexpected decision to bring United States armed forces, including those in Europe, to combat readiness.[2]

I have just completed my address at the World Peace Congress. In my speech, I decided not to touch upon the issue of your decision, which as is well known has attracted widespread attention throughout the world. I did not mention this because I had in mind discussing this question directly with you in a calm atmosphere. However, Israel's continuing non-compliance with the Security Council's decisions combined with the above mentioned actions, undertaken by the U.S.A, unwittingly suggests the idea that the measures undertaken on the part of the United States to influence Israel to immediately fulfill the Security Council's resolutions are not only inadequate and ineffective, but, as is evident, enable Israel to continue its adventuristic actions.

I repeat that we are surprised by your order to bring U.S. armed forces to combat readiness. However, this step unquestionably does not promote a relaxation of international tension, and was by no means the result of any kind of actions by the Soviet Union, which would represent even the slightest violation on our part of the understanding reached with you. But we are faced with the fact and cannot but take this into consideration.

It seems to us that the measures taken were carried out as a means of pressure on the Soviet Union. There have been open comments on this in the American press and even at press conferences. But you yourself understand, that such calculations cannot intimidate us or shake our resolve to act in the spirit of unconditional compliance with all portions of the Security Council's decisions.

Returning to the situation in the Middle East, I would like to stress, that it is our profound conviction that the immediate responsibility is the task of influencing Israel to force it to immediately fulfill the Security Council's decisions, based on our understanding with you.

I also hope that President Sadat's request to you will meet with a favorable decision and that your personnel, as well as the observer personnel, as determined by the Security Council's decision, will within

[2] See Document 269.

the next day be dispatched to [their] designated places to fulfill their functions.[3]

Respectfully,

L. Brezhnev[4]

[3] Brackets in the original. Kissinger spoke with Dinitz on the telephone at 9:40 p.m. to inform him of the contents of Brezhnev's hotline message. Kissinger stated: "We have received a message which gives us another day. They [the Soviets] claim Sadat requested us to send non-military supplies. This they [the Soviets] did not do but they say within a day if this isn't done they will take appropriate measures. I will now have to take it up with the President. I tell you now you can't expect a repeat of the performance of the other night." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23) Printed in *Crisis*, p. 391.

[4] The original bears this typed signature.

289. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Israeli Ambassador (Dinitz)[1]

Washington, October 26, 1973, 10:58 p.m.

D. . . . is transmitting it over the telephone to the Prime Minister this minute.[2] As soon as he is finished reading it I will go back on.

K. I will give you the President's reaction. Right now if you want it.

D. Sure, I will go back to my office. Just a moment.

K. Let me give you the President's reaction in separate parts.[3] First he wanted me to make it absolutely clear that we cannot permit the destruction of the Egyptian army under conditions achieved after a cease-fire was reached in part by negotiations in which we participated. Therefore it is an option that does not exist. We will support any motion in the UN that will . . . Secondly, he would like from you no later than 8:00 a.m. tomorrow an answer to the question of non-military supplies permitted to reach the army. If you cannot agree to that, we will

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] Dinitz is referring to Brezhnev's message to Nixon, Document 288.

[3] The President, who had gone to Camp David that evening, spoke to Kissinger from 10:21 to 10:23 p.m. and then to Haig from 10:24 to 10:31 p.m. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Central Files, President's Daily Diary) No record of the conversations has been found.

have to support in the UN a resolution that will deal with the enforcement of 338 and 339. We have been driven to this reluctantly by your inability to reach a decision. Whatever the reasons, this is what the President wanted me to tell you is our position. An answer that permits some sort of negotiation and some sort of positive response on the non-military supplies, or then we will join the other members of the Security Council in making it an international matter. I have to say again your course is suicidal. You will not be permitted to destroy this army. You are destroying the possibility for negotiations which you want because you are not making possible . . .

D. Your proposal to let the army go is very close to our proposal.

K. You can make any proposal you want to us and we will transmit it. We are not transmitting anything to the Egyptians. We have not had an answer to the last message,[4] but that only went out two or three hours ago. Maybe it will turn out they will accept your proposal and I will have a drink with you. As it stands now it is our official position that if you do not make some proposal along these lines, we will have to go along with the majority of the Security Council. We can probably make a proposal and you can delay the implementation of it on practical grounds and get a little more time.

D. If we make an offer on the supplying of non-military supplies?

K. That is right. Then we could at least point to something that we have managed to achieve in the . . . I must tell you that you are perfectly free to play it your way and see what happens. Maybe the Egyptians will be so desperate they will accept your proposal. It is not my judgment. It is inconceivable that the Soviets will permit the destruction of the Egyptian army and that the Egyptians will withdraw their army. It will bring down Sadat. It is not something he will agree to.

D. I am not authorized or feel competent to give advice. But why can't I answer that Israel offers to let this army go intact with all side arms but cannot have 200 tanks go with these people so they can go back on us.

K. The agreement was ceasefire in place. Now they won't accept losing all that equipment and giving it to you.

D. They can blow it up.

K. You are asking them to destroy 200 tanks and pull their army out. They will never do it and the Soviets won't take that. Why don't you bluff for a day and see if you can get it.

D. That is what we tried to do.

K. If that is going to be your formal answer we will of course transmit it. It can be under no . . .

---

[4] Document 286.

D. Mr. Secretary, if I asked my government to transfer to you the military plans we were able to obtain about the defenses of this army, will it make any difference. What is their operational plan?

K. Right now I don't think they have any plans.

D. They do as of today. We have it on tape.

K. That is their way of breaking out.

D. If they want to break out and go home we could help them. They don't have to kill our people. Their plan is to cut us and fortify themselves with tanks and missiles. It is suicidal for us in either way.

K. It is.

D. 10,000 tons of supplies that the Soviets have provided them. Twenty-four hours and we would have to rush to you like last Friday night.[5]

K. I have given you the President's views of the ceasefire agreement.

D. It is not we who force your confrontation with the Soviet Union. By its actions they have forced it.

K. If the Soviet Union did this to you or Egypt after a ceasefire agreement I would urge on the President the most drastic measures.

D. We did not do this without them fighting us after the ceasefire. You say it's immaterial. The note of Brezhnev is full of mistakes and you know it, Mr. Secretary.

K. I know only the basic situation is produced by bottling up of the Third Army, and I think you can make demands that no additional military equipment go into there.

D. Under what auspices?

K. UN personnel.

D. Including Soviet personnel?

K. That is one of the things that can be raised. That will be reasonable.

D. I will transmit it to the Prime Minister, of course, and get her reaction. Maybe she would want to send a note to the President. She has wanted to and I have been talking her out of it.

K. She can send a note to the President. It won't make the slightest difference. I will get the . . . It is the mildest possible reaction you will get in the bureaucracy. If everybody got . . .

D. I think what is at stake here is so important for us I cannot come . . . what I have said to you.

K. If you will call me at 8:00 in the morning.

---

[5] October 12. See Document 168.

D. If the Prime Minister asks some more questions, can I still get you?

K. I am going home.[6]

D. I will try not to call you.

K. But, of course, if it is important you can call me.

[6] Before going home, Kissinger spoke with Dobrynin at 11:15 p.m. to inform him of the substance of Brezhnev's hotline message, which Dobrynin had not yet received. Kissinger informed Dobrynin that "we will send an answer in a couple of hours. We will discuss the issues that are raised on a really urgent basis with the Israelis and we hope to get an answer by tomorrow afternoon our time, but it is a real tough problem." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23) Printed in *Crisis*, p. 397.

290. Hotline Message From President Nixon to Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev[1]

Washington, October 27, 1973.

Dear Mr. General Secretary:

We have studied your most recent message carefully.[2] I want to assure you that we strongly favor the establishment of an effective ceasefire and that we will continue to make every effort to achieve this fully, in the spirit of our mutual understandings and if at all possible through cooperative efforts with you.

As to your first point, we will raise with the Israeli Government the issue of non-military cargo, including food supplies, medications and blood for the wounded for the Egyptian army located on the east side of the Canal on an urgent basis. We will make every effort to get you a response by late afternoon today Washington time.

We agree also that the United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization personnel should be positioned promptly and our understanding is that this process is well in train. We believe that the same

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin & Kissinger, Vol. 8. No classification marking. A handwritten note on the message indicates that it was LDXed to the NMCC at 1 a.m. on October 27. The message is attached to an October 27 memorandum from Scowcroft to Dobrynin forwarding a copy of it and the subsequent message sent to Brezhnev at 8:55 a.m. later that day (Document 292).

[2] Document 288.

principle should apply to the UNTSO as applies to the UN force; namely, that it would be better if it was made up of individuals coming from countries who are not permanent members of the Security Council. However, in light of your desires to have Soviet observers involved, we have offered a limited number of American personnel for service in the UNTSO. We believe the Secretary General is considering the augmentation of UNTSO, and that he will decide how many of our respective personnel will be utilized. We cannot accept that observers or representatives of any country can be active outside the observer framework of the UN.

At the same time, we also favor the earliest possible positioning of the United Nations force, and we welcome the fact that Secretary General Waldheim has moved promptly and that the first contingents of the UN Force have been airlifted today from Cyprus to the area.

Finally, as to the actions which the United States took as a result of your letter of October 24,[3] I would recall your sentences in that letter: "It is necessary to adhere without delay. I will say it straight that if you find it impossible to act promptly with us in this matter, we should be faced with the necessity urgently to consider the question of taking appropriate steps unilaterally." Mr. General Secretary, these are serious words and were taken seriously here in Washington. We believe our joint support for the establishment of the UN Force including the permanent members was a sensible course in our mutual interest. For our part, we continue to adhere scrupuously to the principle of joint cooperation to help maintain an effective ceasefire looking towards a fundamental settlement.

Sincerely,

Richard Nixon[4]

[3] Document 267.

[4] The original bears this typed signature.

291. Backchannel Message From the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail) to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Cairo, October 27, 1973.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the October 1973 War.]

I have received your message of October 27.[2] I wish to inform you of the position of the Egyptian Government with respect to the Israeli proposals conveyed to us by you.

1. The Egyptian Government is prepared to dispatch a representative of the Egyptian Armed Forces of the rank of major general to come in contact with an Israeli military representative of the same rank. It is understood that each will be accompanied by the adequate number of assistants. They would meet under United Nations supervision by 1500 hours Cairo local time at the kilometer 110 of the Cairo–Suez road. Their meeting place would be put under supervision of the United Nations peacekeeping force.

2. The object of that meeting would be to discuss the military aspects of the implementation of Security Council Resolutions 338 and 339 of October 22 and 23, 1973.

3. We expect a complete cease fire to be effective as of 1300 hours local time October 27, 1973. United Nations observers should be in place in time to supervise this.

4. A convoy carrying non-military supplies for Suez and formations of the Third Army east of the canal should be allowed to have reached its destination by 1500 local time under United Nations and Red Cross supervision.[3]

If such arrangements are acceptable, it is expected that a prompt reply will be received in time to allow for the necessary measures to be taken.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Eyes Only. The message was received in the White House Situation Room at 3:07 a.m. on October 27.

[2] Reference is presumably to Document 286.

[3] The Department of State's Middle East Task Force Situation Report #68 as of 6 a.m. EDT, October 27, stated that the Third Army's October 26 attempts to break out of its encircled position apparently had failed, and warned that if it were not supplied with food and water soon, a complete breakdown of the cease-fire could result. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1176, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations File, 1973 Middle East War, 27 October 1973, File No. 22) In telegram 8673 from Tel Aviv, October 27, 1047Z, Keating warned that the fate of the Third Army appeared central to U.S. hopes of creating a stable cease-fire in the south and its hopes of moving the parties to peace negotiations. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

We expect the exercise of United States influence to facilitate the development of these talks.[4]

[4] At 4:31 a.m., Kissinger sent the following reply: "Your message with our own strong endorsement has been passed to the Israelis on a most urgent basis. A reply should be received within a few hours and we will pass immediately to you." (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973)

292. Message From President Nixon to Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev[1]

Washington, undated.

Dear Mr. General Secretary:

I am happy to inform you that we were able during the night to arrange for direct talks between Israel and Egypt regarding the implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 338 and 339. These talks are right now being arranged by Major General E. Siilasvuo. At our urging, Israel has also agreed to permit a convoy of non-military supply to reach the Egyptian 3rd Army today.

We expect to continue to work closely and cooperatively with you in resolving the Middle East crisis.

I hope that we are now well on the road to the achievement of a true cease fire; a cease fire which will make it possible for the warring parties with our help, to arrive at a just settlement and a lasting peace in the Middle East.

I will inform you immediately as further developments occur.

Sincerely,

Richard M. Nixon[2]

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin & Kissinger, Vol. 8. No classification marking. A handwritten note on the message indicates that it was sent at 8:55 a.m. The message is attached to an October 27 memorandum from Scowcroft to Dobrynin sending him copies of U.S. messages sent to Moscow during the last few hours. A handwritten note indicates that this was hand-delivered to Dobrynin at 10:30 a.m.

[2] The original bears this typed signature.

293. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the White House Chief of Staff (Haig)[1]

Washington, October 27, 1973, 12:28 p.m.

K: The press conference[2] reached Moscow and Brezhnev asked Dobrynin if this could possibly be true. What happened Wednesday was compared to the bombing of Hanoi.

H: Oh no! How is Dobrynin's morale?

K: He thinks there should be direct confrontation between the two gentlemen but you know what happened overnight. It was put to the Israelis that we couldn't tolerate them squeezing Egypt this way—put to the Egyptians that they should meet with the Israelis and work out details. The Israelis blew their stack and said they would go public and that they were being brutalized for the claim of being small. Four Israelis accepted this meeting permitting one convoy to go through. I thought all was settled but now the Israelis are sitting at the meeting place and the Egyptian convoy is sitting somewhere within Israel.

H: We cannot let the people starve.

K: You may help me to settle down those maniacs at Defense. He[3] is now flapping all over the place—we cannot airlift supplies to Egypt.

H: One thing he did mention was putting troops in Trucial States to get oil.

K: He is insane.

H: He thinks forces should be put in.

K: I do not think we can survive with these fellows in there at Defense—they are crazy.

H: I told him he should not come to you. He said we could not let people die in the desert and that the Israelis are lying to us and that we must be tougher.

H: The big thing is to get the two parties to work it out.

K: That way it has a chance. If we go in it will start war again. I have asked him not to send a military mission to Israel. Schlesinger wants to check on whether the Israelis are lying—will you please help me with him.

H: I will do my best.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] Nixon's press conference; see footnote 2, Document 285.

[3] Secretary of Defense Schlesinger.

294. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail)[1]

Washington, undated.

I had learned, shortly before receipt of President Sadat's message No. 10 to the President,[2] that for reasons which I have not been able to ascertain, the meeting agreed to earlier today between Egypt and Israel failed to take place.[3] I also learned that your convoy was not passed through to Suez and the Egyptian Third Army.

I have, therefore, talked personally, and in the strongest possible terms, to Prime Minister Meir.[4] I insisted that arrangements be made so that if your representatives were to appear at 2200 hours Cairo local time today at Kilometer 101 of the Cairo–Suez Road they would be met by Israeli representatives, and that the meeting place would be under the supervision of the United Nations peacekeeping force. I also insisted to Madame Meir that an Egyptian convoy carrying non-military supplies for Suez and formations of the Third Army east of the canal should be allowed to pass Israeli lines at 2200 hours Cairo local time today under United Nations and Red Cross supervision.

I learned from Foreign Minister El Zayyat,[5] shortly after my conversation with Mrs. Meir, that 2400 hours would be more convenient, both for the meeting of Egyptian and Israeli representatives and for the movement of your convoy through Israeli lines. I have now been assured by the Israeli Government that 2400 hours is an acceptable time for both events.[6]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. No classification marking. A handwritten notation on the message indicates that it was sent for delivery at 2:55 p.m. on October 27.

[2] In this backchannel message to Nixon, October 27, 1:12 p.m., Sadat complained that Israel was preventing the Egyptian side from reaching the rendezvous point at Kilometer 101. (Ibid.)

[3] In a telephone conversation with Zayyat, October 27, 12:04 p.m. (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23) Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 404–405.

[4] In a telephone conversation with Meir, October 27, 12:40 p.m. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23). Printed in Kissinger, *Crisis*, pp. 406–408.

[5] In a telephone conversation with Zayyat, October 27, 12:55 p.m. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

[6] In a telephone conversation with Dinitz, October 27, 1:55 p.m. (Ibid.)

You may already have learned this information from Foreign Minister El Zayyat, but I wanted to confirm it to you. I also want you to know that you have the solemn assurance of the United States Government that we have done—and will continue to do—all we can to assure that these arrangements will be carried out.[7]

[7] Kissinger wrote in his memoirs: "Ultimately, at 1:30 a.m. local time on Sunday, October 28, an hour and a half behind the new schedule, Israeli and Egyptian military representatives met for direct talks for the first time in twenty-five years, under the auspices of UN observers." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 611)

295. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the White House Chief of Staff (Haig)[1]

Washington, October 27, 1973, 3:30 p.m.

K. Al, how are you?

H. Henry, OK.

K. We got everything back on track again.

H. Yes, I saw Brent.

K. By tomorrow it may blow up again. The three meetings didn't come off because I think the Israelis pulled a fast one and didn't notify the UN troops. They think it was an oversight. I called Golda Meir[2] and told her if their man wasn't there by 10:00 it was the end of us. The Egyptians asked for a two hour delay. It is now set for 12:00 their time and 6:00 p.m. our time.

H. Are they letting another convoy through?

K. One convoy and a negotiator. Then they can negotiate the other convoy.

H. That's great.

K. Our Defense Department, even Brent, want us to resupply the 3rd Army. Lets see how that negotiation goes.

H. I agree.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] See footnote 4, Document 294.

K. If the Egyptians are under pressure and if the Israelis can get a settlement, fine. If the Israelis overdo it we may have to go in and resupply.

H. It is going to be rather a permanent situation in any event.

K. . . . the Egyptians go back east of the Canal and the Israelis west of the Canal which is a long range situation.

H. If Sadat isn't wiped out in the process.

K. Let's see how negotiations stand tomorrow.

H. They really brutalized me into this thing tomorrow. The President did. He asked me to do it.

K. I think you are making a mistake.

H. I don't relish it.

K. Everyone is delighted these negotiations are going to take place.

H. That is good.

K. I will give you an up-to-date report in the morning. What program are you on?

H. "Issues and Answers" at 12:00. Golda Meir is on the first half hour.

K. You are on the Middle East?

H. No, she is. They will be hitting me with Watergate.

K. Let's see how it is going to be.

H. I walked into a mine field. I will defer on any Middle East questions.

K. As of right now the thing is firmly on track.

H. OK, Henry, that is great.

296. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail)[1]

Washington, October 28, 1973.

Thank you for your message No. 12 of October 28.[2]

We understand that the supply column has now been permitted to move, and I am glad that this first fruit of our cooperative effort is being successful.

We are grateful to have your report of the first meeting with the Israeli representative. We think that it is very constructive on your part to be willing to meet again as quickly as possible. We have transmitted your willingness to meet as soon as possible to the Israeli Government with our favorable recommendation.[3] You should be aware that our ability to influence Israel is being substantially weakened by Egyptian unwillingness to release the prisoners of war, which we had been led to believe were a part of the understanding reached recently in the discussions leading to the cease-fire agreement of October 22.

We appreciate the thoughtfulness of President Sadat in sending Minister Fahmi and Ambassador Iryan to Washington in preparation for my visit to Egypt. I would suggest that they arrive not before Wednesday[4] in order that my trip to Cairo could be announced concurrently with their arrival. However, should you see some advantage in an earlier arrival by Minister Fahmi, that can certainly be arranged.

With respect to efforts to bring a just and durable peace to the Middle East, it is important for us to be concrete in our thinking, as well

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. No classification marking. A handwritten notation on the message indicates that it was sent for delivery by the Situation Room at 1 p.m.

[2] In this backchannel message, October 28, 3 p.m. Cairo time, Ismail stated that the Egyptian relief column was being delayed by Israeli forces, but the meeting at Kilometer 101 took place. Ismail noted that the Israelis introduced "new elements" regarding the exchange of prisoners of war. He also informed Kissinger that Sadat was sending Foreign Minister Fahmi to Washington for talks with Kissinger in preparation for Kissinger's visit to Egypt. (Ibid.)

[3] In a telephone conversation between Kissinger and Dinitz, October 28, 11:10 a.m. (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

[4] October 31.

as to have in mind a reasonable schedule that can in fact be carried out. You have our assurances of a serious effort in this regard.

With warm good wishes,

---

297. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail)[1]

Washington, October 29, 1973.

Dr. Kissinger appreciates Mr. Ismail's message of Sunday night, October 28.[2]

Whatever delays there may have been, Dr. Kissinger understands that the supply column for the 3rd Egyptian Army has now reached its destination. The question of the continued resupply of the 3rd Egyptian Army is a matter which is most appropriately discussed in the direct talks between the Egyptian and Israeli sides, and the US side does not think it should get into the particular means or other aspects, although we are always prepared to offer our good auspices on issues of difficulty.

Dr. Kissinger looks forward to Minister Fahmi's visit to Washington to exchange views and hopes that this visit will mark a major step forward toward a just and permanent peace in the Middle East.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. No classification marking. A handwritten note on the message indicates that it was sent for delivery at 9:38 a.m.

[2] See footnote 2, Document 296.

298. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, October 29, 1973.

PARTICIPANTS

Egypt
H. E. Ismail Fahmi, Acting Egyptian Foreign Minister
H. E. Abdallah El Erian, Egyptian Ambassador to France
Mr. Umar Sirri, Minister, Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Cairo

United States
The Secretary of State
Assistant Secretary of State Joseph J. Sisco

Kissinger: I welcome you. I hope that this will be the start of useful and important discussions which I hope to continue in Cairo.

Fahmi: I have been sent by the President. He sends greetings to you and President Nixon. He sent me here for two reasons: so that we could get to know each other and secondly, to tell you the framework of my mission. We have enjoyed your quick response to our communications.

Kissinger: We remain in contact.

Fahmi: We are at the crossroads. We will make every effort to change the situation which has persisted for the last 25 years.

Kissinger: I agree completely. The great achievement in the present crisis is that it has changed the situation.

Fahmi: This has been due to Sadat's sincerity.

Kissinger: And courage.

Fahmi: He needs it.

You have a small thing like Watergate here; in our country the whole situation is a crisis. President Sadat is in a position to make decisions. He can rally with opponets or those who are reluctant to follow. Sadat is now in a position to make decision with Arab Governments. This has been proven in the recent war. He has great stature. The African countries have [omission in the original] and have supported us and likewise _____. We are at the crossroads. We are about to begin a new chapter. Moreover, this goes even beyond our bilateral relation-

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 27 ARAB–ISR. Secret; Nodis. A handwritten notation indicates that this is a first draft. Saunders sent Kissinger a briefing memorandum for this meeting on October 29. In it Saunders suggested that "the main purpose of your talk with Ismail Fahmi is to hear the opening Egyptian posture and procedural proposals for peace negotiations." (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 635, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. IX, Jan–Oct, 1973) Blank underscores indicate omissions in the original. Other omissions are noted throughout.

ships. This is an opportunity neither of us should miss. Despite misunderstandings, lack of confidence, misinterpretations of past positions, Sadat took the lead with us.

Kissinger: We have exchanged more messages with Egypt than with any other countries.

Fahmi: Confidence is the key. We have no problem with the United States; the problem is with Israel, and it is Israel being negative on everything. Israel and Egypt must establish confidence otherwise we can't go ahead.

Kissinger: I totally agree. I have agreed to go to Cairo.

Fahmi: These talks are a preparation for your trip to Cairo. That is why I am here. Security Council has adopted about three resolutions. You took the initiative jointly with the USSR. Israel accepted the resolutions. Resolution 338 has three parts. The main element is the ceasefire; it is important that the ceasefire be restored so that there will be no problems which will remain affecting the more substantial elements, the more substantial talks later. The ceasefire said that everybody stayed as they were on October 22. The second Security Council Resolution said everybody back to October 22. It also called for a reaffirmation of 242 and negotiations for a peaceful settlement. We cannot start negotiations or preparations unless the ceasefire resolutions are carried out. Everybody has to be in position when the ceasefire came into effect; the October 22 positions. If the ceasefire established on October 22 does not respect its own preparation, a conference cannot go on. It is practically impossible to think of negotiations and a conference if the ceasefire is fragile, and there is confusion as to the ceasefire existence and at the time the ceasefire went into effect. Israel, in three messages, proposed it was ready for a meeting. We said we were ready to meet with the Minister of Defense or Chief of Staff. I recall that in Sadat's message to Israel, Secretary had passed on the Israeli proposal for the military representatives to meet "as an intermediary, not as a recommendation."[2] If you had stopped there, we would have rejected the Israeli proposal outright. You went further to say the United States would do its utmost to solve this problem. You reaffirmed your position that that you would do your best. We, therefore, responded positively and agreed to make contact with the Israeli representative. Fahmi also recalled that in our reply we had informed the Egyptians that the Israelis had accepted the Israeli conditions in totality. Fahmi said that these talks are a good basis for the ceasefire, the process of contacts and negotiations. In effect, President Sadat is sure that this could not have taken place without U.S. influence.

---

[2] Document 286.

Kissinger: Your message came in at 2:00 AM,[3] and we worked hard on the matter.

Fahmi: We will be the last to contribute to your headaches. We will not threaten you; we are not in a position to threaten you.

Kissinger: I have been impressed with your military activity as well as your skill in diplomacy; at no time did Egypt lose sight of its ultimate objective.

Fahmi: We started implementing what was in your message. The UN force would not want to interfere in it. Fahmi convinced the UNTSO General to participate since it was essential to implement Security Council Resolutions 338 and 339 but the other side was not there.

Kissinger: I made a direct demand to the Israeli Prime Minister.[4]

Fahmi: The Israeli representative then came without instructions saying he had no instructions. He did not come there to talk about the three above points. He came there to talk about other things and continued to delay. They were not letting the UN people do their work. The UN's job is disengagement between the armies even before implementing the principle of return to the October 22 position. The UN General met Dayan on the West side. The UN contingent was not able to enter Suez City at all. The UN General is now going to meet Dayan in Jerusalem. Dayan stressed that it is important for the UN to be present on both sides of the Canal.

Kissinger: I believe we should speak generally here tonight. I will be seeing you again tomorrow, and we will take energetic steps to get in touch at the highest levels. Kissinger said I face two problems: (1) The establishment of an effective ceasefire, and (2) to get to real negotiations. We and you must have a certain amount of confidence in each other. If neither of us can trust one another, then relations will disappear. We need confidence because it will take time to achieve a settlement, an indefinite amount of time, but some time. The _____ that has come about is not as a result of threats but rather as a result of our influence on Israel. If we get threatening moves from your fronts, it will also strengthen the anti-Communist moves in this country. If we have to ration our oil then we will have to devote much energy to this problem, rather than on the settlement. For as you know, no settlement will be satisfactory to the Israelis. They will not want to give up territory. I know that you were not pleased with the way which took place during the war (massive airlift) but it was considerably less than we were being pressured to do. The question is what where do we go to use our pressure on. [*sic*] If I spend my capital on every point of the ceasefire,

---

[3] Document 291.

[4] See footnote 4, Document 294.

there will not be any capital left to spend on the peace negotiations. If peace negotiations do not succeed, we can take the present line or the October 22 line—it does not mean anything for there will be another war. The question is how we get ceasefire arrangements that are good enough to get us through peace negotiations over the next three to six months. We are convinced that another war cannot happen and that lines now in existence would become a permanent feature of the international scene. Such a ceasefire would not last. We must move from here to peace.

Fahmi: We are in a more difficult position than you are because our public opinion feels strongly. There is no feeling against American citizens. Fahmi recalled that he advised our head of the Interests Section that there was no need for U.S. citizens to leave Cairo even though other citizens of other countries had left. Our misunderstanding concerns Israel. It is now a 100 times more important for a solution to be found. Fahmi said let me explain about public opinion. For the first 13 days, we felt that Egypt was in full control of the war. Then Israel came in with your new supplies, new sophisticated weapons, military equipment which came from the United States and your depots in West Germany. For 13 days, we made our point. We have no interest in putting Israel into the sea or invading Israel, irrespective of the Palestinian situation. After 13 days, your equipment helped Israel—after your reconnaissance planes took pictures of the positions. _____ public opinion knew we were winning the war for 13 days and the basic change came about as a result of new U.S. weapons. In spite of all of this, President Sadat showed great courage. We got broad support in the Arab world.

Kissinger: We did not send any military equipment for seven days. You will recall that we tried a ceasefire in-place on Saturday, October 13. The Soviets had told us that you would agree. At that time, you held the entire East Bank of the Canal. At great cost, we convinced the Israelis to accept that ceasefire. The British reported to us that you rejected the plan. The British therefore refused to introduce the Security Council Resolution to this effect, and it was only after you refused to accept this plan and the Soviet airlift was in existence for four days we started our resupply effort—we had no other choice.

Fahmi: The British Ambassador Adams told us just the opposite. He said the United States was in constant touch with the Russians and for this reason, they decided not to go ahead.

Kissinger: We were told by the Russians that you would accept the ceasefire in-place. We then went to the Israelis. After 36 hours, we convinced the Israelis. This was the first time we went to the British to introduce the resolution on the assumption that the United States and USSR would abstain; that Egypt had accepted the ceasefire in-place; and therefore there would be a majority in the Council. At midnight the

UK said to us that they understood the Egyptians would accept this. I told the British to go back to Egypt again because the Russians said the Egyptians would accept the ceasefire in-place. The British said Sadat said he would not agree to a ceasefire in-place but only a ceasefire to the 67 lines. Obviously we couldn't get this. The UK then refused to introduce a resolution. This is the reason we are so angry and furious with the UK. They created the whole.

Fahmi: Why didn't you contact the Egyptians directly?

Kissinger: We were told by the Russians that Sadat would only accept it after the Security Council had voted on it and we had abstained with the Russians. If Ismail had not called for a ceasefire in-place, we would have done it ourselves. We tried to get the UK to do it. Why didn't you accept it?

Fahmi: I believe you, I believe you. UK heads told me differently. The Russians told Sadat that the Syrians wanted a ceasefire; Sadat contacted Asad; Asad said no, I didn't tell that to the Russians. Sadat could not accept the ceasefire while the Syrians were refusing. This is what happened. Okay, let us prepare together, a real basis for some achievement before you arrive in Cairo.

Kissinger: There is one problem however. You Arabs say to me—look at what I have been able to do in negotiations. Do it for us. You do not look at the four years it took me to prepare for the Vietnam peace settlement and the 2½ years for the China talks. My method is to make detailed preparation; get everything ready and in place, and then start to move. Let us now schedule how we can proceed from here. I am prepared to do it.

Fahmi: Agreed.

Kissinger: If you want me to be helpful, what good would it do if it goes the way it went in 1971? There is a great deal of pressure to overcome in this country and we must find a method.

Fahmi: There are problems for Sadat too. The Syrians will have no difficulty at the Presidential level. We accept the ceasefire. Referring to the fact that Dr. Kissinger had indicated that we had invited the Syrian Deputy Foreign Minister for a talk, if he will come _____, Fahmi recalled that lower levels in the Syrian Government had rebuked the ceasefire and attacked everybody. It was only after Sadat had contacted Asad that the Syrians had accepted the ceasefire. Fahmi obviously reflected reservations about our seeing the Syrian Deputy Foreign Minister since he was convinced that he would be negative. Fahmi went on to say that you have a secure basis in the Security Council Resolutions. Israel has to accept the Security Council decisions. These things cannot become a matter of bargaining. When the Israeli military representative met with the Egyptians, he told us he had no authority to negotiate on

the military parts of the ceasefire and on the return to the position of October 22. Instead, he proposed some new peace plan.

Kissinger: I do not want to advise you on this.

Fahmi: The Israeli representative was not authorized to talk about a ceasefire. If Sadat is to help the U.S., this Israeli basis has to be rejected. If Egypt implements fully the Security Council Resolution, then the Israelis cannot bargain. They cannot be in a bargaining process for the total settlement. Sadat cannot move. How can he move if they won't even exchange the wounded prisoners? You recalled how the Israelis bombed Suez City and there were at least 2,000 killed and wounded.

Kissinger: How shall we continue our talks?

Fahmi: But can we accept the ceasefire? Respect fully the ceasefire. Allow the UN forces to take their positions. There can be an exchange of the wounded. We are ready to exchange POWs. We are ready to exchange the wounded.

Kissinger: Ismail sent me a letter to this effect.[5]

I will tell you frankly what the Israelis say. We have told them we will not tolerate the destruction of the Third Army. This _____. The Israelis say that if the road is open Egypt will move in heavy equipment and threaten the Israeli army in position.

Fahmi: I give you assurances of President Sadat that there will be no military equipment moved in there by Egypt.

Kissinger: You agree not to send military equipment.

Fahmi: Agreed. They are resorting to delaying tactics. Our people won't surrender. All that we need is food and some water.

Kissinger: It is against the U.S. policy that Egypt should surrender.

Fahmi: They will not surrender. They can exist. They can fast for three or four days.

Kissinger: Nobody has intended that they surrender. Let me talk this situation over with President Nixon tomorrow. We cannot do anything on this tonight but maybe we can do something over the next couple of days. But there must not be any threats from other countries, your friends, while we are trying to do something.

Fahmi: Take the Egyptian position from me, not from others. I assure you that we agree that there will be more non-military equipment sent in on a permanent basis, I say this, on a permanent basis. The UN can supervise this.

Kissinger: This is a constructive proposal. You have told me something important.

---

[5] Ismail's letter has not been identified. Fahmi is referring to the Egyptian proposals concerning the POWs put forward at the second meeting at Kilometer 101; see Document 299.

Fahmi: We need 40 tons of food and only two tons have gone in after 40 hours. We can cut [*get*?] water from Israel too. We need another convoy.

Kissinger: I have to talk to the President. I will see if we can get one more convoy through. Tomorrow I hope to be in a position to talk more concretely.

Fahmi: I am not threatening you. I can't threaten you, but if Israel continues to take military measures than we must fight. I have been told this by our military commander. Get one more convoy through. We are ready to give A) the list of wounded to the Israelis in the next military meeting, B) to give the same list to the Red Cross, C) we are ready to negotiate regarding the exchange of wounded POW's, D) we are ready to give the list of POW's to the Red Cross, E) we have already permitted the Red Cross to visit the wounded POW's.

Kissinger: If we are going to get a solid cease-fire then there must be an immediate exchange of POW's. Soviets told us that they would do everything possible to bring about an immediate release of all the POW's. They agreed to do this on Sunday night in Moscow[6] when the original cease-fire was agreed between us. If Israel is to move to the October 22 positions there must be an immediate release of all the POW's. We got the Israelis to agree to the original cease-fire resolution on the basis of our assurances that we received in Moscow that there would be an immediate exchange of POW's. We told this to the Israelis. We were told this by the Russians. It is impossible to get an effective cease-fire unless there is an immediate exchange of POW's.

Fahmi: What we say here is different from what I know.

Kissinger: I cannot tell the Israelis, leave the POW's in Egypt. They will never agree to this. They will never agree to negotiate. We assured the Israelis there would be an immediate release of the POW's.

Fahmi: This is new—Brezhnev told you this? I must report this to President Sadat. He didn't give any such commitment.

Kissinger: I gave Israel this assurance. Ambassador Erian _____.

Fahmi: Scali expressed this in his speech in general terms.[7]

Kissinger: I know, we didn't want to put it more explicitly and have a public quarrel with the Russians.

Fahmi: We have a big headache in Cairo. The Russians brought in 50 personnel plus 20 interpreters. We have told the Russians we can't

---

[6] October 21. See Document 221.

[7] In his October 21 statement before the Security Council, Scali said that there should be an immediate exchange of prisoners of war. See *Yearbook of the United Nations, 1973,* pp. 196–197.

do anything about this. Ask Malik to talk to Waldheim about it. The Russians told us that the Americans were going to send observers and, therefore, the Russians were to participate.

Kissinger: This is not the case. Let us talk to each other. We received a Brezhnev message that they were sending 70 Soviets to Cairo and they said to us, now join us.[8] We never agreed to it. Our position is clear and we have told this to Waldheim. First, it is in nobody's interest for there to be representatives of the big powers. Secondly, there should be no group that is larger than the group that has the most in UNTSO now, namely the Swedes—32 is this figure. We prefer less. In any case, personnel would have to be under UNTSO, not special. We will not go beyond 32. We never agreed to join with the Soviets.[9]

Fahmi: In concluding, he stressed the importance of getting another convoy through.

---

[8] See footnote 2, Document 277.

[9] A handwritten notation in the margin by Springsteen reads: "HAK says that Fahmi promised to send home 38 of the Russians, leaving 32. GRS"

---

299. Memorandum for the Record by the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

Washington, October 29, 1973.

Minister Shalev gave me a report on the second meeting between the Israeli and Egyptian Generals (12 Noon Cairo time).

The Egyptians raised the matter of Israeli withdrawal to the 22 October lines;[2] the establishment of regular resupply convoys to the Third Army; and the acceleration of the unloading of the first convoy.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, June 4–October 31, 1973. No classification marking. A handwritten notation indicates that the memorandum was LDXed to Eagleburger at 5:52 p.m. on October 29.

[2] Telegram 1228 from Jerusalem, October 30, 1359Z, reported that General Siilasvuo met with Israeli Minister of Defense Dayan at 1:45 p.m. local time on October 30 in the King David Hotel in Jerusalem. On instructions from the UN Secretary General and in his capacity as Commander of the UN Emergency Force, Siilasvuo asked that the Israelis return to the positions occupied by them at 1650Z on October 22. Dayan's interim reply was "no," but he said he would consult the Prime Minister for an official answer. (Ibid., NSC Files, Box 610, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 12, March–October 1973)

The Israelis, in turn, raised the following:

(1) The question of regular resupply convoys and the lines of 22 October would have to be dealt with at a political level;[3]
(2) They agreed that five amphibious vehicles and 50 workers should be used to trans-ship the supplies across the Canal;
(3) An acceleration of the exchange of the wounded and of lists of POW's;
(4) Immediate visits by the ICRC to the wounded and the POW's;
(5) Develop a time-table for the exchange of the POW's.

The Egyptians handed over a list of 45 wounded prisoners and 6 dead and promised by tonight's meeting a positive reply on: (1) the readiness to return the wounded prisoners; (2) arrangements with the ICRC to visit the wounded with medical supplies; (3) the evacuation of seriously wounded prisoners, both in the Third Army and in Israeli hospitals. The Egyptians also promised a list of all POW's within three days, but stated they were not yet in a position to discuss a time-table for POW exchanges.

The atmosphere of the meeting was fairly good. The Egyptian General said he understood the delay in the convoy unloading and that they had no real complaints about it. There were no threats by the Egyptian side of renewed force. They did complain about the shooting down of helicopters which may have been evacuating the wounded.

Brent Scowcroft[4]

[3] In a telephone conversation between Kissinger and Dinitz, 12:45 pm., October 30, the Israeli Ambassador informed Kissinger that Meir agreed to permit another 20 to 30 trucks with general supplies to be added to the "one-time" convoy of 100 trucks to the Egyptian Third Army. (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, June 4–October 31, 1973)

[4] The original bears this typed signature.

300. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, October 30, 1973, 3:08 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Ismail Fahmi, Acting Egyptian Foreign Minister
Abdallah El-Erian, Egyptian Ambassador to France
Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Joseph J. Sisco, Asst. Secretary of State

After conferring privately, Secretary Kissinger and Foreign Minister Ismail Fahmi called in Ambassador Erian and Sisco and in their presence reviewed the situation along the following lines:

Kissinger: It is conceivable that we could put something along the following lines to the Israelis: That they would return to the positions of October 22; that there would be provision for only non-military cargos on the roads; that supervision would be accomplished by the UN; and that after withdrawal to the October 22 positions there would be an exchange of POWs and lifting of the blockade of the Red Sea. There is just a chance; it is conceivable.

Fahmi: I am talking about what we agreed on yesterday.[2] Anything we agree between us has to have the weight of the United States to guarantee its implementation, otherwise it is meaningless. What I need from you is a guarantee that there will be a permanent flow of provisions of non-military cargo to the Third Army and that there will be a 20-kilometer zone on the Suez road supervised by the UN. After that, Israel must go back to the October 22 positions in a short period. Once this is done, I guarantee that I will have authorization for the immediate exchange of all of the prisoners of war. As to Bab Al-Mandab, while we have some military units there, others are involved. The Russians have relations with the South Yemen and they are there. I could ask President Sadat to instruct our units to behave, as long as our forces are not provoked from the other side. If we can agree on this, then you should try to get the Israelis to agree.

Kissinger: This has to be checked out with the Israelis. With some screaming, it is conceivable we could get something like what we have been talking about.

Fahmi: I am prepared to convince President Sadat to agree to this proposal, because we have faith in you, Dr. Kissinger. We have confidence in you. There will be another military meeting in a few days. We

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 27 ARAB–ISR. Secret; Nodis. The meeting was held in the Secretary's office. Brackets are in the original.

[2] See Document 298.

have given a list of POWs to the Red Cross, and we have given the Red Cross an opportunity to visit the wounded. We agree to exchange of wounded, especially those from the Third Army.

Kissinger: What do you mean by permanent resupply of non-military cargos? You mean after the Israelis go back to the October 22 positions? It is inconceivable that we could get the Israelis to agree to a prohibition on mutual reinforcements. What is attainable, what is conceivable, is perhaps something along the lines we have talked about.

I want you to tell President Sadat that I will do my best to get something like this for you. I take no position. I would like his reaction to the exchange of POWs.

Fahmi: The question [of Bab Al-Mandab] is completely a military problem.

Kissinger: It is inconceivable that the ceasefire can only apply to the West Bank and not on sea. You cannot say that the ceasefire does not apply to the sea.

Fahmi: I have told you what I am ready to convey to President Sadat on this point.

Kissinger: We believe it is important that both the exchange of POWs and the blockade be included in the proposal. It is not conceivable that a military blockade can be maintained on the sea while the ceasefire applies on land to the other side. We have two choices before us: We can consider a specific proposition, or alternatively leave it to the parties to work out.

Fahmi: I can guarantee that under my proposal I can deliver the POWs.

Kissinger: What do you mean by permanent non-military cargos? Do you mean even after Israel has withdrawn to the October 22 lines?

Fahmi: Frankly, even if President Sadat was willing to accept this point, I do not believe it is in your interest to put us into an inferior position. The Israelis can resupply their forces in the West Bank whereas we cannot do the same for the Egyptian Third Army.

Kissinger: Our pressure will move Israel. Nothing else.

Fahmi: I want your guarantee.

Kissinger: I can give you no blank check. I have a strong conviction that we can bring about an agreement. I can make a strong recommendation to the President along the lines I have indicated.

Fahmi: But how about the point of putting us in a militarily inferior position?

Kissinger: My proposition calls for the UN supervising on a permanent basis non-military cargos from West to East.

Fahmi: What about the other side? It leaves Israel free to improve its position in weaponry. They are near Cairo. Also you want to unblock the Red Sea. Oil goes to Israel through the Red Sea and this gives Israel a military advantage. They will never listen to us.

Kissinger: They will listen to us. Israel needs us. It needs American supplies.

Fahmi: You are not free. You are under pressure at home. Any agreement should have to be sanctioned by the President. I recall that in 1971 Rogers had a proposal.[3] Israel then went to the Senate and Rogers had to drop his plan.

Kissinger: I can assure you that a proposal I am talking about will be greeted by screams from the Israelis. As to the POWs, the Russians assured us that they would press for an immediate release.

Fahmi: Even if President Sadat hypothetically accepted, it would be to your disadvantage. The Israelis won't move.

Kissinger: We are not proposing any military advantage. You know that if there is no settlement you will probably start another war.

Fahmi: I can get authorization to the exchange of POWs provided the Israelis return to the October 22 position and provided they agree to the permanent supply of non-military cargos to the Third Army. I can guarantee delivery on the part of President Sadat. He wants it done. Moveover, if we succeed in doing this we will resume relations with the US at the conclusion of your mission. President Sadat wants a first class ambassador to Cairo.

Kissinger: We will send an outstanding man to Cairo. I have to talk it over with the Israelis and the President. We will meet again.[4]

---

[3] See footnote 4, Document 7.

[4] Kissinger discussed his conversation with Fahmi in a meeting with Cromer on October 31. Kissinger stated that Fahmi "started with a proposition that sounded reasonably attainable—that if we could get the roads open, they would agree in perpetuity only non-military traffic could move through the UN checkpoints. So I thought only the questions of the blockade and POW's were left. On the POW's, we worked it out for an exchange once the ceasefires lines were established, and he said he would use his good offices on the blockade. It turned out he meant by 'in perpetuity' only the three to four days until the Israelis left the roads; then the roads were theirs! If we work out these three points, then we'll put pressure on the Israelis." (National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL UK–US)

301. Memorandum for the President's File by Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Camp David, October 30, 1973, 6 p.m.

SUBJECT

Meeting with Soviet Ambassador Anatoliy F. Dobrynin, on Tuesday, October 30, 1973, at 6:00 p.m., at Camp David

PARTICIPANTS

The President
Ambassador Dobrynin
Secretary of State Kissinger
General Alexander M. Haig, Jr.

Ambassador Dobrynin thanked the President for receiving him. This week, and today's meeting, the Ambassador said, were very important events in the U.S.–Soviet relations. The Soviet leaders valued the personal relationship with the President.

The Ambassador then read from General-Secretary Brezhnev's letter to the President of October 28, [Tab A][2] which spoke of a "crisis of confidence" in U.S.–Soviet relations produced by Israeli deceit. We should not have a confrontation, the Ambassador declared. It was with a certain amount of sadness that he had to note that relations had reached this point. It took a very difficult decision on the part of Brezhnev to preserve our good relations with each other. We now had a good chance to find the conditions for final resolution of the problem.

The President asked if the Soviets had leaked to John Scali. Ambassador Dobrynin went through the history of the Security Council deliberations which produced the ceasefire resolutions, and then retraced the history of the ceasefire itself. He complained about the press stories about alleged Soviet misbehavior. What kind of a relationship is this, he asked, if one letter produces an alert?[3]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 69, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 20, [October 12–November 21, 1973]. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only.

[2] Attached, but not printed. Brackets in the original. Nixon had originally wanted to meet with Dobrynin on October 29. However, Kissinger informed Nixon during a 3 p.m. telephone conversation on October 29, after a "long session" with Dobrynin, that October 30 would be a better day to meet. "First," Kissinger explained, "we will then know what happened at the meeting of the Egyptians and Israelis. . . . We are concerned with the cease fire and that we will know tomorrow after the second meeting is finished. If your schedule permitted, I think it would be a very good idea." (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

[3] Dobrynin is referring to Brezhnev's October 24 message, Document 267.

Ambassador Dobrynin then discussed what was to be done. One of the first things to be done was to carry out the joint resolutions worked out between us. Then we should each send a senior representative to Cairo to supervise the progress of implementation. Then there should be an end to airlift of military supply, and then a start of political negotiations.

The President replied that he still looked for a better future in U.S.–Soviet relations. He hoped détente would soon be put back on track. He appreciated Ambassador Dobrynin's discussion. Events had not changed the President's view as to the vital role of détente in the world. He cited the indispensable role that our two countries would play in getting a settlement in the Middle East. The key was how we could get both of our recalcitrant friends lined up. Despite the difficulties of the past two weeks, these events gave us the best chance in a long time to settle the problem. We had resisted enormous heat in this country, during five days of a substantial Soviet airlift into Syria and Egypt. Only when we could not get Soviet cooperation to stop it did we start our own airlift.

We must avoid situations where we confront each other, the President pointed out. General Secretary Brezhnev and he must have an overriding concern with avoiding confrontation.

We want to work with the Soviet Union all along the line, the President continued. The principle of détente will not be destroyed. We should hammer out areas where we can work together and demonstrate how it can work concretely. Our new relationship had helped enormously in the present crisis. What we need now is a demonstration that our relationship is durable and we can accomplish positive things together.[4]

[4] Dobrynin recounted the meeting with Nixon in his memoirs. He said that Nixon spoke in a "conciliatory and even apologetic manner, stressing his intention to continue his policy of improving Soviet–American relations." Dobrynin also wrote that Nixon saw the previous week as "just an unpleasant episode in our relations" and asked the Soviet Ambassador to inform Brezhnev personally that he [Nixon] "would not permit the Israelis to crush the encircled Egyptian Third Army Corps." Nixon concluded, according to Dobrynin: "Please inform the general secretary . . . that as long as I live and hold the office of president I will never allow a real confrontation with the Soviet Union." (*In Confidence*, pp. 304–305)

302. Briefing Paper for President Nixon[1]

Washington, undated.

MEETING WITH ISMAIL FAHMI, SPECIAL EGYPTIAN EMISSARY
Wednesday, October 31, 1973
3:00 p.m. (45 minutes)
The Oval Office

From: Henry A. Kissinger

I. Purpose

To summarize our effort to consolidate the Middle East ceasefire and to persuade Egypt to have confidence in US determination to engage actively in Mid-East peace negotiations and to enter those negotiations without preconditions.

II. Background, Participants, Press Plan

A. *Background*: President Sadat sent Fahmi to Washington for an exchange of views on consolidating the Egyptian-Israeli ceasefire and on peace negotiations in order to prepare the way for my talks in Cairo November 6. Fahmi is normally Minister of Tourism but has been Acting Foreign Minister while Foreign Minister Zayyat was at the UN during the war.

Most of my talks with Fahmi have concentrated on a package to consolidate the ceasefire. It would be useful for you to summarize this, and it is detailed in your talking points below. We put this proposal to the Israelis so that Mrs. Meir would have it before her departure.

Beyond summarizing the ceasefire package, I would suggest that you focus on what the US can and cannot do in the peace negotiations.

The problem we face with the Egyptians is the familiar one of persuading them to negotiate seriously on the terms of a peace agreement without insisting that we deliver in advance of negotiations the total Egyptian package.

On the other side, a principal Israeli request is to give them a chance to negotiate some of the terms themselves. When you talk with

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 610, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 12, March–October 1973. Secret; Nodis. The paper is attached to an October 30 transmittal memorandum from Saunders to Scowcroft that reads: "This afternoon before coming back to my office I talked with Secretary Kissinger about his talks with Fahmi today and asked him what he wanted the President to do tomorrow. The attached talker is based on that conversation. Recommendation: That you send the attached to the President tonight."

Mrs. Meir, you will want to be in a position to say that we have done nothing to foreclose that opportunity even though we cannot be optimistic that peace can be achieved if they maintain that position.

Given these two positions, it is likely that the peace negotiations will deadlock very quickly. Our strategy will be to try to segment the negotiations so attention can be focussed in the early stages on a first step that—difficult as it may be—might realistically be taken in the next few weeks while terms of a final settlement are still being negotiated.

If we are to succeed in this course, we will have to develop Egyptian confidence without going into too much detail.

One other issue is our desire to have Sadat, once the ceasefire is consolidated, urge Faisal to relax the oil boycott when negotiations begin.

B. *Participants:* Egyptian Emissary Ismail Fahmi accompanied perhaps by Ambassador Abdallah El Erian (Egyptian ambassador to Paris) and Ahmed Khalil, head of the Egyptian Interests Section in Washington. I will sit in on the US side.

C. *Press Plan:* Press photo opportunity at the beginning. Press Secretary to brief in very general terms.

III. Talking Points

A. I understand you (Fahmi) and Secretary Kissinger are working on a proposal for consolidating the ceasefire. As I understand it the main points are:

—The UN would assure that only non-military shipments reach the Egyptian Third Army when Israeli troops pull back.
—Israeli troops would move back to the October 22 ceasefire line. Prisoners of war would be released immediately.
—The Egyptian naval blockade at the mouth of the Red Sea would be raised.

B. It is important to consolidate the ceasefire, but it will be even more important to establish momentum in the peace negotiations.

C. The US will support those negotiations actively. I want you to understand what we can and cannot do.

—We can help devise a negotiating process that has at least a reasonable chance of succeeding. This may require that the negotiations be broken down into manageable units and steps. Patience will be required.
—We will use our influence with Israel. The convening of a peace conference will provide a framework. But we will need realistic proposals that have some chance of being agreed.
—In short, we have promised to engage in a process with good faith. We want the closest possible cooperation with Egypt.

D. Egypt has an interest in urging the oil producers to relax their boycott. The US will find it difficult to sustain the kind of role that will be required under threat of prolonged boycott.

---

303. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, October 31, 1973, 1 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Ismail Fahmi, Egyptian Foreign Minister
Abdullah al-Erian, Egyptian Ambassador to France
William B. Quandt, NSC Staff

F.M. Fahmi: We were planning on meeting at two o'clock.

Sec. Kissinger: That's right. Then you'll see the President at three.

F.M. Fahmi: I have an urgent message from President Sadat that I thought you should see before I meet with the President.

Sec. Kissinger: Thank you. [See attached text of President Sadat's message.]

F.M. Fahmi: Let me explain that when we talk of participation by the parties we mean Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Israel and also Lebanon and the Palestinians.

Sec. Kissinger: Why Lebanon?

F.M. Fahmi: This has to do with a final settlement. Lebanon still has armistice lines with Israel. They should be included.[2]

Sec. Kissinger: This is a comprehensive settlement plan that you propose.

F.M. Fahmi: Yes, but it doesn't include all details. For example, it doesn't say anything about UN forces at Sharm al-Shaykh, or about Gaza, or about demilitarized zones. This is just a basic framework.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive. Drafted by Quandt. The meeting took place in Kissinger's White House Office. Brackets are in the original.

[2] In telegram 12587 from Beirut, October 30, Buffum reported that Lebanese President Frangieh told him that the United States had about 2 months to make a breakthrough toward a peace settlement before there was a fully united Arab stand against U.S. economic interests. Frangieh also said that a small UN peacekeeping force should be stationed in southern Lebanon and that the Government of Lebanon wanted to participate in an early stage of the peace negotiations. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

Sec. Kissinger: I assume you don't need any immediate reaction. The problems of the October 22 line seem most urgent. This is a complex proposal.

F.M. Fahmi: The agreement on the October 22 lines can be implemented.

Sec. Kissinger: I told you what I thought we could get from the Israelis. But we can't get an unlimited resupply of the Third Army.

F.M. Fahmi: I am not talking of unlimited resupply. I am talking of non-military resupply under the UN forces.

Sec. Kissinger: But only if Israel withdraws to the October 22 line.

F.M. Fahmi: That's right. The October 22 lines are also linked with the prisoner of war exchange.

Sec. Kissinger: On the broader proposals you have here, there are two ways of doing this. One is that we consider this as a package.

F.M. Fahmi: This is just the sequence of things.

Sec. Kissinger: I understand that. There are two possible approaches. One, we can work now immediately on the ceasefire lines, or we can deal with everything in a package.

F.M. Fahmi: This isn't a package. This is just the sequence of events.

Sec. Kissinger: The big problem is that if we recommend to Israel to return to the October 22 lines, we can only do this if you agree to non-military resupply of the Third Army.

F.M. Fahmi: I agree to that, on a permanent basis, even after they return. I know what I am saying. But I want you to understand that it is not in the interest of the United States to tip the military balance in their favor.

Sec. Kissinger: We will oppose any Israeli offensive from the West Bank salient, no matter what the circumstances. We will do this before and after any outbreaks of fighting.

F.M. Fahmi: Can you guarantee that they will not budge from the October 22 lines?

Sec. Kissinger: You won't mind if they move back from those lines, will you? We will assure you that they will not move in an offensive against you from those lines.

F.M. Fahmi: Then the United States assures us that Israel will stay within the October 22 lines?

Sec. Kissinger: That's okay. The document you have given us has some possibilities for progress in it. We will have Prime Minister Meir here tomorrow. I will see her in the morning for breakfast, and the President will see her at noon. We can talk to her. But let's understand how we can proceed. We will say that Egypt agrees on a permanent basis

that only non-military supplies will reach the Third Army under UN observation, once Israel has returned to the October 22 lines. Second, you agree that Israel and Egypt will exchange prisoners once Israel is at the October 22 lines. Third, we will give private assurances to Egypt that Israel will not launch any offensive beyond the October 22 lines if these arrangements are accepted.

F.M. Fahmi: You can't let the Israelis use ceasefire violations as an excuse to attack. There's a danger that they will create incidents in certain areas. The observers will not know of this unless we react, and if we react we will then be blamed for violating the ceasefire.

Sec. Kissinger: Mr. Foreign Minister, can you get the Soviets off my back? They are bringing me new schemes every day. They now say that both we and they have to send senior representatives to Cairo.

F.M. Fahmi: We have had some problems in communication.

Sec. Kissinger: We'll deal with this issue next Tuesday[3] when I am in Cairo.

F.M. Fahmi: Prior to diplomatic relations, we want a senior representative in Cairo.

Sec. Kissinger: We will send one as soon after Tuesday as is possible. This has nothing to do then with the Soviet requests? They are always bringing me messages from Sadat. You can come directly to me.

F.M. Fahmi: The Soviets are not speaking on Sadat's behalf. I am the Foreign Minister.

Sec. Kissinger: We'll send a senior representative right after my visit. He will stay there until we name an ambassador.

F.M. Fahmi: We want a senior man in a proper sense, because he may have to deal with the President directly.

Sec. Kissinger: Okay. We'll send a senior man.

F.M. Fahmi: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Sec. Kissinger: [*less than 1 line not declassified*] But I can tell you that by the end of next week we will have a senior man in Cairo. Now, I've got to go. I have people waiting. Come back at 2:30 and we can talk for fifteen minutes or so before you see the President.[4] Then we will want to talk about my trip.

F.M. Fahmi: I'll be here tomorrow if you want to talk then.

W.B.Q.

---

[3] November 6.

[4] The President met with Fahmi and Kissinger from 3:27 to 4:15 p.m. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Central Files, President's Daily Diary)

Attachment[5]

October 31, 1973.

PRESIDENT SADAT'S PROPOSAL FOR A SETTLEMENT

I. The most immediate steps which would be conducive to strengthening the ceasefire phase and the conduct of peace negotiations consist of:

1. Observation of the ceasefire.
2. Stationing of UN forces in necessary and appropriate points.
3. Return of Israeli forces to the positions of October 22.

The aforementioned steps were specifically ordered by the Security Council and need not be the subject of any delay or contact between the parties.

II. When Israeli forces return to the October 22, 1973, position, an exchange of all prisoners of war will take place.

III. Israeli forces are then to withdraw to a line inside Sinai to be agreed upon by the military. This line should lie as a matter of principle to the east of the passes.

IV. In order that the disengagement be effective, a zone as wide as possible should separate the forces of the two sides. UN forces will be stationed in such a zone, which to the west will have Egyptian forces in their present position.

V. As soon as all Israeli forces proceed eastward to the disengagement zone, the freedom of navigation in the Red Sea will be effected. [In other words, the blockade of Bab al-Mandab will be lifted.]

VI. When Israeli forces reach the disengagement zone and UN forces are stationed therein, the operation of clearing the Suez Canal would begin.

VII. The disengagement stage is to be followed by another single stage, namely, the withdrawal to the international frontier. The time limit for such withdrawal is to be set up.

VIII. When UN forces reach the international frontier, the state of belligerency terminates.

IX. In the course of preparation of the disengagement phase concerning Egypt and Israel, a parallel phase is to be set up for Syria.

X. At the same time as the disengagement zone is set up separating forces east of the passes, a peace conference under UN auspices is con-

---

[5] A handwritten notation at the top of the page reads: "Oral note delivered to Secy Kissinger by F.M. Fahmi, 1:02 p.m., Wed., 10/31/73."

vened with participation of all parties, including the Palestinians. The big powers should participate in the peace conference as well.

---

304. Memorandum From Secretary of Defense Schlesinger to President Nixon[1]

Washington, November 1, 1973.

SUBJECT

Impact of the Mideast War

(TS) This memorandum provides my initial reaction to the recent Mideast crisis and to the transfer of military equipment to Israel. I take great pride in your satisfaction with the Defense Department's performance during this crisis. I am concerned, however, by the degradation of our conventional deterrent due to the loss of critical materiel (which aggravated existing shortages), the wear on our supply system and the reluctance of our allies to minimize the cost of our airlift. It is extremely important, in my view, that the critical items sent to Israel from our assets be replaced as rapidly as possible and that the readiness of our general purpose forces be improved beyond that extant on October 6.

(TS) A wide range of military equipment, in addition to that programmed prior to the outbreak of hostilities, has now been approved for delivery. Our cost estimates are admittedly rough and still being refined, but it is clear that it will cost us over $825 million to replace all the materiel sent to date, and over $2.2 billion if we send everything the Israelis have requested. We anticipate being reimbursed for these deliveries in some form. But reimbursements will not cover the full replacement costs, and in the interim we face a significant financial deficit.

(TS) Of more importance, however, is the burden these transfers place upon the readiness margin on which the credibility of our conventional deterrent rests. In several cases the requirement to resupply Israel necessitated drawing assets from our active forces and reduced our own military readiness to a significant degree. Among the transfers having the greatest impact on our readiness have been:

—The transfer of 34 F4E aircraft. This brought Air Force assets to about six squadrons below authorized strength. Twenty of the F4Es

---

[1] Source: Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, James Schlesinger Papers, Box 14, Middle East. Top Secret.

provided were the latest series, the only type capable of delivering the Maverick missile. Their transfer reduced our total inventory of this type aircraft to 48.

—The transfer of 172 M60 tanks. The drawdown from our war reserve and prepositioned stocks in Europe, in conjunction with prior shortages, reduces our ability to mobilize by over 7 armored battalions. If we transfer the 1000 tanks Israel has requested, it could take 33 months to restore our inventory of October 6.

—The transfer of 105mm armor piercing discarding sabot tank gun ammunition. This reduces our war reserve for Europe by 16% and cuts into our training capabilities. It will take approximately 10 months to replace these; about 30 months if the entire Israeli request is met.

—The transfer of 81 TOW launchers. This reduces our antitank combat capability in Europe by the equivalent of 3 battalions, depletes our stocks in the United States and reduces our training base by 44%. It could take about 5 months to restore our October 6 stockage. If the Israeli request of 320 launchers were met, it would take 7 months to restore our prewar inventory.

—The transfer of 400 Maverick missiles. This reduces our total inventory by 49%; they can be replaced in 3 months. Israeli requests for 800 missiles could be replaced in 6 months.

—The transfer of 8 CH53 helicopters from the Marine Corps. This reduces the effectiveness of one of their 6 operational squadrons by about half. Replacement will take 11 months. It would take 33 months to replace the complete Israeli requests of 25 helicopters.

—The transfer of 46 A4 aircraft. This reduced our naval inventory of this aircraft by 17% and will degrade our training. Replacement will take 30 months. The total Israeli request of 53 A4s could be replaced in approximately 48 months.

(TS) We have consciously and systematically sought to minimize the impact on our military posture. Actions are being taken to accelerate the production of selected items, such as the TOW, and to reopen closed production lines for critical items of equipment. And, as the attached table indicates,[2] we still possess a very potent overall military capability and much of our military inventory will remain intact.

(TS) Still, many of the transfers are significant in terms of those special items which we depend upon to give us the military edge over Soviet forces. This is particularly the case if all Israeli requests are met as well as those of our other allies—requests which may proliferate as a result of satisfying Israeli desires.

---

[2] Attached, but not printed.

(TS) Should our readiness be eroded further by the necessity to transfer additional materiel to Indochina because of a new military offensive by the North Vietnamese, coming as it may before the gaps caused by the Mideast crisis have been filled, our conventional deterrent could well be significantly degraded. Because of my concern that any decline in our military posture would be detrimental at this juncture—on the eve of our MBFR proposals and amid hints that another crisis may be brewing—I am preparing and will forward to you a detailed proposal for a supplemental appropriation to bring our military readiness to the necessary level as soon as possible.

(TS) The response of our European allies to our request for overflight and basing rights was a disappointment. This refusal to cooperate imposed limitations on our airlift which were manifested in reduced responsiveness and lift capability. This was particularly frustrating when compared with Soviet overflights in the region. We will have to review the adequacy of our strategic airlift posture in view of this lack of allied cooperation.

(TS) Finally, I believe the crisis has underlined the necessity for the United States to move with great dispatch toward the diminution of our dependency on oil from the Mideast. Events have made it clear that our ability to respond effectively to such crises is sensitive to temporary disruptions because of fuel shortages.

(U) These represent my initial reactions on this matter and I will report further as our view of the total impact improves.

J.R. Schlesinger

305. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, November 1, 1973, 8:10–10:25 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Prime Minister Golda Meir of Israel
Ambassador Simcha Dinitz
Mordechai Gazit, Director of Prime Minister's Office
Minister Mordechai Shalev
General Aharon Yariv, Former Director of Military Intelligence
General Yisrael Leor, Special Assistant to the Prime Minister
Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff

Kissinger: Will you be staying until Saturday?[2]

PM Meir: Until Saturday night. Because we can't come into Israel on Saturday.

Kissinger: Of course.

PM Meir: Please eat.

Kissinger: Will you stay in Washington?

PM Meir: Yes. I am afraid to go to New York, because there will be bond meetings, UJA meetings, all the time.

Kissinger: You met with the Egyptians, General?[3]

Yariv: Yes.

PM Meir: He started direct negotiations. Without auspices.

Yariv: They were in the presence of two UN officers. Then they stepped aside and we started direct negotiations.

Kissinger: Are these talks going on now?

PM Meir: Yes. I just had a call from Allon. They're dealing now with the wounded.

Yariv: The exchange of wounded prisoners.

PM Meir: Do you want to begin?

Kissinger: It is up to you.

PM Meir: I'm sure you understand if I ask to come here now, and I left home now, it's because things have reached the stage where, beyond the issues of substance, things must be made clear.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL ISR–US. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting was held at Blair House. Brackets are in the original. Saunders prepared a briefing memorandum, October 31, for Kissinger for this meeting with Meir. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 611, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 13, Nov. 73–Dec. 73)

[2] November 3.

[3] At the Kilometer 101 meetings.

Kissinger: I agree. It was a good thing you came here.

PM Meir: We can take stands for or against, but we can't do it piecemeal.

We need to know the plans that are being discussed. We need to know, do we get things after they're done? After it is worked out by other parties?

The horror of the last week was too much. Maybe we need people with stronger nerves.

Kissinger: Which week? After the war?

PM Meir: Yes. After the war. The war was enough, but that we can take. If we live one hundred years, it will be impossible to tell all the impossible acts of heroism of our youngsters. But what we can't take is being told at late hours, "You have to do this. Take your choice."

Maybe Israel has to do everything Egypt wants. But we have to know what is being planned between the parties. Are there plans for the negotiations? We're responsible to our people.

We have had wars before. But this is the first time we've had demonstrations. I had to meet with the wives and parents of our prisoners of war.

What is in jeopardy now is the greatest thing we have, the confidence of our people in us. We promise to them, and we find twenty-four hours later we can't deliver.

Kissinger: Well, I appreciate . . .

PM Meir: We can take the worst, without any trimmings. You people decide.

Kissinger: I appreciate . . . I must say I'm outraged at the stories in Israeli newspapers. I read in Kraft again that we and the Russians agreed on things that I didn't tell you when I was in Tel Aviv, and that you came here to find out from the President the things I didn't tell you.[4]

Yariv: That's pure guesswork on their part.

Kissinger: After what was done here, it's unbelievable. So as far as I'm concerned, after my trip I'm going to dissociate myself and have someone appointed to handle it.

PM Meir: We have as much control over our press as you have over yours.

---

[4] Syndicated columnist Joseph Kraft wrote on October 30 that Kissinger failed to consult "with the Israelis on the content of the [cease-fire] agreement while it was being drawn up. Though satisfied with the terms, the Israelis were puzzled as to why they hadn't been given an advance text." (*The Washington Post*, October 30, 1973, p. A15)

Kissinger: I've told you for months what the psychological climate is here. It is now fed by our allies and it is supported by every single official in the Government. What I've tried to explain to you is that the war has liberated all these tendencies. Regardless of the outcome. It is not your leadership that is the problem. No one else could have done what you did.

There are no understandings with the Soviet Union. In fact, the Soviet Union has said directly to the President I undermined everything that was agreed.

And it seemed plausible to him.

There are two questions: Was there a secret deal? The answer is no. You know everything. I told you everything. Within six hours you heard it. You saw the understanding on joint auspices.

When I went to Moscow, the purpose was to get you forty-eight more hours. I thought they were going to the Security Council that night. How could we have voted against a ceasefire Saturday night?[5]

I asked for battle reports. You gave me good military reports but you didn't tell me what you intended. I had no reason to think twelve more hours, twenty-four more hours, were decisive. I didn't know whether you were heading north or south. It makes no difference now. In ignorance of what your strategic plans were, with them having a unilateral capability to bring about a ceasefire anyway, we made a ceasefire agreement, with direct negotiations which was always your position.

Then you took the Third Army after the ceasefire, which was not expected. Even when you spoke to me, you were talking about Port Fuad. Had I known about it, I would have done different things in Moscow, like delaying submission of the resolution.

Maybe you don't believe our communications broke down. But it's true. We use our airplane for communications so the State Department wouldn't see what I was saying to the President. Maybe the Russians jammed it. Maybe it was atmospherics. We'll never know. Every frequency broke down. It has never happened before. And I didn't know it at the time, for four hours.

We were out of communication for four to five hours. So we finally went back to State communications.

At that time I didn't believe the Russians would jam it because I didn't see any Russian interest in doing it. But maybe they wanted to delay our communication with you. I have used this communication system every trip to Peking and every trip to Moscow.

---

[5] October 20.

There is no understanding with the Russians, except on joint auspices.

In terms of strategy, it is obvious what they are trying to do. To force us step-by-step into a showdown situation. If you think you're in a bad situation, try a situation where every communication gets through to the President from the Russians and Egyptians. There are daily messages from our allies, which I have held up up to now.

This is where we are. We can try to work out a common strategy in this framework.

It is an unusual situation where an army is trapped after the ceasefire went into effect. There would be no problem with us about the Third Army if you had done it before the ceasefire.

PM Meir: Why believe the Egyptians? Why is it that everything we say isn't believed? It is an impossible situation.

Kissinger: It may be, but it's the situation.

PM Meir: I don't have to take that. Whatever Sadat says is the Bible?

Kissinger: Not what Sadat says.

PM Meir: Did you get a history of that Saturday[6] of the convoy?

Kissinger: We've not given you any trouble with that convoy. There were many proposals to have an American airlift to the convoy. There were many appeals direct to the President for that.

Meir: The Egyptians only took twenty trucks through.

Kissinger: That is not an issue now. I don't think anyone has criticized the recent handling of the convoy.

PM Meir: On Saturday, they were waiting at another place. Why can't we be believed?

Kissinger: It was a minor problem.

Dinitz: At that time it was a major problem.

Kissinger: It would have been if it had escalated to the next higher level. The majority of our Government wanted, that Saturday, to start an airlift.

Yariv: Technically it would have been very difficult. It is irrelevant now.

PM Meir: Who knows where the line was?

Kissinger: That's what I have been telling you. I certainly don't know.

---

[6] October 27.

PM Meir: Yesterday we got a note from the UN man.[7]

Dinitz: Siilasvuo!

PM Meir: He wants an answer by noon whether we're prepared to move to the October 22 line. Who knows where the line is? There is no reason to accept what the Russians and Egyptians say. In Moscow you said you didn't know.

If the Egyptians close the road, it's part of the ceasefire.

Kissinger: I agree. I've told the Egyptian Foreign Minister every time that they have to lift the blockade, whatever happens.

PM Meir: They link it with the wounded. They started shooting at the point where the convoy was.

Kissinger: These are all details now, not relevant to the basic problem, which has two parts: The ceasefire, what happens to it. The second is the long-term strategy.

The history of last week—what you received was the absolute minimum given the situation in this Government and the pressures in this Government. It was the absolute minimum. If you don't believe me, we can test it, and you'll see.

After all, you're still in your positions, and there hasn't been a new Security Council resolution. So you have the basic bargaining cards. The basic situation here your Ambassador knows. And it's not the result of an agreement with the Russians. That's what I've prevented up to now.

At this point, there is no agreement with anybody, either the Egyptians or Russians.

PM Meir: As for the ceasefire, they can't push us back to a line which they don't even know.

Kissinger: I have been telling you. There are two possibilities. You can agree to know where it was—invent a line, and if they agree, go back to it. These are just the theoretical possibilities. In no event should military supply be permitted to reach the Third Army. You should tie it to a prisoner exchange and a lifting of the blockade.

The second possibility is that you agree to go back and agree to discuss where it is. You stay where you are until the line is agreed.

My judgment is that in either event, non-military convoys have to be let through. And you can insist on the prisoners and the lifting of the blockade.

---

[7] Not further identified. Siilasvuo met with Defense Minister Dayan on October 29 and 30 (see footnote 2, Document 299) to request that Israeli forces return to their October 22 positions. (*Yearbook of the United Nations, 1973*, p. 206) Presumably the note was sent pursuant to those meetings.

The difference is that in the former case the exchange of prisoners would be more rapidly done.

The Russians have been beating the President all week for a new resolution for a return to October 22 lines.

I have told the Egyptians to get the Russians off our back. I told them that I wanted an understanding from them that whatever the October 22 lines are, there have to be no military supplies, an exchange of prisoners, and an end to the blockade.

Three times they agreed to no military supply, then three times they've withdrawn it.

On the blockade, you saw the paper we gave you. We just received it. We have not discussed it. We have taken no position.

Yariv: The Fahmi paper?

Kissinger: Yes. [Tab A][8]

That's all we discussed, just the ceasefire.

We've never discussed the line, or where it is, just the question of military supplies.

So I'm quite sure we have a commitment from them, which I believe, that there will be no military supply to the Third Army. But it would require some package deal.

I told them they couldn't expect a decision until you consulted with your Cabinet. I told the President, too, that you couldn't make a decision now. So you have until Sunday. Monday I am leaving.[9] This tells you what time you have.

The Russians have now last night made a formal demand for helicopters to be used for non-military supplies to the Third Army.[10]

PM Meir: They have already tried to fly in. We knocked them down.

Kissinger: I told the Russians I don't want to get into these details. I told the Egyptians that any proposition we get through the Russians will be automatically rejected. They have to talk to us, not through Moscow.

Now the question is, how long can this game be played?

That is the situation.

You wonder what five hours takes with Fahmi. It takes five hours because you can talk for hours without saying anything.

---

[8] Attached, but not printed, is the paper Fahmi gave Kissinger on October 31; see Document 303.

[9] November 4.

[10] Dobrynin raised this during a 6:02 p.m. telephone conversation with Kissinger on October 31. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

But there has never been any discussion of that peace plan. There was only discussion of the ceasefire, the blockade, and the prisoners.

The difficulty is that when Dobrynin saw the President, the President practically committed himself to a return to the October 22 lines.[11] But I pulled it off. Dobrynin saw it. They're screaming at me for undermining it.

Dinitz: When you say the principle of non-military supplies, who supervises it?

Kissinger: UN observers.

Dinitz: UN.

Kissinger: I didn't want to negotiate this. They say UN observers should be on the roads. Then they said they should be on the bridges. They agreed it will be done under UN supervision.

PM Meir: According to our people, objectively speaking, the lines as they are held now are impossible. Even if both sides are willing to stop fighting. I don't think there have been fifteen hours with no shooting.

Yariv: Not ten.

PM Meir: There is shooting all the time. That's not a ceasefire. Bab El-Mandeb is certainly not a ceasefire. So the other side doesn't keep it. So we shoot back. When they send helicopters, we knock them down.

Kissinger: We didn't say anything about it.

PM Meir: The best way is what we proposed—separate the forces.

Kissinger: That is out of the question. The Shah wrote to the President a personal letter[12] saying that our proposal of a return to the status quo of October 8 was out of the question. He said we were proposing the overthrow of Sadat. The President won't accept it, as soon as he realizes.

The only thing conceivable is an exchange of the Third Army for the West Bank. But that you won't do. Leave the Second Army.

PM Meir: We didn't start the war, nor did we lose. Now we get these demands.

Kissinger: That's true.

PM Meir: You said in Tel Aviv you were horrified when you heard of the casualties. I can name twenty that we here all know. We are one family. We can't take all this and hand him a victory. What he wanted was clear. What Asad wanted was clear.

Kissinger: All this is true. But it doesn't change the situation.

---

[11] See Document 301.

[12] Not found.

PM Meir: Why should we accept it?

Kissinger: You are seeing the President at 12:00. I'm not your problem. What is it you want to get out of the President? It is impossible to get what you're talking about. If you want, I'll put Secretary Rush in charge and see if he filters your views to the President better.

It's a fact. It makes no difference whether it's just. I'm telling you the situation, which I've kept under control for five years and now is out of control.

There is no way for the U.S. to support an exchange of armies as you propose. You'll be visibly separated from us.

PM Meir: If there is no way to support that, then the next best is that both sides meticulously agree to hold to lines where they are now at.

Kissinger: That I agree with.

PM Meir: Siilasvuo said he needed an answer by noon. His spokesman in Cairo said no one knows where the October 22 line is. We need a lifting of the blockade, immediate exchange of prisoners, and non-military supplies. We would inspect it, and the UN too. Both of us.

You know, the first truck they brought was filled with filter cigarettes. That was for their officers. The second was filled with biscuits. And the third was jerry cans with water, but only one layer. That's how they operate. We're not responsible.

Kissinger: You're not.

PM Meir: They have to get off our back.

Kissinger: I have maneuvered for a week to avoid taking an American position on that.

PM Meir: What should we be doing? We really want your advice.

Kissinger: I'm not saying you are unreasonable. Tragic situations develop which no one can prevent. Every day we get a letter from Heath and a letter from Pompidou. You rely too much on the Jewish Senators.

Dinitz: We don't rely on them.

PM Meir: Who should we rely on?

Kissinger: They can't help you in this situation. The *Washington Post* wrote an editorial yesterday which drove the President crazy. For five years they attacked us for every ceasefire proposition on Vietnam, for every plane we sent to Cambodia—now they take the tough line on Israel. The President was infuriated. I tell you it's counterproductive. I don't say you did it.

Dinitz: The only editorial we influenced was the one that praised the President for a tough line.

Kissinger: I didn't even read it. I saw the President yesterday; he had read it and was livid. He wanted to cancel your visit. He said he wouldn't be pressured like this.

On the October 22 lines, all week long I've got out of a discussion on the lines. I did it by telling the Russians that we were talking to the Egyptians and telling the Egyptians to get the Russians off our backs.

We can get through until next Wednesday[13] when I am in Egypt, when something has to happen. If you could let a few more non-military convoys through. It's a time-wasting thing. It also gets the Russians off our back on the helicopters; we can say the helicopters are no longer necessary.

I understand the trucks don't get to the bank, the way they unload them. So what is the difference if you agree to let fifty more through?

If you agree to go back to the October 22 lines, and then discuss with the Egyptians where the line is.

Unfortunately the Russians photographed something.

PM Meir: Who knows when?

Kissinger: Yes. I can hold the line here. Well, the Department of Defense has photos, which I have kept from being distributed or published in intelligence reports. We photographed only twice. The twelth and the twenty-fifth. With the SR–71. I have to find whether they are guesses or real.

Yariv: If I may say, Mr. Secretary, if you're looking for strategy for the next two days . . .

Kissinger: Yes.

Yariv: We can divide the question of non-military supply from the question of the October 22 line. We can discuss the question of supplies with the exchange of prisoners, not with the line. In my talk with the Egyptian general he understood that the question of the October 22 line was impossible. It wouldn't get us out of it. The question of the line would be with the question of the disengagement of forces. It is shown he understood this because he came up with a plan.

Kissinger: The plan I gave you yesterday.

Yariv: He gave hints they were not so firm on that.

So why don't we work out the question of supplies together with the prisoners and Bab El-Mandeb?

Kissinger: Frankly, I don't think it will work.

Yariv: Can we juxtapose our plan and their plan to the level of discussion between you and us? We don't accept their plan. They don't accept ours.

---

[13] November 7.

PM Meir: It's ridiculous. They start a war and lose. And they want us to hand it to them.

Kissinger: It won't take much to get the U.S. Government to support a return to the '67 borders.

What you now need is time. The question is time.

You keep making reasonable arguments. I keep telling you what the facts are. This is the lousiest assignment I've had since I've been here.

The other night it was obvious to Dobrynin that the President agreed to the October 22 lines and that I stopped him. If they get an appointment with him while I am away, which is not excluded, he'll agree to the October 22 lines. The Russians have proposed senior U.S. and Soviet ceasefire observers. I have stopped that. But there is one other aspect I wanted your opinion on, that I'll discuss later.

We have good intelligence on what the British and French are saying, and they're worse than the Russians. And they are appealing to the President—on top of the Russians, on top of the Egyptians, on top of the oil people, and on top of the whole Government.

If I were playing your hand . . . My only problem is you are too honest. You are too uncomplicated.

PM Meir: Even when we're telling the truth, we're not believed.

Kissinger: It is not a question of being honest but of being more complex. You're too easy to isolate.

I don't think you can avoid accepting in principle the October 22 lines. Then wrap it into the first phase of the Egyptian plan, or another plan. The other possibility is to delay answering. On Wednesday in Cairo I can avoid accepting it there, and I can say I have to check with you.

You accept the principle of October 22 lines, which are to be established in the negotiations between Egypt and you. That will be hopelessly screwed up. In the meantime, non-military convoys can go on these disputed roads, under UN supervision. It is best if it is UN supervision alone, but if you insist . . . Then when this negotiation on the October 22nd lines is completed, then there will be an exchange of prisoners and a lifting of the blockade.

PM Meir: When it's over?

Kissinger: They won't exchange prisoners before then.

PM Meir: Then they won't have convoys. We have a democratic form of government. All we can do is resign. I won't do it. I won't go to my people and tell them I accept this plan.

Yariv: I was with the Prime Minister when she had to convince the military to accept the one convoy.

PM Meir: There is a break between us and our best men.

Kissinger: What's your plan?

Yariv: I think it's possible, if we're tough enough—with your help. When they say no, they're counting on your help.

PM Meir: Yes.

Yariv: If you permit an arrangement on non-military supply, this is coupled with the prisoners and Bab El-Mandeb, and with an agreement that the October 22 line will be discussed in the context of disengagement. I have the impression they might accept it, on the basis of my discussions with the Egyptian general.

PM Meir: I'm convinced the more they get, the more they want. Sadat knows he lost; now his people know.

Yariv is right. They know the Russians by themselves can't give it to them. Only with the Americans. So the key is the stand of the American Government.

Kissinger: I have told you what it is.

PM Meir: Either we give in to them or we fight.

Kissinger: They're not getting everything they want from the Americans. We're in a peculiar circumstance of a territorial occupation after the ceasefire, which puts the President in a peculiar situation. There is the possibility that if you let the roads open, you can trade it for the prisoners.

PM Meir: But the blockade is part of the ceasefire situation.

Kissinger: So is the October 22nd line.

Yariv: In the Ismail message number 9,[14] he asked for a complete ceasefire, by 1300 October 27.

Kissinger: What are you going to tell the President—who doesn't know all these details?

PM Meir: We're prepared to keep the ceasefire on our part; we are prepared to make an arrangement to make an absolute ceasefire, by our plan. But part of the ceasefire is the blockade, which should have been lifted immediately. If you had known of that, you would have spoken of it in Moscow, I am sure, as you raised the prisoners with them.

Kissinger: But neither are you and Ismail living up to the October 22 ceasefire.

PM Meir: They didn't stop shooting on October 22nd. What are we supposed to do?

Kissinger: That's irrelevant. It cuts against you too. If you could live with it on October 22, you can live with it now.

---

[14] Document 291.

PM Meir: Why should we live with it?

Kissinger: There is no sense in debating the issue of justice here. You're only three million. It is not the first time in the history of the Jews that unjust things have happened.

PM Meir: Yes.

Kissinger: I'm just telling you the facts of life. The President won't argue with you; he'll just do what he wants. He never argues with visitors.

Yariv: The road. What they're interested in is the road.

Kissinger: I agree. It is conceivable they would link the prisoners to the UN force on the road, and you can stay where you are.

PM Meir: Our forces stay but the UN checks.

Kissinger: That may be a possibility. Within that context, it would be more elegant if you also agreed in principle on the October 22 lines, subject to discussions on where they are, and then not agree on where the line is.

PM Meir: And the POWs?

Kissinger: In exchange for the road.

PM Meir: And Bab El-Mandeb?

Kissinger: Well . . .

What I need to gain until Wednesday is, first of all, to be able to say that something is moving by Wednesday. Just so I can say you have to go back to Israel to make a decision, but will let the convoys through in the interim. I've got to tell the President something that comes out of this meeting. Or else, my prediction is he'll move unilaterally.

PM Meir: The number of trucks is about 150 and they're moving. They are already moving plasma.

Kissinger: Yes. You've got to do one more thing until Wednesday.

PM Meir: Can I get up and say there will be no more movement of trucks until there is an exchange of prisoners—and then let a truck move with no prisoners? I can't do that.

There is no moving of even the wounded prisoners—except for a gift of one. But there'll be a vote of no confidence.

Kissinger: Then I don't know what to do.

Dinitz: Why can't the movement of trucks be linked to the prisoners?

Kissinger: I can tell Fahmi, "Here's the deal, can you accept?" He'll say yes or no. Then on Wednesday I'll have to spend it talking about a permanent settlement. It puts them in the driver's seat. If you want time until Wednesday, let the convoys through and I can spend the week working out the arrangements. He can claim a big victory getting the trucks. That's why I need til Wednesday.

You're saying that in order not to foreclose the situation you're letting some trucks through, until you make the decisions.

If I put the proposal to Fahmi today, and he doesn't accept, I'll be under pressure from the Russians.

Yariv: Can you stipulate that the trucks already on the road—100 to 150—that these will be let through? This will get to Tuesday.[15]

Kissinger: But I have the proposal from the Russians to fly in helicopters.

Dinitz: Do they have the right to do that?

Kissinger: [Laughing] Your Ambassador knows what the situation is. I can't persuade the people who want to fly American helicopters in that they can't let the UN helicopters in. Whether they have the right or not.

PM Meir: You said, we're only three million. Does this mean the Russians can bully us? Like the Czechs? You're the only one who can stop them. And I don't just mean by force.

Kissinger: We did it all week.

PM Meir: But the Congress . . .

Kissinger: The Congress doesn't want American troops in the Middle East. Hatfield submitted a resolution saying no American troops can be sent to the Middle East.[16] I argued against it in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The mere fact such a resolution was introduced is a handicap to our strategy.

Laird[17] comes back from the MidWest saying the only thing the people want is to keep out of the Middle East.

The newsmen here are saying we cooked it up for domestic reasons.

When the Soviets were on the verge of landing troops, the people here didn't want U.S. troops there. We would have landed troops in the Sinai if we had to, but could never do it again.

I'm telling you the situation. We have to devise a common strategy. We can delay things, we can wait for certain things to crystallize, we can wait for others to make mistakes. When the President is down to thirty percent, what difference is the Jewish vote?

PM Meir: It is not just the Jewish vote.

Kissinger: Anti-semitism is very popular in the United States.

PM Meir: Scheel said it was like 1938.

---

[15] November 6.

[16] Senator Mark O. Hatfield (D–Oregon). Kissinger is presumably referring to the War Powers Resolution, which was passed over the President's veto on November 7.

[17] Melvin R. Laird, former Secretary of Defense.

Kissinger: But where was he? Now that we canceled the Schlesinger trip, and publicly rebuked them—now they'll make a few noises, when it's safe.

We have very good intelligence on what the British and French say.

PM Meir: They say it publicly.

Kissinger: What they say privately is worse.

I must say the President doesn't know the details about access and the roads.

Yariv: The first business is to gain time.

Kissinger: Yes, and let someone show progress.

Yariv: With what is on the road, we can reach Monday and Tuesday. But the Prime Minister can't move even a one-time deal without the prisoners.

PM Meir: Not even the wounded.

Kissinger: Then we'll have the Russian helicopters.

PM Meir: You know the horror stories from Syria about our prisoners?

Kissinger: Yes. We're not talking about the truth.

I told your Ambassador I wouldn't have started with 100 trucks; I would have sold it four times in lots of 25. I was astonished at the number it turned out to be.

Meir: Where did the number come from?

Kissinger: Not from here.

Yariv: They brought them.

Kissinger: I thought you should propose twenty-five. I never proposed a number. When I talked with the North Vietnamese I made three proposals a week which were unacceptable but which looked forthcoming. It was for McGovern,[18] not for Hanoi.

It is irrelevant now.

I have two possibilities. I can propose to Fahmi today that UN forces will be on the roads, in return for an exchange of prisoners and an end to the blockade, and you're willing to discuss the October 22 lines. I would drop "in the context of disengagement". The danger is that if they don't accept, the Russians will come screaming back, and we'll have to come back to you before you are back in Israel. If they do accept, what do we talk about on Wednesday?

Let him have a big victory in letting some more supplies in.

---

[18] Senator George S. McGovern (D–South Dakota) was a critic of the Vietnam war.

Dinitz: If they want supplies, they have to have something with the prisoners—or else the Government can't do it.

Kissinger: How many have they?

Yariv: They have 45 wounded.

Meir: We have close to 7,000 in our hospitals.

Kissinger: Mostly Egyptians?

Meir: I'm speaking only of Egyptians.

Yariv: Plus a couple of hundred Syrians.

Meir: The Egyptians have about 400, including 45 wounded.

Kissinger: There is a chance that if I can push it to the point where he can't let me leave without accomplishing something we might get that. The UN on the road, and an exchange of prisoners and end to the blockade. You stay in your positions, but the UN—only the UN—checks the convoys.

Meir: On Mount Scopus, the UN checked with the Jordanians.

Yariv: The Jordanians checked, under UN supervision.

Meir: Non-military convoys being checked by the Israelis and the UN. But we're certainly not getting off the roads; they're in our lines.

Kissinger: They're in your lines, but I'm thinking of the psychology of it.

Meir: Bab El-Mandeb falls naturally in the ceasefire. I can't say until I get back.

Kissinger: What do we do until then?

Yariv: You tell them that the trucks are still going.

Kissinger: That's not enough. I have to have a position vis-à-vis the Russians and a position vis-à-vis the Egyptians. There is no way around it.

Meir: I'm prepared on my own—if I'm fired, I'm fired—if all the wounded are returned immediately, and the blockade is lifted, and a list of all the prisoners is handed over—if all this comes about in the next forty-eight hours, then we will put in a limited number of trucks of the convoy until all the prisoners are exchanged.

Gazit: There are still one hundred trucks left.

Meir: It's semantics.

Dinitz: By the time you get to Cairo we can add another twenty-five.

Meir: There are already one hundred. Sixty are unloaded.

Dinitz: If by Wednesday they are finished unloading the trucks that are on the way now, we will allow an extra day's unloading.

Meir: It must include what I said.

Dinitz: Yes, linked to those conditions.

Kissinger: You can't get Bab El-Mandeb on top of all that, just for one convoy. It is just as reasonable for you to go back to the October 22 lines. They can take the position that when you're back at the October 22 lines, they will lift the blockade.

Meir: The Shah will be up in arms. It's in his interest, too, to have the Red Sea open.

Gazit: It may sound naive, but it may be useful to emphasize the importance of the talks going on between the generals.

Kissinger: But if I emphasize it too much, the Egyptians will break them off.

I really must tell you you have no appreciation of the situation you face in this country. You may appreciate the battlefield situation.

Meir: Then if we appreciate the situation, we must accept everything the Egyptians put to us? It's only the beginning.

Kissinger: No. But you're right, it's only the beginning.

If you take the absolutist position you've taken with me, you'll be confronted sooner or later with an imposition. No one will admit it. I'll admit it.

What will we discuss with the President?

Meir: We'll discuss military supplies. The Syrians and Egyptians now have more than they had before.

Kissinger: I'm told we have thirteen ships being loaded now. Do you want more?

Meir: There are things we are worried about. They're moving the missiles back in. In 1970, we were told, "What do you want us to do?"

Kissinger: What will you tell the President?

Meir: Tell him either two things. Either there is a disengagement of forces—I don't think it's humiliating to Egypt—or we'll discuss how to meticulously keep the ceasefire.

Kissinger: If you force him into an absolute decision, to go back or not to go back, I tell you . . .

Meir: We're prepared to discuss an absolute ceasefire.

Kissinger: We need a buffer. How will we object to another ceasefire resolution?

Yariv: The Egyptian General said they'd consider disengagement.

Kissinger: You're seeing the President in two hours, and I have to go back. We have not even discussed the peace negotiations.

Meir: That we don't know anything about.

Kissinger: We don't know anything about it either.

Meir: We're prepared to discuss.

Kissinger: With whom? When?

Meir: Anytime. The paper Fahmi gave you is fine—back to the 1967 borders, then we deal with the Palestinians!

What's happening with the Syrians?

Kissinger: Their Deputy Foreign Minister wants to come down. I haven't scheduled him yet.

Meir: Our prisoners are, every one, in danger of their lives. They are in danger of being maimed or killed.

Kissinger: The Syrians are committed to a ceasefire.

Meir: I know they have the Russians backing them in every position. It is assumed that because they are as they are, they can get away with anything.

Kissinger: I've told you the positions are unequal. There are more pressures on you than on them.

Yariv: Can we go back to what we do until Wednesday?

Kissinger: I've told you. If it takes to Sunday or Monday[19] to unload the present one hundred trucks, and you can let another fifty trucks through, it will get the Russians off our back.

Meir: What will we get? The wounded immediately, a list of all of them, and Bab El-Mandeb.

Kissinger: Bab El-Mandeb they won't agree to. My guess is they'll insist on a return to the October 22 lines, and all hell will break loose in the UN next week.

Meir: We can say the October 22 lines, and not one truck. They can't have it both ways.

Kissinger: I've told Fahmi we'll support the October 22 lines in the UN if they discuss it. If we can get that deal, and on top of it you say you're willing to discuss the October 22 lines, you can still discuss it for six months, and by then there will be the POW exchange.

You had better tell the President that I made a proposition to you, that it's very painful for you to accept and you'll probably be overthrown but you'll present it to the Government. Then Monday tell me I can do it.

Meir: Of all the countries in the world, no one put up such a bitter struggle for prisoners as you. For every family, it's the same, but there is really no comparison. A family in Los Angeles doesn't share it with a family in Brooklyn the way all the families do in Israel.

Kissinger: But I don't know what to do.

Meir: I faced a woman the other day. She had lived through Hitler and came here with one son. She is dying of cancer. He wasn't even fighting.

---

[19] November 4 or 5.

Dinitz: He was on the UN observer force.

Meir: What can I say to her? She appeals to me, "Release my son." As if I can do it.

Kissinger: That's a good argument to use with the President. Raise that.

You can tell the President you won't accept the October 22 lines. How can you explain why you could accept it on October 22 but not now?

Meir: Why not a disengagement of forces?

Kissinger: You can raise anything you want with the Egyptians. But not in the proposition.

It would be better if I spring it on Sadat than if I give it to Fahmi and then they're waiting for me there.

I've already told them you don't have the authority to make a decision—because you have a Cabinet of twenty-five, of whom eight want your job.

Yariv: Eight is a small number, Mr. Secretary!

Kissinger: Let me say to them that once the present trucks are through, you'll let more through. You don't have to give numbers.

Dinitz: It has to be with prisoners.

Yariv: I understand your point—a one-time shot of additional lorries.

Kissinger: You don't have to say a one-time shot. By then I'll be in Morocco.

Kissinger: The UN controls military supplies, plus prisoners, plus lifting the blockade and you'll discuss the October 22 lines. It grants the principle of the October 22 lines but I assume they'll not quickly agree where they are.

Dinitz: The UN and we to check. How can we rely on every UN observer?

Meir: We had the experience of nineteen years on Mt. Scopus where the Jordanians went through the trucks, with the UN looking on. Now we say, "Alright, together with the UN." Supposing it's a Yugoslav, or an Indian, or a Swede? You yourself say everyone's against us.

Kissinger: It is not inconceivable you'll get forced back to the 22nd lines, if we don't have a buffer, a diplomatic buffer.

Meir: What do you mean, forced back?

Kissinger: A joint U.S.-Soviet Resolution.

Meir: There is not much difference between us.

Kissinger: No. There are two differences—the UN inspection with the Israelis looking on.

Meir: All right.

Kissinger: I've no reason to think that they'll accept it. I haven't discussed it with them.

Dinitz: We understand.

Kissinger: The second is, do you discuss with them the return to the October 22nd lines?

Gazit: Could we use different language? A redeployment in accord with the UN resolutions?

Meir: I can't make a decision.

Kissinger: I don't want to give the proposal to Fahmi. I just want to tell him you were angry and said nasty things, which is true! Also that you're going back, that you have to tell the Cabinet about our discussion, that there will be no interruption in the convoys of non-military supplies. I won't say one truck or two. Just "no interruption." I'll tell the Russians, too, so no helicopters are needed. And the wounded, and the list.

Gazit: And the wounded.

Kissinger: Do you agree?

Yariv: Yes. And the permission of the Red Cross to visit them all.

Kissinger: My problem is easier with Sadat if I don't have to fight on the principle of a return to the October 22nd lines. I can tell him that in the meantime he has to permit an arrangement on the roads, with no interruption of supplies, and lifting the blockade, etc.

I'd rather discuss this with him for four hours than discuss a peace settlement.

Dinitz: If the Prime Minister is going to take to the Government the decision whether to agree to the principle of the October 22nd lines . . .

Kissinger: I won't settle it in Cairo. I'll send it to you from Cairo, and you take two to three days to consider it.

Dinitz: Fine if the Prime Minister goes to the Cabinet. But can we and you have an understanding that you won't push us off the road?

Kissinger: You can get an understanding from us that we don't know where the 22nd line is. That you can get from the President, if you permit me to tell him I've put the proposal to you, which is very painful. . . .

I don't know whether you can get it from the Egyptians.

And for god's sake don't make a proposal like this to the Egyptians this weekend.

Yariv: No. Of course.

Kissinger: It would be better if you made an obnoxious proposal over the weekend. So I can go to them in Cairo with a big concession. We can work it out.

Yariv: They're awaiting a reply from us Monday on Fahmi's plan.

Kissinger: We need another talk tomorrow on the peace settlement.

Meir: And military supplies.

Kissinger: I didn't know it was a problem.

Meir: Some things are not yet approved.

Dinitz: You stopped with 34 Phantoms.

Kissinger: I've arranged that the 40 are in addition to what you were granted before. They may argue about two, but you have at least 38.

Yariv: The question of military supplies is quite complicated.

Kissinger: All you've got are on top of what was already agreed to. We should get together tomorrow on the peace negotiations.

Yariv: And also military supplies.

Kissinger: Yes. We'll meet tomorrow.

[The meeting ended at 10:25 a. m.]

---

306. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, November 1, 1973, 12:10 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Golda Meir, Prime Minister of Israel
Simcha Dinitz, Israeli Ambassador in Washington
Aharon Yariv, General in Prime Minister Meir's Office
Mordechai Gazit, Head of the Prime Minister's Office

President Richard Nixon
Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State and Assistant to the President
Harold H. Saunders, NSC Staff

The meeting began with photographers invited in and with small talk between the President and the Prime Minister during that session. When the photographers had left, the following conversation took place:

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, November 1–30, 1973. Secret; Sensitive. The meeting took place in the Oval Office. Drafted by Saunders. Brackets are in the original. Kissinger prepared a briefing paper, November 1, for the President for this meeting. (Ibid., Box 611, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 13, Nov. 73–Dec. 73)

Prime Minister: I want to say to you how much we appreciate what you have done and are doing. Last night at Lod Airport I said that a friend proves his friendship when the need is great. There were days and hours when we needed a friend and you came right in. You don't know what your airlift means to us. Our Cabinet Ministers have been out to see it. I have been out to see it.

President: There is one plane every fifty minutes, isn't there? They are big planes, too.

Prime Minister: And your people who have come with the airlift! They work with such enthusiasm!

You are standing up to our friends the Soviets so that they cannot bully a little nation like ours. They have done this before to others; I hope they will never be able to do it to us.

The war was pretty bad. I remember that morning—early Saturday[2] morning—when the Chief of Staff told me that if he could make a first strike, everything would be fine. We said no. We had to be in a position so that Egypt and Syria could not make the excuse that we struck first.

The first few days were terrible days. The Syrians and Egyptians came on. You, Mr. President, were on the Golan Heights, and you know what it is to be up there and to look down on our settlements.

The heroism and self-sacrifice of our boys was something that nobody will be able to describe. I suppose that when you have everything to lose—not just territory but everything—only then can people fight like that.

Why the Arabs did it, I don't know. What they will have to do now is what we have wanted them to do right along—to sit down with us and to work out a peace agreement. Sometimes, we cannot understand their mentality.

What is important now is that they should not get a victory that they did not get on the battlefield. But this must be the last war.

No one has been as staunch as you, Mr. President, on prisoners of war.

President: How many are there?

Prime Minister: There are 380 in Egypt and 120 in Syria, we think. We have 7,000 Arab prisoners. There are wounded, and we want them back. We are too small a people to bear tragedies of this kind. In terms of the US population, we suffered the equivalent of 100,000 casualties.

---

[2] October 6.

Yariv: 150,000.

Prime Minister: In a small nation like Israel, everybody knows everybody else.

Kissinger: Do those include the dead or all the casualties?

Yariv: The dead.

Prime Minister: In our country everybody grew up on a kibbutz, or went to school, or lived in a neighborhood with someone who was hurt in the war. There are 45 wounded in Egypt and the same in Syria.

Yariv: We don't know how many are in Syria, Madame.

Prime Minister: In Syria we don't know. We counted those dead or wounded whom we found. For the rest, we don't know whether they are missing, dead or captured. We have no lists from Syria.

President: You have Syrian prisoners?

Yariv: Three hundred.

Prime Minister: They don't care.

President: They probably consider them dead. At least that is their attitude.

Prime Minister: What we would like now that the ceasefire is in action is to prepare everyone involved for real peace negotiations. We know there is the problem of the Egyptian Third Army. We do not want to destroy it. The question is keeping the ceasefire and then achieving the release of prisoners and the lifting of the blockade in the Red Sea. We can't get any oil from the Persian Gulf. It is the same problem we had at Sharm al-Shaykh before the 1967 war.

The question is will the Russians or will the Egyptians and Syrians through the Russians be able to bully us into a position that is impossible for us to accept.

Our only hope is that you—who appreciate our deep desire to live in peace—is that we can work together.

President: We have been in pretty close contact. [At this point, the Prime Minister picked up a cigarette. The President asked whether he could light it for her, but General Yariv did so. He said that he had told his people to put cigarettes out, because the Prime Minister used them.] We are aware of the enormous suffering that you have undergone. Even if there were only 50 dead, that would still be too many. I remember the note you gave me at dinner the last time we were here when you had only fourteen or fifteen prisoners that you were trying to get back. We know how we felt about our prisoners. Your families feel like ours did.

The problem is now to move on toward the goal that you have outlined—it is a goal the whole world wants. The goal is not to have an-

other war; you have already had four. For a small country, even victories can be disastrous.

My studies indicate that when great attrition is involved, even winners can lose.

The problem you have to consider is whether the policy you have followed—being prepared with the Phantoms and the Skyhawks—can succeed, lacking a settlement. The question is whether a policy of only being prepared for war—although even with a peace settlement you will have to be prepared—is sufficient.

This last war proves the overwhelming conclusion that a policy of digging in telling us to give you the arms and you will do the fighting, can't be the end. Your policy has to be to move as you are moving toward talks. You've had direct talks, haven't you? But they are only on the ceasefire?

Yariv: There was more. The Egyptian General presented a plan for a first phase on a general disengagement. It did not look like much to us, but it was something.

President: But you probably gave them one they could not accept, too, didn't you?

Yariv: Yes.

Prime Minister: When General Yariv had his meeting with the Egyptians, the Egyptian General drew him aside and said that the highest authority in Egypt wants peace if Mrs. Meir wants peace.

President: I think Egypt wants it. We can't speak for Syria. You each want peace at a cost that the other is not prepared to pay. What we need to do is to develop a chain of events, to break the whole matter up and to move step-by-step.

Prime Minister: Absolutely.

President: Neither of you is in a position now to agree on the terms of an ultimate settlement. The problem is to keep the negotiations from getting bogged down. Lacking agreement on final terms, the danger is that you will agree on nothing else.

They have the Third Army problem. You have the problem of the prisoners and the blockade in the Gulf. We need to break those issues off and to deal with them. We need to decide where the October 22 line is—I won't get into that. That is for the experts. The important thing is that communication has begun. You must not miss this opportunity.

As a friend, let me tell you what I have done to date and how I see the future. I want to tell you frankly so you will understand what our situation is. Here it is.

When this war started, there were some here who charged that we kept you from a pre-emptive strike. As you know, you volunteered

that. The reason was that you did not want to be seen as the provocateur.

When the war came the overwhelming sentiment among our leaders was let's not let it spread so that we will not get involved. I reminded them that Prime Minister Meir had always said that Israel does not ask for our men, only for the tools to do the fighting themselves.

We showed restraint. Your people said you did not want a UN resolution in the early stages. We took a lot of heat even from the friends of Israel here—not the sophisticated ones—for not supporting a ceasefire resolution. We did not press for a ceasefire because your ambassador—he is a fine fellow, always tells us the truth—

Kissinger: Eight times a day.

President: We did not press for an early ceasefire because your ambassador at that time said you were at a disadvantage. This was not a popular decision here.

Then came the next decision. The Soviet airlift began. At that point, I had to decide what our reaction would be. When that came up, you told us you were running out of ammunition.

Dinitz: At that time the Soviets had the upper hand.

President: The second decision was to send some consumables. Our bureaucracy favored only modest help to Israel. They recommended three C–5As with equipment. I called Henry. I told him that if we call the Soviets on their resupply and supply Israel, we will be blamed as much for three airplanes full of equipment as for thirty. This airlift was bigger than the Berlin airlift because the planes were larger. I never believe in little plays where big issues are at stake. That gave you the tools to fight. Right?

Prime Minister: Right.

President: I had to ram the airlift down the throats of our leaders. There was no sense sending three planes only. I told the Soviets frankly what we were doing.

Then came the crisis of the following week. It was pretty hairy. The Soviets threatened to put forces into Egypt.

Kissinger: Before that, Mr. President, was the Soviet pressure to get the war wrapped up when the Israelis broke out. My trip to Moscow was to gain Israel another 48 hours.

President: The Soviets then feared they would be on the losing side. I sent Henry to Moscow to gain a couple of more days. As a result of that talk, we got a ceasefire agreement. We thought this would be better for you at that point.

Then came the crisis. The Soviets think we overplayed it. I don't think so. We had our intelligence, and we thought the possibility of Soviet military forces going into the Middle East was real. I ordered a pre-

cautionary alert of our own forces. That caused consternation here. Many people in the Congress asked whether we were going to risk a nuclear war. Despite their great respect for Israel, they could not see risking that kind of confrontation over the ceasefire.

When we ordered the airlift and when we ordered the alert, we did not have a major friend in the world. The Europeans and the Japanese were all closer to the Soviet Union.

Kissinger: We did not even have a minor friend.

President: That's right. There was Mobuto and the Ivory Coast. But they don't count. We were getting pressures from the British, French, Italians, Germans and even the Spanish after all they owe us. The Japanese mounted terrible pressure.

Yariv: Oil.

President: Oil. If this ceasefire breaks down and Europe and Japan freeze this winter, Israel will be in a hell of a spot. That may be wrong. But they all support the Russian position—not for anti-Israeli reasons but for pro-oil reasons. I want you to understand this.

I have always said that we would hold the ring against the Soviets—we risked détente, the nuclear arms limitation talks and a showdown with them over this issue. God knows, I knew about the dangers of Communism before Senator Jackson knew what a Communist was. On détente, what we risked was the resumption of the cold war. In Vietnam, we did not think the Chinese and the Soviets would intervene. But the Middle East is next only to Europe as the most important area in the world.

Where are we now? The point is that now it is imperative to realize that if hostilities break out over an unreasonable Israeli position, we are not going to lose our respect for Israel, but it will be difficult for us—not because of the Russians but because of the Europeans, Japanese and some Americans.

Now we have face-to-face talks. But if the ceasefire breaks down and we have another hairy episode with the Russians—and in addition if the oil embargo gets notched up tighter—everything will break loose.

I am just telling you the problems I have in wanting to support Israel. We will give you the hardware and we will hold the ring.

I know your concerns. But I have read some of the statements in your press—not yours, they have been very responsible—suggesting that Nixon hasn't stood by Israel because he is more interested in getting on with the Soviets. But we have to face the facts that Europe and Japan and many in the United States have attitudes that mean now we have to keep the ceasefire on a reasonable basis. You will be talking to Henry about the details of this. I told the Egyptian Foreign Minister

Egypt must be reasonable and that Egypt will have to compartmentalize the negotiations.[3]

I have had frank talks with the Russians—Dobrynin and Brezhnev. I have talked to them about arms. I have said that if they send weapons, we will send weapons. That is something we'll have to talk to them about. It takes two to make peace. We will stand firm.

But I have digressed. I know the talk in Israel—not from you—that we would risk Israel's future because of our desire to get on with the Russians and to get oil to Europe and Japan. That is not what this is all about. I stand for the survival of Israel. I stand for *secure* borders. I have always used that word "secure."

We must understand that at this juncture, if the ceasefire breaks down, we will have a terrible time building public support.

Others charge that Nixon and Brezhnev are seeking a condominium. We are not going to dictate the terms of a settlement. All we agreed is that we will use our influence to bring the parties together and to influence a settlement. That is fair enough.

Our Soviet friends are always trying to get the edge. They moved in 70 observers. But Henry pointed out that they were just trying to establish a base for getting in more.

Prime Minister: Their 70 wouldn't be 70 anymore.

President: We have stood firm. We provided you with equipment. It is better equipment than the Soviet equipment. Wasn't it, General?

We are not going to sit down with the Soviets and cut up the world or determine the future of the Middle East, But the fact is that the Soviets are in the Middle East. Israel cannot survive without US support. Egypt and Syria cannot survive without the USSR.

The question is: Do we let the Soviets come in and let them unilaterally have that kind of influence, or do we try to work with them and maintain our own role? I have always said that you are a strong leader. I am pretty tough, too. I think it is better for us to influence Egypt and Syria than to have the Soviets do it.

Kissinger: The Syrians have put out feelers through Morocco.

President: The first problem is getting the ceasefire. The second problem is getting it held. On further negotiations, we will use our influence to get peace talks moving along.

We are going to talk to the Soviets. Our strategy is to try to isolate them by working with them. Otherwise the whole world will be ganged up against us and Israel. They will have the Europeans and the Japanese on their side. We will talk to the Soviets, but we are going to

[3] See Document 302 and footnote 4, Document 303.

have lines to Egypt. Our influence in Egypt is not anti-Israeli influence. It is in your interest that we have influence there.

I have tried to give you a frank evaluation of where we are. If the ceasefire breaks down and we have another deadly round, how much we could do is very much open to question. I did not have majority support. I did not have majority support when I made my decision on the airlift. I did not have majority support when I made my decision on the alert. We will still do what is right. But the negotiating track is the best track. You have to have some confidence in me and in Henry that we will do our best not only on the hardware, but on the software side when it comes to negotiations.

Of course, I could leave you to the UN.

Prime Minister: That court of high injustice!

President: All this nonsense that we are going to stab Israel in the back, to negotiate behind Israel's back! But we are going to try very hard to get a reasonable peace settlement. Your interests require it. Our interests require it. The world's interest requires it. These US–Soviet confrontations are not pleasant.

Prime Minister: Thank you, Mr. President. All these comments in the press. I was reading a piece in the *London Times* on the plane saying that since the Egyptians started the war on Yom Kippur, that was proof that the Israelis didn't start it.

President: It was awful to start a war on that day. That proves that the Israelis didn't start it. That's your holiest day, isn't it?

Prime Minister: I was reading a piece on the airplane saying what an idiotic thing it was for the Arabs to choose the one day when there is no traffic on the roads in Israel. If they had chosen Rosh Hashanah—the New Year holiday—people would have been travelling everywhere. I just didn't have the patience to read the newspapers during the war, only the headlines.

President: This fellow Kraft is giving us a hard time. These people are supposed to be friends of Israel's but they kick us around.

Prime Minister: During the Libyan plane business[4] when I was here before, he was the most horrible of all. As far as the Israeli press is concerned, in the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Knesset and among high officials, the only thing that is true as far as your stand is concerned is that you helped us. I went to see the troops on the Egyptian side of the Suez Canal the other day—I told my grandchildren when I returned that I was coming back from Africa—I told the troops of your help.

---

[4] See footnote 2, Document 22.

President: I could understand why the troops would object to the ceasefire and ask why they were not being allowed to kick the Egyptians out.

Prime Minister: I told them what you did with the alert. I told them that I thanked God that there was not a world confrontation over Israel. That would be terrible.

President: You've got the judgment. You are a supreme politician.

Prime Minister: These troops were frank and informal. They asked lots of questions. It hurts to see how good their attitudes are. They believe in me. Everybody in the Cabinet knows what you have done. Where else could I go? Should I go talk to Brezhnev?

President: You would hit it off with with him. I mean "hit."

Prime Minister: I only realized recently that Sir Alec was with Chamberlain at Munich. There was a question and answer in the Parliament recently, and this came out.

President: Can we agree that we are on the right course? We will continue to talk with the Russians.

Prime Minister: Absolutely.

President: We will try to work to consolidate the ceasefire.

Kissinger: What we discussed this morning we haven't discussed with the Egyptians. It will be very difficult to sell to them. What we are trying to do is this. Your policy, Mr. President, is to move the Soviets to a secondary position. The President told the Egyptians that they should talk to us alone. We are trying to decouple the Soviets from this issue. But you have to give us the opportunity to do this. We have to prevent the others from ganging up against us on every issue.

President: We have to take Soviet sensitivities into the act because we have other fish to fry with them.

Kissinger: But de facto we are trying to reduce their influence.

President: The Egyptians will talk with us.

Dinitz: You are the only factor that makes any difference.

President: To have some influence, though, we have to deliver something. We don't want the radicals to become a greater factor in the Middle East. I am told Sadat is not as radical as others. It is better for Israel if the Arabs turn to us for a moderate solution—and we want them to see it is better for them—than if they turn to the Soviets for a radical solution.

Prime Minister: There is no clash of interest between you and us.

President: Good.

Prime Minister: It would be a calamity for the world if the Soviets were to rule in the Middle East, not only for us. When the Europeans talked about détente, they were bleary-eyed. But you know exactly

what you are doing and who your partners are. We have no desires against Egypt. King Hussein sent in two groups of tanks. We got the information at one point that all the Syrian generals were meeting at a particular place, and our boys were eager to go after them. But then we learned that King Hussein might be there and we didn't want to hurt him. The bridges with Jordan were left open during the war. This is a crazy kind of double life. Hussein did the least he could do.

President: Historically it is correct. It does not make sense to kill people who are responsible.

Prime Minister: Life went on as usual on the West Bank. We want peace. I hope there will be a treaty with the Arabs that will really guarantee peace.

Peace will depend on the elements of the treaty, especially borders. Israel is duty bound to be very concerned about that. We do not know whether Sadat will keep the treaty. A bullet could remove him from the scene at any time.

President: I have talked to the Egyptians about a settlement. The Egyptians want Israel to return to the 1967 borders. Israel wants to change those borders. Neither side will get what it wants. I have always said that the borders must be "secure."

Prime Minister: You also once used the word "defendable."

President: Yes, that is the same as "secure." Everybody has to give a little. You can be remembered—I know this doesn't mean anything to you or to me—but I want to see you be the one at last who works this out, who creates an Israel not burdened with a huge arms budget or with war every five years.

Prime Minister: That is what I want.

President: You need your prisoners back. It will not be easy.

Prime Minister: We want you to talk to the Russians and to the Egyptians. We want to talk to each other.

On the ceasefire, we are prepared to keep the ceasefire.

President: And let non-military supplies through?

Prime Minister: Yes. And to exchange prisoners and to have the blockade lifted in the Gulf. If they have claimed about this line or another, now that the generals are meeting and meeting cordially, let's let them decide.

Yariv: Yes the meetings have been very dignified.

President: Kissinger and Le Duc Tho talked cordially, but it was four years before they got a settlement and then it took our military action to get it. I hope that doesn't happen here.

Prime Minister: Let's leave the line to the generals.

Yariv: They know the difficulty of their military position.

Prime Minister: We can't live with this situation on the prisoners. What can be done with the Syrians?

President: Very little.

Prime Minister: You could approach the Russians.

President: We'll do our best.

Kissinger: The Egyptian proposal is far from yours. If one assumes that Sadat wants to get something out of my visit, he could announce that the lines to the Third Army are open and that the principle of the October 22 lines has been accepted. Then we could leave the details to the commanders. We don't want to get into that, because we don't know where the lines are.

President: Supply to the Third Army is indispensible.

Prime Minister: I would urge you not to press the idea of accepting the October 22 lines in principle.

President: But that is my point.

Kissinger: The advantage of the formulation of accepting "in principle" is that it gets us off the hook. It is the best we can do since we do not know where the line is.

Dinitz: If we know the line doesn't mean breaking our hold on the road, that would be all right.

Kissinger: We have already agreed that there would be no military supply.

Prime Minister: They want military supply?

President: No.

Kissinger: That we can insist on.

Prime Minister: You know what the first truck across the line contained? Filter-tip cigarettes.

[At this point, the Prime Minister and the President spent five minutes alone before the President took the Prime Minister to the Rose Garden steps for photographs and then to her car.]

Harold H. Saunders[5]

[5] The original bears this typed signature.

307. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, November 1, 1973, 5:30 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Ismail Fahmi, Acting Egyptian Foreign Minister
Abdallah El-Erian, Egyptian Ambassador to France
Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Joseph J. Sisco, Asst. Secretary of State

Kissinger: I have given your ideas on both the ceasefire and the permanent non-military cargo plan, and as I predicted, the Israelis have to discuss this in the Cabinet.[2] We have urged a continuous non-military supply. In the meantime, until I can discuss the October 22 solution, Israel is willing to exchange wounded with you and we will do what we can to continue the non-military supply. Can we agree?

Fahmi: You assure me on the permanent route but not on the October 22 position.

Kissinger: Realistically, she can agree on resupply from now until I get to Cairo; she has really already agreed to that.

Fahmi: I have been talking about a package of three points: The ceasefire; the exchange of wounded prisoners; Israel going back to the October 22 positions; and at that time all POWs would be exchanged. This is a package. She had time to know this.

Kissinger: The first time I discussed this with her was this morning.

Fahmi: I accept that. You told me you will use your influence to accept the above.

Kissinger: I said I would put it to her. This is as far as I could get her to go.

Fahmi: You said you would get them to agree to one convoy.

Kissinger: She has done it.

Fahmi: Only half. The trucks are moving slowly. Moreover, they will be in a position to transfer military equipment. If she is not ready to accept the return to the October 22 positions, then this needs action by the Security Council.

Kissinger: She will let us know what she will accept.

Fahmi: She cannot bargain on the return to the October 22 positions. The Security Council has decided the matter.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 27 ARAB–ISR. Secret; Nodis. The meeting was held in the Secretary's office at the Department of State.

[2] See Documents 305 and 306.

Kissinger: There is so much I can do in one day. We need enough time to get realistic solutions. You can see what Israel is already saying about us in the newspapers.

Fahmi: Our writers do the same.

Kissinger: She says if there is an exchange of the wounded she can continue non-military cargos. I can cable on Monday[3] to you if I can get a further answer. Moreover, what sense does a ceasefire make while blockading the Red Sea? These matters have to be linked.

Fahmi: As a quid pro quo, Mrs. Meir must agree not to add to her arsenal on the West Bank. She accepted Security Council Resolutions which called for a return to the October 22 positions.

Kissinger: The first Security Council resolution called for an end to all military activities and that applied to the blockade as well. There is no rational way to permit such sea activity.

Fahmi: Both sides must stop. This is the crux.

Kissinger: That is a reasonable position.

Fahmi: You are asking us to take an inferior position: She gets military equipment and oil; this is prevented to our Third Army in the East. I expected you to get agreement on the three points. The POW problem can be handled by the Red Cross in Geneva.

Kissinger: Our problem is to hopefully come up with an acceptable solution.

Fahmi: If you cannot give me a definite answer, does it mean she refused to return to the October 22 positions?

Kissinger: No. They have to consider these matters and they have to have an end to the blockade at Bab Al-Mandab. This would be complete.

Fahmi: This will complicate your position. You cannot do anything on oil unless she goes back to the October 22 positions.

Kissinger: If the oil embargos and curtailments are not stopped, we will have to stop our diplomatic efforts. There can be no pressure.

Fahmi: Before we have contacts with the other Arabs on the oil matter, we need proof.

Kissinger: In negotiating the October 22 line, nobody seems to know where it is.

Fahmi: We will use UN forces to find the locations.

Kissinger: I am trying to get you the principle of the return to the October 22 positions. Delineation could come later. I have to take into account the Israeli position. We are not in a position now to get agreement on the return to the October 22 position.

---

[3] November 5.

Fahmi: I am not confusing the principle and the time to delineate.

Kissinger: The Russians wanted us to send a high-level representative to Cairo jointly to work on implementation of a ceasefire. We will not agree.

Fahmi: I did not ask for any such thing. Send us a senior diplomatic representative. If you want to know our position, talk to us, not to others.

Kissinger: We will agree to send you a good senior American representative.

Fahmi: The Soviets already have their man in Cairo. As soon as there is a return to the October 22 positions, there would be an exchange of POWs.

Kissinger: They will want an exchange of the POWs when they open the road to permanent resupply.

Fahmi: I hope you can settle this whole matter before you come to Egypt. If not, you cannot accomplish anything.

I want to tell you a little bit about your visit in Cairo. You will stay at the Aruba Palace. There is room for eight people. The others will stay at the Hilton. There will be a Presidential appointment, and you will be able to visit the pyramids at night. You will be given a luncheon and a dinner. The negotiating sessions will be in the ministry with me, the Foreign Minister. We want your entire group to be our guests with no exceptions.[4]

[4] At 6:40 p.m., shortly after their meeting concluded, Fahmi called Kissinger to inform him that he (Fahmi) had just received two cables from Sadat, "one discouraging and one hopeful. The first one informs me that today Israeli planes invaded our air space west of Cairo and then they fired on one of our rockets. They fired at that position with a direct rocket, one of your latest. They say it was one of the televised rockets . . . from a distance of 25 to 10K and then they had a direct hit. This is very serious. The second promising thing is that you remember when you talked about this Monday [see Document 298]. I advised the President that we had to do something quiet about it. He responded that only for a week we together get along with things, you know, without infliction on the Egyptian President. On that particular point he is telling me that oil tankers with Liberian flag we let it go through at _____without any interception from our part. This encourages both of us to try to achieve something substantial before I go back . . . Now we have two indications, one very disturbing about flying and hitting about the ceasefire, and then there is this second promising one. I leave it up to you." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

308. Minutes of Washington Special Actions Group Meeting[1]

Washington, November 2, 1973, 10:27–11:35 a.m.

SUBJECT

Middle East; Vietnam and Cambodia

PARTICIPANTS

Chairman—Henry A. Kissinger

State
Kenneth Rush
**Joseph Sisco
*Arthur Hummel
Robert McCloskey

Defense
William Clements
Robert C. Hill

JCS
Adm. Thomas H. Moorer
V/Adm. John P. Weinel

CIA
William Colby
**Samuel Hoskinson
*William Christianson

NSC
Gen. Brent Scowcroft
**Harold Saunders
*William Stearman
Lt. Col. Stukel
Jeanne W. Davis

*Attended only portion on Vietnam

**Attended only portion on Middle East

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS[2]

Middle East

It was agreed that:

. . . an SR–71 mission should be flown as soon as the weather clears;

. . . the sealift of equipment to Israel should continue;

. . . regularly scheduled deliveries to Israel of two F–4's a month should resume in November; the 38 F–4's they received in the emergency should be considered as replacement of battle losses and will not be counted against the previously agreed total;

. . . the President's message on the oil emergency will be redrafted to eliminate mention of the Middle East situation and of any numbers; it should be cast in terms of U.S. energy needs and the steps being taken to meet them.[3]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, NSC Institutional Files (H–Files), Box H–117, WSAG Meetings Minutes, Originals, 1973. Top Secret; Nodis; Codeword. The meeting took place in the White House Situation Room.

[2] A separate Summary of Conclusions on Vietnam and Cambodia is not printed.

[3] The President addressed the nation on November 7 to introduce Project Independence, his program to address energy shortages. For the text of his speech, see *Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, pp. 916–922.

Middle East

(Prior to the arrival of Secretary Kissinger, the WSAG members discussed events at the dinner the previous evening for Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir: her behaviour toward the Secretary, the negative tone of her remarks, the Secretary's remarks, etc. Secretary Kissinger joined the conversation on his arrival.)

Secretary Kissinger: We did not go through four weeks of agony here to be hostage to a nation of two and a half million people. US foreign policy will be determined by the United States, not by Israel. They deliberately misled us at least twice: when they told us that their troops, who moved to surround the Ismailia [*Egyptian*] 3rd Army, were moving north to cut the Ismaeli road and when (Foreign Minister) Eban told us in Tel Aviv that they had accepted the ceasefire because their military told them they had nothing much more to gain.

But now we are in the catbird seat. Everyone is coming to us on their knees begging us for a settlement. We can reduce Soviet influence in the area and can get the oil embargo raised if we can deliver a moderate program, and we are going to do it. If not, the Arabs will be driven back to the Soviets, the oil will be lost, we will have the whole world against us, and there will not be one UN vote for us. We must prove to the Arabs that they are better off dealing with us on a moderate program than dealing with the Russians on a radical program. We are going to head it our way now, one way or another. And we need the support of everyone here, but there must be no talking about it. If we can't do this with the agreement of the Israelis, we will do it without their agreement. For your information, but not for debriefing, we have worked out a moderate program with the Egyptians in which Israel is being paid for stopping something they had no right to do in the first instance. We have Egyptian assurances that no military supplies will be shipped to the 3rd Army and the prisoners will be released if Israel moves back to the October 22 line. We can't have a confrontation with the Soviets over this. We will enforce such a move. If the Israelis refuse, we will get the WSAG together and look at the various pressures we can exert. But we must have total discipline on this. The Israelis even know the things I say in my staff meetings.

Mr. Clements: Right now the key to the Saudis are the Egyptians.

Secretary Kissinger: I agree. The Egyptians will help with the Saudis if we can now do something. Golda (Prime Minister Meir) ripped it last night. Now I'm going to tell her what they have to do. I'm going to let her stew a little but I will see her again, possibly around 8:00 p.m. If she threatens to resign—well, she's no great asset.

Mr. Sisco: I agree, except that the alternative might be more hawkish. But she can't look ahead at all.

Secretary Kissinger: No alternative could be more hawkish than she is. They have been asking for direct negotiations for 30 years. When we got them direct negotiations, they say they won't negotiate. I said in my staff meeting that the Soviets can give hardware but we can give territory. The Israelis have always said they would give territory.

Mr. Rush: You also said that to the oil companies.[4] It was in the open.

Secretary Kissinger: There was never any question that Israel would give up some territory in a peace settlement. The only question was how much, and I have very carefully avoided saying how much. It's just as well the situation crystallized last night.

Mr. Clements: Jim (Schlesinger) and I are supposed to see her at 5:00 p.m. today. Should we see her?

Secretary Kissinger: Yes, but be brutal.[5] I'll call you before your meeting.

Mr. Colby: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Colby: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: Not yet, but they should know that they are dealing with a unified government. It would be better if you all would be to the right of me—be tougher than I am. Then I can play the good guy.

Mr. Clements: We can play that role.

Secretary Kissinger: I need a situation where there is no incentive to undermine me because all the other Cabinet people are rougher than I. Don't cut anything back yet. Keep it flowing, but tell her there will be consequences if they don't cooperate.

Mr. Rush: We also need to have the Congress playing the same game.

Secretary Kissinger: There's no chance of getting the Congress on board, but we're working to get the leadership lined up. I've been talking to (Senators) Stennis and Javits.[6] Our position is reasonable. The

---

[4] Kissinger met with oil company executives on October 26. The memorandum of conversation is printed in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXXVI, Energy Crisis, 1969–1974, Document 230.

[5] Dinitz called Kissinger at 7 p.m. on November 2 to discuss Meir's meeting with Schlesinger. Dinitz described their conversation as "very formal and cordial, nothing of substance." He added: "They discussed the military requirements which he said depended on three things—funding, availability, and national policy. That was all." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

[6] Senator Jacob K. Javits (D–New York).

Israelis have to learn that we are going to go our own way, and there will be a brawl if they take us on.

Now we mustn't carry this too far. We don't want the Soviets to believe they have a free shot. If they see us separating too much from Israel, the Soviets might act as scavengers as they did in 1956. We must keep our pressures low key. Bill (Clements), you and Jim (Schlesinger) can put it on the basis of what Tom (Moorer) reported from the dinner last night. You can tell her there is a sense of outrage in the US Government. I'll call you both on a conference call.

Mr. Colby: Did she thank the President?

Secretary Kissinger: She expressed no appreciation at all during the dinner. She didn't talk to me. She made her speech, claiming that Israel's friends had deprived her of victory, then sat down, without any toast. I made my remarks and sat down, then said to her "I guess there will be no toasts at this dinner unless you make one." She got up, toasted the President, then sat down again. Then I returned the toast.

Mr. Colby: Did she express appreciation in her private meeting with the President?[7]

Mr. Saunders: She thanked him at the beginning.

Secretary Kissinger: She thanked him, but the basic thrust of her conversation was that they wouldn't budge on anything, including any permutations.

Adm. Moorer: They're going to get the Russians right back in.

Secretary Kissinger: No they won't, because we won't let them. We did what we have done in the last few weeks to get the United States in the driver's seat in the Middle East. We took tremendous risks and we are going to get the benefit from them. We didn't do these things to be the captive of Israel. We can break the oil embargo if we can deliver something moderate. Joe (Sisco), do you agree?

Mr. Sisco: Yes, we're in a good position. This trip you are taking is one of the most critical trips in history.

Secretary Kissinger: This is the opportunity we have been waiting for; we will not be deflected.

Mr. Clements: (To Secretary Kissinger) You have never been on a more important trip.

Secretary Kissinger: Okay, let's have about 15 more minutes, then talk about Cambodia. (to Mr. McCloskey) Will you see Walter Cronkite? (to Mr. Colby) Let's have your briefing.

---

[7] See Document 306.

Mr. Colby briefed from the text at Tab A.[8]

Secretary Kissinger: We have a message from the Egyptians saying the Israelis fired a 25 kilometer-range tv-guided missile, possibly a Walleye, at one of their rocket sites. Did we know this?

Mr. Colby: We had no report of that.

Adm. Moorer: It would be a Walleye.

Secretary Kissinger: [*2½ lines not declassified*]

Mr. Colby: No, but they may have been on their way to embarcation points.

Secretary Kissinger: Did you fly an SR–71 today?

Adm. Moorer: We were delayed 24 hours by the weather. There was total overcast. We'll go as soon as it clears.

Secretary Kissinger: It would be helpful if it could go before my trip, or if I could have a read-out during the trip.

Adm. Moorer: We'll get it to you.

Secretary Kissinger: [*2 lines not declassified*]

Mr. Colby: [*4 lines not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: [*2 lines not declassified*]

(Commenting on reports of Soviet military forces in the Middle East)[9] You can't assess the importance of Soviet organized combat forces in the Middle East only in terms of their military capability. Their very presence will tip the diplomatic balance in the area whether they ever fight or not. It's a question of who will be thought to have brought about the situation. If the Soviets get the credit, that would be very bad. Even if they are never in combat, this would be very dangerous development. They would be a major, permanent factor.

Adm. Moorer: (to Secretary Kissinger) If you get there before anything happens, it will be much more difficult for them to make a move.

Secretary Kissinger: The sealift should go forward with a bulge, if possible.

Adm. Moorer: It is. We have six ships at sea now—there will be a total of 12 ships.

Secretary Kissinger: Keep them going. A slowdown now would produce a confrontation. We can use this to paralyze the pro-Jewish Senators. No Arabs are complaining now. What about Israel's long-term requirements?

---

[8] Attached, but not printed.

[9] Kissinger is presumably referring to SNIE 11/30–73, "Soviet Military Options in the Middle East," November 2. See the CIA Freedom of Information Electronic Reading Room.

Mr. Clements: We're waiting on you for a decision. We have an evaluation team in Israel now confirming their losses in various categories. They are running into some lack of cooperation—the Israelis aren't being entirely forthcoming, and we'll talk to (Prime Minister) Golda (Meir) about that today. Our team will establish the par value of a reasonable number of Israeli losses—in tanks, for example, we are thinking about replacing 300 tanks.

Secretary Kissinger: They claim we're replacing only 200.

Mr. Clements: They don't know because we haven't hit on the par number yet. Once we have that established, the replacement items will go forward on the sealift. Assuming the number is 350, beyond that figure we would need confirmation of their net losses. They must be proved by photography, ground inspection, etc.

Secretary Kissinger: Fine. But you'll establish some par figures?

Mr. Clements: Yes.

Secretary Kissinger: On the F–4s, let's continue with the two a month that we had already agreed to starting in November. The 38 we have given them won't be counted. That way we won't have to make a new decision—all hell breaks loose every time there is a new decision. We will count the two we delivered in October.

Mr. Clements: So they will end with 40 F–4s.

Secretary Kissinger: We will count the two in October as part of the regular deliveries. The 38 will not be counted against that total—they will be considered as replacements for battle losses. Then let's go ahead with the two a month starting in November.

Mr. Sisco: We'll just continue the regular schedule.

Mr. Colby: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: [*2 lines not declassified*]

Mr. Rush: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: I'll talk about that tomorrow.

Mr. Colby: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Sisco: They know about those. It has been in the paper and they were talking about it last night. I talked to General Yariv (of the Prime Minister's office) last night. He's the smartest of the lot. Should I see him today?

Secretary Kissinger: No, not until I have talked with the Prime Minister. It's essential that you all be tougher than I.

Mr. Clements: We're doing things exactly as I have told you. If you have made any other agreements, let us know.

Secretary Kissinger: I'll review all the notes of all the conversations and I'll call you before 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Colby: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: Let's wait. We'll know more about their attitude by Sunday.[10] I don't want to ruffle them on the peripheral stuff as long as there's a chance of getting the important things.

Mr. Colby: [*1 line not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: Can we turn to the oil emergency? I understand that has deteriorated into a proliferation of meetings—there were 55 people at the last one.

Mr. Clements: It was horrible.

Secretary Kissinger: It has now been decided that the President will put it out next week. Will that hurt or help if it happens just as I arrive in Cairo?

Mr. Clements: I don't like the latest draft. I've cautioned (Governor John) Love that we shouldn't use all those numbers. That would be alarming.

Secretary Kissinger: Are the numbers still in the message? They have to come out. (to Gen. Scowcroft) We have to get that cut down. You see to it.

Mr. Clements: It just gives the Arabs the ammunition to come back to us.

Secretary Kissinger: If we can get it cleaned up, should we put it out next Tuesday[11] or hold it?

Mr. Clements: We shouldn't get it confused with your visit.

Secretary Kissinger: Should we wait a week?

Mr. Rush: (Saudi Petroleum Minister) Yamani told (Ambassador) Akins that one of the reasons for their actions on oil was to show the US that they will have to turn to other sources of energy. They can pump half the oil at twice the price.

Secretary Kissinger: No, that wasn't why they did it.

Mr. Rush: But it's true that we do have to turn to other sources. If we don't put the message out now, but wait until you come back from your trip, it will look as though the trip was a failure. We should talk about the worldwide energy shortage and how we intend to meet it.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's set up a committee to rewrite the message—Bill (Clements), Joe (Sisco) and Hal (Saunders)—let's do it today.[12]

Mr. Sisco: It should be very low-key—to meet our energy needs, we are taking the following steps.

---

[10] November 4.

[11] November 6.

[12] Documentation on drafting the President's speech is in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXXVI, Energy Crisis, 1969–1974.

Secretary Kissinger: Yes, there should be no mention of the Middle East, no numbers. We'll get the latest draft, rewrite it here so there will be no jurisdictional disputes, then Scowcroft can ram it down their throats. We'll put it out Tuesday. Scowcroft will monitor it.

Mr. Sisco: I've talked with the best Arabists in the (State) Department, and they feel strongly we should go on Tuesday.

Secretary Kissinger: But there will be no cracks at the Arabs.

Mr. Clements: Absolutely.

Mr. Rush: It's not retaliatory—we're just meeting an economic need.

Mr. Clements: (to Secretary Kissinger) Did you see that report from Germany that they are going to announce rationing today or tomorow—they're reaching for a 12% cut in consumption, but they can't do it.

Mr. Rush: Ken Jamieson (of Exxon) is pushing them.

Secretary Kissinger: I thought we told Jamieson to shut up and not to panic people.

Mr. Clements: I don't know whether he is there on his own initiative or whether the Germans asked him to come over.

Mr. Rush: He was already planning to go to Europe. That's why he wanted to shift his appointment with you (Mr. Kissinger).

Secretary Kissinger: The last thing we need right now is for someone to panic.

Mr. Clements: That's why I'm telling you.

Secretary Kissinger: Rationing in Germany won't make any difference.

Mr. Clements: It certainly won't help Henry (Kissinger) for the Germans to panic.

Secretary Kissinger: (to Mr. Rush) Will you call Jamieson and tell him to cool it.

Mr. Rush: I'd better call (Ambassador) Hillenbrand first and get the facts.

Secretary Kissinger: I thought we had agreed everyone could stay cool for two weeks.

Mr. Clements: We did. This will cause a chain reaction in Europe that couldn't be more detrimental to your trip.

Secretary Kissinger: This will just create domestic pressure in those countries to put the squeeze on Israel. Then the Arab incentive to deal with us will go down. Ken (Rush), get hold of Jamieson immediately.

Mr. Rush: I will.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

309. Intelligence Note Prepared in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research[1]

RNAN–50 Washington, November 2, 1973.

SYRIA: MOVING TOWARD 242?

Egypt's acceptance of the cease-fire on October 22 caught Syrian President Asad by surprise. At the time, the Syrian forces seemed on the point of launching a counteroffensive. After some delay, however, Asad overcame the opposition in the Syrian Baath and accepted the cease-fire.

He tried to rationalize this decision in a major speech on October 29. Syrian acceptance, he said, was based on Soviet assurances that Israel would withdraw from Arab territories and honor Palestinian rights. Claiming significant military successes for the Arabs, he stated that Syria was determined to resume the war if Arab aims were not met.

Otherwise, Asad's tone was remarkably conciliatory. His characterization of Resolution 338 as the result of "Arab resolve" contrasts sharply with Syria's long-time rejection of Resolution 242. He did not criticize Egypt for its unilateral acceptance of the ceasefire, nor did he even mention US military resupply of Israel. He left the impression that Syria may be prepared to follow Sadat's lead toward a peace conference. His unaccustomed failure to flay the US may indicate that Syria has joined Egypt in looking to the US as an important agent in the settlement process.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1178, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, Nov. 1, 1973 through Nov. 5, 1973. Secret. Drafted by Albert A. Vaccaro, cleared by Curtis F. Jones, and released by David E. Mark in INR/Near East and South Asia. A typewritten notation on the report reads: "This report was produced by the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. Aside from normal substantive exchange with other agencies at the working level, it has not been coordinated elsewhere."

310. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, November 2, 1973.

SUBJECT

Meeting between Secretary Kissinger and Syrian Vice Foreign Minister

PARTICIPANTS

Secretary Kissinger
Assistant Secretary Joseph Sisco
David Korn (NEA/ARN)

Syrian Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mohammed Zakariya Ismail
Mr. Diyallah El Fattal, Director, Office of UN Affairs, Syrian Foreign Ministry

Secretary Kissinger: I am leaving for various Arab capitals, as you know. I have never had the personal pleasure of any contact with Syrian officials.[2] I want to have what will be a very preliminary talk with you. In planning my trip, we did not propose a visit by me to Damascus because we thought it would be rather sudden in terms of our previous relations. However, I want to assure you that I did not intend any discourtesy. Mr. Sisco could stop in Damascus on his way back if your government thought it useful.

Did you come to New York for the General Assembly?

Mr. Ismail: Yes. I came intending to stay only a short time, but then the war broke out.

Secretary Kissinger: I tried to reach you the day the war broke out but could not. What I was going to ask you would not have done much good anyway.

Mr. Ismail: I remember hearing that you were trying to get in touch with the Foreign Minister; they said you wanted to see the Minister. He was already gone.

Secretary Kissinger: There was some confusion. Well, would you like to speak first or do you want me to go ahead?

(Mr. Ismail indicated he would prefer that the Secretary speak first.)

Secretary Kissinger: What I wanted to say is that relations between the U.S. and the Arab countries have been very difficult, partly because the Arab countries have considered us the lawyer and chief defender of

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 27 ARAB–ISR. Secret; Nodis. Drafted by Korn.

[2] Syria severed diplomatic relations with the United States after the 1967 war. A U.S. Interests Section in the Italian Embassy in Damacus was not established until February 8, 1974.

Israel. That is partly true. We are committed to maintaining the existence of Israel. To the extent that it is the Arab position to destroy Israel, we will be in opposition. On the other hand, we have a long history of friendship with the Arab countries. I spoke to several of your colleagues before the outbreak of the war and expressed the view that I recognized that the conditions that then existed were intolerable and could not continue. I suggested that the U.S. would be prepared after the Israeli elections to make a major diplomatic effort. This remains our view. We recognize that there are legitimate Arab concerns that have to be satisfied, but we cannot do everything for the Arab countries. There are limits, but up to these limits we are prepared to make a serious effort. However, on the Arab side there must be some understanding of our problems. Most Arabs seem to think that all we have to do is order Israel to do something and Israel will do it. The people who think this have not had the opportunity of meeting with the Prime Minister of Israel several times this week as I have; otherwise they would not think this way.

What I am prepared to do is to make an effort. What I want to ask from the Arabs is cooperation in developing a serious program. I think I am in a position to make a serious contribution: I cannot be accused of anti-Semitism, and I have some experience in negotiating difficult matters. Now, that is our attitude and I wanted to communicate it to you and to tell you that we are prepared to have serious discussions with the Syrian Government. The U.S. and Syria should not be cut off from each other.

Mr. Ismail: The meaning of my presence here this evening is that we agree that there should be discussions. Of course, after I received your invitation I was in contact with Damascus. Damascus agreed to my coming here, since we accepted Resolution 338. The acceptance of Resolution 338 was conditional on two essential elements: Withdrawal of Israeli forces from all of the occupied territory, and the safeguarding of the rights of the Palestinians. This was all contained in the letter which I sent to Secretary General Waldheim.

I was deeply impressed this morning when I visited the Lincoln Memorial to read the words cited from Lincoln's inaugural address: He said the U.S. wants a just and lasting peace at home and abroad.

Secretary Kissinger: I think Lincoln's second inaugural address was really his greatest speech, not the Gettysburg Address as is often cited.

Mr. Ismail: This morning I saw in the news a declaration by (Israeli Finance Minister) Sapir that Israel wants to establish a city in the center of the Golan Heights. Such declarations by Israel do not give us encouragement regarding talks with Israel.

Secretary Kissinger: Mr. Minister, one of our problems is that many people say many things for many reasons, particularly for domestic political reasons. Leaders have to prove that they are not giving anything away. What we have to understand is that unless there is a settlement the possibility certainly will exist that Israel will construct a city in Golan. We must not allow ourselves to be deflected from our purpose by what various people say. There is, of course, plenty of reason for suspicion on both sides, but we have to keep this in perspective.

Mr. Ismail: The Israelis have the habit of saying the Arabs want to destroy Israel. This is not true. I have had to answer (Israeli UN Ambassador) Tekoah on this several times. I have said that all we want is to get back our territory and to insure the rights of the Palestinians.

(At this point the Secretary was called from the meeting for several minutes.)

Mr. Sisco: We believe what the various parties say and think that everybody is committed to the proposition that Israel is here to stay. We accept what the Arabs say in this regard.

Mr. Ismail: Maybe Sapir was speaking for domestic consumption, but there are 19 Israeli settlements in Golan and Dayan and others have said that Golan is not negotiable, Jerusalem is not negotiable, Sharm-el-Shaikh and the West Bank are not negotiable. How can they reconcile all these things with Resolution 242?

(The Secretary returned to the meeting.)

Secretary Kissinger: As I was saying when we broke off, there will be a lot of things said that will be objectionable because everyone will want to prove he has not yielded anything; this will be the case, especially in the end.

I have no precise idea of all the elements of a settlement, and I would like to wait on that matter. But we are prepared to make a serious effort and to lend our good offices. We will insist, however, on not being blackmailed while we are doing it.

Mr. Sisco: Mr. Secretary, while you were out the Minister asked a question about our discussions with the Egyptians on the cease fire.

Secretary Kissinger: We have talked to the Egyptian Foreign Minister. What we are trying to do is that the Egyptians want to restore the October 22 line—wherever it was. The Israelis want the return of their prisoners and an end to the blockade. We are talking to all of the parties to see if these problems can be bundled together. It is a test case of what can be done. The Egyptian Foreign Minister has not been able to agree to everything that we have proposed, but I want to say that he has made a real effort. In the meantime we have reached agreement on an-

other convoy. I hope that by the time I get to Cairo this will all be worked out.

Mr. Ismail: Everybody talks about the cease fire on the Egyptian front but nobody mentions the problems on the Syrian front.

Secretary Kissinger: We would be prepared to send an emergency force to Syria if you wanted one.

Mr. Ismail: No, we don't want that. But we have many complaints.

Secretary Kissinger: We support the strict observance of the cease fire, on both sides. May I make a point regarding prisoners? Israel is very anxious to have an exchange of prisoners.

Mr. Ismail: First we have to exchange lists of prisoners. But Israel refuses to give us the bodies of our dead soldiers. This is in violation of the Geneva Convention. Also, we have 15,000 people who were expelled from their homes in the war zone.

Secretary Kissinger: Would you be prepared to release the prisoners if Israel let those people go back to their homes?

Mr. Ismail: Israel would have to give us the bodies of our soldiers and let the people go back to their homes, then we will exchange prisoner lists. If Israel withdraws to the October 22 line, then we might have an exchange of prisoners.

Secretary Kissinger: May I sum up? If Israel permits the return of the displaced persons and the return of the bodies of the dead, then you will exchange lists. As soon as the October 22 line is demarcated and the Israelis withdraw their forces to it Syria will return the prisoners.

Mr. Ismail: Let me make it clear that this is my own point of view and I cannot guarantee that it would be the position of my government.

Secretary Kissinger: If you could get me an answer on that and we get agreement it would help the stability of the Egyptian cease fire.

Was territory of military importance occupied by Israel after October 22?

Mr. Ismail: Yes. Some very important strategic areas in the Mount Hermon region.

Secretary Kissinger: All informed observers that I talked to said the Syrian forces fought well in the war. Everybody was impressed by your performance.

If you could get me an answer on this idea it may be possible to do something.

Mr. Ismail: Could you please repeat it again?

Secretary Kissinger: This is the proposal. I am not endorsing it, just proposing to transmit it. Israel would let the 15,000 displaced persons come back and would allow the Syrian dead to be handed over. Then Syria and Israel would exchange prisoner lists. After that Israel would

go back to the October 22 lines whereupon Syria and Israel would exchange prisoners.

If you could let me know about this by Sunday[3] night it would be helpful, but I can be reached easily at any time.

A more basic problem is how we will regulate our relationship in the future on all sides; we are prepared to continue these conversations.

Mr. Ismail: I am in New York and am ready to talk to you any time. We can make contact whenever there is something to discuss.

Secretary Kissinger: That is fine. What will you say to the press as you leave if you are asked about this talk.

Mr. Ismail: I will say that I was invited by the Secretary of State and we had a useful meeting.

I hope this first contact will lead to even more beneficial contact. For our part we will do our utmost to work for peace and good relations. Maybe on future occasions I will be able to say more.

Secretary Kissinger: I hope so. I think we should continue these efforts.

I am told that in all history nobody has ever won a negotiation with the Syrians; maybe with the Egyptians, but not with the Syrians.

Mr. Ismail: (Laughing) Maybe that is because the Syrians always have the best case.

[3] November 4.

311. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, November 2, 1973, 8:19 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Ismail Fahmi, Acting Egyptian Foreign Minister
Abdallah El-Erian, Egyptian Ambassador to France
Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Joseph J. Sisco, Ass't. Secretary of State

Fahmi: I have decided to stay in Washington a little longer.

Kissinger: If you agree to the exchange of POWs in the proposal we discussed, I would try to see to it that there would be no Israeli offensive military action against the Third Army.

Fahmi: You would guarantee that there would be no military action, even if they move to the October 22 positions.

Kissinger: I cannot assure you that Israel will move to the October 22 positions. I can guarantee that after an agreement on the ceasefire, an agreement which includes no military supplies, we will do whatever we can to prevent Israeli offensive military action against you.

Fahmi: If I agree to non-military cargos and exchange of wounded, the ceasefire is unstable. I will be at a disadvantage if they resupply in the West. You said you guarantee no offensive military action. I want all of this after they have moved to the October 22 positions. I want to take this guarantee in writing to Cairo and I would give it only to President Sadat.

Kissinger: I will see if we can express this in some way, and it would only go to President Sadat. I would like to look at the record of this meeting.

Fahmi: Do you plan on giving this only when you come, or can you get it beforehand?

Kissinger: Let's see what can be done.

Fahmi: I want the guarantee in writing, and only President Sadat would know about it.[2] Mrs. Meir is unfair. She got from us a commit-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt, Vol. VIII, November 1–December 31, 1973. Secret; Nodis. The meeting took place in the Secretary's office at the Department of State. Brackets are in the original.

[2] Following this meeting, Kissinger instructed Sisco to give Fahmi a letter from him that reads: "In connection with any agreement between Egypt and Israel relating to implementation of Paragraph 1 of Security Council Resolution 338: The United States guarantees that it will do its utmost to prevent offensive military operations by Israeli forces on the West Bank against Egyptian forces while the Israeli forces are on the West Bank." (Ibid.)

ment to peace and she got a commitment for negotiations with the help of the United States.

Kissinger: The policy outlined is a fixed policy of the United States. We are determined to play a major role in a settlement and I intend to say this when I come to Cairo.

Fahmi: I am not leaving now. I am waiting for a final summation of Mrs. Meir's position.

Kissinger: We meet again briefly tomorrow. I have not had a report. She has a number of other meetings today. She cannot make the decision here. It would have to be made at a Sunday Cabinet meeting.

Fahmi: She is not interested in her POWs.

Kissinger: She is interested, but does not seem to want to pay very much for them.

Fahmi: We will not give up the POWs for nothing. We have held them for six to eight years. She may have difficulty inside her own country if she does not get her POWs. I heard what you said regarding Israeli acceptance on October 14 of a ceasefire in place with the United States and the USSR abstaining. The tragedy is now; I don't see why she does not return to the October 22 positions.

Kissinger: There is no rational explanation.

Fahmi: The President will receive you on your arrival in Cairo. He will give you—a first in history—a dinner in his own house in your honor. With you and two associates, the President will continue his negotiations and receive you upon arrival and take you to the Palace. Then after that there will be chats, dinner with you and two associates. On the second day, instead of talking to me, he has decided that he will talk to you and do the negotiating.

Finally, I want to inform you we have accepted your proposal that you can fly in the Finns directly rather than through some intermediate point.

You should be ready to discuss disengagement proposals seriously. I will discuss disengagement. What you can expect from us is a serious effort and to focus on realistic solutions and in what time frame something can be achieved. We have full confidence in you. It is in the overall interest of the United States.

Kissinger: The Israelis have enormous domestic strength. I appreciate the courtesies, and there will be reciprocity. I will discuss our general approach in Cairo. I will indicate our capabilities. I cannot make any final commitments to a plan, but I can talk about a direction.

Fahmi: The President does not expect you to have a final plan. What he wants from you is the United States' position.

Kissinger: If we do it too fast, it will not work. We need careful public preparation. Tell your President that we are determined to make

significant progress. I believe our conversations this week have been very useful. Moreover, the presence of the [Israeli] Prime Minister has been helpful. It has given us a clearer picture of the problem we face in Israel and at home. We want to promise only what we can deliver. The question is how to organize ourselves domestically to get ready for the battle ahead. The President and I have to decide how to organize ourselves—on what points to apply pressure. Let's decide what points to apply pressure.

As to disengagement, I am ready to discuss it. However, we have to avoid expending all of our efforts on a return to the October 22 position. Israel is not going to stay forever on the West Bank of the Canal. The October 22 position is only important in relationship to supply; it should not be used as a red flag and everything else forgotten. We want to be sure that we are going in the right direction. We have to think in terms of bigger steps. We have to come to a decision to make progress and to bear in mind the time scale that is possible and not to overinflate our expectations. I believe our basic approach has merit. We will have a massive brawl with the Israelis on the question of the return to the October 22 positions. We have two choices: To do that, or to say, "To hell with this. Let's tackle the bigger problem." We can move on to the broader question. Only we can deliver. It is important that you repeat this to your President.

Fahmi: I appreciate what you have told me. You are confirming my feeling and my President's feeling. It is exactly what I got from the President two days ago. I agree with your proposal of taking seriously the role of the United States. That the United States will deliver the goods is what we want. We want a basic starting point. Nobody in the Arab world believes that you cannot tell Israel what it must do. We want to discuss everything on the Middle East and our future bilateral relationships. I am glad that you are prepared to discuss disengagement.

It is important we get something done on the thin layers problem.[3] Suppose the proposal is rejected by the other side. What will be our situation? This is the question. Suppose we both agree on something and that you cannot deliver. This process of getting together on negotiations will never start. Everybody in the Arab world and elsewhere is pressing us. "What about the October 22 position?" they are saying. "You cannot deal with the Americans," our friends are saying. "Why don't you go to the Security Council?" We are hearing from NATO, from the Soviets, from the Arabs. I agree with your approach. The weight of the United States must finish the job.

---

[3] This is presumably a reference to the disengagement zone manned by UN troops, as proposed by President Sadat. See the attachment to Document 303.

Kissinger: We have an important tactical question. Everything needs time. Let's take this thin layer problem you just mentioned. On the thin layer, if you want to spill enough blood, we can get something. What do we want to spill blood on? That is the question. Is it worth spilling blood for five kilometers or 50 kilometers? I will know what is possible on the thin layer when I have completed my talks.

Fahmi: Do they want a settlement? They will not be able to stay there. She knows this.

Kissinger: She does not. We have got to open peace negotiations. It is important that something happen and that we set up a procedure.

Fahmi: She will not get her POWs and Bab Al-Mandab. How does anyone believe that Sadat can go to negotiations if she does not return to the October 22 position?

Kissinger: If you present them with a pretext to get out of negotiations, then there is no pressure on them. If she can get a brawl started, it is great for them, not for you. We have a strategic problem before us. It is not worth a lot of shouting for tactical points.

Fahmi: Have you asked why we should not exchange wounded POWs?

Kissinger: They are in no hurry.

Fahmi: We are interested in guarantees. We believe this is important. You agree with the Russians on all points regarding starting negotiations. I remind you, however, that nobody speaks in our behalf.

Kissinger: We will speak to you. It was the Russian idea of joint auspices. Dobrynin came in the other day to ask how it might work. We did say Geneva. We have agreed to it.

Fahmi: In New York would be better. We want them in New York where they are closer to you, because we need you. We need your presence.

312. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, November 2, 1973, 10 p.m.–12:45 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Golda Meir, Prime Minister of Israel
Simcha Dinitz, Ambassador to the U.S.
Mordechai Gazit, Director of the Prime Minister's Office
General Aharon Yariv, Assistant to the Prime Minister
Mordechai Shalev, Minister
General Yisrael Leor, Adviser to the Prime Minister

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Joseph Sisco, Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs
Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff

[The Secretary and Prime Minister conferred alone from 10:00–11:05.[2] At 11:05, the rest of the group was admitted.]

Meir: Aharon, tell us what will happen when we say the road is open to non-military material to the Third Army.

Yariv: If we have no control over it, this road will be used to reinforce the Third Army.

Kissinger: With what?

Yariv: Sooner or later, in the darkness hours, anti-aircraft missiles in the Third Army area.

Kissinger: Through UN checkpoints.

Yariv: I think UN checkpoints are not reliable. This is our experience. Maybe not in the first days, but over a period. Because, Mr. Secretary, the present configuration presents them with two problems—first is sustenance and second is our presence near Cairo. In a phase in time when one wants to proceed to a negotiating phase, the configuration of strength is very important. We are in a good bargaining position because we're in a good military position. If we have to withdraw, our

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL ISR–US. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting took place at Blair House. Brackets are in the original.

[2] In a 7 p.m. telephone conversation on November 2, Dinitz told Kissinger that he thought the Secretary and Prime Minister Meir should meet alone in order to reach an understanding for the next week concerning the peace prospects. Kissinger noted that they had sat together the previous evening and that this had not led to anything. Dinitz said that there was a tremendous amount of misunderstanding and that the Prime Minister had not said half the things that she had been quoted as saying. He added that she was not prepared to have anyone else handle the negotiations and that that was why she was in Washington. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

whole position is weakened, to a grave degree, and a big risk. Our experience with the UN is very bad.

Kissinger: That may be true, but one has to look at the alternative. We have kept the UN Security Council off your back by saying we're talking to the Egyptians, and we've told the Egyptians any proposal that comes to us through the Russians is dead. So we have kept pressure off by making them think we will do something. All this mirage will disappear if I go to Cairo and produce nothing. This will produce extreme activity in the Security Council and an unconditional resolution to go back to the October 22 lines, without the prisoners or anything.

That's only a Security Council resolution. But other things will happen. There is the oil pressure. Someone will say, slow down the arms. And we can't be in the position of breaking an agreement with the Russians. No one told us you needed Suez to have a tolerable ceasefire. We made an agreement in good faith with the Russians. It doesn't make any difference who shot first. You'll be forced off the road without anything.

Yariv: I promised the Egyptian general answers to two questions—answer to the first phase of his general arrangement.

Kissinger: You have to tell me what your answer will be.

Yariv: He drew his map, he showed me two beachheads, with the UNEF in between. The size of the forces could be discussed, he said. Second issue was the conditions of life for the Third Army.

I said we would not have the answers before Monday.[3] He said all right. He said the question of prisoners was separate.

Meir: I told the Secretary about the breakdown of the agreement on prisoners.[4]

Yariv: Prisoners will be discussed when she gets back.

Kissinger: There are two problems. They will certainly discuss the disengagement phase with me in Cairo. I've no views on this; I was going to hold forth in an abstract way.

It is absolutely imperative for me to know before I am in Cairo what you'll tell them.

Yariv: We've no problem with that.

Kissinger: But I have to know.

Meir: I only had a brief word with Allon and Dayan on the runway in Lod. To me it's an absolutely impossible suggestion. As a result of this war we should pull back thirty kilometers and let them have both

[3] November 5.

[4] See Document 305.

sides of Suez, with the UN in between. And that's not even the end. It's only the first phase.

Dinitz: This is what was presented to you.

Yariv: Yes.

Meir: The Cabinet won't accept it.

Kissinger: That's not desirable, certainly. I don't think you'll agree to it. But the UN being in between has certain advantages.

Meir: During the discussions for a peace settlement, if they are separated ten kilometers, each side, then there is real hope for peace talks.

Kissinger: There is no chance whatsoever of its being accepted.

Meir: Why?

Kissinger: Sadat can't make a settlement in which he not only gets nothing on the East Bank but gives up ten kilometers on the West Bank. He'll be overthrown.

We have a letter from the Shah pleading with us not to go to this. He's not your enemy, and this is what he thinks it means.

Meir: I don't understand.

Kissinger: The Shah wrote, using the excuse of arguing with our October 8 proposal of a return to the status quo ante. He said don't do it.

Meir: Suppose they move back, and then there is a buffer zone.

Kissinger: They will probably not accept.

Let me say this: If you and we develop a degree of confidence in each other, we can agree on a position in advance. And you can take an outrageous position, and let us force you off it. Then we have a strategy. What I have convinced Egypt of in this war is that the Russians can give them arms but only we can give them territory. The only question is how much, in what time frame. That can take six weeks.

My advice to you is to be tough with them. But the best strategy is one where, however painful it is, only we can produce something.

But we're not in that stage yet. My advice to you is, don't get into a disengagement discussion yet on Monday. That's not the official U.S. Government position, just personal advice.

But the present necessity is the October 22 problem, which if properly played, can be used to get an easing of the oil embargo, an easing of pressures from Europeans, and some illusions in the Arab world. This will ease pressures on you.

Yariv: Embargo? Bab El-Mandeb?

Kissinger: No, the oil pressure. If we can get Sadat to agree, even if only for two months, it gets us through the worst winter months.

This gets us through with the Russians, where now he [Brezhnev] is writing a letter a week to the President saying he's been tricked—

which is not unreasonable—and now they are trying to bypass me by sending Hot Line messages. They don't know I get those too. They make a proposal every other day to send helicopters in to save the Third Army. It is impossible to send American planes to fight Russian planes on that issue. You run the risk of getting forced off the roads for nothing.

Therefore, I would like to try to get your agreement on a package deal while Egyptians are still under the illusion we are the solution to all their dilemmas. Sooner or later they'll turn on us anyway. But what we need now is time.

Yariv: How do we get time?

Kissinger: You agree in principle to return to the October 22 line. The line is to be demarcated between you and Egypt. While the discussion goes on, the road is open to non-military traffic checked by the UN with you standing there. With an understanding that even if the road changes hands, only non-military supply can go through. And there will be an exchange of prisoners and a lifting of the blockade. I have no reason to think they'll accept the lifting of the blockade.

The weak spot in this is that Egypt will insist that the exchange of prisoners can occur only when you return to the line. You'll insist the exchange take place when the road is open on a permanent basis. This is the dilemma.

Meir: I want to ask something which may seem very naive. If they want the road only for supplying of the Third Army, they can have it. We don't care how many cigarettes and biscuits they send in.

Kissinger: They'll say—just as you don't trust the UN, they'll say they don't trust you.

Meir: We can give it as an undertaking to you, in writing, or anything.

Kissinger: The problem is, to handle Egyptian Foreign Minister. If you think it's easy to drag it for five days discussing nothing, on a very simple problem. This is going on now a week. The minute this negotiation fails, the Russians will go in to the Egyptians and say, "You idiots, now let us take over." They'll go to the UN; there will be oil pressure; there will be UN resolutions to put the UN on the road, and our bureaucratic pressures. I told you we had serious proposals for *us* to supply the Third Army.

You can't solve October 22 problem by supplying the Third Army.

Meir: Do they want the October 22 line for supplies or to break the encirclement? This is the problem. If it's that, it means they'll encircle our army.

Kissinger: If they can get enough through the UN checkpoints.

Meir: The tanks are already there.

Kissinger: How far from the roads would you be?

Yariv: He showed me his map. He wants all three roads.

Kissinger: That is insane.

Yariv: Let's suppose it's their maximum. But today we're not holding a road; we're holding a line. We control the whole territory. He's smart. He makes a distinction between supplies and holding a strategic position.

He has the technique of taking me aside to talk frankly. I told him he wouldn't get the October 22 lines because it would put us in an inferior strategic position. He came back the other day and said he wanted "political-level" discussions. Next day he said he was appointed a political advisor!

I told him no October 22 lines. He said, "O.K. I have a plan." So he left October 22 lines. [He opens up a map to show the lines.] Sadat, you remember, said in a speech, "We'll leave you a bridgehead of 400 square kilometers." It sounds great, but it gives them the three roads.

Kissinger: Where were you really at 1852 hours October 22?

Yariv: We cut the two main roads.

Kissinger: On October 22?

Yariv: Yes.

Kissinger: The only one you got afterwards is this one [Adabiyah]?

Yariv: Yes.

During the night he'll infiltrate along this road and build up his force there. He'll insist that the line be drawn in such a way that he can infiltrate.

There is a difference between the road and the line. If we control the line, we control the territory. Otherwise he'll be independent of the road.

It is important for us to move to negotiations when we're in the position of strength. What happens here affects what he's achieved, even with the fact that this army is trapped.

Kissinger: The dilemma I have is this. If you look at history, Prussia started as Israel did and just expanded and filled the territory it expanded into. But there was no UN. There is no question that this is a correct Israeli strategy—if this was a local problem and if you were alone.

One thing the Arabs have achieved in this war—regardless of what they lost—is that they've globalized the problem. They have created the conviction that something must be done, which we've arrested only by my prestige, by my trip, by maneuvers. This will all run out in a few weeks. The Soviets are anxious to get back in. I don't think you're being

unreasonable. But what we can get is something less negative than what you have now.

Your worse danger is not being trapped by the Third Army; it is massive pressure to go back to the 1967 borders.

Dinitz: The problem, Dr. Kissinger, becomes clearer if you realize the Third Army isn't in passive state but is planning every day to break out. They are arming themselves and preparing.

Kissinger: This may be true. But I've left the Arab world and am sitting in China and Sadat makes a speech saying, "The Americans have tricked us." The Russians came into the UN with a resolution to go back to the October 22 line. They'll play that scenario with the helicopters.

We have a period of quiet now by playing this fakery of talking to Fahmi for an hour every day.

Meir: If we're forced into this now, why won't we be forced into anything?

Kissinger: No. We're in a peculiar situation. If you had taken Suez on October 21, we wouldn't be here talking about this.

Meir: Where is the October 22 line?

Kissinger: If it weren't for your prisoners, we could have a great strategy, throwing it into the negotiations.

Dinitz: Why not put the prisoners in with the supplies?

Kissinger: Because you have no right to be on that line. Our only concern about the Third Army is that from Brezhnev's point of view the agreement on ceasefire with a fixed deadline, plus my trip to Tel Aviv, plus your moving afterward—makes him look like a fool. That's our dilemma. They assume collusion.

Dinitz: That's why we allow supplies, to get you out of the dilemma.

Kissinger: The Soviet motivation is not based on a sentimental attachment to their word with us. They'll see an opportunity to get back in. Their political position in Egypt is not that good, because they only saved Egypt from disasters and didn't give them anything positive. My strategy is to be in the position to make them think they can get some progress from us. This helps us keep the Russians out of power plays and to resist them when they do make power plays. If I can give the Egyptians something in Cairo that permits the evolution of the strategy I indicated, we could keep this process going for a while. It may break down at some point, but at that point we may have split the pressures into their component parts. I've kept the oil companies quiet, the Russians quiet, NATO quiet, so far.

I told the Prime Minister we just got 35 Russian "observers" out.

Yariv: You touched on a very sensitive point, the prisoners. Let us assume for a minute that discussion is going on on the October 22 line; in the meantime they don't give in on the prisoners or blockade because they see this as their leverage on us for the October 22 lines. It is an impossible position.

Kissinger: But otherwise you'll be immediately in an impossible position.

Dinitz: What would satisfy the Egyptians?

Kissinger: I don't know.

Meir: If you had known of the blockade when you were in Moscow, you would have raised it.

Kissinger: No question.

Meir: We could go to the Security Council on that.

Dinitz: With great success, Madame Prime Minister.

Kissinger: What would they take? Agreement in principle to the October 22 lines, non-military convoys on the roads, an exchange of prisoners, lifting the blockade. That, I think, is negotiable. The one soft spot is when does the prisoner exchange take place? You obviously want the prisoners now.

Meir: Yes.

Kissinger: What can the U.S. promise them that would make them give them up? Once we get agreement on that, we're in a different position.

I frankly think you misassessed the geopolitical situation. You were correct in the local situation.

What can we promise them? Goodwill in the subsequent situation? Maybe they'll agree to that. I don't know. Joe, can you think of anything?

Sisco: It is hard to get anything concrete.

Kissinger: I am deathly afraid of getting into a concrete peace plan. I like the buffer idea, but I would rather not discuss this with you.

The negotiations won't begin before December 1. It will be many weeks before we have to confront any concrete proposal. The Russians can't threaten to send forces if in the first month you don't agree on disengagement zones.

Gazit: Could you promise dates and procedures for a negotiation?

Kissinger: I'll tell you, ever since we faced them down, they're biding their time. Something eerie is going on there. Their forces are increasing; there are over one hundred ships now in the Mediterranean. In Czechoslovakia there were many false alarms. Now they are publishing articles on Watergate for the first time.

Meir: Really.

Sisco: They are even mentioning impeachment.

Kissinger: If I knew what the ceasefire line would look like, I wouldn't have been in Peking from the 10th to the 13th. I look upon the 10th to the 13th with great trepidation. I don't get the same communication from Dobrynin that I used to get. It is more official now. I get the feeling they're writing a ledger of things we've refused, as if to justify something. I told you they proposed special representatives. That we turned off by agreeing to upgrade our Interests Section in Cairo after my visit. We're both playing our own games.

Sisco: If we can't find practical arrangement as the Secretary described, we face a complicated situation.

Kissinger: Let us look at a balance sheet of our assets: One is your military situation. Second is the Arab belief that they've been stupid to be nasty to the United States. Third is a sentimental belief that because I settled three or four other things I can settle this. They tell each other these things. That can be used with the Europeans, who are cowards. Otherwise, everything will concentrate on forcing you off the road. That you can avoid for a month by avoiding Security Council resolutions. But it will influence every bureaucratic decision in this town. By the end of December we'll certainly be joining in a UN resolution.

I won't mislead you. Even if you go along, you will be under pressure. You and we once worked out a strategy which was relatively painless. Now we have to work out one with a minimum of pain.

Dinitz: What has changed in the three days since you said continuous non-military supply could get the prisoners?

Kissinger: I thought continuous non-military supply linked to the October 22 lines gave you enough to take care of your problem.

Meir: To leave our prisoners there for a certain length of time, that we can't live with.

Kissinger: First, I misunderstood the geography of the situation. I thought the military problem was just one road.

Sisco: Can you conceive of some hypothetical movement of your forces off the roads within a practical arrangement as the Secretary described which could approximate what the other side might think of as the October 22 line, but would not be a problem for your forces?

Kissinger: That wouldn't help. They'd claim another line. You can live with UN control of the road, if you hold both sides of the road.

Yariv: Yes, if we hold the line.

Kissinger: Because however sloppy UN control is, they can't move tanks. The package I'm suggesting is satisfactory to you if I can get the prisoners. You'd run the risk of screwing up the negotiations.

What do I say if they say they accept every detail of this—except the prisoners?

Yariv: Except the prisoners?

Kissinger: Maybe if I say you'll get off the road completely. Just to give them something face-saving.

You've now convinced me the line is more important than the road.

Yariv: The SA–6 missile is like a tank.

Kissinger: I now understand what your requirements are. We've now gone intellectually as far as we can go. Can you give up the Straits if you got prisoners?

Meir: What that means is that we'll be left without oil. This is what we've built very carefully with Iranians.

Kissinger: You may be left without oil anyway. I'm trying to think of something we could sacrifice, or something the U.S. could promise them. Let's think about it overnight. Joe and I will think of what we can offer; you think of what you can give up.

Maybe they'll accept right away. Then there will be no problem.

Yariv: Then it would be a pleasant surprise.

Kissinger: If we can tell him it's a UN road, then it's a victory of sorts. And you don't mind if you can stay ten miles away.

Dinitz: Only UN inspection?

Kissinger: I know what you want; I will be glad to let you conduct the negotiations. But they can't get anything through like tanks, artillery—anything they can't get in a two-ton truck.

Gazit: Is there any chance you could leave that capital with an announcement, in addition to the other things, that the negotiations in third paragraph of 338[5] will begin December 15?

Kissinger: They think that's a concession to you.

Gazit: With an announcement that the prisoners will be exchanged on that date.

Kissinger: It would be a great announcement. I have a good judgment of what is attainable in a negotiation. If you can be obnoxious on Monday . . .

Meir: We have to remember. We've been away from home only two days. We can't allow convoys through without our prisoners. We have our pilots there. We're one family.

They don't care about their prisoners. Why are only 60 trucks unloaded?

---

[5] See footnote 3, Document 229.

Kissinger: Because they want to show that the convoy system is inefficient. Part of scheme is an excuse to bring Russian helicopters to supply them.

The Russians are unnaturally quiet. We're in the eye of a storm which we've engineered around my trip—which will break within a week. I have the impression they're writing it all down. They don't forgive a humiliation. Dobrynin usually calls five times a day for an answer; now he doesn't. We owe him answers to a Brezhnev letter and to their proposal for representatives.[6] I have the impression he'd rather not have an answer.

I don't know what they're doing—military moves or what. There are rumors of a Russian armored brigade in Syria. We're flying photography tomorrow to check it.

We should meet tomorrow maybe for a half hour. If they don't accept, we need to know a fall back position.

Meir: I want to come back to the embargo on the Straits. To us it is a calamity. An enormous investment, and our relationship in Iran.

Kissinger: Madame Prime Minister, if I leave Cairo with nothing, you'll have UN resolutions and an embargo too. We need an attainable alternative. That it will be in my opening position is a certainty. The difficulty arises, when defacto you don't want to go back to the October 22 line, whether we can construct something that gets you your prisoners and eases the oil pressure. The question is what we can throw into the pot.

Meir: You don't want to discuss separation of forces?

Kissinger: I don't want to get into a discussion of that. He'll want to discuss it. They won't under any circumstances accept your proposal. I want to listen to him.

Sisco: The question of disengagement at best would be the first phase of the so-called negotiations.

Kissinger: Yes.

Sisco: That would be quite a beginning.

Kissinger: I'm willing to discuss disengagement in Cairo, but in a sufficiently professorial way in which they can't figure out what I'm saying. I don't want to get into an argument of where your forces are and their forces are. The strategy is to disagree with you and then get you to move to a pre-agreed position.

Dinitz: We've been doing that!

Kissinger: The tactics are great but strategy isn't your forte.

---

[6] See Document 301.

Yariv: Talk to them about disengagement and use this to get the prisoners.

Kissinger: What they need from me is some success that Sadat can point to that he can't get from you. In this sense our interests are parallel. Otherwise, the Russians are after us, and the Europeans and everyone will blame our support for you for their cold winter. And on an issue on which you are clearly in the wrong—as far as the world is concerned. They don't give a damn about that line.

I want the option of disengagement, but I want to keep vaguely in Sadat's mind that I might give him something later on disengagement, but not get into precise schemes. He might even think he'll get his proposal if I stay away from specifics. I can tell him "we can discuss disengagement later, but let's do this now."

Meir: What is the Syrian proposal?

Kissinger: The Syrian proposal is that you permit the 15,000 civilians to return and give them their dead bodies, and they'll give back the prisoners. If you agree to demarcate the October 22 line and return to it, then there will be an exchange of prisoners. They said there are two positions on Mt. Hermon that you took. Then, they say, they'll exchange prisoners.[7]

On the Syrian front, there were really no international pressures at all. I don't give a damn what you do.

Yariv: There they have no case on October 22. They didn't accept the ceasefire.

Kissinger: On Syria, we are pure intermediaries. It is not an international problem.

Meir: What can we do to press them on prisoners? They will kill them.

Kissinger: Well, he said let their 15,000 return.

Meir: 15,000?

Gazit: 1,500?

Kissinger: Maybe he misspoke. It is some protection for you if you get a list.

Meir: At least that.

Kissinger: They say they'll do that.

Meir: We agree to let the Red Cross get in that area to look at the civilians, if we get our prisoners. Or a list of prisoners, because the people there are really in danger of their lives.

---

[7] See Document 310.

Dinitz: It is interesting that the Russians are less interested in Syria than in Egypt.

Kissinger: If it were a normal ceasefire no one would care if you pushed forward. The misfortune is that the armies are behind each other.

I couldn't care less about the morality of the October 22 lines. I care about the reality of getting something started. Because you'll get under enormous pressure from the rest of the world.

The Syrians told us if you let these people back, and return the bodies, you'll get a list. If you want, we can tell them this. This was unconditional.

Sisco: What they weren't sure of without checking was giving you the prisoners if you give up the second position on Mt. Hermon.

Kissinger: He said 15,000. It must be a figure that's determinable by records.

Yariv: It's more than 1,500.

Kissinger: We'll be in touch with you tomorrow morning. That figure I would need only if you want me to tell Syrians anything. I am not recommending for or against it.

Think about the other problem, which is our nightmare: Russian helicopters going in there, and an enormous crisis which then forces you back anyway.

Yariv: There is a Russian saying that, "morning is wiser than evening."

313. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders and William B. Quandt of the National Security Council Staff to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, November 2, 1973.

SUBJECT

Strategy for Middle East Peace Settlement During Your Trip

During your trip, you will probably have to spend some time discussing your efforts to stabilize the ceasefire. The purpose of this memo, however, is to look beyond that.

A primary objective will be to develop sufficient understanding on a general concept for moving toward an Arab-Israeli peace settlement so that negotiations can begin at an early date on a concrete first step beyond stabilizing the ceasefire. This will be difficult to achieve because of the widely divergent views and expectations by all of the parties. The Arabs will press for assurances of full Israeli withdrawal, or at least a major Israeli pullback, as a precondition for entering into negotiations; the Israelis will strongly resist making any concessions at this stage and will insist on negotiating a framework for peace before any withdrawal.

Assuming that the present ceasefire can be stabilized and an exchange of prisoners can be accomplished, the key issues to be addressed in this longer perspective will be the following:

—*Acceptance by the Arabs that negotiations must begin before all issues of a final peace settlement have been resolved and that they must proceed step by step.* It may be necessary to develop some general heads of agreement in order to get the Arabs involved in the process, but the ideal would be to avoid this and begin the negotiations on the basis of Resolutions 242 and 338. The point to be established now is that the negotiations have to move ahead by stages, without guarantees of the outcome in advance. There will be great pressure from the Egyptians to get your commitment that Israel will eventually be required to pull back to pre-1967 lines, and you will have to hold to the position that this cannot be settled in advance of negotiation.

—*In order to keep momentum toward a peace settlement alive and to start the process of negotiations, it will be necessary to work out soon the terms of a serious first step.* The Israelis are apparently thinking of an exchange on

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1188, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Secretary Kissinger's Middle East Trip, 11/5/73–11/9/73 (First) [2 of 3]. Secret; Sensitive. Sent for information.

the Egyptian front where the parties would return to the pre-October 6 ceasefire lines, to be followed by a disengagement of forces from the Canal on both sides, after which the Canal could be reopened to international shipping. The Egyptians, by contrast, speak of a "disengagement stage" which would leave their forces in place on the east bank of Canal, while Israeli forces withdraw to a line east of the passes, thereby creating an intermediate zone to be filled by UN forces.

—*Timing of a peace conference and disengagement of forces.* The current Egyptian position is that a peace conference would be convened "at the same time as the disengagement zone is set up separating forces east of the passes."[2] From the Israeli point of view, this is unacceptable. Israel will insist, and we should try to convince the Egyptians of this, that no disengagement of forces from the October 22 lines can take place until peace negotiations have begun, unless the disengagement is on Israeli terms, e.g., return to the pre-October 6 lines along the Canal. The Egyptians need to understand that serious progress toward a settlement cannot be made in the absence of negotiations because only then will it be possible to provide a framework which Israel might regard as justifying a first withdrawal.

—*The question of Palestinian participation in peace negotiations will have to be dealt with soon.* The Israelis will be very tough on this issue, and it may be impossible to get their agreement to anything other than a Palestinian representative participating as part of a Jordanian delegation. King Hussein will also be very sensitive to how this issue is handled, and it would be best to be non-committal on this until you have talked with Hussein. [See Tab F on Palestinians.][3]

—*The Arab oil-producing countries will have to be made to understand,* perhaps with some help from President Sadat and King Hussein, *that it will be impossible for the United States to engage in the type of diplomatic activity the Arabs expect under the threat of an oil embargo.* As we move into an active phase of negotiations, it is to everyone's interest that the Arab oil producers begin to ease up on the embargo. A confrontation over oil will not be conducive to progress toward a peace settlement.

—Assuming that some early progress on a first stage of an Egyptian-Israeli settlement can be made, the issue will arise of *arranging a comparable step offering something to the Jordanians, Syrians, and Palestinians.* Egypt can afford to get somewhat out in front of the other Arabs, but there will be limits on how far Sadat can go unless some momentum is also being sustained on other fronts. Until a concrete step on the Egyptian front has been accepted, however, we can probably afford

---

[2] See Document 303.

[3] All tabs are attached, but not printed. Brackets in the original.

to stick with a general position of favoring parallel progress on all fronts once negotiations are underway.

The key to getting Egyptian and Israeli agreement on a tangible first step will be to find comparable concessions that each side can offer in negotiations. The problem will be that the Egyptians can offer Israel primarily symbolic concessions, apart from the release of prisoners and lifting the blockade at Bab al-Mandab. The Israelis have long sought Arab recognition, face-to-face talks, and an end to the state of belligerency, but these concessions will not weigh heavily in comparison to Arab demands for Israeli withdrawal of military forces from occupied areas. *Consequently, if progress is to be made in negotiations, it will be essential to provide something concrete in the way of Arab concessions at the outset in order to get the first stage of Israeli withdrawal of forces.* The issue is dealt with in more detail at Tab E.

Issues that may arise at each of your stops in Arab capitals are dealt with in separate tabs. A tab is also provided on the current position of the Palestinians. These tabs are arranged as follows:

Tab A–Morocco

Tab B–Egypt

Tab C–Jordan

Tab D–Saudi Arabia

Tab E–First Stage of a Settlement

Tab F–The Palestinians

314. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, November 3, 1973, 8:47–9:50 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State and Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Dr. James R. Schlesinger, Secretary of Defense
William E. Colby, Director, Central Intelligence Agency
Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
Maj. General Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

Schlesinger: What about the Saudis?

Kissinger: What I can do with them depends on what I can do with Sadat.[2]

Schlesinger: The Saudis are getting heady over the power of oil.[3] I am not sure they have a future aside from the West. They can't survive spitting fire and brimstone at the West.

Kissinger: The Shah would play that game. He is raring to go. The Saudis are having trouble surviving in this kind of world and they have to be more radical than the radicals.

How is the energy speech coming? Should be matter-of-fact.

Scowcroft: It's okay.

---

[1] Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversation, Box 2. Secret. The breakfast meeting was held in the White House Map Room.

[2] A November 3 memorandum to Kissinger reported on Sadat's November 2 meeting with Saudi King Faisal, during which Sadat was very optimistic over the prospects for the success of Kissinger's forthcoming diplomatic mission to the Middle East. Sadat told Faisal he had finally decided that Kissinger was truly sincere in his desire to be evenhanded toward the Arabs and Israel. The Saudis did not want their oil embargo to be the only weapon in the Arab arsenal, so they were relieved to hear that Syria and Egypt considered themselves to be as strong militarily as they were before the war. The Egyptians were fully prepared to return to a war of attrition strategy if this became necessary. The King approved of maintaining this as an alternative and said he would continue to support and encourage Egypt to sustain a war capability until the Israelis withdrew to the 1967 lines. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 139, Country Files, Middle East, Saudi Arabia, [November–December 1973])

[3] A November 4 report from Jidda noted that Saudi Minister of Defense and Aviation Prince Sultan had stated privately that when meeting with Kissinger King Faisal would take a position demanding maximum Israeli concessions—total withdrawal from Sinai and Gaza, from the West Bank of Jordan, from Jerusalem, and from the Golan Heights—before the Arab oil embargo would be lifted. Once negotiations commenced, however, the King would neither endorse nor oppose any particular settlement. He believed that Egypt, Syria, Jordan, and the Palestinian resistance movement deserved the right to make their own settlements on the basis of their own best interests. (Ibid., Box 40, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Mid East, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, State Cables, Nov. 5–16, 1973 [2 of 2])

Colby: Could I review my Meir scenario? I want to say that we can't humiliate Sadat.

Moorer: We have a CENTO exercise in November. A couple of destroyers, right at the entrance to the Gulf. We haven't gotten CENTO into this. It starts the 19th of November.

Kissinger: That is a good thing to have happen. Bill, you should stress the impact of what Europe and Japan will do if a crisis appears to be a result of Israeli intransigence.

Schlesinger: We need a public line on the *Hancock* when it arrives.

Kissinger: Routine. An exercise that we have been planning a long time.

I will discuss with the Shah. If he wants it in, I will let you know.

Schlesinger: No, off the coast of Oman.

Kissinger: Can it go into the Red Sea past the blockade?

Moorer: I don't know if there is a blockade.

Schlesinger: What do I tell the Dutch? They were brave and they are running out of fuel.[4]

Colby: We could contribute oil.

Kissinger: I would tell them we will be sympathetic.

The Israelis are willing to negotiate on the ceasefire line and back off the roads if they can stay on the sides of the road.

Colby: The blockade is broken if Israel backs off. Could you leapfrog the short term and go to the long term?

Kissinger: They will be so easy on the long term!

My guess is the Israelis plan to stay on the West Bank as they did on the Canal.

Schlesinger: You have to keep the Third Army hostage to keep the Arabs in control.

Kissinger: Look at this—they would agree in principle to go to the October 22 lines, they would pull back from the roads, let UN on the road; there would be an exchange of prisoners and a lifting of the blockade. I can get the blockade lifted maybe by telling Sadat the best thing is to get Israel into a withdrawal posture.

Colby: Can we get them across the Canal before the elections?

Kissinger: Only if Egypt withdraws too, and that they won't do.

I personally think the Sadat proposal is not bad: Egypt stays where it is and Israel pulls back 30 kilometers. Golda says that would be an

[4] The oil embargo was extended to the Netherlands on October 23 because of its assistance to Israel.

Egyptian victory. If we had a demilitarized zone of 30 kilometers, Egypt couldn't cross it without leaving their SAM protection.

If Yariv would tell them Monday[5] there will be no more convoys; they would look so bad that I can come in Tuesday with a proposal that will look good.

Schlesinger: Get Sadat to push Faisal.

Kissinger: I have to promise Israeli disengagement right after the first of the year. The Israelis will scream and we must have unity in the country to stand up for it.

Is the oil message going Tuesday night?

Scowcroft: Yes.

Kissinger: We have to start working on the Jewish lobby.

I am disappointed in Jackson. He threatened me with a low defense budget if I didn't go along.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

[Kissinger:] The Russians may make a run at us while I am away. What can we do?

Schlesinger: Turn Israel loose on the Third Army and tell Sadat if he lets the Soviets loose, it will be very bad.

Kissinger: That Syrian is a real rug merchant. He asked for a piece of Mount Hermon in return for the prisoners. He wanted the Syrian bodies back. He offered a territorial split.

Colby: We could aid Israel to blockade Latakia.

Schlesinger: Or work with the Turks to close the Straits.

Colby: Yes. If the Turks think they are being enveloped . . .

Kissinger: We are making an impact on Europe. Brandt sent a good letter. The French are improving their NATO declaration.

Schlesinger: The French are shits. What about the British?

Kissinger: Let's do nothing until I get back. Then we will meet immediately. Brent, keep these people informed.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

Schlesinger: I will be back on Thursday.

Kissinger: Let's work out a plan for grabbing some Middle East oil if we want.

Schlesinger: Abu Dhabi would give us what we want.

Kissinger: The Shah is cynical enough to discuss this with us.

---

[5] November 5.

315. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and President Nixon[1]

November 3, 1973, 11:40 a.m.

K: Mr. President.

N: How are you getting along today?

K: I think these various maniacs are going to work me into a nervous breakdown. I sat up with Mrs. Meir last night until 2:00.[2] I think we are making some progress with her but whether enough to satisfy the Arabs I don't know.

N: You are making some progress?

K: Yes, some progress, whether or not, not as dangerous as the day before.

N: Al told me how rough it was up there.

K: It was brutal, she called yesterday and I refused to meet with her—told her to send her representative. That shook her up a bit.

N: Well, that's the way these things are.

K: Didn't want to pull . . .

N: We know it's just a question of . . . we are trying to balance several different parties here—the Israelis, Egyptians, Syrians, Russians. Let alone the Europeans yapping at our heels and so on.

K: I think the Egyptians realize they are better off taking what they can get now. If they force an all out confrontation on the October 22 issue, then we can—we can't have yet another confrontation three weeks later on the basic settlement issue.

N: Which is much more important.

K: A lot more important.

N: That's the point to make to them, which you naturally will.

K: Right.

N: It's a very solid point.

K: Can make a very good case . . . not just getting off the roads, say non-military supplies on the roads. Egyptians will just move the tanks and other stuff off the roads, give the road up to the Third Army and then they will be trapped . . . put the road operation under the UN, willing to get off the roads, not willing to get off the cross country access.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking. Kissinger was in Washington; Nixon was in Key Biscayne.

[2] See Document 312.

Maybe Egypt would be willing to buy this. Willing to put the UN on the roads.

N: Anyway, there's another day before you take off, Monday, right?

K: Drafted a very positive reply to the Soviets in principle.[3] One problem, there's almost no way to do the joint mission which isn't going to lead to another explosion. I really don't see what useful purpose it serves. Israel let the Soviets in, the British and French are screaming their heads off and US–Soviet mission, I don't see what good can come of it. Egyptians don't particularly want it, Fahmi told me that. After I get back I'll send Rusk or Brownell to the peace talks,[4] with a Moscow first stop. In that context might be willing to have them take the trip.

N: Sounds right. It's a good compromise, sending somebody of that importance. Sounds all right. Let's try that. Anything else of importance.

K: The French have come in on other matters. They now have a very constructive approach to the European Declaration thing. Our screaming at them really has had some rather good impact.

N: Henry, as I see it, let's face it, we can't start having Europeans, British taking a . . . line on everything we try to do. As Dulles used to say maybe we have to make an agonizing reappraisal of European views. We are saving their oil, after all, they need it more than we do.

K: No question.

N: OK, well good luck. Call if you need anything.

K: I will call tomorrow. There's a possibility the White House will be able to announce resumption of diplomatic relations within a month. Possibly announce jointly from Cairo and the White House, and we'll upgrade our Interests Section with more senior personnel for a month.

N: All right, Henry.

K: All right, Mr. President.

---

[3] See footnote 3, Document 316. The message was a reply to Brezhnev's letter that Dobrynin gave to Nixon on October 30; see Document 301.

[4] Dean Rusk, former Secretary of State, and Herbert Brownell, former Attorney General.

316. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, November 3, 1973, 12:20 p.m.

K: Sorry, I have been talking to the President,[2] then I had to make another call. I had a rather lengthy talk with him. First, we will send over the letter for the General Secretary.[3] Let's go to the proposal of joint Soviet-American cooperation. Here is our difficulty. I'm going to be going to Egypt next week. The purpose envisaged in our understanding has not even started yet, although we strongly favor it. What we are going to do is to send a senior man as head of the Interests Section in Cairo. We have no hesitation about announcing publicly that he is to work closely with your Ambassador there on the cease fire agreement.

D: What about cease fire, what is . . . ?

K: Not on cease fire. Work in close cooperation on Security Council resolution issues.

D: Yes. What is actual situation, as it stands now? What is Israeli position and what is, as of now? on the Security Council I mean.

K: As of now we are having a monumental problem with Israel. You can get that from the newspapers. You can see how they are beginning to attack me.

D: What is their position, Henry? They want to have exchange . . . ?

K: They want an exchange of prisoners, and they want an exchange of territories, West Bank for the East Bank.

D: As a whole. Egypt doesn't like the idea?

K: The Egyptians don't like it. There is something to be said for it, but Egypt won't accept it, we're not pressing them.

D: Israelis propose an exchange of prisoners and an exchange of territories. This is their position?

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] See Document 315.

[3] In this message to Brezhnev, November 3, the President sent the General Secretary his thoughts on U.S.–USSR relations. Reflecting on the Middle East, Nixon recalled that both the United States and the Soviet Union had agreed that efforts "to obtain unilateral advantage at the expense of the other" was inconsistent with "peaceful relations and the avoidance of confrontation." This prescription was essential in the current Middle East crisis, Nixon suggested. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin and Kissinger, Vol. 8)

K: Right. We will get at minimum some arrangement for permanent supply of the Third Army.

D: The corridor you mean?

K: That's one of the ideas McCloskey mentioned.[4] I'll be goddamned if I know where he got it, I didn't give it to him, but as it turns out it is a possibility.

D: I think these issues look, putting aside the resolution, October 22 without telling us, unacceptable . . . but I don't, might change their minds.

K: Let me finish the bilateral thing and then we'll go back to that. As soon as we get back I will designate somebody, Dean Rusk or Herb Brownell.

D: Yes, it should be a big man.

K: . . . to represent us in the peace negotiations. We would be prepared to say the first thing he should do is go to Moscow to talk to your people to prepare some action.

D: Did you talk with Rusk or is it just an idea.

K: As a matter of fact, I have been trying to get Rusk on the phone but haven't been able to reach him. Those two people are who we have in mind. I may be able to tell you by the end of the day what reaction I get.

D: When are you leaving?

K: Monday[5] morning at 9:00. To get back to the issues.

D: So where does it stand now?

K: We would like to get Israel to accept the proposal with withdrawal. We are having monumental task. I sat up with Mrs. Meir until 1:30 last night. And, I can imagine prettier girls to sit up with.

D: Well, sometimes you have to sacrifice . . .

K: This is where we stand right now.

D: As of now, peace proposal to begin negotiations of exchange prisoners and territories and position is to solve the Israelis' business? What is position of Egypt? When I spoke with them yesterday they said no, no, but what about today.

K: Their position is no.

D: Then what is your position?

K: Our position is to try to find some, at least interim, solution but we haven't made a formal proposition yet because we are trying to see

---

[4] Kissinger is referring to a statement by McCloskey at an October 31 press briefing. See *The New York Times*, November 1, 1973.

[5] November 5.

what we can get through a combination of negotiation and pressure on the Israelis.

D: As it looks now then, you do not have any decision?

K: The problem is that the Israelis have to have a cabinet meeting tomorrow. By Monday we hope to have the specifics. We will communicate them to you.

D: The general situation is what you just mentioned?

K: That is correct.

D: And maybe by Monday you will have more precise information. Suppose I call you on Monday at 8:00 a.m.

K: Well—will you be home tomorrow?

D: I would like to go out, but could I call you.

K: What time will you be back in the evening?

D: Around 9:00 p.m.

K: Why don't we have a chat tomorrow evening.

D: Around 9:00 or 10:00, whatever you like.

K: Well, I don't mind coming by the Embassy, say around 9:15.

D: OK. I will be back. 9:15? Tomorrow, not today? Just want to be sure.

K: Yes.

---

317. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and the Israeli Ambassador (Dinitz)[1]

Washington, November 3, 1973, 5:15 p.m.

D: Now we have got everybody so excited we will not be able to have a rational discussion. But, let's do it in two parts tonight which we hope will facilitate things.[2] First what you can live with. You can give us your professional assessment of where that leaves us, then see how

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23. No classification marking.

[2] Kissinger and Meir and their parties met again at 10:45 p.m. on November 3. Meir reiterated the Israeli position: non-military resupply of the Third Army, exchange of POWs, and lifting of the Bab el-Mandeb blockade. The meeting lasted until 1:10 a.m. on November 4. A memorandum of this conversation is ibid., RG 59, Records of Henry Kissinger, 1973–1977, Box 3.

much we can take—see what we can do. We shouldn't have it in a Wagnerian atmosphere as you mentioned because the President said he asked her to go back to her cabinet, or rather Haig did . . .

K: That would be nice, but I'm not sure Egypt would accept my proposition. In fact, I rather doubt it, as long as it's an unacceptable proposition I wonder if it makes a hell of a lot of difference what . . .

D: I will try to put it to her, what we think we can live with, start with this.

K: And don't tell me you almost have to have Israel on the road on top of withdrawal. . . . As we discussed yesterday, Israel holds both sides of the roads, the UN does the inspecting, you would therefore see if weapons or . . . I mean, what can they hide in the back of a two ton truck?

D: Well, our military experts say they can do that, their anti-tank missiles, for instance which they have used so effectively . . .

K: I'm telling you this suicidal impulse of the Israelis must be stopped. If you are not willing to open the roads, you will drive us into more . . . if you can turn over the roads, then other things can be discussed, no chance—you are not imposing unconditional surrender, your government is the only one . . .

D: Well, this thing should be discussed between you and the Prime Minister.

K: The proposal of October 22 lines. I think you're wrong but that I can get into my head. OK. I just wanted to tell you the issues.

D: There is no misunderstanding about you are alone.

K: I understand that, this is not between you and me personally. If it were between you and me, somebody else could settle it.

D: It's not between you and her, either.

K: No, not with me, the issue isn't with me. I am clear about that, don't worry.

D: Fine.

318. Backchannel Message From the Deputy Director of Central Intelligence (Walters) to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Rabat, November 4, 1973, 0305Z.

Meeting with PLO representatives took place on evening of 3 Nov at home of [*less than 1 line not declassified*]. King Hassan made introductions and after pleasantries left before any discussion started.[2] Present for PLO was Khalid al Hassan (described by Moroccans as number two to Arafat) and Majid Abu Shawar (phonetic), Political Commissar of Al Asifa (military wing of Al Fatah) and Secretary of Revolutionary Council of PLO.

Khalid asked that I speak first and I did. I said I hoped that meeting could be fruitful. Detailed U.S. position as you instructed me.[3] Said U.S. took positive attitude towards legitimate aspirations of Palestinian people. U.S. did not have master plan but believed that we must use recent tragedy to find just and realistic solution for this problem. President and Secretary Kissinger are embarked on search for such solution and HAK is undertaking a long trip to speak to Arab leaders and I would do my best to convey to Secretary their views. I made point that in context of general settlement U.S. was more than eager to contribute to the well-being of Palestinian people, if they so desired and in way they might desire.

I said I must speak frankly on three matters. We could have no part in any idea of destroying Israel, we regarded the King of Jordan as a friend and could not be expected to do anything against him, and finally I hoped that no act of violence against U.S. would shut off this channel. He understood this. I told them that they were a gallant people with a history twenty times as long as ours. They were a proud people and rightly so (quotes from you to Le Duc Tho). A solution must be acceptable to all parties. No party could get everything it wanted and all sides must be prepared to understand concerns of others. Despite everything that may have stood between us in the past we must

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 425, Backchannel, Backchannel Messages, Middle East/Africa, 1973. Secret; Eyes Only; Sensitive. Sent to the White House for Kissinger.

[2] On November 3, Walters reported from Rabat that King Hassan felt that the Palestinians would be in a conciliatory mood and that it would be up to them to come up with some suggestions that would help Kissinger work out a "just and realistic" formula. Walters said that he told Hassan that King Hussein was a friend of the United States, which would do nothing against him. Hassan responded that this was "noble and fair." (Ibid.)

[3] In talking points, October 26, prepared for Walters by the NSC staff. (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 139, Country Files, Middle East, Palestinians, [July 1973–July 1974])

try and find new approaches. We must live together all of us on the small blue planet which is our common home. HAK sincerely intends to try and use the aftermath of the recent tragedy as an opportunity to promote a rapid and comprehensive settlement. I said that we and the Palestinians had faced one another too long in an adversary relationship. Let us not recite the past. Let us try to begin together a real effort to bring peace and justice to those who have suffered so much and so long (quotes from you to the North Vietnamese). The U.S. was sincerely prepared to give serious consideration to the thoughts of the Palestinian people on how we may move forward into a brighter tomorrow on a just and realistic basis.

Khalid did all of the talking. Shawar took notes. He gave me a somewhat extended history of the Palestinian problem, noted that they were smarter than other Arabs, and expressed strong commitments to democracy and desire not to have other alien ideologies foisted on them. He was clearly referring to Communism. He noted that after '67 war there had been contacts with them from nearly all countries. He specifically mentioned General de Gaulle, Italian Prime Minister, British parliamentarians, and the Soviets. He noted that only the U.S. had not been in contact directly with them. They had been hurt by this. After the '56 war events had pushed them towards the Soviet bloc and all U.S. attitudes had been hostile to them since then. I said that my presence here tonight was proof that this was not so.

Khalid said that the Palestinians had suffered more from Hussein and his grandfather than they had from the U.S. and the Israelis, as exemplified by the September 70 and Jerash/Ajloun incidents.[4] Palestinians are against kingship in general and will never agree to being governed by Hussein or his family.

I asked him if he was telling me that the Palestinians would not live in a Hashemite governed state. He agreed this was so. Khalid said he realized the PLO goal of a Palestinian democratic state where Jews, Arabs and Christians would live in harmony is not practical now, though it could be realized by the end of the century. Pending this, something must be done in short range to satisfy the Palestinians. Coming months will be critical. Will they be pushed into Soviet bloc. Soviets are offering many scholarships and technical training but they cannot give the Palestinians land because they are not in the area. The U.S. can because it is in the area and has interests there. By land is meant a place where three million Palestinians can live and survive. Gaza and the West Bank are not sufficient for even the inhabitants who live there now.

---

[4] In January 1971, the Jordanian army attacked Palestinian bases along the highway between Jerash and Ajloun.

Khalid said that second problem besides land is Jerusalem, by which he made clear in answer to my question that he meant the recovery of the old Jordanian sector of Jerusalem, with free access to the Holy Places to be granted to all religions. In an interesting aside Khalid claimed that Israelis have not invested in those areas awarded to the Arabs in the 1947 partition. I pointed out that nevertheless the Israelis have invested in Jerusalem. In stating this Khalid seemed to be implying that they would like to go back to the 1947 partition. However unrealistic this may seem, it is interesting to note that in stating this he clearly gives recognition to an Israeli state entity. He claimed the PLO is real representative of overwhelming majority of Palestinian people. He said that until recently Communism had made few inroads into ranks of Palestinians because USSR had favored 1947 partition. Communists are gaining influence now by providing arms support and education as well as political support. Khalid said he had heard that U.S. cabinet minister had said recently that U.S. and USSR had reached agreement on what should be done in the Middle East. He said that Soviets had been offering PLO many things in last few days. This led him to believe something was going on. I said U.S.–USSR agreement covered cease fire and now Dr. Kissinger was embarked on long journey to consult leaders and see what our policy would be.

Khalid then asked three questions. 1. What about Watergate. How would it affect President. I said that the President would not be removed from office. He would serve out his term and would be determining U.S. policy. He replied, "That is good." 2. People in the Arab East are wondering why Dr. Kissinger is coming to Rabat. They can understand why he is going to Cairo and Saudi Arabia. Is it because King Hassan is friendly with the Palestinians. I replied that Morocco was a key country. It was Arab, African and understood the West. I noted that Moroccan soldiers had fought alongside the Palestinians. I said we had esteem and respect for King Hassan. Khalid said that King Hassan is the most intelligent leader in the Arab world and what ridiculous troubles he has had from those who do not understand him. I added that Dr. Kissinger had sent me to find out what the Palestinians were thinking and that I would be reporting on this conversation to the Secretary before he arrives in Rabat. 3. He then with visible embarrassment asked me whether the U.S. had anything to do with the murder of their leaders in Beirut.[5] I replied quite firmly that we had nothing to do with these murders. I gave him my word of honor as a soldier this was so. I replied that we did not resort to murder because it was morally wrong, dishonorable and did not produce results. Bullets killed only men, not

[5] See footnote 3, Document 46.

ideas. I said I would ask him no questions about Khartoum[6] but we did not resort to murder. He replied with some embarrassment that in all large groups where there has been much suffering, there are some who undertake violence on their own. I understood him to be telling me that the Khartoum murders were not sanctioned by the Fatah leadership.

Khalid asked me whether they would hear from me again. I replied that I would report our conversation to Secretary Kissinger before he left Washington, but in all honesty I doubted that I would have a chance to discuss it with him before his return from China much later in the month. He said that if he had any communication it would be routed through the King of Morocco, and I said that if we had any further communication we would send it via the same route. We agreed on the need for privacy in this exchange. He said that he could not suggest anything more at this time since we were dealing in generalities. I said that we must move quickly if we are to reach a settlement. He looked startled but agreed.

Khalid stated, "It is good that we are sitting at one table discussing how to solve the problem." Thus far he could say that the meeting has produced two positive steps. One we have met and two we understand how to talk to one another.

Khalid proved himself a supple and amiable interlocutor, well versed in literature and history, soft-spoken and cultured. His companion who was extremely sour at outset, though often nodding agreement with what I said, began to thaw towards end of this extended two and a half hour conversation. I sought more to relax them than to inform them. King Hassan had told me prior to meeting that they had inferiority complex and that I should not take offense at anything they said. They said nothing to give offense. At end of meeting, Khalid said, "Frankly you surprised us tonight." This leads me to believe some measure of rapport was achieved.

King Hassan telephoned twice during the meeting to see how it was going. I spoke to him after it was over and he has asked me to come by and see him tomorrow morning before I leave Rabat for The Hague. I will report on this conversation from next stop.[7]

---

[6] See footnote 3, Document 41.

[7] On November 4, Walters reported to Kissinger that he had met that morning with King Hassan, who had talked with the PLO delegation following their meeting. Khalid had called the meeting "historic" and said that everything the Palestinians had done had been to get the attention of the United States because only it could give them territory. Hassan appeared extremely pleased with the result of the meeting and expressed the hope that the dialogue would continue. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 138, Country Files, Middle East, Morocco, [March 1973–November 1974])

Palestinians arrived in Rabat late and only two came. [*1 line not declassified*] No one else was present. Conversation was in English throughout.[8]

[8] Telegram 12744 from Beirut, November 5, reported that a series of high-level Fatah meetings in Beirut and Damascus had produced an ambiguous communiqué declaring in effect that no decision had yet been reached on participating in the peace negotiations, emphasizing that future fedayeen political strategy had to include solidarity with Syria, Egypt, and the Soviet Union, and implicitly criticizing other fedayeen organizations for publicly denouncing the cease-fire and peace conference. (Ibid., Box 1178, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, Nov. 1973) Kissinger wrote in his memoirs that "Walters's meeting achieved its immediate purpose: to gain time and to prevent radical assaults on the early peace process. After it, attacks on Americans—at least by Arafat's faction of the PLO—ceased. Otherwise the meeting yielded no lasting results." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 629)

319. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders and William B. Quandt of the National Security Council Staff to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, November 3, 1973.

SUBJECT

Israeli and Egyptian Positions on Ceasefire and Disengagement Stage

This memo deals initially with Israeli and Egyptian positions on stabilizing the ceasefire and then concentrates on options for a step of disengagement. The two have to be looked at together because the Israelis and Egyptians have different views about the phase to which some of the terms belong.

Stabilizing the Ceasefire Israeli and Egyptian positions are quite far apart on terms for stabilizing the ceasefire and for moving on to a "disengagement stage." The official Israeli position only deals with the immediate issues of prisoners, resupply, the blockade at Bab al-Mandeb and the October 22 lines. Their position is detailed and filled with conditions. It has not yet been approved by the Israeli cabinet. By

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 40, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, Nov. 5–16, 1973, Misc. & Memos. Secret; Sensitive. Sent for information. A handwritten notation on the memorandum states that it is a briefing paper for Kissinger's Mideast trip. Brackets are in the original.

contrast, the Egyptians have officially put forward a general outline dealing not only with near-term issues, but also with a disengagement phase and an overall settlement. Their position lacks the detail of the Israeli position and predicates everything on Israeli withdrawal to the October 22 lines. For purposes of comparison, these are the two official positions at this point:

Ceasefire Stage

Israeli Position	*Egyptian Position*
1. Israel agrees to *temporary* resupply of 3rd Army while Secretary en route to Cairo, *provided* wounded Israeli prisoners are released; a full list of prisoners is provided; Red Cross is allowed to visit prisoners.	1. Israel must withdraw to the October 22 lines as called for by UNSC.
2. Israel agrees to system of nonmilitary resupply of 3rd Army under joint UN-Israeli inspection, *provided* all prisoners are returned and the Bab al-Mandeb blockade is lifted.	2. Egypt will then release all Israeli prisoners.
3. When all this is achieved, Israel will agree to discuss with Egypt alone the issue of the October 22, 1973, ceasefire lines.	3. Egypt will also then agree to arrangements for the permanent non-military resupply of the 3rd Army under UN auspices. 4. Israeli forces would then disengage to a line east of the passes, leaving a zone to be filled by UN forces. 5. When Israeli forces proceed eastward to the disengagement zone, the blockade of Bab al-Mandeb will be lifted.

The full texts of the Israeli and Egyptian positions are at Tabs A and B.[2]

Points made by the United States to the two parties include:

—The US acknowledges to Israel that it does not know where the October 22 lines are; that it will make this position known at the UN

[2] Attached, but not printed. Tab B is the attachment to Document 303.

and elsewhere; that it will do its best to see no pressure is brought to bear on Israel on the issue of the October 22 lines. The parties will be left to negotiate this issue.

—The US has assured Egypt that it will oppose any Israeli offensive beyond the October 22 lines.

In order to move on to the issues of disengagement of forces under a first stage of a settlement, which President Sadat apparently wants to raise with you, the problems of securing the ceasefire will have to be dealt with first. The changes that we might try to secure in the positions of the two sides in order to accomplish this could be:

—Israel would agree on an interim basis to the continuation of non-military resupply of the 3rd Army without conditions, at least until you have talked with President Sadat.

—Egypt would agree to release Israeli prisoners as soon as a permanent system for resupplying the 3rd Army under UN and Israeli inspection is arranged. As a gesture of goodwill, Egypt should release wounded prisoners, supply lists of prisoners and allow visits by the Red Cross immediately. Israel would agree in principle to return to the October 22 lines and to discuss arrangements with the Egyptians.

—Both Egypt and Israel would instruct their military representatives to work out on the ground the arrangements for establishing the October 22 lines. As soon as agreement is reached, Egypt would lift the blockade on Bab al-Mandeb. [In practice, return to the October 22 lines could be interpreted as Israeli evacuation of Suez City and areas to its south and opening a supply line to the 3rd Army under UN and Israeli inspection. Israeli participation in inspection could be the trade-off for moving Israeli forces off the road.]

—The United States would seek assurances from Israel, and would convey these to Egypt, that Israel will not advance beyond the lines agreed to by the military representatives, provided Egypt does not resume full-scale hostilities.

—The United States would take no substantive position on the location of the October 22 lines, except that they should be compatible with arrangements for non-military resupply of the 3rd Army.

With the completion of this ceasefire stage, the following will have been accomplished:

—Egypt and Israel will have exchanged all prisoners of war.

—Arrangements for the permanent non-military resupply of the 3rd Army, including UN and Israeli inspection, will be worked out.

—Egyptian and Israeli military representatives will have agreed on the October 22 positions, which will thereafter become the agreed ceasefire lines.

—The Egyptian blockade of Bab al-Mandeb will have been lifted.

—The US will have given Egypt private assurances that Israel will not launch an offensive beyond the October 22 lines.

If this can be accomplished, attention can turn to the disengagement stage.

Here the positions are less precise, but they consist essentially of the following:

Disengagement Stage

Israeli Position	*Egyptian Position*
1. Egyptian forces would withdraw from the east bank of the Canal; Israeli forces would withdraw from the west bank.	1. Israeli forces are to withdraw to a line inside Sinai which in principle would lie east of the passes.
2. Both sides would then thin out their forces along the Canal.	2. A disengagement zone, as wide as possible, would be created between Egyptian and Israeli forces in Sinai. UN forces would be stationed in such a zone. Egyptian forces would remain in their present positions east of the Canal.
3. Egypt would undertake to clear and reopen the Canal to international shipping.	3. When Israeli forces reach the disengagement zone and UN forces are stationed therein, the operation of clearing the Canal would begin.
	4. At the time the disengagement phase is set up, a peace conference would be convened under UN auspices.

The prime difficulties at this stage will be:

—The Israelis are asking the Egyptians to give up territory on the east bank of the Canal which is the only tangible sign of Egypt's military successes early in the war. We can expect Egypt to reject this proposal, with the possible exception of the 3rd Army.

—The Egyptian position will be unacceptable to the Israelis because it moves too quickly on the issue of withdrawal. Some sort of negotiation will presumably be necessary on the overall framework of an Egyptian-Israeli relationship before the Israelis will pull forces back from the Canal.

Despite these difficulties, there are some points of general agreement that might provide the basis for progress. For example:

—Both sides appear to be willing to consider the concept of disengagement of forces.

—Both sides appear to agree that Egypt should begin work on clearing the Canal at an early date.

One possible compromise on a preliminary disengagement phase might be the following:

—The 3rd Army would withdraw to the west bank of the Canal; the Israeli forces would withdraw to positions on the east bank.

—Egyptian forces north of Ismailiya would remain in place. Between them and the Israeli forces a disengagement zone would be created in which UNEF forces would be stationed. Specific arrangements would be worked out through direct Egyptian and Israeli contacts.

—Egypt would announce its intention to begin work on reopening the Canal and would acknowledge Israel's right to use the Canal once it is open.

—A Middle East peace conference would be convened to open negotiations on the implementation of Resolution 242. Israel would announce that it sets no preconditions for negotiations and will not preclude any outcome that will assure secure and recognized borders for all states in the area.

Alternative disengagement scenarios might include:

—The Egyptian forces that remain on the east bank of the Canal during the disengagement phase might be subject to various resupply restrictions that could be monitored by UN (as well as Israeli and Egyptian) teams. For example, limits on numbers of troops, types of weaponry (especially heavy weapons), and even on non-military resupplies might be arranged. This could serve to reduce Israeli objections to leaving Egyptian forces on the east bank.

—If Israeli forces leave the west bank of the Canal in the disengagement stage, it might be possible to demilitarize the area they occupied so that Egyptian forces could not move up to the Canal between Ismailiya and Suez City. This might be an interim measure and would require UNEF forces to compel compliance.

—A first step might be arranged whereby the 3rd Army presence east of the Canal is reduced at the same time that the Israeli forces from the west bank are thinned out. UNEF forces would take up positions in both areas, with the objective of creating a zone on both banks that would be free of Egyptian and Israeli forces. This disengagement zone could extend on the east bank to the north, creating a buffer between Egyptian and Israeli forces now in place. In a subsequent phase, the zone on the west bank of the Canal would be reduced in size as it is extended toward the passes on the east bank.

Combined with these arrangements on the ground, the Egyptians and Israelis might make other concessions to give Israel justification for some withdrawal and Egypt justification for formal negotiations. For example,

Egypt could:

—Declare an end to the state of belligerency.

—End the third-party boycott of Israel.

—Acknowledge Israel's right to exist within secure and recognized borders.

—Agree to formal direct negotiations at an international peace conference.

—Work on reopening the Canal and reconstructing the cities along the Canal; recognize Israel's right to use the Canal as soon as it is open to international shipping.

Israel simultaneously could:

—Declare that this first stage of disengagement will not be the last if negotiations continue.

—Agree not to preclude any arrangement that will provide secure and recognized borders.

—Acknowledge a responsibility to work with others to resolve the problem of the Palestinian refugees.

—Recognize that an Arab civil and religious role with a unified Jerusalem will be needed.

—State that Israel's security needs can be met without prejudice to Arab sovereignty in areas occupied by Israel since June 1967.

—Cease construction of new civilian settlements in occupied areas; relinquish control over the oil fields in Sinai; allow repatriation of civilian refugees to occupied areas in Sinai, the Golan Heights and the West Bank.

At this point, the negotiations themselves could take up the terms of a broader settlement and further withdrawal, which itself might be staged.

320. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

Rabat, November 6, 1973, 1615Z.

Hakto 7. Please pass following report to President on my first day's meeting with King Hassan in Rabat.[2] I met privately with King Hassan in his private office at 11:00 pm Monday evening Nov 5, for an hour and 15 minutes. We had a general philosophical discussion of the Arab Israeli conflict.

He expressed his deep appreciation that you were showing such consideration towards Morocco by sending me to Rabat first. Under present circumstances this was an unforgettable gesture. He expressed great personal admiration for you. He pledged that his small country would do all could to facilitate your task in resolving the present crisis. He told me at the end that he would cable President Sadat after his meetings with me and tell Sadat that the United States and especially you were honorable and could be trusted. He would tell Sadat further that we were exact and precise, not romantic, and that confidence had to be built and secrecy had to be preserved. He will also write to Faisal. I thanked the King and told him this would help tremendously. Most of our conversation was taken with the King's impressions of the Middle East and of the motivations of the Arab leaders.

—There were three categories of leaders: those who wanted peace and had the courage to say so (among whom he included Morocco, Tunisia, Jordan, Egypt and Syria); those who wanted peace but could only follow others (Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Algeria); and those for whom peace is a difficult problem for domestic reasons (Iraq and Israel).

—The Palestinians, the King said, were the joker in the deck. This issue was an aphrodisiac for the Arabs; no one would dare do anything against the Palestinians. The King thought the Palestinians were interested in contact with the U.S., and that if the U.S. could win the confidence of the Palestinians, then no Arab nation would fail to follow.

—The King believed that Egypt and Syria were both firmly resisting Soviet influence. The Syrians he said, had withstood two years

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 41, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, HAKTO 1–60, Nov. 5–16, 1973. Top Secret; Immediate; Sensitive. Kissinger was in Rabat November 5–6, then stopped in Tunis on his way to Cairo, where he stayed November 6–7. He was in Amman November 8, Riyadh November 8–9, Tehran November 9, and Islamabad November 10, when he proceeded to Beijing, Tokyo, and Seoul. He returned to Washington November 16.

[2] A memorandum of conversation recording this meeting is ibid., Box 139, Country Files, Middle East, Secretary Kissinger's Trip to Middle East, November 5–10, 1973.

of Soviet pressure to sign a friendship treaty. The U.S. problem was to make up for time we had lost and to present some evidence of U.S. goodwill. The gap between the U.S. and these countries was wide, but it was a "sentimental gap," not an ideological gap.

—It was the King's judgment that the problem would be solved with Israel when it had leaders who belonged to the new generation. The new generation on both sides could talk to each other; the elders were the obstacle.

I told the King that we needed about one month to organize our strategy in the U.S. and prepare our domestic situation. We needed a strategy first, before coming up with any specific plan. Then we would move decisively. I hoped we could begin the negotiation process in December and begin to show progress in January.

In the meantime we needed from the Arabs some patience and some willingness not to make us waste our energies in epic struggles over trivia. The oil boycott, I also pointed out, worked against Arab interests because it would arouse public opinion in America against the Arabs. The King said he would use his influence in this sense.[3]

[3] Kissinger met again with Hassan on November 6. According to a memorandum of conversation, Kissinger insisted that "we must settle [the Middle East crisis] but not under Russian pressure. If there is Russian pressure, we will switch back to Israel because we must demonstrate that the Soviet Union can not settle the problem. There is no pressure from the Soviet Union now. For a week we tried not to do anything. If the Soviet Union would have stayed out, we would have stayed out. When the Soviet Union began sending arms, then it was no longer an Arab versus Israel conflict. It became a matter of suvival of the reasonable Arab countries." (Ibid., RG 59, Records of Henry Kissinger, 1973–1977, Box 2, NODIS Action Memos 1973–1976) In telegram Hakto 12, November 7, Kissinger instructed Scowcroft to pass his report on his second day's meeting with Hassan to the President. The King agreed completely that the massive Soviet resupply of the Arabs transformed the conflict from an Arab-Israeli dispute into an East-West confrontation. Kissinger noted that the United Sates had come to the aid of Israel only for that reason and that the survival of all the moderate Arab governments had been at stake. Hassan suggested that Kissinger tell Faisal that an energy crisis in the United States would backfire seriously against the Arabs. He offered to write to Faisal and said he was sending his Foreign Minister to other Arab countries to urge them to give the United States a chance. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 41, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, HAKTO 1–60, Nov. 5–16, 1973)

321. Telegram From the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) to Secretary of State Kissinger en Route to Cairo[1]

Washington, November 6, 1973, 1739Z.

Tohak 23/WH32723. The attached message was just dictated to me by Dobrynin to pass to you.

Oral message from Brezhnev to Kissinger as read on the telephone to General Scowcroft by Ambassador Dobrynin on November 6, 1973 at 11:09 A.M.

"On our part we do not object against the Security Council resolution being adopted on the basis of consensus without voting and with the understanding that the meaning of the definition 'under appropriate auspices' would be elaborated in this resolution as holding negotiations on the Middle East settlement under the auspices of the USSR and USA.

"Such a resolution by the Security Council would correspond to the agreement reached between us on that matter during Mr. Kissinger's stay in Moscow.[2]

"It goes without saying that the adoption of such a decision by the Security Council will in a major degree depend upon the availability of direct requests from Egypt and Israel to the UN Secretary General with the notification of their readiness to accept the good offices of the USSR and USA. In this connection we take note of Mr. Kissinger's statement that the U.S. is working with Israel along that line and that in any case the White House is firmly convinced that Israel will accept the USSR/USA auspices when the Security Council adopts such a decision.

"We understand, as does the American side, that there may be certain difficulties in that matter related to the position held by some permanent members of the Security Council.

"In that case, another alternative may be also considered. The parties directly involved in the conflict could directly address the Soviet Union and United States with the request to provide good offices and to take part in the planned negotiations between them.

"In this case there would be no need at all for any additional decision of the Security Council having in mind that the Council has al-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 41, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, TOHAK 1–69, Nov. 5–16, 1973. Top Secret; Immediate; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. Sent to Rodman for Kissinger.

[2] See Document 53.

ready adopted necessary decisions concerning the essence of both urgent measures and the political settlement as a whole.

"In conclusion, we would like to stress that we, as before, firmly adhere to the understanding reached in Moscow on the question of Soviet/American auspices and are ready to work on the implementation of that mutual understanding."[3]

[3] In telegram Hakto 9, November 6, 2055Z, Kissinger instructed Scowcroft to call Dobrynin immediately with the following message: "We appreciate General Secretary Brezhnev's message concerning US–Soviet auspices. We are open-minded as to the form by which the auspices should be established. Either one of the courses outlined by the General Secretary would seem possible to us; we have a slight preference for the first option, i.e., Security Council approval. Does the General Secretary believe that Egypt will go along with the courses that he suggests? It would be very helpful if I could get their response while I am in Egypt." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 41, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, HAKTO 1–60, Nov. 5–16, 1973)

322. Minutes of Washington Special Actions Group Meeting[1]

Washington, November 6, 1973, 2:01–2:54 p.m.

SUBJECT

Middle East; Cambodia and Vietnam

PARTICIPANTS

Chairman—Gen. Brent Scowcroft

State
Kenneth Rush
Rodger Davies

Defense
William Clements
Robert C. Hill

JCS
V/Adm. John P. Weinel

CIA
William Colby
Samuel Hoskinson

NSC
William Quandt
Jeanne W. Davis

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, NSC Institutional Files (H–Files), Box H–117, WSAG Meetings Minutes, Originals, 1973. Top Secret; Nodis; Codeword. The meeting took place in the White House Situation Room.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

It was agreed that:

. . . The US Navy ships scheduled to participate in Midlink[2] should sail from the Pacific on November 9 as scheduled, with the final decision on U.S. participation in the exercise to be made when Secretary Kissinger returns.

. . . The U.S. cargo ship, without its escort, should continue through the Red Sea to Jidda despite the Egyptian "blockade".

. . . Further consideration will be given to the possibility of basing an SR–71 in Europe.

[Omitted here are conclusions unrelated to the Middle East.]

Gen. Scowcroft: May we have the briefing?

Mr. Colby briefed from the attached text.[3]

Mr. Rush: (to Mr. Colby) What is your estimate of the number of Russian troops that might be in Syria?

Mr. Colby: Our clearest estimate is 1400 advisers. Other than that, we have no real evidence. We have some fuzzy reports that we can't rely on, but it's quite possible that they have some combat forces there. I think the most likely thing is that they have some kind of anti-aircraft or air defense people—possibly to protect themselves.

Mr. Clements: How hard is the 1400 count?

Mr. Colby: It's pretty hard. That was our count before the war started.

Gen. Scowcroft: (to Mr. Colby) But you come down negatively on Soviet combat troops in the sense of offensive troops?

Mr. Colby: Yes. To put in any size force, short of putting something in for political effect, would be a major effort. It would take 350 AN–12s for even a relatively lightly armored force.

Gen. Scowcroft: How about the cessation of the Soviet airlift? Is that because it has been picked up by the sealift, or is there any other significance?

Mr. Colby: No. The sealift is so much easier. There might be one or two more flights.

Mr. Rush: The air resupply has probably been completed.

Mr. Colby: Yes, with the sealift now bringing in the tonnage. It's still a little unclear as to what the airlift carried. We think primarily missiles and anti-aircraft. We're also pretty sure they carried some air-

[2] Operation Midlink was a CENTO naval exercise scheduled for 1974.

[3] Not attached.

craft—we know they carried some MIG–25s, and possibly some MIG–17s and 21s.

Adm. Weinel: Maybe the airlift was used primarily as a political signal to their friends.

Gen. Scowcroft: I have precious little information from the party. I don't anticipate anything substantive coming out of Morocco or Tunisia, but we don't have a reporting cable yet. On the question of the resupply of the 3rd Army, the Israelis have agreed to let 50 more trucks through. According to their count, that brings the total to 188 trucks. At that rate this will take them past the Secretary's (Kissinger) stop in Cairo. (Prime Minister) Golda (Meir) has said that she rejected an American demand to keep the supply lines permanently open, but they won't cut them off while the Secretary is in Cairo. We talked about the air-lift on Sunday[4] and thought we might cut it off tonight, but the Secretary wants it kept open until probably Friday[5] night. He doesn't think it would be good to terminate it while he is in Cairo.

Mr. Clements: When does he go to Riyadh?

Gen. Scowcroft: On Thursday; he will overnight there Thursday night. What about the *Hancock*?

Adm. Weinel: It's on station, with a destroyer escort.

Gen. Scowcroft: Where's that?

Adm. Weinel: It's on the high seas; it can't be seen from the beach. The only way anyone will know it is there is if we tell them. Its tanker and escort ships will join it tomorrow. We are initially deploying three P–3s to Diego Garcia; I'll get the message out today. They will operate out of there temporarily, now that we have all the necessary clearances. They will probably be there three days to a week. We can decide later whether or not they should go to Bandar Abbas.

Mr. Clements: Has the Shah given permission for the P–3s?

Adm. Weinel: Yes.

Gen. Scowcroft: As long as we stick to his cover story.

Adm. Weinel: I want to be sure we all understand that that cover story is not something we are going to run to the press with. [*1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Clements: We don't need to say anything.

Adm. Weinel: We've marked the whole thing Secret Sensitive and are not talking about it at all. (to Gen. Scowcroft) Your people asked for a report on the evaluation team (surveying Israeli losses), but it's not complete yet. We got a report today from their observances on the Sinai

---

[4] November 4.

[5] November 9.

front. The Israelis told them that they lost all their armament there to infantry weapons, not tanks. They claimed that the head-to-head tank duels with the Egyptians were almost 100% in their favor. At Mitla Pass, there is only a single road, and the Israeli artillery is zeroed in on that. Also they said the Israelis are building a causeway across the Canal.

Mr. Clements: A dirt-rock fill. It's no bridge.

Mr. Colby: That's across the Sweetwater Canal; it blocks the flow of fresh water to the 3rd Army. That's a separate canal system bringing water to the city. It's not across the Suez Canal.

Mr. Clements: But it's part of the Canal system, isn't it?

Mr. Colby: It could be two different things.

Mr. Davies: It would give the Israelis great flexibility with their armor if they could cross the Suez and Sweetwater Canals.

Adm. Weinel: In Suez City, they say the Israelis have the outskirts and all the industry and power, and the Egyptians have City Hall and all the people to worry about. The Israelis lost 109 aircraft, but only 3 to air-to-air combat. They lost 44 to SAMs; 31 to air defense; 6 to SAMs or AA; 3 to air-to-air combat; 9 to technical failure; 10 to unknown causes.

Mr. Clements: But it needs to be said that there were not too many enemy planes flying.

Gen. Scowcroft: There were in Syria but not in Egypt.

Adm. Weinel: It could just as easily have been 44 in air-to-air and 3 to SAMs. It's hard to operate both in the same environment.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

Adm. Weinel: Also, about this Egyptian blockade (at Bab Al-Mandab at the southern end of the Red Sea). My personal opinion is that it is an Israeli invention. It's not a blockade in the international sense. They haven't announced it and they have no ships strung out in a line and no blinker signals. They do have some ships mucking around. One of our cargo carriers left Djibouti this morning on the way to Jidda with an American destroyer along. We called CINCEUR to make sure everyone understood that we wanted no incident in the Red Sea while Secretary Kissinger was on his visit. They told the destroyer to break off and go to Masawa. The freighter is still on its way to Jidda.

Gen. Scowcroft: Let it go on.

Mr. Clements: There's no point in a quasi-confrontation that would make headlines in every Arab newspaper.

Mr. Rush: Right.

Gen. Scowcroft: Yes. What about the blockade? What is a blockade?

Mr. Rush: This is not legally a blockade.

Mr. Clements: In any event, we don't want any confrontation.

Mr. Colby: The Israelis have 13 ships tied up in Eilat. They claim there is a blockade. Technically there isn't, but if you were a master of one of those ships, you wouldn't go out of there.

Adm. Weinel: It serves Israel's purpose to claim a blockade.

Mr. Colby: Sure.

Mr. Rush: But if there is no blockade, and they have to pay something to have it lifted, they will be paying something for nothing.

Adm. Weinel: Also, I'd just like to mention again the possibility of basing an SR–71 in Europe. It costs a half a million dollars to fly one from New York and it would cost $175–200,000 to fly out of Europe.

Mr. Colby: Where in Europe?

Adm. Weinel: [*less than 1 line not declassified*] would be great because the fuel is close.

Mr. Rush: [*less than 1 line not declassified*] wouldn't let us.

Mr. Clements: They might now in the ceasefire environment.

Mr. Colby: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Adm. Weinel: There's [*less than 1 line not declassified*] I suppose we'd have the same problem [*less than 1 line not declassified*].

Mr. Colby: Can [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Adm. Weinel: Yes.

Mr. Clements: Why couldn't we fly them in the ceasefire environment?

Mr. Rush: There would be the question of whether we accede [*1 line not declassified*].

Mr. Clements: [*1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Colby: [*1½ lines not declassified*]

Gen. Scowcroft: What would be the frequency of the flights?

Adm. Weinel: That could be decided. If they were infrequent, we shouldn't have too much difficulty.

Mr. Colby: [*less than 1 line not declassified*] makes sense in the political context.

Mr. Rush: Weren't [*less than 1 line not declassified*] sticky before?

Mr. Colby: No. They were in their public statements, but not in fact.

Mr. Davies: They said that if it were a question of a US-Soviet confrontation, there would be no question where they stood.

Mr. Clements: They were cooperative in every way with the 6th Fleet. We have no complaints; indeed we have nothing but good things to say about them as far as the Fleet was concerned.

Adm. Weinel: If I could quote Secretary Kissinger, he said the people of whom we asked the least were the most forthcoming. I'm not poor-mouthing [*1 line not declassified*].

Mr. Clements: So we'll never know what they would have said, will we?

Adm. Weinel: No. I'm not suggesting any action now on the basing of the SR–71. I'm just suggesting that State think about it.

Gen. Scowcroft: Yes, we'll see what is reasonable and look at the question of frequency.

Mr. Davies: If there is a stabilized ceasefire, it would be different ballgame.

[Omitted here is discussion unrelated to the Middle East.]

[Gen. Scowcroft:] (to Mr. Rush and Mr. Clements) How did your hearings go?[6]

Mr. Rush: Very well.

Gen. Scowcroft: (to Mr. Clements) Except for your remarks about $6 billion for Israel. I heard that on the 11:00 news last night.

Mr. Clements: That was a misprint on the ticker. On one line, they had me saying $1 billion worth had already been done for Israel, and three lines later it was $6 billion.

Mr. Hill: There was no confrontation at the hearing. The Senators were quite cooperative.

Mr. Rush: (Senator) Inouye[7] leaned over backward. If he saw a question give us trouble, he said "just let me have that for the record." It was nothing like the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. Hill: Even Senator Humphrey[8] supported the $2.2 billion for Israel and $300 million for Cambodia in the cross-examination.

Mr. Rush: That was very helpful. I think Senator Javits supported everything too. I tried to put Israel and Cambodia in the same category as countries whose freedom was being threatened by outside forces. It's a little difficult for them to swallow, but it's true.

Mr. Clements: There were no unfavorable comments while we were there.

Mr. Rush: I think there's a real question of urgency, though. We need to push them hard. Senator Fulbright has threatened to hold no hearings until January. We stressed the 30-day limitation on credits,

---

[6] Rush and Clements testified on November 5 before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the administration's supplemental budget request of $2.2 billion for Israel.

[7] Senator Daniel K. Inouye (D–Hawaii).

[8] Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D–Minnesota).

and State and Defense Congressional people are getting together to give this a hard push.

Mr. Clements: We have another Hill appearance in the next few days—before the House Appropriations Committee. That will be helpful.

Mr. Rush: The problem is with (Senator) Fulbright—maybe a little with (Congressman) Morgan[9]—in getting hearings scheduled.

Adm. Weinel: May I go back a little to the problem of verifying Israeli losses. They claim they lost 495 tanks, but our team can only count 68. They think 250 is the best guess, but they won't have a really firm figure even when they get back.

Gen. Scowcroft: When will that be?

Adm. Weinel: They're just about finished. They're putting their final report together.

Mr. Clements: They need to do some consolidating, some sorting and sifting among the various groups that have been scattered at various points; they need to put their data together.

Adm. Weinel: (reading from a message) They said they were well received, but they had some difficulty in getting an independent count of tank losses. The Israelis were making strong representations for more tanks. They had long intelligence briefings [*1 line not declassified*].

Mr. Colby: They want one of their own? How about a satellite system?

Adm. Weinel: Yes. (referring to [*less than 1 line not declassified*])

Mr. Clements: (Prime Minister) Golda (Meir) talked to Jim (Schlesinger) and me about [*less than 1 line not declassified*].

Adm. Weinel: The team's estimate of tank losses is about 120 M–60s and 138 M–48s. They actually saw 15 on the Golan Heights and 53 in the Sinai for a total of 68.

Mr. Rush: Has there been any study of how long the Israel economy, fully mobilized, can stand up?

Gen. Scowcroft: That's a good question.

Mr. Colby: They have plans to drop their mobilization down to 50,000 above their regular strength. Under these circumstances they can get 85% of their normal GNP. Since they probably devote more than 15% to investments every year, they can get along.

Gen. Scowcroft: You mean they can go on indefinitely?

Mr. Colby: They just won't be building for the future.

---

[9] Congressman Thomas E. Morgan (D–Pennsylvania), Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Adm. Weinel: They could partially demobilize now. The Syrians can't get off the roads, and the passes on the Sinai they have zeroed in with artillery.

Mr. Rush: Are they having any trouble supporting their troops across the Suez?

Mr. Colby: No, they have four or five bridges across.

Mr. Clements: And they're well protected; that bridgehead is 25 miles across.

Gen. Scowcroft: (to Messrs Rush and Clements) Have you gentlemen had a chance to look at the latest draft of the President's energy message? We have no great problems with it, although I don't think it's a barn burner.

Mr. Rush: It doesn't set one on fire.

Gen. Scowcroft: Hopefully, they are going to punch it up a little.

Mr. Clements: I think they need more of the patriotic approach—that everyone needs to cooperate—than is in there now.

Gen. Scowcroft: We are making that point to them to try to get some dynamism in it, but it solves our problem about references to the Arabs.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

Mr. Clements: I'd like to make two or three quick points about this oil situation. If we don't solve this oil embargo situation by January 15 or February 1, I can't emphasize too strongly the degree of trouble we'll be in. We need to talk about some things in this group that we can't talk about in the Energy Policy Group or the larger group. I tell you, from my experience, Watergate will be a tea-party compared to this thing by February 1.

Mr. Rush: I agree, and the Israelis will think it's a tea-party, too. What happens in Europe and Japan has a very heavy impact here. As our allies start shedding us off, the impact here will be very serious.

Mr. Clements: There has been nothing in my adult lifetime as serious as the next 90-day period in our energy situation.

Mr. Rush: Our recent problems with NATO are just the beginning.[10] Wait until they start closing plants, schools, jobs.

---

[10] Reference is to the strained relations between the United States and NATO over the neutral stance taken by NATO countries during the war, including denial of base rights for refueling U.S. aircraft involved in the resupply of Israel. (*The New York Times*, October 27, 1973) At his press conference on October 26, Nixon commented that "our European friends haven't been as cooperative as they might be in attempting to help us work out the Middle East settlement." See footnote 2, Document 285. Schlesinger discussed NATO's response to the war with NATO Secretary General Luns on November 26. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–1973, POL 27 ARAB–ISR)

Gen. Scowcroft: In the middle of winter.

Mr. Clements: Our economy will turn itself inside out. And the alternatives are as serious as the ones we are talking about. I have carefully avoided such a discussion up to now, but I want to get this on the record. To use a favorite word in this room, my perception is that the President doesn't have any understanding of how serious the problem is. He has been preoccupied with other things, and understandably so, but compared to this, the naming of a new Attorney General and a new prosecutor are side issues. Ken (Rush), do you agree?

Mr. Rush: We have the reverse of the normal economic situation. The Arabs can increase their prices and cut back their production, and still have more money than they did before. There are no economic pressures on them.

Gen. Scowcroft: None.

Adm. Weinel: And the problem is exacerbated because people can't identify the sacrifices they are being asked to make with any principle. If we could put it in the context of a maximum contribution to the millenium someone could make a speech in the UN about it.

Mr. Clements: Henry (Kissinger) is really on a pilgrimage to Mecca. There's something ironic about that. I know what the problem is and I know what the solution must be, but how to get from one to the other, I don't know. Henry (Kissinger) now understands the problem and the solution—the solution is Saudi Arabia. But how to get there, I'm not smart enough to know. That's the Secretary's (Kissinger) problem. But we can't have any misunderstanding about this. There is no question of how strongly I feel about this, and I know I'm right. We'd better get our eye on the ball. Ken (Rush), do you agree?

Mr. Rush: Absolutely.

Gen. Scowcroft: (to Mr. Clements) I have relayed your views to the Secretary. I think this group should meet fairly frequently in the next week or ten days.

323. Telegram From the Embassy in Israel to the Department of State[1]

Tel Aviv, November 6, 1973, 2200Z.

8997. Please pass to the Secretary. Subj: GOI Position. Ref: Tel Aviv 8996.[2]

The PrMin gave the Ambassador today the following position approved by the GOI Cabinet on November 5:

1. The Secretary will say in Cairo that the Israelis expect the Egyptians to observe the cease-fire. The Israelis assured him that they will maintain the cease-fire on the basis of reciprocity.

2. The Secretary succeeded in getting the Israelis to agree to a system of non-military supplies to the Third Army. There would be joint UN-Israeli inspection.

3. The town of Suez will receive daily supplies of food, water and medicine, details to be worked out between the Israelis and Egyptians.

4. In return for (2),

(A) All wounded Israelis and Egyptians POWs, wounded Third Army troops, wounded civilians in the town of Suez and its environs will be exchanged immediately;

(B) All POWs will be exchanged immediately.

(A) and (B) will be implemented concurrently with (2).

5. The Bab-El-Mandeb and Gulf of Suez blockade will be lifted. This will be done concurrently with (2).

6. The question of the October 22 line will be discussed between the two sides within the framework of the separation and disengagement of forces.

7. Assuming the above is agreed between the U.S. and Israel, the U.S. will exercise the veto in the UN Security Council should the Soviets or other countries attempt to pass a resolution opening the way for Soviet intervention.

Keating

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 611, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 13, Nov. 73–Dec. 73. Secret; Immediate; Nodis.

[2] Telegram 8996 from Tel Aviv, November 6, reported on Keating's meeting with Meir in which she informed the Ambassador of the Israeli Cabinet approved position and described her discussions in Washington. (Ibid.)

324. Editorial Note

Secretary of State Henry Kissinger met with Egyptian President Anwar Sadat on November 7 at the Tahra Palace in Heliopolis to begin discussion of the possible disengagement of Israeli and Egyptian forces, the resumption of U.S.-Egyptian diplomatic relations, and Egyptian participation at the forthcoming peace conference in Geneva. No record of Kissinger's discussion in Cairo has been found. In his memoirs, however, Kissinger described his 3-hour meeting with the Egyptian President:

"Sadat had emerged, dressed in a khaki military tunic, an overcoat slung carelessly over his shoulders . . . He was taller, swarthier, and more imposing than I had expected. He exuded vitality and confidence. . . . Sadat then ushered me into a large room that served as his office. On one side were French windows overlooking a lawn in which wicker chairs had been placed in a semicircle for the benefit of our aides. 'I have been longing for this visit,' said Sadat and started filling a pipe. I have a plan for you. It can be called the Kissinger plan.'

". . . Before we talked about the business at hand, I said, would the President tell me how he had managed to achieve such a stunning surprise on October 6? . . . Sadat told his tale of lonely decision-making, his conclusion after the failure of the 1969 Rogers Plan that there would never be a serious negotiation so long as Israel was able to equate security with military predominance. It was impossible for Egypt to bargain from a posture of humiliation. He told me how he had grown disenchanted with the Soviet Union. Moscow prized its relations with the United States above support of Egypt; the bland treatment of the Middle East question in the communiqué of Nixon's 1972 summit in Moscow had removed any lingering doubts on that score."

"Why had he been so persistent, I asked? Why not wait for the diplomatic initiative we had promised? To teach Israel that it could not find security in domination, replied Sadat, and to restore Egypt's self-respect—a task no foreigner could do for it. Now that he had vindicated Egyptian honor, Sadat told me, he had two objectives: to regain 'my territory,' that is to say, to restore the 1967 boundary in the Sinai, and to make peace."

". . . I turned for the next half-hour to a conceptual discussion. . . . History had shown, I said, that progress toward peace depended on two factors: an Arab leader willing to relate rhetoric to reality and an America willing to engage itself in the process. We would not exercise our influence under pressure; our actions had to be seen to reflect our choice and not submission to threats. We had no incentive to be forthcoming to clients of the Soviet Union. Nasser's policy of trying to extort concessions by mobilizing the Third World against us with Soviet sup-

port had not worked in the past and would not be permitted to work in the future. Peace in the Middle East could not come about by the defeat of American allies with Soviet arms—as we had just shown. But an Egypt pursuing its own national policy would find us ready to cooperate. We sought no preeminence in Egypt. I could discern no inevitable clash of interests between us.

"'And Israel?' asked Sadat. Israel, I insisted, need not be a source of conflict. No Egyptian interest was served by the destruction of Israel; no Arab problem would be solved by it. Egypt had lost thousands of lives for a cause that had never been reduced to terms America could possibly support. We would never hold still for Israel's destruction, I continued, but we were willing to help allay reasonable Arab grievances. All we had ever heard from Arabs were sweeping programs put forward on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. Experience had shown that this course guaranteed deadlock. Israel was indeed stubborn, occasionally infuriating. But as someone who had spoken so movingly of national dignity, he had to understand the psychology of a country that had never enjoyed the minimum attribute of sovereignty, acceptance by its neighbors.

"I urged Sadat to think of peace with Israel as a psychological, not a diplomatic problem. If, as he rightly insisted, Israel could not base its security on physical predominance, it also could not be secure without confidence. And that was the contribution required of the most influential Arab nation, Egypt. . . . Sadat listened intently to these heresies of Arab thought, impassively puffing on his pipe. He showed no reaction except: 'And what about my Third Army? What about the October 22 line?'

". . . He had two choices, I replied. Relying on the declaration of the European Community and Soviet support, he could insist on the October 22 line. It would be difficult, even embarrassing, for us. Eventually, we might be induced to go along. But weeks would go by, and for what would he have mobilized all these pressures? To get Israel to go back a few kilometers on the *west* bank of the Suez Canal—a process that would then have to be repeated under even more difficult circumstances for a real separation of forces leading to an Israeli retreat across the Suez Canal. The better course was to live with the status quo, made bearable by a system of nonmilitary supplies for the Third Army. With immediate tensions defused, the United States would do its utmost to arrange a genuine disengagement of forces, moving the Israelis back across the Canal—although not as far as in his scheme, probably not even beyond the passes. Still it would be the first Israeli withdrawal from Arab territory occupied for any length of time; it would create the confidence for further steps. The diplomacy to induce Israel to return to the October 22 line was about the same as the persuasion needed to

produce a disengagement scheme and we would not be able to accomplish both in a brief period. Paradoxically, forgoing the October 22 line would speed up Israeli withdrawal from the Canal. Sadat should choose. I would do my best either way.

"Sadat sat brooding, saying nothing for many minutes . . . then he astonished me. He did not haggle or argue. He did not dispute my analysis. He did not offer an alternative. Violating the normal method of diplomacy—which is to see what one can extract for a concession—he said simply that he agreed with both my analysis and my proposed procedure. It had been folly for Egypt, he averred, to seek its goals through harassing the United States. Egypt had had enough of war; there was no intention to destroy Israel. Having restored his nation's self-respect, he could now turn to the peace for which his people longed."

"The Third Army, Sadat added, was in any case not the heart of the matter between America and Egypt. He was determined to end Nasser's legacy. He would reestablish relations with the United States as quickly as possible and, once that was accomplished, he would move to friendship. . . . He was prepared to announce his intentions immediately—upon the conclusion of our meeting, in fact. In the meantime, he would raise the head of his Interests Section to the status of Ambassador. He hoped that we would join such an announcement. We had sought for four years to restore relations; I had brought with me a proposal to do so. We agreed that the ambassadors would assume their functions immediately, operating from Interests Sections indistinguishable from Embassies."

Before the meeting concluded, Sadat and Kissinger agreed to a six-point plan that incorporated the agreement that the two had reached during their conversation. The six points were: 1) Egypt and Israel would observe the UN Security Council cease-fire; 2) discussions between Egypt and Israel would begin immediately on a return to the October 22 line and on the disengagement and separation of forces; 3) the town of Suez would receive daily supplies of food, water, and medicine; 4) there would be no impediment to the movement of non-military supplies to the East Bank; 5) United Nations checkpoints would replace Israeli checkpoints on the Cairo–Suez road; and 6) exchange of prisoners of war would take place following the establishment of the United Nations checkpoints on the Cairo–Suez road.

When they had finished going over the six points, Sadat asked an aide to call in Assistant Secretary Joseph Sisco and Foreign Minister Ismail Fahmi, who would refine what Kissinger and Sadat had discussed into formal language. As they waited for their two assistants to arrive, Sadat made one final remark: "Never forget, Dr. Kissinger. I am

making this agreement with the United States, not with Israel." (Kissinger, *Years of Upheaval*, pages 635–641)

In Sadat's account of his November 7 meeting with Kissinger, he wrote that he told Kissinger that he wanted a return to "the cease-fire lines of October 22. I have 800 tanks, while Israel has only 400; for each Israeli tank I have one and a half rockets; the Israelis are besieged, and the gap they've cut open between our armies—4 miles wide—could close and so spell the end of them. There can be no question about that." Sadat added:

"We had a three-hour session, during which we agreed on six points, one of which was that Egyptian-Israeli talks for disengagement of forces and a return to the lines of October 22 would start at Km. 101. . . . The first hour made me feel I was dealing with an entirely new mentality, a new political method. For the first time, I felt as if I was looking at the real face of the United States, the one I had always wanted to see—not the face put on by [John Foster] Dulles, Dean Rusk, and [William] Rogers. Anyone seeing us after that first hour in al-Tahirah Palace would have thought we had been friends for years. There was no difficulty in understanding one another and so we agreed on a six-point program of action, including a U.S. pledge of return to the October 22 cease-fire line within the framework of the forces' disengagement.

"Our agreement on the six-point program of action marked the beginning of a relationship of mutual understanding with the United States culminating and crystallizing in what we came to describe as a 'Peace Process.' Together we started that process, and the United States still supports our joint efforts to this day." (Sadat, *In Search of Identity*, pages 267–268 and 291–292)

Following the meeting, Kissinger transmitted the agreement to resume diplomatic relations and the six-point proposal to the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs Brent Scowcroft in telegrams Hakto 14 and Hakto 15, November 7. The Secretary instructed Scowcroft to inform Israeli Ambassador Simcha Dinitz and ask him to communicate the proposal to Prime Minister Golda Meir immediately. He also asked that the agreement and oral understanding be passed to Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin upon Sisco's arrival in Tel Aviv and that the Ambassador be informed that Egypt had accepted joint U.S.–USSR auspices for the peace talks as well as the Security Council procedure that the Secretary had discussed with Dobrynin earlier. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 41, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip–Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, HAKTO 1–69, Nov. 5–16, 1973)

Scowcroft sent President Nixon a memorandum, November 7, describing Kissinger's conversation with Sadat:

"We have just received a brief report from Secretary Kissinger upon the conclusion of a three-hour session with President Sadat of Egypt. Agreement has been reached on the following proposal, which will be communicated to the Israelis.

"1. Egypt and Israel agree to observe scrupulously the cease-fire called for by the UN Security Council.

"2. Both sides agree that discussions between them will begin immediately to settle the question of the return to the October 22 positions in the framework of agreement on the disengagement and separation of forces.

"3. The town of Suez will receive daily supplies of food, water, and medicine. All wounded civilians in the town of Suez will be evacuated.

"4. There shall be no impediment to the movement of non-military supplies to the East Bank.

"5. The Israeli check points on the Cairo–Suez road will be replaced by UN check points. At the Suez end of the road, an Israeli officer can participate with the UN to supervise the non-military nature of the cargo.

"6. As soon as the UN check points are established on the Cairo–Suez road, there will be an exchange of all POWs, including wounded.

"There is also an oral understanding which states that Egypt undertakes to ease the blockade at Bab El-Mandab. Assistant Secretary Sisco is flying to Tel Aviv now to seek the concurrence of the Israeli government.

"An oral message has also been transmitted from you to Prime Minister Meir in advance of Assistant Secretary Sisco's arrival.

"Secretary Kissinger has informed me of the agreement he has worked out with President Sadat and which has been sent to you for your consideration. In addition, there is an oral understanding between the United States and Egypt regarding the blockade at Bar El-Mandab which Assistant Secretary Sisco will convey to you. Having read the records of your conversation with Secretary Kissinger, it is my firm conviction that the agreement reached will be satisfactory to you.

"Agreement has also been reached in principle on the resumption of diplomatic relations between Egypt and the United States, and the following announcement will be made by Ron Ziegler at noon today.

"The Governments of the United States and of Egypt have agreed in principle to resume diplomatic relations at an early date. The two Governments have also agreed that in the meantime the respective interests sections of the two countries will be raised immediately to the Ambassadorial level. The Government of Egypt has named Ambassador Ashraf Ghorbal. The United States has designated Ambassador Hermann Eilts. They will take up their posts promptly." (Ibid., Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov. 73–Dec 31, 1973)

In telegram Tohak 40/WH37256 to Cairo, November 7, the President wrote to Kissinger: "Congratulations! Great job!" (Ibid., Box 41, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, HAKTO 1–69, Nov. 5–16, 1973) In telegram Tohak 41/WH37258, November 7, Scowcroft informed Kissinger that the agreement to restore diplomatic relations had been very well received. He reported that Dinitz had observed that the proposed agreement had some "rough spots" but had seemed to react to it fairly favorably. Dobrynin had commented that the Israelis ought to accept it since it included everything they had been asking for. Scowcroft added that he wanted to express his own admiration for a proposal that he had feared would be impossible to achieve. (Ibid)

---

325. Telegram From the White House Chief of Staff (Haig) to Secretary of State Kissinger in Amman[1]

Washington, November 8, 1973, 0423Z.

Tohak 52/WH37273. The President is elated by your accomplishments. Israelis have informed us here of inevitable Cabinet endorsement in the morning.[2] You never fail to exceed our expectations.

Due to overriding necessity to reinforce confidence here, the President feels strongly that there should be no, repeat, no announcement of any easing of oil restrictions from your party if you are also able to add this feather to your cap. He hopes that progress made in this area could be announced by him from the White House after your return. In conjunction with such an announcement and as Scowcroft advised you earlier, he would hope to have meeting as early as next week with

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 41, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, TOHAK 1–69, Nov. 5–16, 1973. Top Secret; Immediate; Sensitive; Eyes Only. Sent through Scowcroft to Rodman for Kissinger.

[2] Sisco met with Meir, Allon, Dayan, and Yariv on November 7 from 7:30 p.m. to midnight, to inform them of the agreement on disengagement and the convening of a peace conference. (Memorandum of conversation; ibid., RG 59, Records of Henry A. Kissinger, 1973-1977, Box 24, CAT "C", Nov–Dec 1973 HAK–Golda Meir. The Israeli Cabinet endorsement was relayed from Meir to Nixon through Dinitz, according to a memorandum from Scowcroft to Nixon, November 7. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 611, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 13, Nov.–Dec. 1973)

Faisal[3] in Washington. Following that meeting he would hope to announce progress on oil issue.

The President has delivered a strong message to the nation on the energy crisis tonight.[4] It has been extremely well received and your accomplishments in the oil area would provide essential, repeat, essential capstone to this message and assist us in dramatically healing recent wounds.

I promise you early notice on any new jolts. As of now the problem I anticipated is under control but I will keep you advised in timely manner. As a related matter, we are dramatically increasing the size and competence of White House legal staff along the lines I described prior to your departure. Thanks to you and your most recent accomplishments I sense a sharp turn upwards.

Warm regards,

Haig

[3] In telegram Tohak 43/WH37260, November 7, Scowcroft informed Kissinger that the President was very anxious to have King Faisal visit Washington as soon as possible, possibly as early as the following week. (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 41, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, TOHAK 1–69, Nov. 5–16, 1973) In Hakto 20, Kissinger told Scowcroft that setting up a meeting with Faisal in Washington was "total insanity" and would be seen as a sign of "U.S. collapse." (Ibid., HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, HAKTO 1–60, Nov. 15–16, 1973)

[4] For the text of President Nixon's November 7 speech, see *Public Papers: Nixon, 1973*, pp. 916–922.

326. Telegram From the Embassy in Israel to Secretary of State Kissinger in Riyadh[1]

Tel Aviv, November 8, 1973.

9045. For Secretary from Sisco. Subject: Meeting with PriMin Meir.

1. In final wrap up meeting,[2] most of which devoted to Israeli interpretation of Egyptian-Israeli agreement, PM conveyed her and Cabinet approval of document without any word changes.[3] In order get her to accept, I agreed to informal US–Israeli Memorandum of Understanding regarding certain points.[4]

2. Near end of meeting much to surprise of everyone PM proposed that basic document be changed to reflect nuances of private informal US–Israeli understanding which I had previously worked out with Gen Yariv. We dug in our heels and I refused any change in document, and she finally came around on basis of a suggestion that she would wish to put her gloss and interpretation on document when she speaks before Knesset.

3. We talked about timing and scenario and I said that we would get a precise message to her on this from you now that Israeli Government approval had been given. She suggested that 8:30 p.m. local Friday[5] would suit her very well since she would want to speak to Knesset at that time. She seemed flexible on timing but expressed above preference. If you have worked out a definite timing schedule, I would suggest you not wait my arrival in Riyadh but send your views promptly to PM.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 41, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, TOHAK 1–69, Nov. 5–16, 1973. Secret; Cherokee; Nodis. The original is telegram Tohak 61/WH37285 from the White House to Secretary of State Kissinger, November 8, 1402Z, which copied telegram Tosec 233/220436 from the Department of State to the U.S. delegation in Riyadh and the White House, November 8, 1341Z. Tosec 233 quoted telegram 9045 from Tel Aviv, with a request to pass it to the Secretary in Riyadh.

[2] The meeting was reported in telegram 9034 from Tel Aviv, November 8. (Ibid., Box 139, Country Files, Middle East, Secretary Kissinger's Trip to Middle East, November 5–10, 1973). A memorandum of conversation, November 8, 1:30 p.m., is in the Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Kissinger Papers, Box CL 181, Geopolitical File, Middle East, Chronological File, 7–12 Nov. 73.

[3] See Document 324.

[4] The Memorandum of Understanding is in Document 327. In telegram 9046 from Tel Aviv, November 8, 1300Z, Sisco told Kissinger that at the end of the meeting the Prime Minister had asked him if he could make a very brief statement to the press expressing optimism. They had agreed that he would say: "We have had a useful and constructive meeting with the Prime Minister and her colleagues. I am flying to Riyadh to report to the Secretary of State. I am optimistic." (National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

[5] November 9.

4. I would also suggest an immediate brief, oral message from you to PM saying that I have reported to you and that you appreciate the constructive spirit in which the Israeli Government has approached this matter.[6]

5. Saunders and I will be taking a C–141 to Riyadh as soon as we have filed a full report of the meeting to you. I am glad the Israeli approval has come in time for you to use it to the maximum in Riyadh.

Keating

[6] This was done in a November 8 message from Kissinger to Meir. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, November 1–30, 1973)

327. Telegram From the Embassy in Israel to the Department of State[1]

Tel Aviv, November 8, 1973, 1414Z.

9056. To Secretary from Sisco. Subject: Memorandum of Understanding. Ref: Tel Aviv 9045.[2]

Following is final agreed text of Memorandum of Understanding: *Begin text:* 8 Nov 73. Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of Israel and the Government of the United States on agreement between the Governments of Egypt and Israel concerning the ceasefire.

1. Egypt and Israel agree to observe scrupulously the ceasefire on the ground, in the air and on the sea, called for by the UN Security Council. The ceasefire includes all military actions on the part of both parties and therefore rules out blockade of the Straits of Bab-El-Mandeb.

2. Both sides agree that discussions between them will begin immediately to settle the question of "the return to 22 Oct 1973 positions," in the framework of agreement on the disengagement and separation of forces, under the auspices of the U.N.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 139, Country Files, Middle East, Secretary Kissinger's Trip to Middle East, November 5–10, 1973. Secret; Flash; Cherokee; Nodis; Exdis. Also sent Flash to the U.S. delegation in Riyadh and to Jidda.

[2] Document 326.

3. The town of Suez will receive daily supply of food, water and medicine. All wounded civilians in town of Suez will be evacuated. Details to be agreed upon between both sides.

4. There shall be no impediment to the movement of non-military supply to the East Bank. Details of the routine to be agreed upon by both sides.

5. Inspection of the non-military supply to the East Bank will be according to the following procedure:

A. The western checkpoint on the Cairo–Suez road will be manned by UN personnel. The vehicles carrying non-military supplies and driven by UN drivers will be inspected by UN officers with Israeli officers observing.

B. At the bank of the Canal the unloaded supplies will be inspected by Israeli officers with UN officers observing.

6. As soon as the UN checkpoint is established in accordance with the provisions of para 5 above, there will be an immediate exchange of all POWs (including all those Israelis and Egyptians held since 1969), with first priority for all wounded POWs. *End text.*

Keating

---

328. Paper by William B. Quandt of the National Security Council Staff[1]

Washington, November 8, 1973.

PRESIDENT'S FRIDAY BRIEFING

For the President

Jordan and the Palestinians: Prior to Secretary Kissinger's visit to Jordan yesterday,[2] King Hussein made quick trips to Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Abu Dhabi and Syria to discuss Jordan's position toward the Palestinians and the West Bank. The King is worried that pressure is mounting for an independent Palestinian role in peace negotiations.[3]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1178, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, November 6–10, 1973. Secret. Submitted for inclusion in the President's November 9 briefing.

[2] See Document 331.

[3] Telegram 9027 from Tel Aviv, November 8, reported that Meir had made clear Israel's adamant opposition to a separate Palestinian delegation in any future peace negoti-

Egypt and the Soviet Union have shown signs of supporting the creation of a Palestinian state on the West Bank and in Gaza and some fedayeen leaders reportedly favor this position.

King Hussein found general understanding for Jordan's role in negotiating to recover the West Bank, but the Saudis and Syrians encouraged him to allow the Palestinians autonomy or self-determination once Israeli withdrawal is achieved. In reflecting on his talks, the King indicated that he realized that he could not speak for all Palestinians. Consequently, he is thinking that it might make sense for a referendum to be held among Palestinians on the West Bank and in Gaza after Israeli withdrawal to allow the Palestinians to choose between independence and association with Jordan.[4]

The King's thinking is still at an early stage on this issue, but he is clearly sensitive to how the Palestinian question will be dealt with in negotiations. One of the remarkable developments of the past few weeks has been Syria's rapprochement with Jordan, so that now President Asad appears to be supporting King Hussein's role as representative of the Palestinians in negotiations, whereas Egypt has yet to take a clear position on this issue.[5]

---

ations. She noted, however, that Palestinians might properly be included in the Jordanian delegation but said that was up to King Hussein and the Palestinians. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

[4] A November 7 intelligence report relayed statements by PLO leader Yasir Arafat that indicated that the PLO's policy toward Jordan was "live and let live" and that the Arab unity established during the war was more important than individual differences. Jordan had to accede to a Palestinian entity, however, because all other Arab states wanted this. The PLO was prepared to accept the concept of a Palestinian entity comprised of the West Bank, Gaza, and Hammah, but this concept would be meaningless unless the United States also supported it. Arafat noted that the two superpowers could ensure that this entity remained demilitarized so it should not bother the Israelis. He added that the old "all or nothing" policy and a democratic Jewish/Arab state were no longer political realities. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 40, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, State Cables, Nov. 5–16, 1973 [2 of 2])

[5] Telegram 1278 from Jerusalem, November 8, warned that the question of who would negotiate for the Palestinians and the question of a separate Palestinian state or return to Jordan might become "real issues" during the forthcoming peace negotiations. It advised that U.S. interests would be best served by Hussein negotiating the return of the West Bank to Jordan. A separate Palestinian state would not represent a final and definitive solution and would leave openings for continuing instability. The United States should try to persuade Arab governments and the Soviets not to allow a stalemate to arise in which the Palestinians sent a negotiating team with which the Israelis would refuse to deal. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

Source:

TDFIRDB–315/10890–73, 8 November 1973
TDFIRDB–315/10886–73, 7 November 1973
TDFIRDB–315/10887–73, 7 November 1973[6]

[6] None printed.

329. Message From the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) to the Minister of the Israeli Embassy (Shalev)[1]

Washington, November 9, 1973.

Following are the main points just received from Foreign Minister Fahmi.

A. The Israelis have leaked the understanding on easing the blockade at Bab-El-Mandab. They also claimed through various sources Egypt would lift the blockade. Egypt will be forced to deny these assertions.

B. Egypt stands by its undertaking to ease the blockade if Israel will observe the six points[2] without misinterpreting or changing the agreement.

C. At a meeting at 3 p.m. Nov. 8, Israeli representatives insisted Suez Town is a cut-off town and will continue to be so—no telephone communications out of town, no mail, no non-military goods, no free passage for doctors, etc.

D. Israel interprets point five that only two checkpoints will be placed on the Cairo–Suez road which remains under "Israeli control" from KM 102 to the entrance to town and that Israel will freely use that part of road.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, November 1–30, 1973. No classification marking. The message is attached to a note from the White House Situation Room that reads: "Gen. Scowcroft: Attached is copy of message sent in your name by Sit. Rm. to Minister Shalev per instructions contained in Riyadh 059. Obvious clerical and grammatical corrections were made."

[2] See Document 324.

E. Point five of the agreement states that Israeli checkpoints will be replaced by UN checkpoints and that only at the Suez end of the road Israeli officers can participate with UN to supervise non-military nature of cargo at the banks of the Canal.

F. In view of above, and until Israelis will "faithfully implement" six points, Fahmi hopes that Secretary Kissinger will agree that release by Waldheim of six points should be postponed until next meeting of military representatives Nov. 10 at 2 p.m. local and after which Egyptian military would inform Fahmi "of the Israelis abiding by the text as agreed upon."

G. However, if Fahmi hears from Secretary Kissinger at the appropriate time "that Israelis abide with this understanding" and that Kissinger "guarantee that", then and only then would Fahmi have no objection to the original schedule for release of the six points.

We do not want to take sides on specific points. It is true that there has been some speculation on the Israeli radio, and obviously your military representatives were acting yesterday without reference to the agreement. We know press speculation is unavoidable. However, it is essential your government refrain from prodding the press with information about the specifics of the agreement and in particular any backgrounding or official statements about decisions by Egyptian government on easing blockade. I recognize that you are planning to speak to Knesset at time agreement is announced. We urge that your statement on this agreement avoid specifics of interpretative details a number of which will undoubtedly require full discussion, understanding and cooperation by the military representatives of both sides. We also urge that your representative proceed in a generous spirit. You should know that Sadat told me that a visible presence on the road will make his position with respect to the agreement untenable.

We are responding to the Egyptian Foreign Minister along the following lines:

—I have expressed my concern that detailed comment on the agreement be minimized and that public statement regarding the Egyptian commitment to ease the blockade be avoided.

—I do not believe that the Israeli military officials could be expected to begin implementation of the agreement prior to signature.

—Regarding the specific points on the road and Suez city it must be recognized that the military representatives will have to work out the many specific details of implementation.

—It was clearly understood in our discussions with the Israeli Government that the UN would take over the inspection and UN personnel would man the checkpoints.

—I believe we should go ahead and announce the agreement as planned. We agreed to the text of the six points. As for the points raised on Suez City, I recommend that your representatives give this priority

attention in the Saturday[3] meeting and hope that you will let me tell Foreign Minister Fahmi that this will be the case.

I am sure that PM will agree with me that the prompt and effective implementation of the agreement will depend on the spirit in which it is carried out. Therefore, it is important that Israel proceed now to follow through on the terms of the agreement in a positive spirit and that your negotiators not act in a harassing manner. If this agreement breaks down at this stage, an acrimonious UN debate is unavoidable, and I am certain the terms of a Security Council resolution will be much less generous than the terms of this agreement. Please confirm to me immediately that what we have told the Egyptian Foreign Minister is a proper reflection of your position so that we can proceed.

[3] November 10.

330. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

En route, November 9, 1973, 0740Z.

Hakto 26. 1. For your information only repeat for your information only: Attached is six point agreement on scenario for negotiations, as worked out with Fahmi in Cairo on November 8. This is not yet to be shared with anyone.

2. Warm regards.

Attachment:

Agreement on a Middle East Conference

1. During the week of November 19, 1973, the United States and the Soviet Union will inform the United States [*Nations*] Secretary General and others about the modalities of the conference.

2. The United States and the Soviet Union will arrange for a meeting of the Security Council and the United States will declare that according to its understanding Egypt, Israel, Jordan and Syria have

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 41, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, HAKTO 1–60, Nov. 5–16, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Immediate; Exclusively Eyes Only.

agreed to attend the first stage of negotiations dealing with disengagement and other related matters for a peace agreement.

3. Furthermore the parties agreed that this conference will be convened under the auspices of the United Nations with the participation of the Secretary General in the opening phase of the negotiations.

4. They furthermore agreed that the conference will be under the co-chairmanship of the United States and the Soviet Union.

5. The conference will be convened on December 8 or 9, 1973 in Geneva. The opening session will be at the Foreign Minister level.

6. The question of the participation of the Palestinians and Lebanon will be discussed during the first stage of the conference.

---

331. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

En route, November 9, 1973, 0850Z.

Hakto 28. Please deliver following report to the President:

I had an extremely cordial and relaxed two and a half hour meeting with King Hussein in Amman today.[2] He sends you his warmest regards which I reciprocated on your behalf.

The King explained in some detail the difficult choice he faced in the recent war and spoke with some satisfaction of the way he had avoided the twin dangers of full involvement, on the one hand, and isolation through total non-participation, on the other. He reflected a basic confidence in his position and in the correctness of his policies. At the same time he reiterated many of his old underlying concerns: apprehension about the Soviet position in Iraq, worry that other Arabs will make separate settlements with Israel which leave him out, and suspicion that some Arab leaders may be working for a separate Palestinian state at his expense. He said Sadat had told him the U.S. and Soviets favored this—an idea of which I immediately disabused him.

The King introduced an interesting new concept with regard to the Palestinian question; instead of an immediate return of the West Bank

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 41, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, HAKTO 1–60, Nov. 5–16, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Immediate.

[2] November 8. A memorandum of conversation is ibid., RG 59, Records of Henry Kissinger, 1973–1977, Box 2, NODIS Action Memos 1973–1976.

to Jordan following Israeli withdrawal, an international presence would be introduced in Gaza and the West Bank. A plebisicite would then be held offering the Palestinians there the choice between independence, federation with Jordan in a United Arab Kingdom, or reintegration into the Hashemite Kingdom. I told him that we had always envisaged the Palestinians remaining a part of Jordan but said that his concept was an interesting one which could be kept in mind as the negotiations proceed.

I briefed the King fully regarding the proposal I negotiated with Sadat on the ceasefire and prisoner of war question[3] (Israeli acceptance had not yet been received at the time I left Amman). I also gave him in some detail our ideas for getting a peace conference started under U.S.–Soviet auspices in early December. I assured him that we were not being taken in by the Soviets and had no secret understandings with them. Rather, we felt that the joint auspices idea offers the least difficult and most manageable approach among the available alternatives.

In response to my point that the Arabs could not expect help from us in bringing about a settlement while we were subjected to pressure on the oil issue, the King said he fully agreed with me and had said so to other Arab leaders.

Towards the end of our meeting, the King brought up his need for additional military assistance. I was frank about the Congressional limitations on our ability to be helpful but assured him we would do our best. I was able to convey to him our decision on rapid resupply of his tank losses in the war, which was helpful, but it is clear that he has in mind a more ambitious program and more sophisticated equipment than we have provided Jordan so far. This will be discussed with his military people next month, and I said I would tell the Defense Department to be sympathetic.

After the meeting the King hosted a small informal [gathering?] laced with humor, anecdotes and further examples of our common strategic approach to the Middle East. I reassured him once again that we would always check with him if and when we talked to the Palestinians. I noted that Jerusalem would probably prove to be the most difficult issue, the Israelis showing no sign of give. The Jordanians underlined again the importance of this question; we both agreed that the city could ideally serve as a bridge between Israelis and Arabs. The King stated that he had good relations with such common friends as Iran and Turkey who share our overall approach to the region.

Once again it was clear from this visit that the King highly values his relationship with you. He wants to cooperate closely with us to re-

[3] See Document 324.

inforce our common interests in the area and wants to be sure his policies and actions meet with your approval. I assured him they did.

The King capped our extremely warm reception by flying me to the airport in his helicopter, and providing us with a fighter escort.

---

332. Memorandum From the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, November 9, 1973.

Secretary Kissinger has sent you the following report[2] of his meeting with King Faisal:

I met with King Faisal for three hours at the Royal Palace in Riyadh, late Thursday evening November 8.

First I gave him word of the agreement we had worked out with the Egyptians and Israelis to stabilize the ceasefire and ensure relief supplies to the Egyptian Third Army.[3] He was pleased at the news. I then outlined again the strategy you intended to pursue in the coming weeks: to prepare the ground carefully in order to move decisively in the near future. Faisal was encouraged by this and assured me several times of his confidence in you and of his friendship for the United States.

In this context I raised the matter of easing the oil boycott. An energy crisis in America, I told him, would make your position very difficult. It would only strengthen the hand of those forces in the U.S. who were resisting a just settlement and who were seeking to undermine Presidential authority generally. I made the point subtly that we could handle an oil shortage economically but that its real significance was political and psychological as I described.

King Faisal assured me that nothing would please him more than to be able to maintain and even increase oil supplies to his American

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 139, Country Files, Middle East, Saudi Arabia, [November–December 1973]. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only.

[2] Telegram Hakto 27, November 9, 0755Z, contained the report and asked Scowcroft to pass it to the President. (Ibid., Box 41, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, HAKTO 1–60, Nov. 5–16, 1973) A memorandum of conversation is ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 139, Country Files, Middle East, Saudi Arabia, [November–December 1973].

[3] See Document 324.

friends. But he emphasized he was under pressure from the radicals. He pointed out that all Arabs were united on the basic issues and he hoped we would move as expeditiously as possible toward a settlement. He did indicate that he would do his best to overcome his dilemma.

Immediately after our meeting the King sent his two principal advisers one after the other to encourage us in our present course. Prince Fahd, his Second Deputy Prime Minister, came by for a half hour, and Foreign Minister Saqqaf then met with me for an hour. Fahd said he would do his best to get the oil flowing again. The Foreign Minister said that Saudi Arabia was looking for an excuse to get out of its uncomfortable position of confrontation with the United States.[4]

Foreign Minister Saqqaf came by again this morning, November 9, before my departure. He said Saudi Arabia needed some pretext to change its position. He thought the announcement of the opening of the peace negotiations (now planned for November 20) could be the occasion for a formal communication by you to Faisal on the oil boycott. He thought the result might well be favorable.

I invited King Faisal to Washington on your behalf. He said he could not come until after some more progress had been made towards peace.

[4] Records of these meetings are in the National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 139, Country Files, Middle East, Saudi Arabia, [November–December 1973].

333. Backchannel Message From the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, November 9, 1973, 1627Z.

Tohak 76/WH37305. There follows a message from Prime Minister Meir which has just been relayed to us by Minister Shalev.

"Message for Secretary Kissinger From Prime Minister Meir

November 9, 1973

The Prime Minister is preparing a message to the Secretary[2] according to which the Secretary cannot make an announcement on behalf of Israel so long as the Prime Minister does not receive replies to a number of questions which will appear in her message as well as replies to points she raised in her talk with Ambassador Keating this morning.[3] For Israel, the six points are a package deal with top priority given to the prisoners of war.[4] The new Egyptian positions not only represent substantial differences in the interpretation of the agreement but also differences in its execution of the agreement. This interpretation also stands in direct contradiction to the Memorandum of Understanding between Israel and the United States which was negotiated by Secretary Sisco.[5]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 41, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Seoul, TOHAK 70–119, Nov. 5–16, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Eyes Only; Flash. Sent to Rodman for Kissinger.

[2] See Document 335.

[3] In telegram 9074 from Tel Aviv, November 9, 1256Z, Keating reported on Meir's concerns over the ongoing negotiations. Israel would not turn over the Cairo–Suez road to the United Nations and would not agree to the Egyptian demand that Suez City become a "free or open" city with unimpeded access to the Third Army on the East Bank. She was also opposed to having the peace conference open on December 8 or 9 because of Israel's upcoming elections. Keating asked Meir if a letter from the Secretary reaffirming the validity of the U.S.–Israeli Memorandum of Understanding would result in Israel's agreement not to delay transmission of the letter to the Secretary General. He recommended that Kissinger send a reassuring Flash message to the Prime Minister as soon as possible. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, November 1–30, 1973)

[4] See Document 324.

[5] See Document 327. In his memoirs, Kissinger recalled that "the Memorandum of Understanding was a detailed statement of how Israel intended to interpret the provisions of the six-point accord. These interpretations were not unreasonable; we were prepared to accept them privately and commit ourselves to support Israel should there be a dispute. What we could not do is what the cabinet seemed to want: turn the Israeli-American Memorandum of Understanding into the basic Egyptian-Israeli agreement. This would have required going back to Sadat and asking him to confirm formally what he could only accept de facto: such as lifting of the blockade at Bab el-Mandeb; Israeli control over the Cairo–Suez road; and the details of resupply of the Third Army, which would have brought home its plight to every Arab." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 652)

If the United States will nevertheless publish the agreement and do so in behalf of Israel as well, it must be absolutely clear that as far as Israel is concerned, the six points of the agreement and the Memorandum of Understanding are inseparable as was agreed upon with Secretary Sisco during his visit to Israel on November 7."[6]

[6] In telegram 9096 from Tel Aviv, November 9, 1630Z, Keating wrote that since he had received no reply to telegram 9074, he had felt it necessary to inform the Prime Minister's office that the letter to the Secretary General would be released at noon, New York time. The Prime Minister had asked that the release time be delayed pending clarification of the issues she had raised with him earlier that day, but Keating noted that this was now academic since Reuters had broken the story. He reported that the Prime Minister's public stance would be that Israel was awaiting further "clarifications" but privately to the United States this meant that Israel had ratified the six points with the understanding that they were linked to the U.S.–Israeli Memorandum of Understanding. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 611, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 13, Nov. 73–Dec. 73)

334. White House Press Release[1]

Washington, November 9, 1973.

TEXT OF A LETTER TO UNITED NATIONS SECRETARY GENERAL KURT WALDHEIM FROM SECRETARY OF STATE HENRY A. KISSINGER

Dear Mr. Secretary General:

I have the honor to inform you that the governments of Egypt and Israel are prepared to accept the following agreement which implements Article I of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 338 and Article I of United Nations Security Council Resolution 339.

The text of this agreement is as follows:

A. Egypt and Israel agree to observe scrupulously the ceasefire called for by the UN Security Council.

B. Both sides agree that discussions between them will begin immediately to settle the question of the return to the October 22 positions in the framework of agreement on the disengagement and separation of forces under the auspices of the UN.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1336, NSC Secretariat, NSC Unfiled Material, 1973, 11 of 12. No classification marking. Marked "For Immediate Release."

C. The town of Suez will receive daily supplies of food, water and medicine. All wounded civilians in the town of Suez will be evacuated.

D. There shall be no impediment to the movement of non-military supplies to the East Bank.

E. The Israeli checkpoints on the Cairo–Suez road will be replaced by UN checkpoints. At the Suez end of the road Israeli officers can participate with the UN to supervise the non-military nature of the cargo at the bank of the Canal.

F. As soon as the UN checkpoints are established on the Cairo–Suez road, there will be an exchange of all prisoners of war, including wounded.

It has also been agreed by the two parties that they will hold a meeting under the auspices of the United Nations Commander at the usual place (kilometer 101 on the Suez–Cairo road) to sign this agreement and to provide for its implementation. I would be most grateful if you would take the appropriate steps to insure that a meeting is held on Saturday, November 10, 1973, or at such other time as may be mutually convenient of representatives of the parties to take the appropriate steps.

We intend to announce publicly the agreement at noon New York time on Friday, November 9, 1973.[2]

Best regards,

/s/ Henry A. Kissinger

[2] On November 9, the U.S. Mission released the text of Scali's letter to Waldheim transmitting Kissinger's letter; see *The New York Times*, November 10, 1973.

335. Backchannel Message From the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) to Secretary of State Kissinger in Islamabad[1]

Washington, November 9, 1973, 1855Z.

Tohak 79/WH37308. There follows the full text of the Prime Minister's message to you, which has just been delivered from the Israeli Em-

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 41, HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, TOHAK 70–119, Nov. 5–16, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Eyes Only; Flash. Sent to Rodman or Jonathan Howe for Kissinger.

bassy. Minister Shalev indicated that it had also been delivered to Am-Embassy Tel Aviv, and they also will be transmitting it to you.

Delivered from Israeli Embassy

1:35 pm, 11/9/73

Prime Minister Golda Meir's message to the United States Secretary of State, 9 November 1973

"In addition to the points I made to Ambassador Keating and which he has communicated to you[2] I wish to add the following:

1) Israel's position on the six points that Assistant Secretary Sisco brought with him from Cairo and the oral understanding concerning the blockade[3] was that it could not accept the proposals except in conjunction with certain clarifications. Therefore, we reached an understanding that Mr. Sisco embodied in the Memorandum of Understanding of 8 November 1973. In addition, in the final talk I had with Mr. Sisco on November 8, just before his departure I thought we had further clarified and agreed on some points.[4] I had thought based on all this the announcement of the agreement could be made today.

2) With Mr. Fahmi's latest message before me and your communication of this morning to me[5] I must state that:

(A) Israel is prepared to implement scrupulously the six points proposal as interpreted by the joint Israel–U.S. Memorandum of Understanding.

(B) There is no change in our position as to the status and situation of the City of Suez and our control of the Cairo–Suez road. With regard to the check points our position is as set out in the Memorandum of Understanding (Article 5A & B). To be specific, regarding Suez City what we are committed to is Article (C) of the six points proposal. In the meeting with General Yariv yesterday the Egyptian General made requests beyond what had been agreed. It is significant that he admitted that he had instructions from President Sadat which he then presented. This means that he did not make the requests within the limits of the clearly explicit and well-defined terms of Article (C) of the proposals which he already had before him at the talks. As a matter of fact, he admitted this was so and that he was acting on instructions from the President.

(C) We would appreciate your assurance that this agreement as embodied in the Memorandum of Understanding will have your full

---

[2] See footnote 3, Document 333.

[3] See Document 324.

[4] See Documents 326 and 327.

[5] See Document 329.

support and also that you will lend us your support when we take a stand based on the two documents herein referred to.

(D) On Bab-El-Mandeb, as agreed with Mr. Sisco, I will state publicly in the Knesset and elsewhere that Israel and Egypt would observe the ceasefire on land, air and sea. The reference to sea would indicate that the blockade had been lifted de facto and would not be implemented although no announcement would be made. I cannot be held responsible, and that was agreed to by Mr. Sisco, for any Israeli press and mass media statements.

(E) I was surprised to learn from your message for the first time that Sadat had told you that a visible Israeli presence on the road would make his position with respect to the agreement untenable. This naturally cannot change our position as to the road.

3) (A) You asked me to confirm that what you told Mr. Fahmi is a proper reflection of our position. I regret this is not so. Our position is as outlined above (2).

(B) I cannot agree that in the meeting between the Generals tomorrow the problem of the City of Suez be given priority attention. We have before us a package deal and as you know, Mr. Secretary, Israel's priority are the POW's.

I must take exception to your admonition that our negotiators should not act in a harassing manner. As you know the Egyptians described the meetings as dignified ones. Our negotiating team, headed by General Yariv, is one which is uniquely qualified to conduct negotiations in a spirit conducive to achieve results in an atmosphere of candor and bridge-building.

If we have your assurances, Mr. Secretary, regarding (2) above you may proceed with the announcement in New York as planned.

Note: Whenever any of the six points are referred to above by letters the sequence is as per Secretary of State's draft letter to the UN Secretary General 9 November 1973.[6]

As more extremely disquieting information concerning our POW's in Syria reaches us I must again say that we would appreciate urgent action on your part to persuade the Syrians to hand over to us the list of our POW's and then proceed to the exchange of all POW's. Without such a list in our hands we are certain that all POWs' lives in Syria are in great jeopardy."

[6] Document 334.

336. Minutes of Washington Special Actions Group Meeting[1]

Washington, November 9, 1973, 3:02–4:10 p.m.

SUBJECT

Middle East

PARTICIPANTS

Chairman—Major Gen. Brent Scowcroft

State
Kenneth Rush
Rodger Davies

DOD
William Clements
Major General Gordon Sumner

JCS
Adm. Thomas H. Moorer
Vice Adm. John P. Weinel

CIA
William Colby
Samuel Hoskinson

NSC Staff
William Quandt
Jeanne W. Davis

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

It was agreed that:

. . . The airlift of supplies to Israel would be continued through November 14, but at a reduced rate.

. . . Deputy Secretary Clements would discuss with Secretary Schlesinger, and General Scowcroft with Secretary Kissinger, [*1 line not declassified*].

. . . The Iranians would be invited to fly with U.S. patrols over the Arabian Sea and an Iranian destroyer will be invited to train with a U.S. destroyer in the area in preparation for the Midlink exercise; Midlink should continue.

[Omitted here are conclusions unrelated to the Middle East.]

General Scowcroft: Bill (Colby), may we have your briefing.

Mr. Colby briefed from the text at Tab A.[2]

Mr. Clements: I think the impact of the Arab oil production cut-back on the U.S. will be more severe than CIA does. I estimate a 17% drop.

Mr. Colby: My figure is edging up.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, NSC Institutional Files (H–Files), Box H–117, WSAG Meetings Minutes, Originals, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Codeword. The meeting took place in the White House Situation Room.

[2] Attached, but not printed.

Mr. Rush: It will probably reach 17%.

Gen. Scowcroft: Let me give you a rundown on where we stand in this mixed up agreement. Last night we got a cable from the Egyptians reporting that the Israelis had a significantly different interpretation of the agreement.[3] They were insisting that Suez was a cut-off town—that there would be no phone or mail service, newspapers, doctors or tradesmen allowed in or out. They insisted that the Cairo–Suez road was in Israeli hands and the UN could establish only two check-points. The Egyptians thought announcement of the agreement should be held up until these points were clarified and they had received assurances that Israel would comply with the agreement. We sent word of this to Secretary Kissinger and to the Israelis. The Secretary sent messages to both the Israelis and the Egyptians and there were talks back and forth—a hand-holding operation in both directions. Then Egypt this morning agreed to the announcement, but the Israelis said "no", if the Egyptians were insisting on interpreting the announcement their way.[4] We had already given the letter to the UN Secretary General[5] and the agreement had already been leaked by the Japanese.

Mr. Rush: That was outrageous—it was leaked by the Foreign Ministry.

General Scowcroft: The Israelis argued that the 6-point package was an integral package, including the last paragraph on the lifting of the blockade. Following a special Israeli Cabinet meeting, it was announced that the agreement had the concurrence of both countries and it is scheduled to be signed tomorrow at 2:00 p.m. in the military meeting. So we're off to a shaky start.

Adm. Moorer: 2:00 p.m. local time?

Gen. Scowcroft: Yes, 7:00 a.m. here.

Mr. Rush: The so-called blockade is really a mess.

General Scowcroft: This is to stay within this room, but the Secretary has reached an oral understanding with the Egyptians on the easing of the blockade. The Israelis wanted it said that the blockade would be lifted. The Egyptians complained, saying they would have to deny that the blockade was lifted, but that they would ease it.

Adm. Moorer: But they don't have a blockade.

Gen. Scowcroft: They couldn't lift the blockade because they didn't have one, so they changed "ease" to "relax". The Israelis will say that they understand the ceasefire is a ceasefire on land, sea and air, without saying the blockade has been lifted. The Egyptians wanted no reference

[3] See Document 329.

[4] See Documents 330 and 333.

[5] Document 334.

to the blockade but the Israelis, for internal reasons, needed some reference to it. So the situation is precarious.

Mr. Clements: But there has been some progress.

Mr. Rush: Some progress then some regression.

Mr. Clements: We call that backing and filling.

Adm. Moorer: More filling than backing.

Gen. Scowcroft: The Secretary had good meetings in Amman and Riyadh.[6] The only surprise was that King Hussein hit him up for considerably increased MAP.

Mr. Rush: It would have been a surprise if he hadn't.

Gen. Scowcroft: Right, but they want a substantially more sophisticated program than they have had so far.

Mr. Colby: What did (Saudi King) Faisal say on the 1967 border?

Gen. Scowcroft: He said he wanted to help the Americans but was embarrassed to be in this position. He said he was under strong radical pressure and that all the Arabs were united. He hoped we could move quickly to a settlement and he would do the best he could. He is in a tough position, but he indicated that when he could move, he would: but he couldn't move until there was some movement in the negotiations.

Mr. Clements: We couldn't expect more.

Mr. Colby: If that's all, that's okay. He wasn't hanging on an extreme position.

General Scowcroft: Apparently not.

Mr. Clements: His excuse has to be some movement on the Israeli side.

Mr. Colby: That's essential to progress. I was afraid he was hooked on the 1967 position.

Mr. Clements: He'll move off that.

Mr. Rush: Faisal, for the first time, has sent a congratulatory message to Brezhnev (on the Soviet national anniversary). And they are really chasing us down on supplying our ships with POL.

Mr. Clements: That's (Saudi Petroleum Minister) Yamani.

Mr. Davies: Jeeb Halaby[7] has just had a talk with Yamani and he phoned yesterday afternoon. Yamani said when there was some progress toward a settlement, they would take this as a basis for relaxation of their restrictions. But they had a great interest in using their oil revenues for development in the Arab world and for heavy investment

---

[6] See Documents 331 and 332.

[7] At this time Najeeb Halaby was Chairman of Pan American World Airways.

both here and internally. He was very bitter over the $2.2 billion supplemental request for Israel and charged that the U.S. had flown material directly to El Arish and had participated with the Israelis in the action. He moved off that position during the course of the meeting, however, and Halaby said the atmosphere was more positive when he left.

Mr. Rush: Time is working against us.

Adm. Moorer: The Europeans will be even worse off with the oil restrictions.

Mr. Clements: We're not sure of that yet.

Mr. Colby: I agree. There may be a smaller percentage cut in Europe.

Mr. Rush: But if everyone is cut off, the Europeans will be in worse shape.

Mr. Clements: If the Europeans are under the same embargo we are, they'll be in a helluva shape, but the embargo is not being applied equally.

Mr. Rush: The Europeans aren't being hit yet.

Adm. Moorer: But half of the Netherlands refining output goes to Europe.

Mr. Clements: There will be some adjustment to take care of that. The Netherlands bore the brunt because they were believed to be more active. Twenty-four or twenty-five percent of the Dutch population are Jewish or of Jewish extraction, and they have a disproportionate influence in government, business and banking. They are more pro-Israeli than any other European country.

Mr. Rush: But the EC declaration[8] was quite pro-Arab, and the Netherlands joined in. The Arabs will cut off anything that goes to the U.S.

Mr. Clements: That means from Rotterdam.

Mr. Rush: Also from Aruba, Timor and Curacao.

Gen. Scowcroft: The Secretary feels we shouldn't cut off the airlift yet.

Adm. Moorer: We have enough equipment to keep it going to Tuesday.[9]

---

[8] On November 6 in Brussels, the Foreign Ministers of the European Community issued a declaration on the situation in the Middle East, which called for a return to the October 22 positions and expressed the hope that negotiations would begin for a just and lasting peace through the application of Security Council Resolution 242. (Telegram 6275 from Brussels, November 6; National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

[9] November 13.

Gen. Scowcroft: He wants it to go to Wednesday, but he would agree to a slightly reduced rate.

Mr. Clements: We can do it easily. We are flying 15 planes a day.

Adm. Moorer: We can cut to 12.

Mr. Clements: Is that okay?

General Scowcroft: Yes. He is worried that a cut-off might upset the ceasefire or might look like a price we had paid to Egypt. Have we stopped our discussions with the Israelis on military equipment?

Mr. Clements: For all practical purposes. General Sumner still has some communication with them but not on any new things.

General Sumner: The pressure is off now.

General Scowcroft: You can go ahead and talk to them, but without any commitment.

Mr. Colby: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

General Scowcroft: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Adm. Moorer: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Colby: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

General Scowcroft: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Clements: Admiral DePoix (of DIA) is just back [*3 lines not declassified*]. I think we'd be in a poor position.

Adm. Moorer: [*2 lines not declassified*] the Air Force Chief of Staff was not at all cooperative—we had to go over his head.

Mr. Clements: When we did, we got it. I'll talk to Jim (Schlesinger).

General Scowcroft: Okay; I'll check again with Kissinger.

Mr. Clements: I'd like to do it; this isn't a one-way street.

Mr. Rush: After all we've done for them, if they didn't cooperate—

Mr. Clements: But we shouldn't snap at a gnat and swallow a camel. [*less than 1 line not declassified*] I'd like to see us do it.

General Scowcroft: (to Clements) Let me know (about your conversation with Jim Schlesinger). I'll ask Kissinger.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

Adm. Moorer: We are imposing rigid restrictions on the use of fuel which will have an impact on readiness. We've cut down 35% in some cases. We have the advantage of the normal Christmas standdown, and we are permitting some of the 6th Fleet ships to go into port.

Gen. Scowcroft: Where do we get our fuel for Thailand?

Adm. Moorer: From Singapore.

Mr. Clements: Most of it comes out of the Middle East, with some from Indonesia.

Adm. Moorer: It's from the big companies. The Saudis are telling them that they can't sell to the U.S. or they'll reduce their crude supplies.

Mr. Rush: Having leapt the barrier on the oil embargo, the Saudis are getting a kick out of enforcing it. They're going overboard.

Mr. Colby: In Singapore, too?

Mr. Clements: Everywhere. Look at Canada. The Canadians are responding as quickly as Singapore.

Mr. Rush: They responded at once, but they said they wouldn't cut off our sources in Western Canada.

Mr. Clements: That's because they have no way to get oil from Western Canada to Eastern Canada.

Adm. Moorer: General Casey's team that has been in Israel evaluating their losses has done an outstanding job. Israel started with 993 tanks and lost 495. They have them broken down by type. They lost 87 aircraft. In line with the President's policy of replacing Israeli losses, we had to have a baseline from which to operate. The team will be back this weekend. We plan to follow them with an operational/technical team. They will examine the capability of Soviet weapons: how they were used and how the Israelis defended against them—the doctrinal situation in which losses occurred, etc. They will extract the lessons learned, the way the Egyptians fought; did they follow Soviet doctrine? They will consider if we should emphasize stand-off weapons so we can knock out missiles from a distance. We won't be increasing the total number of U.S. military in Israel—we're just replacing one team with another.

Mr. Colby: Have the British hit you yet on lessons learned?

Adm. Moorer: Yes, the British and the Germans. I expect that will be Topic A at the ministerial meeting in December.[10] We will sanitize our final report and give them the things John Finney has already discussed with them.

Mr. Colby: Senator Symington wants it too.

Mr. Clements: We'll sanitize a report for him too.

Adm. Moorer: But they must understand that this was a peculiar environment—it's as far away from Vietnam as you can get. In this situation, there was no place to hide, the weather was perfect, the tanks were ready targets for guided weapons. We have to be careful about assuming the same things would happen in Europe. This was a natural for the TOWs, Mavericks and Walleyes. The kill percentage was fantastic—65–90%.

Mr. Clements: Tom's (Moorer) group has really been pitching in on this. They have brought all their assets to bear on producing some net assessments. I'm very enthusiastic about this. This evaluation

[10] The NATO Defense Planning Committee met December 7 in Brussels.

process is superior to anything they've done before. They're looking at what happened; what killed the tanks; what was the survival rate; what kind of ammo was used; why did some survive and not others?

Adm. Moorer: When the Israelis started across the Canal, they had one brigade to guard their right flank. The brigade that was scheduled to cross had to be brought in to support that flank, and the reserve brigade was the one that actually went across. Our people said there was a destroyed vehicle every 10 square meters. When the tanks were hit, the ammunition in the turret would go off, and the force would flip the turret upside down in the same mount. In the future they may not want to put their ammunition in the turret. They're looking at things like that.

Mr. Clements: They're looking at effectiveness and usefulness, and the only thing that has made this possible is the full cooperation of the Israelis. It's damned important that we give them something back.

Mr. Rush: But let's not be too grateful. They're not doing this because they love us—it's in their own self-interest. They will get it all back.

Mr. Clements: But it makes a helluva difference in cooperation if they are getting the word from the top. [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Rush: I'd like to send them a few signals without hurting ourselves.

Mr. Colby: It's important that they get the right signals. If we continue the airlift [*less than 1 line not declassified*] the signals might get mixed.

Mr. Rush: But there is the other side of the coin. Not only do they expect to get the $2.2. billion all in grant aid, but they now want $500 million a year each year in the future.

Mr. Clements: If we were in their position, we'd do the same thing. You can't blame them for trying.

Mr. Rush: I just don't want you to feel too grateful to them.

Mr. Clements: Don't worry about me.

Mr. Davies: Motor Hellas has been told they are to be denied crude. Will this affect the Eastern Mediterranean?

Adm. Moorer: Not right away.

Mr. Clements: It won't affect the 6th Fleet, but you may not be able to drive to work some morning. The 6th Fleet will get what it needs to operate. The public just hasn't got the message. It's not complicated; it's really pretty simple.

Gen. Scowcroft: Does our evaluation team pretty well agree with the Israelis on their losses?

Adm. Moorer: No, but we have a par figure. On the aircraft, we know we're correct. But we're approximating on those things that are scattered throughout the sand.

Mr. Clements: We have a gap of 495 tanks between the Israelis and us. The truth lies somewhere in the middle.

Gen. Scowcroft: That's a pretty good gap.

Adm. Moorer: They captured 250 Syrian tanks—T–55s—in pretty good shape. We'll produce a fair number. On the public affairs side, it's important that Washington stick to the Shah's story on the operation of the P–3s. We will instruct the fleet to "no comment" and refer anyone back to Washington. Don't you think that is best?

Gen. Scowcroft and Mr. Rush: Yes.

Adm. Moorer: What about the next SR–71 mission? We're still interested in the SCUDs, and ceasefire violations.

Mr. Colby: Also in tank counts, military lines, resupply efforts.

Gen. Scowcroft: When do you want to fly?

Mr. Colby: We can do it any time.

Adm. Moorer: Whatever Henry (Kissinger) thinks.

Mr. Colby: Would you land in Greece?

Gen. Scowcroft: If it happens soon, we wouldn't be ready for Greece.

Mr. Davies: The ceasefire has to be stabilized first.

Adm. Moorer: (to Gen. Scowcroft) Did you say anything to Henry (Kissinger)?

Gen. Scowcroft: No, but I think it would be acceptable to him.

Mr. Colby: Let me remind you of the risk that the Soviets might put a Foxbat up from Syria.

Adm. Moorer: They couldn't catch it.

Mr. Colby: If the Foxbat started when the SR–71 was over Egypt, they could be together by the time it got to Syria, but only if the Russians fly it.

Adm. Moorer: The SR–71 is Mach 3.2 and the Foxbat is straining at Mach 2. It's primarily a reconnaissance plane.

Mr. Clements: When could you fly a mission?

Adm. Moorer: We could do it tomorrow night.

Mr. Colby: There's no screaming hurry. Let's take a look at the track. We got a good read-out on the last one. We had weather problems, but we got pretty much what we wanted.

Mr. Clements: We should fly them on a regular schedule.

Mr. Colby: I think they have come to accept the flights.

Gen. Scowcroft: What kind of a regular schedule?

Mr. Clements: One a week.

Mr. Colby: That would be a little much if they had to fly from Massachusetts.

Gen. Scowcroft: If they are flying as often as once a week, we should look at the possibility of a European base.

Adm. Moorer: We can go tomorrow night or as soon as the weather permits. Then we might wait a week or so and discuss it again.

Adm. Weinel: What countries might let us base it there? Turkey?

Mr. Rush: No.

Adm. Weinel: What about Iran?

Mr. Rush: That would be okay.

Mr. Davies: Greece would be a possibility if the ceasefire stabilizes. At least I recommend we ask.

Mr. Clements: That's the best prospect. I don't think the Shah would let us.

Adm. Weinel: Not even if we gave him an SR–71?

Mr. Clements: The Greeks are our best chance.

---

337. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

En route to Islamabad, November 9, 1973, 2022Z.

Hakto 31. Please transmit to Ambassador Dinitz for transmission to Prime Minister Meir.

Begin text:

Dear Madame Prime Minister:

With the publication today of the six point agreement on the cease-fire and prisoner of war exchange, the Governments of Israel and Egypt have taken an important step in clearing the way for negotiations. This agreement is also important in another respect. We have brought about a separation between the Egyptian and Soviet positions, since as you know the USSR had sought a return to the October 22 lines.

I have just read Ambassador Keating's report of his conversation with you.[2] There was no intention of extending an ultimatum, Madame

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 41, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, HAKTO 1–60, Nov. 5–16, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only; Flash.

[2] See footnote 3, Document 333.

Prime Minister, in transmitting to you the essence of an Egyptian message[3] and on which we took no position. In our reply to the Egyptians we pointed out that the details of the implementation of the six points would have to be negotiated by the respective military representatives.

The point that we tried to make and I am making here again is that, since the details of the implementation of the six points would have to be negotiated by your respective military representatives, it is important that your negotiator approach this meeting in a positive spirit and in a way that would not make Israel seem to be the cause of any possible breakdown in the future.

While communicating the Egyptian message to you, we repeatedly insisted with Egypt on the position we agreed on with respect to the blockade. I firmly believe that Israel has attained the terms you gave last Saturday[4] night—frankly against my expectations. I was extremely pleased to hear your description of the agreement as a "fantastic achievement".

I do not think it impossible if both sides approach the discussions between your military representatives in a positive spirit, to resolve the outstanding question in a way that takes into account both Egyptian sensibilities and your military necessities.

Of course we stand by the six points and the Memorandum of Understanding as the way you intend to proceed at the military representatives level. It is nevertheless important Madame Prime Minister, that we all turn our attention to the problem of making a success of this agreement which gives Israel essentially what it sought. I hope the Government of Israel will now find itself able to proceed since my view remains that this agreement is based on an Israeli proposal and since the alternatives are much worse. I hope this letter constitutes also a satisfactory answer to your message[5] which I have just received.

Warm regards,

Henry A. Kissinger

End text.

In giving this to Ambassador Dinitz you should tell him that you have shown the message to the President and the President feels the Secretary's message is too mild and is deeply disturbed at these constant attacks in circumstances where we are making an extraordinary effort to protect Israel's interest.

Please pass text of formal message to Keating.

---

[3] See Document 329.

[4] November 3. See footnote 2, Document 317.

[5] See Document 335.

338. Message From Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev to President Nixon[1]

Moscow, undated.

Dear Mr. President,

I have received and carefully studied your letter of November 3.[2] As well as you, we want to be sure that on the basis of fundamental agreements and understandings that we have previously achieved we shall not only overcome the present Middle East crisis but we shall also move even further ahead in strengthening relations between our countries. We, on our part, from the very beginning of events in the Middle East, proceeded from this very perspective and correspondingly built our line of actions in accordance with them.

At the same time it is obvious to us that in order to proceed further along this path it is very important not simply to damp down temporarily the acuteness of the Middle East crisis but to do away with its roots. To do otherwise would mean to act contrary to the lesson that latest events in the Middle East taught us.

Certainly, to find cardinal solutions for the Middle East is not an easy task. In this case one needs self control and tact but not less also energy and principled approach. Without this nobody and nothing can guarantee us from a new explosion in the Middle East with possible even greater complications. We now believe in this as firmly as when we warned you before about unexpectedness and dangers lying in wait for us in the Middle East.

I shall not now touch upon the details of the Middle East problem, we have done this more than once, and soon they will be a subject of negotiations between sides concerned with active participation of the USSR and the US, what we have agreed between ourselves. I shall emphasize only one thing: the key element of the Middle East settlement was and still is the question of withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories occupied by them in 1967 with simultaneous provision—with the participation of the USSR and the US—for guaranteed security of all states of that area, including Israel.

To make the progress in the Soviet-American relations more stable and less painful it is very important also, in our view, to draw correct

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin & Kissinger, Vol. 8. No classification marking. According to a handwritten notation, the message was hand delivered to Scowcroft by Babenko at 4:30 p.m. on November 10. The message is attached to a note from Dobrynin to Scowcroft.

[2] See footnote 3, Document 316.

conclusions from the latest developments, both taking place in the Middle East and accompanying them.

You write, Mr. President, that throughout the difficult days of the Arab-Israeli conflict you have kept carefully in mind the second of the Basic Principles of relations between the USSR and the US,[3] and you quote in your letter certain parts of that Principle. Neither did and do we forget even for a minute both the quoted by you and other provisions of the Basic Principles, including those related to preventing the development of situations capable of causing a dangerous exacerbation of the relations between the USSR and the US or situations capable of increasing international tensions. We also remember and strictly follow the Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War, including its Article IV, providing for urgent consultations between the USSR and the US when certain situations emerge.

Since you yourself touched upon the importance for the sides of living up to the provisions of the above basic documents and in order to make that question completely clear for the future, I should frankly tell you, that some steps taken by the US in this period of time cannot be considered by us as fully corresponding to the letter and spirit of those documents. I have already informed you about my opinion regarding that matter, and I do not think it is necessary now to touch upon the issue again.

I believe it extremely important that we and you have common understanding of what has happened and that both sides make equally correct conclusions from that.

I agree with you that the fundamental documents signed at the two Soviet-American summit meetings have passed the test in the concrete situation and that now it is in real life that their deep substance has already been reconfirmed. The fact was also proved that the peace of the world greatly depends on the actions and policies of our two countries. That once again emphasizes the responsibility resting upon their leadership and necessity of exerting all efforts to remove dangerous hotbeds of conflicts. Everybody will benefit from that and none will lose with the exception of those who would seek profit for themselves from the opposite development of events. And such forces, as you know, do exist.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

In conclusion, I would like to tell you, Mr. President, once again with full certainty that our determination to proceed further along the path of decisive improvement in the Soviet-American relations has not diminished as a result of the events in the Middle East. And we note

[3] See footnote 12, Document 70.

with satisfaction that you are also resolved, as your letter says, to persevere on the chosen course.[4]

Sincerely,

L. Brezhnev[5]

[4] In telegram Hakto 40, November 12, Kissinger asked Scowcroft to hold up on forwarding Brezhnev's letter to the President until he got back. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 41, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, HAKTO 1–60, Nov. 5–16, 1973) On November 21, Kissinger sent the message to Nixon attached to a memorandum in which he pointed out that despite "a somewhat quarrelsome tone," the letter strongly reaffirmed that Brezhnev's determination to improve relations had not been diminished by the Middle East crisis. He noted, however, that the General Secretary had emphasized that the Soviet Union must play an active role in the Middle East negotiations and in any guarantees. Nixon wrote on the memorandum: "K—Very interesting—Of course he could change his mind if he thought our opponents would succeed except for the fact that they now oppose détente." (Ibid., Box 69, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Dobrynin/Kissinger, Vol. 20, [October 12–November 21, 1973])

[5] The original bears this typed signature.

339. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

Beijing, November 13, 1973, 0835Z.

Hakto 46. 1. Airlift can be ended at evening Wednesday.[2]

2. Dinitz should be informed either evening Tuesday or morning Wednesday that this is technical decision related to end of emergency and pick-up of sealift.

3. Defense should repond to questions in lowest possible key not stressing sealift but end of emergency and resumption of regular supply.

4. Warm regards.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 41, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Mideast, Islamabad, Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, HAKTO 1–60, Nov. 5–16, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Eyes Only; Immediate.

[2] November 14.

340. Paper by William B. Quandt and Harold H. Saunders of the National Security Council Staff[1]

Washington, November 13, 1973.

PRESIDENT'S WEDNESDAY BRIEFING

For President

Dispute over Middle East Ceasefire: Disagreements continued yesterday between Israel and the UNEF commander over implementation of the six-point ceasefire agreement which specified that "Israeli checkpoints on the Cairo–Suez road will be replaced by UN checkpoints." General Dayan met with UN commander Siilasvuo to discuss a UN checkpoint on the road established the previous day. Dayan threatened to use force to remove the UN troops if they did not withdraw and, after consulting with Secretary General Waldheim, Siilasvuo agreed to a temporary withdrawal in order to avoid a confrontation. Waldheim is reportedly angry, but is prepared for a compromise that would permit a joint UN and Israeli presence at the checkpoint.[2]

The Israelis are reportedly taking the position that the checkpoints will not be turned over to the UN until Egypt has agreed to a POW exchange. The prisoners issue has been discussed by the Egyptians and Israelis, and the Egyptians were reportedly prepared to turn over a POW list, but at the last moment yesterday disagreement surfaced over the means of exchanging prisoners and arrangements for resupply of the Third Army, and for the moment these issues are still unresolved.

Sources:

USUN 4698, 130356Z Nov. 1973[3]

USUN 4708, 131804Z Nov. 1973[4]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1178, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, Nov. 11, 1973 through Nov. 15, 1973 [1 of 2]. Secret. Submitted for inclusion in the President's November 14 briefing.

[2] In telegram 9185 from Tel Aviv, November 13, Keating advised: "In brief, current negotiating process going on west of canal will be major factor in determining whether it is possible to have any meaningful Egyptian-Israeli peace negotiations. In this respect, process itself is important per se. In other words, a great deal more hangs in balance in connection with Israeli effort to deal directly with Egyptians than just speed with which this or that checkpoint is resolved, although this is also important." (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files) Telegram 224318 to Tel Aviv, November 14, informed Keating that the Department agreed with his comments. It stated, however, that there was no evidence that UNEF Commander Siilavuso had an exaggerated notion of his proper role or that the United States needed to discuss this with UN headquarters. (Ibid.)

[3] Telegram 4698 from USUN, November 13; not printed. (Ibid.)

[4] Telegram 4708 from USUN, November 13, reported on UN Secretary General Waldheim's concern over the situation on the Cairo–Suez road. (Ibid.)

341. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo[1]

Beijing, November 13, 1973, 0320Z.

Secto 150/1416. Subject: Middle East Negotiations.

1. Please deliver following message from me to Foreign Minister Fahmi:

2. *Begin text:*

Dear Mr. Foreign Minister:

I received word here in Peking of the signing of the six point agreement on Sunday,[2] and want to congratulate President Sadat and you personally for the far-sighted statesmanship which made this outcome possible.

The agreement itself is of course of major importance but beyond that, I am heartened by the determination it reflects, on the part of both Egypt and Israel. To look ahead to the opportunity for negotiations on the broader issues between you, rather than backward to the sterile debates and bitter experiences of the past. I am confident the military representatives will approach the task of implementing the six point agreement in this same spirit.

The important thing now is to keep our eyes fixed on the forthcoming conference and to avoid anything which could complicate its getting started. I trust in particular that the immediate questions of the UN checkpoint, the unimpeded non-military supply of the Third Army, the agreed arrangements for Suez, and the exchange of prisoners can be worked out by the military representatives promptly and pragmatically in ways that take account of the essential political and military requirements of both sides. If this can now be accomplished, and as the Red Sea blockade ceases to be an issue, conditions can be quickly created in which a conference can begin

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1178, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, Nov. 11, 1973 through Nov. 15, 1973 [2 of 2]. Secret; Immediate; Nodis. Repeated Immediate to USNATO for Sisco and to the Department of State.

[2] Telegram 3484 from Cairo, November 12, reported that the cease-fire agreement was signed on Sunday, November 11, under UN auspices. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

unburdened by problems not related to the main questions to be negotiated.[3]

Finally, it seems to me that the less said about the specifics of a final settlement before the conference begins, the better, since such discussion tends to limit later negotiating flexibility on both sides. I have in mind two things in particular.

First, I understand that Dr. Zayyat has been discussing the elements of an Egyptian plan in certain European capitals. As I said in my meeting with President Sadat,[4] the premature circulation of peace plans of any kind will make it particularly difficult for all of us, but especially the United States, when negotiations begin.

Second, I am told that the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of African Unity plan to meet November 19–20, and that there is also talk of a possible Arab summit. I am concerned that such meetings will take the initiative away from the parties to the negotiations and adopt public positions on specific aspects of a settlement that will make it all the more difficult to explore practical ways to make progress in the negotiations themselves.

I would welcome your views on these matters.[5] I shall be back in Washington Friday, but am meanwhile at your disposal through Am-

---

[3] Telegram 3487 from Cairo, November 13, transmitted a message from Fahmi to Kissinger complaining that following the signing of the six-point agreement, "the Israelis resorted to their usual obstructions." They had prevented the UNEF from replacing its forces at the checkpoints on the Cairo–Suez road despite several attempts by the UNEF commander to carry out his mandate. Fahmi pointed out that under point 5 of the agreement, the UNEF was to man the checkpoints and be responsible for inspecting and verifying the non-military nature of all supplies sent to the town of Suez. Fahmi wondered how, if the situation continued, the two sides could discuss anything substantive in the proposed peace conference. He said that he hoped the Secretary would ensure that Israel started to cooperate in good faith on these points. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, November 1–30, 1973)

[4] See Document 324.

[5] In telegram 3508 from Cairo, November 13, Eilts reported that he had delivered the Secretary's message to Fahmi, who had commented that he shared the view expressed in the first four paragraphs. He noted, however, that if the Israelis continued to raise obstacles, he was skeptical that meaningful peace talks could take place. Fahmi then launched into a tirade against Israeli actions of the previous day, contending again that they were in violation of point 5. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1178, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, Nov. 11, 1973 through Nov. 15, 1973 [2 of 2]) A November 12 Intelligence Information Cable on the status of implementation of the six-point accord noted that the Israelis had taken the position that UN personnel could be stationed at the checkpoints on the Cairo–Suez road, but side by side with Israeli troops and not in replacement. (Ibid.)

bassador Eilts at any time while I am in Peking and Tokyo on the way home.[6]

Warm personal regards,

Henry A. Kissinger

End text.

3. In delivering foregoing, you should tell Fahmi orally that this week's *Newsweek* story purporting to give account of aspects of my conversations with Sadat re disengagement question and our discussions re U.S. domestic attitudes is distinctly unhelpful. We must all take greater precautions to avoid feeding speculation about what is said in our private diplomacy. Otherwise, U.S. ability to play kind of role we envisage will inevitably be circumscribed.

Kissinger

[6] In Secto 167/14878 from Tokyo, November 14, Kissinger asked that a message be passed to Fahmi in which Kissinger expressed his regrets, but not surprise, at the "initial difficulties" in implementing the six point agreement," but noted improvement. Kissinger informed Fahmi he had emphasized to Meir that it was important for the Israeli military representative to be "positive." Finally, Kissinger hoped that Egypt would not allow public speculation about deadlines for a settlement. (Ibid., [1 of 2]) Kissinger returned to Washington on November 16.

342. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

Washington, November 14, 1973.

SUBJECT

US Role in Egyptian-Israeli Talks to Implement the Ceasefire

This memo is simply to record a few reflections on the Egyptian-Israeli-UN battle in the last two days over the checkpoints on the Cairo–Suez road.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 664, Country Files, Middle East, Middle East War, Memos & Misc., Oct. 18, 1973, Vol. II. Secret; Nodis. Sent for action. A handwritten note on the top of the first page reads: "Thanks. BS."

In establishing a posture for ourselves, there are two conflicting interests to keep in mind:

—On the one hand, it is necessary that we not get involved in the argument over each detail. Above all, not being on the ground, we are not in a position to make sensible judgments about the practices that should be followed in implementing the terms of the ceasefire.

—On the other hand, the US has an interest in seeing both sides behave in such a way that a pattern of reasonable exchanges is established before the peace talks begin. If the Israelis seem to be acting in an obstructionist or harassing manner, we have no interest in appearing to acquiesce. We must bear in mind that the Israelis read silence as assent. Therefore, when they behave as they did yesterday,[2] we should let the record show that they do not have our support in that behavior.

One other major point needs to be kept in mind. The balance we strike between helping to develop general principles of substance and behavior and negotiating practical details will set a precedent for the balance we strike in the peace negotiations. The Israelis will be watching us very carefully to see whether we are going to give them a reasonable chance to negotiate the kind of settlements they want or whether we are going to be inclined to involve ourselves in every detail, limiting their freedom. It is in our interest to give them a feeling that they will have a fair amount of freedom and that our involvement will be reserved for the major issues and the general principles when outside help becomes necessary to break stalemates.

What this boils down to as the Egyptian-Israeli-UN talks at Kilometer 101 proceed is a careful watch from our side and a practice of registering our general concern when Israeli behavior appears obstructionist without getting ourselves into the details.

I will leave it to you to decide whether the above thoughts are worth passing on to Secretary Kissinger.

[2] See Document 340.

343. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo[1]

Tokyo, November 15, 1973, 0008Z.

Secto 181/14891. For Ambassador Eilts from Secretary. Subject: Middle East Negotiations.

1. Please deliver following message from me to Foreign Minister Fahmi.

2. *Begin text:*

Dear Mr. Foreign Minister:

You and I have exchanged many messages during my trip around the world the past ten days, largely on subjects that required your and my immediate attention and intervention to keep our diplomatic efforts on course. I remain ready to do what I can at any time, should further difficulties develop over implementation of the six point agreement signed on November 11.

But as I start back to Washington, I want to take a longer look at what we have accomplished and what lies ahead. Our talks in Cairo could be a turning point in the difficult history of your area over the past twenty-five years, as well as in the troubled course of Egyptian-American relations for much of that period. It is a tribute to the political vision and courage of President Sadat and to your statecraft that we have been able to make this new beginning. For my part, I want to assure you again of my intention to do all I can to see through to a successful conclusion the work we have begun. I was absolutely serious in everything I said during my talks in Cairo.

The most important question on which we should now focus our attention, in my judgment, is when and how to get things moving with respect to negotiations. Do you agree that the time has come to approach others about the schedule and procedures for launching a conference, as you and I discussed in Cairo?[2] We are prepared to move forward now on the schedule which we determined in Cairo. But before I approach others I want to make sure that this continues to represent your own thinking.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1178, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, Nov. 11, 1973 through Nov. 15, 1973 [1 of 2]. Secret; Immediate; Nodis; Cherokee. Repeated to the Department of State and to London for Sisco.

[2] See Document 330.

I have just seen a report of your talk with Ambassador Eilts on November 14. You should know that I have never discussed the question of a corridor with De Borchgrave or the Syrian Foreign Minister. My discussions with the Syrian were devoted to the question of how to establish contact with the Syrian Government.

I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest opportunity. Meanwhile I want to say again how much I appreciated my visit to Egypt, the opportunity it afforded for detailed, cordial and fruitful talks with President Sadat, yourself and your colleagues, and the extraordinary hospitality extended to me and the members of my party.

Warm personal regards,

Henry A. Kissinger

End text.

3. For the Ambassador: From the Secretary:

I have just received Cairo 3522.[3] In your talk with Fahmi I am not so much concerned about your handling every question of his as I am about the broader role we have of keeping him from going to the Security Council. I know in your discussions with him you will not feel compelled to become a nursemaid to all of his specific complaints or provide him with an answer on every one of them. Your being around to listen is a first step in the right direction and you can handle much of what he has to say to you on that basis, again keeping in mind we certainly want to avoid having him seek a Security Council meeting as an alternative.

Kissinger

[3] In telegram 3522, November 14, Eilts reported on his talk with Fahmi when he delivered Kissinger's letter. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1178, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, Nov. 11, 1973 through Nov. 15, 1973, [1 of 2])

344. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo[1]

En route to Washington, November 16, 1973, 1010Z.

Secto 197. Ref: State 226402.[2] Subject: Message From P.M. Meir re Bab-al-Mandab. For Amb Eilts from Secretary.

1. You should pass following message to Foreign Minister Fahmy:

2. *Begin text:*

Dear Mr. Foreign Minister:

When we last met, we agreed on the need to create the best possible atmosphere for the forthcoming negotiations.[3] You have proceeded fully in this spirit during the days since then. It is in the same spirit that I want to let you know I have learned that some shipping to and from Israel through the Bab al-Mandab straits will be resumed this Sunday November 18.

I know you told me on my last evening in Cairo that orders to relax the blockade had been issued but I thought you would want to have this information in order to make doubly certain that any possible difficulties can be avoided.[4]

Warm personal regards.

Henry A. Kissinger

3. For Dept: Inform Shalev that Egyptians have been advised shipping to and from Israel through Bab al-Mandab will be resumed Sunday November 18. In doing so, you should remind Israelis that it is important they avoid focussing public attention on this matter in Israel

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, November 1–November 30, 1973. Secret; Immediate; Nodis; Cherokee. Repeated to the Department of State, Tel Aviv, and Immediate to London for Sisco.

[2] Telegram 226402 to London, November 16, informed Sisco that Shalev had asked the Department to inform him that, in accordance with Sisco's conversations with the Prime Minister on November 7 and 8, the Government of Israel would renew traffic through the Bab-el-Mandeb straits as of Sunday, November 18. (Ibid.) See Documents 326 and 327.

[3] See Document 330.

[4] In telegram 3557 from Cairo, November 17, Eilts stated that Egypt had been informed and word had been sent to Egyptian naval commanders to allow unhindered passage of the first two ships. Fahmi insisted, however, that the government had agreed to ease rather than lift the blockade. Therefore, it wanted the details of all ships to and from Israel that were expected to pass through the straits. Fahmi also expressed his hope that Israel would avoid any publicity, which could embarrass Egypt at this critical juncture. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, [Nov. 73–Dec. 31, 1973])

and in particular that there be no public references to Egypt's "lifting the blockade".[5]

Kissinger

[5] In telegram 227670 to Tel Aviv, November 18, Kissinger informed Keating that he had passed on the information in telegram 3557 to Dinitz, who had since informed him that Israel would do everything in its power to prevent publicity but could not control what appeared in the foreign press. The Secretary added that he had suggested to Dinitz that the Israelis notify the United States of the sailings of ships to and from Eilat so that it could pass the information to the Egyptians. (Ibid., Box 611, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 13, November–December 1973) Kissinger discussed it with Dinitz on the telephone on November 17 at 11:12 a.m. (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 23)

345. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders of the National Security Council Staff to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, November 16, 1973.

SUBJECT

Middle East—Egyptian-Israeli Disengagement

Attached is a paper on Egyptian-Israeli military disengagement revised to take into account the latest positions as we know them and to refine the concept I put to you before your trip.[2]

I note that both Egyptians and Israelis are talking about reaching some agreement on disengagement before the peace conference. If their talks continue along this line, something more limited than the total move outlined in the attached may be needed.

You will note that the suggestions in the attached really cover a disengagement in two steps. The first deals with the troops along the canal; the second involves a pullback from the canal toward the passes. The concept is presented so that the second could be either the second stage of disengagement or the first phase of a later withdrawal.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 664, Country Files, Middle East, Middle East War, Memos and Misc., October 18, 1973, Vol. II. Secret; Sensitive; Outside System. Sent for information. Kissinger initialed the memorandum. All brackets are in the original.

[2] See Document 319.

Attachment

November 16, 1973.

ELEMENTS OF AN EGYPTIAN-ISRAELI DISENGAGEMENT AGREEMENT

Peace Conference, Phase I

The purpose of this paper is to develop a general concept for an agreement on disengagement of Egyptian and Israeli troops during the first phase of the Geneva peace conference.

Opening Positions

Neither side has taken a definitive position on what disengagement would look like, but each made an initial proposal, which has been modified in subsequent discussions. The initial proposals were:

Israeli Position	*Egyptian Position*
1. Egyptian forces would withdraw from the east bank of the Canal; Israeli forces would withdraw from the west bank.	1. Israeli forces would withdraw to a line inside Sinai which in principle would lie east of the passes.
2. Both sides would then thin out their forces along the Canal.	2. A disengagement zone, as wide as possible, would be created between Egyptian and Israeli forces in Sinai. UN forces would be stationed in such a zone. Egyptian forces would remain in their present positions east of the Canal.
3. Egypt would undertake to clear and reopen the Canal to international shipping.	3. When Israeli forces reach the disengagement zone and UN forces are stationed therein, the operation of clearing the Canal would begin.
	4. At the time the disengagement phase is set up, a peace conference would be convened under UN auspices.

In subsequent conversations, the Egyptians have seemed willing to defer discussion of disengagement to the first stage of the peace conference, while in Israel Prime Minister Meir, Allon and Dayan seem to have reached a preliminary judgment that disengagement would best be discussed between the military representatives before a peace conference.

Wherever the discussion takes place, the prime difficulties at this stage will be:

—The Israelis are asking the Egyptians to give up territory on the east bank of the Canal which is the only tangible sign of Egypt's military successes early in the war. We can expect Egypt to reject this proposal, with the possible exception of the Third Army.

—The Egyptian position will be unacceptable to the Israelis because it moves too quickly on the issue of withdrawal. Some sort of negotiation will presumably be necessary on the overall framework of an Egyptian-Israeli relationship before the Israelis will pull forces back from the Canal.

Despite these difficulties, there are some points of general agreement that might provide the basis for progress. For example:

—The convening of a peace conference will in itself convey a measure of the Arab recognition of Israel on which Israel has placed a high premium.

—Both sides appear to be willing to consider the concept of disengagement of forces.

—Both sides appear to agree that Egypt should begin work on clearing the Canal at an early date.

A Possible Disengagement

In developing a disengagement step, it will be necessary to keep these imperatives in mind:

—Israel, if it is to pull its forces back from the 1967 ceasefire lines, will be looking for concrete evidence that Sadat is serious about making peace. Among the specifics that Israel might consider as constituting such evidence are the lifting of the blockade at Bab al-Mandab; willingness to disengage forces without seeking military advantage; actual beginning of work on the Canal; willingness to allow Israeli cargoes or ships through the Canal; end of the boycott; exchange of people like journalists; readiness for a diplomatic relationship.

—Sadat will need to portray Israel's pullback as a first phase of withdrawal toward the pre-1967 borders, will be looking for evidence that disengagement is not just an Israeli stall, and will need to place the move in the context of the restoration of full Egyptian sovereignty in the occupied territory.

—The US will need to portray this as a move which does not significantly jeopardize Israel's security, which gains Israel a measure of Arab recognition, and which buys Israel time for negotiating the elements of a final settlement.

One possible arrangement might be based on an Israeli withdrawal to the passes in return for (1) promised Israeli use of all the waterways,

including the Suez Canal, plus (2) the measure of recognition that the Arabs would have accorded Israel by the act of negotiating directly and being prepared to sign an agreement with Israel. The Israelis have repeatedly said that freedom of shipping is a primary strategic concern in the area and that its denial is a cause for war. Opening the Canal to Israel—or at least to Israeli cargoes—would be a concrete manifestation of the end of belligerency without necessarily requiring an Egyptian declaration of the end of belligerency. *Specifically*:

1. An agreement would state that the steps outlined below had been agreed between the parties as first steps in their efforts to achieve an end of the state of belligerency and durable peace in which each would respect the other's sovereignty and territorial integrity and right to live in security. [The purpose of this article would be to put Israel and the US in the best possible position to argue that the Arabs are serious about making peace and have already taken a significant step toward the full recognition of Israel by signing an agreement and stating such intent.]

2. The Egyptian Third Army would withdraw to the west bank of the Canal; Egyptian civil administrators would move into the area vacated by the Third Army. Israeli forces would withdraw to positions on the east bank which would be east of the area vacated by the Third Army. [A possible variant of this would be to leave the Third Army in place but to require a substantial thinning out of both the Second and Third Armies.]

3. Egyptian forces on the east bank north of Ismailiya would remain in place. The number of Egyptian troops and equipment levels allowed on the east bank during the disengagement phase would be the total with the army in this northern sector. They would be subject to various resupply restrictions that could be monitored by UN teams with Egyptian and Israeli participation. [The purpose of this provision would be to put the Israelis and US in a position to say that the Egyptian military presence east of the Canal was primarily of symbolic rather than of military significance and that Israelis had the right to monitor that presence. One additional proposal which the Israelis will probably make is a general thinning out of Egyptian forces west of the Canal, including a pullback of artillery, SAMs, and amphibious equipment.]

4. Once this first move was completed, the following simultaneous moves would take place:

—Egypt would begin work on reopening the Canal, would acknowledge Israel's right to use the Canal in the context of a peace settlement once it is open and would acknowledge Israel's right of free passage through all the waterways in the area, including the Bab al-Mandab and the Strait of Tiran. Egypt would agree, at least pri-

vately, to allow Israeli cargoes through the Canal as soon as it opened. Israeli ships would be allowed transit rights when final agreement is reached.

—Israeli forces would move back to positions at the passes, retaining control of the passes. Israel would state that this is not the final border.

—Between Egyptian and Israeli forces a disengagement zone would be created in which UNEF forces would be stationed. Egyptian and Israeli liaison officers would serve with the UNEF.

5. Both parties would declare their intention of continuing negotiations beyond this disengagement of forces to achieve a durable peace and the normalization of relations between them. They would state their willingness to examine all proposals in a positive spirit in an effort to reach an agreement at the earliest possible date.

At this point, the negotiations themselves could take up the terms of a broader settlement and further withdrawal, which itself might be staged.

---

346. Memorandum from Secretary of State Kissinger to President Nixon[1]

Washington, November 17, 1973.

SUBJECT

Summary Report on Middle East Trip

Supplementing my reports to you on individual stops during the Middle East portion of my trip, I want to summarize what I see as the principal accomplishments and what lies ahead in our search for Middle East peace.

Ceasefire and POW Exchange

When I left Washington, the immediate need was to stabilize the ceasefire on the Egyptian-Israeli front, a problem which in turn had become linked to an Egyptian-Israeli POW exchange. The groundwork had been laid in my talks in Washington with Foreign Minister Fahmi

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 7 US/KISSINGER. Secret; Sensitive.

and Prime Minister Meir, but the positions of the two sides were still far apart.

The initial breakthrough came in Cairo, with the announcement of the resumption in principle of U.S.–Egyptian diplomatic relations and President Sadat's agreement to a six-point proposal that represented about ninety-five percent of what Mrs. Meir had told me Israel wanted.[2] Most importantly for Israel, it finessed the issue of an Israeli return to the military positions they occupied west of the Canal when the October 22 ceasefire went into effect and before they completed their encirclement of the Egyptian Third Army and the town of Suez. The agreement simply provides that this thorny question will be discussed between the two sides in the context of discussions on the disengagement and separation of forces, thus providing a means for subsuming it in the broader issues at an early peace conference. Israel also got agreement on a full Egyptian–Israeli POW exchange.

The main benefit for Sadat was the establishment of UN-supervised arrangements for the non-military resupply of the Third Army and for meeting the essential civilian supply needs of the Suez inhabitants. While Sadat was unwilling to include specific reference to lifting the undeclared Egyptian blockade of the southern entrance to the Red Sea at Bab al-Mandab, he agreed that the blockade would quietly be relaxed.

I sent Joe Sisco from Cairo to Israel the same day to explain the proposal to Mrs. Meir and her colleagues, including Sadat's assurance about relaxing the blockade, and to obtain their approval. Both sides cooperated in expediting Sisco's travel; the Egyptians gave him a special plane to Cyprus, where the Israelis picked him up and flew him to Tel Aviv. In Israel, Sisco concluded a confidential Memorandum of Understanding with the Israelis,[3] designed primarily to meet their concern about participating in the inspection of non-military cargos destined for the Third Army once they had turned over their checkpost on the Cairo–Suez road to the UN. Having after some difficulty obtained Israeli agreement, Sisco made an unprecedented direct flight from Israel to Saudi Arabia in one of our MAC airlift planes and rejoined me in Riyadh.

Over the next three days, as I went from Saudi Arabia to Tehran, Islamabad, and on to Peking, Israeli and Egyptian military representatives met regularly in the presence of the UN commander at Km. 101 on the Cairo–Suez road to work out the detailed arrangements for supplying the Third Army and Suez town and for beginning the POW

[2] See Document 324.

[3] See Documents 326 and 327.

exchange. I was in frequent contact with both Foreign Minister Fahmi and Prime Minister Meir as various difficulties came up but held firmly to the position that these had to be ironed out in the direct negotiations between their military representatives in coordination with the UN commander.

The agreement was finally signed on November 11.[4] There followed more differences over its implementation between Israel on the one hand and Egypt and the UN on the other, related largely to Israel's desire to limit the UN presence and to maintain a more visible control and use of the segment of the Cairo–Suez road in the area they occupy than was acceptable to Egypt. On November 14, however, the Israeli position became markedly more flexible, and on the 15th the turnover of Israeli checkposts to the UN took place and the POW exchange began.

I find encouraging the progress made over the past two weeks in stabilizing the Egyptian-Israeli ceasefire. The fact that Egyptians and Israelis are talking directly and pragmatically with each other at the military level is a hopeful sign psychologically for the forthcoming political negotiations. Furthermore, both sides clearly reflected a willingness to reach accommodations on the ceasefire and POW issues in order to move to the next stage of a peace conference.

While negotiations related to the six-point ceasefire agreement were a principal preoccupation and produced the most concrete results during my Middle East trip, I also concentrated on two other matters.

Arab Oil Pressures

On the question of Arab oil pressures, I made the point in each Middle Eastern capital that the Arabs need our help if they are to get a fair settlement, and that continuation of such pressures will make effective help from us impossible. As I reported to you earlier, King Hussein was in full agreement and said he has been making the same point to other Arab leaders.[5] The key country in this regard is, of course, Saudi Arabia. While Faisal made no commitment to relax the oil restrictions, he clearly feels himself in an agonizing dilemma. I gave him considerable food for thought,[6] and I have reason to believe I made some headway with his key advisors and ministers. Much will depend on whether we can keep up the momentum already established.

Peace Conference

With that in view, I also explored—particularly in Cairo and Amman—the question of how to get a peace conference launched. In

[4] See footnote 2, Document 341.

[5] See Document 331.

[6] See Document 332.

Cairo, Foreign Minister Fahmi and I came to a tentative understanding[7] on the following largely procedural points:

1. During the week of November 19, 1973, the United States and the Soviet Union will inform the United Nations Secretary General and others about the modalities of the conference.

2. The United States and the Soviet Union will arrange for a meeting of the Security Council, and the United States will declare that according to its understanding Egypt, Israel, Jordan and Syria have agreed to attend the first stage of negotiations dealing with disengagement and other related matters for a peace agreement.

3. Furthermore the parties agreed that this conference will be convened under the auspices of the United Nations with the participation of the Secretary General in the opening phase of the negotiations.

4. They furthermore agreed that the conference will be under the co-chairmanship of the United States and the Soviet Union.

5. The conference will be convened on December 8 or 9, 1973 in Geneva. The opening session will be at the Foreign Minister level.

6. The question of the participation of the Palestinians and Lebanon will be discussed during the first stage of the conference.

Assuming I receive Fahmi's confirmation, which I requested from Tokyo,[8] that the foregoing still represents the way Egypt wants to proceed, I shall begin this next week to seek the views of others concerned including the Soviets. The objective is to get the parties engaged in a negotiating process that will relieve pressures both for a new recourse to the Security Council and for a resumption of the fighting. Once a conference is underway, our aim will be to get it to focus on the question of disengagement of Egyptian and Israeli forces as a first step, and to avoid seeking to come to grips at the outset with the fundamental issues of territory and the Palestinians, which would lead to an immediate deadlock.

Realistically, there can be no progress in any peace conference until after Israel's December 31 elections, but the appearance of negotiations even without the substance will be helpful on the Arab side. Once substantive negotiations begin, moreover, we must expect a series of impasses which will require us to work behind the scenes with Egypt and Israel, and probably with Jordan and Israel as well, to try to overcome them. As we get into the substantive negotiating phase early next year, we can anticipate some difficult times with the Israelis. For this, we will need capital in the bank with them. The fact that we achieved a ceasefire agreement for them with Egypt largely on Israeli

[7] See Document 330.

[8] See Document 343.

terms, that we earlier had achieved Soviet and Egyptian agreement to negotiations which Israel has sought for twenty-five years, and that we are continuing our military and economic support will all help in this respect.

While my efforts to date have focussed largely on the Egyptians, Jordanians, and Israelis, I am seeking to establish an ongoing dialogue as well with the Syrians. They have come a long way but still promise to be the most difficult factor in any negotiation. And, unlike the Egyptian-Israeli front, no agreement has been reached or is in prospect between Syria and Israel to stabilize the ceasefire and exchange POWs.

Finally, we have filled in the Europeans on the results of my Middle East trip and in a general way on our thinking about the future. I intend to keep them reasonably briefed as we go along, in order to minimize to the extent possible their inclination to take unhelpful initiatives which can have a negative impact on our own efforts.

Future Prospects

In assessing future prospects we can, I think, be cautiously optimistic about getting peace negotiations started. Sadat has apparently decided to take a chance on us and to be accommodating with respect to the ceasefire agreement in order to enlist our help once negotiations are underway. The Israelis are reasonably reassured of our basic commitment to their security, but with a bit of underlying nervousness that we may seek to press them to modify their negotiating positions at the peace conference. The Jordanians are ready for negotiations, although worried that Egyptian and Palestinian interests may be accommodated at their expense. The Palestinians, in fact, are in some confusion, with sentiment growing for them to abandon their opposition to dealing with Israel and join the negotiations in order not to be left with nothing in the end. The Lebanese also want in at an early date.

Finally, the Soviets are playing an ambivalent role. On the one hand they want to work with us in arranging joint U.S.–Soviet auspices, and we are being careful to consult generally with them while pursuing our more substantive efforts bilaterally with the parties. At the same time, they have adopted a harder line than the Egyptians on restoration of the October 22 ceasefire positions and seem to be encouraging the Palestinians to play a more active role, which could greatly complicate the job of getting meaningful negotiations started.

As we move into the complex situation that lies ahead, the next month or so promises to be one of the most important periods in the search for peace in the Middle East since the Six-Day War of 1967.

347. Telegram From the Department of State to the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo[1]

Washington, November 18, 1973, 0324Z.

227671. Subj: Middle East Negotiations: Message from Secretary to Fahmy. Ref: Cairo 3550.[2] Please deliver following message to Foreign Minister Fahmy from the Secretary:

Begin text:

Dear Mr. Foreign Minister:

Your letter of November 16 conveyed through Ambassador Eilts was awaiting me upon my return. I very much value the personal relationship we have established and the opportunity to stay in close touch with you through our private correspondence. It gives us the means to anticipate and deal with potential problems in a sensible way as we work to solidify the improving relations between our two countries. I have told you how impressed I was with President Sadat and with the statesmanlike manner in which he is dealing with the problem of peace in the Middle East. I believe the relationship between us is one of the reliable guarantees that we can faithfully serve our respective Presidents in this endeavor.

I have studied carefully the views set forth in your letter. I do not believe that the approach you suggest is the most effective for reaching our common objectives. As I believe we agreed in Cairo, the disengagement of forces is the first question that should be taken up at the peace conference. This is reflected in the second paragraph of the paper we worked out the morning I left Cairo.[3] One of the reasons, in fact, for having only Egypt, Syria and Jordan represented in the first stage of the conference was because they are the Arab countries whose forces would at some point be involved in any disengagement process.

It is, of course, not precluded that the disengagement question could also be discussed earlier between the military representatives, and I would welcome any progress they might make. But the U.S. Government will be better able to be helpful on the disengagement question in the framework of the conference rather than in the more limited

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov. 73–Dec. 31, 1973. Secret; Immediate; Nodis; Cherokee. Drafted by Atherton, cleared by Eagleburger, approved by Kissinger.

[2] Telegram 3550 from Cairo, November 17, conveyed Fahmi's letter to Kissinger in which Fahmi urged the U.S. Government to press Israel to ensure that progress was made in the current disengagement talks before the peace conference convened. (Ibid.)

[3] See Document 330.

context of talks between military representatives at Kilometer 101, where we are not direct participants. Frankly, I am concerned that pressing the disengagement question prematurely or seeking some agreement on it as a prerequisite to the conference could result in little progress in achieving disengagement and fail to bring about a conference.

I continue to believe that the primary need now is to focus on organizing the conference. As I have assured you, we will be able to use our influence constructively in that framework. I was, therefore, glad to hear from Ambassador Eilts that you expect to be in a position to send me your views on how we should proceed in the next day or so. To get things started, either the U.S. and the Soviet Union can inform the Secretary General of the agreement reached with respect to a conference and arrange for a Security Council consensus, along the lines we discussed in Cairo, or alternatively, the parties themselves can do this.

I look forward to hearing your personal views.[4]

Warm personal regards, Henry A. Kissinger.

End text.

Kissinger

[4] In telegram 229447 to Cairo, November 21, Kissinger asked Eilts, when delivering this message to Fahmi, to convey an additional message concerning the opening date of the conference. Kissinger noted that he shared Fahmi's sense of urgency about starting the conference, but was required to be in Brussels December 10–11 for a NATO meeting. He suggested the dates of December 17 or 18, adding that a later date would also give him an opportunity following the NATO meeting to make another trip to Cairo and other capitals in the area to review the situation prior to the opening of the conference. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov.–Dec. 1973)

348. Telegram From the Embassy in Israel to the Department of State[1]

Tel Aviv, November 19, 1973, 0908Z.

9339. Subject: Palestinian Representation at Peace Conference.

1. Israel may just refuse to attend any peace conference at which there will be a separate Palestinian/fedayeen delegation. Israelis would accept Palestinian representation folded into the Jordanian del and it is even possible they might tolerate some fedayeen rep included in the Jordanian or some other Arab state del.

2. The nature of any Palestinian rep at a peace conference, therefore, as a concern takes precedence over the possible shape of a final West Bank settlement. If Israel doesn't attend the proposed peace conference, it becomes just another Arab summit and West Bank settlement scenarios under those circumstances would be highly academic.

3. We have read the excellent reporting from various interested posts with great interest. It is not entirely clear to me, however, what we might expect to come out of the Arab summit,[2] particularly re the nature of Palestinian representation at a peace conference.

4. I would, therefore, appreciate receiving the Dept's best estimate of the possible results of the Arab summit, if that is reasonably predictable. My frank concern is that the Arab summit might, under radical pressure, try to tie Sadat's hands and, in other ways, seek to obstruct real movement towards peace. A "worst case" result from Israel's point of view would be a summit decision that there would be a separate Palestinian/fedayeen delegation.[3]

Keating

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files. Secret; Immediate; Exdis. Repeated Immediate to Algiers, Amman, Beirut, Cairo, Jerusalem, Jidda, and USUN.

[2] An Arab League summit convened in Algiers November 26–28.

[3] In telegram 6152 from Amman, November 19, Brown wrote that he had been making the point to the Jordanians and the Arab Ambassadors in Amman, especially the Saudi Ambassador, that it would be a great mistake to let the Arab radicals take over at Algiers since they might destroy the chance for negotiations in their haste to attack the United States and bolster Arafat. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, X, November–December 1973) Telegram 233802 to Cairo, November 28, reported that the summit recognized the PLO as the sole representative of the Palestinians but that no official statement was made that would prejudice the peace conference. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

349. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail)[1]

Washington, November 20, 1973.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the October 1973 War.]

[2 *lines not declassified*] We, too, place great stress on maintaining this Presidential channel. My experience has shown that communications at this level often permit the exploration of ideas that are more difficult to discuss in formal government-to-government channels.

On this occasion, I especially want to use this channel to tell you how very much impressed I was with President Sadat's perception of the longer term issues with which all of us must deal in the present situation. I am convinced that there will be no peace in the Middle East unless the principal leaders there take a long view and are prepared to persevere in their pursuit of fundamental objectives regardless of shorter term turns in the course of events. Your President has clearly demonstrated this capacity, and a great deal now rests on his continued statesmanship.

I assume you will have seen my recent exchange of messages with Foreign Minister Fahmi.[2] I have considered the suggestion that the opening of the peace conference be conditioned on success in the near future in talks on disengagement. My own view is that this would be a mistake and that, as I said to President Sadat, disengagement should be the first substantive subject dealt with at the peace conference. At that time, it would be possible to discuss some of the schemes that President Sadat mentioned in his conversation with me.[3] I believe that some of those ideas are adaptable to Syrian conditions as well. In my view, the peace conference is the place where US influence can be most effectively used.

I would also like to add my further thought that it would be a mistake to advance in other forums at this time some of the specific thoughts on disengagement that President Sadat made to me. I fear it will limit US flexibility if these ideas are placed too soon in the public spotlight where they can be attacked before there is an opportunity to introduce them at the right moment in the negotiations. Perhaps you could recall to President Sadat my suggestion along these lines.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Eyes Only. A handwritten notation on the memorandum indicates that it was sent for delivery at 3:37 p.m. on November 20.

[2] See Document 347 and footnotes 2 and 4 thereto.

[3] See Document 324.

It looks to us now as if the best date for the opening of the peace conference, from our viewpoint, is about December 17. I also want you to know that I am exploring the possibility of a visit to Damascus December 13 or 14 after my attendance at the NATO meeting. If this can be arranged, I would appreciate the opportunity to make another stop in Cairo in order to renew my acquaintances and to talk again with President Sadat on the eve of the opening of the peace conference.

Again, I am pleased to continue my communications with you. Please pass to President Sadat my best wishes and my appreciation and admiration for the way he has conducted our relationship.

With warm personal regards,

Henry A. Kissinger

---

350. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, November 21, 1973.

SUBJECT

Meeting Between the Secretary and Syrian UN Permanent Representative Kaylani

PARTICIPANTS

Haytham Kaylani, Syrian Permanent Representative to the UN
Diya'allah al-Bettal, Director, UN Department, Syrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary, NEA
David A. Korn, Country Director, NEA/ARN
Camille Nowfel, Interpreter

Secretary Kissinger

I am grateful to you for taking the time to come down here to exchange ideas. I have had an opportunity to talk to leaders of many Arab countries but have not had the pleasure of having discussions with Syrians, other than your Vice Foreign Minister whom I saw a few weeks ago.[2] So I want to tell you what our general thinking is as to how discussions might proceed and first to make clear the general proposi-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 129, Country Files, Middle East, Middle East—1971–72–73–74. Secret; Nodis. Drafted by Korn.

[2] See Document 310.

tion that we are fully prepared to have an exchange of views with Syria as well as with other Arab countries. The only reason we did not propose a visit to Damascus during my last trip was that we thought it might cause embarrassment for you. I want to tell you that I am tentatively thinking now of visiting some Arab capitals again in December. I will be in Europe from about December 9 to 11 and thought I might be in the Middle East from about December 13 to 16. I would be pleased to come to Damascus if your President were able to receive me and so wished.

All of your friends have given us advice on how to deal with the Syrians. The only ones who have not advised us on this subject are the Syrians themselves. One of your friends has said that the Syrians are impossible on the first meeting but better during the second. Maybe we had better start with the second. I couldn't testify to the truth of that, however, because your Vice Foreign Minister was very reasonable, but he did not tell me anything.

I assume you have been informed by your Egyptian friends regarding our conversations. Our thinking—and the Egyptians'—was that we should begin a peace conference about the middle of December. We said December 8 or 9, but now it appears that December 18 would be actually the most convenient. In the first phase, the conference would include Syria, Jordan, Israel, Egypt, the USSR, the US and maybe the UN Secretary General. We also recognize that there are others like the Palestinians and the Lebanese who would have an interest but in the first phase it would concentrate on military issues and there would be no need for Lebanon and the Palestinians to participate at the beginning.

We think US–Soviet auspices would be the best because if other permanent members attend it is possible the Israelis might not attend. In addition, this procedure would give balance between the two points of view. Also, management of the conference would become impossible if too many are involved.

Those are our general views. Did I leave anything out?

Mr. Sisco

Did you mention the site?

Secretary Kissinger

Geneva.

Mr. Sisco

And the level of participation?

Secretary Kissinger

In the first two days it would be at the Foreign Minister level. After that we would appoint someone of Ambassadorial rank as Permanent Representative.

Ambassador Kaylani

I would like to thank you for your kind and generous reception. Thank you for your kind initiative which makes an exchange of views at the level of the Secretary of State. I shall convey to my government your desire to visit Damascus and to meet with President Asad.

Secretary Kissinger

My security people forbid it, I might evoke too much popular feeling. Seriously, I would be delighted to do it.

Ambassador Kaylani

You have had no previous dealings with Syria?

Secretary Kissinger

No.

Ambassador Kaylani

Your knowledge may be based on what you have been told or read.

Secretary Kissinger

I have never been in an Arab country before my last trip, and I have the warmest feelings from that experience. By the way, your friends in the Arab world spoke of you with great affection.

Ambassador Kaylani

I believe you will bring back the very best remembrances from any visit you might have with Syrian leaders. With your permission I would like to ask a number of questions about what you said regarding the peace conference. You said that in the first phase of the conference military questions will be taken up. What is meant?

Secretary Kissinger

What I have in mind, subject to the views of all the other participants, is the disengagement of military forces from contact and the beginning of the withdrawal process.

Ambassador Kaylani

Do I understand this implies taking up the question of Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories to the lines of June 4, 1967?

Secretary Kissinger

I think we would take up the first stage of that process.

Ambassador Kaylani

As far as the participation of the Palestinians in the conference is concerned—I ask inasmuch as you play the key role in organizing it—how can the Palestinians be excluded?

Secretary Kissinger

Since they have no direct military role, they need not take part in the first stage. That does not imply a permanent intention to exclude them.

Ambassador Kaylani

You did mention a number of countries you would like to have take part. Are you in favor of having the permanent members of the Security Council participate?

Secretary Kissinger

Only the Soviet Union and the United States. Otherwise I think the permanent members would have as much contention among themselves as between the Arabs and Israel. If you have all the permanent members you have a guarantee for a stalemate and then the solution will have to take place outside the conference.

Ambassador Kaylani

Also I understand that the participation of any state other than the ones you mention is undesirable.

Secretary Kissinger

What I am telling you is what we have agreed with the Egyptians. This reflects also the views of President Sadat. Of course they must speak for themselves but this is my impression. As you know I said publicly today in my press conference that the United States is determined to play a major role and you know as well as I do that the U.S. is the only country that can produce a settlement.[3] We will not do it under pressure. We will do it because we think it is necessary for the well being of the Middle East and of the world.

A lot of countries that are volunteering advice are in no position to be helpful.

Ambassador Kaylani

One last question. It may be rather redundant but I hope you will accept it with your characteristic generosity.

Secretary Kissinger

Mr. Sisco doesn't agree (laughter).

Ambassador Kaylani

Can you assure us that the Palestinians will participate in the conference after the first stage?

Secretary Kissinger

I think some solution will be found to that problem. But this is one of the subjects we should discuss, concerning the appropriate level and how it would be done. It is not a question that we are in principle opposed to, but it is a delicate issue.

---

[3] Kissinger's November 21 news conference was devoted almost entirely to the Middle East. Excerpts were printed in *The New York Times*, November 22, 1973.

Ambassador Kaylani

Do you have any idea how long such a conference will last?

Secretary Kissinger

That is a good question. If it opens on December 18—I think your government will find in its dealings with us that I am candid—I don't think there will be any real progress until after the Israeli elections of December 31. The first phase could take place quite quickly; after that we will have to look at things. The big problem is to get momentum going. After all, Israel has never withdrawn from anything.

Ambassador Kaylani

Sir, I want to thank you for your revealing answers. You have been very generous. If there is anything else you have to add I would be glad to listen. Otherwise, I would like to tell you that I leave this discussion with an excellent and a very warm impression.

Secretary Kissinger

You can communicate to your government that we will make a serious effort. All the governments involved need to face up to the problem and to give it a try.[4]

[4] Kissinger also met with Eban on November 21 to discuss plans for a peace conference. According to a memorandum of conversation prepared by Stackhouse, Kissinger stated that while he believed the conference would open on either December 17 or 18, he had informed the Egyptians that no progress could be made until after the Israeli elections on December 31. "Even if I had not said this," Kissinger told Eban, "it is not reasonable to expect progress immediately in an international conference on such a long-standing problem . . . We have made clear to the Arabs that we want them to lift the oil embargo before the peace conference, otherwise we could not be helpful." Eban replied that although Israel would participate in a multilateral conference, "We want as much bilateralism as possible in the peace conference. We want to discuss particular problems with those countries directly involved. For example, we want to discuss freedom of navigation in the [Suez] Canal with Egypt, not with Syria." (National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 7 ISR)

351. Telegram From the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo to the Department of State[1]

Cairo, November 22, 1973, 1340Z.

3611. Subject: Delivery of Secretary's Messages of November 18 and 21 to Fahmy. Ref: State 227671 and 229447.[2]

1. *Summary:* November 18 letter and your November 21 supplementary message delivered to Fahmy today. He reacted negatively, insisting prior progress on disengagement is necessary if serious problems are to be handled at peace conference. This need not mean complete disengagement, but he recalled withdrawal to October 22 lines had been called for by Security Council. Charging idea of leaving disengagement talks for peace conference and delaying conference reflect Israeli wishes, he complained Egypt being asked to make all the concessions, Israel hardly any. I disputed these assertions, emphasized USG serious in desiring work for just and durable peace and urged that our best judgement on how to proceed be given full weight. Fahmy said your proposal will be referred to Sadat and formal reply will be given in due course. This might not be until after Arab summit. *End summary.*

2. I saw Fahmy this morning to deliver your November 18 letter and supplementary message of November 21 (reftels). He had returned last night from OAU meeting in Addis. In giving him the messages, I explained that your letter had in fact arrived on the day he departed for Addis and regretted that it could not therefore be delivered sooner. Both messages clearly disturbed him a bit. He commented that they contained nothing new.

3. Somewhat irately, Fahmy stressed that his earlier letter to you of November 16 (Cairo 3550)[3] did not reflect what he called a "personal Fahmy view". It was rather a formal GOE position. That letter had been dictated on President Sadat's specific instructions and the President had gone over every word before it was approved. He contended, moreover, that his November 16 letter is a direct reflection of the earlier understanding which you and he had worked out. He was concerned that the USG might be reneging on this understanding.

4. The present ceasefire, he insisted, is "fragile" and should not be taken for granted. He quoted you as having told him USG could get Oc-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov. 73–Dec. 31, 1973. Secret; Nodis; Cherokee.

[2] See Document 347 and footnote 4 thereto.

[3] See footnote 2, Document 347.

tober 22 lines, but that it prefers to exert its influence on the bigger issue of disengagement. This he argued was Mrs. Meir's idea. GOE should not be considered "naive." Up to now GOE had made all the concessions, and Israel hardly any. The Security Council has called upon Israel to return to the October 22 lines. These lines are also mentioned in the six point agreement as a step toward disengagement.

5. GOE realizes that military talks cannot achieve complete disengagement. He insisted however some meaningful progress on disengagement is necessary before "serious problems" can be discussed at a peace conference. Egypt is not prepared to come to such a conference simply to discuss ceasefire lines. Even though USG is not a direct participant in the military talks, it has the influence to help insure there is progress on implementing all the points. It does not have to wait until a peace conference before it could use that influence.

6. I emphasized to Fahmy that he should have no doubt of high respect that USG has for GOE and for him personally. I strongly disputed suggestion that USG regards Egypt as "naive" and rejected his suggestion USG reneging on its understanding with Egypt. On contrary, our proposal that disengagement talks be considered at the peace conference represents a pragmatic approach fully consistent with the understanding you and Fahmy had reached earlier. He could also be assured that you fully appreciate that his letters reflect GOE and not simply personal views and that they are being treated as such. While I was aware of Egyptian concern about the October 22 lines, there are conflicting views about these lines, whether one likes it or not. This is precisely why the disengagement concept was introduced. It has the virtue of avoiding small issues when we ought to be thinking about broader, more important ones.

7. I continued that it is a fact that USG can be more helpful in peace conference forum than as an outside party seeking to influence outcome of the military talks. I was sure he understood this. As I had previously assured him, you are absolutely serious in wanting to move ahead on the problem and your judgment on the best way to proceed ought to be given the most careful weight. USG is not simply playing the Israeli game in working for a conference. It is anxious to have a just and durable peace acceptable to all parties.

8. As for the suggested change of date, I reminded him that your schedule is extremely crowded. A peace conference should not be handled hastily and needs great care. Postponing it to the suggested date will also enable you to make another visit to the area. Fahmy responded that in his view principal aim of your contemplated visit will be work on Damascus, not Egypt. You are of course welcome in Egypt at any time, but Egyptian views are already known to you. I said that another visit to ME prior to the peace conference will unquestionably

be useful to facilitate peace talks. I was sure that in coming to the ME again, you are as interested in visiting Cairo as you were Damascus. It will be important to know if Syrians prepared to attend conference. He recalled he had told you that, in the end, Syrians will attend.

9. I also reminded him that Egypt has benefited directly from the implementation of six point agreement as worked out in the military talks. POW's are being exchanged, Suez is being resupplied, etc. He responded that most of these things could have been handled by the Egyptian army, and Egypt had no particular reason to feel grateful for arrangements which Egypt could have gotten on her own. He then went into a long account on how Egypt had reluctantly agreed to a ceasefire and how the Israeli army moved into the West Bank salient using massively-supplied USG weapons. Egypt was not prepared have ceasefire work to its disadvantage.

10. Since we were by then going round and round on the disengagement question, I asked Fahmy if his comments were the GOE answer to your proposal. He backed off a bit and said that they are not. He will have to discuss the matter with the President in order to give a formal reply. Such a reply could conceivably be available today, but he rather suspected it will not be until after the Arab summit.[4]

Eilts

[4] In a November 22 backchannel message to Kissinger, Eilts commented that much of Fahmi's foul mood during the meeting reported in telegram 3611 was clearly prompted by his personal annoyance that a direct channel with Ismail had been reestablished and his fear that business between their two governments would be conducted behind his back. Eilts wrote that when he had given Fahmi the two messages, Fahmi had "exploded" because he already knew everything in them from Ismail and showed Eilts a copy of Kissinger's November 20 letter to Ismail (Document 349). The Ambassador noted that, in view of Kissinger's instructions not to let Sadat or Ismail know that he was aware of the private channel, he had feigned ignorance. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973)

352. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Head of the U.S. Interests Section in Egypt (Eilts)[1]

Washington, undated.

In response to Fahmi's concern about my direct channel with Hafez Ismail (your message of 11/22/73),[2] you should make an appointment with him as quickly as possible to make the following oral points:

—[*less than 1 line not declassified*] meeting with Hafez Ismail was at Ismail's request.

—The proposal for the maintenance of a private Presidential channel was also made by Ismail.

—I have total confidence in Fahmi and do not intend myself to initiate any correspondence through the channel to Ismail.

—I count on my friendship with Fahmi and on the confidence which I feel has developed between us to maintain the close and frank communication essential to see us successfully through the delicate days which lie ahead.

—I still believe that our original plan to have disengagement as the first phase of the peace conference is the most effective. He can count on strong American support to make progress.

—With respect to the Arab Summit my views are as follows:

—As we are both aware, many of the Arab governments that will be assembled in Algiers take a far less practical and constructive approach to the Arab–Israel problem than your own government. The possibility, therefore, strikes me as real that the conference might adopt negative or restricting positions that could damage the atmosphere for negotiations, attempt to prejudge such issues as Palestinian representation, or even merely provide the pretext for delaying the convening of a conference.

—It will be equally important to avoid any statements or actions that might have the effect of complicating an early lifting of the oil embargo and production cuts which will be a prerequisite if the United States is to play the role we both envisage at the conference. I hope you will agree that for these reasons it is important for Egypt to keep sufficient control of the proceedings in Algiers to forestall such damaging results. President Sadat has already demonstrated both far-sightedness and steadfastness in not allowing less responsible Arab states to deflect Egypt from its carefully chosen objectives.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973. Secret. A handwritten notation on the message indicates that it was sent for delivery at 3:37 p.m. on November 22. The original is marked "Draft."

[2] See footnote 4, Document 351.

—You might show Fahmi the attached text of a proposed joint US–Soviet letter to the Secretary General[3] if Egypt agrees to our procedure. Does Fahmi have any comments?

—With respect to my trip to the Middle East you might tell Fahmi that I am prepared to start it in Cairo or do anything else that would underline the paramount importance we attach to US–Egyptian relationships.[4]

[2 *lines not declassified*]

---

[3] Attached, but not printed.

[4] On November 23, Eilts sent Kissinger a backchannel response, stating that he had received the Secretary's message a few minutes earlier, but that Fahmi had already left for Algiers and was not expected to return until after the Arab summit. He said that he would convey the still pertinent parts of the Secretary's message to the Foreign Minister as soon as he returned. The Ambassador added that he had earlier impressed upon Fahmi the importance of not having the Arab Foreign Ministers adopt "unhelpful positions which could impair the negotiating process." Fahmi had said he was aware of this and expressed confidence that Egypt could control the meetings. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VII, October 1–31, 1973)

---

353. Backchannel Message From President Nixon to Moroccan King Hassan[1]

Washington, November 23, 1973.

The President appreciates His Majesty King Hassan II's recent communication concerning the Palestinians.[2] He understands that it is

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 138, Country Files, Middle East, Morocco, [March 1973–November 1974]. Secret; Sensitive. A note on the message indicates that it was received in the White House Situation Room at 12:35 p.m. on November 23. Sent to Rabat to the attention of General Walters.

[2] In a backchannel Eyes Only message to President Nixon, November 20, Hassan stated there could not be a solution in the Middle East as long as the United States did not reveal its attitude toward the Palestinian problem. Referring to the November 4 meeting (see Document 318), he was proud the two sides had chosen Morocco as an intermediary. The King argued that unless the other Arab and Muslim states knew that the United States and the PLO had been in contact, there would be growing animosity toward the United States. He felt that the most important and sensitive part of the U.S. intention to achieve peace in the Middle East—the Palestinian problem—should not remain hidden. He believed that it was time to make public the news of the contacts in Rabat. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 138, Country Files, Middle East, Morocco, [March 1973–November 1974])

motivated by a genuine desire to contribute to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East and to prevent the Soviet Union from appearing as the sole advocate of the Palestinians.

In the present delicate diplomatic situation, however, the President feels that it would not be helpful to reveal the fact that contacts have taken place between a representative of the United States Government and of the Palestinians. Therefore, the President hopes that His Majesty will understand the need to preserve complete confidentiality on this subject.

The President wishes to assure His Majesty that the United States is fully aware of the great importance of addressing the legitimate interests of the Palestinian people in peace negotiations. At this point, however, the urgent need is to begin a process which can lead to peace, and this will require patience and discipline on all sides. The United States has reached a general understanding with the parties to the Middle East conflict that the peace conference, which hopefully will convene next month, should deal in the first instance with the disengagement of military forces.

In closing, the President would like to express his thanks to His Majesty for the discreet manner in which he has helped to bring together Palestinian representatives with those of the United States. This may prove to be a most useful channel of communication in the future, which is all the more reason to preserve its confidential nature.[3]

The President wishes His Majesty to know how much he appreciated the cordial welcome accorded to Dr. Kissinger. The President also thanks His Majesty for his kind words of friendship and takes this opportunity to convey to His Majesty warmest personal greetings.

[3] In telegram 3587 from Cairo, November 20, Eilts reported that Said Kemal, Political Affairs Director of the PLO's Cairo office, had proposed that he meet with U.S. officials in Washington to discuss the Palestinian aspects of a Middle East settlement. Kemal said that he would be acting as Arafat's personal representative and not simply as a representative of the PLO. (Ibid., Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov. 73–Dec. 31, 1973)

354. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Ambassador to Jordan (Brown)[1]

Washington, November 23, 1973.

Please make an appointment with the King as soon as possible and convey to him the following points:

—We recently received a request from the Palestine Liberation Organization to meet with them to hear their views.

—In response to this request and through the intermediary of King Hassan II, we sent an intelligence officer to Rabat to meet with a representative of the PLO.[2]

—Our representative was under explicit instructions simply to listen to the presentation of the PLO representative and convey the message to us. No proposals of any kind were put forward by the U.S. side.

—Our representative did make clear, however, that there were certain fundamental considerations on which U.S. policy toward a Middle East settlement would rest:

—We would not consider any settlement which might threaten any vital interests of Jordan.

—The special and longstanding bonds of friendship between the United States and Jordan would guide U.S. attitudes toward settlement of the Palestinian problem.

—We would not countenance any proposal which envisioned the destruction of Israel.

—While nothing of substance was set forth by the PLO representative, our impression is that the PLO is probing to ascertain the U.S. attitude toward the Palestinian issue in the peace negotiations.

—Assure the King that we will arrive at a position on the Palestinian question only after the closest consultation with him and strictly within the frame-work of our discussions.

—The U.S. intends to work closely with Jordan on all aspects of the peace negotiations which lie ahead.

—Please thank the King once again on my behalf for the generous hospitality and friendship shown me during my recent visit to Amman.

Warm regards.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 137, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan/Rifai, January 3, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Eyes Only. A note on the message indicates that it was received in the White House Situation Room at 1:40 p.m. on November 23.

[2] See Document 318.

355. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders and William B. Quandt of the National Security Council Staff to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, November 23, 1973.

SUBJECT

The Palestinian Issue at the Peace Conference

Palestinian developments could take rapid turns in the next few days, and it will obviously be some time before we have a clear view of how the Palestinian question might be dealt with at a peace conference. Nonetheless, we thought it would be useful for you to have this now.

The attached study[2] analyzes in some detail elements of the Palestinian issue as they are likely to arise in coming months. This memorandum highlights some of the near-term developments involving the Palestinians that you will want to be aware of and puts forward for consideration a strategy through the first phase of negotiations.

The Present Situation

Pressures are obviously building in several quarters for the formation of a provisional Palestinian government. The Soviets appear to be prepared to recognize the PLO as a government-in-exile, although it is less clear that they will insist on PLO participation in peace negotiations. At the Arab Summit in Algiers on November 26, it is possible that most Arab states will recognize the PLO as the sole representative of the Palestinians and the formation of a provisional government may be announced. At the same time, King Hussein is trying to build support for his idea of a referendum for the Palestinians under international auspices after Israeli withdrawal from the West Bank.[3]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 664, Country Files, Middle East, Middle East War, Memos and Misc., Oct. 18, 1973, Vol. II. Secret; Nodis. Sent for information. Kissinger initialed the memorandum.

[2] Attached, but not printed.

[3] In telegram 6234 from Amman, November 23, Brown reported that King Hussein seemed to have come to grips with the problem of asserting Jordan's claim to the West Bank and its right to represent the Palestinians, and had apparently decided that a plebiscite was the best way to defeat PLO efforts to become the sole Palestinian spokesman. The Ambassador noted that the Jordanian Government apparently had reached the conclusion that the odds of winning a clear-cut representational role at an early date through inter-Arab bargaining were increasingly slim, but that the King still hoped to be able to initiate a dialogue with PLO moderates that could lead to a compromise. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, X, November–December 1973)

The Principal Issues

Our problem at this point is to try to get negotiations started without settling the issues involving the Palestinians and their representation. Consequently, we should be mindful of the following:

—If a provisional Palestinian government is formed in the near future, this could complicate the prospects for negotiations, especially if the Arabs and Soviets insist on PLO participation at the outset. Over the longer term it may not necessarily be harmful to have a provisional Palestinian government waiting in the wings at some point, but for the moment it would leave greater maneuverability if this did not move too fast. We can argue that in the first phase of negotiations the issue of Palestinian participation can be deferred because of the topics being addressed, e.g., military disengagement. In brief, while we should let the Palestinians know that our position on their representation in the first stages of negotiations will not determine our view on a subsequent Palestinian role, we may want to take the line that *no irrevocable steps should be taken before the peace conference is in a position to discuss the issue of how the Palestinians will be represented.*

—King Hussein's idea of a referendum is in some ways attractive, but it contains several possible pitfalls and uncertainties. On the one hand, it could gain widespread support and provide a useful approach for dealing with the future status of the West Bank and Gaza. On the other hand, the practical difficulties of administering a referendum, and the chances of political turmoil in advance of voting, could be destabilizing and might risk Israeli intervention precisely at a time when we would hope for a general calming of the Arab-Israeli situation. *While expressing a general sympathy with the idea of allowing the Palestinians to determine their own political future, we will not want to wed ourselves now to any specific approach such as a plebiscite under UN auspices*.

—Along these same lines, we should *avoid committing ourselves now to any preconception of how the West Bank may be governed*. It is tempting to share Hussein's view that Jordan will have to play a role if Israel is to release the West Bank and if turmoil is to be avoided. However, the inter-Arab political process is still too fluid to rule out any outcome.

—When the peace conference convenes next month, we *will not want to have any rigid timetable established for Palestinian participation*. A general understanding that the issue of Palestinian representation will be dealt with when issues directly involving the Palestinians arise should be sufficient. At the same time, we will want to avoid saying that we view King Hussein as the sole representative of the Palestinians.

A Possible Short-term Scenario

On the basis of present intelligence reporting, it seems as if something like the following scenario may evolve over the next few weeks:

—The PLO will seek recognition as the representative of the Palestinians and may form a provisional government. It will not, however, insist on a place at the conference table in the first stage. The PLO, along with Egypt and Syria, may acknowledge that Jordan should negotiate for Israeli withdrawal from the West Bank and Jerusalem (and perhaps Gaza).

—During the first stage of negotiations, the PLO will not resort to violence to disrupt the peace-making process, but will instead seek to be in a position to join negotiations at the point where issues involving refugees and self-determination for the Palestinians are dealt with. King Hussein has acknowledged that the PLO might have a voice on these issues, so the prospects for accommodation are reasonably good.

—At the urging of the major Arab countries, contacts between the PLO and the Jordanian government will take place, possibly leading to a limited reconciliation. An understanding could be reached that Jordan will negotiate for the return of Palestinian-inhabited territory to Arab sovereignty, and that subsequently the political arrangements in these areas will be worked out between Jordanians and Palestinian leaders, resulting in some form of loose association between the West Bank and Jordan. Whether this would be accompanied by a referendum could be settled at a later date.

If the intelligence reports suggesting this scenario turn out to be generally accurate, the Palestinian issue could fall into place for the moment. The risk of the PLO trying to join the negotiations too soon, thereby scaring off the Israelis, would be avoided. The problem of leaving the PLO out entirely, and thereby losing the historic opportunity of gaining Palestinian acceptance of Israel, also would be manageable, at least for now.

However, we cannot rule out that pressures will increase to speed up consideration of this issue and that Egypt and Syria might call for immediate Palestinian participation in peace talks. In addition, the Arab states may take a stand calling for the creation of an independent Palestine. King Hussein, who will not attend the conference in Algiers, has let it be known that if Egypt and Syria support the PLO as a provisional government of an independent Palestine then Jordan will refuse to participate in peace talks and will concentrate on building up the strength of the East Bank. The King fears that an independent West Bank might be a prelude to a Palestinian takeover of Jordan itself, and this he is determined to resist. With this possibility in mind, it may be worth conveying to the Soviets and the Egyptians that we see some dangers of delaying the peace settlement process if the Palestinian issue is pressed too rapidly. Israel might well use this as an excuse not to begin negotiations and delays would run the risk that the fragile ceasefire could break down and the chances for peace might be lost.

For the moment, the United States should take firm positions that the Palestinian issue should be left for the peace conference. We should stick to general statements on the need to address legitimate Palestinian interests in the negotiations, while keeping open all options. We will, of course, want to consult closely with Jordan, Israel and Egypt, and may from time to time find it desirable to deal directly with the Palestinians as well.[4]

The attached analysis spells out in more detail possible elements of a Palestinian settlement and alternative ways of getting there.

---

[4] In a meeting with Nixon and Kissinger at the White House on December 4, Romanian President Ceausescu urged that a provision be made for Palestinian representation at the peace conference. Kissinger replied that such participation at the beginning, in the opinion of all participants, raised too many problems, but acknowledged that the question could be discussed during the first phase. (*Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume E–15, Part 1, Documents on Eastern Europe, 1973–1976, Document 29) The following day, in a meeting with Kissinger, Ford, and Senator Hugh Scott at the Romanian Embassy, Ceausescu again raised the issue of Palestinian representation. According to a memorandum of conversation, Ceausescu informed Kissinger that Arafat would be visiting Bucharest in December and had asked Ceausescu to convey a message to the U.S. Government regarding his (Arafat's) interest in contacts with the United States. Kissinger replied that the United States did not exclude such contacts. He stressed, however, that "the Palestinians would have to avoid any terrorist actions whatsoever against Americans. Otherwise it would be impossible for us to consider anything connected with them." Kissinger added that since Ceausescu would be seeing Arafat he might share with him his impressions of his visit to Washington and then let the United States know what comes out of the discussions. (Memorandum of conversation, December 5; National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 24–1 ARAB–ISR)

---

356. Telegram From the Department of State to the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo[1]

Washington, November 24, 1973, 1924Z.

231328. Subject: Middle East. For Ambassador Eilts from the Secretary.

1. We and the Soviets have now agreed to present to the GOE on Tuesday, November 27, the text of the joint letter which follows in paragraph 4, below.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov. 73–Dec. 31, 1973. Secret; Immediate; Nodis; Cherokee. Drafted by Eagleburger, cleared by Pickering, and approved by Kissinger.

2. Delivery by the U.S. and USSR should be done separately, but within one hour of each other; you should coordinate with Ambassador Vinogradov in advance to assure that this is accomplished. In presenting letter to the GOE you should ask for approval by the Egyptians as rapidly as possible.

3. You will note that the joint letter has been modified slightly; thus, the draft sent you earlier is no longer operative.[2]

4. Text of letter follows:

Dear Mr. Secretary General:

On October 22, 1973, the Security Council adopted Resolution 338, jointly sponsored by the United States and the Soviet Union, which called upon the parties concerned to start negotiations under appropriate auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East. The United States and the Soviet Union have now been informed by the parties concerned of their readiness to enter the negotiations mentioned above under the auspices of the USA and the USSR.

It is our understanding that Egypt, Israel, Jordan and Syria have agreed to participate from the outset in the conference, which could begin in Geneva on December 17 or 18 without prejudice to possible additional participants at a subsequent phase. The parties have also agreed that the conference should be under the co-chairmanship of the United States and the Soviet Union.

It is our hope that you will find it possible to participate in the opening phase of the conference at which it is expected the governments concerned will be represented by their respective Foreign Ministers and later by their specially appointed representatives with Ambassadorial rank. We also hope you can make available a representative who would keep you fully informed as the conference proceeds. Finally, we would also appreciate it if the United Nations could make appropriate arrangements for the necessary conference facilities.

We request that you circulate this letter to the members of the Security Council for their information. We believe it would be appropriate for the President of the Security Council to consult informally the membership with a view to securing a favorable consensus of the Council. *End text*.[3]

---

[2] See Document 352 and footnote 3 thereto.

[3] In telegram 3647 from Cairo, November 26, Eilts warned that there would be real difficulty in delivering the draft letter to a knowledgeable Egyptian official on November 27 since Sadat, Ismail, Fahmi, and other ranking officials were in Algiers. He added that Vinogradov had also informed his government that there was no one presently in Cairo to whom the letter could be delivered. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov. 73–Dec. 31, 1973) Kissinger and Dobrynin confirmed in a telephone conversation, No-

5. FYI. We also intend to present draft to GOJ and GOI on November 27.[4] USSR will give draft to GOS on same date. End FYI.

Kissinger

vember 27, 4:55 p.m., that the letter was delivered to Fawzi. (Ibid., Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 24)

[4] Telegram 231329 to Amman, November 24, instructed Brown to deliver the draft to the Government of Jordan. (Ibid., NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, X, November–December 1973)

357. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, November 26, 1973, 2:07–2:35 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Simcha Dinitz, Ambassador of Israel
Minister Mordechai Shalev

Major General Brent Scowcroft
Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff

Scowcroft: We want to let you know we have had contact with representatives of the PLO. They asked us urgently for contact. We sent one of our intelligence people, and a meeting took place in Morocco.[2] He was instructed to listen to what they had to say. There were no proposals. He made clear that there were two fundamental foundations to our policy: The existence and security of Israel, and our strong friendship for Jordan and King Hussein. These were the bedrock of our policy.

They mostly talked about the background and history of the PLO, and were upset that we have never had contact with them, as other governments have had. They feel they are discriminated against. They said they were the valid representatives of the Palestinian people, and that they would never be willing to live in the Hashemite Kingdom. And that they would have to participate in any peace negotiations.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 139, Country Files, Middle East, Palestinians, [July 1973–July 1974]. Top Secret; Sensitive; Nodis; Exclusively Eyes Only. The conversation took place in the Map Room at the White House.

[2] See Document 318.

Dinitz: They specifically said they would take part in the peace conference?

Scowcroft: This all took place before that. In the first part of November.

Dinitz: The participation of the Palestinians in the peace conference, if it ever gets to that, would be a very complex issue for us.

Scowcroft: For us, too, and the Arabs, too.

Dinitz: This is one of the questions I had to raise with the Secretary, I hope today. Because of the decisions we will have to take. I hope to be able to see him today.[3]

[3] Before the meeting began, Dinitz handed Scowcroft a detailed list of military equipment needed by Israel. The paper stated that these items were "of the utmost priority for the Israeli Defense Forces especially in view of the possibility of the resumption of warfare by Egypt and Syria. We therefore ask that these items be shipped immediately, *by air*." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, November 1–30, 1973)

358. Memorandum From Secretary of State Kissinger to President Nixon[1]

Washington, November 26, 1973.

SUBJECT

Information Items

Middle East Situation: Egypt called off yesterday's scheduled meeting with Israeli representatives on the question of the disengagement of forces, apparently in protest against what the Egyptians view as Israeli stalling. Another meeting is set for today. A senior Egyptian official reported on November 24 that the talks had reached a "dangerous" but not "critical" stage because of what he described as Israel's persistent refusal even to discuss the restoration of the cease-fire lines of October 22. Although General Gamasy, Egypt's chief negotiator, has

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 56, President's Daily Briefing, President's Daily Briefs, 16 November–31 December, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Contains Codeword. A stamped notation reads: "The President has seen."

indicated that he personally will not participate in further talks,[2] there has been no indication that the Egyptians intend to terminate the meetings completely.

The Israelis reported over the weekend a further rise in the level of both Egyptian and Syrian preparedness.[3] They cited the following developments on the Egyptian front as possible indications of intentions to renew hostilities:[4]

—ground forces are conducting patrols and may have gone to a higher state of alert;
—at least nine surface-to-air missile batteries have been shifted to an unspecified location on the west bank;
—"meteorological preparations" for artillery fire were noted along the front yesterday; and
—the Egyptian Air Force has conducted reconnaissance flights all along the front.

The Israelis report, in addition, that Syria declared a maximum alert for its air force on November 24 and that there has been unusual activity in Syrian communications systems. U.S. sources have been unable to confirm any of this Egyptian or Syrian activity. Egyptian air activity, in fact, has been normal or below normal.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

---

[2] Telegram 5090 from USUN, November 25, reported on the November 24 talks at KM 101 during which Egyptian General Gamasy indicated that he would be quitting the talks because of lack of progress. The report noted that the Secretary General was thinking about asking the United States to intervene with the Egyptian Government to retain Gamasy as chief negotiator. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

[3] Intelligence Memorandum No. 1464/73, November 25, describes the buildup. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1177, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, 1973 Middle East War, CIA Situation Reports)

[4] The President highlighted this and the following paragraphs and wrote in the margin: "K—if Israel—*regardless* of any alleged provocation engages in military action they will go it *alone*."

359. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, November 26, 1973, 7:10–7:55 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Ambassador Simcha Dinitz of Israel
Minister Mordechai Shalev

Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger
Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff

Dinitz: First a point of explanation. These questions weren't with me last time.[2] They just had a government meeting. Otherwise I wouldn't have asked to see you again. I remember your crack at the dinner the other night that if the Israeli Ambassador doesn't see you four times a day he thinks Israel is discriminated against.

Kissinger: Nahum Goldmann said the campaign against me has begun in Israel.[3] I thought it wouldn't be before January.

Dinitz: It's over now. There were nasty things before—and about the Prime Minister and myself also. You're not the only one.

I want to start with a piece of information you might find interesting. Armand Hammer was in the Soviet Union and saw Brezhnev on November 16 for two hours.[4] This is from him.

Kissinger: It's probably true.

Dinitz: During their conversation, Brezhnev told him, on his own initiative, that the Soviet Union was interested in peace in the area and a solution acceptable to both sides. Brezhnev asked, "What can the Soviet Union do to advance peace?" Hammer replied that the most important thing would be to renew diplomatic and economic relations with Israel. He thought a face-to-face meeting with the Prime Minister would create favorable conditions for the improvement of relations.

Kissinger: He doesn't know the Prime Minister!

Dinitz: I expected that remark.

Hammer said Brezhnev talked about the U.S. military alert but said he had forgiven the U.S. Hammer also thought a meeting with the Prime Minister would also help persuade Senators like Jackson to ease

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 27–14 ARAB–ISR. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting took place in the Secretary's office at the State Department. All brackets are in the original.

[2] See Document 357.

[3] A prominent Jewish Zionist, Nahum Goldmann nonetheless was critical of Israel's reliance on military power and advocated a conciliatory position toward the Arabs.

[4] Armand Hammer, American businessman and owner of Occidental Petroleum, was a frequent visitor to the Soviet Union.

their stand on MFN—which is Hammer's main interest. According to Hammer, Brezhnev made it clear throughout that the Soviet Union's main interest in its foreign policy was détente with the United States.

We informed Hammer that we thank him, and we asked him not, repeat not, to take any initiative. If they want relations with us, they know where to reach us.

Kissinger: I think it is possible that they might renew relations.

Dinitz: I think they will make feelers on this after the conference starts, so they will be in a position to talk to both sides.

Kissinger: I agree. Exactly.

One of the pressures we do have with them is economic deals. If your friends in the Jewish community weren't so demented . . .

Dinitz: I must say, in the frankness with which I usually speak to you, I'm not sure we have such control over the Jewish community, or that the Jewish community has such control over the Senators.

Kissinger: Since any settlement is not going to be pleasant for you—we've talked about this before—these economic deals might help get a more moderate Soviet position.

Dinitz: But conditions could make this easier in the Congress.

Kissinger: To be concrete, if the House passes the Vanik amendment, they lose credits as well as MFN.[5] Then there is no chance for the Senate–House conference. The House bill will be the same as the Senate bill.

Dinitz: Did you make progress with Jackson when you saw him?

Kissinger: No. I don't expect to.

Dinitz: I thought that at the right moment a meeting might advance things.

Kissinger: Not now.

I have to make an inventory of the assets I have. If there is no Title IV in the House bill, it allows only the theoretical possibility of credits—but it could keep the Soviets dangling for six months.

Dinitz: If I were the Soviets, I would renew relations with Israel.

Kissinger: But by then we will have missed the House session. Our people think that will kill the trade bill altogether.

Dinitz: Wasn't that one idea once?

Kissinger: That is what we have to do, because the bill isn't right.

---

[5] Congressman Charles Vanik (D–Ohio) was the sponsor of the House of Representatives version of the Jackson amendment; see footnote 7, Document 35. Documentation on the administration's efforts to mitigate the impact of the Jackson–Vanik amendment to the 1974 Trade Act is in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXXI, Foreign Economic Policy, 1973–1976.

Dinitz: That's not our fault.

Kissinger: No, I don't blame you. I don't blame Israel for that.

Dinitz: The Government has decided in principle to accept the Peace Conference in Geneva and the 18th.

Kissinger: Yes, I heard. The formal proposal says the 17th or 18th,[6] but I prefer that you accept the 18th. You will be shown it formally tomorrow.

Dinitz: In that document there are references to an invitation to the parties in the following language: "to start negotiations under appropriate auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East." This is almost a quotation of 338, except for the deletion of "between parties concerned . . ." The Prime Minister says this is an important omission.

Kissinger: I'll have to raise it. I see no difficulty.

Dinitz: It also says "without prejudice to possible additional participants at a subsequent phase." We understand this means it is left to later.

Kissinger: Yes.

Dinitz: It doesn't say that it requires the consent of the parties concerned. Therefore, we suggest to delete the sentence.

Kissinger: Impossible.

Dinitz: Or add that it requires the unanimous consent of the parties.

Kissinger: We can try to get it, or we can do what we did on the Six-Point Agreement, that is, have a memorandum of understanding between us.

All right.

Dinitz: The next small point is, we suggest that in the invitation there should be reference to the obligation by the parties to observe the ceasefire. We attach great importance to this. It was in the August 1970 document before we accepted the Jarring mission. Especially in view of their current buildup.

Kissinger: I'm not worried about that. It could happen. But I don't think they are that foolish.

Dinitz: You said you talked to the Russians, and to the Egyptians. What did you say to the Egyptians?

Kissinger: We told them through our Ambassador that it would do damage to the peace efforts.[7]

---

[6] Kissinger is referring to the U.S.–Soviet letter; see Document 356.

[7] See Document 351.

Dinitz: Perhaps we raise this only because we were caught once by surprise.

Kissinger: I'll talk to Dobrynin again tonight.[8]

Dinitz: Thank you.

The Prime Minister wants also to know what "co-chairmanship" means. "Auspices" we understand—we don't understand it but we know we don't understand it!—but this we don't understand.

Kissinger: It's an administrative term. Every meeting has to be chaired by someone.

Dinitz: It doesn't take you beyond the function of an "auspice"—whatever the singular of "auspices" is?

Kissinger: No. And this won't be determined by what's in the letter. The Soviets will try to turn "auspices" into a form of pressure, we know. My strategy is to have enough momentum so that the Arabs feel they have something—not much, but something. If the Soviets press for something, my reaction is to reject it. This is your assurance—the strategy.

It doesn't go beyond "auspices."

Dinitz: The next point is the Syrians. The Prime Minister had a very difficult time in the Knesset on the Syrian question. The opposition called for a no-confidence vote on this.

She asks me to tell you that our participation in the conference with the Syrians is problematical, in view of the failure to exchange prisoners, or even lists. We won't delay the conference. But she asked me to tell you that we must receive, before the conference, the lists and permission for visits by the Red Cross.

Kissinger: I'll become very brutal with the Arabs, especially on the oil embargo—and very tough on prisoners—once we get them signed up on the conference. As soon as we send the letters this week. I'm not sure we should give them an excuse to not show up at the conference.

Dinitz: Her exact words were, "Have the Secretary give the Syrian Foreign Minister the same treatment he gave me that night.[9] He'll get the prisoners." [To Rodman] That's for the record.

Kissinger: She got her whole program and then she claimed she had been raped. Which in her case is implausible.

Dinitz: On Kabrit, this will be taken up tomorrow.

Kissinger: Will you let me tell the Egyptians?

---

[8] Kissinger spoke with Dobrynin on the telephone at 10:26 p.m. A transcript of the conversation is in the National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 24.

[9] See Document 312.

Dinitz: Yes.

Kissinger: It's better for you if I do it.[10]

Dinitz: I know. Of course. We have accepted your suggestion to delay the question of the separation of forces until the peace conference.

Kissinger: Good.

Dinitz: Yariv will not break off the talks at km 101 on our initiative.

Kissinger: Good.

Dinitz: But he will leave after the conference is open, and these meetings will deal with purely local issues.

Kissinger: Very good.

I heard Yariv might be Foreign Minister.

Shalev: Not likely.

Dinitz: This is one of many rumors that circulate.

Kissinger: Does Eban have a power base?

Dinitz: Not in the normal sense. He's convenient to many people for many reasons.

Kissinger: Could he be convenient as a Prime Minister too for the same reason?

Dinitz: It is conceivable, but it is not likely.

I think the election results might be surprising to many who go on wrong assumptions.

Kissinger: I tell my associates that the present constellation in Israel is the best possible for us. My colleagues say it would be better to swing to the doves—but that it is not likely.

Dinitz: And it is better to deal with strong leaders.

Kissinger: But we're also dealing with the most responsible element.

This is going to be a difficult period. I've made no secret of that. We won't know what is going to be necessary until the process gets going. But we will have to face it cold-bloodedly.

Dinitz: The Prime Minister gave me six important points she wanted me to raise: first, a positive decision on the supply of arms.

Kissinger: We're pushing it. I gave the orders today.

Dinitz: I know it is a cardinal element of your policy that Israel not deal at the conference table from a position of weakness.

Kissinger: Of course.

---

[10] See Document 362.

Dinitz: Second is the matter of our prisoners in Syria. We mentioned that. Third is preservation of the ceasefire. We discussed that. Fourth, the Bab el-Mandab arrangement should continue.

Kissinger: That seems to be going well.

Dinitz: Yes.

Next, the Prime Minister wants to celebrate Christmas! We don't want a formal commitment to a date for adjournment, but nothing substantive should . . .

Kissinger: I assure you nothing will happen before your elections.

Dinitz: Then, the Prime Minister asks, when we get a formal invitation, how does it look when we accept the invitation from the United States and Soviet Union when we don't have diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union?

Kissinger: You should make that point. You can give us a note for them. And make a number of your other points, too.

Shalev: In the reply to the American invitation?

Kissinger: Yes.

[Dr. Kissinger and Ambassador Dinitz conferred alone for ten minutes.]

---

360. Minutes of Bipartisan Leadership Meeting[1]

Washington, November 27, 1973, 8:30 a.m.

President Nixon: Henry will give you a review of the Middle East.

Secretary Kissinger: I will summarize what the President tried to do during the war, where we hope to go over the next few months, and a few words on the oil embargo.

---

[1] Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversation, Box 2. Confidential. The meeting was held in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. A list of attendees is in the President's Daily Diary. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, White House Central Files) Attending were, among others, Senate Majority Leader Michael J. Mansfield, Senate Minority Leader Hugh Scott (R–Pennsylvania), and Senators J. William Fulbright, John C. Stennis, Milton R. Young (R–North Dakota), and John L. McClellan (D–Arkansas); Speaker of the House Carl Albert, House Majority Leader Thomas P. O'Neill (D–Massachusetts), House Minority Leader and Vice President-designate Gerald R. Ford, and Congressmen William S. Mailliard (R–California) and Samuel S. Stratton (D–New York).

During the war there were two objectives: (1), a rapid ceasefire, and (2), to put the U.S. in a position to have a major influence in a settlement. Therefore, we had to do many things which leaned to one side: First, the airlift. If we had allowed a victory of Soviet arms over American arms, the whole balance of power would have shifted. Secondly, the President maintained a personal contact with the Arabs. With the Soviet Union we used our relationship to moderate the conflict and worked with them to bring it to a newer stage.

Let me explain what our view is of détente. We want a relationship with the Soviet Union not because the domestic structures of the United States and the Soviet Union are coming closer. Not because they have changed their goals. Détente is necessary because of the vast strategic arsenals of nuclear weapons on both sides. It is an imperative of our policy to prevent a nuclear war.

Obviously détente does not prevent incompatible actions in many areas. Nor does it mean that we acqueisce in the policies of severe repression in the Soviet Union.

When I went on the trip to the Middle East, first, we faced the Arab demand for a return of Israeli forces to the 22 October lines. Second, we had to get a negotiating process started. Third, I told the Arabs that only the United States could bring them negotiations and territory. I told Sadat he had an historic opportunity. He could argue about the ceasefire line or he could work for a conference which could bring about a true peace. Sadat is a wise man. As a result, we negotiated the 6-point plan to consolidate the ceasefire and begin the negotiating process.

The negotiations are now being organized. This week the Soviet Union and the United States will appeal to the parties to convene a conference.

The reason for doing this under U.S.–Soviet auspices is that a wider forum would widen the quarrel as much as the parties. The Chinese and Soviets would quarrel and the British and French would quarrel with us.

Our forum is not yet fully put together but I think it will be this week. Israel can't do much before January. The first portion will probably be devoted to separation of forces—hopefully to inject some UN forces so that the subsequent negotiation can be freer from the prospect of fighting.

The second phase is the difficult issue of Israel's border, security arrangements between Israel and the Arabs, and outside guarantees. We don't want guarantees such that the United States and Soviet Union are automatically charmed into every little dispute.

Our impression is there is more disposition in the Arabs for moderate discussion than at any time since World War II. Nevertheless,

there is severe pressure from the rich radical states—Iraq and Libya. Potentially also from the Soviet Union, although not yet. Also regretfully, the British, French, and Japanese, who take positions near those of the radical Arabs. (The EC made a demand for the October 22 line just after Sadat had given it up, making his position tough.)[2]

The prospects are bright, but it will be difficult.

There will be some painful time for Israel, who will have to withdraw from some territories. But Israel can't want to keep on with these debilitating wars.

Let me talk about the oil embargo. It is very important that we not make public statements on this.[3]

I had an extensive conversation with King Faisal.[4] He is a religious fanatic, a conservative, a friend of the United States. But he is between Iraq and South Yemen. He therefore tried to leapfrog the radicals and appear as the leader of the Arab cause. Their public views are always fierce, but privately I think they are looking for a way out of it.

How do we get out of it?

The Europeans and Japan have gone to the Arabs and said "What do you want us to do?" This is intolerable. If we give in to this: (1) It encourages the radical elements. (2) It gives an opportunity to the Europeans to escalate the proposal. (3) It gives an opportunity to the Soviet Union to escalate the proposal. For example, the Africans are now proposing to keep the embargo until the United States stops its racist policies. We could be faced by blackmail from all raw material producers.

We will talk with the producers, but not under blackmail. There is some chance they will back off the embargo and give negotiations a chance.

The Israeli problem is traumatic. They have relied totally on military supremacy and now know they can't do that.

Let me add a word on the Soviet Union. People say that if détente is so great, how come these confrontations? If we didn't have problems with the Soviet Union, we wouldn't need détente.

There were some things the Soviet Union did we didn't like, but in some other ways they were restrained. They gave no encouragement to terrorists. There was never a day when the President and Brezhnev

---

[2] See footnote 8, Document 336.

[3] On November 19, the OPEC Ministers, meeting in Vienna, announced that the embargo on the United States and the Netherlands would remain in place until a peace settlement based on the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by force was achieved. The next day it was reported that Saudi Arabia would increase production if Israel agreed to a timetable for withdrawal. (*The New York Times*, November 19 and 20, 1973)

[4] See Document 332.

were not in contact. They made a crisis about the Third Army and the President took strong action in order to forestall the introduction of Soviet troops. Once the action was taken, our communications were able to move us quickly to a settlement.

This is the meaning of détente and on the whole it has worked. If we keep our nerves and pursue our goals, we have a good chance for a real peace.

President: Could you spell out some dates, Henry?

Kissinger: I hope the conference will start by the middle of December.

President: Let's talk candidly. We want the embargo lifted, but don't say anything which would make it hard for the Arabs.

Kissinger: If you want to say personally that our task is not made easier by oil threats . . .

Ford: Can we talk about the conference participants?

Kissinger: No. Make it an internal Arab problem.

Question: What is Syria's hang up?

Kissinger: There isn't that much hang up. They have sought contact with us. Their problem is Iraq and the Baathist parties. We don't have relations with Syria so the Soviet Union has to bring them to the conference.

President: Syria is geographically closer to the Soviet Union.

Fulbright: What happens if the Israeli elections are postponed?

Kissinger: We can't wait past December 31. We can stall til then on organizational details but not after.

Fulbright: What can we do to help Israel realize they must rely on guarantees as well as military strength? What sort of guarantee can we give?

Kissinger: Before the war, Israel thought that any conflict would be a repetition of 1967. Israel thought they couldn't be in a better position, and there was no real pressure to make them change.

Now things are different—the war, and their diplomatic isolation. Basing their policy on automatic U.S–Soviet hostility on every issue is risky. Of course they put faith in their ability in the U.S. to mobilize strength. We must make clear that we are committed to Israeli security, but it must be sought in other than purely military ways.

I think territorial belts of security are better than guarantees. The only guarantee Israel would take seriously would be a U.S. guarantee. A European-U.S. or a UN guarantee they would laugh at. The Soviet Union could guarantee the Arabs.

Fulbright: How about joint, for both sides?

Kissinger: Okay, as long as it could be implemented individually, with no veto.

Fulbright: How about Jerusalem?

Kissinger: There are two non-military aspects: Jerusalem and the Palestinians.

On the Palestinians and Gaza there is a possibility. Jerusalem is a tough problem. A way must be found to remove the Arab holy places from Israeli control. Egypt doesn't care much about Jerusalem; Faisal is obsessed by it, but doesn't care much about the Sinai.

Intellectually, Jerusalem is solvable with a Vatican-type setup.

Scott: Are the Israelis more or less intransigent than American Jews?

Kissinger: Less. Israel's problem now is the election campaign. Since October 22, Israel's position has evolved and they are willing to talk about things. But the American Jews are so tough and tend to hypo the Israelis and give them illusions.

Fulbright: Isn't that an illusion?

President: It is in this Administration.

Fulbright: Not in Congress.

Kissinger: Let's make clear: We are trying to preserve Israel's security. We have no intentions of sacrificing Israel, and some day they will thank us.

Albert: Why do the Europeans think the destruction of Israel would end the blackmail?

Kissinger: This is a sad chapter in the history of Europe. There is no good answer.

Mailliard: Are you going to Europe?

Kissinger: I am going to the NATO meeting and the President has told me to lay it out cold. There will be screaming.

Scott: Do the American Jews know the extent of Israeli losses?

Kissinger: We will be working with the American Jews. The President is the best friend Israel ever had. In time they will realize that. Israel can't go on with military solutions. They cannot win a war of attrition.

Stennis: How much is this conference our conference and what are our stakes?

Kissinger: The answer is delicate. It is in our interest to involve the Soviet Union so they don't take an extreme position, but we also must make it clear to the Arabs that a settlement can come only through American influence. This is a narrow course to follow. We do it to bolster the moderate Arabs and demonstrate that the

extremists won't get the Arabs anywhere. We will therefore fight radical proposals but move to force Israeli acceptance of moderate proposals.

Young: How important is opening the Canal?

Kissinger: That would be part of any military withdrawals. Don't worry about Canal opening the Indian Ocean to the Soviet Navy. We can watch them in the Indian Ocean and elsewhere.

Stratton: What is the significance now of Resolution 242?

Kissinger: In the family—242 doesn't mean a thing.

President: It means 1967 for the Arabs and for Israel it means what they have plus ten percent.

Kissinger: We want to distinguish between demilitarized belts and frontiers. Sadat seems to understand the security belt idea.

Fulbright: It is not right to say 242 doesn't mean anything.

President: It means different things to different people. To us it means what is negotiated.

Let me sum up:

We are for Israel's security and we are against any effort to impinge on that. We demonstrated it twice in this conflict—by the airlift and by the alert. The Israeli hawks have to talk this way. But Israel has no friends. They are totally dependent on the United States. As long as we provide the weapons, Israel can lick the Arabs for twenty-five years, but they can't keep the Soviet Union at bay. What they must ask themselves is what we would do if the Soviets call our hands. This last time we did.

—There is no détente with regard to philosophy; the same with China.

—We and the Soviet Union disagree on China; our interests in Europe are opposed. But we no more have yearly crises on the autobahn. And in the Middle East. In Southeast Asia, their interests were never so involved that they might get involved. That is true in only three areas: China, Europe, and perhaps in the Middle East. This time, in the Middle East, they decided that relations with us were more important than the Middle East.

—Everyone here is for Israeli survival. But it can survive only if it has American support in the face of possible Soviet moves in the Middle East.

The American people will be moved by our friends in Congress for weapons but they will back off if they see American forces going into the Middle East against the Soviet Union.

Israel can't base its policy on military security. We need that supplemental so they don't think we are blackmailing them.[5] A settlement has to cost Israel some territory. That is why we are for 242. It avoids our having to come down on one side or the other.

The U.S. is committed to movement on peace. In that case, only the U.S. and the Soviet Union matter and that is why the Soviet Union must play a role.

The third thing, the United States now has good relations with virtually all of the Arabs.

We can work with all of them for a settlement. We don't want to embarrass the Soviet Union.

We want to give the moderate Arabs an incentive to work with us.

O'Neill: 'Til 1972 Egypt had Soviet troops there and kicked them out. What happened?

Kissinger: The President said in 1970 we didn't like the Soviets in Egypt. Sadat was dissatisfied with progress with the Soviet Union there, so he threw them out. They were dissatisfied with the situation after they threw them out and started a war. I must admit the prospects are more favorable than if the war hadn't happened.

Mansfield: Do Egypt and Israel have the capability to make nuclear weapons?

Kissinger: Israel has the capability to make small numbers. Not Egypt. And we don't think the Soviets have put them in. Should Israel brandish nuclear weapons, the Soviets would counter it and it would be very dangerous for Israel.

McClellan: What incentive do the Arabs have for a peace? Israel has no friends; they have the oil.

Kissinger: The Arabs have learned that in their lifetime they cannot win a way, though they can bleed Israel. The radical Arabs certainly want Israel's destruction. The moderate Arabs, though, fear that the cost of belligerency jeopardizes the stability of their regimes.

I can make a case that Israel is more secure with a border near the 1967 border and a security zone than with the present borders and their forces in contact. With a security zone, the Arabs must move from under their SAM belt. Not all the Arabs will seek peace, but peace

---

[5] In his November 28 Evening Report to Nixon, Kissinger wrote that he had had a "warm" meeting that morning with the House Foreign Affairs Committee during which there had been numerous expressions of support for the administration's handling of the Middle East crisis. Chairman Morgan had agreed to press forward that week with hearings on the administration's request for $2.2 billion emergency assistance for Israel with the hope of going to the floor the following week with an authorization bill. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 56, President's Daily Briefing, President's Daily Briefs, Nov. 16–Nov. 30, 1973)

would break the unity of the Arabs because they have different motivations.

President: There is another reason. All Arabs are nationalists. The United States has faults, but no one thinks that relations with the United States infringe their independence. That is not true with the Soviet Union and the Arabs know that. That may be partly responsible for Egypt's throwing out the Soviets in 1972. I think the moderate Arabs would prefer the United States to play a role in a settlement than to be beholden to the Soviet Union.

McClellan: As long as there are respites, there is hope, but I am not optimistic on the prospects for a durable peace.

President: You are realistic, but we have no other choices and we must play a role with both sides. Who wants a showdown with the Soviet Union? Only the columnists.

Mansfield: Mr. President, you and Kissinger are to be commended.

---

361. Telegram From the Embassy in Israel to the Department of State[1]

Tel Aviv, November 27, 1973, 1134Z.

9548. Subject: Eban Briefing re Middle East Peace Conference and Syrian POW Issue.

1. *Summary.* Eban told me last evening that Israel had now acceded to two U.S. requests conveyed through him; to attend peace conference opening December 18 in Geneva, and to agree with Egyptians in Kilometer 101 talks to transfer further discussion of disengagement issue to January–February sessions of Geneva peace conference. Eban said he assumed formal invitation to peace conference when it came would, through either its listing of participants or its description of conference purposes, preclude fedayeen participation. Eban said Secretary had given him "very strong assurances" that U.S. could induce Egypt and USSR to agree on maintenance of ceasefire and on non-resort to UN Security Council during interim between now and opening of peace conference. Israel meanwhile would try to keep Kilometer 101 talks alive by discussing subjects other than disengagement and would not take

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 611, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 13, Nov. 73–Dec. 73. Secret; Flash; Nodis; Cherokee.

initiative of breaking off talks.[2] Although he did not read me text of formal GOI reply to U.S. which he said Dinitz would convey, he indicated reply called for Syria to start adhering to Geneva Convention on POWs if Syria was interested in attending peace conference.[3] He said that any such Syrian interest would create opening for U.S. to get Soviets to push for POW exchange and that Israeli public opinion would require POW exchange before Israel could negotiate with Syria. Eban added that GOI was expecting Secretary to visit Israel December 16 following visits to Arab capitals, including Damascus. End summary.

2. Eban invited me to Jerusalem evening of November 26 for briefing on latest Middle East settlement developments. Also present were Assistant DirGen MFA Evron, North American Director Elizur, DCM, and PolOff Smith.

3. Eban said Secretary had been interested in two things during their conversations last week:[4] a) formal GOI decision to accept procedures for Middle East peace conference, and b) Israeli agreement to transfer question of disengagement of forces from Kilometer 101 talks to peace conference. Secretary's proposal re peace conference involved date, venue, and levels. Eban learned that U.S. proposal had been discussed with various governments concerned and that Israeli amendments could mean undesirable delays in getting conference started. Secretary had impressed on Eban that chief thing was opening date, importance of which Israelis had not realized. Secretary had said date of opening could have positive effect on ceasefire in Middle East and on easing energy crisis. Creation of fact of conference would have important psychological effect across the board, whereas any postponement would arouse great suspicion.

4. Eban said that when all this was explained to Israeli Cabinet November 25, GOI had decided to accept proposal. GOI reply to USG was now being delivered in Washington by Israeli Ambassador. GOI reply among other things noted expectation that if Syria were to attend the conference, Syria first would have to commence observation of Geneva

---

[2] In telegram 3368 from Cairo, November 27, Eilts reported Egyptian perceptions that while Israeli negotiators at KM 101 could not be accused of bad faith during the discussions since November 11, implementation of the cease-fire accord had been marked by Israeli delays. (Ibid., Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov. 73–Dec. 31, 1973)

[3] In telegram 9543 from Tel Aviv, November 27, Keating reported that in his conversation with Eban, the Foreign Minister had been most interested in the modalities of convening the Geneva peace conference. He had reiterated the Israeli Government position that it would not sit down to negotiate with Syria until the Syrians started complying with the Geneva Convention on POWs. He also reaffirmed the Israeli position against negotiations with Arafat and those "murderers in Beirut." (Ibid., Box 611, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 13, Nov. 73–Dec. 73)

[4] See footnote 4, Document 350.

Convention concerning POWs. Eban continued only thing Israel now awaited was to learn exact terms in which formal invitation to peace conference would be couched. Eban presumed invitation would be based on Resolution 338, would state who the participants were to be, and would indicate that purpose of conference is negotiations and agreement with Israel. Even if Arafat wanted to wreck conference, Eban doubted he would be willing to come to conference purpose of which contradicted the very reason for existence of fedayeen organizations. Eban hoped list of participants in invitation would be as it had been outlined to Eban in Washington.

5. Eban turned to what he described as Secretary's second request of Israel: agreement to transfer discussion of disengagement issue from Kilometer 101 talks to Geneva. Eban said this was more of a problem for Israel. Israelis had thought it would be good to have stabilization of ceasefire in effect before peace conference. Secretary believed this could be handled at Geneva and that U.S. could assure Israel that Egyptians and Soviets would not during interim resume fire or rush off to UN Security Council. He had told Eban that U.S. could "hold the line."

6. Eban said he still had not received report on outcome of November 26 meeting at Kilometer 101. In November 24 meeting at Kilometer 101, it looked as though Secretary's prediction that Israel would not be able to achieve agreement on disengagement through these talks was coming true.[5] Eban noted his understanding was disengagement issue would be covered in January–February sessions of peace conference rather than at opening meeting.

7. At this point I asked Eban if his understanding was that opening meeting on December 18 would be purely formal, and he said yes. Eban added that although opening session would not bring substantive progress, choice of date would help situation, as there would not be long wait. Symbolism of opening session would in itself be very important.

8. I asked Eban if he did not consider fact of ongoing talks at Kilometer 101 was in itself a breakthrough. Eban said this was true. However, these talks were less difficult for Egyptians than peace conference because Egyptians could answer critics of Kilometer 101 meetings by pointing out that Egypt met with Israel previously on military level under terms of 1949 Armistice Agreement. Now that opportunity existed to commence actual peace conference, Israel had to seize it as it might be fleeting. As for non-substantive nature of opening session, Foreign Ministers would be present from Arab countries, Israel, U.S. and USSR, and UN Secretary General would also be present, meaning

[5] See footnote 2, Document 358.

there would be sufficient number of general statements to last a couple of days.

9. I asked how Israel at opening session would be able to schedule next meeting of conference in January when Israelis would not know how long it would take them to form new government. Eban replied if party composition of new Israeli Government would be the same as present one, which he expected, formation should not take too long. I then asked specifically if Israel would be prepared at December 18 session to set date for next meeting. Eban said yes, and suggested Israelis in setting date could note in passing their assumption that next GOI would have same composition. Even if things turned out differently and formation of government took longer than expected, it would be wise at December 18 meeting to set date in January and then later, if necessary, request postponement of a few days.

10. I asked Eban if he was concerned about reported Soviet efforts to assist in forming Palestinian government in exile and how he related this to general picture. Eban said he was quite concerned about this Soviet activity. He said he did not know what exactly Soviets were trying to do. This development made it all the more important to Israel to receive list of participants in peace conference. In Israel's oral exchange on subject with us, all that had been specified was that conference should begin on December 18 in Geneva commencing at Foreign Minister level with countries which took part in October war plus UN Secretary General. (He added conference at later time could be expanded to include all belligerents of 1967 and 1973 wars.) I noted U.S. was aware that Israel would not want to sit down with Arafat and others like him, and I had reported this feeling to Washington as conveyed to me by Prime Minister. Eban said that even if one set aside Jordanian positin on this issue, Israel would have great difficulty with it. It therefore was important that invitation state purposes of peace conference. Eban continued he had told Secretary that if King Hussein were to include Palestinians in his delegation, that would be another matter. These could include West Bank Arabs who are King Hussein's citizens and who reside in what formerly was Palestine, but not people who live in Beirut.

11. Eban then turned to Secretary's assurances that transfer of disengagement discussions to Geneva could be arranged without danger that Soviets or Egyptians would take matter to UN Security Council. Eban replied Secretary had assured him Egypt and USSR would agree to postpone further litigation over disengagement issue. Secretary had also told Eban he believed Egypt would respect ceasefire. Eban said he was glad to have "very strong" U.S. assurances that neither political nor military action would be taken between now and

peace conference. I asked Eban if his feeling of confidence extended also to Syria, and Eban merely replied that Syrians were "a problem."

12. I asked Eban if Egyptians had given Israel a position on disengagement in Kilometer 101 talks on take-it-or-leave-it-basis which was unacceptable to Israel, or whether Egyptians in Israeli view were trying to maneuver situation so that Israel could be accused of breaking off these talks. If so, it occurred to me there were many other topics Israel could discuss to keep talks going. Eban said that in GOI's formal reply to us concerning opening of peace conference, GOI had specified that Israelis would not take initiative of breaking off Kilometer 101 talks and in fact would try to keep talks alive. Yariv had been instructed that, if no progress on disengagement was evident in his forum, he was to agree to transfer of this issue to Geneva. Eban said Yariv was instructed to say GOI could not accept proposal made by GOE November 24;[6] he doubted Egyptians would be offering new concessions although he said he would inform me promptly if anything of substance happened at Nov 26 meeting at KM 101. Press this morning reports no progress was made.[7]

13. I asked Eban for his view of how Arab summit would affect climate between now and peace conf. Eban said Secretary had been aware of forthcoming Arab summit when he assured Eban Egyptians and Soviets would not disrupt ceasefire or resort to UN Security Council during interim before peace conf. At the same time, Eban said he was concerned about Egyptian public statements which were threatening and about fact Syria also issuing such statements. He felt that Israel would have to consider atmosphere and rhetoric in area before and during conf although it was better not to raise this subject before Arab summit.

14. In context of discussing importance of creating conducive atmosphere before peace conf, Eban again turned to issue of Israeli POWs in Syria. Eban saw no solution but to go on putting pressures on

---

[6] At the November 22 meeting at KM 101, General Gamasy proposed an "initial and temporary disengagement and separation of forces." (Telegram 5040 from USUN, November 23; National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files) He clarified his proposal at the November 23 meeting. (Telegram 5074 from USUN, November 24; ibid.)

[7] In telegram 5114 from USUN, November 27, Bennett reported on the November 26 KM 101 meeting during which Yaariv turned down Gamasy's earlier disengagement proposal and said Israel could not accept Gamasy's proposed force level for Egyptian forces on the East Bank, suggesting these be reduced to a token level. It was agreed that Yaariv would go back for more instructions and would propose lines for Israeli forces beyond the main force. Gamasy would then reconsider the question of Egyptian strength east of the canal, but he made it clear that Egypt would accept no limitations on Egyptian strength west of the canal. Bennett noted that it seemed that the Israelis were holding out the promise of considerable concessions, but were unwilling to be pinned down until the elections and/or peace talks. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1179, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, December 1, 1973 thru December 5, 1973 [2 of 3])

Syria in various ways, especially through Soviets. Secretary had been unable to confirm by time of Eban's departure from U.S. whether Syria would come to peace conf or not. Secretary had talked late last week with Syrian Rep at UN, who only said he would report U.S. concern about POW issue to Damascus.[8] Waldheim had told Eban that Syrian official who had made original more flexible proposal for POW exchange from which Syria had subsequently backed off had now been shunted off to Bonn. Nevertheless, if Syria really were interested in coming to peace conf, this in Eban's opinion would create some leverage on POW issue. It was known fact that Israeli public opinion would not allow peace negotiations with Syria without POW exchange first. Any Syrian expression of interest in peace conf, Eban said, would give us excellent opportunity to speak to Soviets about need for POW exchange.

15. At end of meeting Eban said GOI was looking forward to Secretary's arrival in Israel Dec 16, after which Secretary would go to Geneva. He added he understood Secretary would first visit Arab capitals which he did not cover on his Mid East trip and that this would include Damascus.

Keating

[8] See Document 350.

362. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Egyptian Presidential Adviser for National Security Affairs (Ismail)[1]

Washington, November 28, 1973.

Secretary Kissinger has discussed with the Israeli Government the three points raised by Mr. Ismail in his message of November 23, 1973.[2] The Israelis have made the following points:

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt/Ismail, Vol. VIII, November 1–December 31, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. A note on the message indicates that it was sent for delivery at 10:44 a.m., with instructions to pass to Eilts who was to give it to Fahmi. Eilts should tell Fahmi this message was in reply to a letter from Ismail and that Kissinger would not initiate further contacts with Ismail.

[2] Not printed. (Ibid.)

1) The Israeli Government is prepared to allow non-military supplies to pass to Kabrit.

2) The Government of Israel agrees to allow additional non-military items to pass to the city of Suez.

The Israeli Government has informed Secretary Kissinger that it is prepared to proceed as outlined in numbered paragraphs one and two above on condition that the Government of Egypt is prepared to release one Mr. Baruch Mizrachi.

As explained to the Secretary, Mr. Mizrachi was captured by the Yemeni some months ago and thereafter transferred to Egypt. The Secretary was also told that the Government of Egypt has agreed in principle to release Mr. Mizrachi but has indicated that in return the Egyptian Government expects the release of a number of Egyptians now held by the Israelis. According to the information provided by the Government of Israel, the Israelis have indicated to the Egyptians their willingness to accede to this request if the Government of Egypt will provide them a list of the names of those they desire released.

The Government of Israel has informed Secretary Kissinger that this commitment to release Egyptians now held by the Israelis continues in effect.

Thus, in summary, the Government of Israel has asked Secretary Kissinger to inform the Government of Egypt that it is prepared to take the steps outlined in numbered paragraphs one and two above, as well as to agree to the release of Egyptians now held by the Israelis (a list of these persons to be provided to the Government of Israel by the Government of Egypt) in return for the release of Mr. Baruch Mizrachi.

Secretary Kissinger suggests to Mr. Ismail that should this arrangement prove satisfactory to the Government of Egypt, details could most appropriately be worked out in the ongoing discussions between the Government of Egypt and the Government of Israel at Kilometer 101.

363. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Washington, November 29, 1973.

PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State and Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs
Dr. James R. Schlesinger, Secretary of Defense
William Colby, Director of Central Intelligence
Admiral Thomas Moorer, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
Amb. Kenneth Rush, Deputy Secretary of State
Major General Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

Kissinger: I have been telling the President that we should say to the Arabs that we will make progress when you lift the embargo—not that the embargo will be lifted as we make progress.

Schlesinger: We have been talking about using the Marines.[2]

Kissinger: We should have a plan before we move troops. It is ridiculous that the civilized world is held up by 8 million savages. I spent three hours with Faisal.[3] His problem is he is a friend of the United States, but he is pressured by radicals. So he is leapfrogging the radicals so he isn't embarrassed by his U.S. relationship.

We have had two letters from Yamani. I told them that we couldn't operate under pressure.[4]

I get the impression they are blinking.

Colby: Yes, they are looking for ways to get us oil.

Schlesinger: They are turning up the screws on Aramco.

---

[1] Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Memoranda of Conversation, Box 2. Top Secret; Nodis. The meeting was held in the Map Room at the White House.

[2] Schlesinger discussed the use of military force to secure Middle East oil during bilateral meetings on energy issues with members of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group, November 5–8. (Telegram 4914 from The Hague, November 8; National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files) According to a U.K. account of a November 15 meeting between Schlesinger and Ambassador Cromer, Schlesinger again stated that the U.S. Government seriously contemplated using military force to secure oil fields in the Middle East, including launching airborne troops to seize fields in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Abu Dhabi, but only as a "last resort." The U.K. memorandum, dated December 12, is in the Public Records Office, PREM 15/1768. It was publicly released on January 1, 2004, and reported in *The New York Times* the next day. See also *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXXVI, Energy Crisis, 1969–1974, Document 244.

[3] See Document 332.

[4] Yamani's first message is dated November 11, to which Kissinger replied on November 16. Yamani's second message is dated November 19. All are in the National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 139, Country Files, Middle East, Saudi Arabia, Nov.–Dec. 1973. See *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXXVI, Energy Crisis, 1969–1974, Documents 240 and 242.

Rush: I don't know how it could be done without being found out.

Colby: If it was antitrust, they could keep it quiet. The oil companies don't have the incentive.

Kissinger: They seem to be looking for a way out. They told me if they could have announced the six-point deal, they could have lifted the embargo.

The opening of negotiations might do it.

Rush: If we could get a withdrawal to the passes . . .

Kissinger: Ken, we can't yield to blackmail. We can't tie ourselves to any scheme. We have to show our muscle now or the Russians will take extreme positions and drive us right out of the Middle East.

We will have to pressure Israel, but if it looks like we do it under pressure, we won't even get credit for it. We must pressure Israel, but at the right time; don't nickel them on petty issues.

I was impressed with Sadat. He showed statesmanship. I told him if he insisted on the 22 October line, he could get it, but with great agony and it would stop there. The same agony later would get us something more.

I think he doesn't like the Soviet Union.

An announcement of the Conference has a 50–50 chance of getting action on the oil.

If I support 242, that will get us something.

We *won't* make the oil conditional on progress in the substance of the talks. We have to be prepared to stop the negotiations if we get pressure—otherwise the Russians will make extreme demands. The Arabs like us. I am going to Syria after the NATO meeting.

Sadat has several schemes. I told him to make more extreme demands so I could back him off it.

Rush: Dobrynin told me if we could just settle the Middle East, we could make real progress.

Kissinger: If we get the settlement we want, we will never get MFN. The Jews will be mad.

Our strategy has to be that when the Soviet Union, the British and French press, we stall—so all of them know only we can deliver. That will help Sadat and the moderate Arabs. All the Arabs are coming to us. We will commence on the 16th. (That is closer to the Israeli elections).

Then we have to move for a disengagement. But only after the lines are set and everyone is screaming, then we will go to Egypt and say: "This is what we will do."

The British and French are being complete shits.

On the ceasefire, Whitehall never let the British Ambassador ask the right question: Would they *accept* a ceasefire, not would they *seek* it.

Schlesinger: I get the impression the British are just incompetent. They are floundering.

Rush: I disagree. They are competent. They have a plan but no power.

Colby: Their policy for years has been to make up for lack of power by close association with us.

Kissinger: Let me summarize.

Hassan, Hussein, and Bourguiba are with us.

Faisal, I think, is in a dilemma. He gave me a hard line and I told him bull shit. I said you tell me about the World Wide Jewish conspiracy and you want me to take it on without preparation. These Jewish groups will say we are yielding to the Arabs' blackmail. That is impossible. He agreed and said, "Can't you help me? Can't you give me Jerusalem?" I said: "That's the last. Our enemies would like to hang us up on a tough point like that. Give us time and we will do it." He asked me to do something, and I said I would see what I could do. Then Fahd and Saqqaf came to me and said they would do what they could. They bled about some Navy deal where we keep raising the price.

Moorer: I know about that.

Kissinger: If we could give on that—but let me do it.

[Read Yamani letter.][5]

I have already done some—when I said in Peking that Israel would have to do some withdrawal. We have shaken the Saudis. They are saying they trust me. If we keep discipline, we have a chance. But we can't put out that the oil embargo will be lifted as we make progress.[6]

Sadat has a six-point plan for withdrawal.[7] I told him Israel had to hold the passes. If we could get a withdrawal of Israel for the Third

[5] Brackets are in the original.

[6] In telegram 5257 from Jidda, November 29, Ambassador Akins warned that the Saudis would be offended by the omission of Jidda from the Secretary's itinerary. He noted, however, that if the oil boycott and production restrictions were still in place and there was no indication that they were about to be lifted, he would not advise Kissinger to come. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1178, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, November 28, 1973 thru Nov. 30, 1973 [2 of 3]) In telegram 234699 to Jidda, November 29, Kissinger responded that the Department had concluded that the disadvantages of not offering to visit Saudi Arabia were greater than the risks Akins foresaw, even if there was no give by then in the King's position. (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 43, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, State Cables, Memos & Misc., Dec. 8–22, 1973)

[7] See Document 324.

Army, a thinning out of the Egyptian Army. He even had a plan for Sharm el-Sheikh.

I told him Egyptian policy was made in Tel Aviv, cause if I were Israel, I would want extreme positions put forth.

We have to use Israel in this game, to show that we are the only ones who can deliver.

Colby: Won't Syria be tougher?

Kissinger: If we could get a zone between the Syrians and Israelis, and put UN in between, then Syria couldn't move without crossing UN troops and moving out from under their SAM belt.

In the first phase, we would have Syria, Egypt, Jordan. In the second phase, add Lebanon and the Palestinians. Sadat's scheme is to turn the West Bank over to the UN for five years or so. Hussein has a similar idea, with a plebiscite to see whether they want to be independent or stay with Jordan. The only thing I don't have a clue to is Jerusalem.

But we must be tough. If we get pressure from the Soviet Union, Britain, France and Japan, we just sit on our hands. The British and French are terrible. The British sabotaged the French because they would have been playing an American game.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

364. Minutes of Washington Special Actions Group Meeting[1]

Washington, November 29, 1973, 2:39–3:20 p.m.

SUBJECT

Middle East and Indochina, (see separate minutes for Indochina portion)

PARTICIPANTS

Chairman—Secretary Henry A. Kissinger

State
Kenneth Rush
Joseph Sisco

DOD
William Clements
Robert C. Hill

JCS
Adm. Thomas H. Moorer
Vice Adm. John P. Weinel

CIA
William Colby
Samuel Hoskinson

NSC Staff
Major Gen. Brent Scowcroft
Harold Saunders
Jeanne W. Davis

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

It was agreed that:

. . . an SR–71 photo mission would be flown over the area from the U.S. next week; thereafter the flights would originate from the UK;

. . . the Defense Department should evaluate the present Egyptian and Syrian military equipment situation in relation to the October 6 level;

. . . Defense would review the latest Israeli requests for military equipment and prepare some options including various packages of equipment and rates of delivery.

Secretary Kissinger: (Commenting on ticker item that the Egyptians had pulled out of the military talks with the Israelis at Kilometer 101)[2] I think this will work out all right. The Israelis made a proposal they never should have made, then they pulled back from it. I think they will stagger along until the Geneva meeting is over.

Mr. Sisco: I agree. It won't be easy, but with the Secretary talking in the area and my contacts . . .

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, NSC Institutional Files (H–Files), Box H–117, WSAG Meetings Minutes, Originals, 1973. Top Secret; Nodis; Codeword. The meeting took place in the White House Situation Room.

[2] Telegram 5231 from USUN, November 30, transmitted a report on the November 29 meeting at Kilometer 101. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

Secretary Kissinger: The Egyptians will get in touch with me if they have a real axe to grind.

Let me review the diplomacy. (to Clements) Your Saudi Arabian friends were not as upset by my press conference as you were.[3] The intensity of their correspondence with me has not slackened. I think things are on track for the December 18 meeting in Geneva at the Foreign Minister level. Both we and the Soviets have received substantially the same reply. There is agreement in principle but everyone is nit-picking. (Israeli Foreign Minister) Gazit is the worst. He is insisting that "contending parties" be mentioned one more time in the first paragraph when it is already mentioned six times. Joe (Sisco) is trying to put it in once more. The Egyptians have made what they call "suggestions". Dobrynin told me the Syrians had mumbled something about other countries participating. We had already heard this from the British. The Egyptians are violently opposed. So, unless Egypt and Israel blow up between now and December 18, things are on track. We have used Saudi Arabia as an intermediary with the Syrians. The Saudis wanted to play that role, but the Syrians won't answer us through the Saudis. They insist on coming back directly to us. We have pretty good contacts with the Syrians now. Incidentally, the Saudis are financing Syrian resupply and rebuilding.

On oil, there is more going on than the formal statements would indicate.[4] I don't think Yamani had full instructions. He's coming over here next week. We'll have a fuller report once the conference is set.

On possible countermeasures, we should review when would be the time to implement them, if ever. Let me make clear our strategy on the oil embargo. We think if we yield to the embargo in the sense of bargaining with the Saudis on the specific terms for the conference, we will get ourselves on a hopeless wicket. It would take too long. It would make the Saudis responsible for every point and they would be driven by their radicals. The British and French would be given an incentive to leapfrog.

Every producing country would set up its own OPEC for the purpose of blackmailing us. Our position with the Saudis is that they have demonstrated their power. They have moved us off our position of letting things take their natural course. We have assumed a major responsibility for the negotiations, which they wanted. Now it is their turn to

---

[3] Kissinger is presumably referring to his November 21 press conference; see footnote 3, Document 350.

[4] Kissinger is possibly referring to the announcement on November 28 at the Arab League summit in Algiers of the extension of the oil embargo to Portugal, Rhodesia, and South Africa; Arab agreement to exert continued economic pressure; and an endorsement of the Arab efforts toward a peace settlement. See *The New York Times*, November 29, 1973.

help. To take action which would inflict harm on segments of the American population before we have had an opportunity to develop something in the negotiations is unacceptable to us. They may have a monopoly on oil but we have a monopoly on political progress. They have already done everything to us that they can. On the basis of regular exchanges we are having with the Saudis, I'm confident this message is getting through. All of you should stick to this line. What we are going to have to do in the negotiations will be painful and difficult for some segments of the American public. If, on top of that, we have serious fuel shortages, it will make our position impossible. If we drop a hint now and then on what actions we might take in return, it might worry them a little. We're getting through; they are definitely thinking about what we might do. When Yamani comes over next week, we should stop commiserating with him on his problem and talk about our own. I really think we are going to make it. What do you think, Bill (Colby)? Joe (Sisco)?

Mr. Colby: I agree, on the basis of the messages I have seen.

Mr. Sisco: So do I.

Secretary Kissinger: We're really making progress.

Mr. Sisco: Despite what some people may believe, I think this thing will work out.

Mr. Clements: (to Secretary Kissinger) I have great confidence in what you're trying to do. But I can't agree, as Bill (Colby) can, on the basis of messages that I haven't seen. I think there is one thing missing from your equation, and it is very difficult to understand unless you have been deeply involved in all these questions of dislocation, redistribution, etc. I can't emphasize how important the next five weeks are for the well-being and security of the United States.

Secretary Kissinger: But there is nothing we can do in five weeks to get Israel back to her 1967 borders.

Mr. Clements: I don't agree. I think we must make some responsible move toward an attempt to get that valve cracked open. If we do not have a new line of communication opened with some oil flowing to us before Christmas, that 17% short-fall the President talks about will be 23%.

Secretary Kissinger: What would be a responsible move?

Mr. Clements: Send someone over there who can look (King) Faisal in the eye and talk to him. Yamani is a ribbon clerk compared to Faisal, Fahd and Sultan.

Secretary Kissinger: Those are the people we are in touch with. What would you tell them?

Mr. Clements: Tell them that we're hurt. Tell them: You've made your point, but there is a point beyond which you can't push us

without its being counterproductive. You've proved your point; that's reflected in Wall Street. Just look at the Saudi investment in relation to six weeks ago. Say, as a matter of good grace, and in your position, you should restore relations with the U.S. It is unbecoming and unproductive for you to pursue this line. You need to assume a larger stance and open the valve. From a technical standpoint, your position will be just as good a year from now, if you want to close it again.

Secretary Kissinger: I agree with that strategy. That gives me no problem.

Mr. Clements: But he can be told that this week. Nothing will be lost. And it can't be done in one hour or even in one day. You would have to give Faisal time to consult with Fahd and Sultan and mull it over in his own mind. It could be done on a very low key basis, with no advertising. We could use a cover story, and Tom (Moorer), Bob (Hill) and I have a perfect reason for being in Saudi Arabia. We've got $2 billion worth of equipment for their Navy and National Guard on the rocks over there. We're trying to get over there to see if we could get things moving. We could play the whole thing in a very low key. If we were successful, then you (Kissinger) could come over for the closing bit. You could be the hero.

Secretary Kissinger: Now you're speaking my language!

Mr. Clements: It should be the Secretary of State who does it. If we fail, we can just ugly off into the desert. No one will ever know and there will be no embarrassment. At least we will have accomplished something on our other problem. If we don't do something on that, we will just foul up on the $2 billion we have been trying to use as a bridge to the royal family.

Secretary Kissinger: What $2 billion?

Mr. Clements: We've got a $700 million Navy modernization program. Also a modernization program for the Saudi National Guard—the outfit that protects the King. These programs have been underway for more than a year and they have never really gotten off dead center. The Saudis are beginning to think we're not serious about them. They're beginning to flirt with the French. The French Defense Minister has been over there and the French are busting a gut to take over from us in Saudi Arabia. If we're successful on the oil issue, we will have cracked the valve and that feared shutdown, which would cut the flow to the Eastern seaboard by 50% until February or March, won't happen. We have a responsibility to do everything we can as quickly as we can to alleviate this situation.

Secretary Kissinger: I have heard this same line in Japan. Everyone who is in a jam says we must do something. But the question is whether certain actions are more likely to get it done or not. We'd be nuts to send a mission to Saudi Arabia before our talks with the various emis-

saries who are coming over here. After those talks, we can sit down and discuss what to do next.

Mr. Clements: We've already wasted too much time.

Secretary Kissinger: Before the Arab summit meeting, we might have done it but it would have made no difference at all. The Saudi Arabian problem was to align itself with enough other Arab countries so it wasn't out in front. After that, it's a matter of tactics.

Mr. Sisco: And they did that through the Arab summit meeting.

Secretary Kissinger: Yes. Let's wait and see what the emissaries bring us. After that, we may decide that a mission to Saudi Arabia is important.

Mr. Clements: I can't say any more.

Secretary Kissinger: But you can't say we have wasted two weeks.

Mr. Colby: I'd like to raise the question of photo coverage. We would like to have periodic coverage, either SR–71 or U–2, although the latter is not good. We have the satellite photography and there is no urgent requirement for an SR–71 flight at the moment, but it would help.

Secretary Kissinger: What is the situation on neighborhood basing?

Mr. Colby: [*2½ lines not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: What about the British?

Adm. Moorer: We're beginning to move the fuel into Mildenhall on January 1. Meanwhile, the U.S. is the only place they can fly from, and that costs about $500,000 and uses 230,000 gallons of fuel.

Mr. Colby: I can't honestly say there is an urgent need. But, all other things being equal, it would be good to have periodic coverage.

Secretary Kissinger: After January, we can fly out of the UK. [*less than 1 line not declassified*] I don't care if we fly out of the U.S. except for the money.

Adm. Moorer: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Secretary Kissinger: How would we get in?

Adm. Moorer: Over Turkey.

Secretary Kissinger: Would they let us?

Adm. Moorer: [*1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Colby: We would go around the Persian Gulf and up the Red Sea.

Adm. Weinel: We would fly over Turkey.

Secretary Kissinger: Would we have to get permission?

Adm. Moorer: We asked the Turks at the outset.

Mr. Colby: [*1½ lines not declassified*]

Adm. Moorer: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Colby: [*less than 1 line not declassified*] in Turkey, would they let us fly over?

Mr. Rush: The same considerations (Egyptian and Israeli agreement) would pertain to flying over [*less than 1 line not declassified*].

Secretary Kissinger: [*less than 1 line not declassified*]

Mr. Sisco: We shouldn't ask them.

Adm. Moorer: The last flight was November 18.

Secretary Kissinger: We told them about that, but they didn't protest. We shouldn't get in the habit of telling them about the flights.

Adm. Moorer: (to Mr. Colby) How many flights do you want?

Mr. Colby: One about every three weeks. We'd like to have one next week. Our satellite photos will be down on December 18 or 20. Thereafter, we'd like a flight in January.

Secretary Kissinger: In January we can fly out of the UK.

Adm. Moorer: The tanker still has to go to Turkey. That's the only place we have the fuel. We're using it for other flights. We could run one SR–71 flight next week from the U.S.; after that, from the UK.

Secretary Kissinger: Why not do it that way.

Mr. Colby: If the money is no great problem.

Adm. Moorer: It's just the equivalent of two flights instead of one.

Mr. Colby: I'd like to run one from the U.S. next week.

Secretary Kissinger: Okay, let's do it.

Mr. Clements: We need to talk about where we are going with regard to the resupply of Israel. We have a DIA report that says that, at this point, they think, plus or minus a little, the Israelis are where they were as of October 6. But the gut issue is the position of the Egyptians and Syrians with relation to where they were on October 6.

Secretary Kissinger: That's right.

Mr. Clements: We're not at the point of a professional military evaluation that says the Syrians and Egyptians are back at the October 6 level. We need to get that evaluation next. Then we can determine where we are in the balance.

Secretary Kissinger: I agree. We should make an evaluation of where the Syrians and Egyptians are in relation to October 6. That would be extremely helpful.

Adm. Moorer: We have taken a gross look. In terms of tonnage, so far we have shipped 102,000 tons for Israel and we estimate the Soviets have shipped 109,000 tons. So we're about even on tonnage.

Secretary Kissinger: But we would have to look at the distribution of the Soviet tonnage. I talked to Jim (Schlesinger) at lunch today about that $2.2 billion figure and what we should do about (Congressman)

Mahon. The only thing I can say about that figure is that it exists. I don't know how it was arrived at. But we've already paid the price with the Arabs for it, and it would be worse to cut it back now and have to go back two months later for $500 million more. Whatever you may say about a peace settlement, it will mean a substantial Israeli withdrawal. I don't want to spook them before the real pressure starts. We may have to pay them off in equipment for territory. (to Mr. Clements) If it helps you, that's my attitude toward equipment for Israel. We need the study of where Egypt and Syria are. I think Jim (Schlesinger) has a solution that he can talk to (Congressman) Mahon about.

Adm. Moorer: He's talking to Mahon this afternoon.

Mr. Rush: I'd better find out what happened before I go up before the Appropriations Committee tomorrow morning.

Secretary Kissinger: When I was up with the House Foreign Affairs Committee, they weren't enthusiastic, but they were asking the wrong questions. Cutting down the figure won't help, since it will hurt us more with the Arabs if we have to go up for more later. I think Jim Schlesinger's formula is a good one: $1.7 billion and $500 million in discretionary authority for the President. That will give us some real leverage on the negotiations.

Adm. Moorer: They may insist on a line-item treatment.

Mr. Rush: That's (Congressman) Passman.[5] He's the one who developed that $1.7 billion figure.

Secretary Kissinger: (to Mr. Clements) You should go ahead and have active talks with the Israelis. We shouldn't give them the sense that we are slowing down. By February we will be in a real brawl with the Israelis. I don't want to excite their supporters in this country in December when we have nothing on the table for them. I know that's a very cynical attitude.

Mr. Clements: We should consider what needs to be done currently. We're getting lists and conversation at the lower levels every day. Some of the things they want would really enhance their capability, but some of the things are marginal.

Secretary Kissinger: Let's give them the morale builders quickly.

Mr. Colby: (Defense Minister) Dayan wll be here next week.

Secretary Kissinger: Don't give anything to Dayan. He's moving to the right of the Prime Minister. If you're going to give them anything, give it to (Israeli Ambassador) Dinitz. Don't let Dayan come out of his talks here as a hero. In 1971 he was a dove; now he's a super-hawk.

Mr. Clements: It's a question of how much and when.

---

[5] Congressman Otto Passman (D–Louisiana).

Secretary Kissinger: Can you give us some options; various packages and the rate of delivery.

Mr. Clements: This has nothing to do with capability.

Secretary Kissinger: (Ambassador) Dinitz gave me a list, and it would be helpful to me if I could get him something from that list. I have no judgment at all about the items. I asked Brent (Scowcroft) to send the list to Defense; why don't you (Clements) get together with him and go through the list. I'll take the credit with Dinitz for springing some things, but you (Clements) should be the one to give him the particular items. This was a special request from the Prime Minister. I have said that I would look at the list, and now I will say that you (Clements) have the action.

Mr. Clements: We've been playing this very close hold. We have not been responsive to their lists at all.

Mr. Colby: (to Secretary Kissinger) Bill (Clements) has really been very good on this.

Secretary Kissinger: I know; he has got us exactly what we wanted. We wanted Golda (Prime Minister Meir) to come to the President.

Adm. Moorer: In the matter of tonnage, the Syrians and Egyptians lost, either destroyed or captured, more than the Israelis did, so the balance now is a little more in favor of the Israelis. We counted 873 Egyptian tanks and 659 Israeli tanks in the Suez. The Israelis began with around 1500 tanks and they lost some 900.

(The discussion of the Middle East ended, and the meeting turned to the Indochina topic, which is covered in a separate set of minutes.)

365. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders of the National Security Council Staff to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, November 30, 1973.

SUBJECT

Our Position on Egypt–Israel Disengagement Talks—A Further Elaboration

Sadat and Fahmi are again pressing for disengagement before the peace conference. Fahmi's strong message today[2] reopens the possibility of an Egyptian appeal for US–Soviet intervention to guarantee implementation of Security Council Resolution 338. Egyptian forces are in a high state of alert and there are reports that hostilities will be resumed in the next few days.

The US position has been that lack of progress in the Egypt–Israel disengagement talks should not become an impediment to the opening of the peace conference in December—and indeed, that disengagement should be the first issue on the agenda.

Our strategy has been based on: (1) the desirability of an early agreement to establish momentum at the peace conference and (2) the desirability of having the US be instrumental in closing the gap.

However, one thing the US does not have an interest in doing is pouring cold water on any agreement that Egyptians and Israelis could move toward themselves. Although Egypt and Israel are not close to agreement, the gap between their two positions is far narrower than might have been predicted a couple of weeks ago. How narrow depends on whether the Israelis have deliberately pulled back at our suggestion or whether Yariv got ahead of his instructions. Still, the questions are how we pursue our strategy without getting in the way of self-generated progress and whether there is a way to achieve our purposes while still giving Sadat a sense of movement.

In this situation, I wonder whether it would not be advisable to take a more active role now while still reserving final agreement for your trip and the peace conference. You might elaborate your present position as follows:

—We will naturally welcome any progress that the Egyptians and Israelis can make in narrowing the gap between them on a disengage-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt, Vol. VIII, November 1–December 31, 1973. Secret; Nodis; Outside System. Sent for action.

[2] The message of November 29 is in telegram 3720 from Cairo, November 30. (Ibid., Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov.–Dec. 31, 1973)

ment agreement. We will be glad to see what we can do with the Israelis now, although as we have said it is very difficult for us to play a role where we have no framework for our participation.

—In any case, we would suggest that both sides consider the advantages to them of putting any final agreement that may be possible into the context of the peace conference. This would permit immediate establishment of an aura of effectiveness and achievement at the conference that could work to everyone's benefit as the conference proceeds.

If we were to take this line, then we would be supporting just enough progress to keep the talks alive, to reduce frustration and perhaps even to be useful in reaching final agreement. At the same time, by talking with the Israelis, we could reserve the opportunity for ourselves at the beginning of the conference—or perhaps even in connection with your trip—to take credit for the final closing of the gap.

The alternative, of course, is to stand fast and make the Egyptians choose between our way of doing things and a policy of disruptive brinksmanship. If this were the choice, a firm message would be in order pointing out that it will undercut everything that has been achieved if they follow through on their threat. The attached would keep to our line but with a little greater show of activity in response.

Recommendation: That you consider the attached oral message[3] to Fahmi as a follow-on to the one sent earlier today.[4]

[3] Attached, but not printed.

[4] The earlier oral message was sent in telegram 234899 to Cairo, November 30. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov.–Dec. 31, 1973) There is no indication on the memorandum if Kissinger acted on the recommendation, but see footnote 2, Document 369.

366. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders and William B. Quandt of the National Security Council Staff to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, November 30, 1973.

SUBJECT

Allon and Eban on Prospects for Peace

In recent days both Deputy Prime Minister Allon and Foreign Minister Eban have spoken out publicly on peace and the need for policy rethinking within Israel. If you have not already seen the attached cables,[2] you may want to read them.

Beyond noting these remarks by two influential Israeli leaders, however, you may find it useful, particularly in your contacts with Congress, to be able to cite *Israelis* on the need for Israeli flexibility and the inability to achieve security through territorial acquisition.

The following points are the most useful in this regard:

Allon:

—Israel regards peace as a concrete objective. . . . All alternatives must be explored. Israel must do everything possible to make this the last war.

—With the disengagement of forces, it is not Israel's intention to create a new status quo. Israel does not insist on geographic symmetry as far as the separation of forces is concerned, but does require "strategic symmetry."

—"In view of the possibility of demilitarized zones, I would prefer minor border changes."

—He attacked extremist territorial demands by Israelis (e.g. Galili), which have created the image of Israeli intransigence compared to Arab moderation.

Eban:

—Israel must undertake a far-reaching conceptual reassessment. The results of the 1967 war did not reflect the real military balance between Israel and the Arabs.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1179, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, November 28, 1973 thru Nov. 30, 1973 [1 of 3]. Confidential. Sent for action.

[2] Telegrams 9553 and 9610 from Tel Aviv; attached, but not printed.

—Before the war, the Israeli doctrine based on absolute confidence caused a national style and rhetoric that was excessively strident, leading to maximalist statements.

—Borders are only one of the conditions of security. An integral security doctrine must include such elements as the balance of forces, vigilance, organization, economic productivity, *and ability to draw strength from external connections.* Without these, Israeli security would be undermined, regardless of boundaries.

—Israeli policy should be aimed at making the Arabs not only unable, but also unwilling, to fight Israel again. This requires a degree of restraint on Israel's part.

—Israelis have lived with numerous illusions: that the ceasefire could last indefinitely in a diplomatic vacuum; that one million Arabs could be kept under Israeli control indefinitely provided that their economic and social welfare was impressively advanced; that Zionism forbids sharing of national sovereignty within the former Palestine mandate area; that Israel must demonstrate its toughness in every contingency to be seen as strong.

—Strategic depth, which is necessary, need not always be achieved by territorial change.

—The peace conference must be approached as an opportunity and not only as a danger.

Recommendation: That you may find it useful to draw on these points in talks with Congressional leaders. If you approve, we could also provide this information to others who deal with Congress for their guidance (Laird, Timmons, etc.)

Agree. Do memo covering these points that can be provided to others on FYI basis.

I will use this in my own way.[3]

[3] Kissinger checked this option.

367. Telegram From the Department of State to the Mission to the United Nations[1]

Washington, December 1, 1973, 0158Z.

236005. Subject: US/USSR Consultations on Convening of ME Peace Conference.

1. We agree that it would be desirable to give Waldheim a status report on where matters stand with respect to U.S./USSR consultations on the question of convening a peace conference. You may inform Waldheim of the following:

2. Since Secretary's conversation with SYG,[2] U.S. and USSR have continued their consultations with the principal parties concerned. We cannot report formal approval as yet since a number of the details are still being worked out. We do have an agreement in principle to attend the conference from the Israelis and the Jordanians, and we expect, now that the Arab summit is over, positive formal replies at an early date from both Egypt and Syria. However, there are still a number of details to be worked out. Our target is early next week for an announcement on the convening of the conference in mid-December, probably December 18 in Geneva.

3. As to the United Nations' role, which concerns Waldheim, as indicated by the Secretary both we and the Soviet Union favor UN involvement. You can tell him we are focussing on this question further, and do not exclude the possibility of the chairmanship for the SYG. We have been using our influence with the Soviets in this direction.

Rush

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1179, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, December 1, 1973 thru December 5, 1973, [2 of 2]. Secret; Immediate; Nodis. Drafted by Sisco, cleared by Pickering and Popper, approved by Kissinger.

[2] Kissinger met with Waldheim in New York on November 23.

368. Telegram From the Embassy in Israel to the Department of State[1]

Tel Aviv, December 1, 1973, 1432Z.

9700. Subject: Middle East Talks.

Summary: At request of PriMin Meir, FonMin Abba Eban expressed to me today serious concern over "explosive" situation existing between Egypt and Israel as result of GOE insisting disengagement be settled in KM 101 forum prior to opening of peace conf, GOE breaking off KM 101 talks, Egyptian threatening order of battle, and GOE intention stop Israeli ship from transitting BAM. He stated Israel is prepared for worst but wants to avoid break-down of cease-fire and will not take initiative to upset it. Eban, recalling his conversation with Secretary in Washington,[2] requested that U.S. take urgent action with GOE, UN and others as appropriate to "hold the line" on cease-fire, to avoid a return to the polemics of the Security Council and to keep momentum going towards opening of peace conference as scheduled. End summary.

1. At FonMin Eban's request I met with him today at 11:00 local at his home in Herzliya. Also present were Evron (MFA), Gen Yariv, DCM and DATT.

2. Eban opened conversation by stating PriMin Meir had asked him to review with me very serious situation which had developed as result of various Egyptian attitudes and actions which threaten to lead to destruction of cease-fire and resumption of large-scale hostilities. Yariv interjected that info lead Israelis to believe such a move could be taken Dec 5 or Dec 6. Eban stated that he had just been informed that Egyptians were planning to prevent ship from Eilat from transitting BAM. This made conversation even more urgent and situation could only be described as "explosive."

3. At Eban's request, Yariv reviewed latest meeting with Gamasy at KM 101.[3] Yariv said that in private conversation he told Gamasy that maintenance of cease-fire (in land, sea and air) linked to continuing supply for Suez City and 3rd Army. Yariv said he made no threats, just a flat statement. In reply, Gamasy never suggested that the cease-fire might not hold at BAM. Gamasy said he believed Yariv's statements that Israel wanted peace, not resumption of hostilities, and Gamasy said he had communicated this to Sadat. In same conversation, Yariv

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, December 1–31, 1973. Secret; Flash; Nodis. Received at 1731Z.

[2] See footnote 4, Document 350.

[3] See footnote 2, Document 364.

claims Gamasy agreed, despite lack of progress on disengagement, to meet again on Sunday,[4] only to change his mind once he returned to tent, obviously as result of being reminded of his instructions to break off talks.

4. Eban then read excerpts from telegram just received from Israeli Mission in UN re the Egyptian memo sent to Waldheim on November 30,[5] noting following points:

A. GOE decided to end all "military contacts" at KM 101.
B. "It clear" from GOE and Siilasvuo contacts with Israelis that GOI used talks only to get back POWs, and stalling on question of disengagement.
C. GOE regards 6 points as inseparable package, Israel cannot choose which points to implement and ignore other.
D. Question of disengagement is military matter and must be resolved before parties can meet in Geneva peace conference to discuss broader political matters.

5. Eban then passed on report received from Tekoah re Siilasvuo conversation with Egyptian warning Ismael along lines USUN 5260.[6] He confirmed Siislasvuo would see Dayan tomorrow in Jerusalem, and noted as a glimmer of hope Ismael's reported willingness to wait for results of this conversation before definitely shutting off KM 101 talks.

6. Eban noted that, if asked 24 hours ago to give assessment of Egyptian policy, he would have said GOE wanted to go to Geneva, to negotiate in good faith. After series of recent developments (and he repeated concern about BAM) GOI is uncertain as to what Egyptians really want and what they intend to do.

7. Eban reviewed his conversations in Washington with Secretary, noting GOI had complied with Secy request that discussions on disengagement be postponed to Geneva. In so doing, GOI had also relied on Secy belief he could "hold the line" on the ceasefire and also avoid a return to the Security Council in the period before the opening of the conf. Israel urgently requests the Secretary's appraisal of the U.S. ability to deliver in view of the latest developments, which indicate a change in Egyptian policy. He asked that the U.S. take action with the Egyptians, UN and others (presumably the USSR) as appropriate in

---

[4] December 2.

[5] The Egyptian démarche was in the form of a message from Foreign Minister Fahmi to Waldheim. The text is in telegram 5280 from USUN, December 1. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

[6] Telegram 5260 from USUN, November 30, reported a conversation between Egyptian War Minister Ismael and General Siilasvuo, in which Ismael charged that Israel never intended to reach an agreement in the KM 101 talks. Ismael wanted to hear Dayan's comments before Egypt would consider resuming the talks. (Ibid.)

order to avoid a breakdown in the ceasefire and to continue the momentum towards Geneva.

8. Eban also noted that GOI was upset that Egyptians and UN were charging Israel with reneging on promises to negotiate in good faith at KM 101 talks with widespread press play. This not true and Israel now had to take some "steps" with press to correct this impression. He added it would be useful if U.S. could aid GOI in this effort to set record straight.

9. In our discussions with the Egyptians, Eban asked that we emphasize that Israel does not want war. In view of latest indications re Egyptian readiness to renew hostilities, however, Israel has to be and is prepared for war if necessary. Eban reminded me that Israel's original interest had been seriously to discuss disengagement at KM 101; if this is what is required to get the peace express back on the tracks, Israel, of course, would be willing again to engage the Egyptians in such discussions in this forum.

Comment: I assume we either are already or will soon be engaging in discussions with the Egyptians and others along the lines requested by the Israelis.[7] Their concern appears genuine and I hope we can respond to them as soon as possible. An immediate problem is that of the ship due to transit the BAM (I assume this is the *Beer Sheva,* State 233439)[8] noon tomorrow, Dec 2. If this problem can be resolved the Israelis might be willing to give the GOE a bit more benefit of doubt re possible military intentions.[9]

Keating

---

[7] In telegram 236858 to Cairo, December 4 Kissinger sent a message to Fahmi urging that the Egyptian military representative return to the Kilometer 101 talks and promising that he would speak to the Israelis "about returning to the talks and proceeding in a businesslike way." (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov. 73–Dec. 31, 1973)

[8] Not found.

[9] In telegram 236152 to Tel Aviv, December 1, Kissinger instructed Keating to assure Eban that he was sparing no effort with the Egyptians regarding staying on course for the peace conference and maintaining the cease-fire, including urging noninterference with Israeli shipping through Bab al-Mandab. He added that he hoped that Israel, in correcting false impressions in the press regarding whether Israel was negotiating in good faith, would avoid doing this in a provocative manner. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 611, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 13, Nov. 73–Dec. 73)

369. Telegram From the Department of State to the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo[1]

Washington, December 1, 1973, 0503Z.

236062. Subj: Letter From the President to President Sadat. For Ambassador from Secretary.

1. Please deliver following message from the President to President Sadat:

2. *Begin text.* Dear President Sadat: I have been following closely developments in the area and your role of leadership during these crucial days. I know that you have just returned from a very important meeting with your Arab colleagues, the results of which, I believe, reflect the hope and the desire of the overwhelming majority of the Arab world—indeed people from all corners of the earth—for a just and durable peace in the Middle East based on Security Council Resolution 242.

3. We are at an important stage, Mr. President, and I hope all of us have the wisdom and the courage, despite difficulties, to stay on the course charted by you and Secretary Kissinger recently in Cairo.

4. We agree that the six-point agreement is a package. We do not believe that certain elements can be implemented and others left to languish indefinitely. However, the disengagement proposals which Egyptian and Israeli military representatives have been discussing in recent weeks are far-reaching. This is the reason we have felt, and have said honestly to you, that final agreement was probably not possible before the peace conference. I can assure you, however, that in our view the groundwork laid in the military representatives' talks has not been in vain. We will make every effort to ensure that the ideas on disengagement discussed in that forum will be carried over for consideration at the Geneva conference.

5. I want to reenforce what Secretary Kissinger has conveyed to your government. To retreat now on the understanding reached in easing the blockade of the Red Sea and to permit your disappointment over the lack of progress in the Kilometer 101 talks to divert us from opening the peace conference on the 18th of December would be a major set-back with incalculable consequences. Moreover, Mr. President, with all due respect, asking the United States and the Soviet

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt, Vol. VIII, November 1–December 31, 1973. Secret; Immediate; Cherokee; Nodis; Niact. Drafted by Sisco, cleared by Eagleburger, and approved by Pickering. Repeated Immediate to USUN as Tosec 7.

Union to come into the area to guarantee the implementation of the Security Council resolution would be an ever more grave step, a step which would not serve either the interests of your country or of world peace generally.[2]

6. Secretary Kissinger will be writing in more detail to Foreign Minister Fahmi. I just want to leave you with one concluding thought. I am committed to a major effort to achieve a durable and just peace in the Middle East. There will be disappointments on the way. You and I know that the road will be difficult and arduous because there remains in the area deep mistrust and a lack of confidence. The Kilometer 101 talks are not the main arena. It is at the peace conference that the United States will be in a position to exercise our constructive influence towards peace based on Security Council Resolution 242.

7. As Secretary Kissinger has written to Mr. Fahmi,[3] the objective conditions today in which the conference will take place are better than at any other time in the history of this problem for achieving a just peace settlement in accordance with Resolution 242. It would be a tragedy if this opportunity were missed. A breakdown of the ceasefire would regrettably again force us into a situation of confrontation and that opportunity could be irretrievably destroyed.

8. I have asked Secretary Kissinger to undertake another trip to the area and to make Cairo his first stop. I hope that you will agree to receive him on December 13th or 14th, and that meanwhile restraint with respect to the ceasefire will be exercised by both sides, so that all aspects of the situation can be discussed in the spirit which prevailed in his first talk with you. We will of course similarly counsel restraint in our discussions with the Israelis. Sincerely, Richard Nixon. *End text.*

---

[2] In telegram 3737 from Cairo, December 1, Eilts reported that he had delivered to Sadat the President's letter and the Secretary's November 21 letter to Fahmi (see footnote 4, Document 347). Sadat said that he now wondered if he had done the right thing in accepting the six-point agreement. He warned that if there were no first phase disengagement, Fahmi would have to make an opening statement at the peace conference that negotiations were not possible until the cease-fire was fully honored and then walk out. Sadat said he needed U.S. help in achieving first phase disengagement in order to strengthen his position. Otherwise, he would have to call on the United States and Soviet Union as guarantors of the Security Council resolution to send forces. Eilts reported he had assured Sadat that the United States wanted to continue to work with him, and warned that an appeal to the Security Council for joint U.S.–Soviet action would set the peace process back. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, X, [Nov. 73–Dec. 31, 1973])

[3] The letter was sent in telegram 236061 to Cairo, December 1. (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt, Vol. VIII, November 1–December 31, 1973)

9. You may convey foregoing message through Foreign Minister Fahmi or in whatever other way you consider most appropriate and expeditious.

Rush

---

370. Telegram From the Embassy in Jordan to the Department of State[1]

Amman, December 1, 1973, 1700Z.

6361. Subj: Jordan's Participation in Middle East Peace Conference.

1. I asked PM Rifai this afternoon if, after discussions with returning Jordanian delegation to Arab summit conference, he could give me latest GOJ thinking on Geneva peace conference by elaborating on remarks made by King this morning (being reported septel)[2] during speech from throne at opening of Parliament.

2. Rifai said that secret resolutions on PLO adopted at Algiers conference were very dangerous. What in fact Arabs are asking Jordan to do is to try negotiate with Israel for return of West Bank and Arab Jerusalem, assume responsibility (and eventually all the blame) for whatever territorial concessions might be necessary to get Israel's acceptance, then turn over what might be truncated West Bank to PLO. This, he said, Jordan will not do.

3. GOJ is willing, in principle, to attend Geneva peace conference since it assumes PLO will not be invited to take part in first stages of negotiations. It will do so, however, only as part of an Arab delegation, including Egypt and Syria which will have to share responsibility for decisions reached at conference regarding West Bank and Jerusalem. Egypt, Syria and PLO will also have to agree to eventual plebiscite

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, X, November–December 1973. Secret; Immediate; Nodis; Cherokee. Received at 1746Z.

[2] Telegram 6362 from Amman, December 1, reported that the King's speech at the opening of Parliament had reiterated Jordanian policy pronouncements of the previous 10 days and had appealed for Arab support and a unified stand. Most significant was the indication that Hussein seemed to be seeking a face-saving formula so that Jordan could attend the peace conference, and that he was increasingly equivocal about his threat to boycott the conference over the Arab summit's decision to recognize the PLO as the sole representative of the Palestinian people. (Ibid., Box 1179, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, December 1, 1973 thru December 5, 1973)

under UN auspices to decide future status of West Bank. GOJ is willing to discuss these questions with Egypt and Syria, and even with PLO, prior to Geneva peace conference but it will not take initiative to begin such discussions.[3]

Graham

[3] A December 1 Intelligence Information Cable reported that Hussein was still very bitter about Jordan's treatment at the Arab summit, especially the decision to recognize the PLO. Hussein had said that until there was clarification of the summit decision on the PLO, Jordan would not commit itself to participating in the peace conference. The King appeared steadfast in his refusal to do any more for the Palestinians than he had already done, saying that the PLO could not have it both ways. If they were to be the sole representative of the Palestinian people, they could negotiate for the return of the territory. If he were to do so, the Palestinians could always blame him for the failure to get everything they wanted. (Ibid.)

371. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders and William B. Quandt of the National Security Council Staff to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, December 3, 1973.

SUBJECT

Egyptian and Israeli Positions in Km 101 Talks

Our information on the substance of the talks at Km 101 has been limited to Egyptian and UN sources, plus some press information from Israel. You may have heard more about the Israeli position from Ambassador Dinitz, but the picture we have from the available sources seems fairly consistent. In brief, the talks seem to have moved through the following stages:

—*November 22.* Yariv opened with a proposal that both parties pull back from territory gained in the war and that UNEF take over these areas. Gamasy countered with a suggestion that the Egyptian forces would stay in place and that the Israelis would withdraw to a line in the vicinity of the passes. He proposed zones for main forces, lightly armed screening forces, and a central area held by UNEF between the two

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov. 73–Dec. 31, 1973. Secret; Outside the System. Sent for information. Kissinger initialed the first page.

sides. Yariv responded with the idea that Israel would withdraw from the west bank provided that the Egyptian forces on the east bank were thinned out.

—*November 24.* Yariv said that the Egyptian forces could stay in Sinai provided that their armor was removed. In return, Israel would withdraw to a line west of the passes. Gamasy then introduced the idea of mutual reduction of armored strength.

—*November 26.* Yariv was still pressing the point that Egypt must reduce the level of armor on the east bank, *but stated that Israel was prepared to withdraw to a line east of the passes.* The talks ended with disagreement in the concept of mutual reductions in strength.

—*November 29.* Gamasy tried to press Yariv further on withdrawal and mutual reduction of forces, but found that Yariv was under instructions to go back to the original Israeli proposal that both sides withdraw from the territory gained in the war. This led to the breakdown of the talks and to Egyptian anger at what appeared to be Israeli stalling tactics. The Israelis apparently took the position that the talks were going well beyond the type of disengagement needed to stabilize the ceasefire and were beginning to deal with basic issues of a peace settlement.

On the basis of the positions put forward on November 26, the main areas of disagreement seem to have been:

—Egypt wants any thinning out of forces to be on a "comparable" basis.

—Egypt would like a clear idea of when a second stage of disengagement would begin.

—Israel wants to reduce the Egyptian forces on the east bank of the Canal to a token presence.

If talks are to resume at Km 101 prior to the Geneva peace conference, we should be able to encourage movement on the substance of a disengagement phase without losing the opportunity of appearing to produce an agreement at the conference itself. You could convey to both sides your hope that progress will continue in the direct talks, so that during your trip to the Middle East the final details could be worked out. Then, if agreement is in fact possible, both sides should agree to make this known during the opening sessions of the Geneva talks. This would help them get off to an impressive start.

The cables that best describe the positions taken in the talks are attached.[2]

---

[2] Telegram 5040 from USUN, November 23, and telegram 5090 from USUN, November 25, are attached but not printed. See, respectively, footnote 6, Document 361, and footnote 2, Document 358.

372. Special National Intelligence Estimate[1]

SNIE 30/3–73 Washington, December 5, 1973.

THE ARAB-ISRAELI SITUATION AND THE OIL CRISIS

Major Judgments

The ceasefire agreement between Egypt and Israel has taken some of the heat from the Middle East confrontation. The parties have accepted the principle of peace talks which at least hold out the prospect of basic change in the conflict. Highly contentious issues remain unresolved: principally the disengagement of forces and some important modalities of the peace conference—including representation issues. *While the parties recognize the need to begin the peace conference without delay, the negotiations will be long and difficult and an early breakthrough cannot be expected.*

Egypt knows what it wants from negotiations, and it wants it relatively quickly. President Sadat began the war to galvanize the Great Powers to impose a solution on Israel. While he will bargain over such matters as the phases of disengagement and the extent of demilitarized zones in the Sinai, *Sadat is determined to restore Egyptian sovereignty over the peninsula.* He feels he must make rapid progress toward a start of Israeli withdrawal to head off criticism.

In dealing with Israel, *Damascus will probably follow the Egyptian lead, lagging a few steps behind,* and taking a harder bargaining position. Yet if the Syrians are not satisfied, they may renew hostilities.

Serious peace talks raise extremely divisive questions within Israel. Territorial issues have always proved extraordinarily touchy matters for the Israeli body politic, and public opinion will find it especially hard to consider giving up the security that the Sinai, Golan Heights, and West Bank buffer zones provided. Moreover, in the context of the campaign for elections on 31 December 1973 Mrs. Meir's government feels particularly vulnerable to its political critics.

Substantive progress in negotiations is thus not likely at least until formation of a new government with a new mandate following the

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 362, Subject Files, National Intelligence Estimates, Part 6. Secret. The Central Intelligence Agency and the intelligence organizations of the Departments of State, Defense, the Treasury, and NSA participated in the preparation of the estimate. The Director of CIA submitted this estimate with the concurrence of all members of the United States Intelligence Board, except the representative of the FBI who abstained on the grounds that it was outside his jurisdiction.

elections. *Should Mrs. Meir's coalition lose its majority in the Knesset, Israel's terms for a peace settlement would harden.*

Both the Arabs and Israel look to the US as the key element in peace negotiations.

—The Arabs believe the US can force a total Israeli withdrawal, and they will grow increasingly impatient with Washington, and with the negotiating process, if movement toward this goal is not soon forthcoming.

—Israel still looks to the US to protect its interests and to serve as a counterweight to the USSR. But Israeli leaders cannot escape doubts about the reliability of Washington in light of the oil embargo, the strains in the European alliance, and the US–Soviet détente. Hence, *Tel Aviv is inclined to move as slowly as it can in the peace process without alienating Washington.*

Soviet actions reflect the depth of Moscow's commitment to preserving, and, if possible, extending its influence in the area.[2] The Soviets are determined to insist on being accorded a role as arbiter of developments in the Middle East. While much of their activity will be directed to demonstrating support to their Arab clients, their own particular goal will be to get a settlement which gains formal US acknowledgement of their role in the area.

If hostilities resume, Moscow would support the Arabs. *Should the Arabs face military disaster, the chances are that the Soviets would intervene in some fashion.*

The linking of Saudi oil to Egyptian military might has been one of the striking new elements in the current phase of the Arab-Israeli dispute. While there may be some flexibility in using oil as a weapon, the Arabs will demand progress including substantial Israeli withdrawals from occupied territory before ending the squeeze on oil supplies. King Faysal will concert his actions closely with those of his Arab partners, especially Egypt. Beside supporting Sadat, Faysal's religious convictions impel him to insist on some form of Arab control over the old city of Jerusalem.

The Palestinians also cannot be left out of the peace process. While Sadat and the leaders of other Arab states are not much swayed by Palestinian desires, *the fedayeen are likely to resort to terrorism in an effort to disrupt negotiations if they are ignored.*

Both Arabs and Israelis are at maximum alert. Already *eagerness to fight is spreading* among the troops of both camps, and *accidental fire-fights will become increasingly difficult to control.*

---

[2] For the reservation of the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, USAF, on this point, see footnote 2 on page 9. [Footnote in the original. That page of the SNIE is not printed here.]

Military action would not promise easy success for either side. Given the high state of alert, surprise attack is not possible. *Resumption of fighting would involve high casualties on both sides.*

Nonetheless, Arab impatience, Israel's inclination to delay, and the arms resupply increase the risk of renewed hostilities. Indeed, *if a peace conference does not soon promise significant results and the ceasefire threatens to freeze the situation on the ground in present positions, another round of war would be almost inevitable.*

[Omitted here is the body of the estimate.]

---

373. Letter From the Secretary of State Kissinger's Executive Assistant (Eagleburger) to the Soviet Ambassador (Dobrynin)[1]

Washington, December 5, 1973.

Dear Mr. Ambassador:

Attached are a copy of the Fahmi 6-point proposal[2] and the new draft of the letter to the Secretary General which Secretary Kissinger discussed with you on the telephone this evening.[3]

As the Secretary pointed out, our problems with the latest Fahmi proposal relate to two points:

—While we agree with the Egyptian view that the conference should have some endorsement of the Security Council, we are not in favor of a formal meeting of the Security Council to achieve this purpose.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 70, Country Files, Europe, Exchange of Notes Between Dobrynin and Kissinger, Vol. 8. No classification marking.

[2] Printed below. Telegram 3810 from Cairo, December 5, transmitted Fahmi's proposal to Washington. Eilts stated that the Foreign Minister had explained that these six principles should be the basis for convening the peace conference. (Ibid., NSC Files, Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov. 73–Dec. 31, 1973) In telegram 3828 from Cairo, December 6, the Ambassador noted that Fahmi had strongly implied that the revised language in paragraph 3 specifying that the Secretary General or his representative would participate in the conference and not just the opening phase was necessary because of Syria's insistence. (Ibid.)

[3] The letter is not attached and not found. Kissinger and Dobrynin discussed the Egyptian letter at 8:18 and 8:22 p.m. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 24)

—With regard to point 6, we have problems with the phrase "the timing of the participation . . .", and would prefer that the earlier formulation, "the question of the participation . . ." remained.

Sincerely,

Lawrence S. Eagleburger

Attachment

1. The United States and the Soviet Union will inform the United Nations Secretary General and others about the following modalities for the conference.

2. The United States and the Soviet Union will arrange for a meeting of the Security Council and they will declare that according to their understanding Egypt, Israel, Jordan and Syria have agreed to attend the peace conference.

3. The conference will be convened under the auspices of the United Nations with the participation of the Secretary General or his representative.

4. The conference will be under the co-chairmanship of the United States and the Soviet Union.

5. The conference will be convened on December 18, 1973, in Geneva. The opening sessions will be at the Foreign Minister's level.

6. The timing of the participation of the Palestinians and Lebanon will be discussed during the first stage of the conference.

---

374. Telegram From the Embassy in Jordan to the Department of State[1]

Amman, December 6, 1973, 1315Z.

6467. Subj: Hussein's Options.

1. There is no question in my mind that Jordan will be represented at opening session of Geneva peace conference but we should keep in mind that King Hussein, more than any other Arab leader, is faced with

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, X, November–December 1973. Secret; Immediate; Exdis. Repeated to Beirut, Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, Cairo, and Jidda.

a terrible dilemma with regard to future fate of Palestinians and may have to reconsider his position during course of conf. It is easy for Boumedienne or other Arab leaders whose territories are far from Israel to claim that Jordan has no occupied territory. Such leaders have obviously no direct interest in a settlement and some of them would not be unhappy if the Palestinians were to take over Jordan. For King Hussein, however, the problem is far more complex.

2. For the East Bankers and for the Hashemite regime, none of the solutions to the Palestinian problem now envisaged is likely to be satisfactory in the long run. A union of East Bank, West Bank and Gaza would mean a state composed of some 2.5 million Palestinians (assuming refugees in Lebanon and Syria would be transferred to this new state) as against 500,000 East Bankers. While some Palestinians now in Jordan will continue to support the Hashemite regime, the vast majority of Palestinians are likely to be indifferent at best to the fate of King Hussein. The King, if he can maintain the support and loyalty of the Jordan Arab Army which is overwhelmingly composed of East Bankers, could, in the short run, keep control of such a state but it is difficult to imagine that he could do so over a long period of time.

3. A confederation of Palestine and Jordan under the Hashemites, perhaps more loosely constituted than the proposed United Arab Kingdom, might make it possible for the East Bankers to maintain their identity, especially if the West Bank and Gaza were demilitarized. Since Palestinians most likely would continue to constitute a majority on the East Bank, Hussein's governing problems would remain difficult. However, the complex economic and familial ties linking the two banks would give such a confederation some chance for viability. The essential requirement would be for Hussein to give his Palestinian subjects true autonomy; a return to the heavy-handed governing methods used prior to June 1967 would be inconceivable. Post-Algiers realities do not favor this confederation solution. If Hussein were lucky enough to get it through default by the PLO and its proponents, prospects for Hashemite survival would be enhanced. This solution likewise would be optimal in terms of U.S. interests.

4. An independent Palestine would undoubtedly be an unstable nation dominated by radical elements and would be a thorn in the side of both Israel and Jordan. If this solution eventually prevails, East Bankers will probably insist on the expulsion of some 800,000 Palestinians now in Jordan or at least of all those who do not identify with the Hashemite regime. Where would these Palestinians go? The West Bank, not to mention Gaza, could not possibly absorb them. If they remained in Jordan, they would constitute an effective 5th column for the eventual takeover of Jordan by the Palestinians. For the majority of East Bankers, therefore, the only acceptable solution would be an independ-

ent Palestine either absorbing most of Palestinian refugees or making permanent arrangement with other Arab states to absorb a fixed quota of Palestinian refugees.

5. Keeping in mind that Jordan is the only Arab country which has done, and continues to do, a great deal for Palestinian refugees, the above analysis illustrates the dilemma in which King Hussein now finds himself.[2] Sadat is interested in getting back Sinai and then turning inward to tackle his domestic problems. Lebanon is interested only in getting rid of 250,000 Muslem Palestinian refugees, keeping Christian refugees in Lebanon in order to maintain religious balance. Syria wants Israel out of Golan Heights and also wants to get rid of its Palestinian refugees. We assume that these three confrontation states would be quite willing to achieve their objective at Jordan's expense even if it meant the downfall of the Hashemite regime.

6. On the basis of this analysis, we arrive at two main conclusions:

A) Whichever way we turn, we end up with some 1 million Palestinians too many who will have to be absorbed. While the Arabian Peninsula continues to offer some opportunities for emigration, the absorption problem centers on lands encompassed by pre-1967 Jordan. This fact coupled with Palestinian and external Arab opposition to his rule form the crux of Hussein's problem.

B) No matter what happens at the peace conference and after, the future of King Hussein and of the Hashemite regime is uncertain. The establishment of a loose confederation as described in para 3 above, however, would probably provide least objectionable solution for Hashemite as well as U.S. interests.

Graham

[2] On December 7, in a paper for Kissinger for inclusion in the President's Saturday Briefing, Quandt and Saunders discussed Hussein's dilemma in deciding whether or not to attend the peace conference, noting that he felt betrayed by Egypt and Syria because of the position they had taken at Algiers. They noted he would not decide on whether to send a delegation to Geneva until the Secretary's visit and if he did, it might be composed entirely of Palestinians. Prime Minister Rifai had said publicly that Jordan should take part in the peace conference only as part of a unified Arab delegation in which each party would have agreed on the role of the others and that there would be no partial settlements. The Prime Minister also said that Jordan had no objection to the PLO's participation in the conference, perhaps as part of the Jordanian delegation. (Ibid., NSC Files, Box 1296, Harold H. Saunders Files, Jordan, 9/1/73–12/31/73)

375. Memorandum for the Record

Washington, December 7, 1973, 10–10:50 a.m.

[Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Folder 3. Secret; Sensitive; Eyes Only. 6 pages not declassified.]

---

376. Memorandum From Harold H. Saunders of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

Washington, December 7, 1973.

SUBJECT

General Dayan's Main Points

You could inform Secretary Schlesinger that General Dayan made the following points in his conversation with Secretary Kissinger this morning:[2]

1. The Israelis have received from the US far less equipment since the war started than Egypt and Syria have received from the Soviets, other Communist countries and other Arab countries.[3]

—The Israelis estimate that, while Israel has received 90,000 tons by sea the Arabs have received 300,000 tons.

—Secretary Kissinger noted that our figures indicate that the US and USSR have sent just about the same amounts and those amounts by our calculations are slightly over 100,000 tons. He asked Israeli and

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 611, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 13, Nov. 73–Dec. 73. Secret; Nodis. Sent for action.

[2] A memorandum of conversation recording this meeting is ibid., RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, DEF 12–5 ISR. The meeting took place at noon in the Secretary's office at the Department of State. Dayan also met with Helms on December 7 and made similar points. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, December 1–31, 1973)

[3] CIA Intelligence Report ER IR 73–24, December 1973, entitled "Soviet Military Resupply Activities in the Middle East," provided policymakers with an estimate of the Soviet resupply effort since the outbreak of fighting on October 6. The paper is in the CIA Freedom of Information Electronic Reading Room.

US intelligence people to get together to understand the wide discrepancy between US figures and Israeli figures.

2. One thing that is new is the extensive involvement of Communist countries other than the USSR—Cubans, North Koreans, perhaps North Vietnamese, not to mention the Pakistanis.

3. Israel is disillusioned that it cannot get from the US more than 200 tanks and 150 APCs. Whether additional equipment is available or not, Israel would like to place orders now so that the equipment will at least be in prospect.

4. If the US is counting captured Soviet equipment as a useful part of the Israeli inventory, that is a mistake.

5. Stand-off equipment is of highest priority. No one item will provide the whole solution. Some combination of items is necessary.

6. If the Israelis pull back from the Canal, Israel would prefer that neither the US nor the Soviets be present, but if the Soviets are to have forces in the area, the US must be present also.

Secretary Kissinger made the following comments on some of the equipment which General Dayan had mentioned:

1. We could give Israel 150 more tanks.

2. We just do not have the quantity of TOW missiles that Israel has asked for.

3. The only way we can provide additional APCs is to take them off the production line and away from our reserve forces.

4. On rifles we could provide 40,000 now and another 40,000 out of new production.

5. On ammunition, we will provide 140,000 rounds of 155 anti-tank ammunition. On 175 and 105 ammunition, there is some 175 in Europe which we will provide. The remainder will have to come out of production.

The Israelis are interested in some jamming equipment for use on the Egyptian and Syrian fronts. The Israelis were unclear themselves on what they wanted but seemed to have an idea from General Casey that some equipment useful against the SAMs is available here.

377. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and United Nations Secretary General Waldheim[1]

December 7, 1973, 4:19 p.m.

K: I didn't get the message yesterday that you had called and I am sorry I did not return your call.

W: That's ok. I was informed by the major belligerent of the text of the draft agreement[2] and I have to feel that—

K: Wait, there is no draft agreement. We are discussing it with them.

W: I thought I should mention it to you and it was an Egyptian source. Today they requested a meeting with me . . . and I wanted to check with you.

K: I don't know what version they have shown you.

W: The text that says the conference will start on the 18th in Geneva then that two parties are seeking the Security Council to—

K: No. We disagree with that. We do [not?] think there should be a Security Council meeting . . . it should be done on a consensus basis.

W: The non-aligned, and this is the other aspect, has had a meeting this morning and has prepared a draft text of Security Council resolution which will take . . . and then express hope that the Secretary General will play a useful role in the conference and so on. This is something they discussed this morning. I got the text confidentially and I thought it was important for you to know that they are working on this. They are _____ that they have nothing til now and in the afternoon at 5:00 they are coming to see me, the Chinese are coming to see me this morning and they are worried about the fact that the Council has not heard anything further and that the Council will not have enough time to study the matter.

K: In what way can the Council study the matter, it won't be the first time in history.

W: All in all they are really ready to cooperate and they are worried that they will be confronted at the last minute to take steps and they want to have enough time to develop the matter and give me a blanket message. They understand that it is in interest of cause to give

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 24. No classification marking. Blank underscores indicate omissions in the original. Kissinger was in Washington; Waldheim was in New York.

[2] See the attachment to Document 373.

the Secretary General a blanket good will message and to leave it to him. That is the best.

K: The difficulty is there isn't any agreed text and you have been shown an Egyptian proposal. We haven't accepted it.

W: I see. It says a co-sponsorship under the auspices of the US and USSR and they gave me the impression that this is an agreed text.

K: That is not my impression.

W: I thought it important to tell you this and it is interesting to know the feeling in the Council. I just had a talk with Ceausescu and he expressed role of the UN.

K: Their solicitude is touching but they haven't expressed it before.

W: The members of the Council, not only the non-aligned, they want to _____ that it is called under UN auspices but that we just offer a roof.

K: What the French and British want is to be involved with no responsibilities.

W: I am glad you are clarifying the situation to me. What they said is they are afraid you will give us this information and they . . .

K: That is not the intention. Thank you for being so meticulous in keeping me informed. I will let you know as soon as I have some more information.

W: May I say that—

K: Mr. Secretary General I am surrounded by a bunch of busy bodies. There is no agreement. They are trying to protect me. If I come I will come for two days.

W: I did instruct my man in Geneva that he can take the necessary measures for having the meeting at the UN but he can't say this has been decided.

K: That is correct.

W: Well, thank you for calling back and I wish you a successful visit.

378. Telegram From the Department of State to the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo[1]

Washington, December 8, 1973, 2037Z.

240917. Subject: Ghorbal Discussion With Secretary on Middle East.

1. Newly-arrived Egyptian Ambassador-designate Ghorbal paid initial 75-minute call on Secretary Dec 7.[2]

2. After welcoming Ghorbal warmly, Secretary opened conversation by saying he had kept his promise to President Sadat and had made good progress in trying to shape public and Congressional opinion toward support for a peace settlement. Once peace conference opened in Geneva we expected to see substantial progress. Secretary referred to process of ironing out of details of modalities such as letter to SYG, saying he hoped these would not impede convening of the conference. Brief discussion ensued on efforts to resolve textual differences in letter to SYG (Ghorbal had apparently not been informed of latest exchanges).

3. Ghorbal said he had message to convey from President Sadat prior to Secretary's departure from Washington. Following President's meeting with Ambassador Eilts,[3] Ghorbal had found Sadat "quite disturbed" because of Israeli intransigence and the feeling that U.S. was not putting sufficient weight behind getting Israelis to implement para B of six-point agreement. Ambassador Eilts had raised factor of Israeli elections and Sadat had answered that he too had serious political problems, even mentioning fact that Soviets have protested recently enhanced U.S.-Egyptian relations.

4. In consequence, said Ghorbal, Sadat feels that real building up of confidence which had taken place between Secretary and him is now being jeopardized by Israeli tactics. Indeed this poisoning of incipient improvement in U.S-Arab relations had always been Israel's objective. Ghorbal said Sadat feels disengagement was Secretary's idea; he bought it, but now he fails to see any follow-through, and he is beginning to wonder what he got into. In brief, said Ghorbal, he felt he owed it to Secretary to say that real problem was shaping up in terms of ero-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov.–Dec. 31, 1973. Secret; Nodis; Cherokee. Drafted by Sterner, approved by Kissinger.

[2] A memorandum of conversation recording this meeting is ibid., NSC Files, Box 1027, Presidential/HAK Memcons, HAK & Presidential, December 1973 [2 of 2].

[3] See footnote 2, Document 369.

sion of credibility which Secretary had so successfully established during his trip in November.

5. Ghorbal referred to significant concessions Sadat had already made under six-point agreement: POW exchange (which Ghorbal said had been most difficult decision) and Bab al-Mandeb. Sadat had not been afraid to make these concessions any more than he had been afraid to go to war when that was necessary. Ghorbal said that what was now needed was an "initial phase" of disengagement prior to convening of peace conference because such a step would materially improve atmosphere for conference itself.

6. Secretary said he appreciated Ambassador's candor and hoped that Ambassador also appreciated fact that, during many years they had known each other, Secretary had always been candid about what was possible and what was not possible. When he was in Cairo he had explained to President Sadat that he needed time to prepare public opinion for the steps that would be necessary to reach a peace settlement. Secretary said in intervening month he had worked hard on this and felt he had made substantial progress. He thought there was growing segment of opinion—including within American Jewish community—for kind of substantial disengagement plan that Secretary had talked about with Egyptians. He had also worked hard to get Israelis to accept this concept. There was already some sign that these efforts were bearing fruit in General Yariv's proposals, even though Israelis had had to pull back because of domestic political problems.

7. Secretary said that what might look like slow procedure to President Sadat was necessary in terms of our own political process and would actually lead to faster results. If moves were made prematurely which led to explosion of public opinion against them everything would be wrecked. All he could say to President Sadat was that within measurable period of time after peace conference convened—Secretary said he would be prepared to discuss time frame more precisely when he got to Cairo—we would achieve kind of disengagement plan that would make whole question of October 22 lines irrelevant. Secretary had told Sadat this in November;[4] he was saying it again now; and Ambassador would see that this was in fact what happened.

8. Ghorbal said he would faithfully report these assurances, and then reverted to idea that some initial measure of withdrawal might be accomplished prior to peace conference. Perhaps something "symbolic" was possible. Secretary said he was giving most careful thought to this possibility and might have something to raise with President

[4] See Document 324.

Sadat when he got to Cairo. He did not wish to leave Ambassador with impression that he was promising anything, however.

9. Ghorbal asked about military assistance to Israel. Secretary responded that regular supplies were continuing. Ghorbal noted that, whereas resupply airlift had stopped, deliveries were continuing by sea. Secretary acknowledged this but said that our information was that what we were sending to Israel was less than what was going to Arabs. Secretary said this, however, was no longer the issue. As result of October fighting Israelis now knew how dependent they were on U.S. This fact had changed perceptions in Israel.

10. In response to Ghorbal question about Dayan call on Secretary,[5] Secretary said two main issues had been discussed. First was that Dayan felt U.S. was not being liberal enough in its arms supply to Israel; secondly, two had spent a lot of time discussing what Secretary feels needs to be done in terms of solid progress toward a peace settlement.

11. In summary, Secretary asked Ambassador Ghorbal to tell President Sadat that we continued to attach greatest importance to our relations with Egypt, that we felt that Sadat had taken a courageous step in agreeing to six points and implementing them, that we understood his concern that insufficient progress had been made to date toward goals we had mutually discussed, and that Secretary was asking for matter of weeks to show that these results could and would be achieved.

Rush

[5] See Document 376.

379. Telegram From the Embassy in Jordan to the Department of State[1]

Amman, December 8, 1973, 1520Z.

6510. Subject: King's Comments on Geneva Conference. Ref: State 240807.[2]

1. I delivered Secretary's message to King at noon Dec 8. He studied it with great care, reread it, and finally said that he was most appreciative of thoughts it contained. I have impression that, as far as King is concerned, Secretary's message went a long way to alleviate uneasiness mentioned para 3 my tel 6468.[3]

2. In ensuing conversation, King seemed in mood to share some of his current worries. He repeated much of what he had said publicly at opening of Parliament December 1 and what PM Rifai had told me privately last week (my tel 6361).[4] He said Jordan would "of course" attend Geneva peace conference and preparation of position papers for Jordanian delegation was now in full swing. He emphasized that negotiations in Geneva would obviously entail much "give and take" and he did not want Jordan to be held responsible for the "give" while "the others" (presumably Egypt, Syria and the PLO) were given credit for the "take". It was essential, he said, that Egypt and Syria be fully associated with all decisions reached in Geneva with regard to West Bank, and that Palestinians be given a chance to determine freely their own future. If necessary, PLO reps could be included in Jordanian delegation but he could not accept view that PLO was spokesman for all Palestinians.

3. With regard to clarifications which he had said publicly he was awaiting on Arab summit conference decisions, King said his past experience with his Arab colleagues led him to believe that he should not appear to be too eager to seek such clarifications. He had just sent Ab al-Munim Rifai to sound out Sadat, however, and would await result of

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, IX, January–October 1973. Secret; Immediate; Nodis; Cherokee.

[2] Telegram 240807 to Amman, December 8, transmitted a letter from Kissinger to Hussein responding to the King's message sent in telegram 6464, December 6. (Ibid.) The Secretary apologized that he would not be in Washington when General Bin Shaker arrived, but assured the King that he was fully aware of the scope of the challenges Jordan faced and the importance of maintaining its military strength. Kissinger wrote that he was also fully conscious of the important role Jordan had been playing in the search for peace in the Middle East. Thus, the United States would do its best, within the limits set by Congress, to assist Jordan in meeting its defense needs. (Ibid.)

[3] Dated December 6. (Ibid.)

[4] Document 370.

this sounding before approaching Syria and perhaps PLO. He said he realized that these problems had to be sorted out by Arabs themselves, but he hoped Secretary, during his forthcoming tour of Middle East countries, might be able to help in bringing Syria and Egypt closer to Jordanian position.

Graham

---

380. Telegram From the Department of State to Secretary of State Kissinger in Brussels[1]

Washington, December 9, 1973, 0601Z.

Tosec 18/240937. Subject: Middle East Negotiations. Reference: Secto two.[2] For the Secretary From Sisco.

1. I have been in touch with Scowcroft persuant to your instructions in Secto two. He has already reported to you by cable with the results of his conversation with Dobrynin indicating to him that we are prepared to give on UN auspices but not on the Palestinian "timing" issue.[3] In order to assure that we instruct Eilts precisely of what you have in mind, here is the telegram that I would propose to send to Eilts.

2. For Ambassador Eilts from the Secretary.

Scowcroft has talked to Dobrynin and has informed the Soviets that we can move on UN auspices, in response to Fahmy's views,

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt, Vol. VIII, November 1–December 31, 1973. Secret; Immediate; Nodis; Cherokee. Drafted and approved by Sisco. Repeated Niact Immediate to Cairo. Kissinger was in Brussels December 8–11 attending the NATO Ministerial meeting.

[2] In telegram Secto 2/3190 from USNATO, December 8, Kissinger informed Sisco that he was prepared to give in on UN auspices, which were largely cosmetic, but would not agree to any movement on the Palestinian "timing" issue, that is, the question of when the Palestinians would join the conference, adding that if that remained a sine qua non for Egyptian participation, there would be no conference. The Secretary noted that he had instructed Scowcroft to talk to Dobrynin along these lines. (Ibid., NSC Files, Box 1179, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, December 6, 1973 thru Dec. 12, 1973 [2 of 3])

[3] In telegram Tohak 6/WH37487, December 9, Scowcroft reported to Kissinger that as instructed he had just met with Dobrynin, who said that he had already discussed both the UN auspices and the "timing" issues with the Secretary and had communicated with Moscow. Scowcroft had reiterated the danger of a complete road block, which the "timing" issue posed for the conference. (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe and Mideast, TOHAK 1–75, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

which is consistent with our agreement. Scowcroft has also informed Dobrynin that insistence on changing positions regarding point six relating to Palestinian issue is not sustainable in Israel.

3. You should see Fahmy immediately and tell him that we are prepared to meet his view on the question of UN auspices, but insist that he hold to the understanding on the question of Palestinian representation that was reached between the Secretary and Fahmy in Cairo talks.[4] You should explain to Fahmy that changing positions on point six is not sustainable in Israel. We therefore suggest very strongly immediate Egyptian agreement to following revised letter.

"Dear Mr. Secretary General:

"On October 22, 1973, the Security Council adopted Resolution 338, jointly sponsored by the United States and the Soviet Union which calls for negotiations to start between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices, aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East. The United States and the Soviet Union have now been informed by the parties concerned of their readiness to participate in the peace conference under the auspices of the United Nations.

"It is our understanding that Egypt, Israel, Jordan and Syria have agreed to participate from the outset in the conference which would begin in Geneva on December 18. The parties have agreed that the conference should be under the co-chairmanship of the United States and the Soviet Union. The parties have also agreed that the question of the participation of the Palestinians and Lebanon will be discussed during the first stage of the conference.

"It is our hope that you will find it possible to participate in the opening phase of the conference at which it is expected that the governments concerned will be represented by their respective Foreign Ministers and later by their specially appointed representative with Ambassadorial rank. We also hope that you can make available a representative who would keep you fully informed as the conference proceeds. Finally, we would also appreciate it if the United Nations could make appropriate arrangements for the necessary conference facilities.

"We request that you circulate this letter to members of the Security Council for their information. We believe it would be appropriate for the President of the Security Council to consult informally with the membership with a view to securing a favorable consensus of the Council."

End text.

[4] See Document 330.

4. Eilts is also authorized, regardless of Fahmy's initial reaction, to agree to added formulation contained in State 239993.[5]

5. I am repeating this internal telegram to Cairo for information. If you agree with the recommendation, please send a go ahead to Cairo, with an information copy to me at the Department. In the meantime, Eilts should take no action whatsoever.[6]

Rush

[5] In telegram Secto 7/3195, December 9, Kissinger informed Scowcroft that he approved the actions proposed in paragraphs 3 and 4. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1179, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, December 6, 1973 thru Dec. 12, 1973 [2 of 3]) In telegram 239993 to Cairo, December 7, Kissinger told Eilts that if Fahmi raised the point that the draft letter to the Secretary General made no direct reference to the conference being under UN auspices, the Ambassador was authorized to suggest the following alternative language, which would become the penultimate paragraph: "If as we hope you will find it possible to participate, as co-chairmen the U.S. and the Soviet Union would appreciate it if you would agree to serve as convener of the conference and preside in the opening phase." The Secretary added that his own preference was for the draft as it stood, but that he had provided this additional paragraph in case Fahmi had any problem with the "auspices" issue. (Ibid.)

[6] In telegram 3870 from Cairo, December 9, Eilts reported that when he delivered the revised draft letter, Fahmi had "exploded." Fahmi charged that once again the United States was deferring to the Israelis, while also giving them $3 billion for weapons to kill Arabs. Fahmi said he was skeptical that the conference would even take place, and insisted that confining its first phase to initial disengagement was not enough. He warned that unless "large or medium scale disengagement" was agreed upon and finalized in the upcoming Geneva talks, Egypt would not go back to the conference. Eilts reported that he had pointed out that all he was asking was Egypt's expeditious concurrence in a revised letter containing language that Fahmi himself had earlier accepted as satisfactory. The Foreign Minister agreed "wearily" to submit the letter to Sadat and the Syrians for approval. (Ibid., Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov.–Dec. 31, 1973)

381. Telegram From the Department of State to Secretary of State Kissinger in Brussels[1]

Washington, December 10, 1973, 0155Z.

Tosec 60/241816. Subj: Conversation With Israeli Ambassador. For Secretary From Sisco.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1179, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, December 6, 1973 thru Dec. 12, 1973 [2 of 3]. Secret; Immediate; Cherokee; Nodis. Drafted and approved by Sisco.

1. I gave Dinitz Memorandum of Understanding which is reproduced in this telegram for the record, saying that I assumed Israel would wish to give this matter further study. I did not find it necessary to elaborate on the individual points, since Dinitz found them self-explanatory and provided me with several preliminary comments immediately. He focussed on para 3, underscoring that their draft made it clear, whereas ours did not, that Israel would refuse to participate in the conference with Syria until Syria took the minimal actions indicated therein with respect to POWs. I limited my remarks to saying that U.S. was keenly aware of the importance Israel attaches to this question, and that I was sure that POW question was one matter which you would be taking up in Damascus. Dinitz reiterated that this is a highly emotional issue in Israel and that if we could accept their formulation it would make it less difficult for Mrs. Meir in the Cabinet.

2. Dinitz also focussed on para 8, stressing as you would expect, that they are insisting on unanimity and that "full [omission in original] their insistence in this regard did not come out of any doubt as to our own position but rather their concern over the position of other participants in the conference.

3. He also made a comment on para 9 saying that phrases like "essentially non-substantive capacity" and "principal duty" left open a possible substantive role for the SYG and his representative. On this one he seemed less concerned than on the other two points.

4. Dinitz said our redraft would be carefully studied and that they would send their reaction to you via Scowcroft.

5. Following is the draft which I provided Dinitz:

Begin text. "Memorandum of Understanding. This Memorandum of Understanding is intended to express how Israel and the United States will approach their respective roles at the Geneva conference.

1. The Governments of Israel and the U.S. agree that the Geneva conference is aimed at the attainment of a just and durable peace between the parties, that this peace will be a contractual peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors, and that the ultimate objective is full reconciliation between the two sides.

2. In the spirit of the special relationship that exists between our two countries, the U.S. will consult with Israel on a step-by-step basis with respect to any ideas it may wish to explore with the Soviets or with the Arabs concerning the settlement.

3. The U.S. will make every effort, along with the Government of Israel, to seek a prompt resolution of the Israeli-Syrian POW problem. This includes efforts with the Arab states as well as the USSR. The U.S. will make a major effort to encourage the Government of Syria to submit a list of Israeli POWs, to permit the International Committee of the

Red Cross to visit them and report that they are being treated in conformity with the Geneva Convention, and to agree to a joint exchange of wounded POWs.

4. Israel reiterates its decision to observe scrupulously the ceasefire on land, air and sea on a reciprocal basis. The U.S. will exercise its good offices in order to assure that the other side will abide by its undertaking to observe scrupulously the ceasefire.

5. All the existing arrangements with regard to the non-military supply to the Third Army as well as the City of Suez will be maintained unless superseded by other arrangements mutually agreed.

6. The U.S. will do its utmost to insure that the existing arrangement regarding the uninterrupted passage of ships through Bab-el Mandeb, to and from Israel, will remain in force, and that Egypt will not apply any blockade measures.

7. Israel and the U.S. would agree to the participation of Lebanon in the conference at an appropriate stage. This undertaking is based on the assumption that disengagement of forces will be discussed at the outset of the conference.

8. It is understood that any possible additional participation at an appropriate phase of the conference will have to be decided upon after full consultation between all the initial participants. No state, group or organization will be invited to take part in the conference without full consultation between us. The U.S. will take fully into account in particular Israel's views and those of Jordan.

9. The negotiations in the conference will be conducted between the parties concerned as specified in Resolution 338. Israel and the U.S. agree that it is their view that the SYG should participate in the opening sessions in an essentially non-substantive capacity and that he can appoint a representative who would remain throughout the conference after he has left. His principal duty would be to keep the SYG informed and to help assure that the technical and conference arrangements being provided by the U.N. are in order.

10. Since the negotiations between the parties are under U.S.–USSR auspices, it is expected that the two major powers will maintain close contact with each other and the negotiating parties. At the same time, it is the view of both Israel and the U.S. that the prime focus should be negotiations between the parties concerned. While Soviet–U.S. participation is to be expected at the beginning and subsequently at key points, the U.S. will work in concert with Israel to maximize opportunities for negotiations between the parties without the presence of either of the major powers.

11. In view of the fact that the Soviet Union does not maintain diplomatic relations with Israel, the Government of Israel seriously ques-

tions the propriety and the feasibility of the Soviet Union acting as one of the two powers under whose auspices the conference is being held. The U.S. notes Israel's reservations regarding the role of the Soviet Union at the conference. The U.S. will make every effort in its consultations with the Soviet Union to encourage it to play a constructive role at the conference.

12. As previously indicated to the Israeli Government, the U.S. will work to assure that Israel will not be faced with any important decisions of substance on the issues of a final peace settlement before the Israeli election of December 31. The U.S. believes that it will be both desirable and necessary for the peace conference to deal with such issues at an early appropriate date in January.

13. The U.S. will do its utmost to prevent any attempt to convene the UN Security Council or any other UN body for the purpose of discussing or taking action on any of the outstanding issues which were discussed at Kilometer 101 or which will be discussed at the peace conference.

14. Israel and the U.S. agree that nothing in this memorandum alters the text of the joint U.S.–USSR letter which will be despatched to the UN SYG upon receipt of the approval of the parties concerned." *End text.*[2]

Rush

[2] In telegram Tosec 57/241811 to USNATO, December 10, Sisco informed Kissinger that during their meeting on the Memorandum of Understanding, Dinitz had given him Israeli suggestions on the rules of procedure that should govern the conference. Sisco had replied that he would study them, but noted that the United States had not yet decided if it would be necessary for the conference to decide formally on rules of procedure. The proposed rules suggested two initial meetings and then adjournment. Shalev, who was also present, noted that there was no specific mention of disengagement as the subject of the initial session, although Israel had no objection to that being the first subject of discussion. He emphasized that the objective of the conference ought to be a peace settlement, not carrying out any one UN resolution. (Ibid., NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, December 1–December 31, 1973)

382. Telegram From the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo to the Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization[1]

Cairo, December 10, 1973, 1105Z.

3876. Subject: Middle East Negotiations. Ref: Cairo 3870.[2]

1. Fahmy's extraordinary performance last night was a mixture of gamesmanship, frustration and genuine concern. Despite his bombast, he wants a peaceful settlement and has staked his reputation on it. Same time, he is acutely conscious that radical Arab critics are charging Egypt with having become soft. With competing Arab centers of power such as Algeria, Syria, and money-rich Saudi Arabia to contend with, Egypt's objective of retaining pre-eminence in the Arab world can only be retained by continuing to lead the pack. Syria shows signs of kicking traces and Assad's unexpected trip to Qadhaafi worries Egyptians. To keep others in line, Fahmy realizes Egypt desperately needs something tangible to point to to justify its current more moderate line.

2. Failure to achieve initial phase disengagement through U.S.-sponsored six point agreement has come as a blow to Fahmy and his government. Rightly or wrongly, Sadat had expected some initial Israeli disengagement prior to the peace conference and that USG would press a reluctant Israel to do so. Before recent African and Arab forums, GOE representatives from Sadat down boldly gave justificatory assurances that this would happen. They must now eat crow, and attribute awkward position in which they placed themselves to USG unwillingness fulfill what they conceived as obligation. They are fearful they will be fed a bone and lose face at home and abroad.

3. Fahmy's warning that unless substantial disengagement is agreed upon and finalized at first session of peace talks should not be entirely discounted. For the sake of form in Arab world and at home, Egyptian leadership may find it has to do just that. Yet Fahmy is still desperately hoping that something will come out of first phase talks that GOE can use to continue to justify the policy he and Sadat have devised. Though rejecting adequacy of initial phase disengagement for this purpose, it will be noted that he significantly threw out thought that either "large or medium" scale disengagement must emerge from the first phase of the conference (para 7 reftel). To my knowledge, this is the first time Fahmy has used the term "medium" scale disengage-

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov.–Dec. 31, 1973. Secret; Immediate; Cherokee; Nodis. Also sent Immediate to the Department of State.

[2] See footnote 6, Document 380.

ment. Heretofore his dichotomy has been "larger" and "first" or "initial" stage.

4. Conceivably, a face-saving formula may be found by casting whatever disengagement proves to be negotiable at upcoming Geneva talks by focusing on "medium" stage disengagement, whatever that may be, and trying finesse so called "first" or initial phase. Fahmy did not define what he meant by "medium" stage disengagement, but given his earlier concern about broader UNEF-manned belt somewhere around Mitla Pass area, something along these lines, if Israelis will buy it, might just do the trick.

5. Fahmy and other senior Egyptians are currently highly sensitive to any suggestion Israeli elections should govern pace of negotiations. They need be discreetly reminded of this salient fact, whether they like it or not, though conceivably time factor could also be finessed by all parties quietly agreeing that Christmas, Muslim Bairam holidays (January 3–4) and Coptic Christmas (January 7) offer at least a plausible reason to defer second phase of conference until mid-January. We hear from press sources that at least some responsible Egyptians are acknowledging that, despite current high level of tension which GOE-inspired press is maintaining, no change in Egyptian policy likely to be made until January 15 or after. This may or may not be so.

6. Meanwhile, as previously reported, Fahmy remains deeply worried about his personal position. He believes that his contacts with the army are good, but seems worried about possible adverse university student reactions. He is also mindful of his many critics and rivals in Peoples Assembly, press and elsewhere at home and in radical Arab world and has sometimes spoken of his "at least five rivals" for his job. At the moment he still seems to have Sadat's confidence, but the President is mercurial and could easily make him a scapegoat. The image of an omnipresent, bitter Mahmoud Riad, who as Arab League SYG still gives frequent vent to how USG let him down, is indelible in Fahmy's mind. He is afraid that the pace we envisage may be too slow to keep Sadat, Arab and public opinion in line and him in office. Result is he is likely to continue to play it tough.[3]

Eilts

[3] In telegram Secto 17/3214 to Cairo, December 10, Kissinger responded to Eilts, thanking him for his helpful analysis. He instructed the Ambassador to tell the Foreign Minister that the Israelis were even angrier with him at this point than Fahmi was. The Secretary added that he wanted to assure Fahmi that he would stick literally to his understandings with him and with Sadat. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1179, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, December 13, 1973 thru Dec. 17, 1973 [1 of 3])

383. Backchannel Message From the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) to Secretary of State Kissinger in Brussels[1]

Washington, December 10, 1973, 1553Z.

Tohak 24/WH37511. I have passed the message in Hakto 4 to Dinitz.[2] He said he would convey it to his government immediately.

He also provided me with comments from Tel Aviv on our conversation of yesterday regarding Fahmy's demands on "UN auspices" and "timing."[3]

(1) Regarding "auspices," he said that Israel would not participate if the talks were held under UN auspices.

(2) On "timing," Dinitz said that Israel asks for the original wording, "without prejudice to possible additional participants at a subsequent phase," with the addition of the phrase, "with the unanimous consent of the parties." He said Israel is not prepared to accept the language, "the question of the participation of the Palestinians and Lebanon," and that formulation does not "seem acceptable to us" even with the addition of the phrase on unanimous consent. Nor, he said, can Israel accept the original language with the phrase on unanimity

[1] National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 42, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, TOHAK 1–75, Dec. 8–22, 1973. Top Secret; Flash; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. Sent to Eagleburger for Kissinger.

[2] In telegram Hakto 4, December 10, Kissinger, noting the latest *Newsweek* story that he had put pressure on Israel to delay the talks at KM 101, instructed Scowcroft to see Dinitz immediately and tell him that the Secretary would like a statement from the highest levels of the Israeli Government as to how it would be possible to conduct confidential discussions during his upcoming visit in light of the *Newsweek* story and to insist on an authoritative Israeli Government denial of the story immediately. (Ibid., HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, HAKTO 1–88, Dec. 8–22, 1973) In telegram Tohak 45/WH37539, December 12, Scowcroft transmitted a message from Golda Meir that she was very sorry about the *Newsweek* article and would take every possible step to ensure the confidentiality of their talks. (Ibid., HAK Trip, Europe & Mideast, TOHAK 1–75, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

[3] In telegram Tohak 16/WH37498, December 9, Scowcroft informed Kissinger that he had discussed the draft letter to the Secretary General with Dinitz, who said that he had just learned that the passage in the original draft on future participation in the conference had been modified to include specific references to Palestinian and Lebanese participation. The Ambassador stated that his government was "absolutely and definitely" against a conference under UN auspices and would prefer restoration of the phrase "U.S.–Soviet auspices." Dinitz also reiterated Israel's absolute opposition to the "timing" phrase, and expressed thanks for U.S. support on this issue. He said Israel would prefer the wording in the original draft that did not mention Lebanon or the Palestinians by name plus the addition of a phrase requiring unanimity on future participation. (Ibid.)

contained in the U.S.–Israeli Memorandum of Understanding[4] rather than in a public letter.

Warm regards.

[4] See Document 381.

384. Memorandum From Secretary of State Kissinger to President Nixon[1]

Washington, December 10, 1973.

SUBJECT

President Sadat's Reply to Your Letter

President Sadat, in the attached letter [Tab A][2] dated December 8, 1973, has replied to your letter of December 1 [Tab B].[3] The tone of the letter is statesmanlike and generally positive. Its highlights are as follows:

—He agrees with you that there is a unique opportunity to bring peace with justice to the Middle East.

—The United States has a particular role to play in working for peace in the Middle East. He is pleased with your personal commitment to make a major effort.

—Egypt will explore all avenues that might lead to peace, and in this spirit has agreed to attend the Geneva peace conference on December 18, 1973.

—He expects an immediate demonstration at Geneva of good faith and intentions, as well as an early recognition of basic principles governing a peace settlement—in particular Israeli withdrawal from all ter-

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt, Vol. VIII, November 1–December 31, 1973. Secret; Nodis. Sent for information. A stamped note on the memorandum reads: "The President has seen." Scowcroft initialed for Kissinger who was still in Brussels. All brackets are in the original.

[2] Attached, but not printed. The letter was transmitted in telegram 3864 from Cairo, December 8. (Ibid., NSC Files, Box 611, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 13, Nov. 73–Dec. 73)

[3] See Document 369.

ritories occupied since June 1967 and the recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people.

—More concretely, he expresses hope that during the opening phase of the peace conference a major disengagement will promptly be effected.

—A US role in bringing about Israeli withdrawal would have an impact on US–Egyptian bilateral relations.

The main point of President Sadat's letter seems to be that some progress must be made at an early point in order to create momentum for reaching a full peace agreement. In particular, Israel must agree to a major withdrawal as part of the disengagement of forces, and the US is expected to play a major role in bringing about such an agreement. As you know, we are trying to work toward such a disengagement at an early stage.

No reply to President Sadat's letter is required at this time.

---

385. Telegram From the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo to the Department of State[1]

Cairo, December 11, 1973, 1700Z.

3933. Subject: Vinogradov's Draft Letter to SYG Based on Egyptian/Syrian Principles. Ref: Cairo 3932.[2]

1. Following my return to USINT after meeting with Fahmy, Vinogradov called to say he had prepared a revised draft letter to SYG based on "principles" enunciated by Fahmy and wanted us to submit it to our governments as a joint draft. He would send over Soviet Embassy officer with text. I reminded Vinogradov that Fahmy had specifically stated he had a series of "principles" in mind and that language based on these principles could be worked out by our governments. While I could not therefore endorse any specific text, I was willing to review his draft to ascertain whether it was consistent with my understanding of Fahmy's "principles."

2. Vinogradov's draft revision reads as follows:

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov.–Dec. 31, 1973. Secret; Immediate; Nodis; Cherokee. Also sent Immediate to USNATO for Secretary Kissinger.

[2] Telegram 3932 from Cairo, December 11, contained the account of Eilts's meeting with Fahmi and Vinogradov. (Ibid.)

"Dear Mr. Secretary General:

"On October 22, 1973, the Security Council adopted Resolution 338 and 339,[3] jointly sponsored by the Soviet Union and the United States which calls for negotiations to start between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices, aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East. The Soviet Union and the United States have now been informed by the parties concerned of their readiness to participate in the peace conference. The conference should be convened under the auspices of the United Nations.

"It is our understanding that Egypt, Israel, Jordan and Syria have agreed to participate from the outset in the conference which would begin in Geneva on December 18. The parties have agreed that the conference should be under the co-chairmanship of the Soviet Union and the United States. The parties have also agreed that the question of the participation of the Palestinians and Lebanon will be discussed during the first stage of the conference.

"It is our hope that you will find it possible to participate in the opening phase of the conference at which it is expected that the governments concerned will be represented by their respective Foreign Ministers and later by their specially appointed representatives with Ambassadorial rank. We also hope that you can make available a representative who would keep you fully informed as the conference proceeds. Finally, we would also appreciate it if the United Nations could make appropriate arrangements for the necessary conference facilities.

"If as we hope you find it possible to participate, as co-chairmen the Soviet Union and the U.S. would appreciate it if you would agree to serve as convener of the conference and preside in the opening phase.

"We request that you circulate this letter to members of the Security Council for their information. We believe it would be appropriate for the President of the Security Council to consult informally with the membership with a view to securing a favorable consensus of the Council."

3. I sent word to Vinogradov that I would submit his text to the Secretary and Washington, as he had requested, with an indication that it is consistent with my understanding of Fahmy's principles. I could

---

[3] In telegram 3939 from Cairo, December 12, Eilts reported that Vinogradov had just telephoned to say that he had shown his new draft to Fahmi and asked if it accurately incorporated his "principles," to which the Foreign Minister replied that it did. Vinogradov said that he had emphasized that this was his own personal attempt to formulate acceptable language, and was not official. He also had asked Fahmi about inclusion of a reference to UN Security Council Resolution 339, which had not been in any of the earlier drafts. The Foreign Minister said someone had told him to include it, but he could not remember who. He then agreed that there was no need to include a reference to the resolution in the draft letter. (Ibid.)

not, however, endorse any particular text since my government would have to make final determination.[4]

4. *Comment:* With exception of separate sentence on "under UN auspices" at end of first para and a new reference to UN Res 339 in that same para, text is that of our withdrawn third draft.[5]

Eilts

[4] In telegram Hakto 10 from Brussels, December 12, Kissinger instructed Scowcroft to give the text of the draft in telegram 3933 to Dobrynin immediately and tell him that the United States was seeking immediate approval from Israel. He should also give Dinitz the text as soon as possible, stressing several points. First, the letter did not state that the conference would be under "UN auspices" but rather that it would be "convened under UN auspices." There would be no substantive role for the Secretary General. Second, the Security Council would be consulted informally. Third, the United States had successfully fought to delete the phrase on the "timing" of Palestinian participation. This formulation was neutral and left the matter open. Finally, he should urge Israel not to make the Syrian-Israeli POW issue a precondition of its participation in the conference. (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip, Europe & Mideast, HAKTO 1–88, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

[5] In telegram Secto 51 to Cairo, December 12, Kissinger stated that the United States was informing Dobrynin that the text in telegram 3933 corresponded with the U.S. understanding of what their two countries had agreed upon, based upon the Egyptian and Syrian "principles." Dobrynin would be asked to confirm the text with Moscow. The text would also be given to Dinitz for Israeli agreement, to King Hussein, and to Waldheim. The Secretary instructed Eilts to tell Vinogradov and Fahmi that he was consulting with Moscow and with Israel regarding the text. (Ibid., Box 1179, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, December 6, 1973 thru Dec. 12, 1973, [1 of 3])

386. Memorandum from Secretary of State Kissinger to President Nixon[1]

Washington, December 12, 1973.

SUBJECT

Information Items

Situation in the Middle East: Israeli Foreign Minister Eban has stated that the Israeli Government has decided not to take part in the peace

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 56, President's Daily Briefing, 16 November–31 December, 1973, President's Daily Briefs, December 1–December 15, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Contains Codeword. Scowcroft initialed for Kissinger. A stamped notation on the memorandum reads: "The President has seen."

conference with Syria until the latter submits a list of Israeli prisoners, allows Red Cross representatives to visit them, and treats them in accordance with the Geneva Convention.[2]

UN sources report that the Syrian Ministry of Planning has been put on a "war basis" and that all other ministries and schools have been alerted to go on a war footing as soon as instructed. The Syrian Government apparently took similar measures in the week prior to the attack on October 6.

For the second straight day, Syrian and Israeli forces exchanged fire on the Golan front. The Syrians claimed to have inflicted about a dozen casualties and to have destroyed several pieces of engineering equipment that were being used to improve advanced Israeli positions in the area.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

[2] A handwritten notation by Nixon in the margin reads: "K—tell Eban et al—if *this* demand on their part brings on another war they go it alone."

387. Memorandum From the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, December 13, 1973.

The Israelis are objecting strenuously to two points in the proposed US/USSR joint letter to the UN Secretary General convening the conference on the Middle East. At Tab B[2] are the objections expressed

[1] Source: Ford Library, National Security Adviser, Scowcroft Daily Work Files, Box 5, Dec. 12–15, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive.

[2] Attached, but not printed, is a retyped copy of telegram 10130 from Tel Aviv, December 13, in which Keating described his meeting with Eban, who had said that the proposed text was not acceptable to Israel and that there were three major points in the text which, if allowed to stand, would change the nature of the conference the Israeli Cabinet had agreed upon. First, Israel wanted deletion of the words "and 339," since this suggested that a major concern for the conference would be Israeli withdrawal to the October 22 cease-fire lines. Second, Israel objected to the greatly enhanced role given to the UN and Secretary General and wanted deletion of the sentence referring to UN auspices. Last, Israel wanted to delete the sentence providing for discussion during the first stage of the conference on the participation of the Palestinians, which Eban described as the most explosive and controversial issue.

by Foreign Minister Eban to Ambassador Keating.[3] In addition, Minister Shalev conveyed to me an oral note from the Prime Minister to Secretary Kissinger stating that she does not accept the changes made in the letter since the first draft. These changes she considers to be not semantic but substantive and far-reaching and, while she has accepted faits accomplis before, she is not able to do so this time.[4]

There are two points to which the Israelis object. The first issue is the passage in the draft letter (Tab C)[5] in the first paragraph that the conference should be convened "under the auspices of the United Nations." The Israeli concern is that this phrase will open the door to substantial UN participation in the conference, a development which they would find unacceptable. We have pointed out to them that this phrase is purely cosmetic, that there is strong pressure at the UN for substantial UN involvement and that this is the minimum acceptable reference to the UN.

The second Israeli objection is to the phrase in the second paragraph that "the question of the participation of the Palestinians and Lebanon will be discussed during the first stage of the conference." On this point, the Israelis wish to add the phrase "by unanimous consent of the parties." On this issue, the Egyptians only reluctantly agreed to back off from insistence that only the timing, not the question of, Palestinian participation would be the issue. The formulation in the draft letter, again, is compromise wording which appears fully to protect legitimate Israeli concerns.

Israeli reluctance to agree to the draft letter not only threatens the opening of the conference but as well makes more likely some action by the Security Council which could greatly complicate the situation. Since all other parties have now accepted the draft letter, Secretary

---

[3] In telegram Hakto 14, December 12, Kissinger instructed Scowcroft to call in Shalev immediately and inform him that the President wanted Prime Minister Meir to know that the United States had fought very hard for the Israeli position over the last several weeks. Israel's position was fully protected in the latest draft, which the United States would like to transmit to the Secretary General as soon as possible so that the opening of the peace conference could be announced. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, HAKTO 1–88, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

[4] In telegram Tohak 66, December 13, Scowcroft informed Kissinger that he conveyed Kissinger's message at length to Shalev, who said he had an oral message for Kissinger from the Prime Minister in addition to that given by Eban to Keating. She could not accept the changes in the letter, which she considered substantive and far-reaching modifications, rather than merely a matter of semantics. (Ibid., Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, TOHAK 1–75, Dec. 8–22, 1973) The oral message from Meir, December 13, is ibid., Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, December 1–13, 1973)

[5] The text at Tab C is that transmitted in Document 385.

Kissinger feels that a letter from you to the Prime Minister would be very helpful in persuading the Israelis to positive action.

Recommendation

That you sign the letter to Prime Minister Golda Meir at Tab A.[6]

[6] Nixon signed the letter. See Document 388.

388. Letter From President Nixon to Israeli Prime Minister Meir[1]

Washington, December 13, 1973.

Dear Madame Prime Minister:

I have read Ambassador Keating's report of his conversation with Foreign Minister Eban regarding Israel's objections to the joint U.S.–USSR letter to the Secretary General which would convene the Geneva conference on December 18.[2] I am also aware of your oral note to Secretary Kissinger objecting to the letter.[3] I must tell you in all candor I am disturbed over these reports. For weeks we have been in intensive negotiations, and we have achieved with great difficulty a draft letter which protects fully all of Israel's vital interests.

Of the three issues which Foreign Minister Eban has raised, we have achieved the deletion of the words "and 339." However, the other two points cannot be accomplished. Your Foreign Minister has said that your Government is opposed to the greatly enhanced role which the letter accords to the UN and the Secretary General. But the letter does not do this. The Secretary General does not have a substantial role. His role is specifically limited and symbolic. Moreover, you must appreciate, Madame Prime Minister, that this conference is being convened under Resolution 338 and it is unavoidable that in this sense it should be convened under UN auspices.

As to your final suggestion that the sentence providing for discussion of participation of the Palestinians during the first stage of the con-

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, December 1–December 31, 1973. No classification marking. A handwritten notation on the letter indicates that Scowcroft handed it to Shalev at 6:45 p.m. on December 13.

[2] See footnote 2, Document 387.

[3] See footnote 4, Document 387.

ference be deleted, I want to stress that the present formulation does not in any way prejudge the question. This is a major achievement since all other participants wanted the letter to embrace a decision in principle in favor of Palestinian representation. Moreover, as you know, in accordance with accepted international procedure the participation at an appropriate stage of the conference of any possible additional state, group or organization will require the agreement of all the initial participants, who will have the right to decline to negotiate with any state, group or organization to whose participation they have not agreed. I have approved a formal understanding to this effect.

I conclude with this final thought, Madame Prime Minister. I want to say to you in all solemnity that if Israel now fails to take a favorable decision to participate in the conference on the basis of the letter that we have worked out, this will not be understood either in the United States or in the world and I will not be able to justify the support which I have consistently rendered in our mutual interests to your Government.

I urge that you transmit promptly your favorable reply.

Richard Nixon

---

389. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

Cairo, December 14, 1973, 0045Z.

Hakto 27. Deliver to Gen. Scowcroft no matter where he is. You are to pass the following message from me to General Haig immediately, no matter where he is, for immediate reply. I have just learned that the

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, TOHAK 1–88, Dec. 8–22, 1973. Top Secret; Flash; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. After leaving Brussels on December 11, Kissinger traveled to London and Algiers before arriving in Cairo on December 13. The next day he went to Riyadh. He was in Damascus and Amman December 15, Beirut December 16, and Jerusalem and Tel Aviv December 16–17. He visited several European capitals before arriving in Geneva on December 20 to attend the peace conference.

President has recently seen Dobrynin alone to talk about the Middle East.[2] This report concerns me deeply for three compelling reasons.

First, I cannot overemphasize the extremely tenuous nature of the current situation here. It is now a very close run thing whether we will

[2] The President met with Dobrynin on December 13 from 12:41 to 1:33 p.m. (Ibid., White House Central Files, President's Daily Diary) In his memoirs, Dobrynin wrote that his "private conversation" with Nixon "was unusual both in content and form in that he was extraordinarily frank about domestic questions." Nixon, Dobrynin recalled, said that he attached "much importance" to the "troubled Middle East" and the prospects of the forthcoming Geneva peace conference. "Surprisingly," said Dobrynin, "Nixon then went on to criticize Israel's policy. He argued that Israel actually did not want to end the state of war with the Arabs and indeed the Cold War in general. He said Israel and the American Jewish community were anxious to prevent any improvement in Soviet–American relations and wanted to take advantage of permanent confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union. Nixon said he had come to these conclusions only recently, because he had not even imagined at first that Israel could have such long-term aspirations. But the result, he said was 'Israel's intransigence' about the Middle East settlement, which was encouraged in every way by the politically influential Jewish lobby in America, which in turn helped shape American foreign policy." Dobrynin added that Nixon was "clearly vexed by the hostile campaign against him over Watergate by the mass media." Nixon told Dobrynin that the American media were run "essentially by the same Jewish circles," which, Nixon insisted, were against him and "showed no gratitude for all he had done for Israel." The President, according to Dobrynin, then made a "curious remark" about Kissinger. "He paid deserved tribute to his [Kissinger's] intelligence and service and pointed out that his Jewish origin made him less vulnerable to the attacks of the American Jewish community, which would be an asset at the coming Middle East negotiations. Nixon observed that Kissinger had at times strongly indulged Israel's nationalist sentiments, for which he had to be corrected." Dobrynin wrote that his "overall impression" of the meeting with Nixon was that his criticism of Israel and the Jewish community "grew out of his identifying them with the mass media, whose attacks on Watergate and issues of policy he resented strongly and emotionally as the end approached." (*In Confidence*, pp. 308–309)

Kissinger wrote in his memoirs that both he and Scowcroft believed that the President's meeting with Dobrynin was a response to the speech Kissinger had delivered in London on December 12 to the Society of Pilgrims regarding U.S. relations with Europe and the energy crisis (see footnote 4 below). According to Kissinger, Nixon was "inflamed" by the extensive media coverage the speech received, especially as it concerned energy, where Nixon "harbored the hope of being able to emerge with some spectacular breakthrough." Scowcroft wrote in a cable to Kissinger that while the meeting was an "upsetting development" it could have been worse. Kissinger, however, disagreed: "I did not view the meeting quite so objectively—especially since the press was given the grand explanation that it had been a 'general review' of the 'overall relationships between the United States and the USSR.' It was no laughing matter to have the White House announce what could only be construed as a Presidential move to strengthen our Soviet ties on the same day that Sadat had informed me that he planned to end the Soviet–Egyptian Friendship Treaty." Neither Scowcroft nor Haig was able to elicit precisely what had been discussed, Kissinger recalled, but he believed that was precisely Nixon's point; "after all," Kissinger wrote, Nixon "was to demonstrate that he was in charge." (*Years of Upheaval*, pp. 771–772) In telegram Hakto 28, December 14, 0122Z, Kissinger told Scowcroft: "I hope in the future if you are given any other hare-brained orders similar to the instructions to get Dobrynin in you will first check them with Haig to see if he can get them reversed. As I indicated in my note to Haig, nothing could have gone on at that meeting that could do us any good at all." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, HAKTO 1–88, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

ever get the parties together in Geneva—much less next week. At the present moment I cannot predict with any confidence that we will have our conference, and the slightest miscalculation—the least slip—and we will be embroiled in a major foreign policy failure of the gravest sort. Every move must be planned and carried out with the greatest care.

Second, the major spoiling role the Soviets are trying to play—the mischief they are about—has become glaringly obvious since my arrival in Cairo today. Sadat, from whom I have just come, spent well over 30 minutes pleading with me to help him stand up against Soviet pressures—which he says are getting more intense by the day. During the course of the conversation Sadat quoted several messages, purportedly from Dobrynin. I recognized the occasions, but the reports themselves were such misrepresentations of fact as to be totally misleading. One can only imagine the turmoil and mischief that such a miscast description of a conversation with the President could cause.

Third, I will be seeing Gromyko in Geneva next week if the conference convenes. I will be in an intolerable position if he knows, or even suspects, that he is privy to information on the President's thinking that I do not have. The challenge to my credibility could be disastrous.

Thus, I must insist that I be given a full report of the Dobrynin conversation with the President. I am flying blind without it, which at this point could have disastrous consequences for all we are trying to do here and at home to build a peace and restore foreign and domestic confidence in this administration.[3]

As to the Pilgrims speech, I have said all I intend to on the subject.[4] It was given in good faith, cleared within the bureaucracy, and directed at strengthening the President's hand in the tough months of slugging that face us in bringing Europe to its senses. It is not I but the country that is being punished by this act of pique. I shall be seeing Sadat again tomorrow at 11:00 a.m. Cairo time for a heavy negotiating session. I must insist that I be given a full report of the conversation before that time, although I must tell you that there is almost no scenario of that

---

[3] In telegram Hakto 30, December 14, 0756Z, Kissinger asked Scowcroft to pass a message to Haig stating that the general statement that the President had wide-ranging discussions of U.S.–Soviet relations was not adequate for his needs. Noting that Sadat told him that he intended to abrogate the Egyptian-Soviet Friendship Treaty, Kissinger warned that something that smacked of a U.S.–Soviet condominium would create a new situation. He also warned of the danger from those that would see it as worthwhile to break up his relationship with the President, thus knocking out one of the administration's remaining props. The Secretary asked Scowcroft, on his behalf, to make a formal request to the President for a report on his meeting with Dobrynin. (Ibid.)

[4] In a speech before the Pilgrims Society in London on December 12, Kissinger spoke mostly about U.S. relations with Europe and the energy crisis brought on by the oil embargo. The text of his address is printed in *The New York Times*, December 13, 1973.

conversation that I can imagine that will not be damaging—the question is only the degree of damage perpetrated.

I ask for your help, for the sake of the country, in two ways:

1) To get me the information quickly and,

2) To assure that this sort of thing does not happen again. Finally, I must emphasize how gravely I view this development. I urge you not to underestimate the seriousness of this cable.[5]

[5] In telegram Tohak 79/WH37588, December 14, 1606Z, Haig responded to Kissinger, saying that he had just left Nixon and had made a formal request for more details on his meeting with Dobrynin. He reported that the President said that regarding the Middle East, he had merely urged continued U.S.–Soviet cooperation in achieving a settlement and had asked the Ambassador to use Soviet influence on Syria regarding the POW issue. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, TOHAK 76–133, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

390. Editorial Note

Secretary of State Henry Kissinger met with Egyptian President Anwar Sadat on December 13, 1973, at the Barrages, one of Sadat's residences north of Cairo, to discuss Egypt's attendance at the proposed Geneva conference and disengagement of Egyptian and Israeli forces. No record of Kissinger's conversation with Sadat has been found. In his memoirs, however, Kissinger described his meeting with the Egyptian President:

"Sadat began the conversation, seated on a low sofa along the far wall, and then continued at dinner when a table was wheeled in. Without referring to the perplexities of Geneva, he outlined his view of the future. He profoundly distrusted the Soviet Union, he said. On each visit to Moscow he had been humiliated by Soviet crudeness and condescension. The Soviets had only wanted to use Egypt for their own selfish designs. They had broken Nasser's heart in the literal sense of the word; he had returned from his last visit to Moscow a few weeks before his death determined to cut loose from an embrace that threatened to suffocate. Now that he had restored Egyptian self-respect, Sadat intended to carry out this aim. He would gradually eliminate the last vestiges of the Soviet presence: the four MiG–25 Foxbat supersonic jets flying reconnaissance missions from Cairo West airport and the Soviet naval squadron in Alexandria would be sent home. He would let the Soviet-Egyptian Friendship Treaty slide into desuetude or cancel

it—he had not yet decided which. But he could not do any of this until the peace process was further advanced. He candidly avowed his dependence on Soviet military supplies. He would prefer to shift to American weapons, but he saw no immediate prospect. Nor could he totally abandon Soviet diplomatic support before he could point to a concrete achievement of another course. And if a negotiating deadlock developed, he would again be driven to war. But he was now looking to the United States: 'You hold all the cards here,' he said, using what soon became a standard slogan."

"Sadat added that I had been right four weeks earlier in stressing that peace was primarily a psychological problem [see Document 324], but the barriers were not only on the Israeli side. The Arabs were proud; they had been humiliated. They had difficulty knowing how to go from the impasse in which they found themselves to the peace that most of them wanted. He, Sadat, would try to chart a course—if necessary alone, but he hoped not so far ahead of his brothers that they would not follow ultimately. But Israel had to give him some help. I could tell Golda Meir that he genuinely wanted peace but not at the price of 'my' territory. He asked whether I thought Golda was strong enough to make peace—a good question, since he knew peace would not be made by an affable Israeli leader but by a strong one. I said that if strength was the prime requirement, Golda was his man."

The conversation then turned to the draft letter of invitation to the Geneva conference. "By now I was convinced that arguing about the text of the draft letter was an assignment for a theologian, not a diplomat. We would never get an agreement by an exegesis of its clauses," Kissinger concluded. He added:

"As for the letter of invitation, I argued, it was essential to break out of the irrelevancies by which each party was trying to use the drafting exercise to foreordain the outcome before the conference was even assembled. Peace in the Middle East would not emerge from dependent clauses. Perhaps we should scrap the long draft letter in favor of a simple one-paragraph invitation, and let the conference settle all the procedural nitpicks. If we were serious about disengagement first on the Egyptian and then on the Syrian front, the prime task was to assemble Geneva, using whatever letter was easiest, break up into subgroups as rapidly as possible (preferably without Soviet participation) and get on with the serious negotiation. Any reference to the Palestinians was bound to touch an Israeli raw nerve. It was too much to ask Israel to face the issue in this manner immediately prior to an election and after a war that overturned so many of the premises of its previous policy. A short letter could skirt the whole dilemma.

"Sadat . . . reacted as he had a month earlier. Without argument he accepted the main lines of my presentation. Egypt would attend Ge-

neva, he said, even if Syria stayed away. It could not be beyond the wit of man to draft a letter that met everyone's needs. He would go along with a short letter of invitation, though it may delay matters because a totally new draft ran the risk of starting the whole clearance process over again. I used this opening to offer yet another compromise watering down the language on Palestinians. If we stayed with the long letter, I told Sadat, it might be best if we agreed on a neutral formulation about other participants that made no explicit reference to the Palestinians at all—such as that 'the question of *additional participants*' would be discussed during the first stage of the conference. The Arabs could say that they would urge the Palestinian participation at that point; Israel could say it would refuse—but all this would happen after the conference had opened and the issue would never be settled unless it did." (Kissinger, *Years of Upheaval*, pages 767–770)

Following his meeting with Sadat, Kissinger met with Soviet Ambassador to Egypt Vladimir Vinogradov at 1:30 a.m., December 14, to brief him on the contingency plan for a very short letter of invitation. Kissinger returned to the Barrages at 10 a.m. for another meeting with Sadat. No record of this conversation has been found. According to Kissinger, the meeting focused on disengagement of Egyptian and Israeli forces. Kissinger described the meeting in his memoirs:

"Sadat asked for our 'plan'; he was loath to relinquish the idea that there just had to be some 'Kissinger plan.' I told him that it would be a mistake to lay down a hard-and-fast program. It was bound to leak; inability to achieve its precise terms would then be a token of failure overriding the very real accomplishment inherent in any significant Israeli withdrawal and the separation of Egyptian and Israeli forces. I suggested we review the general principles that should guide the negotiations.

"When we did so, the Kilometer 101 negotiations proved to have been helpful after all—especially some of the Israeli ideas that Yariv had tried out with Gamasy. Building on the Yariv–Gamasy conversations, I put forward the concept that a thinned-out Egyptian force would remain east of the Canal, Israel would pull back to the area of the Mitla Pass about twenty miles from the Canal, and a UN force would be placed in between. Sadat and I made no effort to draw lines or to define the limitations of arms applicable to each zone. That was to be left for a later trip and for what we still expected would be the subsequent negotiations in Geneva." (Ibid., pages 772–773)

In his memoirs, Sadat provided a much different account of his December meetings with Kissinger. He wrote that he told Kissinger that he could not accept this way of conducting negotiations. "I am going to liquidate the Israeli Deversoir pocket. What will be the American attitude?" Kissinger replied:

"I know you're ready for it; I knew it before I came to see you . . . I asked the Pentagon for a few aerial photographs of the battlefield and received a full report. Your wall of rockets consists of so many batteries . . . you have 800 tanks surrounding the Israeli Deversoir pocket . . . and you can actually wipe out the pocket. You must know however, that if you do this the Pentagon will strike at you. . . . The Pentagon will strike at you for one reason: Soviet weapons have once before defeated U.S. weapons and, in accordance with our global strategy, we can't allow it to happen again. . . . Do you know, when you created an international crisis, when you asked the two superpowers to come in and get the forces back to the cease-fire lines of October 22, otherwise, you threatened, you'd do it yourself provided the Pentagon didn't stand against you—do you know what sort of plan the Pentagon laid down at the time? We planned to land in your country, in Sinai, if the Russians landed west of the canal, to finish you off. Our aim was to show you that the Russians were unreliable, and so we'd have dealt you a blow that actually hit the Russians! We're in the same situation today. If you attempt to liquidate the Israeli pocket, the Pentagon will strike at you because this is U.S. established policy. Besides, the Pentagon wants to avenge the defeat of its weapons in October. But do you insist on a military liquidation of the infiltrating forces?"

Sadat responded to Kissinger's question by saying, "Not at all . . . You know I am a man of peace. If you had accepted my 1971 Initiative, no war would have broken out at all. I care very much for human life, and am loath to losing one soldier, not to mention an officer. But you didn't take me seriously—and this was the outcome." Sadat then told Kissinger that "Just as we embarked on a Peace Process, let us have a forces disengagement which would peacefully put an end to this counterattacking." (Sadat, *In Search of Identity*, pages 268–269)

Kissinger transmitted a report of his conversations with Sadat to the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs Brent Scowcroft in telegram Hakto 34, December 14. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, HAKTO 1–88, Dec. 8–22, 1973) Scowcroft sent President Nixon a memorandum, December 14, relaying Kissinger's report of his "private meetings" with Sadat:

"I have just completed two long meetings in private with President Sadat. He sends you his best regards and wants you to know he remains fully committed to go to Geneva and negotiate seriously. As evidence of this, he was both flexible and pragmatic in adjusting his position to get around the last minute obstacles the Israelis have raised to launching the conference on the basis we succeed with great difficulty getting the Arabs and Soviets to agree to. He has also agreed to weigh in with Syria on the Israeli POW issue. In my talks with Sadat, we

reached agreement on a number of points that will help get the conference started and keep it moving on a practical, realistic basis.

"First, we agreed that the opening session in Geneva beginning December 18 would last four or five days and be devoted to ceremonial and procedural matters, then adjourn until about January 15 to get us past the Israeli elections.

"Secondly, we agreed that this first phase would concentrate on the question of disengagement of forces, discussion of which would be completed at the January session.

"Third, I obtained Sadat's acceptance of the elements of a disengagement plan in Sinai which goes very far toward a proposal the Israelis floated earlier during the military representative talks. In brief, it would (a) leave the thinned out Egyptian military force, with certain limitations on type and number of weapons, in their present positions east of the Canal, (b) involve an Israeli pullback to the eastern end of the strategic Mitla Pass, and (c) place a UN force between the Egyptian and Israeli lines. Once this is accomplished, Sadat said he would return Egyptian refugees to the Suez Canal cities and begin to clear the Canal, which would then be open to Israeli cargoes.

"Fourth, Sadat agreed that the question of Palestinian representation at the conference, which gives Israel serious problems, will not be raised during the disengagement phase—in effect, not through January.

"Fifth, while we and the Soviets will be participants at the conference, Sadat agreed that we need not be present at meetings of subgroups of the parties, which is where the real work of the conference should take place. This in effect creates the kind of direct, bilateral negotiating situation the Israelis have long sought.

"I have sent a message to Mrs. Meir informing her of the foregoing with the exception of the disengagement proposal. My present intention is to talk to the Israelis about disengagement along these lines when I get to Jerusalem. Before doing so, however, I want to wait and see what the situation is when I get there, including in particular the result of our efforts to get Israeli agreement to go to Geneva." (Ibid, Box 43, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, HAKTO 1–88, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

391. Letter From President Nixon to Israeli Prime Minister Meir[1]

Washington, December 14, 1973.

Dear Madame Prime Minister:

I have just learned that your Government at today's Cabinet meeting was unable to reach a decision to attend the peace conference in Geneva on the basis of the joint U.S.–Soviet letter[2] and the clarifications contained in my last letter to you.[3]

While I recognize that you are in a delicate election period, I must nevertheless tell you frankly that I deeply regret your Government's failure to come to a positive decision. As I said in my last letter, I am convinced that, as a result of Secretary Kissinger's intensive negotiations, the proposed letter to the Secretary General fully protects your position and interests.

Because so much that we have both worked and hoped for is at stake, we are with great reluctance proposing to the Soviet Union and the other parties that the opening of the conference be delayed until Friday, December 21. This will give you an opportunity to present your Government's views fully to Secretary Kissinger when he visits Israel this Sunday[4] and to hear my views from him. I hope that the others concerned will agree to this delay. But I must tell you that I cannot ask for a longer postponement, given their readiness to attend the conference on December 18 and the advanced state of planning by their Foreign Ministers. You know, of course, that December 18 was originally chosen to accommodate your Government.

As you know, Madame Prime Minister, the point would not have been reached of obtaining Arab agreement to enter negotiations with you, which has been your goal for so many years, had it not been for the untiring efforts and determination of this Government and its support for your goal of a negotiated peace. It is of course inconceivable that we should now not take this step. I want you to know that I have instructed Secretary Kissinger to be present at the opening of the conference on

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, December 1–December 31, 1973. No classification marking. A handwritten note on the letter indicates that Scowcroft handed it to Shalev at 6:15 p.m. on December 14.

[2] The final text of the letter was transmitted to Scowcroft in telegram Hakto 39 from Riyadh, December 14. Kissinger instructed Scowcroft to send Keating a copy of the letter after giving it to Shalev. (Ibid., Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, HAKTO 1–88, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

[3] Document 388.

[4] December 16.

December 21 if the others agree to a postponement, or December 18 if they will not.[5]

Sincerely,[6]

[5] In telegram Tohak 85/WH37599, December 15, Scowcroft reported to Kissinger that he had passed the President's letter to Shalev, who had reacted very positively, saying that the extension of time would be of great benefit psychologically because it would remove Israeli fears that they were once again being faced with a fait accompli. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, TOHAK 76–133, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

[6] Printed from an unsigned copy.

392. Memorandum From Secretary of State Kissinger to President Nixon[1]

Washington, December 15, 1973.

SUBJECT

Information Items

Military Activity Noted Along Syrian Front: Large-scale movements of Israeli and Syrian forces apparently have occurred along the Syrian front over the past days. UN truce observers reported seeing heavy traffic of Israeli tanks and wheeled vehicles near Al Qunaytirah on the evening of December 12. Additional movements of Israeli tanks and artillery were observed west of Syrian-held Sasa that same evening. The next night, the observers reported large-scale movements of Syrian vehicles opposite Al Qunaytirah and near Sasa on both sides of the Israeli salient into Syria.

Substantial Israeli and Syrian forces are already stationed in the areas of the reported movements, and it is not known whether the sightings represent a redeployment of forces there or an augmentation of them. For the past week, a number of Arab sources have reported that Syria has been putting its civilian and military forces on a wartime footing. They have also claimed that significant Syrian troop movements have occurred along the Golan front and that Syrian forces there

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 56, President's Daily Briefing, 16 November–31 December, 1973, President's Daily Briefs, December 1–December 15, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Contains Codeword. Scowcroft initialed for Kissinger. A stamped notation on the memorandum reads: "The President has seen."

have been reinforced. The reported Israeli troop movements may be in reaction to the Syrian activity.[2]

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East]

[2] Nixon underlined the last eight words of this sentence and wrote: "I doubt it. It sounds like the usual Israeli provocation."

393. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Damascus, December 15, 1973, 4–10:30 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

President Assad of Syria
Foreign Minister Khaddam of Syria
Secretary Kissinger
Assistant Secretary Sisco
Interpreter (Syrian)

Kissinger: This visit is important to peace in the area and our bilateral relations. Thank you for the polite, cordial reception.

Assad: Thank you, I am pleased to meet you. This is the first high level contact between our two countries in years.

Kissinger: I am the first Secretary of State to come in 23 years, since Mr. Dulles.

Assad: The U.S. responsible for all this.

Kissinger: The Foreign Minister pointed this out. (With a smile) The Foreign Minister was courteous, but I do not imply he was not strong in his views. Weakness is not one of the attributes of Syrian character.

Assad: We are glad our guests are pleased. Want to make clear the facts we believe in. Our relations can be built soundly by making certain facts clear.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1027, Presidential/HAK Memcons, Memcons, HAK & Presidential, December 1973, [1 of 2]. Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. Drafted by Sisco. The meeting took place in the President's office. Kissinger met with the Foreign Minister just prior to this meeting. (Memorandum of conversation, December 15; ibid., RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 7 US/KISSINGER)

Kissinger: We must be honest with each other; we must be frank with one another. I'll tell exactly what I think. I'm not a professional diplomat.

Assad: I am pleased to meet you. I have heard from other Arab brothers that you are frank. Most recently I have heard from our brother in Egypt.

Kissinger: I had good talk with Boumedienne.[2]

Assad: President Boumedienne recently sent envoy to brief me on your talk.

Kissinger: I knew Sadat was doing this. I told both of them they were free to tell you what I told them.

Assad: That is exactly what Boumedienne's envoy told us.

Kissinger: We have no desire to divide the Arab people.

Assad: We have no interest in division either.

Kissinger: I have told every Arab leader the same thing, and the Israelis too.

Assad: Although this is difficult, it is easier in the long run.

Kissinger: It is a difficult road to travel. We can do it only if we have confidence in each other.

Kissinger: How would the President like to proceed? What order?

Assad: The main problem is Israeli aggression. If these things you want to know about, anything, I would welcome any questions. If not, let's discuss the aggression. I want to stress our concern over US opinions and its stance. I may have an image of the US, yet direct talk gives clearer picture.

---

[2] Kissinger met with Houari Boumedienne, President of Algeria, December 13, at The Presidency, Algiers, 11:20 a.m.–1:15 p.m. According to the memorandum of conversation prepared by Rodman, Boumedienne began the conversation by accusing the United States of practicing a foreign policy of the "big stick" and raised concerns that the Arab states would be forced to accept a peace proposal imposed unilaterally by the United States or jointly by the United States and the Soviet Union. Kissinger replied by saying, "We don't want a Russian–American peace either, but we work with the Soviet Union because it is the only way to influence their actions. But we don't have the same objectives. Therefore, your second hypothesis, a U.S.–Soviet peace is also wrong . . . I told President Sadat, so I will tell you the same thing: We don't need a recognized preferred position in Egypt, Algeria, or anywhere. We can afford to rely on the proposition that a nationalist Arab who wishes to improve the well-being of his own people will have many reasons for good relations with the United States. We don't need an exclusive position, and we have enough confidence that we can have a mature relationship based on mutual interest. What we want from the Arabs is simply negative. We don't want them to be bases, military or political, for another superpower." Regarding the oil embargo, Kissinger stated that "it is unacceptable that pressure is put on us while we are trying to get some of the Arab demands. It is morally difficult. . . . It would be much more effective for the Arabs if the boycott were lifted and at some point of deadlock in the negotiations it could be used as pressure at a particular point." (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1027, Presidential/HAK Memcons, Memcons, HAK & Presidential, December 1973 [2 of 2])

Kissinger: There may be some bilateral problems to discuss, but first I will discuss the principal subject. The principal subject is bringing peace and justice to the ME. I gave a lunch for Arab foreign ministers in N.Y. before the war.[3] I said I recognized conditions under which Arabs were living were intolerable and we have to do something to change them. We would make an effort. American intentions were clear before the war. Nevertheless, war has created objective conditions which make hope possible. President Nixon understands this very well.

Assad: Some he does not understand.

Kissinger: As a former Harvard professor, I tend to confuse complexity with profundity. I never use one when ten words are possible. It is opposite with the President Assad.

Assad: I can talk as much if I have the material. Dr. Kissinger has a greater volume of material.

Kissinger: The truth is that I sometimes speak beyond my material. The truth is that without your sacrifices and courage, I would have tried and failed. There would be no chance of a peaceful solution without the Syrian and Egyptian effort on the battle field. As result, objective conditions to make progress toward peace are better than they have been. There is a good possibility to bring peace. I can't be certain, I don't want to mislead you. We will make a major effort. We have succeeded in a number of other fields. Many countries can write the exact conditions they favor. They don't have to implement them. We are the only country that can bring about political progress without war. You are right in pointing out we have supported Israel. That is true. Candidly, there are strong domestic pressures in US in favor of support of Israel. We have to manage our domestic situation if we are to be helpful. Don't put us in a position where we have to take final positions, when what is required are first steps. People say if you can't get Israel to go back to the October 22 positions, you cannot do anything. If I had been stupid, I could have achieved this. That's not a problem. For me to waste capital, to waste ammunition on this would not make sense, what is a few kilometers? Pressure on Israel must be for a bigger withdrawal. Israeli strategy is to get me to get them to say exactly where Israel is going, then all media and groups will start agitating against me, or they will start a fight on small issues. Next time when I ask for something bigger they could accuse me of being anti-Israeli. That's why there has been no fight over the October 22 positions. We need some time to organize ourselves domestically. We have made

[3] Secretary Kissinger hosted a lunch for Arab Foreign Ministers and Permanent Representatives to the UN in New York on September 25. A report was sent to all Middle Eastern posts in telegram 3416 from USUN, September 26. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

progress in organizing ourselves at home. I have spent much of my time with Congress. The press has also begun to turn. I told Sadat that after January 1 we will begin to show our hand. That promise remains in force. I repeat the same to you, I make the same promise to you.

How do we plan to proceed. First, we must get peace conference opened. Why? A peace conference provides legal front within which negotiating activity can go on. Real solutions will occur outside the conference. We must plan it as you make military campaigns. We must have agreement on a first phase, and then on second phase. We can use the conference to provide scenery and framework. What is first step? We are having difficulty getting the conference opened; but let's get back to substance.

On the Egyptian side, it is to get Israel to withdraw to something. This is significant psychologically; more important than any legal interpretation of 242. Israel should withdraw from the Canal region to the vicinity of the Mitla Pass. This would bring about a great psychological change everywhere in area. I have worked out some principles of a proposal which we hope to get approved after January. I will be glad to tell you, but Sadat may want to tell you.

I believe the same principles should be applied on Syrian side. There should be a first phase withdrawal from Syria. This will be harder since Israelis don't like you at all. That's my concern. I don't want the offensive. We can agree on some ideas on withdrawal. We are prepared to state this is first stage. It should be done during January. Then we should have discussions regarding the next stage. We are determined to make a major contribution to peace. We can discuss now withdrawal negotiations which should take place in January and which the US is prepared to support. Then there can be a discussion on the next phase.

We have a procedural problem with the Israelis, this is their willingness to agree to the US–USSR joint letter to the SYG. Some say they should agree, some say not. It is in their interest to get into a fight with us because it would confuse American public opinion. Israel is not eager to get conference started because it will require sacrifices. For six years they have said they want direct negotiations because they knew you would say no.

We need to do two things; delay the conference until December 21, so I can talk to them, so they can be brought around. I talked to Sadat, and he agreed it makes no difference whether it is the 18th or 21st. What is your view?

Assad: Of course, the whole thing depends on general results of our talk today. This is not a new idea, we had it previously.

Kissinger: Whether you come at all?

Assad: Our attitude as a whole our attendance at the conference depends on results of our talk.

Kissinger: Your life won't be unfulfilled if it does not open on 18th. Is this impression correct? You don't dream about not going to Conference?

Assad: We are not dreaming about going to the conference. No measures have been taken as yet, even the delegation has not been formed. We have heard of conference, that's apparent; we do not know what the conference will be, what it will achieve.

When we accepted 338 we had an idea of what conference should be. We are only one of the parties. It is clear that there are many interpretations of the peace conference and 338. They give an ambiguous picture. In addition, it is not clear how US and USSR see the picture. What is the agreement between the US and the USSR?

Kissinger: The USSR is a close ally of yours. They should help keep you informed. They always tell me what good friends you are. There is no agreement, except the conference. We'd rather make an agreement with you rather than the USSR make it with you. They have made specific proposals and a plan for a peace settlement. I've avoided them. Because if it viable proposal, we can make it directly to the Arabs. Lots of people give us advice. We have to do some work with the Israelis and Soviet Union can't help us there. They have no influence with Israel. There is only one agreement: a conference, and we'll stay in touch with one another. There is no agreement on substance on any issue. If you are told anything else, then it isn't true. I told Boumedienne that we do not recognize any sphere of influence in the Middle East. What will happen at the conference will depend on you and us. You can talk to the Soviets, we don't want influence Syrian-USSR relations. We will attempt to get separation of forces in the first phase, meaning some Israeli withdrawal. This would be followed by another stage of withdrawal and discussions on security, borders, Jerusalem and the fate of Palestinians. Timing of when these items go on the agenda, we should do intelligently and agree among each other. This is my course. I recognize the Palestine movement has to be discussed, but not in first phase. Once the conference exists for a week, it would probably become impossible to end it. Whoever does so takes on a tremendous responsibility. At this point we should talk about complex issues. That is my idea of conference. The conference is a mechanism for moving from war to peace. Time has come to bring about peace. We've been told by the Soviets, you had agreed to go to conference. We'd assumed you'd be there. I didn't know the question was still open. They told us you told them you are coming.

Assad: This has never happened. This does not mean we are not attending. Last thing discussed were some observations; this is not important now.

Kissinger: We must establish contact between us. If you want an interests section without diplomatic relations, then we can exchange messages directly. This would be useful at this stage.

Assad: It is true we have to seek doing things and urging direct contacts between us.

Kissinger: Otherwise we flying blind and might urge you to do things without knowing what you thought. Just a few people are enough. It is not satisfactory to tell the Italians what we want to tell you. On peace conference are you saying that since it no hardship for you not come on 18th, it is hardship for you not come on the 21st. Seriously, let us delay to the 21st if it does not make any difference to you.

Assad: Sadat has agreed?

Kissinger: Yes.

Assad: Nodded affirmatively and with a big smile on his face.

Kissinger: You have seen the letter to the SYG we intend to send to the participants. Our problem is Israelis don't want reference to the Palestinians in that letter, particularly because of their elections. Our view is that it would be a mistake to take up the Palestinian question now in the Conference. We recognize the problem cannot be solved without taking into account interests of the Palestinians. We are not opposed in principle to contact with the Palestinians. I already have an arrangement with the Moroccan King. There are so many Palestinian groups, we don't know who to deal with. You might advise us as to which might be an authentic group. We are willing to have contact with Palestinians at a level below me, say Sisco. I want to be in a position at present to say I've had no contact with them. As to any reference to the Palestinian question in the US–USSR letter, there are two ways to settle it. Everyone said to me you would get angry if I raised the Palestine question with you. The Russians say they are afraid to raise it with you. I'll take my chances. I rely on Arab hospitality.

As to the sentence on Palestinian representation in the US–USSR letter, one way to avoid it is to say "the question of other participation will be decided at first stage of conference." I've told you our view of the Palestinian issue, and I will be glad to give you a note as to our view on that sentence. It is just a way to avoid a big fight for nothing so the conference can get started. You are free to tell them what I have said re Palestinians, but you must promise it will not be made public. Sadat is willing to have invitation go without any specific mention of the Palestinians. There was another idea which is bigger departure than this which Sadat accepted. This would be for the US–USSR to send out a simple invitation without any legalistic formulae. We have a text. This Sadat has agreed to, but the Russians didn't want to put it to you. You see everybody says that of all the Arabs, you Syrians are the most impossible to deal with. I will send you a letter of apology.

Assad: If US policy toward the Arabs and the Syrians is based on wrong intelligence reports, it backs up my view you are responsible for the break in relations.

Kissinger: That's true. In September, intelligence reports described your military disposition as defensive. I called the Israeli Ambassador and asked if Syria was going to attack. He said impossible, not a chance. I didn't believe it. So I asked our own intelligence people. They said not a chance. Three times hard intelligence reports rejected the possibility. Since then, our intelligence predicts attacks every day. Does this happen in Syria too?

Assad: It is a mistake in estimating the situation. Perhaps someone sympathetic to Arabs.

Kissinger: I don't hardly listen to the experts. If you can accept the first alternative, I don't have to bother you on the second alternative. Sadat has accepted the second alternative. I have not discussed the question of other participants with Sadat. Israelis would have to accept it.

Assad: During my meeting with Sadat I saw a text which said "question of the Palestinians" would be raised at first stage. There were two texts; the Conference would discuss the "question of Palestinians", the other text would decide matter at first phase.

Kissinger: President Assad agreed to "question of"?

Assad: Yes.

Kissinger: I appreciated it. This is new suggestion to avoid meaningless fight. Whether the Palestinians will be invited cannot be decided by a few words. If Israeli propaganda machine starts in US, Israelis will say terrorists are being given recognition. I am willing for Sisco meet secretly with Palestinians. We are not trying to avoid problem, you could arrange a meeting if you wanted. Sentence would say "question of other participation," implies Palestinian representation.

Assad: Is it my turn to speak?

Kissinger: Please express your views.

Assad: I welcome you Dr. Kissinger. I am pleased to be meeting with you. This will give each of us an opportunity to understand the other side correctly. It is important that this understanding be accurate. The meeting should be frank and clear and should help us with clear ideas. This is what we seek from this meeting.

As a professor you have spoken for fifty minutes. The President was an officer and officers are brief. As a military man, I take the place of politicians; professors take the place of politicians. (Kissinger interjected most professors cannot replace politicians.)

Assad: I recall a report of your talk with the Arabs in New York, you made the point that your country cannot seek miracles. Miracles require prophets. I do not have any illusions about miracles or facts being interpreted as illusions. Facts should be named as facts and stressed as facts, despite difficulties. Facts are one thing; miracles are another.

I want to make the following points:

First, we are not or never have been against the people of the United States. I have said this many times and in many places. There is much convincing evidence that we have to be against U.S. policy because it is against Syrian interests and Syrian just aspirations. Had it not been for U.S. assistance in support of Israel, Israel could not remain in occupation and force out the Palestinians from their lands since 1948 but we are not against the United States as a country or a people.

Secondly, our policy is decided in light of our national interests. We want to build our line in a completely independent way. Syria is non-aligned. It is an effective member of the non-aligned group and a member of the Bureau [*Politburo*]. It cannot be diverted, because it has deep convictions.

Kissinger: We will not always agree on policy. We believe Israel should survive. This is not the Syrian objective. Our interest is that we want Middle Eastern countries to be independent and with strong leadership which reflects the authentic will of the people. We prefer to deal with strong leaders. We are interested in national independence. We like to think you don't follow any other's line. What you have said is philosophically acceptable to us.

Assad: We find our policy reflects the hopes and aspirations of our own people. They support it. Otherwise we could not face a number of difficulties. What you say is important and useful. (He stressed this twice.)

Third, we in this area want to realize a just peace. We are serious. We want to build our own country. We need a just peace.

Fourth, there can be no peace with justice unless the Arab Palestinian question is settled. The Arab people of Palestine were driven out by force and are now living in camps. How can there be peace without settling their problem?

We believe the U.S. is the major factor to check the aggressive Israeli spirit. Simultaneously, the U.S. is also a major factor in encouraging the aggressive spirit. When we discuss the question of Israel or our fight against them, it is not out of hatred of Jews. I have said this often. This is an area of Judaism, Islam and Christianity. They have lived together for a very long time. We do not deny Israel by maltreating Jews. The Zionist movement by their attitudes has affected

their lives in countries they live. Nevertheless, we view the citizens as citizens of Islam. Even when the Jews had their normal life in our country, Israel tried to force them to take action contrary to their interests. For example, the two and one-half year campaign regarding the Syrian Jews is untrue. The biggest store in Syria is owned by a Jew. The most famous pediatrician was a Jewish doctor and most of his patients were Moslems.

Kissinger: There is no question that the Jews have lived together with the Moslems in peace for a long time. I agree.

Assad: We recently seized spies for Israel, one Jew, one Moslem. We have full evidence against them. About a year and one-half ago, there were certain questions regarding some Jews accused of taking money out of the country. Many citizens in our country were condemned under this law. But two Jewish women were given special amnesty because of their Jewish faith. We are against Zionism as an expansionist move but we are not against Jews or the Jewish religion.

The next point I want to make is that no leaders of a regime can give up any sovereignty. We cannot compromise one inch of territory. It should all be restored. Within the framework of these points, Israel does not want peace and cannot realize her dream without the U.S. Israel talks about secure borders. The invalidity of this theory is obvious. Are there secure borders in these important times? Modern weapons show there are no real secure borders. This theory is invalid.

If we are to suppose there are such secure borders, history shows we are in the need of secure borders if anyone. Why should secure borders be at the expense of Syria. Let secure borders be at Galilee if anywhere. Under what logic should secure borders be at the expense of the population of Golan. Why should the line of danger be closer to Damascus than Tel Aviv? The distance from the '67 border to Damascus is 80 kilometers; the distance from the '67 border to Tel Aviv is 135 kilometers. So why should they want secure borders. If the idea behind it is to keep danger away from both capitals, why not?

Kissinger: You will be in trouble if they move their capital to Haifa.

Assad: In that case we will move our capital to Koneitra. As to Egypt, we have to take into account its rate of population and that it will soon be 50 million.

Kissinger: I am not condemning it. I made a joke.

Assad: Some people may answer that these are the realities that Israel occupies the territory and has force. Of course, in this context we can only take lessons from history. We are also guided by the objective analysis of the past and the future. We conclude that the future is not for the logic of Israel. Israel today is in the Golan Heights. Maybe some day we will be somewhere beyond Golan. Israel would be in another

place if it had not been for the U.S. in this recent war. Israel has made penetrations and pockets, but they have not gained any military advantage.

Kissinger: I agree.

Assad: On the contrary, it is a grave point of weakness for Israel. The war is stopped. Both sides are tired. Had the war continued for two days more Syrian forces would have been in a different position. I am completely confident on this on the basis of fighting on the two fronts. Until when will the Israelis rely on their unlimited American support? This attitude is against the U.S. interests and principles of peace and justice. I do not have in mind the question of oil when I mention U.S. national interests. It goes beyond merely oil. If the U.S. interests were confined only to oil that would be a catastrophe. U.S. has many other vital interests. We do not believe this American backing will continue in the manner it has. This is our first meeting. I am speaking frankly and openly so it will lay the basis for a future common understanding between our two countries.

Kissinger: The Russians don't want to discuss the conference with you. They want us to do it. They want me to take the blame. I mean no disrespect for what you have said and your philosophy. It raises the question of your concept of peace. Perhaps we could concentrate on some practical questions.

Assad: I understand from other Arabs that you believe things should move gradually. You believe that things require time. I believe when the US tells Israel to go back it will do so without hesitation. There is a precedent in 1956, and then it was even more complicated because the US and UK were allied with Israel. This is a fact not a miracle.

Kissinger: I agree. The present situation is different and the internal situation is much more complex.

Assad: I move to practical steps.

1. Is the US with us on our idea that we cannot give up one inch of territory or do you have other views?

2. Do you believe that there can't be a solution without the peoples of Palestine?

3. Are we to go to the Peace Conference for implementation of the above two points or only to think and take a long time without reaching a radical solution?

Kissinger: The purpose is to convene a conference for peace not for trivialities. There is no question that those who want to delay matters want to concentrate on trivialities. We will use our influence to move towards a sound peace. This is my response to the first question.

As to the second, we recognize that a final settlement must take into account the problems and the aspirations of the Palestinians.

Third, we are prepared to discuss with you now or later withdrawal of Israeli forces in a first stage. As to the ultimate destination (withdrawal), it is true that the Security Council resolution 242 opposes the acquisition of territory by force. We recognize that there have to be further withdrawals beyond the first stage. We have avoided taking a position on your question because everything in the Middle East becomes public sooner or later. That would be suicidal for us. But you are a man of facts and two facts are evident: there can be no settlement you don't agree to and we will not force you; in any event, if there is a start with some of your territory regained, my view is after the first stage of disengagement we must then address the specific problems of security guarantees, borders, and so on. After disengagement, that should be less difficult to resolve. I don't deny that there will be difficulties but our direction is clear. We must move now to disengagement. I discussed principles with Sadat, and there have to be modifications in negotiations. We did not discuss the details, we discussed concepts only. These included: The Egyptian Army staying east of the Canal; a thinning out; a withdrawal of three Egyptian divisions; restrictions on tanks and heavy artillery; Israeli withdrawal from the West Bank to about 35 kilometers east in the area of the Mitla Pass; a buffer area with UN forces in it; and an Israeli thinning out of their forces on their own side of the line and possible moving of their army back east of Mitla. We are prepared to support such concepts. Now as to the Syrian situation, is there an area where you could have a buffer, an area where the Israelis could stay in the first stage. We would be prepared to say publicly we consider it a first stage.

Assad: Golan is smaller than the Sinai. Weapons of one side should not affect weapons of the other side. Moreover, the villages in Golan are numerous, 163 more than in the Sinai. Of course, disengagement should involve all of the Golan Heights.

Kissinger: They will never accept it. Can I see any ideas you may have? I do not know the area. It is conceivable that the Israelis might be willing to go out of the area they occupied after October 6. I want to make clear I have never discussed this with the Israelis.

Assad: That is not worth anything. It is in our interest they stay where they are. It is only a pocket.

Kissinger: I haven't studied it.

Assad: The weapons should become ineffective.

Kissinger: How far should it be?

Assad: At least 20–25 kilometers.

Kissinger: I cannot promise something I cannot deliver.

Assad: Disengagement is different from withdrawal.

Kissinger: It is possible that the Syrian Army might be able to follow up and occupy up to a certain point certain of the areas evacuated.

Assad: No observers?

Kissinger: I don't want to mislead you. Conceivably, your army could move up from part of the way and UN observers could be in place.

Assad: If withdrawal is only restricted to the pocket, it doesn't solve the problem.

Kissinger: You are thinking of disengagement beyond the October 6 line.

Assad: Of course, after all our forces are on the October 6 line, the only exception is in the pocket.

Kissinger: Their generals didn't know war has to be fought for political objectives. I don't understand why they did what they did.

Assad: I don't either.

Kissinger: Territory is meaningless unless it gives a political advantage. I want to talk to the Israelis about this matter. Everybody thinks you are irresponsible. I would like to communicate with you. How do I do this?

Assad: If you go to Geneva, I can contact you. I agreed with Sadat that disengagement first had to be settled with you.

Kissinger: I did not know a prior disengagement agreement was a condition of your attendance at Geneva. I can send Sisco back to Damascus. Or you can always go to the conference. We ourselves don't need a conference. We are in the ridiculous position of talking with everybody to go to the conference. If the conference doesn't start, you are playing the Israeli game. It will be an open conference, two days of meetings. In the internal working groups studies of the problems will be made, then the conference will resume. If no progress is made, you don't have to go back to the conference. If by the time it resumes we will not have made real progress on disengagement you could refuse to go back.

Assad: I agreed with Sadat that the question of disengagement on the Syrian-Israeli front should be discussed with you, that the conference would be only a framework. This question of disengagement must be settled beforehand.

Kissinger: I have had many chances to have talks with the Israelis. If you are willing to have talks with the Israelis so that in the interval you can make proposals and they can make proposals, this would be fine.

Assad: The question of POWs should be closely linked to disengagement.

Kissinger: I understand this. First, the conference should be opened then there would be set up working groups on disengagement. Before the conference, Syria should give its list of POWs to the Israelis, permit Red Cross visits, and release the wounded. The rest of the POWs could be released when there is actual agreement on disengagement. With that I could go to Israel. They would think I have real influence with you. You still have the basic weapon of withholding the final release of all the remainder of the POWs if there is not agreement on disengagement.

Assad: In light of past experience with Israel, I believe no result will come. There must be prior agreement on Syrian-Israeli disengagement, otherwise our attendance at the Conference is without sense.

Kissinger: The best we can do is our best effort. We have not given anyone any promise we can't keep. I'm in no position to make an agreement. If the conference never meets, I have no objection. Let everyone talk alone and see what they can get, but I believe it is important to get the conference started. Then it is a means for continuing pressure for withdrawal, and we will help in that.

I came here under a misapprehension. I did not think your attendance was conditional on anything. When I said I would discuss disengagement, it was out of good will, not to get you to go to the conference.

Assad: Let me say that we welcome you here, Dr. Kissinger, so that we can understand each other. I did not link this meeting, we may or may not agree on attending the Peace Conference but I have not told anybody that I would without saying additionally what I have said to you. I have never told anyone that we are going without certain requirements being met, and Sadat agreed.

Kissinger: We were misled.

Assad: I was told by Sadat that there had been agreement between you and he on disengagement, that there was agreement on the framework.

Kissinger: That is correct. First we must have a conference. You understand that there have been no talks between you and the Israelis on disengagement as there have been between the Egyptians and the Israelis.

Assad: Today I received Sadat's envoy who said that the question of disengagement on the Syrian-Israeli front would be agreed between us.

Kissinger: There have been six weeks of exchanges with Sadat on the question of disengagement. There have been no such exchange with Syria. There is also the background of the Israeli-Egyptian talks at Kilometer 101. I will work in the same spirit with you. It would be irresponsible for me to start drawing lines. I have not studied the matter. You

wouldn't respect me if I did this. I am a serious man. Moreover, the Russians have told us you have accepted the US–USSR letter to the Secretary General.

Assad: I would respect you because I suppose you will be following up on these things. You have made this clear.

Kissinger: When I promise you something I want to keep it. For that there is need for a framework. There is need for a Geneva Conference.

Assad: The general impression is that Dr. Kissinger is a serious man and keeps his promises.

Kissinger: There are two practical problems. One is procedural and the other is substantive. I cannot be the principal negotiator. I can be the mediator. Perhaps there can be military talks with the Israelis on disengagement outside the conference. The danger in this is that they may agree on disengagement, then there would be no Israeli incentive to go to the conference.

Let me summarize. You don't care about the date of the conference if you aren't coming.

Assad: It makes no difference to us.

Kissinger: You agree to the 21st.

Assad: If I'm not going, our opinion is of no value.

Kissinger: Your decision does not depend on that.

Assad: No, it does not.

Kissinger: The Egyptians and the Soviets have agreed to go to the conference. I don't know how to proceed. If you are willing to start military talks with the Israelis, we are willing to help you bring about an acceptable disengagement agreement. If you don't give the list of POWs, Israel won't agree to go.

Assad: We have to agree on disengagement before we go to the Conference.

Kissinger: You need to give the list, permit a Red Cross visit and exchange the wounded to get discussions on disengagement.

Assad: Our understanding of what you say is that agreement on disengagement must be accompanied by the POW list and a Red Cross visit.

Kissinger: I told Sadat Israel won't talk to you unless you give them the list and permit the Red Cross visit.

Assad: There are two Geneva Conventions including one on the repatriation of civilians. They have made an offer. 20,000 people are important. Why should we give anything without anything in return. We are taking back our own land.

Kissinger: The Israelis will permit the return of your people to the lands when you return the POWs.

Assad: That is why disengagement is linked to the release of the POWs.

Kissinger: I understand it. I need to give the list, the Red Cross visit and an exchange of the wounded. The POWs should be released before discussions on disengagement.

Assad: Why give up these cards, for what? The exchange of POWs is linked to land.

Kissinger: How about the list?

Assad: There must be prior agreement on disengagement.

Kissinger: Before the list?

Assad: What do we get?

Kissinger: Give the list, begin negotiations on disengagement.

Assad: Beginning talks are a loss to us. Our people do not want talks.

Kissinger: How shall we proceed? Israelis won't talk to you unless you give the list. I can't understand why you take the view that there can be no release of the POWs until disengagement agreement is achieved. When I was in Moscow, Brezhnev promised that you would release the POWs in a few days.[4]

Assad: I never talked on this subject with them.

Kissinger: I will be glad to show you the minutes of the meeting. I never deceive you. When the conference opens there would be two working groups established. Before the beginning of the work of the two groups, you would give the Israelis the POW list. This would make it easier to deal with them later.

Assad: This would be possible providing first there is agreement on disengagement on the Syrian-Israeli front.

Kissinger: The Israelis would agree that there should be some disengagement, but the details would have to be negotiated.

Assad: This is difficult. We will never agree with the Israelis.

Kissinger: You can have the UN there in a subgroup, and we will help you on the side, I promise you.

Assad: I prefer to reach prior agreement with you on where the line of disengagement. This is just the way it was in the case of Egypt.

Kissinger: Egypt is different. There have been a number of discussions with the Israelis, then military talks at Kilometer 101. I gave them some ideas.

---

[4] See Documents 221 and 222.

Assad: Egyptian-Israeli talks on disengagement and other disengagement talks were not fruitful.

Kissinger: Yes and no. They were fruitful enough for me to have a full exchange with both sides.

Assad: There is no agreement on distance.

Kissinger: Put forward some proposals, so I can understand what can be done.

Assad: I understand with Sadat he has worked out an agreement with you.

Kissinger: It is more complicated than that. On the Syrian-Israeli front I could not draw a line. It would be stupid for me to do so. You have to get the Israelis used to the idea. The Cabinet would have to decide. If I bring a proposal now to them, there would be an explosion.

Assad: If within a period of time our people see the results, it would have a big effect on our people.

Kissinger: We have to get started.

Assad: If we go to the Conference without deciding things our losses would be very great.

Kissinger: I told Sadat I would use my influence. I could not tell him what would happen.

Assad: Israel cannot say no when the US wants them to say yes.

Kissinger: The problem is much more complex than that. It is essential to get a process started. If this is impossible, there is no natural law that we have to be the mediator. If we can do it, I will use my best efforts to produce a disengagement agreement. I can't tell you at this point what it is. I want to hear from Israel, then you should talk to the Israelis, then I can help. Everything I promised Sadat I have done.

Assad: I will await a reply from you. I suggest we look more at the map. (There was a period in which Assad showed Secretary Kissinger the enclave and the October 6 line; he mentioned no specific lines of withdrawal; he stressed how small an area the Golan is.) It is not difficult to see the short distances and within a short period of time.

Kissinger: It took me four years to settle the Vietnam war. You are asking for something absolutely impossible if I were to attempt it. I cannot draw a line. It is too important a mission to start it. It would disappoint you. We can help once negotiations start, like the Egyptian case. Sadat knows and appreciates timing, and how to make things develop. This is important. We haven't got a line agreed to. Maybe Israel won't come to the Conference. "Participation of other Participants" will solve the problem.

Assad: This could mean Europe, China, etc.

Kissinger: It could say "Other participants from the Middle East".

Assad: Isn't this too much support by the US for Israel?

Kissinger: Why fight it now? This is totally irrelevant now. For me to make such promises are not worth it.

Assad: Anything you agree with Egypt on a text of a letter is all right with us.

Kissinger: The points I made regarding the Palestinians is our position. What will your answer be to the letter? Will you put your weight behind it? In time I will help you, before the end of January, before the end of six weeks. The only two people who can pull off a settlement are President Nixon and myself.

If at the beginning you say "no conference", I will be totally discredited. If there is no conference after two trips to the Middle East I will be discredited. Perhaps the best thing for me is for there not to be a conference. I have no personal ambition in this. In ten years they will thank me in Israel. They don't understand that now. When you make your decision, I hope you keep in mind the fact that it is a chance for the first time in 25 years. We must trust each other at least for a month or two. We want the conference to open and the working groups to meet in the first week of January. You should give the list and allow the Red Cross to visit at the opening of the working group meeting and work out an agreement by the end of January. You can have a UN man there. We will be glad to work behind the scenes with you. I can send Sisco to you in January, and we'll shape it up. You can release all the remainder of the POWs after the agreement has been achieved.

Assad: Difficulties are being created by Israel. We cannot go to the conference without things being clear. Disengagement should be agreed on before the conference.

Kissinger: Principles, possibly, but details impossible.

Assad: In this case Egypt and Jordan will go, and we will see what happens.

Kissinger: It is a mistake for you.

Assad: I don't agree with you.

Kissinger: How can we discuss disengagement on the Syrian-Israeli front if there is no military working group at the Geneva Conference.

Assad: In any event, agreement will be outside the conference.

Kissinger: Well then, the US–USSR letter will be sent you, and you can either accept it or not as the case may be.

Assad: In any case, I think your contact can be maintained. We shall not attend any conference before agreement on disengagement.

Kissinger: I was never told this, to the contrary. What will you tell the Secretary General in response to his invitation to go to the conference.

Assad: The text of the letter is not accurate.

Kissinger: But you said you agreed to the text of the letter. The letter won't be accurate if you do not agree to go to the conference, the letter cannot be sent. My Middle East mission would be a failure. It would be difficult for me to do any more work on this problem.

Assad: If you continue, there could be progress. Are we to give up territory?

Kissinger: That is not what I want to do. There is no sense talking to you if my purpose was to bring about what the Israelis want. I cannot agree to a disengagement plan. I didn't do that with Sadat, and I can't do that with you. I can have full influence once the talks have begun between you and Israel.

Assad: You will get acquainted with the Israeli view.

Kissinger: I cannot get a disengagement agreement by Friday,[5] perhaps by the end of January.

Assad: Maybe you should postpone the conference.

Kissinger: I can't travel around the world. If there is no conference I will not be able to do anything more. We will look ridiculous. Somebody else can see what can be done. If I go to Israel and tell them you are not going to the conference, there will be a celebration in Israel. If you do not go this would set things back. It would be difficult to explain it failed. This would be a setback for months. I will not do it. This would make us the laughingstock in the American press. This is not necessarily your problem. I don't see where diplomacy goes from here.

Assad: We were very clear with all of the people we contacted.

Kissinger: I would not be here if I had been told this. I would not have taken on a trip under such conditions. If I were to send the text of the letter, you would be saying no objection to the text, but you have objection to the conference.

Assad: This is not quite accurate. All things we are discussing are clearly connected. For example, the letter, the conference, the working group, are connected. The text is a framework but it is irrelevant unless we agree on substance.

Kissinger: How can I agree on a plan on disengagement, when you don't even have a plan. There is no point in going forward.

I have tried to be helpful to the Arab people. If this is not possible, it is fine with me. I can't promise what I can't deliver. Perhaps we should drop the whole process of a letter or accept either form. I must caution you that all of these discussions are very confidential. We will contact Egypt and the USSR to see what they think.

---

[5] December 21.

Assad: Anything you don't want made public will not be made public, except only our attitude.

Kissinger: If the talks fail and there is no conference, speculation will be so rampant. It will be hopeless to recreate the circumstances. In America this will be impossible.

Assad: I'm sorry if you have failed. I have no cards to help facilitate your discussion. I have nothing at all to offer. I want to help you. We will not attend. It is important that there be disengagement on both fronts.[6]

Kissinger: I agree that there should be disengagement on both fronts, but I cannot agree on a line at this time. I have not studied the matter.

Assad: Before leaving for Algiers I talked to Sadat. Egypt wants Israel to withdraw east of the passes. This occurred at the Kilometer 101 talks.

Kissinger: Israel withdrew the Yariv offer immediately. I'll do my best in the framework of the conference. I am sure I will succeed. I can't tell you the exact line today.

Assad: We still have a few days. Maybe that will be enough.

Kissinger: You will be sent the US–USSR letter. Let's see what happens. If there is a conference I will work with you seriously. By the end of January, disengagement on both frontiers should be possible.

Assad: If we go to the conference how will we know where the line will be? On the Egyptian-Israeli front they know.

Kissinger: They don't know exactly. Where should the line of disengagement go?

Assad: Can you suggest anything?

Kissinger: I cannot. I have not studied the problem.

Kissinger: Can we agree to establish an American Interests Section? We must maintain contact.

Assad: Yes, we must maintain contact. What do you have in mind?

Kissinger: An Interests Section of a few people just as we have in Baghdad and Algiers.

Assad: That should be possible.

---

[6] Kissinger wrote in his memoirs: "This seemingly perverse reaction hid a major breakthrough. In his convoluted way, Asad was in fact blessing the peace process and our strategy. If Syria did not object to the peace conference and was indifferent to the content of the letter of invitation, all roadblocks would disappear. We could finesse the Palestinians by simply placing them among 'other participants' in the draft letter. Israel's insistence on the release of its POWs as a precondition for participating with Syria in the peace conference now became academic." (*Years of Upheaval*, pp. 784–785)

Kissinger: As to further immediate contact maybe we could send Ambassador Buffum to see President Assad.

Assad: Yes, that would be fine.

Kissinger: I will have him come in a few days to report to you on my talks in Israel.

Assad: I agree that you can send a few people to Damascus.

Kissinger: You are free to do the same—to send them to Washington.

Kissinger: What should we say publicly?

Assad: That we have had a frank and useful talk, and that we have agreed to maintain contact.

---

394. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Amman, December 15/16, 1973.

PARTICIPANTS

His Majesty King Hussein
Crown Prince Hassan
Prime Minister Zaid Rifai
Abdul Munim Rifai

The Secretary
Assistant Secretary Joseph J. Sisco
Chargé d'Affaires Pierre Graham
Deputy Assistant Secretary Alfred L. Atherton, Jr.
Mr. Harold Saunders

Secretary: I regret the delay in our arrival. Our planning was not good. We had not counted on the time it would take for translation of my talk in Damascus[2] and on the fact that Assad is a Syrian. He began with a two-hour speech on the whole Ba'ath Party program.

About the present negotiations, it is a procedural problem. The Israelis don't want to mention the Palestinians in the letter to the Secretary General. I assume Your Majesty doesn't want to either. We have now found a new formulation which will simply refer to "other participants" instead of "Palestinians and Lebanon." Assad told me that if

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 27–14 ARAB–ISR. Secret; Nodis. The original is marked "Draft."

[2] See Document 393.

Egypt accepts this formulation, Syria will also. We have sent it to the Egyptians. If they agree, we will then transmit it to Israel.

Assad does have one slight problem: he objects to the phrase that Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Israel have agreed to participate in the conference. Assad said he has not agreed. He wants to know the outcome of the conference in advance. Your Majesty will appreciate that this is impossible. The way it was left is that if Sadat agrees to the draft letter, we will send our Ambassador in Beirut to Syria for a further talk with Assad. I think Syria will probably go along, though I can't imagine why I am so anxious to have Syria at the conference.

King: Is Syria the reason for delaying the conference?

Secretary: No. The delay is due to Israel's objection to mentioning the Palestinians. I have asked that the conference be postponed until the 21st to give me an opportunity for a discussion with the Israelis.[3] We may have a conference with only Jordan and Egypt. Seriously, though, I think Israel will have to go to the conference and that Syria will also go.

Zaid Rifai: What about the POW question?

Secretary: I discussed it with Assad. He said he would not deal with it before the disengagement stage. What we particularly discussed was whether Syria would turn over the list of POW's before or after an agreement.

King: I raised the POW question when I was in Damascus. Assad said that if Israel would leave his territory, he was prepared for a POW exchange.

Secretary: Assad sounds very tough.

What are Your Majesty's views on how to handle the Palestinian question?

King: I have always been committed to peace and I am speaking more and more about the Palestinians. We and the Palestinians have a long history of close ties. The problem is that before 1948, Jordan was the only Arab country to say that the other Arabs should not involve themselves in the problem. But the other Arabs entered the war then, and it has been a problem ever since. The other Arabs would like now to find a way out, and insist on handing over the Palestinians to the PLO. But I don't think the PLO has any claim. The trouble is that the Palestinians sit back, protest, and leave the problem to others. The Soviets are playing a double game with the Palestinians.

---

[3] In telegram Secto 112 from Riyadh to Cairo, December 14, Kissinger sent a message to Sadat through Fahmi asking for the delay. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1179, Harold H. Saunders, Middle East Negotiation Files, Mideast—1973, Peace Negotiations, December 13–17, 1973 [3 of 3])

Secretary: They can't act in good faith. In Egypt, I told the Soviets what we were doing to avoid confusion, and they used it against us.

King: I am prepared to let the Palestinians decide what they want.

Secretary: Sadat has agreed that the Palestinian question should not be discussed until after the disengagement stage.

Zaid Rifai: What does disengagement mean? Does it mean Arab-Israeli, including Jordan?

Secretary: It means mostly those who were in the last war, but should not exclude Jordan.

Zaid Rifai: Would disengagement be local?

Secretary: It means creating a buffer zone including those involved in the October war; then would come the second stage.

Zaid Rifai: Why schedule the Palestinian question at the second stage?

Secretary: The draft letter says only that it will be discussed.

Zaid Rifai: We have no problem with discussing the Palestinians so long as this is not linked to withdrawal. We should first get withdrawal and then a Palestinian settlement.

Secretary: That is a reasonable view. Our point was that we would not want to discuss the Palestinian question during the first week of the conference.

King: Can you give some impressions of your trip?

Secretary: In Cairo, Sadat was reasonable. Faisal was more moderate than before.[4] I have just described the Syrians. I don't have to describe the Israelis. I assure Your Majesty that tomorrow night, after an exhausting week, I will be accused by the Israelis of having betrayed them.

I am optimistic if we can once get negotiations started and if the Arabs maintain discipline. Candidly, the only Arabs that worry me are the Syrians. I am not certain that they are in touch with reality. What is Your Majesty's view? Do they have any chance of winning if fighting breaks out again?

King: I doubt it. They had a surprise the last time. Israel won't be so overconfident again. I have the impression that Egypt and Syria are talking in terms of resuming hostilities. It depends on the Soviets. We need to make progress.

Secretary: It will be hard to make progress if there is no conference.

Zaid Rifai: Did you discuss anything specific in Cairo?

---

[4] The memorandum of conversation of Kissinger's December 14 meeting with King Faisal is ibid., RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 27 ARAB-ISR. A portion is printed in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXXVI, Energy Crisis, 1969–1974, Document 267.

Secretary: We mainly discussed procedures. There is a need for three working parties: Israeli-Egyptian, Israeli-Jordanian, and Israeli-Syrian. I also made the point that the Palestinian issue should not be discussed in the first stage. I told Sadat that the situation is complicated enough without the Palestinians. Sadat did not contradict me.

Abdul Munim Rifai: This is agreeable to the Egyptians?

Secretary: Yes, but I am not sure about the Syrians. I am not sure how we get them involved.

Zaid Rifai: I agree with the Syrians that the negotiations should be between one Arab side and the Israeli side. I am concerned that Egypt will make its own agreement and abandon Jordan.

Abdul Munim Rifai: I raised this with Sadat, who agrees with our views.

Secretary: They are also our views.

King: It is alright to negotiate the details separately, but we need a package settlement.

Secretary: I agree, but if all parties negotiate together, there will be no settlement.

Abdul Munim Rifai: The West Bank problem is different from the problems of Egypt and Syria. We need them.

Sisco: Would it not be better if each country negotiated its own problems?

Zaid Rifai: All I meant was that the final document should be approved by all parties.

Secretary: That's what I meant too.

Abdul Munim Rifai: Do you envisage sub-groups at the outset?

Secretary: Largely in the disengagement phase. We need results quickly. Israel's strategy is to make a fuss about every issue so that nothing will be settled. The best thing is to get disengagement out of the way first.

Abdul Munim Rifai: Will there be a disengagement phase with Jordan?

Zaid Rifai: We would like that—a few kilometers on the West Bank would help.

Secretary: You mean for Jordan to re-occupy?

Zaid Rifai: Yes.

Secretary: I doubt that is possible. The need is to ease a few categories of control.

Zaid Rifai: What will happen in the opening stage? Just speeches? We need an agenda.

Sisco: That would complicate matters.

Zaid Rifai: His Majesty has ordered that Jordan should go to the conference.

Secretary: Jordan should go and establish its presence. When the other Arabs look at the problem, they will want Jordan to negotiate. Israel will not give up the West Bank to Arafat.

---

395. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo[1]

Amman, December 16, 1973, 0001Z.

Secto 133/6628. For Ambassador Eilts From the Secretary. Subject: Peace Conference. Please pass the following oral message to President Sadat through Fahmi.

"I want to give you a brief report on the six and one half hour conversation I had with President Asad.[2]

We discussed the date of the opening of the conference and he has no objection to a postponement to the 21st. After a rather detailed discussion on the content of the draft U.S.–USSR letter to the Secretary General, President Asad said that he is prepared to go along with any formulation which is acceptable to you.

I discussed with him frankly the difficulties which Israel is finding with the draft letter and in particular to the reference to the Palestinians in the letter. I discussed with President Asad the following reformulation of the last sentence in paragraph 2 which I hope you will find acceptable. It would read 'The parties have also agreed that the question of other participants from the Middle East area will be discussed during the first stage of the conference.' If you agree to this revision, I will make a major effort in Israel on Sunday[3] to get its approval.

However, I regret to report that I learned for the first time that President Asad is very hesitant about coming to the conference unless there is prior agreement on the precise line of disengagement in the Golan Heights. I frankly told President Asad that in my judgment it

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, X, November–December 1973. Top Secret; Flash; Cherokee; Nodis. Repeated Immediate to the Department of State to pass to the White House for Scowcroft.

[2] See Document 393.

[3] December 16.

would be a serious mistake if he decided not to participate in the conference. I pointed out that getting agreement on a specific line of disengagement before the conference would be impossible. I explained that, for example, there had been no military representative talks between the Syrians and Israelis as there have been between your representatives and those of Israel. Without some prior indication of the position of both sides, as was the case in the discussions of the Egyptian-Israeli military representatives, I could not be expected before the 21st to produce such an agreement and that I would not promise what I could not produce. I did state to President Asad my firm belief that once the conference is convened, and a Syrian-Israeli sub-group is formed, that it would be possible for me to make a major effort in the month of January with a view to achieving a disengagement agreement on the Syrian-Israeli front as we hope and expect on the Egyptian-Israeli front.

I hope that you will find a way to communicate with President Asad in light of the above report. I hope you will urge him to attend the conference. If the conference fails now, all the momentum I have built up and all the hopes we have had will be dissipated.

If you agree with revised formulation in the letter given above, I intend to ask the Soviets to have their Ambassador in Damascus present the draft letter to the Syrians and then they can decide how they will respond to the Secretary General's invitation. I intend also to ask the Soviets to urge an affirmative decision on the Syrians and I hope that you will do the same."[4]

Ambassador should brief Vinogradov[5] generally on the above after briefing Fahmi, telling him that we are going to take up this matter specifically and in detail with Dobrynin[6] for Moscow's reaction. I will

---

[4] In telegram Secto 141/6637 from Amman to Cairo, December 16, Kissinger instructed Eilts to explain to Fahmi that the United States would turn to the short letter to the participants and to the Secretary General only if it failed to get Israeli approval of the longer draft letter, and to emphasize that it was imperative for Sadat to weigh in with the Syrians to help assure that there would be an affirmative Syrian reply. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1179, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, December 13, 1973 thru Dec. 17, 1973) In telegram 4036 from Cairo, December 16, Eilts reported that he had conveyed the Secretary's messages to Fahmi, who noted that Sadat had already indicated that the precise language of the draft letters was no longer important and who expressed doubt that further intervention with the Syrians would be successful. (Ibid., Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov.–Dec. 31, 1973)

[5] In telegram 4041 from Cairo, December 16, Eilts reported that he had just briefed Vinogradov, whose only comment had been to express some personal skepticism that the conference would take place. (Ibid.)

[6] As instructed in telegram Hakto 48 from Kissinger to Scowcroft, December 16. (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, HAKTO 1–88, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

have to have a reply from Fahmi before I arrive in Israel Sunday evening.[7]

Kissinger

[7] In telegram 4043 from Cairo, December 16, Eilts conveyed Sadat's reply, noting that the President had said that Kissinger should know he would stand by the agreement the two of them had reached and that Egypt would "under all circumstances" go to the peace conference. He had also asked Fahmi to again get in touch with the Syrians. (Ibid., Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov.–Dec.31, 1973)

396. Memorandum From the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, December 16, 1973.

The following is a report from Dr. Kissinger on his meeting in Damascus with President Asad.[2]

"I had a six and one-half hour conversation with Asad[3] which gave me an insight into Syrian character and shrewdness. Asad is intelligent, tough, personable with a sense of humor, a leader who seems to be walking a tightrope in face of internal pressures from the Baath party. There is no question, however, that he is the toughest and least conciliatory Arab leader that I have met.

"He was relaxed on the question of the postponement of the peace conference from the 18th to the 21st, making the point to me that Syria probably would not go to the peace conference unless I would commit us in advance of the negotiation to a precise line of withdrawal for Israel. This we cannot do before the conference has even convened. On the other hand there are other indicators that he will probably go to the conference and that this is only bargaining. I told him it was impossible to achieve a disengagement agreement before the opening of the conference but that if he could give me some specific Syrian ideas in this

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 43, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, State Cables, Memos & Misc., Dec. 8–22, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Eyes Only. Sent for information.

[2] The report was transmitted to Scowcroft in telegram Hakto 52 from Jerusalem, December 16. (Ibid., Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, HAKTO 1–88, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

[3] See Document 393.

regard which I could discuss with the Israelis, I could make a major effort to bring about a disengagement agreement on the Syrian-Israeli front more or less symmetrical with the one we hope to achieve on the Israeli-Egyptian front. I will be exploring Sunday[4] with Mrs. Meir any ideas she may have in this regard. I will then send our Ambassador to Beirut, Buffum, to Damascus on Tuesday for further discussions.

"I pressed him very hard on the POW issue and told him that it would be in his interests to provide the Israelis with a list, permit Red Cross visits and exchange the wounded at the time the peace conference opens, and he could defer the exchange of the remainder of the prisoners until an agreement on the disengagement was achieved. He did not budge on this, and we know from other previous reports that he thinks that he can get even better terms from the Israelis in view of the emotions on this issue in Israel during this election campaign.

"Asad saw immediately the need for ongoing practical contacts between us and he has agreed that we can open an interests section with three or four people without a lot of public fanfare.

"I got some insight to the Syrian relationship with the Soviets. He did not give me the impression that there has been much close contact between the two of them with respect to preparations for the peace conference and he seemed anxious to have direct contact with us. He seems to be concerting his position closely with Sadat. But it is clear that the Syrians will be hard to deal with."

[4] December 16.

397. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Beirut, December 16, 1973.

PARTICIPANTS

Lebanon
Suleiman Frangie, President of Lebanon
Taqi al-Din al-Sulh, Prime Minister
Fuad Naffa, Foreign Minister
Major General Iskandar Ghanim, Commander of the Lebanese Armed Forces
Najib Sadaqa, Director General, Lebanese Foreign Ministry

United States
Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
William Buffum, US Ambassador to Lebanon
Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State
Harold H. Saunders, NSC Staff
Camille Nowfel, Interpreter, Department of State

Kissinger: Thank you for the extremely cordial reception you have given me. It is symptomatic of the close relations between our two countries. Your Foreign Minister and I had a very useful discussion this morning.[2] We spoke to him with great frankness.

I might add to those points I explained to the Foreign Minister one comment on the US–Soviet role in the negotiations which I did not want to make in the larger group. We have no illusions about the Soviet Union, but we think that they can do less damage if they are involved in the Peace Conference than they could do if they were outside the Conference playing with the radical groups opposed to the Conference.

As I explained frankly, no matter what the formal arrangements at the Conference are, we will deal with whatever groups seem most useful. Our objective is to reduce the Soviet role in the Arab World, not to enhance it. We want to maneuver it in such a way that they will not gain. I tell you this in the strictest confidence.

Frangie: We welcome you. We wish you all success in the efforts which aim at the peace which all of us want.

You may have wondered why we are the guests of General Ghanim today. [In an attempt at humor] This is the first expression of our action against you. You deprived us of a free weekend by coming,

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1027, Presidential/HAK Memcons, Memcons, HAK & Presidential, December 1973 [1 of 2]. Secret; Nodis. Drafted by Saunders. The meeting took place at the Officers' Club at Riyaq Air Base in Beirut. Brackets are in the original.

[2] Kissinger met with the Foreign Minister from 12:10 to 1:25 p.m. (Memorandum of conversation, December 16; ibid.)

so we decided that we would take a pleasant weekend ride. So we deprived you of the pleasures of seeing a demonstration against you in Beirut.

Kissinger: I thought that many of my former students wanted to greet me.

Frangie: Lebanon is the only country from the Mediterranean to Japan whose system resembles Western political systems. After World War II, all of the Arab countries considered themselves pro-Western, except that they did not have a warm feeling for the colonizers.

Then we had the Palestine problem which imposed changes on this part of the world and changes in our systems. For instance, Nasir rose against Farouk as a result of the Palestine problem. In Syria Qasim made his coup because of the Palestine problem. Then in Syria there were a series of coups because of that problem. The point is that systems began to be changed in the 1950s because of the results of the Palestine problem. In 1956 the Suez War took place and the position of the West caused many countries here to turn against the Western camp.

Unfortunately as a result of turning toward the East, states had to get their weapons there, and that gave the Eastern camp increased influence. The unfriendly behavior of some friendly countries toward this area opened the door to Communist influence. In some of the Arab countries which remain friendly toward the West, the people accused their leaders of high treason. In spite of this, the friends of the West regained their friendship. I myself can tell you a lot about anti-Western demonstrations because they have been directed partly at me.

Often leaders of the demonstration against the West are American youth. American citizens in Lebanon have often demonstrated against their own country—rightly so, we believe. Once, American citizens in Lebanon marched 40 kilometers on foot to demonstrate against the United States. American citizens when they see and live the facts that are the consequences of the Palestine problem and when they are not subject to Zionist political influence, they begin to feel as the Arabs here feel.

We know that during the past 25 years, for any American politician—before the oil was used as a political weapon—giving support to the Arab cause was tantamount to committing political suicide. But today after petroleum has become so effective as a political weapon, it has become incumbent on every American and every Arab to bring about a solution to the Palestine problem.

After the October War and after US aid to Israel and after the Arabs were sure of the effect of oil as a political weapon, we believe any delay in a just settlement would subject leaders in the oil-producing

countries to radical coups d'etat. If King Faisal, the Amir of Kuwait or the Amirs in the Persian Gulf were to fall, who would take their place? Something like this happened in Aden. The men who took over there were not only Marxists but Maoists. If we should reach such a situation, who will prevent the Communists from taking over around the whole area? What benefit could result should such a thing happen? If Israel does continue to exist in that situation, it shall exist in a huge prison. There is no advantage in reaching a solution where Israel is in a prison. If, on the other hand, because of your efforts, Israel can exist as a free nation, the Arabs must exist as free nations as well. In that case the interest of the West and of the Arabs would be preserved. Furthermore, this embarrassment which every friend of the US finds himself in would be removed.

What I am saying, I believe, is true unless there is an American scheme to lose the entire Middle East. I do not believe this is the case. No state wants to lose its principles just to establish a base in Israel. I do not believe this is the American planning.

I would like to make a few remarks on the basis of your talk with the Foreign Minister:

First, you mentioned the rights of the Palestinian people, their right to live as human beings.

Second, you mentioned the problem of Jerusalem. As you know, it has been an Arab city since the Arabs came into existence. Then came the Jewish religion, also born in Palestine. Likewise Christianity, born in Palestine. However, there were 800 years between the last Jewish control and Arab control of Jerusalem. During the tenth century, a fanatic Christian spirit in Europe expressed itself in the Crusades and Europeans occupied Jerusalem for 200 years. And it became evident that those who came in the name of religion had political motives. Then they disagreed among themselves—I expect that is what will happen in Israel—and an Arab hero liberated Jerusalem. Then until 1948, the Moslem Arabs and the Arab Christians and Arab Jews lived happily in Jerusalem together. I wish Israeli leaders today would recall these events because we believe that history repeats itself.

There remains one question—the cause to which you have pledged yourself. For this effort we wish you all success. Your predecessor, Secretary Rogers, came up with the Rogers Plan.[3] The Arabs had difficulty accepting Israel's existence. All we are asking now is that Israel continue to exist by the will of the Arabs, otherwise they cannot continue to exist in this part of the world.

---

[3] See footnote 4, Document 7.

In closing, I would like to say that Lebanon is the greatest example of how people of different faiths can live together. There are seventeen different denominations living here. The Prime Minister is a Moslem, and I would like him to express his views.

Prime Minister: I have no special point of view. I agree with the President. There is only one difference between us—he worships in a church and I in a mosque.

As a former professor of history, you may know the story about Mohamed. A delegation of Christian Ethiopians came to him, and when the time came to pray, the question arose as to where each group should pray. Mohamed suggested that the Moslems pray in one corner, and the Christians in another.

We have always wanted Palestine to be for all. This is our wish now. The Moslems who control Jerusalem have always held that all people of the book should have a position in Jerusalem. Arab countries from the ocean to the gulf have had Jewish cabinet members over the years.

In closing, I would like to say that this problem can be solved only by the United States and no one can convince the Arabs otherwise. The US is the only country that can convince Israel and can bring about results. It is important for the US to understand the Arabs.

Kissinger: I appreciate very much this frank explanation. As you know, we are engaged in a very major effort to try to bring peace to this area. But for this effort to succeed I am glad that you noticed the importance of the US role. Many of our allies are very good at making proclamations and if you would like rhetoric, I recommend that you deal with the Europeans and the Japanese.

Frangie: No. We want action.

Kissinger: If you want action, you will have to deal with the US and we will have to proceed in our own way. Action takes longer than rhetoric. At home, we could face a strong domestic reaction. Therefore, while we have an obligation to understand the Arab position, the Arabs have an obligation to understand the US. We are moving in a situation with great complexity to try to bring peace.

We cannot fight every battle simultaneously. One of the difficulties my predecessor had is that he put all of his ideas into one paper. So you have to understand that we need time. You have to understand our need. We think we know what is needed, but we have to do it in our own way. So far, I have no complaint on this score with the Arab leaders with whom I have talked. They seem to understand.

Since you spoke frankly, there is another question on which I would like to comment—oil. We understand that, when the US seemed

slow or seemed to support Israel, certain measures were taken that indicated Arab displeasure. This we have understood.

Now that we have committed ourselves to a major effort for peace, it is inappropriate to punish the American people while their leaders are trying to help the Arabs. And if there are hardships in the US this winter, the public will turn against the Arabs and not against Israel.

Up to a certain point we have understood. We will show our good will by organizing a peace conference and organizing talks on military disengagement. But we are a great country with principles to protect. If the pressure continues beyond a certain point, we will stop doing anything.

I apologize for speaking with such frankness. But I promise you that I will make a major effort. By far my most difficult stop on this trip will be my next stop in Israel.

Frangie: Our only fear is that the longstanding friendship and US–Arab ties would go out of business.

Kissinger: You have to understand our act during the war. Why did we send arms to Israel? Once the war started, it was our decision that it should be ended as soon as possible and that as soon as it was over, we would make a major effort to bring about a settlement.

During the war, the danger we saw was that countries armed by the Soviet Union would achieve a dominant position. The paradox is that it was necessary for the US to prevent a victory for Soviet arms as an American act so that after the war we could help to bring peace as an American act. Paradoxically, our act in aiding Israel saved Lebanon and Saudi Arabia who must be concerned with the Soviet condition in the area. If we can now bring about peace, the people will understand that this is also the result of American action.

Prime Minister: This is what we want to happen.

[At this point, the group adjourned to lunch.]

Harold H. Saunders[4]

[4] The original bears this typed signature.

398. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Jerusalem, December 16, 1973, 6:35–8:35 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Golda Meir, Prime Minister of Israel
Simcha Dinitz, Israeli Ambassador to U.S.
Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff

Meir: Okay, what good news have you?

Kissinger: I don't have so much good news. I'll give you a brief report of my trip first, because that is the important thing.

I sent you a cable about Sadat. I think you misunderstood what he said. Whatever his ultimate objectives, at this moment he's not making trouble. Asad is a different story.[2] Sadat's statement about no direct negotiations—he was really provoked into it by the newsmen. He didn't volunteer it. It seemed like a fiction, meeting in the same room but without direct negotiations.

Meir: That's not decisive.

Kissinger: He said it was not necessary to have the U.S. and Soviet Union sitting in, and it could be like the formula for Kilometer 101 with the U.N. technical people maybe sitting in. He doesn't favor the U.S. and Soviet Union sitting in.

Of all the Arabs I met he is really an Egyptian nationalist. He mentioned Palestine just enough to be able to say that he mentioned it. Hussein told me that too, that Sadat is thinking more in Egyptian terms.

What he wants is some disengagement. He says ninety percent of his problem could be solved with something like the Yariv Plan.[3]

Meir: I will tell you a secret; I agreed with you all along.

Dinitz: I told the Secretary.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Records of Henry Kissinger, 1973–1977, Box 2, NODIS Action Memos 1973–1976. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. Drafted by Rodman. The meeting took place at the Prime Minister's office. Brackets are in the original.

[2] The cable was not found. Kissinger is referring to his December 13–14 meetings with Sadat and his December 15 meeting with Assad. See Documents 390 and 393.

[3] During the KM 101 talks, Yariv proposed to Gamasy a plan for the disengagement of Israeli and Egyptian forces. Yariv told Kissinger on December 17 that his "so-called" plan called for the Egyptians to have administrative and police forces, as well as a "symbolic" force presence, within 10 kilometers east of the Suez Canal, combined with a UN presence in the same area as the Egyptian symbolic forces. Israeli forces would remain to the east of that line (see Document 401).

Kissinger: It is a tragedy. If you had been mean and then given this, it would have been great and bought you two more months. He told Asad, who now wants something like it.

They all ask me what's my stand on the borders; I say, "I won't give you a stand." The others press me—Faisal,[4] etc. Sadat is shrewder than the others. He promises to demobilize after disengagement, to start reconstruction, etc. We don't have to kid ourselves. But let me tell you why disengagement is essential: You can't have the war start again without massive problems.

Given the American mentality, if the Egyptians have to attack across a U.N. zone, it has an effect. In the present situation, if the war starts in any way that you can be blamed for, you're in massive difficulty. The President won't support you; he certainly won't support you. Your Ambassador can tell you. William White had an article that the President had to overrule me to get the airlift started.[5]

Dinitz: I talked to him. Clements and Schlesinger are telling him that.

Kissinger: With the obsession with the energy problem, it took the most massive efforts on my part to get the $2.2 billion through. Fulbright wants to hold it up.

Dinitz: He did hold it up.

Meir: He refused a meeting until Tuesday.

Dinitz: He may try another tactic to postpone it past the recess.

Kissinger: [To Rodman] Peter, have Scowcroft call Fulbright.

I've told Sadat that nothing can move before January. You said you're willing before January; it's up to you. I told him that in my judgment there might be movement in January—that I had promised you there would be no discussion of substance until then.

We wouldn't object if . . .

Meir: It depends on what conditions . . . In a big group we'll be alone.

Kissinger: What he has in mind is to stay where they are on the East bank, and withdraw three divisions—keep only two there—and only infantry. Then a demilitarized zone with U.N. forces, and Israelis at the Mitla Pass.

I told him he had to give some assurances about equipment in my view. He said he was willing to have no SAMs and no heavy artillery.

Meir: If that's what he wants, it's all right.

---

[4] See footnote 4, Document 394.

[5] William S. White was a nationally syndicated columnist. The article has not been identified.

Kissinger: That's what he substantially wants.

Meir: Let's leave the question of disengagement to the big meeting.

Never did we consider unilateral disengagement. For Gamasy to talk of three divisions!

Kissinger: To my mind, it is essential to separate the forces substantially.

Meir: That we agree.

Kissinger: That one-kilometer thing—I mentioned it lightly, but he wasn't interested.

Meir: We agree that it is essential for the war not to start again, but that we can withdraw from "Africa" and his three divisions remain on the East side—that we can't buy.

We were the ones who started this question of disengagement, but it can't be unilateral.

Kissinger: Wasn't that what Yariv proposed?

Meir: No. We have it all written down. We started from something very simple, symmetrical; we agreed also to something not symmetrical, but for him to remain on our side is impossible.

Kissinger: If you're not on the Canal, what is the difference? It is just symbolic.

Meir: It just happens that he didn't win the war. We'll withdraw from the West, he can withdraw from the East.

Kissinger: That he won't do. I think the war will start again.

Dinitz: What he proposed was a symbolic presence on the East side, a thin force—but not two divisions.

Kissinger: This isn't now the principal issue, because I think something has to happen on this in January or before.

Meir: We'd like to discuss it with you tonight to reach something acceptable.

Kissinger: Okay. Beyond disengagement, I've discussed nothing with any Arabs—nothing about frontiers, security zones, guarantees, representation of the Palestinians—except generalities—and nothing about Jerusalem. I've done nothing like what the Europeans have done. I've made general expressions of being willing to be helpful, which they can interpret.

Sadat's major concern is not to be seen withdrawing from any Egyptian territory he's recaptured. That's his concern. My judgment is he'll certainly start the war again if you remain on the West Bank.

It's also Hussein's judgment, for what it is worth. If there is no movement soon. Asad's analysis is totally different. Sadat really wants to go through a period of building up Egypt. I don't think Asad gives a damn about building up Syria.

We didn't discuss Sharm el-Shaikh or anything else.

Meir: If we can come to agreement with Sadat and not with Syria or the Palestinians, he would sign a final agreement?

Kissinger: [pauses] I think if you've offered something similar to Syria . . . The Palestinians I don't think he gives a damn about. This is only my impression.

Meir: Of course.

Kissinger: He might not call it a final settlement; he might call it an end to the state of belligerency.

His major passion is to recapture Egyptian territory and overcome the constant humiliation. While Asad I think wants to destroy Israel. In words Asad talks like Sadat, about the 1967 borders. But when Sadat did so, I said I'm not prepared to talk about the borders, and he never pressed very hard.

Meir: If there is an agreement on disengagement, would he hold a long time?

Kissinger: He said disengagement—of the type he described—would solve ninety percent of his problem. The last time I was there[6] he said three divisions had to remain; this time he said two. It means he is not absolutely fixed on that. He says, if so, he will allow the people to return and demobilize a substantial part of his army. The physical conditions for war won't be there.

Meir: What happens to the West Bank if we leave?

Kissinger: I assume unrestricted use. I didn't ask him. My assumption is . . .

Meir: No U.N.

Kissinger: That's my impression. I frankly don't think even the plan he gave is a good deal for him—even if it is politically impossible for you. But he couldn't start the war again without breaking the agreement. That wouldn't stop him, but he also couldn't start the war without your having a chance to mobilize. So he would have to start it without the conditions that brought his success, and he would have to do things that would make it difficult in America.

Dinitz may disagree, but I am convinced you are in a very precarious situation. I suffer from the illusion that I've kept the wolf from the door by this razzle-dazzle.

Our whole government is against you. I've attacked the Europeans, which kept their pressure off. The energy crisis has not yet focused on Israel.

---

[6] See Document 324.

I had a helluva time with the House Armed Services Committee and Mahon.[7]

Meir: We got a good vote in the House on the $2.2 billion.

Dinitz: The Secretary did a good job.

Meir: I don't doubt it.

Kissinger: First of all, it is imperative not to have the war break out. If we can get the oil embargo off, we can continue our methods. Disengagement would help. That makes it much tougher to focus it on the 1967 frontiers.

For subsequent diplomacy, Sadat is not in a brilliant position.

You know my strategy with Faisal. I keep telling them we can't negotiate terms with them: "We are a great power. Go to the Europeans if you want a declaration; if you want action, come to us. But turn the oil on."

I told Yamani,[8] "We like your government because it's conservative. If you act like radicals, it makes no difference. I've demonstrated my ability to work with Communist governments."

And they overestimate the ability of the CIA to overthrow them. That had quite an effect on them.

Last time he said there would be no oil until you return to the 1967 borders. This time I told him, "It is inconsistent. You keep talking about your dignity. It's inconsistent with our dignity to negotiate about other countries' borders, and under pressure. And three, you're helping Communism." The last time he said, Israel wasn't the tool of Russia, Russia was the tool of Israel! The Jews took over the Communist Party and then Russia, and then the Middle East. He believes this.

I told him that Jerusalem at this moment is an insoluble issue. I tell them all that I won't discuss vague terms with them.

The Japanese are the worst.

Meir: The Japanese issued a communiqué on the death of Ben-Gurion[9] saying they wouldn't send a condolence message!

Kissinger: They sent an emissary to the Saudis saying they must have oil three months before us, so don't lift the embargo.

He said this time that it is not essential to have the issue of Jerusalem settled now. This is important; he influences a lot of people.

---

[7] Congressman George Mahon (D–Texas), Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

[8] Kissinger is likely referring to his meetings with Saudi Oil Minister Yamani that took place in Washington December 5–6. See *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXXVI, Energy Crisis, 1969–1974, Document 263.

[9] David Ben-Gurion, Israel's first Prime Minister, died December 1 of a cerebral hemorrhage.

And he says the Palestinian issue can be settled by compensation and not only by a return of all of them.

Thirdly, if there is any progress at all, he will lift this embargo. On disengagement. Then, of course, he said we have to make a statement about return to the 1967 lines. I said we make no statement. Then he said, any statement? I said no.

He then sent the Foreign Minister to tell me if there was any progress, they would lift it.

I think it will be hard for them to put it on again. Boumedienne, for example, told us how it hurt to have to cut his production by 25 percent. He impressed me.[10]

Asad was the worst. I spent a lot of time with him on prisoners. He says he'll act like the North Vietnamese. I said he'll have to give lists and allow Red Cross visits. Sadat told me, as I told you, that he used his influence. Asad told me.

The President called in Dobrynin last week and personally made a request for that.[11]

Asad wants disengagement because Sadat told him he had a Yariv Plan, and he wants something like it. [Dinitz chuckles]

That isn't so bad, if we can work something out that works.

He said he would have the lists and Red Cross visits as soon as disengagement is agreed to, and the prisoners after disengagement is carried out. I said that was out of the question, that we would support your refusal to talk if there are no lists and visits. He said, "You're asking me to give away something for nothing." But he didn't reject it.

He told me on his personal assurance that the wounded were well taken care of. Pay no attention to personal assurances, but I have to tell everything he said.

Meir: We have it on good intelligence, from a good Arab source, that 28 prisoners were killed. If there is the slightest wound, especially if it is a pilot, in the arm and leg, it is amputated.

Kissinger: He did say it was a problem for them to return pilots to Israel.

Meir: The Arab source asks us, are we sure we got all our POW's back?

Kissinger: I asked Sadat, and Sadat swore yes. We had the same problem with the North Vietnamese. A secret prisoner has no political utility. If they surface them, they can bargain for them. If not, they would be better off killing them.

---

[10] See footnote 2, Document 393.

[11] See footnote 2, Document 389.

Meir: I think they did. We have evidence of pilots landing safely who then disappeared. Gamasy admitted it.

Kissinger: In Vietnam I don't believe they're holding the prisoners secretly, because what good would that do?

Meir: No, we assume many were killed. We got much fewer back than we think they had.

Kissinger: In my judgment, Madame Prime Minister, it is possible to get lists and visits at the beginning of a disengagement discussion, and the prisoners at the conclusion. I think it's attainable. They wanted me to tell them what disengagement. I said I have no ideas. He [Asad] showed me a map. I said I have no personal idea. Then he said he wouldn't go to the Conference.

I had a mad conversation with him. He agreed, after a long conversation, to change the date, and change the sentence on Palestinian participation. I said, "I thought you were hard to deal with." Then he said he objected only to the sentence that said he would come!

I think he'll go to the Conference. I can send a letter to him through our Ambassador to Lebanon, whether I can see any sense in a discussion on disengagement. Dayan said it might be possible. My judgment is that if you left that pocket that you took after October 6—and anything symbolic beyond October 6, even a kilometer or two, he'd almost certainly accept it. To be replaced by U.N. and not Syrian forces. There is a two-thirds chance he will accept even just a withdrawal from the pocket, for prisoners.

On Sinai, I at least had some idea of what you want from our earlier discussions on the interim agreement.

Meir: That's right.

Kissinger: But I need your thinking on disengagement.

Meir: In Washington, you told me the proposition to return the 15,000 civilians and the two posts, and they'd return the prisoners.

Kissinger: That was from the Vice Foreign Minister,[12] and it was wrong.

Meir: Now we do not even have lists!

Kissinger: But your problem has nothing to do with justice. Having been in Europe and Japan, I know. What happened in their summit?

Meir: Brandt, the Dutch and the Dane didn't go along with the others. The French are the real rascals.

---

[12] See Documents 310 and 312.

Kissinger: I talked with Jobert.[13] He said he'd be willing to come here to show his good will.

Meir: I'll show you a cable of Jobert's talk with our Ambassador. I have never seen anything like it except the Russians. Home is one step behind.

Kissinger: I've been able to continue to maneuver the issue away from the question of frontiers. Once the oil is turned on and the winter is over, the negotiations will be in a much less hysterical climate. If I were Sadat, quite honestly, I'd start fighting—unless you can beat him in three days.

Meir: Dayan spent all yesterday in "Africa." His opinion, after he studied it and spoke to the men, is that he has no doubt.

Dinitz: If there is war, a devastating blow can be struck.

Meir: Even last week we thought it was touch and go.

Kissinger: But if there is war, my opinion is the President will oppose you.

Meir: Even if the Egyptians attack?

Kissinger: Yes, in my judgment.

Meir: I saw the letter from the President.[14]

Kissinger: Hussein said you treated him better this time. Better than before.

Meir: I'm surprised at the things they say about me.

I'll show you the messages he sent during the war; it was really touching.

Kissinger: They asked me my assessment. Could there be a disengagement in the Jordan Valley? I said there was no possibility. Then they said if they could get some thinning out of your presence on the West Bank and some administrative presence of theirs, that would satisfy them.

Meir: The last time even Rifai was almost human. I asked him what would have happened if they had won the 1967 war? There would be no Israel? He said yes. So I asked, "What would happen to the Jews in Israel?" I got no answer. I said, "What if there is no peace agreement, can we agree not to fight each other?" He said they'd have to consider their interests.

---

[13] Kissinger met with French Foreign Minister Michel Jobert at 11:30 a.m. on October 11 in Kissinger's State Department office. A memorandum of conversation is in the National Archives, RG 59, Records of Henry Kissinger, 1973–1977, Box 3. A portion is printed in *Foreign Relations,* 1969–1976, volume XXXVI, Energy Crisis, 1969–1974, Document 211.

[14] Document 391.

Kissinger: Seriously, I must say, Hussein has never spoken ill of you. He is a gentleman. Rifai I don't know.

Meir: I told him we had a common problem—the Palestinians. We had no objection to the West Bank Palestinians being elected to Parliament in Jordan. At the end of the meeting, Dayan asked about an interim arrangement. Rifai said, "interesting."

Kissinger: They told me that if you'd let them administer Jericho . . .

Meir: Before the war, they were interested and agreed there should be a joint company for the joint development of the Dead Sea project.

Kissinger: They told me they're still willing.

Meir: They told us.

Kissinger: I think one way of dealing with the Palestinian problem is to increase the Jordanian presence administratively on the West Bank.

Meir: There are some; they're doing it.

Kissinger: I don't know what the view would be in the U.S. Government.

Meir: I think we can work something out because I believe Hussein doesn't want another war.

Kissinger: That is clear.

Meir: He sent tanks there, and he told us.

Kissinger: We sent him one message a day, and we delayed it.

Meir: We saved his life. We had information that the generals were going to meet in one place—and were going to do something. But we found out at the last minute that he was to be there, so we stopped it.

Dinitz: A point of clarification—Asad might be prepared to give a list if we promise we will discuss the question of a separation of forces with him?

Kissinger: If I could give him . . . He'll certainly give you the prisoners if there is an agreement; that he's clearly said. Whether he can give lists, I believe I can get through pressure by the Russians and Egyptians—if you agree to discuss. That's my impression. He never turned it down. He said, "What do I get for it? Why should I do it?" But he never turned it down.

Dinitz: When you mentioned your funny conversation with Asad, where he agreed on the condition that he doesn't go, you said Sadat had gone back to the original letter.

Kissinger: Let me show you the letter.[15]

Meir: How did the Palestinians and U.N. get into the letter?

Kissinger: We discussed it with the Soviets, then we came to you, then with the Arabs. Then the Arabs insisted on a lot of things: 339, "the timing of participation."

Now I have worked out this phraseology: "The parties also agree that the question of other participation from the Middle East area will be discussed during the first stage." The first stage is the disengagement stage.

Meir: The first stage is the first two days?

Kissinger: No, the first stage of the conference is the disengagement stage. I have Sadat's assurance that the issue of the Palestinians won't be raised at all—by him anyway.

Meir: When you came here from Moscow, you said "U.S.–Soviet auspices" was the least bad of all the alternatives. We agreed that U.N. auspices means the Security Council. We see what it means. [Resolution 344][16] Of the ten that voted, five have no relations with us, the sixth is India, and their decision is that the Secretary-General must keep them informed.

Kissinger: But there is no way to avoid this no matter how the Conference was formed. The Europeans and Secretary-General and Security Council will form some sort of connection no matter under what auspices the Conference is convened.

Meir: We have the Security Council interfering.

Kissinger: Assume it is U.S.–Soviet and no U.N.: if there is a deadlock, no one can prevent Egypt from going to the Security Council on the basis of the implementation of 338. We have kept the Egyptians away from the Security Council for two months by promising that something would happen somewhere.

Your best protection is not legalisms but the sense that this issue is no longer a central issue. What gives the Security Council power is not a legal basis but the fact that every government is hysterical. I went to Japan; usually they're obsessed with China. At NATO, the only question discussed was energy. If energy can be solved, the U.N. pressure will be solved.

Dinitz: Can I suggest some changes?

---

[15] See Document 400.

[16] UN Security Council Resolution 344, adopted December 15, expressed hope for speedy progress at the Geneva peace conference and confidence that the Secretary General would play a "full and effective" role. It also requested the Secretary General to keep the Council informed of the negotiations.

Kissinger: No, I can't change it any more. I would have to go around again to the Egyptians, the Syrians, and the Russians.

Meir: The line about the Palestinians is now out.

Kissinger: Yes. And the U.N. auspices is "convening under U.N. auspices."

Meir: One point. It makes no difference whether it is before or after the election. Either we form a government or Begin[17] forms a government. Whichever happens, we will not change our position on the Palestinians one iota. We'll support Begin on that.

Kissinger: The question will only be discussed. You'll discuss it negatively.

Meir: What we want to know, in the memo of understanding,[18] is what is the position of the U.S. Government on this question? The question of the Palestinians means at best a new Palestinian state. One member of the Cabinet noted that letter said "parties" not "states."

Kissinger: Because every document I've ever negotiated says "parties."

Dinitz: That's what I told them.

Meir: If the Jordanian delegation includes Palestinians, that's okay. But Algiers recognized Arafat as spokesman.[19]

Kissinger: Sadat told Hussein, according to Hussein, that he recognizes Arafat only as a spokesman for the Palestinians outside of Jordan, and Hussein as the spokesman for the West Bank.

Meir: Hussein told me about a secret resolution at Algiers that the PLO has the sole right to determine the national rights of the Palestin-

---

[17] Menachem Begin, leader of the Israeli Herut Party.

[18] Document 410.

[19] Arab leaders met in Algiers, November 26–28, at the suggestion of Sadat and Asad. Arafat attended the summit as the head of the Palestinian delegation. The declaration issued at the conclusion of the summit maintained that the cease-fire ending the October war "in no way means that the struggle has ended and that one can impose upon the Arab nation a solution not meeting its just goals. So long as the causes of the war of aggression and expansion that put the world on the edge of a generalized conflict are not eliminated, there will be in the Middle East neither a lasting peace nor true security." The declaration listed two "paramount and unchangeable" conditions for peace: "evacuation by Israel of the occupied Arab territories," and the "re-establishment of the full national rights for the Palestinian people." (*The New York Times*, November 29, 1973) Kissinger wrote in his memoirs that the summit declaration made Israel's agreement to attend Geneva more difficult. "Israel was determined to resist the demands that Algiers espoused. The Algiers summit therefore injected new tensions into a diplomacy that soon found all the parties quibbling over the draft letter of invitation. Israel demanded an explicit provision in the invitation stating that the original composition of the conference could not be expanded except by unanimity—so that the PLO would be formally barred and its later participation subject to an Israeli veto. . . . Meanwhile, after Algiers, Egypt's Fahmy predictably went in the opposite direction, insisting on explicit reference in the letter to Palestinian participation at a later stage of the conference." (*Years of Upheaval*, pp. 757–758)

ians. This is the first time they used the words "national rights" instead of "legitimate rights." It could mean all of Palestine, could mean a leftist Russian-oriented state. There was even a suggestion of a 1% subsidy from every Arab budget. The Russians promised support. It would include the West Bank, Gaza and corridor also to El-harma. The Russians are seriously working on such a plan.

Kissinger: I don't doubt there could be a plan.

I've told your Ambassador repeatedly that the biggest service I can get for you is no American position.

I don't see how you can have a Palestinian state on the West Bank. My view is you cannot accept it. But my tactic is different from yours. I frankly think you take insufficiently strategic and too legalistic a point of view. An Arafat Palestine is impossible for you. Therefore I'll never recommend it. How it will be handled in our government—if I'm in charge, you'll never be pressured by me to accept Arafat as a negotiating partner. I may double-talk it. But let's not worry about tactics.

Meir: In the letter now, the Palestinians are not in it. Why is Lebanon left out?

Kissinger: Because originally it was those who fought in the 1967 war. I must say, having talked to the President of Lebanon today,[20] I don't know why you want them. The wildest statements I've ever heard on the Palestinians I heard from him.

Meir: They want to get rid of them.

Kissinger: They're infinitely more violent on the Palestinians than others.

Meir: Anyone on the delegation who wants to go home alive has to be.

We wanted the decision in the Conference to be unanimous. But the President in his message and the memorandum of understanding said this was consistent with "accepted international procedures," which required the agreement of all the initial participants. It means we won't have to negotiate with them, but not that they won't participate in the conference.

Dinitz: If we omit the latter part of the sentence—"who may decline to negotiate," and end the sentence with "require agreement of all parties."

Kissinger: [Studies it] What does that do if they participate as advisers to somebody?

Dinitz: If they participate as part of the Jordanian delegation.

---

[20] Document 397.

Meir: Not Arafat. We're not talking about Jordanians who are former Palestinians. We wouldn't complain. We're talking about Arafat, Habbash.[21]

Kissinger: I frankly never heard this interpretation about participation without negotiating.

Dinitz: The Prime Minister asked me to ask you about this.

Meir: But elsewhere you talked about not sitting with the Syrians at the Conference.

Kissinger: I believe you can't afford not to go to the Conference.

Meir: We'll go to the Conference.

Kissinger: But what will you do about this letter?

Meir: We won't go into the hall. You had your prisoners in Vietnam.

Kissinger: But we negotiated with them.

Meir: Here the parents and wives wanted us not to go to the Conference until they were freed. That we couldn't have. Dayan said we would not go to the Conference without lists; he was heckled "What about the release?" He said, "If we have the lists, it will be the first item on the agenda with them."

We have experience: Ten years ago they said they had no prisoners. Then they turn up and there were only twelve. One had committed suicide, and the other 11 had to go directly to an insane asylum. They're the cruelest people on earth.

Kissinger: If you refuse to go and the Conference fails because of you, the President will not support you. Especially if the Syrians don't go. He [Asad] won't go unless he has a disengagement plan like what Yariv gave to Gamasy.

Dinitz: My own idea is, if we authorize you to tell the Syrians there can be discussion of disengagement at a future point, but only if the POW issue is totally resolved, with a full exchange, would it work?

Kissinger: I doubt it. I believe you can get a list from them as a condition for discussing a disengagement plan. You can say yes, that after you have the list you'll discuss disengagement.

The immediate requirement, in my judgment, is: I've arranged with Sadat that the Conference will start and end immediately.

Meir: The Conference starts Friday? On Shabbat?

Kissinger: Yes. I hadn't thought of that. We were prepared to go Tuesday.[22]

---

[21] George Habbash, Secretary General, Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine.

[22] Friday, December 21, and Tuesday, December 18.

Meir: I know.

Kissinger: I've told the Russians that the Syrians indicate they may not come. My fear is the Russians may blame you for the failure of the Conference. I'd like to get your agreement to the letter to Secretary-General so we are not at fault.

Meir: Please read it again, your new formulation.

We can do it at dinner tonight, and discuss disengagement tomorrow.

[There was a short break, and then the conversation resumed.]

Kissinger: Even if it's known that the Syrians are hanging Israeli prisoners by the toes from lampposts, our people will turn it against Israel. The energy crisis will be turned against you, and people will say, "Force them back to the 1967 lines and they'll get their prisoners."

It's your misfortune to be in an area of oil with no oil. Otherwise you'd never hear all this moral indignation in Europe and Japan about the Arabs.

I've been maneuvering. If we can solve the oil thing, we'll be in a different climate.

Dinitz: How can we be sure they won't reimpose the embargo?

Kissinger: I don't know. Boumedienne complained to me bitterly about those who dispose of his national treasure. The problem is that in a moment of passion they put it on and agreed not to lift it except unanimously. Now Arab disunity works against you. But the next time it won't be the same as when it happened in the winter, with a crisis coming that no one had been thinking about.

We have two problems: I'd like to inform the Egyptians, preferably tonight, that the letter is okay, and inform the Russians. That only produces a letter of invitation.

Meir: Who sends it?

Kissinger: Waldheim. You'll get the invitation from Waldheim to come. So accepting this letter doesn't commit you to a Syrian decision tonight.

Meir: The Syrian decision is already taken.

Kissinger: I thought we'd get a chance to talk.

Meir: I'm surprised it's a surprise to you. You have seen all our messages.

Kissinger: But to do it when I'm on my way here, which can blow up the Conference, is not the way to do it.

Meir: We didn't volunteer it. According to our rules, 32 members of the Knesset can raise the matter.

Dinitz: The Syrians may not go.

Kissinger: But you'd be better off not having made this statement.[23] If the Syrians are already looking for an excuse not to come, this does it. No one would complain if the Conference fails because I, as U.S. Secretary of State, was asked to come up with a disengagement scheme at the first meeting with the Syrians. But now it will come out blamed on you.

Dinitz: What if you said, "Israel wants to come to the Conference but can't without this elementary right to know who is alive and who is dead?"

Kissinger: We negotiated with the North Vietnamese for four years. Asad says he'll do what the North Vietnamese did, give the lists after the agreement. I think your statement today was a disaster.

Dinitz: There was no statement today.

Kissinger: I saw some statement on the ticker today.

Dinitz: I told it to Scowcroft before I left.

Kissinger: Let's get this letter agreed upon. All it does is let the U.S. send a letter to Secretary-General. It says you've told us you will attend the Conference; you've also stated your view publicly on the POW's. When you get the invitation, you can do one of three things: You can accept it unconditionally; you can accept it but not talk to the Syrians, or accept to come to the opening session but not continue without the lists; or you can refuse altogether.

This gets us to Tuesday. By then we'll know whether the Syrians will attend. But the Conference won't have failed because of you.

If you approve the letter tonight, I can inform the Egyptians and Soviets that you did so and that you're having massive problems on the prisoner issue.

Meir: I must say, taking out the Palestinians helps. And if you can agree on the question of participation . . .

Kissinger: I'll settle the memorandum of understanding tonight.

I'd like to send it off to the Russians—not to Waldheim—tonight.

Meir: We have to say we agree to U.N. auspices?

Kissinger: That's not your major problem.

Dinitz: It would have been easier if it was the "U.N. Secretary-General" instead of the "U.N." as convenor.

Kissinger: I can't go around the horn again; it would run an unacceptable risk. It would make no difference, frankly, because it is under 338 anyway.

---

[23] Meir's office issued a statement on December 16 that Israel would not discuss a peace settlement with Syria until Syria turned over a list of prisoners and allowed Red Cross visits.

Meir: The new Security Council resolution says he has to keep them informed.

Kissinger: You can make that reservation when you reply to the invitation from Waldheim.

Meir: Here it says "we agree."

Dinitz: Your understanding is that Secretary-General issues invitations?

Kissinger: That is my understanding.

Dinitz: Will he refer to 242 in his invitation?

Kissinger: No, nothing that is not in here.

Meir: Just, "I'm told by the United States and the Soviet Union that you'll come, so please come."

Kissinger: Right. That we can handle. We can draft the text here of what we want him to say. We can give it to Bennett to tell Waldheim informally that it is what we want him to say.

There cannot be an answer until Tuesday from the Syrians.

Meir: Can you send a message to Brezhnev on his word of honor?

Kissinger: Sure. I'll show you what I'll send. I can show you the message I sent yesterday. And the President mentioned it to Dobrynin.[24]

Dinitz: [to Prime Minister] You'll have massive problems with U.N. auspices. [to Kissinger] It would be better if instead of "convened under U.N. auspices" it said "convened by the Secretary-General of the U.N."

Kissinger: I would have to go around the horn again. The letter doesn't strictly tie you to agreeing to U.N. auspices. It is a letter from us.

Dinitz: [reads letter, first paragraph] "The Soviet Union and United States are now informed by the parties concerned that they are ready to join the conference. The Conference should be convened under U.N. auspices."

Kissinger: I don't want to kid you; the implication is there. But "convened" is the protection. I've gone to them every day with modifications.

Dinitz: "The convening of the Conference should be under the auspices of U.N."

Kissinger: That I might be able to do.

Meir: I'm trying to find another place for this sentence. After "The parties agree to co-chairmanship of United States and Soviet Union."

---

[24] See footnote 2, Document 389.

Kissinger: You still have the same problem. You want "The convenor of the conference should be the U.N.?"

Dinitz: Yes.

Kissinger: "The auspices of the U.N. should be used for convening the conference." I'm trying to use as many of the words that are in there as possible.

Dinitz: That's better.

Kissinger: Better not to add now a word that was not used before.

My trouble is, if I change this sentence, I'll have to go back to Sadat, and at some point he'll tell me to go to hell. It will take all of tomorrow. Then I have to go to the Russians. We'll have a major public relations debacle in the U.S. if the Conference isn't held.

On the next page it asks him to be the convenor. How about moving the sentence to the beginning of this paragraph? It would separate it from the agreement, and make it clear that all we're talking about is convening. I think what helps you most is to move it to the beginning of the next to last paragraph, unchanged. It limits it to convening.

Dinitz: My objective is to fix it easily.

You helped a lot on the Palestinians, because the text and the Prime Minister's understanding we can tell the Cabinet.

Meir: The Cabinet will say it is a different Conference now, since they accepted the original draft. They accepted it under U.S. and Soviet auspices.

Dinitz: When we agree to this letter we get an invitation, and if we accept the invitation, we accept the letter.

Kissinger: But your reply can say that.

Dinitz: And on the prisoners too?

Kissinger: Yes or no, depending on what we decide tomorrow.

Dinitz: Can I check Peter's notes on these changes?

Kissinger: You're thinking of it in the wrong way. We can fix the letter without Peter's notes. I have a practical problem.

Dinitz: May I suggest you try for these changes, and if the Egyptians explode, we can go to reservations in the letter?

Kissinger: Thinking out loud: If I can leave tomorrow saying to the press there was complete agreement between the U.S. and Israel on the things holding us up, then if you send reservations, we can say it is our understanding too. Then we can tonight send the text to the Russians and Egyptians. We can put in the prisoners point too.

We have to put any change to Sadat.

I'm talking about what you tell your Cabinet tonight. You can say to them, "It is not the most brilliantly conceived letter, but the Secretary

of State has assured me that it means only convening, and if we say this in our reply, the U.S. won't have any problem with us."

Dinitz: But the public won't see your assurance.

Kissinger: You can say it, and your reply will be published. I think that is the best way.

I've never even promised you I can save you from the 1967 borders pressures.

Meir: I know you never promised it, but we know you can do it.

Kissinger: I hate to go back to the Egyptians with another change.

Dinitz: I had an idea regarding the Chinese. We could assure them we would work together to minimize Soviet influence.

Kissinger: Without mentioning the Arabs.

Waldheim we dealt with because he is vain.

Your big problem isn't the Security Council, but Britain and France. But this letter makes no difference. I understand your political difficulties, but it is no practical difference.

Vinogradov, the Soviet Ambassador in Cairo, said to Eilts that the letter really made no difference because the Syrians weren't going to show up. This is what worries me. I think the Russians may be trying to set this up.

[The private conversation then ended.]

399. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Jerusalem, December 16, 1973, 9:30 p.m.–12:42 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Mrs. Golda Meir, Prime Minister of Israel
Yigal Allon, Deputy Prime Minister
Pinchas Sapir, Minister of Finance
Moshe Dayan, Minister of Defense
Abba Eban, Minister for Foreign Affairs
Simcha Dinitz, Ambassador to the U.S.
Mordechai Gazit, Prime Minister's Office
Mordechai Kidron, Director General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Ephraim Evron, Deputy Director General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Lt. Colonel Bar-On, Aide to Minister Dayan
Eliahu Bentsur, Aide to Minister Eban

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Joseph Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State
Kenneth Keating, Ambassador to Israel
Alfred L. Atherton, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State
Harold Saunders, NSC Senior Staff
Peter Rodman, NSC Staff
Nicholas Veliotes, Deputy Chief of Mission

Dr. Kissinger: Asad I thought would be difficult.[2] We were reviewing the text of the draft letter to Waldheim on the convening of the Conference. I told him we wanted the date changed; he said, "Fine." I said the Israelis had problems with the phrase about "the timing of the participation of others." We discussed it a while, and then he agreed. I said, "Mr. President, I had been told you would be difficult to deal with. But you're not." Then he said there was one sentence in the letter he objected to—the sentence that said Syria agreed to come. [Laughter] I said to him, "In other words, you don't care about the date of the Conference because it doesn't make any difference whether you don't show up on the 18th or you don't show up on the 21st?" He said, "That's right." [Laughter]

Prime Minister Meir: On that we agree with Asad.

Dr. Kissinger: No, he will come.

Mr. Sisco: They are briefing a delegation already to come.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Records of Henry Kissinger, 1973–1977, Box 2, NODIS Action Memos 1973–1976. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. Drafted by Rodman. The meeting took place at the Foreign Minister's residence. Brackets are in the original.

[2] See Document 393.

Minister Eban: There are no Aluwites or Baath members in the delegation—so if he has to execute them, there will be no loss of party membership!

Minister Eban: It will take a week to count the votes.

Prime Minister Meir: No matter who wins, no government will be formed until the 15th.

Minister Sapir: The judge will publish the results on the 15th.

Dr. Kissinger: Every time I win something, I expect a little praise. There was no agreement on a recess at all before.

If there is some progress on disengagement, the 15th will not be a problem.

Minister Alon: Could you get them to be more moderate in their statements? It would help.

Prime Minister Meir: I heard the Moscow statement attacking the United States and Israel.[3]

Minister Alon: It's détente.

Minister Dayan: You told us what the Syrians said to you about disengagement, but it was one-sided. There was nothing on the Syrian side.

Dr. Kissinger: That was my impression. What they want is that you withdraw from new territory you took, plus some symbolic step in withdrawing from the old territory. UN forces could follow.

Minister Alon: Are they ready to start negotiations on disengagement when talks begin?

Dr. Kissinger: No.

Minister Alon: Are they ready to give us a list before the first meeting?

Dr. Kissinger: My impression—if I could tell them Tuesday[4] that a plausible scheme is negotiable and give some theory of it, I could maybe get the lists. If I can get the Russians involved, which I think I can.

Minister Alon: It may not be a first priority politically, but it is humanly, emotionally. After we committed the Government before the people and Parliament.

Dr. Kissinger: But whatever is just or right, the reality is that your international support is precarious. I think if you have to refuse, you should go there and refuse there.

---

[3] On December 13, official Soviet news agency TASS declared that responsibility for the oil embargo rested with Israel's supporters in the West rather than the Arab nations imposing the embargo.

[4] December 18.

Minister Eban: The Red Cross is in Geneva; it's a good place to give the lists.

Dr. Kissinger: They said to me, "You negotiated four years with the North Vietnamese before you gave your lists."

Prime Minister Meir: But you bombed them too.

Minister Eban: I wonder how far the parallel goes. Will you get the Nobel Prize?

Dr. Kissinger: [laughs] He just wants something in return, to put it crudely. I believe it may be possible to get the lists in the first phase of the disengagement talks.

Minister Dayan: Unless we get the lists, I do not see how we can go to Geneva.

Dr. Kissinger: I think your Foreign Minister can give you the picture of the international consequences. I am not saying your position is wrong; it is morally right. You are in a very, very difficult position and you need maneuvering room.

Minister Alon: Whatever we choose may be wrong.

Dr. Kissinger: True.

Minister Alon: Having committed ourselves to their parents, government, people, no one can understand why they don't give the lists. Only lists, not people. How in the civilized world?

Dr. Kissinger: They are not civilized. They are doing it because you want them.

Minister Eban: Moral strength is a tactical disadvantage.

Dr. Kissinger: As a practical matter, we have to ensure that Israel does not get blamed as the obstacle.

Minister Eban: Will there be talks like at Kilometer 101?

Dr. Kissinger: They prefer it at Geneva. He says he has a domestic problem—which, according to our reports, is probably true. He says negotiation is a liability for him.

Minister Eban: But he wants to come.

Dr. Kissinger: No, he doesn't. There is a fifty-fifty chance.

Minister Eban: That would solve the problem.

Dr. Kissinger: Let them be the ones who stay away. If I may be tactless, if you keep quiet this week . . . What he said was all negative, but in terms that suggested the possibility of bargaining.

Minister Eban: They were once interested in allowing the return of 15,000.

Dr. Kissinger: Yes, you could use that. But it was for the return of the POW's, not for the lists.

Minister Eban: That was true.

Dr. Kissinger: It was the Deputy Foreign Minister's proposal, which they then disavowed.

Prime Minister Meir: What did they say we had to go back to, for the lists?

Dr. Kissinger: First he said, go down from the Heights. I said, "That is impossible." He showed me a map, and asked me to make a proposal. I said I couldn't because I had never discussed it with you. Three or four times he said, "Make a proposal." He says you are in a trap there in the bulge.

Minister Dayan: Maybe we should agree to keep our forces in the trap, in exchange for the lists. [Laughter]

Minister Eban: Or else we would withdraw!

Prime Minister Meir: Only you could get a concession like that! [Laughter]

Dr. Kissinger: Sadat says he is willing to demobilize his forces, start economic reconstruction and conduct himself in such a way as to make war harder.

Prime Minister Meir: Then why does he need forces on the East Bank?

Dr. Kissinger: What he says is that he can't afford to withdraw from part of his territory that he reconquered.

Minister Dayan: Was there any discussion of the southern Sinai oil fields?

Dr. Kissinger: I make it a practice never to discuss next steps or final steps, and they never raised it, so I had no need to.

Prime Minister Meir: Of course.

Minister Dayan: Why should he demobilize if the rest of his territory is not recovered?

Dr. Kissinger: He said ninety percent of his problems would be solved by disengagement.

Minister Sapir: You think it is an economic burden on him?

Dr. Kissinger: It is essential to break the current link between the oil pressures, the possibility of resumption of hostilities which would create massive pressures for a return to 1967 borders, and the current Arab unity. Time is of the essence. Arab disunity leads to continuation of oil embargo. Faisal can't do it alone without throwing away everything he has gained in terms of wrapping himself in radical legitimacy. Therefore all those who come appealing to him are all wrong. I've never asked him directly to lift the oil embargo.

Minister Alon: Most of the silent majority on the West Bank still favors Hussein.

Dr. Kissinger: If we have any preferred solution, it is to strengthen Hussein. We're not cooking up a deal to turn it over to the PLO. I've made the point in all my stops that the Palestinian issue can't even be discussed yet at this early stage because there are so many other issues.

It won't help to have extreme suspicions, Yigal!

Minister Alon: We are worried by the possibility that the Palestinians won't be invited to come back to the West Bank.

Dr. Kissinger: There will be massive pressures in that direction. But it won't be settled on the basis of legalities, but on the basis of reality.

Minister Alon: The Russian plan is to have independent Palestinian entity with the West Bank, Gaza, Syria, and part of Iraq. The question is how far the Russians should be allowed to advance. We're not against détente, for which we give you great credit, Mr. Secretary.

Dr. Kissinger: You are in a particularly insincere mood, Yigal. You have to understand our strategy. We're not engaged in condominium. The only reason we have them in "auspices" is that they are more dangerous outside than inside. The opponents of Brezhnev could make a case that he's got nothing in return except words.

Minister Eban: He got a European settlement.

Dr. Kissinger: They got that from the Germans, not from us. We kept the Europeans in the reservation by our détente policy. Otherwise they would have all been screaming against the bellicose U.S. policy.

So we've been using détente to restrain them. My trip to Moscow was a way—the only way—to get you an additional 48 hours.

Minister Alon: Why do they do it if they get nothing?

Dr. Kissinger: Brezhnev isn't that bright. He also thought he could get economic growth—and a combination of your supporters, intellectuals and the right wing is on a suicidal course of depriving us of the weapon we can use to restrain them. For five years we kept them in line by talking about credits. If this goes on, we run the risk they will ask that question.

I can see a legitimate concern that we may anticipate the Soviets too much in trying to preempt the Arabs. But I have told them they can't expect everything.

Minister Alon: You have led them to expect a great deal.

Dr. Kissinger: What counts is not what they expect but what is reality. What will hurt you is the combination of pressures—the oil, the Europeans, the Arabs.

Minister Eban: The European coalition is now creaking.

Dr. Kissinger: Only because they think what we're doing will succeed.

Minister Dayan: Perhaps Jordan won't be able to agree on something final because of the Palestinians, but maybe we could reach some agreed policy—not call it an interim agreement—to let the Jordanians acquire more authority there. We could admit some issues—settling down the refugees, and allowing a few '67 refugees to go back, to strengthen the authority of the King and the Government of Jordan in the West Bank, and not weaken our military position in settlements.

Otherwise what I'm afraid of is the mood of "Palestine for the Palestinians", and in a time when the King is not too popular. Sometimes he is, but not now.

Minister Eban: Not since the war.

Dr. Kissinger: I think that's a good idea. But it's a tactical question, which I can't answer in abstract terms. My instinct is to make a visible and dramatic move which establishes a reality, rather than do it grudgingly and slowly. Whatever strengthens the Government of Jordan is in our interests. But it should not look like it was bled out of you.

If Egypt agrees to disengagement, you could do this as the equivalent of a disengagement agreement—a particular arrangement to deal with particular conditions. Don't call it an "interim agreement." If there is also some movement of your forces to reduce their visibility—I have no idea whether it is visible . . .

Minister Eban: They're not.

Dr. Kissinger: It would be under the rubric of disengagement, and would be the most effective answer to the Palestinians.

Minister Dayan: We would prefer a final settlement with all of them. But suppose we can't—and Jordan can't settle alone—the danger is that in the interim the King will lose his authority. I would ask him what we, Israel, can do to help him maintain and even increase his authority or influence.

We're now allowing towns like Nablus to take loans in Jordan; if he can choose the administrators, etc.

Dr. Kissinger: We're not in a position to make specific proposals.

Minister Eban: Dayan is saying this comes when we've tried a final settlement and not gotten anything.

Minister Dayan: The best one to ask is Hussein, not me but Hussein.

Dr. Kissinger: Your problem on all these things is to get ahead of the curve, and not behind it. You must always look as if you're guiding it, not at the last minute to throw it to the wolves under pressure—because this only increases the pressures.

Prime Minister Meir: Hussein thought he could wait. Now he has to fight for . . .

Dr. Kissinger: Legitimacy.

Prime Minister Meir: . . . his people.

Minister Eban: For the allegiance of his former people.

Prime Minister Meir: He's losing time; he is losing the people. We can say very honestly that everything we've done on the West Bank is not against him and not for the Palestinians. He knows we have no interest in the population. Now he realizes he is not safe.

Minister Alon: Particularly after Algiers.[5]

Prime Minister Meir: Maybe a proposition to him now that gives him entree to the people would help.

Mr. Sisco: You both want the same thing.

Dr. Kissinger: We really have no interest in whether you make it or not. But I think if you are going to make it, you should make it in the disengagement discussion phase, before the Palestinian issue can be raised. Then you are safe. It will help him.

Minister Dayan: I heard recently that Hussein, after long refusing, has agreed to give the Gazans Jordanian passports. They never had any Arab passport. The Egyptians never gave them. We don't (only laissez passers). But now he authorized the mayors to give them.

Minister Alon: And now they refused, because they are afraid of the terrorists.

Dr. Kissinger: You have to think first of what it is you are trying to accomplish, not details. Make it look as natural as possible—not a sudden new development or an "interim agreement"—as a natural counterpart of disengagement.

The mere fact of making him the effective spokesman of the West Bank.

Prime Minister Meir: We've agreed to discuss the question of disengagement at 9:00 tomorrow.[6] Dr. Kissinger wants tonight an agreement on the letter . . . The Government had three points: UN auspices; inclusion of the Palestinians; and the question of the decision not to participate in any form, including the opening, if Syrians are there, unless the Syrians beforehand hand over lists of our POW's and allow the Red Cross to visit them, if the report is they are decently cared for.

The Secretary brought a rewrite of the letter.

Dr. Kissinger: The letter read "question of", not "timing of" and it was only to be discussed. Nevertheless, because of your strong objections, we went back to the Egyptians, Syrians, and Russians and got an

[5] See footnote 19, Document 398.

[6] See Document 401.

agreement on "the question of other participants from the Middle East area."

Minister Eban: Fine.

Dr. Kissinger: And "first stage" means disengagement phase, not first two days.

Prime Minister Meir: We wanted a clearer sentence on unanimous consent. But at any rate, the Palestinians are out, and the first phase is the whole disengagement phase.

Minister Alon: How does this affect the memorandum of understanding?[7]

Dr. Kissinger: It doesn't affect it.

Prime Minister Meir: But we would like to drop the phrase in paragraph 7 of the memorandum, last sentence.

Minister Eban: We checked, and it is established international practice.

Ambassador Dinitz: [reads] We want to delete "who have the right to *decline* to participate."

Prime Minister Meir: And the President in his letter to me says he's consented to this.[8]

Dr. Kissinger: Not to the deletion.

Prime Minister Meir: No, to the sentence.

Dr. Kissinger: I wanted to make sure you were not negotiating with the President behind my back.

Prime Minister Meir: I'd like to.

Dr. Kissinger: Madame Prime Minister, you would not. I'll be glad to give you the opportunity.

Prime Minister Meir: We absolutely can't have Arafat present at the conference.

Dr. Kissinger: Let's be realistic.

Minister Alon: It's our nightmare.

Dr. Kissinger: I know you have nightmares. We do too; but we can't solve them by memoranda of understanding. But we agree to drop that clause.

I give you our judgment that it is not desirable for Arafat to be negotiating at the Conference for a Palestinian state to emerge from the Conference. Our considered opinion is worth more than memoranda of understanding. It is in no way in our interest.

---

[7] Document 410.

[8] Document 391.

And point three: You prefer "the US will show full understanding" instead of "the US will not press." We accept your suggestion.

On UN auspices, let me explain. The intention here, though unhappily phrased, is to have the UN as convening it, not more. This intent is made clear in the later part, where we ask the Secretary-General to appear as the convenor.

Our situation is: If the Conference fails to come off because of Israel's refusal to agree to the letter, you are in a serious situation.

We have to go back to Sadat because of what will look like an Israeli nitpick. If he refuses, we're in trouble. If he accepts, we're in good shape, but we have to go back to the Egyptians and Syrians and Russians with the letter. The Syrians are tottering on the brink. If anything complicated comes back, the Conference slips and this brings a terrible reaction in America.

We want to send it tonight to the Russians, and add the reminder of Brezhnev's word of honor and that we think the Israelis are right. If you are hesitant, they can use this as an excuse. The Soviet Ambassador in Cairo today said the letter makes no difference because Syria won't come anyway.

We can meet uncertainty by, first, sending Waldheim a draft invitation to you. Second, you can make clear your understanding in your reply to the invitation. Third, our reaction will be, "That is right; that is our understanding too." If he doesn't raise it in his invitation, you should just accept it, and you can give your interpretation afterwards. If he refers to this letter in his invitation, you should raise your interpretation.

We wouldn't volunteer it but if asked we will not oppose it.

If he doesn't mention it, after you reply you can plant a question at a press conference 48 hours later and make it clear.

Prime Minister Meir: We have a problem. You know we don't like UN auspices. When the Cabinet accepts that, we immediately have to go to the Foreign Affairs Committee—they'll hold it against us for not going to them first. But that is our problem.

I don't mind if opposition raises something, unless I think they are right.

Maybe we would go to the Knesset on our initiative; then we'll have to say—it may not be before Tuesday—that even though it says "the parties have agreed." We'll try to follow Dr. Kissinger's method that the Soviet Union and the United States have now been informed . . . period. And the second sentence is not "agreed." We tried to play around with moving the sentence. If we can't find something, we'll have to say what our reading is of this letter. To the first sentence, we have agreed; to the second sentence, our interpretation of "UN aus-

pices" is the Secretary General acting as convenor and presider at the opening phase.

Secretary Kissinger: And you can point to the final paragraph which spells out his functions.

Minister Alon: Can you change the position of the paragraph?

Secretary Kissinger: I thought of moving that sentence back. But my nightmare is that Vinogradov will go to Sadat and say these sons of bitches have made a cute maneuver, and they have done it in Jerusalem. I just don't think it is worth it. It would be the third time in three days that the American Ambassador has gone in there. Then we have to trigger the Syrians from Lisbon. We run up against a tight deadline, and will look silly.

Prime Minister Meir: There is that resolution that Waldheim has to report.

Secretary Kissinger: But that exists already. In practice the UN will play the same role whatever the letter says, because the British and French will attempt to break in. They'll do it not by appealing to that sentence, but to 338 or to "international peace and security." They'll say the UN is seized of it anyway.

Minister Eban: They'll do it anyway, but this sentence adds a little more handle to it.

Secretary Kissinger: A little more handle to it. But you can say it in the Knesset.

Minister Alon: If anyone tries in the UN Security Council to misinterpret it, can we count on your support?

Secretary Kissinger: Unless you are exceptionally provocative.

Minister Alon: That is not our nature.

Secretary Kissinger: There is no possibility that there will be a Security Council interpretation of a letter drafted by two of its members.

Ambassador Dinitz: In paragraph twelve of the memorandum, add "U.S. will do utmost to prevent *and oppose* . . ."

Secretary Kissinger: I don't think we can guarantee to oppose a Security Council resolution on any issue.

Minister Alon: What is the meaning of "utmost?" In my view, if worse comes to worst, the veto will be used.

Secretary Kissinger: We can veto the substance of the discussion, not the discussion itself, and we can't commit ourselves in advance to oppose whatever comes out of the Security Council.

Our basic policy will be as it has been—and successfully—to prevent any Security Council resolution. But to commit ourselves now on any resolution would be irresponsible.

Prime Minister Meir: It is inconceivable that while we are still discussing, the Security Council would pass a resolution on substance.

Secretary Kissinger: That would be our policy. But letter or no letter, I can see circumstances in which it might happen.

Prime Minister Meir: The United States and Soviet Union should say "wait a minute, we can't run this on two parallel lines."

Secretary Kissinger: That would almost certainly be our attitude. Your best protection against this is the mood of the international climate. I told your Prime Minister, your protection is not this memorandum but the degree of understanding between us. I don't want to delude you.

When Kilometer 101 broke down, they threatened to go to the Security Council. I said, "You go to the Security Council and we'll never lift another finger on negotiations."

If it breaks down, we'll try to prevent a Security Council resolution. But whether we veto or not, frankly depends on the degree of our understanding at the time.

Our policy is to prevent it. Of that I can assure you. On disengagement we can stop it.

I keep telling them, "if you want resolutions, go to the UN. But do you want resolutions or disengagement?"

On disengagement I can't foresee circumstances—although it depends on our discussion tomorrow.

Even the Syrians, they are within negotiating range of the Egyptian proposal.

Ambassador Dinitz: One other point, Dayan's. In trying to prevent debate, you say we'll do our "utmost." But in trying to prevent measures, can we at least have the guarantee that we won't be faced with the situation in which the Security Council will be taking measures or actions and the United States will abstain.

Secretary Kissinger: When did we ever vote for "measures?"

Ambassador Dinitz: Once you abstained on a resolution which contained the word "measures." The idea is, we would be safeguarded against the application of measures, beyond just the general prevention of resolutions.

Secretary Kissinger: I'm trying to bring a sense of reality to this discussion. The mood in America is such that if Israel is increasingly seen as the obstacle to the negotiations and the cause of the oil pressure, you'll have tremendous difficulty. Memorandum or no memorandum. I can put anything in this memorandum that I want.

Prime Minister Meir: I know that.

Minister Alon: Once we let the Arabs know of the power of the oil weapon, they'll never stop making demands.

Secretary Kissinger: That is why we've never discussed specifics with the Arabs in return for the oil pressures. If we get it lifted, we can control it. If we can't get it lifted, they'll say "Kissinger is too complicated; let's just do what the others are doing."

Ambassador Keating: The mail from America is saying just that. It's turning, for the first time.

Secretary Kissinger: Next time they impose an oil embargo, we'll use the same tactics.

I believe we can get it lifted if there is a disengagement agreement. That is my firm conviction—if no one talks about it.

Prime Minister Meir: I hope so.

Secretary Kissinger: A year ago the idea that we would do something against Israel would have been an inconceivable question. What I'm trying to do is ensure that the conditions remain that it's not conceivable.

Prime Minister Meir: You are saying, if a war breaks out, or the oil is not lifted, we face being sanctioned, one way or another—either by the UN or by the absence of an airlift. Not that the US is doing something against us, but by what it is not doing. Whether it is just or not, moral or not moral, you say any time the talks break down because we haven't accepted Egyptian or Syrian demands, or the oil isn't lifted, or the Egyptians and Syrians begin to shoot—is there any point at which the US will say Israel is right?

Secretary Kissinger: Rightly or wrongly, the present perception is that Israel was excessively obstinate for six years and contributed to the October war—the starting of the war again would have disastrous consequences.

Prime Minister Meir: Even if the Egyptians start it.

Secretary Kissinger: It makes no difference in the present mixture of forces.

If I were Sadat, I wouldn't want disengagement.

If there is disengagement, and there is a UN force there, it is technically harder to start it—and it would be in violation of a UN resolution, which affects the American mentality. And winter will be over. This enables us to keep the conditions in which America can stand firmly with you. And you can point to concessions you had offered.

So far we've kept this going by, forgive me, my charismatics. It may sound conceited but it is true. That's why I'm so eager to get this Conference going.

Secretary Sisco: I testified in an executive session of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the $2.2 billion, and I was amazed by the questions there.

Secretary Kissinger: And we got it by making a series of negative arguments—that we'd already paid the price of the oil and we might as well get it out of the way now rather than in bits and pieces now and over six months. Senator McClure,[9] who I never heard of, went around the Middle East.

If we can bring it off without having given in, having semi-confronted the Arabs, we can use these tactics again.

Ambassador Dinitz: I think you are absolutely right in your conclusion but I wouldn't go along with the severity of your analysis of Congressional and public reaction. Every poll, Gallup, Harris—

Ambassador Keating: Wait until the gas goes.

Ambassador Dinitz: That's a projection, for the future. I agree it is a possibility in the future.

Prime Minister Meir: We must go back to the Syrian problem.

Secretary Kissinger: We have three choices, if the Egyptians and Syrians both come: negotiations with them without reservation, be at the plenary session with them but say you won't discuss any issue bearing on the Syrians without lists, or refuse to come at all. If it is the latter, there are two ways: refusing to go there, or go there to receive the list and refuse to enter the hall, if you don't get it.

My view is, if you can refuse to go, your Foreign Minister should go there and on the steps of the hall say you won't enter because of the bestial quality of the Syrians. My view is that you should go to the plenary session.

But let me send this letter to the Soviets tonight with one more strong letter to the Soviets saying it is their responsibility. You don't have to decide this tonight. We should discuss disengagement tomorrow and then we can see whether I can move the Syrians.

Call Larry's office tonight. We will have the cables written now and pre-position them.

[The dinner meeting ended at 12:42 a.m.]

[9] Senator James A. McClure (R–Idaho).

400. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

Jerusalem, December 17, 1973, 0221Z.

Hakto 55. 1. For your background, I have just completed more than six hours of discussions with Mrs. Meir, Allon, Sapir, Eban, Dayan and other colleagues.[2] Mrs. Meir called Cabinet into session at 1:00 a.m. Monday,[3] and Cabinet approved action described below.

2. Please tell Dobrynin immediately that the Israelis have agreed to the text of the letter in paragraph 5 below, to which President Sadat had previously agreed.

3. Please ask Dobrynin to have the Soviet Ambassador in Syria present the letter to the Syrian Government and seek Syrian agreement December 17. Remind Dobrynin that Asad told me that any text agreeable to Sadat would be agreeable to him.

4. In addition, please point out to Dobrynin that Brezhnev gave us his word of honor that the prisoners would be released shortly after the ceasefire.[4] If Soviet promises are to mean anything, it is essential that the Syrians produce a list of prisoners by the opening of the conference. If this is not done, we cannot guarantee that Israel will stay at the conference.[5]

5. The text of the joint U.S.–USSR letter to Waldheim now reads as follows:

Begin text.

Dear Mr. Secretary General:

On October 22, 1973, the Security Council adopted Resolution 338, jointly sponsored by the Soviet Union and the United States which calls

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 43, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, HAKTO 1–88, Dec. 8–22, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Eyes Only; Flash.

[2] See Documents 398 and 399.

[3] December 17.

[4] See Documents 221 and 222.

[5] In telegram Secto 173 to Beirut for Buffum, December 17, Kissinger instructed the Ambassador to give Assad an oral message that stated that Israel had agreed to a slightly modified version of the draft letter to the Secretary General and that advised him that it was in Syria's interest to attend the conference. Kissinger added that based on his talks with the Israelis, he believed there were good prospects for progress on disengagement on the Syrian-Israeli front. The Secretary emphasized, however, that although Israel was prepared to engage in serious and concrete discussions on disengagement of forces with Syria at Geneva, it could not do so unless Syria provided a list of POWs and permitted a visit by the Red Cross. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1179, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, December 13, 1973 thru Dec. 17, 1973 [1 of 3])

for negotiations to start between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices, aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East. The Soviet Union and the United States have now been informed by the parties concerned of their readiness to participate in the peace conference. The convening of the conference should be under the auspices of the United Nations.

It is our understanding that Egypt, Israel, Jordan and Syria have agreed to participate from the outset in the conference which would begin in Geneva on December 21. The parties have agreed that the conference should be under the co-chairmanship of the Soviet Union and the United States. The parties have also agreed that the question of other participants from the Middle East area will be discussed during the first stage of the conference.

It is our hope that you will find it possible to participate in the opening phase of the conference at which it is expected that the governments concerned will be represented by their respective Foreign Ministers and later by their specially appointed representatives with Ambassadorial rank. We also hope that you can make available a representative who would keep you fully informed as the conference proceeds. Finally, we would also appreciate it if the United Nations could make appropriate arrangements for the necessary conference facilities.

If as we hope you find it possible to participate, as co-chairmen the Soviet Union and the U.S. would appreciate it if you would agree to serve as convener of the conference and preside in the opening phase.

We request that you circulate this letter to members of the Security Council for their information. We believe it would be appropriate for the President of the Security Council to consult informally with the membership with a view to securing a favorable consensus of the Council. *End text.*

6. You should call Dobrynin's attention to the minor change from the previous draft of the final sentence of the first paragraph of the letter. Whereas it used to read: "The conference should be convened under the auspices of the United Nations," it now reads: "The convening of the conference should be under the auspices of the United Nations." Should the Soviets object to this change, tell Dobrynin we will go back to the previous language.[6]

---

[6] In telegram Tohak 108/WH37645, December 17, Scowcroft informed Kissinger that the text and instructions in telegram Hakto 55 had been passed to Dobrynin. (Ibid., Kissinger Trip Files, Box 42, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, TOHAK 76–133, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

7. For your information only, we are asking Eilts to run the letter to Fahmi one last time.[7] We also asking Jordanians for final agreement as a courtesy, although this is certain.[8] As soon as we have responses from all, we will be ready to concert with Soviets on sending to Waldheim. At that point, we will want to suggest to him the exact wording of his brief invitation.

[7] In telegram Secto 161/1489 from Jerusalem to Cairo, December 17, Kissinger instructed Eilts to show the revised U.S.–Soviet letter to Fahmi in concert with Vinogradov. (Ibid., Box 611, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 13, Nov. 73–Dec. 73)

[8] In telegram 6654 from Amman, December 17, Graham reported that he had just informed Prime Minister Rifai, who said that it was quite clear from their earlier discussion that Jordan would agree to any text acceptable to the Secretary, but that if he needed the formal concurrence of the Government of Jordan, he had it. (Ibid., Box 618, Country File, Middle East, Jordan, X, November–December 1973)

401. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Jerusalem, December 17, 1973, 9:30 a.m.–1 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Golda Meir, Prime Minister of Israel
Yigal Alon, Deputy Prime Minister
Abba Eban, Foreign Minister
Moshe Dayan, Defense Minister
Mordechai Gazit, Prime Minister's Office
Simcha Dinitz, Ambassador to the U.S.
David Elazar, Chief of Staff
General Aharon Yariv
Mordechai Kidron, Director General, Foreign Ministry
Ephraim Evron, Deputy Director General, Foreign Ministry

Secretary of State Dr. Henry A. Kissinger
Kenneth Keating, Ambassador to Israel
Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary for Near East and South Asian Affairs
Alfred L. Atherton, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary
Harold Saunders, NSC Senior Staff
Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Records of Henry Kissinger, 1973–1977, Box 2, NODIS Action Memos 1973–1976. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. Drafted by Rodman. The meeting took place at the Prime Minister's office. Brackets are in the original.

Kissinger: We've sent off the messages, Madame Prime Minister. [The revised draft letter to Waldheim, with modified language on UN auspices at Tab A.][2]

Meir: Thank you.

At any rate, from this point on, if it gets turned down, it is not Israel's responsibility. If the invitation is rejected, it won't be by Israel.

We appreciate it very much.

What can you tell us of Sadat's ideas on separation of forces, disengagement?

Kissinger: First, Madame Prime Minister, I have explained the general political theory behind the disengagement discussion. There is no need to do it again: It permits us to avoid a discussion of frontiers, it permits one to have some success. On the oil situation, either they will continue the embargo, which gives us a pretext to stop our efforts, or if they lift it, it eases the pressures. It makes it objectively harder to start the war again.

[Yariv enters and takes a seat.]

I've heard about you in Egypt. They like you. They want a Yariv plan.[3]

To start the war, they would have to violate a limitation on the quality of arms in the zone, and they would have to violate the limitation on stationing.

The first time I saw Sadat, his scheme had a line that went as far as El Arish.[4] I told him it went too far. He said they had to keep three divisions on the East bank, and he said he would accept no restrictions on the arms there. He told me this on November 6. I told him three divisions was impossible as a proposal, but I didn't go into details.

His suggestion this time was that the Egyptians stay where they are, whatever distance they are now from the Canal.[5] (He said ten–fourteen kilometers.) Then he would withdraw three divisions, then there would be a zone of disengagement up to the Mitla Pass with U.N. forces, then the zone of Israeli forces. I said, as a general proposition, that I knew the passes are of some significance to the Israelis. He said the Israelis can stay in the eastern end of the passes.

Having dealt with him I don't think it is his absolute last word.

I thought about it overnight and the next day I said to him it ought to include a limit on the types of forces. Then he said there could be no

---

[2] Attached, but not printed.

[3] See footnote 3, Document 398.

[4] See Document 324.

[5] See Document 390.

armored divisions across the Canal, just the tanks organic to an infantry division (which I guess is about 100), and no SAMs or heavy artillery. I didn't ask him to define it.

He said he'd begin clearing the Canal as soon as it was done.

He would have a significant demobilization which would guarantee his commitment to peace. That's what he told me. I didn't even tell him I'd present it to you.

He said Israeli cargo can go through the Canal, but not Israeli ships.

Eban: How long would it take to clear the Canal?

Kissinger: Six months to open it; longer if it is decided to improve it.

Alon: He is intending to update the Canal for heavier shipping?

Kissinger: Yes.

Meir: What about Bab el-Mandab?

Kissinger: He said it of course would end any blockade plans. He said as much as that.

Meir: We should hear from Yariv about what happened at Kilometer 101.

Kissinger: He gave his Yariv plan to Asad, who now wants one for himself. [Laughter]

Yariv: There were at 101 on disengagement two or three unofficial Egyptian proposals and two unofficial proposals from our side. He asked me to turn our unofficial proposal into an official one, and I said we couldn't.

The first Egyptian proposal was as you said: a line east of El Arish down to Ras Mohammed. Then there was a modified version: El Arish to Ras Mohammed, ten kilometers to the east and ten kilometers to the west, which amounts to a twenty kilometer U.N. zone.

Then he presented what he called an "unofficial plan," which he then said was an official plan: ten kilometers east of the Canal they will have three divisions, more or less related to the existing bridgeheads. Then a ten-kilometer "security zone," with light Egyptian forces, then a fifteen-kilometer zone with U.N. forces, then a ten-kilometer zone with light Israeli forces, then the main line of Israeli forces. Thirty-five kilometers is the closest that any Israeli forces will be to the Canal.

And he won't start to open the Canal unless we are 55 kilometers back. This scheme is to last to January 15, when another plan had to take over.

Our proposals were: First, each side withdraws to its bank, and ten kilometers back. In between is the U.N. on a twenty kilometer strip.

Our second official proposal was that each side will evacuate ground taken in the last war, and that will then be occupied by the U.N.

Our mutual official proposals were mutually turned down. I also rejected his unofficial proposal because of the timing, because of the distance, and because of the type of forces.

Our unofficial proposal was that Egyptian forces would remain on the East bank with their administrative and police forces, to ten kilometers. There would be a U.N. presence in addition within this ten kilometers. Our security forces would be stationed along a line between ten and twelve kilometers, taking account of our line. The main force will be back out of artillery range of the Canal, and our light forces will have no equipment capable of attacking the Canal.

He turned it down. He asked for another proposal. He linked the distance of our forces to the type of forces. The closer they were, the lighter they had to be. I said police, but we might discuss police forces.

I drew a line of light forces at ten–twelve kilometers. I said his proposal of thirty-five kilometers was too far. I suggested something in between, say fifteen kilometers; his principle of size and distance would mean more than three divisions. I said, "What is this?" He said he would reconsider.

We had four or five discussions of general principles. I used up all my ammunition—rearranging the order of the principles, etc.—and said I had no other proposals. He said, it was a deadlock. I said yes, it means we have to discuss disengagement at Geneva.

This is how we finished at 101.

The so-called Yariv proposal is: the Egyptians are with administrative and police forces, and perhaps some symbolic forces, together with the U.N. forces, within ten kilometers east of the Canal. We are to the east of that line.

Kissinger: In other words, there would be no U.N. buffer at all.

Yariv: The U.N. presence is in the same area as the Egyptian symbolic forces, ten kilometers.

[General Elazar talks to Yariv]

Our Chief of Staff reminds me to tell you that our artillery will all be out of range of the Canal so they can clear the Canal and resettle the cities without worry.

He asked, "What about the limitations on the West Bank?" I said we would like limitations on SAM's, etc.

He told me without hesitation they wouldn't accept any limitations west of the Canal.

Kissinger: That is correct.

I didn't know your plan. They somehow have it in their head that there is a U.N. buffer zone between you and them. It may be deliberate

or a misunderstanding. Fahmy told our Ambassador that the Yariv plan would be more acceptable if "the U.N. zone were expanded."

I don't think much of the idea of strips of light forces. What you want out of the scheme is some criteria that have to be clearly violated, as a firebreak. The distinction between light and heavy forces isn't all that clear to most people.

I didn't know there was a Yariv plan until he said that that was the reason they were upset at the breakdown of 101.

We didn't object to an agreement—just in case someone talks to the press again—my advice was just, as I said, to link it to the Conference.

Meir: There are no restrictions on the West Bank.

Kissinger: No, but there would be no movement of SAMs across the Canal.

Yariv: All that was cabled back to Washington.

Kissinger: I didn't catch up to it.

It is not so bad that it reached the point it is at now, because it gives us a basis to negotiate.

Meir: If he doesn't really want to restart the war, it makes more sense to have it clear; everybody goes back and the U.N. goes in.

Kissinger: I've talked to him enough; that he won't accept. If their two divisions were taken as a point of departure, it would not be his last word on the subject.

The principle should be, it seems to me, that the forces should not enable him to start an attack with the forces there. So, to start a war, the forces would have to be reinforced and the U.N. forces would have to be attacked—so that two violations of the agreement would give a chance to mobilize world, or at least American public opinion. And the buffer gives you time to mobilize.

I'm not speaking for the U.S. Government because I didn't think we should discuss this in detail. So I'm speaking as a student of it.

It seems to me the Canal can be a barrier if you're on the Canal. If you're not on the Canal, they can clearly cross it against your light forces, if they want to violate it. So militarily there is little difference whether or not there are some forces across the Canal, if they are small in number.

Alon: In addition to geography and type of forces, there are basic conditions we must clarify first.

What do we expect the Egyptians to accept in return for our withdrawal from the West Bank? We are, after all, far from being encircled there. We can strike a decisive blow if, God forbid, the war starts.

—An end to the state of belligerency? Freedom of navigation, including Israeli shipping, at Bab el-Mandeb and the Suez Canal?

—Basically the two Egyptian armies should withdraw themselves to the West Bank. I'm not addressing the size of the forces to stay on the East Bank. But it would be much much less than two divisions, less than these "organic" tanks.

—There is no question the Egyptians will be able to exercise their sovereignty on the East Bank, resettlement and rehabilitation of cities there, with an administrative and civilian presence.

—There must be some limitation on the means of warfare, the weapons. It must include some zone west of the Canal and some area behind our area.

—UNEF must be present between the two lines, but we have to work out some sort of an agreement, with maybe Security Council approval, about the legal status of UNEF so the experience before the June war will not be repeated. There are two cases: if one party asks them to leave, or if a government calls its units back under, say, oil pressure.

Since we're now talking about disengagement and not a final agreement, we have to talk about the line somewhere.

You were right, Henry, by telling Sadat that the passes, Giddi and Mitla, are so vital to us in disengagement phase. It will be discussed in the ultimate settlement, but we must remain there with massive forces meanwhile. This will help us when we reach the ultimate phase of negotiating the final peace agreement.

—Then the inspection problem, limitation of forces, etc. on both sides. We would prefer mixed Egyptian-Israeli units, maybe with third parties. We will want all modern techniques, including air photography, to give more confidence to both sides.

—Resettlement of abandoned cities, and reopening of the Canal will help.

—Both sides should not expect that Israel will stick to the disengagement lines forever, but Israel is willing to continue discussions sincerely for a final peace.

These are some of the conditions we and you should clarify.

Dayan: Have you got a concept about the U.N. forces? Because now it's something provisional. When you go seriously into a permanent arrangement, the questions of guarantees and security zones come up. Who stands behind the Poles and the Finns? You can't really rely on them. It is one thing if we have observers. Right now there is no difference between U.N. forces and U.N. observers. If one side violates it, they observe and send a note. It is very useful, but not quite enough.

Something very funny, the other day the Egyptians asked the U.N. forces to move a little out of the way so they could fire on us. The U.N. forces wouldn't, so the Egyptians moved a little away. [Laughter]

They exercise functions like checking convoys, but otherwise they're really only observing. If they are to be really a solid buffer, there has to be more agreement on permanence.

Eban: They showed us a draft agreement on UNEF but it's completely silent on the question of permanence and removability.

Meir: There is the Security Council resolution which we accepted on the ceasefire. There are days on which there are tens of incidents of fire. The Chief of Staff can bear me out. I don't know if we've had five to six days consecutively of quiet.

Elazar: Not even one.

Meir: And casualties too. And this is his acceptance of the ceasefire. If his idea of disengagement is that [only] we withdraw across the Canal, I don't know. How are we going to live just on the promise that he won't do something? We had the experience of the ceasefire three years ago.[6] If nothing happens on the West Bank except this dramatic Israeli withdrawal?

What does the Chief of Staff say?

Elazar: If there is no limitation of forces on the West Bank, there is no problem for them to reinforce the East Bank. It is a question of three or four hours to have an attacking force on the East Bank.

The second point is, if there are SAMs on the West Bank, they have a range of forty kilometers, within which all of our main forces are covered. From a military point of view, the limitation of forces on the West Bank has to be regarded as a vital part of any agreement.

Meir: How many are there in two divisions?

Yariv: Two divisions is about 24,000 men.

Eban: How is this to be checked?

Yariv: It is difficult to count people, but you can count armaments.

Kissinger: Before getting into details, we have to consider the strategic purpose of talking about disengagement. The strategic purpose of talking about disengagement is to avoid talking about frontiers, and avoid talking about what everyone else wants to talk about, namely the 1967 borders. The second purpose is to have enough of a success to get the oil embargo lifted. Once this happens, the international context will be changed and some of the hysteria will be gone. And we can use the same methods. Otherwise, every pressure from the Russians and others will be in the direction of the 1967 frontiers and guarantees.

---

[6] Meir is referring to the August 7, 1970, Egyptian-Israeli cease-fire agreement. The Soviets and Egyptians moved Soviet-made surface-to-air missiles into the Canal zone, in violation of the agreement, within hours of its implementation. Documentation on the August 7, 1970, cease-fire is scheduled for publication in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXIII, Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1969–1972.

We have to keep this in mind, and not be preoccupied with military details. I don't disagree that some of your ideas have merit. For example, the thinning out of the forces on the West Bank is not precluded.

On the permanence of the U.N. force, I think you're infinitely better off to have the U.N. force as a bunch of incompetent observers. It is totally against your interests to make it an effective fighting force, because the chances are infinitely greater that it will fight you, not the Egyptians, given the composition. What you want them to do is observe, be a physical presence.

The more you talk about its permanence, the more you trigger Sadat to link it to a permanent settlement. I think he's not taking full advantage of the situation in which if he starts the war, and even if he loses, the whole world will jump on you. I think it's vanity; he wants to ride in an open car into Suez City. In his eagerness he's given up any link to a final settlement. We should take advantage of this.

On the first trip he did link it, and he also wanted El Arish. This time he didn't raise it. We spent not ten minutes on what happens after disengagement. All I said is that I'd be then prepared to listen to whatever ideas he had on what happens afterwards.

If you raise the issue of permanence too insistently, you risk linkages to a final settlement.

You can ask certain questions. You can hope it will end up as semi-permanent. But you must act as if it were temporary. The utility of the UNEF is, it is some screen for violations but if he breaches it it gives you time to mobilize. Permanence becomes crucial when you're talking about permanent settlement, but it is not crucial now.

The trick here is not to pretend this is permanent. You can raise some of these issues but should be careful not to trigger them. And it should be rapid.

Eban: The Secretary-General's report leaves it all to a Security Council decision.[7]

Another argument against an effective U.N. force is that it will be used to implement the June 4 lines.

Kissinger: Yes, to implement 242 in whatever form they want.

Dayan: I appreciate your thoughts on UNEF.

You rightly asked what do we want to accomplish. Basically, there is one objective—to divide the forces and avoid clashes. Theoretically the two parties should withdraw from one another, and not just one, and avoid clashes.

---

[7] The Secretary General made several reports to the Security Council on the establishment and functioning of the UNEF from October through December. See *Yearbook of the United Nations, 1973,* pp. 203–207.

We have to delay and not now discuss boundaries.

But the first phase of the withdrawal is the most important one, especially when you say it should be done rapidly.

Kissinger: You should agree rapidly.

Dayan: On the West Bank, we are not trapped there. In case you have some communications with Sadat.

Kissinger: That's what he said, but that's my concern.

Dayan: It's not a fact, but it's not the point. Once we withdraw from there to something significant, then practically we will have made a major concession and he would get a major advantage. And he will not be keen on the final border.

So we can get back to whether withdrawal on the East Bank should be called the basic agreement or disengagement. The Yariv plan is more [illegible text] not a final one, but it's a major step. Because it's the Canal and Egyptian cities and the oil pipeline for them; it has more than just military significance.

We read they want to operate the oil fields there.

We can't discuss this or agree about that just as a disengagement of forces. Major other provisions must be there, such as no more fighting and what's allowed in the Canal once it's open. Once we are ten to twenty kilometers east of the Canal, that's it. I don't know if they'll fight the U.N. forces, but we certainly won't.

Kissinger: Certainly it's important, but it is also important to make a correct assessment of the situation. Sadat has two choices: he can do it with us in a calm atmosphere, or he can do it with the Europeans, Japanese, and Russians—in fact everyone—and we'll just be dragged along or acquiesce. He can do it by starting the war, or even a series of incidents.

If it were just between you and the Egyptians, it would make sense to sell the Canal at a high price. But it's not just you.

In designing your strategy, you should get the maximum of what General Dayan is suggesting—a limitation on the West Bank, etc. You shouldn't invest much in strengthening UNEF. But you should list what's essential.

Your forces on the West Bank aren't trapped militarily, but they are politically. Right now the pressures in our Government are under control only because there is a sense that our present strategy will get the oil embargo lifted and that we'll pull something out of a hat.

Alec Home attacked me and said I'm only confusing the issue, because the real issue is joining to pressure Israel to return to the 1967 lines.

Anything you get by the end of January is okay, as long as there is some progress in January. Something is possible. He may go down

from two divisions to less. I've never really negotiated with him. So the level of forces is certainly negotiable. The thinning out of the West Bank, except in the areas you vacate, I don't know. It is not totally unattainable. I raised it only in passing.

A permanent agreement, tight formulation—I don't know what it's worth.

Gazit: An inspection arrangement?

Kissinger: Inspection, I don't know whether we need it, because we have aerial photography. The joint teams or liaison offices in the East Bank may be attainable, in the U.N. zone.

On tactics, if you do this, if we decide on something, my recommendation is to let us offer the generous things; you be a little tougher. It's one way.

What else is on your list?

Gazit: The distance problem, depth of the belts.

Kissinger: I wouldn't have as many belts—I'd have three belts—Egyptian, U.N., Israeli. I consider an Egyptian light belt indistinguishable from a heavy belt.

I'm talking about our public opinion. In America, the U.N. has a constituency. Attacking the U.N. has an impact. But I'd forget about a light zone.

On depth—they always talk about thirty to thirty-five kilometers from the Canal.

Alon: This is negotiable.

Kissinger: He's already changed. He started with El Arish. During the war he said the disengagement zone has to include the passes. Now you can be occupying the east end of Mitla Pass. Will he now give the west end? I don't know. I'd give him a vague principle he can claim as victory to his colleagues, then haggle over details. But I negotiate less honorably than you. [laughter]

Sisco: How far is the western end of the Mitla to the Canal?

Elazar: Twenty-seven to 28 kilometers.

Kissinger: So if you accepted the principle of the disengagement zone of 26–35 kilometers, you could then negotiate within that range. I think it's negotiable.

Alon: How about Bab El-Mandeb?

Kissinger: That's easy.

Eban: How does he define it—as a de facto situation?

Kissinger: He sends us a note every few days saying they didn't really lift it, they just eased it. But we reply saying there would be grave consequences.

On the Canal, he doesn't want to lift the state of belligerency.

You can raise it in your negotiations—Israeli-flag shipping—but you have to decide your priorities.

I'm sure two divisions aren't his last word on the subject.

They want subgroups at Geneva to deal with this problem. Sadat suggested the U.S. and Soviets should join this discussion. I said they'll drive everybody crazy. So he agreed not to have the Soviets or United States, and said that a 101-type U.N. presence was okay.

Dayan: In Geneva?

Kissinger: Yes, transfer the Kilometer 101 talks to Geneva.

Dayan: There is a Russian observer at 101.

Kissinger: Really? I think we can have it essentially the same. We can do what we have to do with you bilaterally; we don't need to be there.

Dayan: In January?

Kissinger: We agreed it won't begin until early January. This will be a decision of the first phase.

Dayan: Will the Soviet forces be in the permanent UNEF?

Kissinger: It's up to you, but I'm violently against it. I think the strategic presence of the Soviet forces in any guise whatsoever are a disaster. So you shouldn't ask for American forces, because we'll have to purchase it with Soviet forces. This is the only reason I left it slightly open at my press conference.[8]

Meir: Mr. Secretary, you won't like what I'm going to say, but I have to say it. You painted a realistic picture. But what you call disengagement is really Israeli forces pulling back. There is nothing mutual in that.

Kissinger: There is a thinning out and restraint on the Egyptians.

Meir: He says he'll demobilize without any inspection from anybody. He may do it; he may not. We'll never really know.

You say we have to consider what's happening in the world—Sir Alec, our French friends, Japanese friends—even if he starts the war again. Justice is determined by what happens in Wall Street, London, Paris.

You say these negotiations have to end in January. And it's not the end.

You say the world wants the 1967 borders.

---

[8] Kissinger is possibly referring to his press conference with Sadat on December 14. In his memoirs, Kissinger wrote that he told the press: "We agreed that disengagement of forces—separation of forces—should be the principal subject of the first phase of the peace conference and I will go to other countries to discuss with them how to proceed." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 773)

Kissinger: They want oil.

Eban: But they think the 1967 borders is the way to get oil.

Meir: You say it's not impossible for them to reimpose it again if they lift it. So what are our advantages? We have our army in Africa, as we call it. When, in March or April, the world begins pressing again, we'll be X kilometers from the Canal. We'll fight at a great disadvantage. And the world will not say, "a plague on both your houses;" the world will say, "a plague on the House of Israel."

Kissinger: That we don't agree on.

Meir: Then you're more optimistic about the world than I am. A coalition of the world. How are we going to do this in February or March? How will it be less in February than now? If we are realistic and honest with ourselves, we Israelis, it really means we have come out of this war, which was as it was, by pulling back. That's what it really is, if you call it by its right name. Just pulling back, that's what it is. If Sadat thinks he is not getting what he wants, with the Russians, the threat of war will start again, and we will be in a less favorable position.

This is not something imaginary.

Kissinger: It is real.

Meir: It is real. If that's what it amounts to, if this must lead to a picture . . .

Sadat is going to a peace conference, not a disengagement conference. What are his thoughts about "peace"—this magic word?

This is the first step towards it. Moving away from the Canal is copyright in Israel. We offered it in the interim agreement,[9] but we never got anywhere because Sadat wanted impossible conditions.

This is the first step towards 1967. Unless you tell me in February to March that Sir Alec won't be Sir Alec, that Jobert won't be Jobert, that the Japanese won't be the Japanese. Except they will have oil.

Kissinger: That's a big difference.

Meir: Unless it is excluded that it will be threatened again.

Kissinger: It's not excluded.

Eban: The threat will be credible because it has been done once.

Meir: In this world you paint, it makes no difference who attacks. The aggressor and victim are in the same position—except the aggressor has oil. In this world, Israel can't be right. Israel has to decide now.

Kissinger: You can do better than what Sadat said to me.

Meir: I know, but it's a unilateral step. You won't like it but—

---

[9] See footnote 3, Document 10.

Kissinger: No, you've said nothing to me that I didn't like so far.

Meir: I'll try again. [laughter]

In 1970 Mr. Sisco and Mr. Rogers were shocked that missiles were there. A standstill went into effect at midnight. It was Nasser that time. This time he won't even promise not to do it.

We don't lose sight of our size. We don't lose sight of our great real friend the United States. We don't lose sight of the rest of the world, with the Soviets at the top. But it comes down to the fact that whatever they want we have to accept. We have no choice.

Kissinger: Madame Prime Minister, what you say is essentially the case. It is ninety-nine percent true. Whatever you say is equally true of the Yariv Plan as of the Sadat Plan. The basic question, as you say, is where is the end of the pressure going to be? Even if there are limitations on SAMs, they can violate them on the West Bank as easily as on the East Bank. I agree the Yariv plan is better, but you'll still have to face the possibility they'll violate it and the question of where the pressures are going to end.

Nasser's violation of the ceasefire was not costless to Egypt, in the sense that, while we were not able to prevent it, it helped in America—I think it proves my case as well as your case—to mobilize public opinion for you. If Joe will forgive me, it broke the cycle of our intention to press you into negotiations quickly which you didn't want to do. And third, you got arms.

Sisco: And you weren't pressured for several years afterwards.

Kissinger: The ceasefire bought you two and one half years. I don't think you lost that much. In public opinion, you're increasingly seen as the unreasonable cause of a world crisis. I think it's essential to break this cycle of governments who don't want to admit their lack of foresight, their lack of courage. They want to show they're doing something by jumping on Israel. Tanaka told me he has an election in July and has to show he has done something.[10]

Now, what would a successful disengagement agreement do in January? Why were the Europeans a little tougher in their recent statement? Maybe because of your talks with the Socialists. But I think it's because of what I told them privately at NATO: "To the extent it is an Arab-Israeli problem, you're making it worse because you're encouraging the Arabs to hold out."[11] I think in the next crisis they might try that tactic if it's been shown to work.

---

[10] Kissinger met with Japanese Prime Minister Kakuei Tanaka November 15 in Tokyo.

[11] Kissinger attended the NATO Ministerial meeting in Brussels December 10–11.

We are talking about time. I don't want to pretend you'll be safe. But the worst that can happen if we do this is almost certain to happen now. If the war starts now, they will certainly attack you. If the Arabs attack U. N. forces, the Europeans will be sheepish and apologetic—but they won't be able to support the Arabs. Sir Alec wants the 1967 borders plus guarantees, not even with security zones.

Incidentally, I asked Sadat about demilitarized zones. He told me, he will fight for demilitarized zones on both sides until the last day, then he'll yield and accept demilitarized zones on your side only.

On oil, from my talks with Boumedienne and Faisal,[12] I think, given Arab disunity, it's one thing for them to agree to cut oil when the war is going on, and it's another to do it on the grounds that a complicated negotiation isn't going well.

Incidentally, there should be no comment from Israel about the oil problem, because that would ruin what's been done.

But while you're absolutely right in your basic analysis, what you can gain is that when a crisis starts we can start with the present strategy instead of a global strategy, because of the prestige of our present course and of those implementing it successfully.

Sir Alec is a fanatic. If there is an election next spring he won't be Foreign Secretary, whoever wins.

Meir: When he was here before he was Foreign Secretary, he told us not to yield an inch!

Eban: And that America didn't understand the Soviet threat.

Dayan: One, what we want is a deal to give territory for an agreement. We accept it will be one-sided. I'm not talking about a peace settlement. What we want in return is some kind of agreement.

Kissinger: General Yariv, what did they expect to come out of these talks?

Yariv: A disengagement agreement.

Kissinger: In writing?

Yariv: Yes.

Dayan: Secondly, we want to ensure that our withdrawal won't be exploited militarily against us in the short term, for example for armor to follow us immediately.

The third point, the area should undergo a normalization process, which Sadat has got in mind. This is one of the safeguards—better than others—of peaceful intentions. Turn the Canal into a civilian waterway and repopulate the cities.

---

[12] See footnote 2, Document 393 and footnote 4, Document 394, respectively.

This will take time and we don't want to be cheated. If we pull back now, they'll take six months for normalization. Then we'll be in the next stage of negotiations, and if we don't yield quickly they'll stop their normalization process.

Kissinger: You can't demand normalization in a written document from him. He can promise it to us.

Dayan: I don't think it should take a very long time.

Practically, it shouldn't start until the beginning of January.

Kissinger: That's easy. I have already told him that.

Dayan: What should be done in writing or in some other way, what should be through you or otherwise, can be discussed.

Kissinger: My view is that it's probably better to get these promises on repopulation and clearing the Canal to us—because then we can say we've been tricked too. If you do it, first, it will be arrogant of you to demand it.

Alon: The Russians are very eager for the opening of the Canal.

Kissinger: We've never discussed it with them.

Alon: If it's okay with you, it is okay with us. Maybe they can help with this.

Kissinger: I frankly want to keep them out of the negotiations as much as possible. If there is a disengagement agreement, I want it clearly to be the product of Sadat's moderate course towards us and ignoring the Russians. I don't want to go to them now and say, "Give us a little help."

Alon: But they won't oppose it.

Kissinger: That's okay.

Alon: With all Sadat's victories, he's no further than ten kilometers further than the Canal, and his Third Army is encircled. So there are the bargaining positions. We are conceding a lot to them.

Kissinger: That's right. I didn't go to them in a position of weakness. We have kept them quiet for three months, which is important. If we get disengagement as soon as January, it will take a month to get the forces actually disengaged. This gets us to March. This gives us a chance to quiet down the hysteria and break the cycle. It will be a quiet period.

Eban: Just because of the fact of the conference.

Kissinger: And the fact of a success. Look what this little November 8 agreement got us [six-point ceasefire strengthening agreement of November 8].[13]

---

[13] See Document 324.

In Viet-Nam we fought off all the pressures for four years. I don't think we can stretch this out for four years, but to gain time is not irrelevant.

Meir: No.

Sisco: And it is useful to you, for your manpower situation, to thin out the West Bank.

Meir: Oh yes, we want to do it.

Kissinger: We should have an understanding between us. We ought to try to get an agreement by the end of January. We can have working groups start January 7. You could send somebody to Washington, or we could send somebody here.

I think we understand each other enough.

Alon: On the principles.

Meir: Before we leave "Africa," I want to mention two Israelis who are there.

Kissinger: Mizrachi.

Meir: Mizrachi, and this one in an insane asylum.

Dinitz: Levy.[14]

Kissinger: I will raise it in a letter to Sadat that I'm sending after this visit.[15]

On disengagement, I think we should have more practical discussions before the working groups start. And I'm hoping to be on vacation between December 29 and January 6. Can we make it before the 29th?

I told Sadat it would meet the first week in January, January 6 or 7th.

Dayan: Anytime between the election and date of the Conference would be much more authorized.

Kissinger: I said to him, right after the 1st of January. You could start negotiations with the Yariv Plan.

Dayan: If we sent someone tomorrow to Washington he wouldn't be able to say any more than we've said here.

Meir: What Dayan is getting at is, to do this two to three days before elections, Begin won't accept this.

Kissinger: If Begin wins and doesn't accept this, I guarantee within six months he'll accept something infinitely worse than this.

Dayan: That's what we're trying to explain to people!

---

[14] Mizrachi and Levi were two accused Israeli spies in Egyptian custody.

[15] Document 403. There is no mention of the two in Kissinger's letter.

Kissinger: When the group meets, it's essential that you start with something that looks to Sadat like a success. The major thing is to have enough of a strategy so that when you offer something to the Egyptians they will be sufficiently excited by it to allow you to draw them into a four-week negotiation. Otherwise they'll storm out and go back to the U.N.

Meir: We'll think about it.

Kissinger: Think about it. It doesn't have to be a high-visibility group in Washington. The alternative is to work out a general understanding on what you'll do the first week in the working group, and we can use that week for technical discussions.

Eban: What happens now in the scenario?

Kissinger: We wait for replies from the Egyptians and Syrians—though we sent it to them without saying we wanted their clearance.

Eban: You mentioned the prisoners?

Kissinger: I sent the Russians a message saying it was their responsibility to get Brezhnev's word of honor implemented, so we're not responsible if the Israelis don't stay at the Conference.

Dayan: I have a list here of our arms requests [Tab B].[16] It is a list of three main classes, in order of priorities.

Kissinger: On the tanks, I ordered 200 when you were there. Isn't that definite?

Dinitz: One hundred and fifty to two hundred.

Elazar: And not definite.

Dinitz: They don't know when.

Kissinger: I can only intervene at crucial moments, and I can intervene best by getting somebody in the Defense Department to think he thought it up himself. In the context of negotiations, it should be easier to get it.

[He reads from the Israeli list.] Two hundred tanks have been approved. Have the APC's been approved? I ordered that you be given access to current production.

The laser-guided bomb, I was told you'd get it.

Dayan: Secretary Schlesinger said we can and should get them, but the next day he said . . .

Kissinger: You'll have a massive problem in the Defense Department. It will be eased when the oil problem is lifted. We have got an oil fanatic in there.

---

[16] Attached, but not printed.

I believe I can break down their … Now that I know your priorities.

On tanks: 650. I don't know if we can get all of these.

Alon: Why not? The Arabs get all they need and more than they can use. Why do we have to be short?

Kissinger: Some one of you, with excessive Israeli straightness, told them you had 300 Soviet tanks. They're counting them now.

When General Dayan was in Washington, they complained to Scowcroft about the 200 tanks I got.[17]

Meir: The last battle we won was letting an El Al plane in.

Eban: We had it in the first week of the war, these holdups.

Kissinger: On APC's I know I can do something. On tanks I consider ourselves committed to 200, and that you were told already.

Dinitz: We were told, then it was taken back, and we don't know when.

Kissinger: On troop carriers, I have to look into it.

On TOWs, I know we don't have 240. I don't know what the production rate is.

Alon: The Secretary of State has great power. Don't underestimate it!

Kissinger: No, it depends more on the President, and which way things are going.

On Syria, can we talk enough so that I know what we can tell them?

Alon: Tell them we can start negotiations on disengagement in the north immediately after the lists are delivered.

Kissinger: We have to give them a little more. They want a Yariv Plan for themselves.

Meir: But we withdrew it.

Kissinger: That was after the [Algiers] Summit. He's mad at Sadat, not at you. Asad was at the Summit the whole time without a plan of his own!

Meir: The fact is the Egyptians gave us a list. All we're asking for is a list, and the Red Cross visits. The Geneva Convention requires it.

Kissinger: The North Vietnamese negotiated with us for four years without giving us lists. We kept invoking the Geneva Convention.

I told him I'd send our Ambassador in Beirut to Damascus tomorrow. I thought we could tell him something.

---

[17] See Document 376.

Meir: On substance?

Kissinger: Yigal told me you could give me something.

Meir: We'd have to hear. The fact is that we're prepared to discuss with him disengagement.

Dayan: You realize, Mr. Secretary that we have no Cabinet decision yet, but I will tell you how I feel about it.

I will oppose giving him a yard of territory in return for a list. If we have to promise him to withdraw one-sidedly, in return for a list, I'll oppose it.

Kissinger: For a list, you only have to go to the Conference.

Dayan: It means we agreed in principle that we have to withdraw. We suggested before—maybe it means nothing to him—that 15,000 peasants could return and we'd return two posts on Mt. Hermon. Do we promise to withdraw from an area just to see that our people are treated decently?

Keating: You always said you were not insisting on keeping the territory.

Kissinger: I don't give a damn if they don't come to the Conference. Then there is no problem of prisoners, and there is a stalemate.

Keating: Can you give the Secretary permission to say that you don't insist on keeping all the territory?

Kissinger: That I don't want. That's the final settlement.

Meir: You can tell him you came away from here with the impression that we're prepared in principle to negotiate, just as we did with Sadat.

Kissinger: Sadat isn't his model; his model is the North Vietnamese.

He said I was asking for two liabilities—giving up the lists and agreeing to talk to the Israelis.

Eban: What levers do you have?

Kissinger: The levers we have are the Russians, the matter of prestige, because he fought and he has nothing to show for it.

He has offered to give lists at the beginning of the disengagement talks and prisoners at the end of the disengagement phase. If we can bring some pressure, maybe we can get the lists at the beginning of the Conference and the prisoners at the beginning of the disengagement phase.

Meir: There must be a limit somewhere. I told you yesterday we got information about amputations on Israeli pilots, if there were the slightest wounds—so that Israeli pilots should know what's awaiting

them.[18] It's moral, it's emotional, but I can't forget it. The world can't forget this; there must be something human.

Kissinger: I'm not arguing against your stand. I'm asking if our Ambassador can go there and say anything that will get this started better.

Alon: Why can't your Ambassador say we're prepared to start negotiations on the same day that we get the lists, which will lead to disengagement, which after all has territorial consequences. We took your word, because you accepted the word of honor of Brezhnev. We didn't trust Brezhnev, but we trusted you, your expertise in this matter.

Eban: If the Russians believe this would wreck the Conference, would this be pressure?

Kissinger: I don't know. I'm trying to find some way to give him an excuse or incentive to do what we want him to do—give lists at the beginning of the negotiations. I agree with you completely that you must have lists and visits before you negotiate on anything. We agree on that. What I want is something that sounds specific enough without really giving him anything in advance.

Alon: Isn't it enough to tell him there will be territorial consequences?

Kissinger: The only question is whether we can increase his interest in a negotiation by giving him some hint, or direction, that gives him an incentive.

The reason he might not come to the Conference is because I refused to give him my idea of what the disengagement line should be. This is why I kept King Hussein waiting four hours.

Eban: And the meeting ended without his agreeing to come to the Conference.

Kissinger: Yes. The only question is whether there is something double-talking we can give him.

Alon: Within the framework of disengagement, we won't ask him to withdraw towards Damascus.

Kissinger: That he takes for granted. If we can't agree, I'll just tell him you're prepared to talk if you have lists.

It is a totally different situation from Egypt. He's [Asad] not all that eager for it. He thinks time is working against Israel. Sadat just wants a victory. He's just an Egyptian nationalist, if he can get the borders he finds acceptable. Asad doesn't give a damn about getting his territory back, he just wants a moral victory over Israel. Therefore, the strategy

[18] See Document 398.

has to be totally different. Asad told me he thinks the world will sooner or later get tired of Israel and then you can be destroyed.

Dinitz: The Russians have a responsibility, Mr. Secretary. They are co-chairmen and they also made commitments. It is incumbent on them to do it.

Kissinger: It may be incumbent on them.

Meir: I can't imagine, with all they're pouring in there, why they don't have enough influence to get what they want, if they're human.

Kissinger: I was going to say that with all we're pouring in here we don't always get what we want. [Laughter]

Meir: We can do a list some time.

Eban: It's a matter of U.S.-Soviet relations.

Kissinger: We're pressing it. I must say, having met the Syrians, that I sympathize a bit with the Russians.

Alon: Try our proposal.

Kissinger: That's a proposal they've already rejected. I told him, that as a result of my conversation with your Defense Minister, I had the impression you might be willing.

Alon: Tell him we are ready to immediately begin negotiations on disengagement, and within the framework of these talks there will be territorial changes.

And try with Moscow.

Kissinger: I told you last night that détente has worked for us.

Alon: And a little for us too.

Kissinger: On the Egyptian disengagement issue, since we'll all be in Geneva, we could have a few days talks in Geneva—what I said we should do in Washington.

Meir: I don't think the timing is good, and Geneva is the worst place. All television will be at you.

Eban: What do we tell the press?

Kissinger: I'll say we had very good, very friendly, very useful talks in which we achieved agreement on all issues related to the convening of the Conference and the principles of the first phase related to disengagement. If that is agreeable.

Meir: No, it's not. At the Cabinet we agreed not to say anything about going to the Conference until Tuesday.[19] I don't think we should say anything about disengagement.

---

[19] December 18.

Dinitz: On the convening of the Conference, we have to discuss it first with the Cabinet.

Eban: If we say we agree to go to the Conference, we'll be asked about Syria.

Kissinger: Our press is saying we came here to smooth out disagreements. I think it's helpful to us to show there is no disagreement between us so if the Syrians stay out it's their fault.

Meir: We can't stop anyone from asking if this means any change in our position on convening with the Syrians. We'll have to say no.

Kissinger: We're not asking you to say anything else.

I think it would be helpful if we could say we achieved complete agreement on the procedures and terms of reference for convening the Conference. You could also say you'll send a delegation to Geneva if all the others come, but have not changed your position on sitting with the Syrians. It is better than saying you won't send a delegation.

Meir: No, we never said that.

Eban: On disengagement . . .

Kissinger: We can say it was fully discussed. Because it whets Sadat's appetite a bit.

Meir: But the minute we say that, we'll be asked by the Knesset Foreign Affairs Committee what we said.

Kissinger: We've said it is the first phase, so it would not be unusual to discuss it.

Eban: We can say we agreed on procedures.

Kissinger: That you agreed that the first item should be a separation of forces and that we had a full discussion of the problems involved.

Meir: It is important that you say it won't take place on the 21st.

Kissinger: You say it; we'll back it up.

Sisco: There is a room at the hotel where you can make a statement together.

Kidron: The airport is better.

Kissinger: Set up a room at the airport. I'll start: I'll say: It was as always a conversation among friends. The conversations were very warm, very useful, and very constructive. We achieved complete agreement about the procedures and terms of reference about the opening of the Conference. We are informed that Israel will send a delegation to the Conference if the other parties agree. We agreed further that a separation of forces should be the first agenda item of the Conference and we had full discussion of the problems and issues involved in the separation of forces.

Then the Foreign Minister will say it doesn't affect your basic attitude about negotiations with the Syrians, and in his judgment nothing will be negotiated until January 1st, and we can say we back it up.

[The meeting thereupon ended.]

---

402. Memorandum From the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, December 17, 1973.

Secretary Kissinger has asked that you be provided with the following report of his meeting with Prime Minister Meir and key members of her Cabinet.[2]

"I have just completed some ten hours of meetings with Mrs. Meir and key members of her Cabinet,[3] and am now en route to Lisbon.

"The Israelis have, after much backing-and-filling, now agreed to:

"go to the conference;

"the text of a letter we and the Soviets will send to Waldheim asking him to convene the conference and invite participants to Geneva on December 21.

"But there remains one outstanding issue yet to be resolved; if it is not, the conference could be still-borne. The Israelis are determined not to sit down or negotiate with the Syrians until they receive, at a minimum, a list of POW's now held by Damascus. When I arrived in Jerusalem I was told that until this precondition was met Israel would refuse to go to Geneva. After some hours of debate the Israelis finally agreed to go to Geneva but I am not sure they will actually attend the session unless a list of prisoners is given them. Your letter to Mrs. Meir of December 14[4] was decisive in obtaining even their agreement to go to the conference.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 43, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, State Cables, Memos & Misc. Dec. 8–22, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only.

[2] The report was transmitted in telegram Hakto 58 to Scowcroft, December 17. (Ibid., Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, HAKTO 1–88, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

[3] See Documents 398, 399, and 401.

[4] Document 391.

"But at the time that I left, it was still Israel's position that it will do little more in Geneva (if the POW list has not been received) than make an opening statement to the effect that Israel will not negotiate with Syria until the POW list is turned over, and then walk out. I think on this point the Israelis are right. Brezhnev promised that the prisoners would be released a few days after the ceasefire and this was one reason Israel accepted it. We are working with the Soviets and Egypt on this problem. Thus, we still have some dangerous days ahead, but at least Israel will appear in Geneva. In the meantime, we are working very hard on the Soviets to use their good offices in Damascus to see that a list is turned over to the Israelis before December 21. I am not overly hopeful at this point, either that the Soviets will push Damascus hard, or that they would succeed if they did. But we must do our best and then wait and see.[5]

"I shall report to you from Lisbon tomorrow while en route to Madrid."

[5] In telegram 4600 from Lisbon to Tel Aviv, December 17, Kissinger sent Keating a message for the Prime Minister stating that he understood the significance of the decision her government had taken to send an Israeli delegation to Geneva, and that he had no doubt that history would show it was the right decision. He added that he had already set in motion further efforts to obtain favorable Syrian action regarding the Israeli POWs. He noted, however, that even if this issue was not resolved before the conference opened, the important thing was to bring effective pressure to bear on the Syrians and to mobilize support for the Israeli position in the forum offered by the conference. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1179, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, December 13, 1973 thru Dec. 17, 1973 [1 of 3])

403. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo[1]

En route, December 17, 1973, 1740Z.

Secto 172. Subject: Message to President Sadat. You should pass following message from Secretary to Sadat through Fahmi as quickly as reasonably possible:

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov.–Dec. 31, 1973. Secret; Nodis; Cherokee. Repeated to the Department of State, Beirut, and Lisbon.

"Dear Mr. President:

"I have just completed my talks in Israel[2] and want you to know that I had very good discussions on Egyptian-Israeli disengagement along the lines of my discussion with you.[3] I am confident that a serious and successful negotiation is possible when the working group starts its talks in Geneva in early January and that it can be completed during January. I shall speak further to your Foreign Minister about this when we meet in Geneva.

"The important issue now remains to begin the process of negotiation. The Israelis have told me that they are prepared to begin discussion of an Israeli-Syrian disengagement promptly and to allow the 15,000 or so Syrian villagers displaced in the recent war to return to their homes. Before any of this is possible, however, Syria must provide a list of the prisoners of war they hold and must allow Red Cross visits to those prisoners. I believe I can be helpful in a serious disengagement effort on this front as on the Egyptian front but only within the framework of the conference. Indeed, I cannot guarantee that Israel will stay at the plenary session of the conference if Syria is present and has not provided a prisoner list before the conference. I hope that you can use your influence to persuade Syria to create the conditions for the progress which is now so attainable.[4]

"As I leave the Middle East, Mr. President, I want not only to thank you for your hospitality but also to tell you again how much I continue to admire the statemanship with which you are proceeding.

"Warm personal regards.

"Henry A. Kissinger".

---

[2] See Documents 398, 399, and 401.

[3] See Document 390.

[4] In telegram 4076 from Cairo, December 17, Eilts reported that Fahmi had told him that he had been sent earlier that day to Syria where, during a 5-hour meeting, Assad and Khaddam had continued to insist that a prior agreement on disengagement which could be publicly announced at the opening session was a prerequisite for Syrian attendance. Fahmi had been unable to persuade them to budge. He had suggested that perhaps, in light of Syria's position, the language in the joint letter should be altered to delete the names of all the parties, so that the door would be left open for Syria to attend. Eilts noted that Fahmi had been "dead tired" and they had had no opportunity to discuss the message to Sadat. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov.–Dec. 31, 1973)

404. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Embassy in Jordan[1]

Lisbon, December 17, 1973, 2215Z.

Secto 177/4601. Subject: Message for King. Eyes Only for Chargé. Please pass the following message from Secretary to King, directly or through PM as most convenient for them:

"Your Majesty:

"As I leave the Middle East, I want not only to thank you again for your great kindness during my visit but also to tell you of my talks in Israel.

"I want to inform you that Israel has agreed to the U.S.–USSR letter[2] and to send a delegation to Geneva. The important issue now is whether Syria will attend. We are urging that Syria reply affirmatively.

"I particularly want you to know, Your Majesty, that progress was made in discussing the principles of disengagement, and I believe serious negotiations are possible on both the Egyptian and Syrian fronts. Of special interest to you is the fact that I found the Israeli leaders already thinking of possible ways to discuss with Jordan in January steps that might be taken on the West Bank designed to strengthen Your Majesty's role there along the line of our breakfast conversation.[3]

"As I said to Your Majesty at breakfast Sunday, I do not have anything specific to suggest along these lines because I am not close enough to the situation on the West Bank. But I am increasingly per-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1179, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, December 13, 1973 thru Dec. 17, 1973 [1 of 3]. Secret; Immediate; Nodis; Cherokee. Repeated Immediate to the Department of State.

[2] Telegram Secto 190/7497 from Kissinger in Madrid, December 18, instructed Graham to give the King and Prime Minister the revised text of the joint letter to Waldheim and tell them that the revision was necessary because of Syria's failure so far to agree to attend the conference. The new draft omitted the sentence "It is our understanding that Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and Syria have agreed to participate from the outset in the conference which would begin in Geneva on December 21" from the beginning of the second paragraph. See Document 400. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1180, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, December 18, 1973 thru Dec. 22, 1973 [3 of 3]) In telegram 6704 from Amman, December 18, Graham reported that Jordan had no problem with the new text. (Ibid., Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, X, November–December 1973)

[3] See Document 394.

suaded that some such step could substantially strengthen Your Majesty's hand in ways that would serve the objectives we discussed.

"Again, Your Majesty, I am deeply grateful to you."[4]

Kissinger

[4] In telegram 6703 from Amman, December 18, Graham conveyed a reply from the King who stated that he had received Kissinger's message with great satisfaction and was grateful for the information about his talks in Israel and for his continuing efforts to help Jordan arrive at a just and honorable peace. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, X, November–December 1973)

405. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the Embassy in Israel[1]

Lisbon, December 18, 1973, 0610Z.

Secto 180/4605. For Ambassador From Secretary. Subject: Middle East Developments. Ref Cairo 4076.[2]

1. Please convey following message from me to Prime Minister Meir.

2. *Begin text.*

Dear Madam Prime Minister

I want to bring you up to date on the latest developments with regard to Syrian participation in the conference at Geneva.

We have just been informed by Ambassador Eilts that the Egyptians sent Foreign Minister Fahmy to Damascus yesterday to seek Syrian agreement. Fahmy ran into the same problem with President Asad as I did—namely, that he wants prior agreement on Syrian-Israeli disengagement before sending a Syrian delegation to the conference. In these circumstances, the Egyptians have asked that the first sentence of the second paragraph of the letter to the Secretary General regarding the parties' agreeing to attend the conference be revised so Egypt can attend the conference in any case.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt, Vol. VIII, November 1–December 31, 1973. Secret; Flash; Nodis; Cherokee. Repeated Flash to the Department of State.

[2] See footnote 4, Document 403.

Fahmy also insists on staying with the original language about UN auspices in the last sentence of paragraph one—namely, "The conference should be convened under the auspices of the United Nations."[3] To deprive the Syrians of using a change in this sentence as a pretext for not going to Geneva, I have agreed—as you said we could—to restore the original language quoted above. We would have no objection to Israel's declaring publicly that the UN auspices apply only to convening the conference, and we shall support this interpretation.

With respect to the other change suggested by Fahmy, in the interest of speed we have tentatively agreed to the new language quoted below. This does not change the substance and will make it possible to convene the conference without Syrian participation if the latter do not respond positively to Waldheim. The absence of Syria from the conference would of course relieve you of the nightmare you described to me and enable you to make progress with Egypt as we discussed yesterday.

We have informed the Egyptians[4] and Soviets[5] of our tentative agreement that the sentence "It is our understanding that Egypt, Israel, Jordan and Syria have agreed to participate from the outset in the conference which would be convened in Geneva on December 21" be replaced by the following: "We request you to contact the parties to the conflict with a view to convening the conference in Geneva December 21." In conveying the joint letter to Waldheim, we and the Soviets would make clear to him that the "parties to the conflict" are Egypt, Israel, Jordan and Syria.

Please let me know immediately if you have any contrary feelings about this change. It is our hope to be in a position to transmit the revised US–Soviet letter to Secretary General Waldheim Tuesday[6] afternoon New York time.[7]

---

[3] The language in the previous draft reads: "The convening of the conference should be under the auspices of the United Nations."

[4] In telegram 4088 from Cairo, December 18, 0850Z, Eilts reported that Fahmi had no problem with the revised formulation. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov–Dec. 31, 1973)

[5] In telegram Hakto 63 from Lisbon, December 18, 0550Z, Kissinger instructed Scowcroft to inform Dobrynin of the proposed revision, noting that it had been suggested by Fahmi and that the United States had accepted it subject to Israel's approval. (Ibid., Kissinger Trip Files, Box 42, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, HAKTO 1–88, Dec. 8–22, 1973) In telegram Tohak 123/WH37680, December 18, 0713Z, Scowcroft informed Kissinger that he had passed the message to Dobrynin, who said he would ask Moscow for approval immediately. (Ibid., TOHAK 76–133, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

[6] December 18.

[7] In telegram 1504 from Jerusalem, December 18, 1056Z, Keating reported that he had just met with Eban, who had focused on Kissinger's statement that the United States and the Soviet Union would make clear to Waldheim which countries were the "parties

Warm personal regards,
Henry A. Kissinger
End text.

Kissinger

---

to the conflict." The Foreign Minister said that if this were made clear in writing and if the Secretary General or the United States made this definition public, he would recommend to the Prime Minister that Israel go along. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 611, Country Files, Middle East, Israel, Vol. 13, October 1973–January 1974)

---

406. Backchannel Message From Secretary of State Kissinger to the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

Lisbon, December 18, 1973, 0905Z.

Hakto 64. You should as soon as feasible this morning contact Dobrynin and make clear to him that while we are briefing the Syrians on the present state of play, we have no continuing contacts with them and that it is a Soviet responsibility to bring Syria to the conference. That task is not our responsibility and it is not a responsibility we intend to assume. It is up to the Soviets, both on the POW issue and attendance at the conference, to assure adequate Syrian performance.[2]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Trip Files, Box 42, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, HAKTO 1–88, Dec. 8–22, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Immediate.

[2] In telegram 4095 from Cairo, December 18, 0945Z, Eilts reported that Fahmi was both apologetic and defensive about Syrian intransigence and claimed that Egypt had warned that disengagement would be a Syrian precondition for attending the Geneva talks. The Ambassador said that he had responded that at no time had the Foreign Minister given any such indication to him, although the two agreed that he had suggested that the Syrians might be difficult. (Ibid., Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov.–Dec. 31, 1973) In telegram Tohak 127/WH37690, December 18, 1550Z, Scowcroft informed Kissinger that Dobrynin had called with a message for him and the President, saying that the Syrians had been approached "at the highest level" regarding the POW issue and attending the conference. (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, TOHAK 76–133, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

407. Memorandum From the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, December 18, 1973.

General agreement has now been reached on the text of a US–USSR letter to be delivered to the Secretary General regarding the convening of the Middle East conference in Geneva on December 21. The US and Soviet Ambassadors to the UN will deliver the letter to the Secretary General this afternoon.[2]

Egypt, Jordan and Israel have all agreed to the letter and to attend the conference, but Syria has not yet indicated its willingness to attend. Ambassador Dobrynin asked that you be informed that Soviet representations at the highest level have been made to Syria on the issues of Israeli POWs and Syrian attendance.[3] The Egyptian Foreign Minister made a trip to Damascus yesterday likewise to urge Syrian participation. Thus far, however, there has been no affirmative Syrian response and no indications of Syrian willingness to provide a list of Israeli POWs. Should Syria maintain its present attitude, the conference will convene without Syrian participation. While this may be something less than optimum, it will permit the crucial Egyptian-Israeli discussions to commence.[4]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 43, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, State Cables, Memos & Misc., Dec. 8–22, 1973. Secret.

[2] In telegram Hakto 69, December 18, 1615Z, Kissinger instructed Scowcroft to see Dobrynin right away and confer with him on sending a joint instruction to Malik and Bennett ordering them to transmit the agreed text of the U.S.–Soviet letter to the Secretary General at 4 p.m. that day. He noted that they should inform Waldheim that Syria had not yet agreed to sending the letter, but that the words "the parties concerned" referred to Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and Syria and that his message convening the conference should be sent to those four, and those four alone. They should also explain that the joint letter had undergone intensive negotiation and that every word meant a great deal to one side or the other. Thus, Waldheim needed to be careful to neither add to, nor subtract from, its wording. (Ibid., Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, HAKTO 1–88, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

[3] See footnote 2, Document 406.

[4] In telegram 5685 from USUN, December 18, 2308Z, Bennett reported that he and Malik had delivered their respective Russian and English texts of the joint letter to the Secretary General at 3:30 p.m. that day. Waldheim indicated that he understood each point and had no problem with any of them. He promised he would use the text, adding only "at Palais des Nations" after Geneva. The Secretary General noted that there were a number of procedural questions to be resolved before the conference opened. Malik responded that these questions would have to be settled with the Foreign Ministers of the two sponsoring powers and Waldheim agreed. Bennett reported that the Secretary General had released the U.S.–Soviet letter and his transmittal letters to Egypt, Jordan, Israel, and Syria at 5 p.m. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1180, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, December 18, 1973 thru Dec. 22, 1973 [3 of 3])

408. Telegram From Secretary of State Kissinger to the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft)[1]

Madrid, December 19, 1973, 1620Z.

Hakto 81. Call Dobrynin and tell him that I am concerned about the potential of Syria to cause trouble, particularly since it has decided to stay away from Geneva.[2] We know there are those in Syria who favor a resumption of the fighting. If Syria attacks, Egypt may be drawn in.[3] This is not only likely to torpedo the Geneva conference before it has had a chance, but create new risks and dangers in the area and difficulties for both of us. Tell Dobrynin to tell Moscow that we count on them to restrain the Syrians and to stay in close touch with us about the Syrian situation. We will, of course, restrain the Israelis. A resumption of fighting would have very unfortunate consequences for our relationship.[4]

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, HAKTO 1–88, Dec. 8–22, 1973. Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only; Immediate.

[2] In telegram 14364 from Beirut, December 18, Buffum reported to Kissinger that Assad had decided not to attend the Geneva conference because of Israeli linkage of the POW issue and the fact that the conference would start by merely discussing disengagement rather than a peace settlement. (Ibid., Box 1180, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, December 18, 1973 thru Dec. 22, 1973 [2 of 3])

[3] As of December 19, the predominant view at CIA was that Assad did not want to undermine the conference but rather sought to pressure the Israelis into giving in to Arab demands. If this was the case, the Soviets and Egyptians could probably dissuade Syria from resuming hostilities. Assad, however, was under strong domestic pressure from the army and leftists in the Baath Party to launch another strike against the Israelis. (Ibid.)

[4] In telegram Tohak 154/WH37720, December 20, Scowcroft informed Kissinger that he had spoken to Dobrynin along the lines of telegram Hakto 81. Dobrynin had asked if U.S. concern was based only on Syria's refusal to attend the conference or on something more specific. Scowcroft said he responded that there were some "worrisome indications" and the Ambassador said he would pass the message to Moscow immediately. (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, TOHAK 134–185, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

409. Memorandum From the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs (Scowcroft) to President Nixon[1]

Washington, December 19, 1973.

Secretary Kissinger has asked me to pass on to you the following message:[2]

"As we look towards the opening of the conference on the Middle East in Geneva on Friday,[3] I thought you might want to have some perspectives of where we are and where we want to go. The strategy we developed in the wake of the Arab-Israeli war is unfolding largely as planned. We have built on the ceasefire and negotiating formula worked out during my October 20–22 trip to Moscow to stabilize the ceasefire on the Israeli-Egyptian front and to launch the negotiating process which will begin in Geneva. This is a historic development, the first time the Arabs and the Israelis will negotiate face to face in a quarter of a century. We have done this while enhancing our influence in the Arab world and reducing that of the USSR.

"Egypt, Jordan, and Israel will participate. Syria, historically the great spoiler of the Middle East, has decided for the time being to stay away. Waldheim will be there in a limited role, taking some of the European and non-aligned pressure off our back while satisfying Israeli concern.

"The Syrian non participation decision[4] is very satisfactory for us—a blessing in disguise. We narrowly averted a situation in which all three Arab states would go to Geneva while Israel, in the midst of an election campaign, would decide not to participate because of Syrian intransigence in refusing to give prisoner lists.

"But Asad, under pressure from the Baath party, adhered rigidly to the position that there must be prior agreement on Syrian-Israeli disengagement before he attends the conference. If he had dropped this condition, Israel would not have participated unless Syria first made available the list of POWs and allowed Red Cross visits. This was unlikely. If it was Israel that was seen balking, our whole effort and hard won renewal of confidence in the Arab world would have been set

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 43, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, State Cables, Memos & Misc., Dec. 8–22, 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only.

[2] Kissinger transmitted this message to Scowcroft in telegram Hakto 80 from Madrid, December 19. (Ibid., Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, HAKTO 1–88, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

[3] December 21.

[4] See footnote 2, Document 408.

back; the likelihood of renewal of war increased; any chance of easing the oil embargo would have disappeared and further restrictions applied; and the possibilities for a Russian resurgence in the area enhanced.

"In present circumstances: (1) We can now concentrate on agreement between Egypt, Jordan, and Israel; (2) The fact that there is a Geneva conference will help achieve disengagement of forces in the next six weeks; (3) The Geneva conference provides some, though not a decisive deterrent to a renewal of hostilities; (4) It provides Faisal an excuse to lift the embargo, hopefully sometime in January.

"For these reasons, we should let Asad stew in his own juice for a while and let moderate Arab pressures and possibly some Soviet pressure build on him as he watchfully, with suspicion and mistrust, awaits developments at Geneva. We shall have to watch him carefully and make clear to the Soviets that they are contributing to another war in the Middle East by the substantial supplying of Syria, and that another war would have a serious effect on our relations. Intelligence indicators are beginning to point to a possible renewal of fighting on the Syrian-Israeli front, and we should make clear to the Russians they must pull out all the stops with their Syrian ally to prevent this. If it were to occur, Sadat could not stay out, and Hussein would be under even greater pressure than in the past to participate in a meaningful way, and once again the specter of a Soviet-American confrontation could face us.

"As I look ahead, I believe there is a real chance of an Egyptian-Israeli agreement on disengagement. Sadat has bought our concept of a step-by-step phased approach. He has been consistent throughout—he decided he was going to Geneva no matter what.

"The prospects between Jordan and Israel are also hopeful since they share a mutual interest in keeping out the Palestinian radicals from the West Bank. Both seem ready to explore ideas that will strengthen Hussein's authority in the West Bank as an insulation against radical inroads.

"As to Syria, its participation later may prove possible if progress can be made behind the scenes with our help to resolve the POW issue and get agreement on the outlines of Syrian-Israeli disengagement. We thus in a way have the best of both worlds. Regardless of their non-participation, their unwillingness to talk separately to the Israelis, and their distaste for partial solutions, our relations with Syria have improved. As a result of my talk with President Asad,[5] we shall soon be establishing an interests section in Damascus. This should lead to a bet-

[5] See Document 393.

ter dialogue and enable us to play a more effective role between Israel and Syria.

"The Russian role will be tested anew. I do not believe they will be obstructive; neither will they be particularly helpful. We must meet the strong Arab desire that they deal with us directly; they want agreements to come largely as a result of US efforts. At the same time, we will have to keep the Russians in the picture and coordinate our efforts with them as much as possible.

"As for Israel, the reality of their situation is beginning to sink in. If Mrs. Meir's labor party wins sufficient support, at least the door is open. Israel finds itself unable to afford another attritional war, and at the same time unable to score an overwhelmingly decisive victory. They are beginning to see this very unpleasant fact. Anguishingly, they seem to be moving towards serious negotiations. In this connection, our continuing sea pipeline of arms is absolutely essential. But a rightist victory could be seriously complicating to our peace efforts; we will know soon."

---

410. U.S.–Israeli Memorandum of Understanding[1]

Washington, December 20, 1973.

This Memorandum of Understanding is intended to express how Israel and the United States will approach their respective roles at the Geneva Conference.

1. The Governments of Israel and the United States agree that the Geneva Conference is aimed at the attainment of a just and durable peace between the parties, that this peace will be a contractual peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors, and that its objective is full reconciliation between the two sides.

2. In the spirit of the special relationship that exists between our two countries, the United States will consult fully with Israel on a step-by-step basis with respect to any ideas it may wish to explore with the Soviets or with the Arabs concerning the settlement.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 136, Country Files, Middle East, Dinitz, December 1–31, 1973. Secret. The memorandum is attached to a December 20 transmittal letter from Shalev to Scowcroft which stated that he took pleasure in forwarding two copies of the Memorandum of Understanding, which included the changes agreed upon during the Secretary's visit to Israel, December 16–17. See Documents 399 and 401.

3. The U.S. will make a major effort with the Syrians and Soviets to achieve a prompt and satisfactory solution to the Israeli-Syrian POW problem. It will press Syria to submit promptly a list of POW's, to permit the International Committee of the Red Cross to visit them and report that they are being treated in conformity with the Geneva Convention and will agree to an immediate exchange of wounded POW's. If Syria has not taken the above action, Israel will participate in the opening phase of the conference but not undertake any substantive discussion with Syria at that phase, and the U.S. will show full understanding for Israel's attitude.

4. Israel reiterates its decision to observe scrupulously the ceasefire on land, air and sea on a reciprocal basis. The United States will exercise its good offices in order to assure that the other side will abide by its undertaking to observe scrupulously the ceasefire. If the U.S. has reason to believe that there has been any change in the Egyptian position the U.S. will seek a reconfirmation that the Egyptian commitment to observe the ceasefire remains in force.

5. All the existing arrangements with regard to the non-military supply to the Third Army as well as the City of Suez will be maintained unless superseded by other arrangements mutually agreed.

6. The United States will do its utmost to insure that the existing arrangement regarding the uninterrupted passage of ships through Bab-El-Mandeb, to and from Israel, will remain in force, and that Egypt will not apply any blockade measures.

7. It is understood that, in accordance with accepted international procedure, the participation at a subsequent phase of the conference of any possible additional state, group or organization will require the agreement of all the initial participants.

8. The negotiations in the Conference will be conducted between the parties concerned as specified in Resolution 338. Israel and the United States agree that it is their view that the Secretary General should participate in the opening sessions in a non-substantive capacity and that he can appoint a representative who would remain throughout the Conference after he has left. His principal duty would be to keep the Secretary General informed and to help assure that the technical and conference arrangements being provided by the U.N. are in order.

9. Since the negotiations between the parties are under U.S.–USSR auspices, it is expected that the two major powers will maintain close contact with each other and the negotiating parties. At the same time, it is the view of both Israel and the United States that the prime focus should be negotiations between the parties concerned. The U.S. will work in concert with Israel to maximize opportunities for negotiations between the parties without the presence of either of the major powers.

10. In view of the fact that the Soviet Union does not maintain diplomatic relations with Israel, the Government of Israel seriously questions the propriety and the feasibility of the Soviet Union acting as one of the two powers under whose auspices the Conference is being held. The United States notes Israel's reservations regarding the role of the Soviet Union at the Conference. The United States will make every effort in its consultations with the Soviet Union to encourage it to play a constructive role at the Conference.

11. The Peace Conference will not discuss or take any action on any substantive issue prior to the elections in Israel, other than the question of the disengagement and separation of forces. The Peace Conference will reconvene only after the new Cabinet is formed.[2]

12. The United States will do its utmost to prevent any attempt to convene the U.N. Security Council or any other U.N. body for the purpose of discussing or taking action on any of the outstanding issues which were discussed at Kilometer 101 or which will be discussed at the Peace Conference.

13. Israel and the United States agree that nothing in this Memorandum alters the text of the joint U.S.–USSR letter which will be despatched to the U.N. Secretary General upon receipt of the approval of the parties concerned.

---

[2] (provided it is understood that the U.S. does not feel resumption of Conference could be delayed beyond mid-January). [Footnote in the original.]

---

411. Research Study Prepared in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research[1]

RNAS–22 Washington, December 20, 1973.

MIDDLE EAST: POSSIBLE FUTURES FOR PALESTINE

An independent Palestine offers a theoretical solution to the refugee and fedayeen problems, but no one has yet devised a bloodless way to reconcile the conflicting interests of 3 million Palestinians, 2.5 million Israelis, and 700,000 Jordanians.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL 27 ARAB–ISR. Secret; No Foreign Dissem. Drafted by Jones, Vaccaro, and McAndrew. Cleared by Jones and released by Mark, INR/Near East and South Asia.

Abstract

The fourth round in the 25-year war between Israel and the Arabs has produced unprecedented momentum toward an overall settlement based on Israeli withdrawal from territories occupied in 1967 in return for still unspecified Arab and international guarantees. Arab League recognition of the Palestine Liberation Organization as the sole representative of the Palestinian people[2] has encouraged the moderate wing of the PLO to consider seeking to participate in the upcoming Arab-Israeli negotiations in the hope of inheriting some part of occupied Palestine as the site for a Palestinian state. The Soviets are reportedly urging this course of action on the PLO. To this end, PLO leader Arafat is reportedly working toward the proclamation of a Palestinian government-in-exile early in 1974.

The obstacles to the creation of a Palestinian state are formidable. The radical wing of the resistance movement considers the Geneva Conference just one more device to delay the Israeli withdrawal called for in UN Resolution 242. The radicals are holding out for continuation of the armed struggle until the state of Israel itself has been eliminated, and continuing terrorist operations designed to sabotage the conference can be expected. Their campaign enjoys the political and financial support of Iraq and Libya, and their position has been reinforced by the Syrian decision not to participate at Geneva—at least not in the opening sessions.

Failing some dramatic evidence of new Israeli flexibility, it is most unlikely that Arafat will try to crack down on the radicals. On the other hand, should the next meeting of the Palestinian "parliament"—the Palestine National Council[3]—unexpectedly produce a consensus for participation at Geneva, Israeli agreement to such participation would be excruciatingly difficult to obtain. Even those Israelis who themselves engaged in terrorist operations in the days of the Mandate consider the PLO so brutal and unrepresentative as to be beyond the pale of diplomatic intercourse.

This posture is close to that of the third Arab participant, Jordan, which fought its own war against the fedayeen in 1970–71 and now maintains that it should be the agency that handles the recovery of any part of Palestine relinquished by Israel. Thereafter, King Husayn has indicated, he would be willing to let the West Bankers determine their future by plebiscite.

It seems definite that most Palestinians in and outside the occupied territories would prefer political autonomy. However, Gaza

[2] See footnote 19, Document 398.

[3] The Palestine National Council next met in Cairo in June 1974.

would present special problems, and a viable Palestinian state is difficult to visualize in any event unless it encompasses both banks of the Jordan River. In short, the three-way conflict of interest among the Palestinians, Israel, and Jordan is so deep-seated that its resolution by negotiation presents one of the most forbidding diplomatic challenges in history. Whatever resources the great powers are able to commit to this problem, much more unrest and bloodshed seems inevitable.

[Omitted here is the body of the study.]

---

412. Report Prepared by the Intelligence Community Staff[1]

Washington, December 20, 1973

THE PERFORMANCE OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY BEFORE THE ARAB–ISRAELI WAR OF OCTOBER 6, 1973: A PRELIMINARY POST-MORTEM REPORT

[Omitted here are the title page and table of contents.]

Principal Conclusions and Recommendations[2]

1. There *was* an intelligence failure in the weeks preceding the outbreak of war in the Middle East on 6 October. Those elements of the Intelligence Community responsible for the production of finished intelligence did not perceive the growing possibility of an Arab attack and thus did not warn of its imminence.

---

[1] Source: Central Intelligence Agency Files, Subject Files, Job 83–M00171R, Box 18, Folder 4. Top Secret; Handle Via Byeman–Talent–Keyhole–COMINT Channels Jointly. The report was reviewed by the U.S. Intelligence Board. A note on the title page reads in part: "This is the first of several reports concerning the activities of the Intelligence Community before and during the Arab–Israeli War of October 1973 which will be submitted to the NSCIC by the DCI or his representatives." A Note on Sources and Methods at the end of the paper explains the methodology used by the "post-mortem team," which was composed of Intelligence Community staff and officers from CIA, DIA, INR, NSA, and IDA. The note reads in part: "The interpretations of events and judgments of intelligence performance appearing in this report rest on the facts as perceived by the post-mortem team and, unless otherwise indicated, reflect in general (though not necessarily in detail) a preliminary Community-wide view."

[2] This section is classified Top Secret; Sensitive.

The information provided by those parts of the Community responsible for intelligence collection was sufficient to prompt such a warning. Such information (derived from both human and technical sources) was not conclusive but was plentiful, ominous, and often accurate.

2. Our post-mortem survey suggests that there were errors of evaluation among all producing offices. These can be attributed, in part, to attitudes and preconceptions lying behind the analysis, and also to various systemic problems affecting the analytical effort.

Certain substantive preconceptions, reinforced by official Israeli interpretations, turned the analyst's attention principally toward political indications that the Arabs were bent on finding non-violent means to achieve their objectives and away from indications (mainly military) to the contrary.

It is true, of course, that the analyst was faced with the tremendously demanding task of discriminating between the good and the bad in the flow of information crossing his desk. And the machinery of which he is a part did not always make his task any easier or provide him with systematic ways to challenge the quality of his own assessments.

3. We preliminarily recommend that: (a) efforts be made to further attune aspects of the collection system to the needs of the analytical systems; (b) regular systems be established to encourage analysts to exchange views and challenge consensus and to improve their ability to evaluate data; (c) the Community's warning system be revamped and the language of its issuances be designed to clearly reflect degrees of probability; (d) the Community consider the advisability of adopting a coherent national family of products for publication during periods of crisis; and (e) the Community provide for continuing assessments of the handling of intelligence during crises and potential crises. (These recommendations are given fuller treatment in Section V. p. 21 ff.)

4. Finally, our preliminary post-mortem report has some implications for the general problem of resource allocation within the Community. If it is true in this instance that the collection effort was generally adequate but that our analytical effort was deficient, then a program to improve the latter will oblige us to try to augment the quantity, improve the environment, and add to the quality of the manpower which devotes itself to the production of finished intelligence. This in turn might require us to find additional resources, and these might have to be drawn in part from other areas of effort within the Community.

[Omitted here are Sections I. Key Questions, and II. The Community's Performance.]

III. The Collection Effort[3]

In intelligence jargon, the principal categories of the effort to obtain (collect) information are HUMINT (human sources: clandestine, military, and diplomatic), SIGINT (encompassing communications [COMINT] and electronic intelligence [ELINT]),[4] and PHOTINT (including satellite photography). A post-mortem survey of collection activities in these three areas of acquisition during the crisis period reveals that there were problems which were peculiar to each country involved, and which in the aggregate affected the quality, dissemination, and ultimate value of the data collected. But there were no major weaknesses or uncompensated omissions in the overall effort. In particular, information concerning, for example, the kinds and numbers of weapons in the Arab inventory was adequate (though the effectiveness of some Soviet weapons—e.g., the SA–6, which had not previously been observed in combat—came as something of a surprise). [*1½ lines not declassified*] Some HUMINT too should be counted as quite good, [*less than 1 line not declassified*].

Intelligence From Human Sources

Specifically concerning clandestine reporting, it is apparent (at least in retrospect) that [*less than 1 line not declassified*] in late September gave a clear indication of impending hostilities. [*1½ lines not declassified*]

"[*less than 1 line not declassified*] Syrian Army units are expected to be in position by the end of September. [*3½ lines not declassified*] Missiles and antiaircraft units are deployed close to the front lines to support the attack at zero hour.

"[*1½ lines not declassified*] Cities, particularly Damascus, are in the process of taking all possible civil defense precautions.

"[*1 paragraph (12 lines) not declassified*]"

Copies [*less than 1 line not declassified*] with similar content were disseminated within the Community in May, June, September and early October and were sent to appropriate diplomatic and military addressees in the field and to the NSC Staff. They also reached officials at high policy levels whose concern and interest were aroused, sufficiently at any rate to prompt requests for immediate assessments of the material by analysts in the Community.

Two clandestine reports which suggested that Syrian military movements were defensive in nature [*less than 1 line not declassified*] were disseminated in early October. This opinion contradicted what

[3] This section is classified Top Secret; Ruff; Zarf; Umbra; Handle Via Byeman–Talent–Keyhole–COMINT Channels Jointly; Limited Distribution; No Foreign Dissem; Sensitive Intelligence Sources and Methods Involved.

[4] Brackets in the original.

purported to be fact in the other reports (we *now* believe that the other reports were indeed substantially factual[5]) and the contradiction (which may have been inspired by Syrian "misinformants") seems to have reinforced the conviction of many analysts that the reported Syrian attack plans were merely "visionary."

Certainly few intelligence analysts seemed prepared to believe the contents and implications of the reports on Syrian attack plans. This was partly so because there was an element of "cry wolf" in them (the imminency of a Syrian attack on Israel has been repeatedly reported since May), partly because there was contradictory reporting from clandestine and other sources, partly because the political climate did not seem warlike, and partly for reasons (e.g., the predispositions of the analysts themselves) which are discussed in a later section of this paper (in Section III).

Clear in hindsight, but not apparent to analysts at the time, is a pattern in the development of the Syrian war plan. Over time [*2½ lines not declassified*] the Syrian plan evolved and revealed an increasing degree of precision concerning order of battle, movements, axes of attack, locations of forces, etc.—a degree of precision never before detected in any previous "exercise" or "defense deployment." Moreover, analysts failed to take account of ample earlier evidence of a coordinated Egyptian-Syrian plan.

Clandestine reporting from and concerning other areas in the Middle East during 1973 was more equivocal. Except for a large volume of reports [*less than 1 line not declassified*] suggesting the likelihood of war in the spring, the reporting was not very extensive in any case.

During June, July, August, and early September, most of the reporting from CIA, US diplomatic posts, and the offices of the US Defense Attachés in the Middle East tended to support the analysts' belief that various political developments in the area militated against the outbreak of war.[6] (In contrast, most of the reporting from these sources during the spring had tended in one way or another to reinforce the supposition that President Sadat was at that time seriously considering war.) There were few if any real substantive disagreements in the reports from State and Defense Attaché officers, and this was also generally true of CIA reports [*less than 1 line not declassified*].

---

[5] Studies seeking to compare the [*less than 1 line not declassified*] contained in these reports with the actual attack mounted on 6 October are in progress. So far, the accuracy of the report seems to have been basically confirmed. [Footnote in the original.]

[6] Among these were, as interpreted by the analysts, Egypt's improving relations with Saudi Arabia, the signs related to the growing viability of oil as a political weapon, Egyptian and Syrian suspicions of Soviet motives toward the Arab world in light of US–USSR détente, etc. [Footnote in the original.]

All US human collection efforts of course suffered from difficult or peculiar operational environments. [*3 lines not declassified*]. In some instances, HUMINT also suffered from the need to depend to a very large degree on [*less than 1 line not declassified*].

Reports from official Israeli sources through US liaison channels were nearly unanimous in their judgment that war was unlikely. An assessment provided by the Israeli foreign ministry officer in charge of Middle East affairs on 3 October, for example, concluded that Arab military movements were routine and that "the voice of reason" would prevail in Damascus. The Israelis apparently remained relatively relaxed about the possibility of war until the evening of 5 October.

[Omitted here are sections on SIGINT and Photographic Intelligence (PHOTINT).]

IV. The Analytical Effort[7]

Attitudes Behind the Analysis

The Legacy of History

It is true that intervals of peace have occurred from time to time in the tortured relationship between Arab and Israeli, but these have regularly been marred over the past quarter of a century by military incidents and harassments, displays of strength, and menacing rhetoric. Thus the Middle East analyst—in or out of government service—has long since become accustomed to a precarious state of affairs between Arab and Israeli. He has for some time lived with, and has more or less calmly adjusted to, the notion that war could resume at almost any time and that eventually it almost certainly will. And because of the frequency of one or another variety of threats of war, especially from the Arab side, the expert has had to learn to discount most indications of hostile intent.

There is then a Cry Wolf factor at work here: the seasoned analyst has been provoked too many times by alarms which seem to others to signal particular peril but which, more often than not in the past, have subsequently proved false. A senior officer in one of the Community's production offices put it this way:

"Some analysts who are not real Middle Eastern experts had a greater sense of danger than those who are; the experts fell victim to a trap, ignoring the simplistic and obvious (e.g., SIGINT) indicators."

Some very specific aspects of the Cry Wolf problem are clearly apparent in published intelligence assessments. They have also been cited

[7] This section is classified Top Secret; Sensitive.

by analysts who have sought to explain the analytical problems they faced in the pre-hostility period. For example:

"For several years we have watched training (by small units almost exclusively) in water crossing operations and in the negotiating of tank barriers, such as those along the eastern edge of the Golan Heights. Both Syrian and Egyptian forces had been deployed in great strength in areas contiguous to the cease-fire lines for at least three years with artillery emplaced well forward in what at first observation would be described as an offensive posture. Exercises of many types have taken place periodically and readiness postures have been raised frequently during times of tension and during periods when Israeli forces were active in field training exercises. The posture of the Egyptian and Syrian forces was one of defense but one which could become offensive almost as quickly as the decision to do so could be made. Troop movements, exercises, and armed clashes have taken place on many occasions since 1967 in an environment of belligerent rhetoric without leading to actual acts of war."

And, from another source:

"We looked at military activity as it fit into the political picture and did not also see it by itself. We eventually were forced to make military information fit into the political puzzle, even when the pieces didn't fit very well at all."

The Impact of Preconceptions

The latter view (above) identifies another significant element which influenced, indeed led astray, pre-war evaluations of Arab intentions, viz, the power of preconceptions. The relevant quote here is from an authority, whose observations, if themselves perhaps preconceived, are also at least well-conceived:

"There are always two aspects to intelligence. One is a determination of the facts, the other is the interpretation of these facts. And there is the tendency of most intelligence services . . . to fit the facts into existing preconceptions and to make them consistent with what is anticipated. And if you start from the assumption that a war is probably unlikely—if you know that there have been Egyptian maneuvers every September over the last ten years—then there is probably a tendency to make observed facts fit your preconceived theories. This is one of the gravest dangers of all intelligence assessments. And facts are much easier to come by than intentions."[8]

No preconceptions seem to have had a greater impact on analytical attitudes than those concerning relative Arab and Israeli military

[8] Secretary Kissinger, 12 October 1973. [Footnote in the original. Reference is to Kissinger's comments during his press conference; see footnote 5, Document 159.]

prowess. The June War[9] was frequently invoked by analysts as proof of fundamental and perhaps permanent weaknesses in the Arab forces and, inferentially, of Israeli invincibility. The Arabs, despite the continuing acquisition of modern weapons from the Russians, remained about as far behind the Israelis as ever: "Israel superiority in such factors as technical competence, morale, leadership and the like offsets the Egyptians (or all Arab) superiority in quantities of men and equipment." (From the joint CIA–DIA–INR *Arab-Israeli Handbook*, July 1973) Moreover, from the same source, an unusually flat assertion (to be proved wrong within three months): ". . . the (Egyptian) ground forces are (not) capable of a multi-divisional operational assault across the Canal." And, again from the same source: ". . . the recent introduction of new (Soviet) air defense, naval, and ground force materiel (including SA–6s and SA–7s) has not significantly increased Syria's military potential."

There was, in addition, a fairly widespread notion based largely (though perhaps not entirely) on past performances that many Arabs, as Arabs, simply weren't up to the demands of modern warfare and that they lacked understanding, motivation, and probably in some cases courage as well. These judgments were often alluded to in conversations between analysts and were reflected somewhat euphemistically in published statements such as the following:

"A fundamental weakness of the Egyptian army continues to be the quality of Arab manpower . . . the average conscript lacks the necessary physical and cultural qualities for performing effective military services. . . . In the field the troops have little motivation and tend to approach difficult situations with a fatalistic attitude."
—CIA *UAR Handbook*, July 1971.

There is of course no disputing the validity of the Community's basic judgment that the Israelis retained military superiority. This, we believe, was about to be demonstrated once again, dramatically so, on the west bank of the Suez Canal when the cease-fire actually went into effect on 24 October. Moreover, implicit in the low judgment of Arab capabilities vs. Israeli capabilities was the strongly held view that the Israelis would not be caught by surprise and be so unprepared in the event of an Arab attack. But the successful crossing of the Canal by major Egyptian forces, the establishing of a substantial bridgehead on the east bank, and the initial successes of Syrian forces in the Golan Heights, all came as a surprise to the Community (and many others). So too did the slow-reaction time of the Israeli forces and the magnitude of Israeli losses.

[9] That is, the June 1967 war.

There is no question that the effect of errors of judgment concerning Arab military capabilities on the Community's political estimates was significant. It is clear, for example, in the following statement of an analyst seeking to identify the reasons for his and others' misinterpretions of events:

"A second element in our estimate was the degree of deterrence afforded by Israeli military superiority. The results of the 1948, 1956, and 1967 Arab-Israeli fighting and the 1969–70 war of attrition clearly established that Arab troops were no match for Israel, that the Arabs knew it, and that an Arab decision to go to war, though it could never be ruled out, would be a desperate emotional and/or irrational act."

The implication of this view was apparent in intelligence publications throughout the summer of 1973 and into October itself: if resorting to war would be an irrational act for, say, Sadat, then—since Sadat is a rational man—he would try to find other, non-military ways to achieve his objectives. Thus, succinctly:

"The whole thrust of President Sadat's activities since last spring has been in the direction of bringing moral, political, and economic force to bear on Israel in tacit acknowledgment of Arab unreadiness to make war."
—CIA Assessment of Purported Syrian Military Preparations, Memorandum for the Secretary of State. 30 September 1973.[10]

A Case of Wisdom Lost

But in hindsight it is clear that a vital element was missing from this calculus, i.e., the estimate that—at least so long as Sadat seemed to have political alternatives—Arab military weakness would probably preclude war. What was missing here, but which had been firmly in view during the spring, was the estimate that the question of Arab military capabilities might have little bearing on the issue of whether or not the Arabs would actually go to war; Sadat and Asad might make the decision to go to war with little or no consideration of the chances of a disastrous military outcome.

Community analysts agreed in the spring (in NIE 30–73, "Possible Egyptian-Israeli Hostilities," 17 May 1973),[11] for example, that a continuing diplomatic stalemate would tend to precipitate hostilities if Sadat (despite his awareness of Egypt's military weakness) concluded that this "would stimulate more active US and Soviet involvement in the settlement process." In other words, an Egyptian (and Arab) decision to resort to war—quite limited war in the view of the NIE—did not rest at all on an assessment of the prospects (dismal) for Arab military success.

---

[10] Document 93.

[11] Document 59.

On the contrary, rational men like Sadat and Asad might make such a decision in full anticipation of defeat on the battlefield, but with hope for a victory at the conference table.

The NIE did not say that it was likely that Arab considerations of this character would in fact lead to war. It estimated, correctly, that "substantial Egyptian-Israeli hostilities appear unlikely in the next few weeks" (and this responded directly to the principal question raised by the requester of the Estimate). But it also stated that, though the danger of war would "probably rise if UN debates and the US-Soviet summit pass without any results judged useful by Cairo, this does not mean that hostilities will then become inevitable or even probable."

There was no published dissent to that judgment in the NIE. But within two weeks of the NIE's issuance, INR analysts recorded their disagreement in an Information Memorandum addressed to the Secretary:

"INR is inclined to state the case on the risk of hostilities for a political purpose with a little more urgency (than the NIE). If the UN debate of next week produces no convincing movement in the Israeli-Egyptian impasse, our view is that the resumption of hostilities by autumn will become a better than even bet. . . ."

This remarkable memorandum then argued the case on wholly political grounds:

[Omitted here are three quoted paragraphs of the May 31 INR memorandum; see Document 65.]

Lamentably, as the summer wore on, analysts seemed to lose sight of this wisdom. They became convinced that King Faysal, in league with Sadat, was determined to use the oil weapon in peacetime to pressure the US into making Israel withdraw from occupied territories, that this was seen by the Arabs as a viable option, and that therefore Arab military action was not necessary. This despite the Arabs' continuing apprehensions about the results of the US-Soviet summit, their sustained disappointment with US actions and policies, and their unrelieved frustration about the impasse at the UN—all matters which the NIE had suggested Sadat would find "intolerable."

It is probably true that for a time last summer the Arab leaders would have welcomed acceptable non-military means to achieve their objectives, and that they made some effort to find such means. But none of this precluded a simultaneous effort to plan seriously for military "solutions" which would be implemented if "peaceful" approaches failed. Nor—as the May INR memorandum pointed out—would the Arabs' fears of military inadequacy necessarily determine their course of action. But in late September and early October, the analysts were examining events as they happened and did not review or consciously recall this wise counsel from the previous spring.

Precisely when and why Sadat and Asad decided to embark on hostilities (essentially for the reasons adduced in the INR memorandum) remain questions for which there are no factual answers. There is, however, reporting to the effect that the Israeli shootdown of 13 Syrian MIGs on 13 September[12] was the last straw and led to Sadat's and Asad's subsequent decision to attack when the circumstances seemed propitious.

[Omitted here are a section on Other Elements of the Problem; Section V, Preliminary Recommendations; and the Note on Sources and Methods.]

[12] See footnote 2, Document 93.

413. Memorandum From the Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs (Sisco) to Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Geneva, undated.

SUBJECT

Framework for Geneva

The purpose of your two days in Geneva will be to set a clear course for the disengagement phase of the Peace Conference between now and roughly the end of January. You will have in mind that there will probably be several phases beyond that, but you can turn your attention to those in January.

The present concept is to think of the Friday and Saturday[2] sessions as Phases 1–A and 1–B. Phase 1–A on Friday would be open and would consist of the speeches by Waldheim and the foreign ministers. This would be followed later Friday by further informal consultations on Conference procedures. Phase 1–B on Saturday would be closed and would deal with Conference procedures.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1180, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, December 18, 1973 thru Dec. 22, 1973 [1 of 3]. Secret; Nodis. Printed from an uninitialed and undated copy.

[2] December 21 and 22.

Objectives and Issues

Specifically, the following are your principal objectives:

1. You will want to reach a general understanding on conference procedures in such a way as to have them established as quickly as possible before the Saturday session with the least possible formal discussion among the parties. If they get deeply involved, they are likely to stall progress for some time. I suggest the following approach:

a. Try to settle the main procedural issues with Gromyko Thursday[3] night. A checklist of these issues is included in the memorandum for your dinner meeting with Gromyko (Tab A).[4]

b. Agree that we will try to achieve consensus on procedures in informal consultations Friday so the Saturday meeting can proceed with the least possible controversy.

c. For those issues not resolved or which may come up in the future, it may be desirable to establish a working group so that the foreign ministers can refer issues there rather than taking up the time of the ministerial meeting on these problems.

2. In the public sessions, you will want to establish a sense that the Conference means business and that it has a realistic plan for achieving early agreement on some issues, particularly disengagement. Without getting into any formal communiqué, it may be desirable for you and Gromyko as co-chairmen to announce at the end of the sessions (a) that the conferees have agreed that talks are scheduled to begin January 7 on disengagement of military forces and (b) that Egyptian-Israeli and Jordanian-Israeli working groups will meet in Geneva on that date for that purpose. It might also be announced—although this should be kept flexible if it is done at all—that the foreign ministers have discussed the possibility of meeting again in mid-January when this first phase of discussions is well along. The purpose would be to focus public attention on some concrete achievements at the Conference and a sense of direction. Some of this, of course, will be done in your speech.

3. In your bilateral meetings with Eban, Fahmi, and Rifai, focus should be on procedures for getting the disengagement talks started and for a continuing exchange of views between us as these talks proceed.

Scenario

You will see *Gromyko* for dinner Thursday evening. A detailed memo for your talk with him is at Tab A. In brief, you will want to cover with him:

---

[3] December 20.

[4] Attached, but not printed.

—Conference procedures.

—Understanding that we will aim for disengagement agreements by the end of January.

—The need to prevent Syria from resuming hostilities.

—The USSR's responsibility for Syrian participation, if any.

—The need for the USSR to make good on Brezhnev's promise for a prisoner exchange soon after the ceasefire.

You will see *Eban* for breakfast Friday morning. You will want to cover with him:

—When and where we can meet with an Israeli representative to get a clear picture of what position Israel will advance on disengagement on the Egyptian front.

—Agreement that disengagement talks with Egypt can begin January 7 in Geneva. Egyptian and Israeli representatives will make their own arrangements for resuming the talks.

—How best to hear Israel's ideas on a "disengagement" phase with Jordan, following up on the discussion of this issue at Eban's dinner last Sunday evening.[5] It might be worth suggesting that Eban try to get together with Rifai and let you know what happens.

—How to begin exchanging ideas in January on structuring Phase II of the Conference beyond January.

—Agreement on the procedures you and Gromyko have discussed.

You will pay a courtesy call on *Waldheim* before the Conference opens. This will be an opportunity to convey whatever general conclusions you and Gromyko have reached, to assure that he understands your general concept for the first phase of the Conference and to explain what you hope to have come out of the first two days of the Conference.

At the *opening session* of the Conference on Friday Waldheim and all of the foreign ministers will speak beginning with Gromyko and you. Your speech is designed to outline your general approach to the work of the Conference, to give a sense that early progress is possible, but to inject some realism about how quickly and how much progress can be expected in the early stages.

Friday evening, there will be a *reception by Waldheim.* Your main purpose there will be to help encourage the breaking of the ice among the senior delegates.

—Friday evening will also be a time for developing consensus among the parties on the issues that will be discussed at the Saturday

[5] December 16. See Document 399.

meeting—conference procedures, conference organization, agenda timetable.

You will see *Fahmi* for dinner Friday. You will want to assure understanding that:

—The Egyptian-Israeli working group will meet January 7. Members of the Egyptian and Israeli delegations will make their own arrangements for resuming disengagement talks.

—Egypt agrees to the procedures you and Gromyko have discussed.

—Each of you will begin developing ideas in January on how to structure Phase II of the Conference beyond January.

You should try to see *Rifai* sometime Saturday to round out your consultations. The main business with Jordan is to see how much further it is possible to go in defining the scope of talks on a "disengagement" phase on the West Bank. However, Abdul Monem Rifai may not be the best channel for this. You might give him an opening, but reserve real discussion for the King in Amman. Otherwise, your main purpose will be to get his concurrence in the procedures you and Gromyko have discussed.

At the *conclusion of the Conference* it would be desirable to have some sort of statement, perhaps by you and Gromyko, outlining how the work of the Conference will proceed. The main points would be:

—The Conference has agreed on procedures and organization for its future work.

—The Conference has agreed that the first issue to be dealt with will be the disengagement of military forces.

—Egypt-Israel and Jordan-Israel working groups have been established to discuss this issue.

—Those working groups will meet in Geneva January 7.

—The full Conference will be reconvened in Geneva on January 15 or at a slightly later date if the work in the disengagement groups requires.

414. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Geneva, December 21, 1973, 8:10–9 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Abba Eban, Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs
Ephraim Evron, Deputy Director General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Eliahu Bentsur, Aide to Eban

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, Ambassador-at-Large
Joseph Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State
Harold Saunders, Senior Staff Member, NSC
Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff

Secretary Kissinger: How is the seating settled?

Assistant Secretary Sisco: It is not settled yet.

Secretary Kissinger: I made a proposal yesterday that they should leave three seats open and let the Arabs and Israelis make a race for them. [Laughter]

What is the problem?

Minister Eban: As long as they are in the same room!

Assistant Secretary Sisco: This is where it stands: Egypt, the Secretary General, the USSR, Syria, Israel, Jordan, the U.S. This is a compromise. It puts it out of alphabetical order. But it looks like opposite camps.

Mr. Evron: How about this? Israel is to the right of the Soviet Union; next to us is Jordan. The Secretary-General, Soviet Union, Israel, Jordan, Syria, Egypt and the United States.

Assistant Secretary Sisco: That is all right.

Secretary Kissinger: That is all right.

Minister Eban: The advantage is it is impossible to derive any possible significance from it.

Assistant Secretary Sisco: Should I try it out on the Secretary-General?

Secretary Kissinger: Yes. [Sisco goes out.]

Minister Eban: Eppie [Evron] can get a five percent share of the Nobel Prize.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Central Files 1970–73, POL ISR–US. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting was held in the Secretary's suite at the Hotel Intercontinental. Brackets are in the original. Kissinger arrived in Geneva on December 20, as did Ambassador at Large Ellsworth Bunker who was the alternate head of the U.S. delegation.

Secretary Kissinger: We'll share it in an institution. If your press will quit for a day, the conference may start.

Minister Eban: There is no press on the Sabbath. The Syrian matter was still in doubt when you left?

Secretary Kissinger: You are not heartbroken, are you?

Minister Eban: It spares us the need to go through the scenario.

Secretary Kissinger: We would have urged you to go to the opening session and make your statement there.

Minister Eban: Your suggestion was rational and therefore impractical in parliamentary terms.

Secretary Kissinger: I have the impression the perception of reality there is lacking. This is incredible. I had the feeling you were one of the few who knew what reality is. To talk about 50 versus 100 tanks is irrelevant, given what you are facing.

Minister Eban: There is great reverence for what the Generals say.

They were convinced Egypt could never cross the Canal.

What about the procedures?

Secretary Kissinger: Today the Secretary-General and the co-chairmen speak and tomorrow the parties.

Minister Eban: The advantage is if you say something momentous, you get the press for yourself.

Secretary Kissinger: If it is momentous, it won't be because it is specific.

Minister Eban: Fahmi wants—this is bad for us—to start the disengagement talks right away. We have no proposal.

Secretary Kissinger: We had it arranged with Sadat that it wouldn't happen right away. Vinogradov and Fahmi were on the plane together. It got him steamed up. We should have let Eilts go on the plane.

Gromyko was unpleasant last night.[2] It is unusual in our relationship. He was worrisome.

---

[2] Kissinger described in his memoirs that during his dinner meeting with Gromyko on December 20, Gromyko had been upset that the Soviets were taking a secondary role to the United States in the peace process. According to Kissinger, "Gromyko had forgotten that he had assigned the task [of assembling the peace conference] to me in order to saddle me with the onus for failure or at least for exacting changes in the letter from reluctant Arab participants. Throughout, the behavior of the Soviet diplomats had been either incompetent or duplicitous—probably a combination of both. . . . When Gromyko grumbled that the Soviet Union would not let itself be excluded from the peace process, his frustration must have been all the greater because he must have known that the Soviets' dilemmas were both self-inflicted and insoluble. So long as the Soviet Union had no ties with Israel, we were the only superpower conducting a dialogue with both sides. . . . Gromyko sought to combine the advantage of close association with our peace effort with unconditional backing of every Arab demand. We refused to play this game." (*Years of Upheaval*, p. 794)

Minister Eban: The absence of Syria has a psychological effect on Egypt.

Secretary Kissinger: It is kind of humiliating for him [Gromyko] to be sitting there and say the Egyptians told me something and I say he is wrong.

Minister Eban: They are worried by the sheer intensity of American diplomatic effort.

There is a tradition for the parties to call on the co-chairmen of a conference. I wonder if I should do it with Gromyko. We have an old relationship. But a rebuff would be bad.

Secretary Kissinger: I will ask him.

There is another procedural problem. Gromyko suggested that after the Foreign Ministers should go, Ambassadors will stay. This has advantages and disadvantages—it keeps the conference going, but it avoids the need to set a date for resumption. I gave no view. What is yours?

Minister Eban: It would be a problem for us because of the commitment that there would be a break. On that assurance we got authorization.

Secretary Kissinger: There could be a compromise that the Ambassadors stay—but Bunker would go home for Christmas and New Years. So nothing could happen.

Minister Eban: It would be better for us if we play it close to the book, given the sensitivities in Israel this week.

Assistant Secretary Sisco: Could there be a working group here? That is a possible compromise.

Minister Eban: No, it is the same problem.

Secretary Kissinger: I really implore you to come up with something on disengagement which can work. This is the way I kept it from a frontier discussion.

I had a conversation with Bouteflika.[3] He says the Syrians are interested in disengagement but worried about their domestic situation. They have a domestic problem regarding the prisoners. I asked Bouteflika, could you do it through me? He proposed that you give me a list of theirs, and I would give it to them. I added one bit to it and said, "If we give it to you, would you add your request to it?" He said he would.

Mr. Evron: We already gave the list to the Red Cross. But it is a mere formality.

---

[3] A memorandum of conversation recording Kissinger's December 20 meeting with Bouteflika in Paris is in the National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1027, Presidential/HAK Memcons, Memcons, HAK & Presidential, December 1973 [1 of 2].

Secretary Kissinger: That is a pity!

Mr. Evron: Immediately after your return from Moscow.

Secretary Kissinger: By the way, Joe Kraft is saying you accepted the ceasefire on the basis of what I told you about Brezhnev. But you had already accepted the ceasefire before I came.

Minister Eban: Of course. The opposition is saying we accepted an American diktat.

Secretary Kissinger: Bouteflika says Asad himself isn't so bad by Syrian standards, but has a murderous domestic situation. This is consistent with my impression. I told you he told me your prisoners are alive and well treated. That is what he said I could tell you. Bouteflika said that what bothers the Syrians is that these prisoners are elite pilots, not ordinary soldiers.

Minister Eban: They said the Geneva Convention doesn't apply because there is a distinction about aerial bombing.

Secretary Kissinger: If you want to get me that list, I'll give it to Bouteflika.

Minister Eban: Yes, we will.

Secretary Kissinger: Bouteflika thought it would work a little later when the disengagement talks with Egypt were further along, and made some progress.

Minister Eban: Their absence helps us with the opening.

Secretary Kissinger: What they really want is for me to conduct disengagement talks. Bouteflika said they might be willing to talk if we—me or Bunker—conducted the disengagement negotiations. We can't possibly conduct the negotiations, but the only thing we can consider is possibly a Rhodes-type operation.

Minister Eban: Before bringing it to the conference itself?

Secretary Kissinger: Yes. I am not recommending it, just reporting it.

Bouteflika says their major concern is domestic. I saw a radio report today from Damascus that was more moderate; said they would join honorable peace negotiations, and accepted 338.

Minister Eban: We understand there would be a break and then resumption.

Secretary Kissinger: Fahmi made a passionate pitch for Ambassadors to stay. It is conceivable we could have the Ambassadors return in early January for a working group.

Mr. Evron: It is possible.

Minister Eban: We thought the soldiers, the disengagement negotiations, would come back.

Secretary Kissinger: It is not much difference if the Ambassadors are here too.

Mr. Evron: The danger is that they would stir up trouble.

Secretary Kissinger: That is clearly their intention. But I've kept Egypt under control by saying, "If you make trouble, there will be no progress."

Minister Eban: It would be difficult if there were, if there were an agreement in the beginning of January.

Secretary Kissinger: Yes, but there really has to be an agreement in January.

The Russians are clearly trying to back the Arabs and be their lawyer, to put us in the position of being yours.

Minister Eban: They are doing it quite insidiously.

I'll say something in my speech about the need to have it fast.

What will be the rules of procedure?

Assistant Secretary Sisco: The speaking order is alphabetical.

Secretary Kissinger: But we thought we would avoid rules of procedure altogether.

Assistant Secretary Sisco: We will operate by consensus. The official languages will be English, Russian and French.

Secretary Kissinger: On substance, and my speech. The first third is abstruse philosophizing. Then there are four general principles: Scrupulous adherence to the ceasefire, and then disengagement proposals. Those will be the first steps towards a final settlement. Then I had to mention withdrawal, recognized frontiers, security arrangements, international guarantees; the interests of the Palestinians, and recognition that Jerusalem contains the holy places of three great religions. That way, if Faisal runs amok, I can say I mentioned it.

Minister Eban: A state of peace.

Secretary Kissinger: It is not in that list but it is in a separate paragraph. Fourthly, I say that the weight of the negotiations should be borne by the parties. You have no problem with this?

Minister Eban: There shouldn't be. There are no geographic references?

Secretary Kissinger: No, it just says "withdrawals".

Assistant Secretary Sisco: There is less specificity on withdrawals than in early statements.

Secretary Kissinger: Even Begin agrees to some withdrawal.

Minister Eban: Begin and Jackson think the U.S. can't let the Suez Canal be open.

Secretary Kissinger: Jackson believes it. The strategic argument is nonsense. If they can move their Mediterranean Fleet to the Indian Ocean, so can we. And we can get the 7th Fleet in too.

Minister Eban: The Soviets were marginal users before. Liberia was the main user.

How do we justify adjournment?

Secretary Kissinger: For informal consultation. We should meet tomorrow morning—for breakfast at 8:30.

Minister Eban: We'll give you the prisoner list as soon as the meeting is over.

Secretary Kissinger: I think Bouteflika may have overstated it.

Minister Eban: But one should always take them up on it.

Secretary Kissinger: Is there something now you could give me? Bouteflika apparently thought you hadn't given a list.

If you could have been more specific on disengagement than your generals were willing to be, I think that would have made a big difference.

Mr. Evron: If we unilaterally let 15,000 citizens back—

Secretary Kissinger: No, not unilaterally.

Minister Eban: It is a significant concession letting them take two posts back.

Assistant Secretary Sisco: Put them in the package.

Secretary Kissinger: It is new to Bouteflika but not to the Syrians.

Minister Eban: The Prime Minister put that together in a speech to the Knesset yesterday.

The Egyptians are playing it very formal here.

Assistant Secretary Sisco: The Secretary-General wanted an informal meeting, a reception, without pictures. Fahmi said no.

Secretary Kissinger: I think the absence of the Syrians is a problem. It sharpens everything.

We got a message from Hussein that the Syrians told him Egypt was the sponsor of the PLO, not them.

I think Gromyko will make a detailed speech.

Mr. Evron: A 40–45 minute speech.

Secretary Kissinger: Mine, if I read slowly, is 15 minutes.

Minister Eban: Waldheim will speak for ten minutes.

Mr. Evron: I read that Congress, both houses, has now approved the $2.2 billion.[4]

[Secretary Kissinger and Minister Eban talked alone from 8:55 to 9:00.]

---

[4] On December 20, Congress passed a compromise foreign aid appropriations bill, which included $2.2 billion in emergency military aid for Israel.

415. Report by Secretary of State Kissinger to President Nixon[1]

Geneva, undated.

After a brief delay to resolve some seating problems, the Geneva Peace Conference got underway in two public sessions in which the principal participants—Egypt, Jordan and Israel—made public statements largely with an eye to public consumption at home. On the whole, each struck a posture designed to protect himself—Egypt against the charge from Syria that it may be moving toward an agreement separate from the other Arabs, Jordan that it is less Arab than its brothers, and Israel conciliatory in tone but maintaining its substantive position in the face of right wing election rhetoric against the Geneva Conference. Tomorrow the Conference has one closed session focusing on the organization of its future work,[2] and it is likely that a sub-group will be set up to deal with the question of military disengagement and to give at least the outward appearance of continuing the session until the parties can get down to serious business shortly after the Israeli election.[3]

On the seating issue, Israel proved both reasonable and flexible. Fahmi (Egypt), who obviously is reflecting Egyptian concern that it may be exposed here in Geneva due to Syrian failure to participate, insisted on seating arrangements which avoided their being next to the Israelis and the Soviet Union as would have been the case if the normal UN alphabetical seating practice had been followed. The Egyptian alternate plan would have the Jordanians seated next to the Israelis, but Prime Minister Rifai, who reflects King Hussein's suspicion of Egyp-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 43, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, State Cables, Memos & Misc., Dec. 8–22, 1973. Secret; Sensitive. The report is attached to a December 21 memorandum from Scowcroft to the President. It was transmitted in telegram Hakto 85 from Kissinger to Scowcroft, December 21. (Ibid., Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, HAKTO 1–88, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

[2] See footnote 2, Document 417.

[3] Telegram Secto 231/6739 from Geneva, December 21, transmitted another report on the December 21 session. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files) On December 21, before the conference began, President Nixon sent Kissinger a message that reads: "On the eve of the convening of the historic conference on the Middle East, I wanted to express to you my respect and the gratitude of the American people for your crucial role in this great enterprise. Without your diplomatic skill, perseverence, and dedication to the cause of peace, this conference would not be taking place. While this is but the first step on the road to a just and durable peace in the Middle East, it is a vitally important step, and the American people are proud that it was their Secretary of State who brought it about. Needless to say, you have my full support as we work together in this vital pursuit." (Telegram Tohak 171, December 21; ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 42, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, TOHAK 134–185, Dec. 8–22, 1973)

tians, took the view that he was not going to permit himself to be used by the Egyptians in this regard. After a round of talks I had before the Conference opened with Waldheim, Gromyko and Fahmi, the issue was resolved with the U.S. being seated between Egypt and Jordan, and the Soviets being seated between the Israelis and the empty Syrian place at the seven-sided table.

At the Conference itself, Waldheim, who chaired reasonably well, opened the proceedings with a brief non-substantive, ten-minute speech describing the U.N. role in an entirely acceptable way. There were no new surprises in the public statements of any of the participants.[4]

Gromyko gave a short and relatively restrained speech, stating standard criticism of Israel and supporting the Arab position on return to the 1967 borders. The most significant thing in Gromyko's speech was the emphasis on the need to accept Israeli sovereignty and its right to national existence. In this connection, at Eban's request, I have arranged for him to call on Gromyko, using the grounds that it is normal at conferences for participants to pay a courtesy call on the chairmen.

I spoke next and in my brief statement, I sought to strike a note of accommodation and reconciliation.[5] Stressing the main question before us at this historical conference—how to move to peace—I made four principal points in this regard: the need to maintain the ceasefire; some realistic appreciation of what can be accomplished in a reasonable time frame; the need for early disengagement of forces as an essential first step; and above all, the essentiality of realistic negotiations between the parties themselves, who will have to live with the results. I reiterated your commitment to a major effort to achieve a peaceful settlement, and I devoted some paragraphs on your general foreign policy approach and the place of the Middle East within it.

I was followed by Egyptian Foreign Minister Fahmi, who while reiterating all standard Egyptian positions in uncompromising language and sharply critical of Israel at certain points, yet kept his rhetoric within reasonable bounds and stressed frequently that the Egyptian objective is a peaceful settlement recognizing the sovereignty of all states in the area. I had had a session with Fahmi in the morning and will be having dinner later with him this evening, and it is clear to me that Sadat has taken a real risk in coming to Geneva, since lack of progress will give the extremists, such as the hardliners in Syria and the militant Palestinian elements, a real opportunity to undermine him if in

[4] Excerpts from the opening statements were printed in *The New York Times*, December 22, 1973.

[5] The full text of the Secretary's statement is in telegram Secto 229/6714 from Geneva, December 21. (National Archives, RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files)

the coming weeks we cannot achieve a significant disengagement agreement. Fahmi feels it is essential that the Conference be at least politically and juridically in session and that some kind of work group sessions be held next week on the question of disengagement. Otherwise, he feels that Egypt may not be able to return to the Conference table in January. I have therefore asked Eban whether it would be possible to get an Israeli military representative to Geneva sometime next week, on the understanding that the Egyptians appreciate that during this last week before the Israeli elections, their respective representatives would largely go through the motions. Eban understood and said he would undertake to try to do this. He is querying Jerusalem on this this evening.

Jordanian Prime Minister Zaid Rifai, obviously with an eye to protecting his flank in the Arab world, gave a considerably more hardline speech than Fahmi, with repeated charges against the Israelis, and with few of the references to the need for peaceful settlement which were found in the speech of the Egyptian Foreign Minister. At a luncheon meeting I had with him right after the morning session, Rifai explained that this "was all politics" in the Arab world and that it should not be taken seriously. I believe the Israelis understand this, although I expect that any possible progress on disengagement between the Jordanians and Israelis is very apt to lag behind the understanding between the Egyptians and Israelis. Rifai told me in our meeting that what he wants from Israel is a small four-kilometer symbolic move away from the Jordan River, where the present Israeli positions are located. His argument is a very simple one: such a four-kilometer move to higher ground would have no adverse strategic impact on the Israeli situation, but would have an important political impact which would be helpful to the Jordanian position in the Arab world. In their view it therefore, serves Israeli and Jordanian interests in helping assure in the long run that Hussein's influence in the West Bank would be uppermost rather than the radical Palestinian elements. While there may be a certain logic in all this, I doubt that even after the Israeli elections, such an idea will be very attractive in Jerusalem. I believe that Israelis are more apt to move in the direction of de facto arrangements with the Jordanians designed to create and strengthen Hussein's authority in the West Bank, primarily in returning Jordanian administration to various cities in the West Bank.

The day's proceedings were wound up by Eban's speech in the afternoon session. His statement was punctuated with many of the oratorical flourishes for which he has become world renowned; while expressing skepticism regarding Arab intentions, it was nevertheless moderate in tone and an eloquent plea for reconciliation, while maintaining a very firm position on the substance of the settlement and the need for Syria to make available its POW list.

While the atmosphere could not be characterized as one of reconciliation, the parties were careful to keep all doors open. Tomorrow at the closed session, we will establish a work group and thus get some movements toward discussion on disengagement.[6] In order to avoid giving the impression that the conference has met briefly and has suspended until early January, it will formally remain in session, and both we and the Soviets as well as the parties will be keeping on hand our respective heads of delegations who will have an opportunity to engage in further informal consultations.

Finally, your strategy is working well. We are the only participant who is in close touch with all the parties, the only power that can produce progress, and the only one that each is coming to in order to make that progress.

[6] The Egyptian–Israeli military working group began meeting on December 26; see Document 425.

416. Memorandum of Conversation[1]

Geneva, December 22, 1973, 1:30–4:25 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS

Andrei Gromyko, Soviet Foreign Minister
Viktor Sukhodrev, Soviet Foreign Ministry (Interpreter)

Secretary Henry A. Kissinger
Peter W. Rodman, NSC Staff

SUBJECTS

Middle East; US–GDR relations; Summit preparations; SALT; CSCE; MBFR; Trade; Brezhnev visit to Cuba; Pompidou and Brandt visits to USSR

[After a brief photo opportunity, the conversation began informally in the anteroom.]

Secretary Kissinger: I think we came out all right.

Minister Gromyko: When I talked with the General Secretary just before I left, he said it is all arranged on Zavidovo.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 71, Country Files, Europe, USSR, Gromyko 1973. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only. The meeting took place in the Soviet Mission. All brackets except those that indicate omitted material are in the original.

Secretary Kissinger: Good. It is a great place.

When I looked at the auspices question yesterday, I realized that you preferred what we would have preferred. I think we let the Egyptians maneuver between us. We had no interest in having UN auspices and we had a lot of trouble with the Israelis on this. We were lukewarm, and you were too, but neither of us wanted to take the responsibility for it.

I think the British and French were pushing it.

Minister Gromyko: Especially the French.

Secretary Kissinger: This is just for you: I've complained officially to the French for their behavior on the Middle East.

Minister Gromyko: Jobert never misses any forum to throw his arrows at us.

Secretary Kissinger: That is true.

Minister Gromyko: I asked him how many arrows he has sharpened for us!

[Vodka was served. Gromyko recommended a Belorussian vodka named for "bison herbs," which prompted a discussion of bison, boar, and hunting.]

Secretary Kissinger: Can you go hunting in Zavidovo in the winter?

Minister Gromyko: Yes. I went just before I left Moscow for Geneva.

Secretary Kissinger: We'll get the Israeli military delegation here by Tuesday,[2] just to talk.

Bunker will be back on Thursday.[3] I've talked to Eban; he'll have an Ambassador here.

You were right. It'll be better that way.

[The group then moved to the dining room for the luncheon. The main topics of the conversation over lunch were eating, drinking and hunting.]

Secretary Kissinger: Ambassador Dobrynin has a good cook. We know sooner or later we will lose him [Dobrynin].

Minister Gromyko: You'd prefer later rather than sooner.

Secretary Kissinger: From our point of view. He is intelligent, reliable, a good friend of the United States.

---

[2] December 25.

[3] Bunker, who was also negotiating the Panama Canal Treaty, left Geneva on December 24 and did not return, but accompanied Kissinger on his Middle East trip in January 1974.

Minister Gromyko: He played a role in the development of US–Soviet relations.

Secretary Kissinger: The Arab world is very new to me, Mr. Foreign Minister. I've no experience with it.

Minister Gromyko: You never dealt with them before?

Secretary Kissinger: I have never been in an Arab country and never had much dealings with them. I frankly thought I could get through my term of office and let someone else do it. To be honest. Now that I have started, I will finish it and with enthusiasm.

Minister Gromyko: It is an extremely complicated world.

Secretary Kissinger: Extremely. And you can't count on every word they say. [Laughter]

Minister Gromyko: Should I comment or not?

Secretary Kissinger: [Laughter] No. That is why we should communicate; otherwise the confusion will be total.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

Minister Gromyko: Tomorrow I have to repay my courtesies to the Egyptian Foreign Minister and I invited him to come over in the afternoon to discuss some matters connected with the Middle East conference. So I leave the day after tomorrow, in the morning.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

[Minister Gromyko:] Now, as regards the problem of the agenda for the next Summit—and the agenda for the discussions with you, as your meeting will be in the context of preparations for the Summit—I would like to add a few words in addition to what we discussed at the UN General Assembly and when I was in Washington and met with the President.

[Both drank glasses of cognac].

Secretary Kissinger: I am amazed [at his drinking]! Training!

Minister Gromyko: What comes to mind in this respect—and this is something I talked about in great detail with General Secretary Brezhnev—we'll be at that time at a certain point as far as the Middle East is concerned. So certainly this has to be on the agenda as a major item.

Secretary Kissinger: No question. And in much better conditions than last time. Because if there is progress, so much the better, and if there is no progress, it will be all the more important for our two leaders to break the deadlock.

Minister Gromyko: We should put out of our head talk of no progress.

Secretary Kissinger: I agree. There will be progress, and we will be able to envisage the final outcome by then. There will be progress by the Spring.

Minister Gromyko: That is something that must be achieved.

Secretary Kissinger: I agree. It will be a much better discussion than last time.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

Secretary Kissinger: Of course. I want to thank you for not only the fact of this information but the spirit. Especially on the Middle East. It is more reliable if we talk to each other instead of learning from the Egyptians.

Minister Gromyko: I appreciate the spirit in which you receive it.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

---

417. Paper Prepared in the Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs[1]

Washington, December 22, 1973.

Talking Points for the President on the Middle East

Our basic strategy remains on the track and on schedule.

—Opening plenary session of Geneva Conference at Foreign Minister level went off with no serious hitches.

—We got two Arab states—Egypt and Jordan—and Israel around the same table. All three made speeches for their domestic audiences, but all carefully avoided posing pre-conditions or taking positions that would close the door to further negotiations. No one walked out.

—Although Syrians decided at last minute not to go, their place at the table was kept, and they have preserved option of joining Conference later. If progress is made in this first phase, Syrians will probably come along.

—We kept Soviets engaged procedurally without their assuming significant substantive role.

—No one raised any of the fundamental issues which would lead to an immediate deadlock—borders, Palestinians or Jerusalem.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 43, Kissinger Trip Files, HAK Trip—Europe & Mideast, State Cables, Memos & Misc., Dec. 8–22, 1973. Secret; Sensitive. Drafted by Atherton. A handwritten notation on the first page reads: "Report to President, Dec. 22, 1973."

—Waldheim was involved and UN facilities were used, with no loss of control to them and with major benefits in terms of reducing the pressures for meddling by the non-aligned and other permanent members of the Security Council.

—In brief, all present have agreed to give a chance to our concept of a step-by-step, pragmatic approach to the negotiation process. An institutionalized Conference framework has been established, which with careful nurturing will keep the principal parties and the Soviets engaged, will keep the UN happy and will help preserve the ceasefire.

The specific state of play is as follows:

—The Conference agreed to a consensus, publicly announced by Waldheim, that it remains in session at Ambassadorial level, and that a military working group on Egyptian-Israeli disengagement will begin work next week.[2]

—After Christmas, Ambassador Bunker will return to Geneva to maintain continuing consultations with the Soviet, Egyptian, Jordanian and Israeli delegations.

—Israel will send military representatives to discuss disengagement with their Egyptian counterparts, with UN military officers present. This gives the form of continuity, which Egypt wants and the Soviets pressed for, but all concerned recognize that no real progress can be made until after the Israeli elections.

—Meanwhile, Israel will send representatives to Washington next week to discuss with us a detailed disengagement proposal which we will seek to help work out between them and Egypt.

—Somewhat later, a parallel working group will be established to discuss Jordanian-Israeli disengagement.

—A further plenary session of the Conference will be held—hopefully in late January—to announce agreement on Israeli-Egyptian disengagement.

What lies ahead?

---

[2] Telegram Secto 234/6746 from Geneva, December 22, contains Waldheim's statement. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files) In Secto 237 from Geneva, December 22, Kissinger reported that in a very brief closed session that day, the conference had agreed that it would continue its work through setting up a military working group to discuss disengagement of forces, while the participants would maintain their delegations at the Ambassadorial level and reconvene at the Foreign Ministers' level "as needed in light of developments." The Secretary added that the meeting had proceeded in a brisk and businesslike fashion since the main points had been agreed to beforehand in bilateral discussions. (Ibid., Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1180, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, December 18, 1973 thru Dec. 22, 1973 [1 of 3])

—The prospects are reasonably good for maintaining the ceasefire and for getting an Israeli-Egyptian disengagement agreement in January or February.

—The Syrians are the most unpredictable factor. Their internal situation is complex; they can always initiate irrational military action, and their deplorable handling of the Israeli POW issue is a major obstacle to getting meaningful disengagement negotiations started with Israel.[3]

—Once we get through the disengagement phase, there will be pressure from the Arabs and Soviets to move to basic issues, which will face Israel with some fundamental decisions. This will be a difficult time for Israel and for us—but it will come after Israel has had time to absorb more fully the lessons of the last war and after it has put behind it the paralysis and trauma of the present election period.

—On the oil problem, we are not yet out of the woods, but the prospects are more hopeful. You will have seen the encouraging report of Faisal's latest thinking.[4]

---

[3] Following the second session of the conference on December 22, Sisco met with the Minister Counselor of the Syrian UN Mission in Geneva, Mowaffak Allaf. He told Allaf he would like to fill him in on U.S. impressions of the conference and hoped he would convey these to Damascus. He emphasized that the important thing was the conference had decided to set up an Egyptian-Israeli military working group, which would focus on the question of military disengagement on that front, possibly as soon as the following week. Sisco said that the U.S. Government was determined to play a helpful role in these deliberations. He added that the United States wanted Assad to know that once he felt able to join the conference, it would work closely with Syria to help achieve a disengagement agreement on the Syrian-Israeli front. (Memorandum of conversation, December 22; ibid.)

[4] The report indicated that King Faisal would consider ending the oil embargo after the opening of the conference. (Ibid., Kissinger Office Files, Box 139, Country Files, Middle East, Saudi Arabia, Nov–Dec 1973) Printed in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXXVI, Energy Crisis, 1969–1974, Document 268.

418. Memorandum for the President's File by Secretary of State Kissinger[1]

Washington, December 26, 1973, 10:35–11:29 a.m.

SUBJECT

Meeting with Soviet Ambassador Anatoliy F. Dobrynin, in the Oval Office, Wednesday, December 26, 1973, 10:35–11:29 a.m.

PARTICIPANTS

The President
Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin
Secretary of State Kissinger

The President greeted Ambassador Dobrynin during a photo opportunity.

The President began the conversation by remarking on the vote in the Congress on the Trade Bill which prohibited MFN for the Soviet Union on grounds of restricted emigration. It was a "miserable vote." The opponents of MFN were American Jewish groups and others who were hawks in the Middle East and doves in Viet Nam. The opponents thought better relations between the Soviet Union and the United States served parochial interests. The Europeans too, were now attacking détente. But the United States and the Soviet Union were the two nations that mattered in the world today. It may not last, the President suggested. But we must take the responsibility. Ambassador Dobrynin asked, Why be so pessimistic?

The point of the matter, the President continued, was that we had to understand that the shape of the world would be determined by our two countries. Such matters as arms control in Europe were very much determined by us. The United States and the Soviet Union must come out working together in a world where the two superpowers can organize the world.

The newspapers did not reflect his views, the President continued. The course on which we were now embarked was irreversible.

Our decisions were so important, because of the danger of miscalculation. "Maybe we made a mistake in October," the President said, "maybe you did." But it was an interesting thing, with Jackson and with the liberals all moving to the right.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 72, Country Files, Europe, USSR, U.S.–USSR, Presidential Exchanges. Top Secret; Sensitive; Exclusively Eyes Only.

The main thing was the shape of the world, the peace of the world. General Secretary Brezhnev must have his own problems. The American press was creating the impression that we could not succeed. Communication between our two sides could help the peace of the world. There were different kinds of opportunities for different countries. For our part, "we will continue to work together."

Ambassador Dobrynin thanked the President for his remarks. The President had just covered the whole gamut. The Ambassador wanted to mention his analysis of the situation including our domestic situation. It was important to keep our relationship on a frank and good basis. He wanted to keep it on a personal basis.

On the Middle East, the Ambassador said that we agreed on the main points and he did not want to go into detail. A crisis should not occur. Both governments should work together in close cooperation and should not let the opposing sides in the conflict pit us against each other. The Soviet side was going to see to it very carefully that foreign policy would not pit us against each other. General Secretary Brezhnev gave instructions to Gromyko that he should work closely together with the United States, and there was very good cooperation at the Geneva Peace Conference.

The President emphasized one point he wanted to make to the Ambassador—that we must not be in conflict and we must not have one side try to drive the other out. That was a short-sighted view. The Ambassador agreed. It went without saying that that approach must not be used by either side. He looked forward to close cooperation as the negotiations proceeded. He wanted to mention once again that as the Soviet side evaluated the situation, the task was to make progress on implementing Security Council Resolution 339. Ambassador Dobrynin complimented Secretary Kissinger for bringing the parties together.

"I will deliver the Israelis," the President declared. "It will be done."

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

419. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between Secretary of State Kissinger and Egyptian Foreign Minister Fahmi[1]

December 26, 1973, 3:05 p.m.

K: Everything is going along fine.

F: How is your health?

K: I am much improved.

F: Tell me I have good news.

K: What is the news? You have good news? What is it?

F: The Syrians have accepted to send a military man to join the military committee.

K: I am not sure the Israelis will sit with him.

F: Why not? He will be in our delegation.

K: He will be part of your delegation?

F: He will be part of our delegation. This is a good step. If you can work on the Israelis and let me know. This is a good step to bring the Syrians to the conference.

K: Yes, but do we have to do it before the elections?

F: Why not?

K: They will never agree before the elections.

F: The next meeting is on Friday.[2] When the Syrian man comes here I can convince him to come after the election.

K: That would be very desirable.

F: Can you do that tomorrow and let me know.

K: I will do my best. What would you discuss? Only Egyptian matters or Syrian matters … with Egyptians or with regard to Syrian …

F: Both of them.

K: They won't do it without getting a prisoner list.

F: We will discuss later on. We have a unified command … good formula to get the Israelis out from under the umbrella …

K: If you can get them to provide a list then no problem.

F: Don't make a condition. Let's take one step at a time.

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological File, Box 24. No classification marking. Kissinger was in Washington; Fahmi was in Geneva. The blank underscore indicates an omission in the original.

[2] December 28.

K: I think the Israelis might agree to the Syrian if it doesn't concern Syrian problems. They will not discuss Syrian problems.

F: They will if necessary.

K: If they get a prisoner list.

F: I will work on that but don't make it a condition.

K: Not for me to do that but I can guarantee the Israelis will do that.

F: If I have the list in my hand, I can guarantee the Syrians can _____.

K: I will be in touch with you. The problem is we have had it all set and you are complicating it.

F: I am not. This is a big step. I want to get the Syrian letter out formally.

K: Let me get in touch with the Israelis and I will call you back.

F: Work hard on them, Henry; and get in touch with me direct. Not through your man here.

K: OK.[3]

[3] Kissinger spoke to Fahmi again at 4:50 p.m. and urged him not to raise the issue of a Syrian officer on the Egyptian delegation until next week: "Next week there is one chance in five, this week there is none." (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, Kissinger Telephone Conversations, Transcripts (Telcons), Chronological Files, Box 24)

420. Minutes of the Secretary of State's Staff Meeting[1]

Washington, December 26, 1973, 3:10 p.m.

PROCEEDINGS

Secretary Kissinger: I see a lot of new faces.

I thought we would have a brief meeting to bring you up to date on what has happened on the trip and what our general strategy has been.

[1] Source: National Archives, RG 59, Transcripts of Secretary of State Kissinger's Staff Meetings, 1973–1977: Lot 78 D 443, Box 1, Secretary's Analytical Staff Meetings. Secret.

There were two essential parts to the trip. One was the relation with the Europeans. The second was the relationships in the Middle East, leading to the Geneva peace conference.

[Omitted here is material unrelated to the Middle East.]

Now, with respect to the Middle East, we had the problem first of getting the conference organized; secondly, developing a strategy for the conference.

Getting the conference organized involved the very mundane problem of developing a letter signed by the Soviet Union and us that each of the parties would accept.[2] And that turned into a rather harrowing exercise. We finally had everybody except the Syrians. And there were two points in the letter that we wanted to change. One—the date of the conference; and the second, we wanted to drop the word "Palestinians" from the letter. So when I saw Assad—Joe [Sisco] and I saw President Assad, in that bizzare place.[3] We asked, "Can we change the date from December 18th to the 21st?" He said, "Sure." I said, "Can we drop the word 'Palestinians'?" He said, "Certainly." I said, "Why does everyone say it is impossible to deal with you. It took us an hour-and-a-half to do this with the Egyptians and here we did it in ten minutes with you." I said, "Is there anything else in that letter that bothers you, since this is our last chance?" He said, "Yes, as a matter of fact, there is one sentence in the letter that bothers us." I said, "What is it?" He said, "That the parties have agreed to go to the conference. (Laughter) We haven't agreed to go to the conference." This to my knowledge was the first time that anybody heard that the Syrians were dubious about going to the conference. It certainly came as a surprise—unless they are consummate actors—to both the Egyptians and the Soviets.

And to this day I don't understand the strategy. Because if he had wanted to blow up the conference, he could easily have refused to change the word "Palestinians" in which case the Israelis wouldn't have come. In fact, he could have accepted the letter with the changes and gone to the conference, in which case again the Israelis wouldn't have come.

So why he accepted the letter and permitted the conference to go on is not easy for me to understand.

But Dean[4] is the expert on the Arab mentality and perhaps can explain it.

---

[2] Document 356.

[3] See Document 393.

[4] Kissinger is likely referring to L. Dean Brown, Ambassador to Jordan September 8, 1970–November 29, 1973, who was appointed Deputy Under Secretary of State for Management on December 19.

So actually, from our point of view the decision of the Syrians not to come was a rather favorable development—all the more so as they have not really made a systematic effort to blow up the conference.

And I must tell you, Joe, right afterwards, regrettably, they are now showing signs of wanting to go to the conference, (Laughter) giving us a totally new nightmare.

From our point of view, the best thing would have been if they had not come while the first stage of the conference was gaining momentum.

Now, as for the strategy that we pursued, our problem was as follows.

We had to prevent, in the first phase of the conference, that the coalition of the West Europeans, Japan, the Soviet Union and Arab producers focus on some issue in which Israel would be totally isolated and we would be isolated with them, either because we agreed with Israel or because we disagreed with Israel and couldn't produce her. Either case would have been disastrous for us.

Therefore, in the last six weeks we have been looking around for some issue that could be settled in the first stage of the conference as a result of our activity and that nevertheless was not so complex either to produce a showdown between us and Israel or to produce a demonstration of our impotence vis-à-vis Israel.

Now, I think there is now a good possibility that the issue of the disengagement of forces can provide such a vehicle. And what this would mean is a moving apart of the Egyptian and Israeli forces with perhaps some UN forces in between, which would have the double advantage that the conference would have started with some success brought about by the United States, and secondly, that starting the war again would become much more difficult, or could be achieved only by actions which would prevent the element of surprise from being as operative as it was on October 6, and therefore would produce an added deterrent to military operations.

We had extremely good talks with the Israelis in which for the first time a glimmer of the strategic reality of their position seemed to us to exist.[5] And while this doesn't mean that their precise positions will be in accord with what we think may be necessary, at least it permits us to talk from a common conceptual base, which is more than existed before.

Finally, we have wanted to reduce the dominant influence of the Soviet Union in the Arab countries by inducing the Arab countries to

[5] See Documents 398, 399, and 401.

deal with us and to recognize that others might have a better rhetoric but only we could deliver on a responsible settlement.

Now, this essentially was achieved.

At the conference, the histrionics were kept to an absolute minimum and a mode of operation was adopted which gives the maximum possibility for progress in the sense that the issues to be discussed first will be military issues to be discussed by military men in the absence of Soviet and U.S. participants, with a member from the UN Emergency Force in the chair—in other words, transferring the Kilometer 101 talks to Geneva. And given the fact that at Kilometer 101 there were already some signs of progress, the first phase of the conference, unless the Syrians suddenly show up, is likely—well, I agree with Dayan, that it has a slightly better than 50-50 chance of working.

What happens afterwards will depend on the nature of the disengagement agreement, to see whether one can have a second phase.

If the Arabs and Soviets can be induced to stage their proposals so that we never face an all-or-nothing situation, then I think we could gradually approach a settlement through a series of steps that could bring about a de facto situation, that would be much safer and much more sustainable. And if we can keep up the position where the Soviet Union does not actively disturb the negotiations, but also does not get into the central position of where its proposals dominate the conference, then I think we will come out of this reasonably well. And I think we are well on the way to doing that, certainly in the first phase of the conference.

Joe, do you want to add anything?

Mr. Sisco: Do you want to say a word about oil? I think there will be a good deal of interest here in the group.

[Omitted here is material relating to the Arab oil embargo. For text, see *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXXVI, Energy Crisis, 1969–1974, Document 270.]

421. Telegram From the Embassy in Jordan to the Department of State[1]

Amman, December 27, 1973, 0955Z.

6802. Subject: Reply of Prime Minister to Secretary's Message. Refs: A. State 250024.[2] B. Amman 6795.[3]

1. Prime Minister Rifa'i just handed me following reply to Secretary's message contained Ref A:

2. "Dear Henry, I was sorry to hear of your indisposition. I hope you are much better.

I have contacted the Chief of Staff and he can leave London to Washington on Saturday, the 29th. Could you see him on Monday, the 31st? Please let me know.

On another subject, I went to Damascus yesterday and had a three and one-half hour meeting with President Asad. It was the best meeting we've had so far. He is more furious at Egypt than ever. He told me Sadat is sending messages to him asking him not to worry because Egypt will never accept to disengage forces with Israel without Syria. Asad says he knows Sadat is trying and that all arrangements for disengagements on the canal are about to be completed.

I spoke to him very frankly and perhaps harshly about the necessity of Syria attending the conference. He was quite lenient about this, and said that he does not believe in disengagement, but total withdrawal all at once. But he has decided to accept disengagement if it were applied to all fronts. He said he is willing to go to Geneva if he can have assurances from the U.S. that disengagement will take place on the Israeli Syrian borders. He added that the only way to have this commitment would be to agree with you on the line to which disengage-

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1180, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, December 23, 1973 thru December 31, 1973 [2 of 2]. Secret; Flash; Nodis; Cherokee.

[2] Telegram 250024 to Amman, December 26, transmitted Kissinger's message to Rifai. Kissinger apologized that he had been ill with the flu and not in his office on Monday (December 24) when Jordanian Chief of Staff Bin Shaker planned to meet with him. The Secretary said he would like to talk with General Bin Shaker, although he doubted he could go beyond what had been said in the General's meetings with Defense Department officials the previous week. He added that if the General could return to Washington following his business in London, he would be happy to meet with him. (Ibid., Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, X, November–December 73)

[3] Dated December 26; not found.

ment would take place.[4] If you arrived at this agreement with him, he will then send a delegation to Geneva to formalize. He asked me to speak on his behalf with you and in conference until they join it. He requested me not to let you know that he had asked me to get in touch with you, and make it appear as if it were my own initiative. If you think there is something worth following up in what Asad suggested, please let me have your thoughts and advise as to where we should move next and to where we go from here. Sincerely yours, Sayd."[5]

Graham

[4] In telegram 6807 from Amman, December 27, Graham reported that Rifai told him that Assad, who had seemed more forthcoming than during his previous meeting with Hussein, said that if a disengagement of forces on the Syrian-Israeli front could be negotiated in advance, he would be willing to attend the Geneva Conference to formalize such disengagement and then would participate in the peace negotiations. Rifai said that although the official Syrian position was that Israel had to withdraw from all territory occupied in 1967, he thought that at this stage, Assad would be willing to allow Israel to continue to occupy that part of the Golan Heights that directly overlooked Israeli territory. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 618, Country Files, Middle East, Jordan, X, November–December 1973)

[5] Telegram 6809 from Amman, December 27, reported that because of an unusual concentration of Israeli troops on the Jordanian border, the King had decided to recall General Bin Shaker immediately from London. (Ibid.) In telegram 25214 to Amman, December 29, Kissinger responded to Rifai's message, saying that he appreciated hearing about the Prime Minister's meeting with Assad and that Rifai's account paralleled what Assad had told him in Damascus. The Secretary noted he would be giving more thought to the question of possible future Syrian participation at Geneva, and would sound out the Israelis on Syrian-Israeli disengagement. (Ibid.)

422. Letter From President Nixon to Egyptian President Sadat[1]

Washington, December 28, 1973.

Dear Mr. President:

Secretary Kissinger has given me a full report of his trip to the Middle East, the opening phase of the Geneva Conference, and, in particular, his most recent discussions with you. From this report, I remain convinced that there is opportunity for real progress towards a settlement and for a dramatic improvement in our relations.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt, Vol. VIII, November 1–December 31, 1973. No classification marking. The President's letter to Sadat was transmitted in telegram 251343 to Cairo, December 28. (Ibid.)

I am pleased that as a result of the discussions you and Secretary Kissinger have had and the exchange of messages between us we can point to a number of significant accomplishments. Relationships between our two countries have been put on a new basis of cordiality and understanding. We have promised what we have felt could realistically be achieved. The ceasefire, the six-point agreement, the opening of the Peace Conference, important as they are, are only beginnings. We are committed, as you know, to full support and implementation of the November 1967 Security Council Resolution. We have also developed together basic principles of a disengagement agreement, subject, of course, to a number of details still to be worked out and negotiated. Israel has sent its military representatives to Geneva where they are meeting with your military representatives looking towards an early agreement on the disengagement of forces. We have also arranged for Defense Minister Dayan to come next week to the United States so that we can pursue the full details with him of a possible disengagement agreement incorporating the principles of your discussions with Secretary Kissinger. All of these are solid achievements to which both Egypt and the United States have made an important contribution.

I am deeply convinced, Mr. President, that our two Nations stand at the threshhold of a great turning point in history. We can, if we have the will, bring a new era of peace and prosperity to all the peoples of the Arab world. But should we fail, we will condemn not only your countrymen but the entire area to a long and bitter continuation of the conflict which has for too long plagued the Middle East. For my part, I pledge myself to do everything in my power to ensure that my second term as President will be remembered as the period in which the United States developed a new and productive relationship with Egypt and the Arab world.

I am also convinced, however, that only if the United States continues to play a major and decisive role in the negotiations now underway in Geneva can we hope for any lasting success. But in order to make it possible for me to move decisively it is necessary that the discrimination against the United States, which the oil embargo represents, be brought to an end. Thus, Mr. President, I have noted with dismay the December 25 decision of the Arab oil ministers in Kuwait to increase Arab oil production by ten percent to help meet the needs of Japan and various European countries while continuing the embargo against the United States.[2] This action has put me in a most difficult position since it constitutes a continuation of a policy of discrimination

[2] The OAPEC Oil Ministers met in Kuwait December 24–25. The communiqué cited the injustice done to the Arab world bcause of the occupation of Arab territory and the expulsion of the Palestinian people.

against the United States. You know from our past exchanges that we believe it is essential that the United States be in a position to engage itself in a positive manner free of outside pressures. The activities of the last several months demonstrate clearly and without equivocation the role the United States has played and would intend to play in order to help bring about a just and durable peace agreement in the area. You know the great stress I place on close relations with the Arab world. However, the clearly discriminatory action of the oil producers can totally vitiate the effective contribution the United States is determined to make in the days ahead. Therefore, Mr. President, I must tell you in complete candor that it is essential that the oil embargo and oil production restrictions against the United States be ended at once. It cannot await the outcome of the current talks on disengagement.

I have felt free, Mr. President, to speak as directly and as frankly as I have in this letter to you because I know from all of your recent conversations and exchanges of messages with us that you are a man who both appreciates and understands clarity and directness. I am writing today to His Majesty King Faisal in the same vein.[3] With the opening of the talks on disengagement, we have now reached the stage where the United States influence could prove decisive.

I am aware that you and His Majesty King Faisal have kept in close touch regarding the embargo. I believe it would be in the interest of everyone concerned and in the interest of progress in the upcoming talks for this matter to be resolved promptly. I am confident, Mr. President, that you will wish to give these views your urgent considerations.[4]

Sincerely,

Richard Nixon

---

[3] Attached, but not printed. The President's letter to King Faisal was transmitted in telegram 251342 to Jidda, December 28. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 139, Country Files, Middle East, Saudi Arabia [2 of 3]) Printed in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXXVI, Energy Crisis, 1969–1974, Document 274.

[4] Telegram 251946 to Jidda, December 28, transmitted a message from Kissinger to Saudi Foreign Minister Saqqaf expressing his strong disappointment and dismay regarding the OAPEC decisions announced on December 25. He pointed out that the discriminatory nature of those decisions, which singled out the United States for a continuing embargo when it was the only country seriously working toward the just settlement in the Middle East that Arab nations wanted, put President Nixon in an impossible position. The Secretary warned that, under these circumstances, he would be unable to continue on the course he had set for himself, and that it was absolutely essential that the oil embargo and oil production restrictions directed against the United States be ended immediately. (National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 139, Country Files, Middle East, Saudi Arabia, [2 of 3]) Printed in *Foreign Relations*, 1969–1976, volume XXXVI, Energy Crisis, 1969–1974, Document 273.

423. Telegram From the Department of State to the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo[1]

Washington, December 30, 1973, 0159Z.

252353. Subj: Message From Secretary to Sadat re Syrian Intentions. For Chargé From Secretary.

1. Please arrange to have following message from me to Sadat delivered to him as expeditiously as possible.

2. *Begin text:* Dear Mr. President: I am writing to share with you my puzzlement and concern about reports reaching me of possible imminent Syrian military action.[2] I do not pretend to know what Syrian intentions may be and do not want to appear alarmist. It is entirely possible that these reports are in error. At the same time, because of the risk that any breakdown of the ceasefire would pose to the constructive work we have already accomplished together and to our hopes and plans for greater progress in the future, I thought I should be in touch with you and seek any views about the situation which you may care to share with me.

3. It would of course be a major tragedy if the military situation were to deteriorate and the negotiating process so recently launched in Geneva were to be set back, just when we are on the threshhold of the first real and tangible progress toward a just settlement in over six years.[3]

4. I want to reaffirm to you my commitment to the program for disengagement which we have discussed and my commitment to work for a serious disengagement arrangement between Syria and Israel as well. This can only be done in the context of progress at Geneva and would be placed in serious jeopardy if there were a resumption of hostilities. Certainly renewed fighting would undermine the ability of the

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt, Vol. VIII, November 1–December 31, 1973. Secret; Niact; Immediate; Nodis; Cherokee. Drafted by Atherton and approved by Kissinger.

[2] A December 29 Intelligence Information Cable reported that during recent discussions with Sadat in Cairo, Saudi officials were told that the Syrians were pressing the Egyptians "every day" to resume hostilities. Sadat had begged the Syrians not to start anything until the United States had been given the chance to prove that it could bring about disengagement. (Ibid., Box 1180, Harold H. Saunders Files, Middle East Negotiations Files, Middle East—1973 Peace Negotiations, Dec. 23–31, 1973)

[3] In telegram 4249 from Cairo, December 30, Chargé d'Affaires Smith reported that since the Foreign Minister was still in Aswan, he delivered the Secretary's message to Egyptian Undersecretary Loutfi, who had commented: "What can the Syrians do alone?" Loutfi then promised to transmit the message immediately to Sadat. (Ibid., Box 639, Country Files, Middle East, Arab Republic of Egypt, Vol. X, Nov.–Dec. 31, 1973)

United States to play the role we have set out for ourselves in the peacemaking process. If you think it would useful, you may convey my foregoing commitment to President Asad.

Sincerely,

Henry A. Kissinger.

End text.

Kissinger

---

424. Telegram From the U.S. Interests Section in Cairo to the Department of State[1]

Washington, December 30, 1973, 1411Z.

4252. Subject: Letter to the Secretary From Foreign Minister Fahmi. Ref: Cairo 4245.[2]

1. I was called to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs at 1400 local today by Omar Sirri to receive a letter to the Secretary from the Foreign Minister. Sirri told me that this letter was in effect a reply to President Nixon's letter of December 28 to President Sadat[3] and also the Secretary's letter to President Sadat,[4] but he left open the possibility that President Sadat might also reply directly about any new development regarding the basic issue raised in President Nixon's letter.

2. Sirri made a special point of telling me that the Government of Egypt wanted to respond quickly to messages from the USG and in this particular case President Nixon's letter and the Secretary's letter were both seen by President Sadat on Dec 29 and the response which we are transmitting at this time was prepared on the same date although it is dated Dec 30, 1973. Sirri said that he made the trip from Aswan to Cairo for the sole purpose of delivering the response to me and he would be returning to Aswan tomorrow morning. He did not know how much longer he and the Foreign Minister would be in Aswan.

3. The Foreign Minister's letter to the Secretary of State follows:

---

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Kissinger Office Files, Box 132, Country Files, Middle East, Egypt, Vol. VIII, November 1–December 31, 1973. Secret; Immediate; Nodis; Cherokee.

[2] Dated December 29; not found.

[3] Document 422.

[4] See Document 423.

"Dear Mr. Secretary of State,

"This is to inform you that President Sadat has received President Nixon's message of Dec 28, 1973. This message referred, inter alia, to your reporting to the President regarding your talks with my President and, in particular, to the principles you have agreed upon concerning the disengagement problem.

"President Nixon, furthermore, referred to the ceasefire and the six point agreement. As you know, the ceasefire is still fragile and while we have carried out all that was required from us under the six point agreement, the Israelis, on the other hand and up to this very minute, have not implemented in good faith their obligation so far as item 2 of this agreement is concerned. Moreover, they are complicating the situation of the town of Suez, which is supposed to be an open town, refusing to supply Egyptian positions of the Third Army at Kabrit on the eastern bank of the canal while still holding 57 Egyptian prisoners of war.

"In spite of that, Egypt went to the peace conference in the hope that a serious step be taken towards a disengagement agreement which, after a long and protracted delay, we expect to be concluded soon as President Nixon repeatedly promised and guaranteed.

"After reporting to President Sadat on our talks in Geneva and on the proceedings of the conference, he received President Nixon's message which he carefully examined. He took note with appreciation of President Nixon's reference to the improvement in our bilateral relations and to his and President Sadat's efforts to build a new basis for the common good and welfare and benefit of the area where we live.

"President Sadat fully reciprocates President Nixon's desire to set up this new relationship on frankness and directness. He asked me to convey to you, and through you to President Nixon, that he took special notice of President Nixon's personal pledge to do everything in his power to ensure that his second term as President will be remembered as the period in which the United States developed a new and productive relationship with Egypt and the Arab world.

"As to President Nixon's reference to the December 25 decision of the Arab Oil Ministers in Kuwait, President Sadat authorized me to say that this decision was not meant, in any way whatsoever, to be discriminatory in relation to the U.S. President Sadat's feeling is that the Arab Oil Ministers, while having in mind the direct and immediate impact of the embargo on the European countries, were under the impression that the United States, because of its resources was not that badly affected.

"However, in view of the apparent difficult situation which President Nixon is facing in the light of the Dec 25 decision, President Sadat will make immediate and appropriate contacts with King Faisal who

received from President Nixon a similar message on the same subject[5] and also with President Boumedienne.

"In this connection it is germane to indicate that during your talks with President Sadat it became apparent that an effort will be made to ease the embargo even so far as the U.S. is concerned, once the disengagement agreement is signed. As promised President Sadat will do his best to see to it that this will be brought about.

"In concluding, I hope that you for your part will be able to guarantee that Defence Minister Dayan and his government will be in a position to accept and implement forthwith the agreement on disengagement which was discussed and approved during your talks with my President.

"I will certainly keep you informed of any new development regarding the basic issue which President Nixon raised in his message of Dec 28 to President Sadat.

"With warm personal regards

"Ismail Fahmi"

Smith

[5] See footnote 3, Document 422.

425. Paper Prepared by the National Security Council Staff[1]

Washington, January 10, 1974.

DISENGAGEMENT TALKS IN GENEVA

1st Meeting, December 26, 1973[2]

[Gur/Magdoub]

Restatement of "principles of disengagement by both sides. Egypt presented its five principles—(a) agreement must result in Israeli forces being moved east of canal, (b) distance between the forces must exceed the range of land force weapons, (c) security zones with lightly armed troops must be established, (d) plan must entail buffer zone wide enough to allow UNEF to operate freely, (e) disengagement line must be far enough back from canal for Egypt to secure entire canal zone. Israel said it agreed to these but wished to add two more—(a) from new disengagement lines neither party should derive political benefit (Siilasvuo described gist of this as Israel believing line must reflect military outcome of war and not be first stage of withdrawal in broader political plan) and (b) reciprocity or a mutual contribution, i.e. if Israel were to withdraw there must be some Egyptian withdrawal as well. Egypt objected to latter. Siilasvuo pressed Israel to come up with some other kind of reciprocity (rather than Egyptian withdrawal) if at all possible.

[1] Source: National Archives, Nixon Presidential Materials, NSC Files, Box 1332, NSC Secretariat, NSC Unfiled Material, The Middle East at the Summit, June 1973, Mr. Saunders. Secret; Exdis. Drafted by Rosemary Niehuss. All brackets are in the original.

[2] Telegram 6777 from Geneva, December 27, reported that the first meeting of the Egyptian-Israeli military working group convened at 5 p.m. on December 26 and lasted for about 90 minutes. General Gur headed the Israeli delegation, General Magdoub headed the Egyptian delegation, and General Siilasvuo represented the United Nations. The meeting consisted entirely of restatement by both sides of the "principles" which they believed should govern disengagement, all of which had been put forward during the Kilometer 101 talks, and there was nothing new of substance. Siilasvuo commented afterward that there had been very little interchange during this meeting, and said that there seemed to be a tacit understanding that there would be little progress until after the Israeli elections. (Ibid., RG 59, Central Foreign Policy Files) Sterner based his reporting cables on briefings that General Siilasvuo provided him after each of the working group meetings.

2nd Meeting, December 28, 1973[3]

[Gur/Magdoub]

Continued from last meeting, further discussion of principles. Israels stressed need for reciprocity, citing as example the proposition that the greater the reciprocity the farther east Israel would be willing to draw disengagement line. Siilasvuo saw as only new element in this meeting Egyptian presentation indicating that while Egypt expected final disengagement line to be clearly defined, Israelis could withdraw to it by a series of moves to intervening lines according to a specified timetable. [Gur belittled, saying it obvious Israel could not jump back 30 KM in one day.] Israel asked Egypt whether November 22 proposal was still valid. Egypt replied no, considering Geneva talks a fresh start.

3rd Meeting, January 2, 1974[4]

[Gur/Magdoub]

More talk of principles. Siilasvuo opened meeting with pep talk urging progress and reminding participants that group had limited military and non-political mandate. He also suggested two possible approaches—(a) that the group continue in the current direction of talking about a disengagement line east of the canal ("disengagement plan #1") or (b) failing that, consider focussing on paragraph b of the six-point agreement, i.e. a line in the context of the demand of the UNSC that the parties return to October 22 positions ("disengagement plan #2"). Siilasvuo said he also envisaged combining both plans. [Siilasvuo described to Sterner combined proposal as picking up on Magdoub's remark in the 2nd meeting that Israel would withdraw to line in stages.]

Egypt restated known positions, then indicated it was unable to accept Israel's two additional principles because they injected "political" and "psychological" factors into military talks. Israel said it did not accept Egypt's five principles unless Egypt accepted Israel's two. Israel further defined "reciprocity," referring for the first time in these talks to a "thinning out" of Egypt's forces east of the canal. Indicated that depth of Israeli withdrawal east of the canal was specifically linked

---

[3] Telegram 6805 from Geneva, December 28, reported on the second meeting of the working group, which lasted 2 hours and 15 minutes, noting that it was difficult to arrive at a coherent picture of what had happened. Both sides spent much time reiterating and explaining the "principles" set forth at their first meeting. The atmosphere was more relaxed than at the first meeting, but again nothing significantly new emerged. The Israeli attitude following the meeting was one of mild satisfaction; the Egyptian one was that nothing significant would occur until after the Israeli elections. (Ibid.)

[4] Telegram 20 from Geneva, January 3, 1974, reported on the meeting, which lasted 3 hours. Sterner commented that Siilasvuo told him that the meeting was "not particularly productive." (Ibid.)

to such things as the strength of Egypt's forces on the east bank, numbers, level of armament, kinds of equipment, numbers of forces to be allowed in the lightly armed zones, etc. as in the KM 101 talks. Also proposed there be joint Egyptian/Israeli inspection of both the security zones and main forces. Siilasvuo suggested Israel translate these thoughts into specific proposals.

4th Meeting, January 4, 1974[5]

[Gur/Magdoub]

Israel presented two "models." *Model #1* (preferred Israeli plan which Mrs. Meir has mentioned publicly) would have both Egypt and Israel withdrawing—the canal would be the dividing line with a UN zone of 25-KM straddling the width of the canal (12 KM on either side); immediately to the east and west of this would be 10-KM wide "security zones" (lightly armed forces) held by Israel to east and Egypt to west, beyond which main forces would be positioned. *Model #2* [which Siilasvuo described to Sterner as a "modified Gamasy plan of Nov. 22/23 and Sterner described as resembling the counterproposal put forth by Yariv at the time]—Main Egyptian force would be withdrawn to west bank of canal and main Israeli force to a line 35 KM east of the canal; on the east bank there would be a 10-KM wide Egyptian security zone with lightly armed Egyptian forces; moving east from there would be a 15-KM wide UN zone, then a 10-KM Israeli security zone (comparable to Egypt's in strength and numbers) and ultimately the Israeli main force. Artillery on both sides would be far enough behind main force lines as to be out of range of UNEF zone and also applying to SAM and AAA to that they could not reach over UN zone. No tanks or artillery in lightly armed security zones. Re aircraft, two approaches are possible (a) no aircraft other than UNEF would be allowed to fly beyond main force lines or (b) each side might agree to allow reconnaissance overflights.

Egypt asked that "models" be translated into concrete proposals. [In commenting on models, Sterner recalled that Yariv proposal would have left Egyptian army in place on east bank (perhaps thinned out), whereas Gur proposal above would seem to rule that out.]

5th Meeting, January 7, 1974[6]

[Gur/Magdoub]

Egypt opened by saying that if the sides could not agree on disengagement east of canal, perhaps they should turn to October 22 lines

---

[5] Telegram 57 from Geneva, January 4, reported on this meeting. (Ibid.)

[6] Telegram 69 from Geneva, January 7, reported General Siilasvuo's comment that the fifth meeting, which lasted about 2 hours, "made no further progress." (Ibid.)

(recall Siilasvuo speech at 3rd mtg), and co-sponsors could become involved. Israel rejected any suggestion of involving co-sponsors, reiterated that Israeli acceptance of Egypt's five principles was linked to Egyptian acceptance of Israel's additional two and stressed that proposals put forth by Israel in the 4th meeting were "models", not concrete proposals, and that Israel currently had nothing concrete to offer. Egypt pressed for concrete proposals at next meeting. [In this session Israel made veiled reference that UN may have confused reportage on Israeli "models" and was at pains to point out they were *not* specific proposals. Israeli rep made case that Israel domestic situation was still unclear and government not ready to present specific plans.]

6th Meeting, January 9, 1974[7]

[Gur/Magdoub]

Retread of previous sessions. Israel made following familiar points: (a) Israeli government not yet ready to be specific; (b) Israel disappointed that Egypt has resurrected question of October 22 lines and Israel rejects co-sponsor involvement; (c) Israeli acceptance of Egypt's five principles linked to Egyptian acceptance of Israel's additional two; (d) Israel's (preferred) Model #1 would have been good alternative to October 22 proposal; (e) Egypt misunderstood "reciprocity" and "mutuality." These terms could comprise political as well as military measures; (f) When Israel is prepared to put forth concrete proposals, it would be good idea if both sides put forth plans simultaneously, including precise lines on maps, force levels, etc.

Egypt responded with points (a) If Israel is not ready to accept Egypt's five principles, there is nothing left to discuss but October 22 lines, and Egypt does not rule out experts from the outside. (b) There is no utility in discussing theories; Egypt understood from Dayan comments that a specific plan was forthcoming.

Siilasvuo injected proposition that both sides think about specific examples of "reciprocity." The sides agreed to meet again January 15.[8]

---

[7] Telegram 122 from Geneva, January 9, summarized the sixth meeting. All the parties, including General Siilasvuo, agreed to potpone further meetings until January 15 when Israel might be ready to put forward a specific proposal. (Ibid.)

[8] After this meeting, the Israeli military delegation returned to Jerusalem for consultations and General Siilasvuo returned to Cairo to rejoin the UNEF. (Telegram 145 from Geneva, January 10; ibid.) On January 14, the Israelis informed the U.S. delegation in Geneva that they had been instructed to postpone the meeting scheduled for January 15. (Telegram 193 from Geneva, January 14; ibid.) The military working group never resumed its meetings in Geneva.

Index

References are to document numbers

Abouhamad, Khalil, 46
Abu Shawar, Majid, 318
Abu Zaid, Salah, 15
Adham, Kamal, 47
Agnew, Spiro, 107, 149
Airlift to Israel during war (*See* U.S. military aid to Israel)
Akins, James E., 363
Albert, Carl, 143, 360
Aldrich, George H., 250
Aleksandrov, Andrei M., 53
Alert of U.S. Forces, 269, 277
Alexandrov-Agentov, A. M., 221
Algeria, 135, 195, 197, 198, 393
Allaf, Mowaffak, 417
Allon, Yigal:
  Geneva Conference (*1973*), 399
  October 1973 War, 147, 150, 155, 232
  Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 366, 401
  Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 8
Allon Plan (*1967*), 8, 30
Arab Defense Council, 5, 15
Arab military activity (May-Oct. *1973*) (*see also* Egypt's war plans):
  Cline memorandum, 93
  Israeli intelligence estimates, 94, 95, 97, 250
  Jordanian concerns, 51
  Jordanian-Israeli discussions, 64
  Keating memorandum, 94
  Kissinger-Hussein correspondence, 61
  Meir-Kissinger correspondence, 97
  National Security Council staff memorandum, 59
  Schlesinger memorandum, 52
  Special National Intelligence Estimates, 98, 148
  U.S. intelligence performance, 412
  U.S.-Israeli discussions, 51, 250
  U.S.-Soviet discussions, 53
  Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 57
Arab Summit (Algiers, Nov. *26-28, 1973*), 348, 352, 355, 364, 370, 398
Arafat, Yassir, 41, 81, 328
Armstrong, Willis, 187
Asad, Hafez:
  Geneva Conference (*1973*), 395, 405, 408, 409
  National Intelligence Analytical Memorandum, 83
  October 1973 War, 235
  Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 309, 393, 396, 403, 421
  Soviet-Syrian discussions, 10
Atherton, Alfred L. (Roy):
  Geneva Conference (*1973*), 347, 394, 399, 417
  October 1973 War, 103, 221, 232
  Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 401
  Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 26, 27, 63
al-Atiqi, Abdul Rahman, 200

Bab Al Mandeb Straits:
  National Security Council staff memorandum, 319
  U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 300, 303, 307, 311, 324, 329, 344
  U.S.-Israeli discussions, 230, 305, 312, 327, 329, 335
  Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 322, 336
Babenko, Yuri, 194, 338
Bakr, Hassan, 10
Balfour Declaration (*1917*), 26
Barakat, Jamal-al-din, 63
Bar-On, Lt. Col. Aryeh, 399
Bayh, Birch, 126
Begin, Menachem, 414
Benhima, Ahmed Taibi, 195
Benhima, Ghali, 131
Bennett, W. Tapley, Jr., 361, 407
Ben Shaker, Gen. Sharif Zaid, 15, 421
Bentsur, Eliahu, 399, 414
Bettal, Diya'allah al-, 350
Black September Organization, 41, 46, 57
Boumediene, Houari, 135, 393

339-370/428-S/80003

Bouteflika, Abdelaziz, 195, 414
Brezhnev, Leonid (*see also* U.S.-Soviet summit (June *1973*)):
  Kissinger meetings, 53, 54, 221
  Nixon meeting, 73
  October 1973 War:
    Ceasefire, 241, 246, 247, 251, 262
    Ceasefire resolution proposals, 149, 165, 194, 204
    Hostilities, 120, 123
    Shultz discussions, 201
    Soviet military intervention possibility, 267, 269, 274, 277, 288, 290
    U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations, 203, 211, 217, 219, 221
  Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 288, 290, 292, 316, 321, 338
  Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 38, 53, 56, 70, 79
  United Nations Emergency Force, 277, 290
  U.S.-Soviet summit (June *1973*), 73, 74
Brown, Dean:
  Arab Summit (Algiers, Nov. *26-28, 1973*), 348
  Geneva Conference (*1973*), 356
  October 1973 War:
    Ceasefire, 233, 235, 237, 238, 239
    Ceasefire resolution proposals, 207, 224
    Hostilities, 125, 128
    Jordanian military participation, 136, 147, 150, 152, 155, 163, 171, 179, 188, 224
  Palestinians, 89, 354
  Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 5, 15
  U.S. economic aid to Jordan, 44
Brownell, Herbert, 316
Buffum, William B., 90, 133, 139, 303, 397, 400, 408
Bunker, Ellsworth, 414
Bureau of Intelligence and Research (*See* Cline, Ray)
Burke, Peter, 194
Byrd, Robert C., 143

Caetano, Marcelo, 173, 176
Campbell, Richard, 53, 90
Casey, William, 187
Ceaucescu, Nicolae, 355, 377
Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) (*see also* Colby, William E. and Schlesinger, James R.):
  Geneva Conference (*1973*), 408
  Intelligence Memorandum, No. *1652/73*, ''The Status of Soviet Relations with Egypt and the Palestinians,'' 66
  Oil embargo, 200
  Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, U.S.-Egyptian secret talks, 3, 10
  Pre-War Intelligence Assessment, 50, 52, 57, 98, 412
  Soviet military aid to Egypt and Syria, 376
China, People's Republic of (PRC), 114, 250
Clements, William P., Jr.:
  October 1973 War:
    Ceasefire, 259
    Hostilities, 121, 131, 161, 181, 191
    U.S. military aid to Israel and, 173, 186, 191, 198
  Oil supplies, 186, 191, 198, 208, 364
  Palestinian-Lebanese conflict (May, *1973*), 57
  Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 308, 322, 336
Cline, Ray, 65, 93, 170, 250, 264, 269
Colby, William E.:
  Alert of U.S. Forces, 269, 277
  October 1973 War:
    Ceasefire, 259
    Hostilities, 103, 112, 121, 131, 181, 191
    Soviet military intervention possibility, 269
    U.S. military aid to Israel and, 135, 173, 191, 198, 261
    U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations, 213
  Oil supplies, 186, 191, 198, 208, 364
  Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 308, 314, 322, 336
Congress, U.S.:
  October 1973 War, 126, 127, 140, 143, 191, 269
  U.S. military aid to Israel, 208, 259, 322, 360, 364
  War Powers Resolution, 305

339-370/428-S/80003

Cooper, Charles, 170
Crisis: The Anatomy of Two Major Foreign Policy Crises (Kissinger), 99
Cromer, Lord (George Rowland Stanley Baring), 114, 129, 165, 180, 269, 363

Davies, Rodger, 322, 336
Davis, Jeanne W., 57, 103, 112, 121, 131, 186, 191, 198, 208, 259, 308, 322, 336, 364
Dayan, Moshe:
  Arab military activity (May-Oct. *1973*), 93, 94
  Geneva Conference (*1973*), 399
  Israeli occupied territories policies, 45
  Lebanon raid (Feb. *21, 1973*), 23
  October 1973 War, Ceasefire, 232
  Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 299, 305, 401
  Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 17, 64
  U.S. military aid to Israel, 376
Defense, U.S. Department of (DOD) (*see also* Richardson, Elliot L. and Schlesinger, James R.), 44
De Poix, Vice Adm. V.P., 265
Derus, Irene G., 63
DiBona, Charles, 181, 186, 191, 198, 208
Dillon, Betty, 33
Dinitz, Simcha:
  Arab military activity (May-Oct. *1973*), 51, 95, 250
  Egypt's war plans, 50
  Geneva Conference (*1973*), 357, 359, 381, 383, 398, 399
  Meir U.S. visit (Mar. *1973*), 35
  October 1973 War:
    Ceasefire, 242, 245, 254, 255, 263, 270, 281, 284
    Ceasefire resolution proposals, 141, 196, 206, 227, 228
    Hostilities, 124, 126, 134, 135, 154, 166, 168, 215
    Jordanian military participation, 158, 159, 188
    Kissinger Israel visit, 212
    Soviet military intervention possibility, 268, 272
    U.S. military aid to Israel and, 133, 134, 141, 166, 168, 173
  Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations:
    Kissinger discussions, 287, 289, 299, 317, 344
Dinitz, Simcha—*Continued*
  Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations—*Continued*
    Kissinger-Meir discussions, 398, 399, 401, 402
    Scowcroft discussions, 324
    U.S.-Israeli correspondence, 337
    U.S.-Israeli discussions, Meir U.S. visit, 305, 306, 312
  Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 43, 47, 55, 88
  U.S. military aid to Israel, 308, 357
    October 1973 War and, 133, 134, 141, 166, 168, 173
  U.S.-Soviet summit (June *1973*), 71, 78
Disengagement. *See* Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations
Dobrynin, Anatoly:
  Geneva Conference (*1973*), 373, 380, 406, 407, 408
    U.S.-Soviet joint letter, 356, 405
  Ismail Soviet Union visit, 79
  Nixon meetings, 389, 418
  October 1973 War:
    Oct. *6-8*, Initial attack:
      Kissinger discussions, 100, 105, 106, 108, 110, 111, 120, 123
      Scowcroft discussions, 110
    Oct. *9-13*, second stage, Kissinger discussions, 140, 157, 162
    Ceasefire resolution proposals, Soviet-Egyptian discussions, 193
    Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 149, 194
    Soviet military intervention possibility, 263, 266, 268, 277, 285, 293
    United Nations Security Council meeting (Oct. *8, 1973*), 123, 130
    U.S. military aid to Israel and, 165, 181, 183
    U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations:
      Kissinger discussions, 105, 106, 123, 149, 172, 175, 178, 180, 202, 209, 210, 211, 247, 253, 256, 258, 263, 266
      Kissinger Moscow trip, 209, 210, 211, 221, 229
      Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 194

Dobrynin, Anatoly—*Continued*
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 289, 292, 316, 321, 338
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 9, 38, 53, 56, 79, 92
United Nations Emergency Force, 277
U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations, 301
U.S.-Soviet summit (June *1973*), 72, 73, 74
Douglas-Home, Sir Alec, 23, 175

Eade, James, 185
Eagleburger, Lawrence S.:
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 347, 356, 373, 383
October 1973 War:
Ceasefire, 232, 279
Ceasefire resolution proposals, 228, 278
Hostilities, 113, 115
Soviet military intervention possibility, 269
U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations, 218, 223
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 369
Eban, Abba:
Arab military activity (May-Oct. *1973*), 250
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 350, 361, 386, 387, 399, 405, 414, 415
October 1973 War, 104, 112, 113, 115, 119, 127, 232
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 366, 368, 401
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 55
Saudi Arabia, 88
Waldheim Middle East trip, 78
Egypt (*see also* Soviet military aid to Egypt and Syria *under* October 1973 War; Fahmi, Ismail; Gamasy, Gen. Mohammed Abdel; Ismail, Muhammad Hafiz; al-Zayyat, Muhammad Hasan):
Fahmi U.S. visit, 296, 297, 298, 300, 302, 303, 307, 311
Ismail U.S. visit:
Hussein U.S. visit discussions, 30
Kissinger-Ismail correspondence, 4, 19
Egypt—*Continued*
Ismail U.S. visit—*Continued*
Kissinger memoranda, 25, 28, 40
Meeting memorandum, 26
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 22, 24, 27, 29
Nixon-Sadat correspondence, 21
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 23, 31
Jordanian relations with, 1, 5, 89
Kissinger-Ismail channel (*see also* Ismail, Muhammad Hafez; U.S.-Egyptian secret talks *under* Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations), 351, 352
Kissinger visit, 236, 261, 279, 280, 296, 297, 298, 311
Libyan relations with, 66, 84, 91
Political situation, 10, 42
Saudi relations with, 84, 91
Soviet relations with, 14, 26, 324, 389, 390
Prewar military aid, 31, 35, 66
Egypt's war plans (*see also* Arab military activity (May-Oct. *1973*)):
Cline memorandum, 65, 250
Egyptian-Jordanian discussions, 1
Greene memorandum, 67
Hussein U.S. visit discussions (Feb *6, 1973*), 14, 15
Israeli intelligence estimates, 50
National Intelligence Estimate, 59
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 58
Soviet-Egyptian relations and, 14
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 55
Eilts, Hermann F.:
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 347, 351, 352, 362, 373, 382, 395, 406
U.S.-Soviet joint letter, 356, 380, 385, 395
Palestinians, 353
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 341, 343, 344, 361, 369, 403
Elazar, Gen. David, 232, 401
Eliot, Theodore L., Jr., 75, 80
Elizur, Michael, 361
al-Erian, Abdallah, 298, 300, 303, 307, 311
Ethiopia, 55
European Community (EC), 336
Evron, Ephraim, 232, 361, 399, 401, 414

339-370/428-S/80003

Fahd bin Abdul Aziz al Saud, Prince of Saudi Arabia, 200, 332
Fahmi, Ismail:
  Geneva Conference (*1973*), 330, 347, 351, 352, 373, 382
    Session report, 415
    Syrian participation, 403, 406, 419
    U.S.-Soviet joint letter, 380, 385
  Kissinger Egypt visit, 311
  Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 341, 343, 344, 347, 362, 365
    Kissinger-Sadat discussions, 324
    Nixon-Sadat correspondence, 369
    U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 329
  U.S. visit, 296, 297, 298, 300, 302, 303, 307, 311
Faisal ibn Abd al-Aziz al Saud, King of Saudi Arabia:
  October 1973 War:
    Hostilities, 102, 128, 131, 198
    U.S. military aid to Israel and, 191
  Oil embargo, 332, 363, 417
  Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 314, 332
  U.S. visit proposal, 192
Farhi, David, 45
al-Fattal, Diyallah, 310
Fedayeen. *See* Palestinians.
Ford, Gerald, 355, 360
France, 80
Frangieh, Suleiman, 303, 397
Friedheim, Jerry W., 112
Fulbright, J. William, 143, 322, 360, 398

Gamasy, Gen. Mohammed Abdel Ghani (*see also* Kilometer *101* talks *under* Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations), 358, 361, 368, 371
Gazit, Mordechai:
  Geneva Conference (*1973*), 399
  October 1973 War, 230, 232
  Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 305, 306, 312, 401
Geneva Conference (*1973*):
  Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs paper, 417
  Kissinger-Gromyko meetings, 414, 416
  Kissinger memoranda, 346, 409, 415, 417
Geneva Conference (*1973*)—*Continued*
  Kissinger staff meeting discussions, 420
  Kissinger-Waldheim discussions, 377
  National Security Council staff memorandum, 425
  Nixon-Congressional leadership discussions, 360
  Nixon-Meir correspondence, 388, 391
  Nixon-Sadat correspondence, 369, 384, 422, 424
  Palestinian participation:
    Keating memorandum, 348
    National Security Council staff memorandum, 355
    Nixon-Hassan II correspondence, 353
    Special National Intelligence Estimate, 372
    U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 390
    U.S.-Israeli discussions, 357, 361, 387, 398
    U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 379, 394
    U.S.-Soviet discussions, 380
    U.S.-Syrian discussions, 350, 393
  Session report, 415
  Sisco memorandum, 413
  Special National Intelligence Estimate, 372
  Syrian participation:
    Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs paper, 417
    Kissinger memoranda, 386, 409
    Kissinger staff meeting discussions, 420
    Scowcroft memorandum, 407
    U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 419, 421
    U.S.-Israeli discussions, 414
    U.S.-Soviet discussions, 406, 408
    U.S.-Syrian discussions, 350, 393, 395
  U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 347, 349, 351, 352, 395, 403
  U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 330, 382, 390
  U.S.-Israeli correspondence, 405
  U.S.-Israeli discussions, 350, 359, 361, 381, 383, 386, 387, 398, 399, 402, 414
  U.S.-Israeli Memorandum of Understanding, 381, 383, 410
  U.S.-Jordanian correspondence, 404
  U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 370, 379, 394, 400

339-370/428-S/80003

Geneva Conference (*1973*)—*Continued*
U.S.-Soviet correspondence, 373
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 406, 407, 408
U.S.-Soviet joint letter, 356, 380, 383, 385, 387, 388, 390, 395, 399, 400, 404, 407
U.S.-Syrian discussions, 350, 393, 395, 396, 417
Waldheim correspondence, 367
Germany, Federal Republic of (FRG), 284
Ghanim, Maj. Gen. Iskandar, 46, 397
Ghanim, Muhammad Hafiz, 26
Ghorbal, Ashraf, 378
Golan Heights. *See* Israeli occupied territories policies.
Goldmann, Nahum, 359
Goodpaster, Gen. Andrew J., 185
Graham, Pierre, 102
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 370, 379, 394, 400, 404, 421
Palestinians, 370, 374
Great Britain (*See* United Kingdom)
Greene, Joseph N., Jr., 41, 47, 48, 67, 70
Gromyko, Andrei:
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 414, 415, 416
October 1973 War, 151, 162, 221, 229, 263
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 53, 70, 92
U.S.-Soviet summit (June *1973*), 72, 73, 74, 78
Gur, Lt. Gen. Mordechai, 134, 425

Haig, Gen. Alexander M. Jr.:
Alert of U.S. Forces, 269, 277
Nixon-Dobrynin meetings, 389
October 1973 War:
Hostilities, 106, 107, 116, 181
Nixon-Congressional leadership discussions, 140
Soviet military intervention possibility, 267, 268, 269, 285, 293
U.S. military aid to Israel and, 116, 166, 167
U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations, 106, 223, 258
Oil embargo, 325
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 293, 295, 301
Haig, Gen. Alexander M. Jr.—*Continued*
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 6, 75
Watergate scandal, 234, 325
Halaby, Najeeb, 336
Hammer, Armand, 359
Hannah, John A., 15
Hare, Paul, 87, 88
Hassan bin Talal, Crown Prince of Jordan, 147, 163, 179, 188, 394
Hassan II, King of Morocco, 318, 320, 353
al-Hassan, Khalid, 318
Hatfield, Mark O., 305
Heath, Edward, 23, 78, 157, 159, 208
Hébert, F. Edward, 259
Helms, Richard M., 1, 3, 10, 81, 376
Hill, Robert C., 198, 208, 259, 308, 322, 364
Hoskinson, Samuel:
October 1973 War:
Ceasefire, 259
Hostilities, 191
U.S. military aid to Israel and, 191, 198
Oil supplies, 186, 191, 198, 208, 364
Palestinian-Lebanese conflict (May, *1973*), 57
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 308, 322, 336
Hoveyda, Amir Abbas, 125
Howe, Cmdr. Jonathan T., 181, 227, 269, 335
Huang Zhen, 114
Hume, John, 172
Hummel, Arthur W., Jr., 148, 187
Humphrey, Hubert H., 322
Hussein, ibn Talal, King of Jordan:
Arab military activity (May-Oct. *1973*), 51, 61, 93
Egyptian-Jordanian diplomatic relations, 1, 5
Egypt's war plans, 1
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 370, 379, 394, 404
Israeli occupied territories policies, 45
October 1973 War:
Ceasefire, 233, 235, 237, 238, 239
Ceasefire resolution proposals, 128, 207, 224
Hostilities, 102, 128, 136, 163, 171
Military participation:
Brown discussions, 147, 150, 155, 179, 224

339-370/428-S/80003

Hussein, ibn Talal, King of Jordan—*Continued*
October 1973 War—*Continued*
Military participation—*Continued*
Kissinger correspondence, 136, 163, 171
Meir correspondence, 158, 171, 188
Soviet-Jordanian discussions, 135
Saudi troops in Jordan, 128, 131
Palestinian-Lebanese conflict (May, *1973*), 62
Palestinians, 89, 91, 331, 355, 370, 379, 394
Personal distrust between Sadat and, 14, 30
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 331, 394
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations:
Jordanian-Israeli secret talks, 12, 64, 84
Nixon correspondence, 1, 2
U.S. initiative proposals, 1, 5
U.S. visit (Feb *6*, *1973*), 5, 8, 13, 14, 15
U.S. visit (Feb *30*, *1973*), 30
U.S. economic aid to Jordan, 39, 44, 68, 77, 78
U.S. military aid to Jordan, 2, 13, 14, 39, 331
Hyland, William G., 53, 221, 229

Idan, Avner, 43, 55, 71
Inouye, Daniel K., 322
International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), 33, 35, 85
Iran, 55, 88, 125, 305
Iraq, 10, 14, 61, 233, 235
Ismael Ali, Ahmad, 368
Ismail, Mohammed Zakariya, 310
Ismail, Muhammad Hafez (*see also* U.S.-Egyptian secret talks *under* Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations):
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 349
Great Britain visit, 23
Kissinger channel, Fahmi challenges to, 351, 352
Kissinger visit proposals, 261
Libyan Arab Airlines Flight 114, 26
October 1973 War:
Ceasefire, 231, 236, 241, 248, 252, 254, 260, 273, 275, 279, 282
Ismail, Muhammad Hafez—*Continued*
October 1973 War—*Continued*
Ceasefire resolution proposals, 138, 189, 190, 205, 226
Hostilities, 118, 125, 160
Soviet military intervention possibility, 266, 271
U.S. military aid to Israel and, 189
U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations, 214
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 349, 362
Kilometer *101* talks, 286, 291, 294, 296, 297
Soviet Union visits, 20, 79
U.S.-Egyptian secret talks, 3, 10
Greene discussions, 70
Kissinger correspondence, 4, 19, 41, 47, 69
Kissinger meetings, 48, 63
U.S. military aid to Israel, 69, 189
Israel (*see also* Allon, Yigal; Dayan, Moshe; Dinitz, Simcha; Eban, Abba; Gazit, Mordechai; Meir, Golda; October 1973 War; Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations; Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations; Rabin, Yitzhak; Shalev, Mordechai; U.S. military aid to Israel):
Lebanon raid (Apr. *9*, *1973*), 46, 318
Lebanon raid (Feb. *21*, *1973*), 23, 35
Occupied territories policies:
Kissinger memorandum, 86
National Security Council staff memoranda, 45, 87
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 88
U.S.-Syrian discussions, 310
Political situation, 16, 84, 148, 372, 382

Jackson, Henry ''Scoop,'' 35, 140, 173, 185, 359, 414
Jarring, Gunnar (*see also* Jarring proposal (*1971*)), 23
Jarring mission, 23, 69, 72, 75, 78, 80
Javits, Jacob, 308, 322
Jobert, Michel, 398
Jones, Curtis F., 264, 309, 411
Jordan (*see also* Hussein, ibn Talal; Jordanian role *under* October 1973 War; U.S. economic aid to Jordan):
Egyptian relations with, 1, 5, 89

339-370/428-S/80003

Jordan—*Continued*
Egypt's war plans, 1
Kuwaiti economic aid, 30, 44, 89
National Security Council staff memorandum, 89
October 1973 War:
Oct. *6-8*, Initial attack, 102, 131
Israeli violation of Jordanian airspace, 128
Military participation:
Kissinger-Hussein correspondence, 136, 163, 171
Meir-Hussein correspondence, 158, 171, 188
National Security Council staff memorandum, 139
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 159
Soviet-Jordanian discussions, 135
U.S.-British discussions, 157, 159
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 147, 158, 159, 188
U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 128, 147, 150, 152, 155, 179, 188, 224
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 140
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 181
National Security Council staff memorandum, 124
Saudi troops in Jordan, 128, 131, 163
Palestinian-Lebanese conflict (May, *1973*), 62
Palestinian relations with, 89, 91, 313, 318, 328, 355
Palestinian West Bank representation, National Security Council staff memoranda, 328, 355
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations:
Hussein Egypt/Syria visits, 5
Hussein U.S. visits, 5, 8, 13, 14, 15, 30
Syrian relations with, 89, 328
U.S. military aid, 2, 13, 14, 39, 44, 150, 331

Kalb, Marvin, 277
Kaylani, Haytham, 350
Keating, Kenneth:
Arab military activity (May-Oct. *1973*), 94
Keating, Kenneth—*Continued*
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 348, 361, 387, 399, 402, 405
Israeli occupied territories policies, 86, 87
October 1973 War, 99, 124, 136, 139, 141, 147, 155, 232
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 291, 323, 326, 333, 340, 344, 368, 401
U.S. military aid to Israel, 141, 167, 196
Waldheim Middle East trip, 82
Kemal, Said, 353
Kennedy, Edward M., 126
Kennedy, Richard T., 1, 2, 37, 44, 57
Khaddam, Abdel Khalim, 393, 403
Khammash, Amer, 15
Khartoum terrorist incident (Mar. *1973*), 41, 46, 55, 318
Kidron, Avraham, 232
Kidron, Mordechai, 399, 401
Kissinger, Henry A. (*see also* Kissinger shuttle diplomacy):
Alert of U.S. forces, 269, 277
Arab military activity (May-Oct. *1973*):
Cline memorandum, 93
Hussein correspondence, 61
Meir correspondence, 97
Schlesinger memorandum, 52
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 51, 250
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 53
Brezhnev meetings, 53, 54, 221
Egypt's war plans, 1, 50, 58, 65, 250
Egypt visit, 261, 279, 280, 296, 297, 298, 311
Fahmi U.S. visit, 298, 300, 302, 303, 307, 311
Faisal U.S. visit proposal, 192
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 346, 409, 415, 417
Gromyko meetings, 414, 416
Meir correspondence, 405
Nixon-Sadat correspondence, 384
Palestinian participation:
National Security Council staff memorandum, 355
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 390
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 387, 398
U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 398
U.S.-Romanian discussions, 355
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 380
U.S.-Syrian discussions, 350, 393

339-370/428-S/80003

Kissinger, Henry A.—*Continued*
Geneva Conference (*1973*)—*Continued*
Sisco memorandum, 413
Staff meetings, 420
Syrian participation, 419
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 347, 349, 351, 352, 395, 403
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 330, 382, 390
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 350, 359, 381, 383, 386, 398, 399, 402, 414
U.S.-Jordanian correspondence, 404
U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 394
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 406, 408
U.S.-Soviet joint letter, 356, 380, 383, 385, 387, 390, 395, 399, 400
U.S.-Syrian discussions, 350, 393, 396
Waldheim correspondence, 367
Waldheim discussions, 377
Ismail channel, Fahmi challenges to, 351, 352
Israeli occupied territories policies, 45, 86, 87
Libyan Arab Airlines Flight 114, 22, 23, 27, 34, 35
Meir U.S. visits, 16, 24, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 305, 306
Nixon-Dobrynin meetings, 389, 418
Nobel Peace Prize, 192, 193
October *1973* War:
Oct. *6-8*, initial attack:
Diplomacy overviews, 99, 103, 109, 112, 143, 148
Haig discussions, 106, 107, 116
Ismail correspondence, 118, 125
Military situation, 124
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 123
Nixon discussions, 104, 118, 132
Nixon-Soviet leadership correspondence, 108
United Nations Security Council meeting proposals
Scali discussions, 110
U.S.-British discussions, 180
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 113, 115, 119
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 110, 111
Waldheim discussions, 117
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 112
Kissinger, Henry A.—*Continued*
October *1973* War—*Continued*
Oct. *6-8*, initial attack—*Continued*
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 101, 111
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 100, 106, 108, 112, 113, 115, 126
U.S.-Jordanian correspondence, 102
U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 128
U.S.-Saudi correspondence, 102
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 100, 105, 106, 108, 110, 111, 120, 123
Waldheim discussions, 106, 117
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 103, 112, 121, 129, 131
Oct. *9-13*, second stage:
Ismail correspondence, 160
Jordanian role, 136, 163, 171
Military situation, 134, 135, 137, 139, 159, 166, 174
Nixon discussions, 153, 159
Staff discussions, 148
U.S.-British discussions, 165
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 154
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 157, 162
Waldheim-al-Zayyat discussions, 174
Oct. *14*, Israeli offensive, 166, 180, 181, 182, 186, 191, 198, 208
Oct. *15-25*, Ceasefire resolution proposals:
British-Egyptian discussions, 172
Haig discussions, 106, 116
Ismail correspondence, 138
Nixon-Arab Foreign Ministers meeting, 197
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 194
Nixon discussions, 117, 180, 192, 197, 203
Nixon-Meir correspondence, 228
Scali correspondence, 225
Schlesinger discussions, 177, 184
Scowcroft discussions, 205
Sonnenfeldt memorandum, 170
Soviet-Egyptian discussions, 191, 192, 193
Staff meeting discussions, 148
U.S.-British discussions, 129, 165
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 189, 190, 205, 226

339-370/428-S/80003

Kissinger, Henry A.—*Continued*
October *1973* War—*Continued*
Oct. *15-25*, Ceasefire resolution proposals—*Continued*
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 141, 154, 196, 206, 212, 227
U.S.-Jordanian correspondence, 207, 224
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 112, 129, 135
Arab Foreign Ministers meeting, 192, 195, 197, 198
Ceasefire:
Cline memorandum, 264
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 246, 247
Nixon discussions, 266
Staff meetings, 250
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 231, 236, 241, 243, 244, 248, 252, 254, 260, 273, 275, 279, 282
U.S.-Israeli correspondence, 278
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 230, 232, 242, 245, 250, 254, 255, 263, 270, 281, 284
U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 233, 237, 238
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 259
Israel visit, 212, 230, 231, 232
Jordanian role:
Oct. *9-13*, second stage, 136, 163, 171
Military participation
National Security Council staff memorandum, 139
Nixon discussions, 159
U.S.-British discussions, 156, 157, 159
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 158, 159, 188
U.S.-Jordanian correspondence, 136, 147, 163, 171, 188
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 140
Lebanon and, 126, 133
NATO meeting, 191
Nixon-Congressional leadership discussions, 140, 143
Soviet incitement of Arab countries, 142, 151
Soviet military aid to Egypt and Syria:
CIA papers, 376
Kissinger, Henry A.—*Continued*
October *1973* War—*Continued*
Soviet military aid to Egypt and Syria—*Continued*
Nixon-Arab Foreign Ministers meeting, 195
Sonnenfeldt memorandum, 170
Soviet-Egyptian discussions, 142
Staff meeting discussions, 187, 250
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 189
U.S.-Moroccan discussions, 320
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 181, 186, 191, 198
Soviet military intervention possibility, 260
Haig discussions, 267, 268, 285, 293
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 274, 277, 288
Nixon discussions, 277
U.S.-British discussions, 269
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 266, 271
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 164, 268, 272
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 263, 266, 268
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 269
Soviet role, 162, 170, 201, 250
United Nations Security Council meeting (Oct. *8*, *1973*), 137
Nixon discussions, 122, 127, 132
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 125, 131
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 123, 130
United Nations Security Council meeting proposals, 114
U.S.-Chinese People's Republic discussions, 114
U.S. military aid to Israel and, 139, 215
Oct. *14* Israeli offensive, 166, 168
Advisory group discussions, 261
Haig discussions, 166
Nixon discussions, 159, 180, 182
Schlesinger discussions, 167, 177, 184
Scowcroft discussions, 156, 249
Staff meeting discussions, 187

339-370/428-S/80003

Kissinger, Henry A.—*Continued*
October *1973* War—*Continued*
U.S. military aid to Israel and—*Continued*
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 189
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 115, 124, 126, 134, 141, 154, 166, 173
U.S.-Saudi correspondence, 186, 191
U.S.-Soviet correspondence, 165
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 181, 183
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 135, 173, 181, 186, 191, 198, 208, 259
U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations, 109
Brezhnev correspondence, 241, 251
Dobrynin discussions, 105, 106, 123, 149, 172, 175, 178, 180, 202, 209, 210, 211, 247, 253, 256, 258, 263, 266
Haig discussions, 106
Moscow trip, 213, 215, 216, 219, 222
Brezhnev meetings, 221
Dobrynin discussions, 209, 210, 211
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 217
Nixon memorandum, 218
Scowcroft memorandum, 223
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 214
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 149, 165, 194, 203, 288
Nixon-Dobrynin meeting, 301
Schlesinger discussions, 184
Vorontsov discussions, 240, 243, 244
U.S. strategy options, 169
Oil supplies, 139
Embargo, 200, 208
Advisory group discussions, 363
U.S.-Algerian discussions, 393
U.S.-Saudi correspondence, 422, 424
U.S.-Saudi discussions, 332
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 208, 308, 314, 364
Nixon discussions, 312, 315
U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 331
Kissinger, Henry A.—*Continued*
Oil supplies—*Continued*
U.S.-Moroccan discussions, 320
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 103, 112, 121, 181, 186, 191, 198
Palestinian-Lebanese conflict (May, *1973*), 57, 62
Palestinians, 81, 318, 354, 374
Post-October *1973* War disengagement negotiations, 358
Asad discussions, 393, 396
Brezhnev correspondence, 321
Egyptian-Israeli agreement (Nov. *9*, *1973*), 334
Faisal discussions, 332
Frangie discussions, 397
Haig discussions, 293
Hassan II discussions, 320
Hussein discussions, 331
Israeli public statements, 366
Keating memoranda, 323, 326
Kilometer *101* talks:
Haig discussions, 295
National Security Council staff memorandum, 371
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 286, 291, 294, 296, 297
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 298
U.S.-Israeli correspondence, 286
National Security Council staff memoranda, 319, 345, 365, 366
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 338
Nixon-Congressional leadership discussions, 360
Nixon discussions, 312, 315
Shuttle diplomacy memorandum, 346
Six-point agreement (Nov. *11*, *1973*), 341
Staff meeting discussions, 420
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 341, 343, 344, 347, 349, 362
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 298, 300, 302, 303, 307, 311, 324, 378
U.S.-Israeli discussions:
Dinitz discussions, 287, 289, 299, 317, 344
Keating memorandum, 368
Kissinger-Meir discussions, 398, 399, 401, 402
Meir U.S. visit, 305, 306, 312, 316, 317

339-370/428-S/80003

Kissinger, Henry A.—*Continued*
Post-October *1973* War disengagement negotiations—*Continued*
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 289, 316
U.S.-Syrian discussions, 310
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 308, 314
Pre-October *1973* War settlement negotiations:
Hussein U.S. visit (Feb *6*, *1973*), 13, 14
Hussein U.S. visit (Feb *30*, *1973*), 30
Ismail U.S. visit, 25, 28, 40
Meeting memorandum, 26
Nixon discussions, 22, 24, 27, 29
Rabin discussions, 23, 31
Jordanian-Israeli secret talks, 12, 64
Soviet role, 20, 29, 31, 43, 70, 79
State Department role, 7, 22, 24, 27, 48, 49
United Nations Security Council discussions, 80
U.S.-Egyptian secret talks, 25, 28
Ismail correspondence, 4, 19, 41, 47, 69
Ismail meetings, 48, 63
Nixon discussions, 22
State Department role, 24, 27, 48, 49
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 55
U.S. initiative proposals, 25, 28
Buffum discussions, 90
Nixon discussions, 11, 29, 36
Rogers memorandum, 78
Saunders memoranda, 7, 8
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 88
U.S.-Soviet discussions:
Brezhnev discussions, 53, 54
Dobrynin correspondence, 9
Dobrynin discussions, 38, 79
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 56
Nixon discussions, 58
Nixon-Gromyko/Dobrynin discussions, 92
Nixon-Soviet leadership correspondence, 20
Prisoners of war, 298, 300, 307, 312, 324
Sadat speech (Mar. *26*, *1973*), 42
Secretary of State appointment, 88, 90
Society of Pilgrims speech (Dec. *12*, *1973*), 389
Kissinger, Henry A.—*Continued*
Syrian postwar military activity, 386, 392, 423
United Nations Emergency Force, 275, 276, 277, 278, 280, 305
United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, 280, 283
U.S. economic aid to Jordan, 15, 30, 39, 44, 68, 77
U.S. Middle East strategy approach, 84
U.S. military aid to Israel (*see also Under* October *1973* War *above*), 37, 60
House Foreign Affairs Committee meeting, 360
Ismail correspondence, 69
Nixon-Haig discussions, 6
Post-October *1973* War disengagement negotiations and, 339
Postwar, 339, 360, 364, 376, 401
Prewar, 32, 34, 36, 37, 60
U.S.-German Federal Republic discussions, 284
U.S. military aid to Jordan, 2, 13, 39, 331
U.S. military aid to Lebanon, 76
U.S.-Soviet summit (June *1973*), 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 78
Waldheim Middle East trip, 82
Watergate scandal, Haig memorandum, 234
Kissinger Middle East trip (Nov. *1973*). *See* Kissinger shuttle diplomacy; Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations.
Kissinger shuttle diplomacy (*See also* Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations):
Kissinger-Asad discussions, 393
Kissinger-Faisal discussions, 332
Kissinger-Frangie discussions, 397
Kissinger-Hassan II discussions, 320
Kissinger-Hussein discussions, 331, 394
Kissinger-Meir discussions, 398, 399, 401, 402
Kissinger memorandum, 346
Kissinger-Sadat discussions, 324, 390
National Security Council staff memorandum, 313
Korn, David A., 15, 57, 310, 350
Kornienko, Georgi M., 53, 221, 229

339-370/428-S/80003

Kraft, Joseph, 250, 305, 306
Kreisky, Bruno, 35
Kubisch, Jack B., 148, 187
Kuwait:
  Economic aid to Jordan, 30, 44, 89
  October 1973 War, 195, 197, 198
Kuznetsov, V. V., 221, 229

Laird, Melvin R., 305
Lebanon:
  Israeli airliner seizure, 85
  Israeli raid (Apr. *9*, *1973*), 46, 318
  Israeli raid (Feb. *21*, *1973*), 23, 35
  October 1973 War and, 126, 133, 139
  Palestinian-Lebanese conflict (May, *1973*), 55, 57, 62, 64
  Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 303, 397
  Terrorism and, 46
  U.S. military aid, 46, 76
Leor, Gen. Yisrael, 305, 312
Libya (*see also* Libyan Arab Airlines Flight), 114
  Egyptian relations with, 66, 84, 91
  October 1973 War and, 103, 112, 121
Libyan Arab Airlines Flight 114, 22, 23, 27, 33, 34, 35
Lindsay, John, 121
Lord, Winston, 221, 232
Love, John, 181, 186, 191, 198, 208
Luns, Joseph, 191

Magdoub, Gen., 425
Mahon, George H., 143, 398
Mailliard, William S., 360
Maitland, Donald, 112
Makarov, Vasily, 72
Makhluf, Abd-al-Hadi, 63
Malik, Yakov A., 407
Mansfield, Mike, 127, 143, 197, 360
Mark, David E., 264, 309, 411
Marsh, John O., Jr., 181
McCarthy, Colman, 277
McClellan, John L., 143, 360
McCloskey, Robert:
  October 1973 War:
    Ceasefire, 232
    Hostilities, 112, 131, 148, 181
    U.S. military aid to Israel and, 186, 187, 198
    U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations, 229
  Oil supplies, 186, 198
McCloskey, Robert—*Continued*
  Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 308, 316
  U.S. military aid to Israel, 186, 187, 198
McIntyre, Laurence, 110
Meany, George, 232
Meir, Golda:
  Arab military activity (May-Oct. *1973*), 97
  Geneva Conference (*1973*), 387, 388, 391, 398, 399, 405
  Jordanian-Israeli secret talks, 12
    Saunders memoranda, 64, 84
  Libyan Arab Airlines Flight 114, 35
  October 1973 War:
    Ceasefire, 230, 232, 242, 270
    Ceasefire resolution proposals, 190, 206, 228
    Hostilities, 99, 154
    Jordanian military participation, 158, 171, 188
    Kissinger Israel visit, 230, 232
    U.S. military aid to Israel and, 134, 135, 196
  Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations:
    Keating memorandum, 323
    Kilometer *101* talks, 294
    Kissinger discussions, 398, 399, 401, 402
    Sisco discussions, 326
    U.S.-Israeli correspondence, 333, 335, 337
    U.S. visit (Nov. *1973*), 305, 306, 308, 312, 316, 317
  United Nations Emergency Force, 278
  U.S. economic aid to Jordan, 78
  U.S. military aid to Israel:
    October 1973 War and, 134, 135, 196
    Postwar, 308, 401
    Prewar, 32, 33, 34, 35
  U.S.-Soviet summit (June *1973*), 71
  U.S. visit (Mar. *1973*):
    Kissinger memorandum, 16
    Kissinger-Rabin discussions, 23
    Meeting memorandum, 35
    Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 24, 32, 34, 36
    Saunders memoranda, 8, 33
    Zurhellen memorandum, 17
  Waldheim Middle East trip, 82

339-370/428-S/80003

Merrick, Roger, 65
Middle East Task Force, Situation Reports, No. *15*, 135
Mizrachi, Baruch, 362, 401
Moore, George C., 41, 46
Moorer, Adm. Thomas H.:
  Alert of U.S. Forces, 269, 277
  October 1973 War:
    Ceasefire, 259
    Hostilities, 103, 112, 121, 131, 161, 181, 191, 208
    Soviet military aid to Egypt and Syria, 144, 145, 185
    Soviet military intervention possibility, 269
    U.S. military aid to Israel and, 135, 173, 176, 185, 191, 198, 261
    U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations, 213
  Oil supplies, 186, 191, 198, 208, 363, 364
  Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 308, 314, 336
  U.S. Middle East strategy approach, 265
Morgan, Thomas E., 322, 360
Morocco, 103
  October 1973 War, 131, 195, 197, 198
  Palestinians and, 353
  Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 318, 320
Al-Mufti, Zuhayr Mahmud, 15

Naffa, Fuad, 397
Nasr, Sherif, 179, 188
National Intelligence Analytical Memorandum, NIAM *36.7-73*, 83
National Intelligence Estimates, NIE *30-73*, ''Possible Egyptian-Israeli Hostilities: Determinants and Implications,'' 59
Newsom, David D., 148, 187, 250
Niehuss, Rosemary, 425
Nixon, Richard M.:
  Brezhnev meeting, 73
  Dobrynin meetings, 389, 418
  Egypt's war plans, Kissinger discussions, 58
  Fahmi U.S. visit, 302
  Geneva Conference (*1973*):
    Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs paper, 417
Nixon, Richard M.—*Continued*
  Geneva Conference (*1973*)—*Continued*
    Congressional leadership discussions, 360
    Hassan II correspondence, 353
    Kissinger memoranda, 409, 415
    Meir correspondence, 388, 391
    Palestinian participation, U.S.-Romanian discussions, 355
    Sadat correspondence, 369, 384, 422, 424
    U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 390
    U.S.-Israeli discussions, 386
    U.S.-Soviet joint letter, 387, 388, 407
    U.S.-Syrian discussions, 396
  Israeli occupied territories policies, 86
  Israeli raids on Lebanon, 46
  Libyan Arab Airlines Flight 114, 22, 26, 27, 34, 35
  October 1973 War:
    Oct. *6-8*, initial attack:
      Brezhnev correspondence, 120, 123
      Kissinger discussions, 104, 118, 132
      Kissinger memorandum, 109
      Return to Washington, 106, 107, 116
      Soviet leadership correspondence, 108
      United Nations Security Council meeting proposals:
        Kissinger discussions, 104, 118, 132
        U.S.-British discussions, 180
    Oct. *9-13*, second stage, 137, 153, 159
    Oct. *14* Israeli offensive, Kissinger discussions, 180, 182
    Oct. *15-25* Ceasefire resolution proposals:
      Arab Foreign Ministers meeting, 197
      Faisal correspondence, 198
      Kissinger discussions, 117, 180, 192, 197, 203
      Meir correspondence, 228
    Arab Foreign Ministers meeting, 192, 195, 197, 198
    Brezhnev correspondence, 120, 123, 149, 165, 194, 204
    Ceasefire:
      Brezhnev correspondence, 246, 247, 262, 288, 290

339-370/428-S/80003

Nixon, Richard M.—*Continued*
October 1973 War—*Continued*
Ceasefire—*Continued*
Kissinger discussions, 266
Sadat correspondence, 248, 252, 255, 257, 260, 279, 282
Congressional leadership discussions, 140, 143
Jordanian military participation, 159
NATO role, 322
Soviet military intervention possibility:
Brezhnev correspondence, 267, 269, 274, 277, 288, 290
Kissinger discussions, 277
Press statement, 285, 293
Sadat correspondence, 271
Soviet role, 201
Speech (Oct. *15*, *1973*), 195
United Nations Security Council meeting (Oct. *8*, *1973*), 122, 127, 132, 137, 143
U.S. military aid to Israel and, 159, 173, 176, 180, 182, 195, 304
U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations:
Brezhnev correspondence, 149, 165, 194, 203, 217, 288
Kissinger Moscow trip, 214, 217, 218, 219, 222
Oil supplies, 312, 315, 360
Speech (Nov. *7*, *1973*), 308, 325
Palestinian-Lebanese conflict (May, *1973*), 55
Palestinians, 353
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations:
Brezhnev correspondence, 292, 316, 338
Congressional leadership discussions, 360
Dobrynin meeting, 301
Kissinger discussions, 312, 315
Kissinger-Faisal discussions, 332
Kissinger-Meir discussions, 402
Kissinger memorandum, 358
Kissinger-Sadat discussions, 324
Kissinger shuttle diplomacy memorandum, 346
Meir U.S. visit, 305, 306
National Security Council staff memoranda, 328, 340
Sadat correspondence, 369
Nixon, Richard M.—*Continued*
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations—*Continued*
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 302
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations:
Brezhnev correspondence, 38, 56, 70
Hussein correspondence, 1, 2
Hussein U.S. visit (Feb *6*, *1973*), 13, 14
Ismail U.S. visit:
Kissinger discussions, 22, 24, 27, 29
Kissinger memoranda, 25, 28, 40
Meeting memorandum, 26
Jordanian-Israeli secret talks, Kissinger memorandum, 12
Meir U.S. visit (Mar. *1973*), 16
Kissinger discussions, 24, 32, 34, 36
Meeting memorandum, 35
Sadat correspondence, 1
Sadat speech (Mar. *26*, *1973*), 42
Soviet role, Ismail Soviet Union visit, 79
U.S.-Egyptian secret talks, 11, 19
Ismail discussions, 26
Kissinger discussions, 22
Kissinger-Ismail meetings, 63
Sadat correspondence, 21
State Department role, 27, 49
U.S. initiative proposals:
Haig discussions, 6
Hussein correspondence, 1
Ismail U.S. visit discussions, 26
Kissinger discussions, 11, 29, 36
Kissinger memoranda, 25, 28
Rogers memoranda, 75, 84
Sadat correspondence, 1
Scali discussions, 18
U.S.-Soviet discussions:
Gromyko/Dobrynin discussions, 92
Kissinger-Brezhnev discussions, 53, 54
Kissinger discussions, 58
Kissinger-Dobrynin discussions, 79
Soviet leadership correspondence, 20
Syrian postwar military activity, 386, 392

339-370/428-S/80003

Nixon, Richard M.—*Continued*
United Nations Emergency Force, 277, 280, 290
United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, 280, 283
U.S. military aid to Israel:
October 1973 War and, 159, 173, 176, 180, 182, 195, 304
Prewar, 6, 32, 34, 36, 60
U.S. military aid to Jordan, 2, 13
U.S. military aid to Lebanon, 76
U.S.-Soviet summit (June *1973*), 70, 73
Watergate scandal, 214, 217, 220, 223, 234, 325, 389
Noel, Cleo, 41, 46
North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), October 1973 War, 191, 199, 322
Nowfel, Camille, 350, 397
Noyes, James H., 57, 103, 112

October 1973 War (Oct. *6-25*, *1973*):
Oct. *6-8*, initial attack:
Egyptian Embassy demonstrations, 121
Kissinger diplomacy overviews, 99, 103, 109, 112, 143, 148
Kissinger-Haig discussions, 106, 107, 116
Kissinger-Ismail correspondence, 118, 125
Kissinger memorandum, 109
Military situation, 109, 112, 121, 124, 126, 129, 131
National Security Council staff memorandum, 99
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 120, 123
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 104, 118, 132
Nixon-Soviet leadership correspondence, 108
Syrian/Egyptian United Nations letters, 104
United Nations Security Council meeting proposals:
Kissinger-Ismail correspondence, 118
Kissinger-Waldheim discussions, 117
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 104, 118, 132
U.S.-British discussions, 114
October 1973 War (Oct. *6-25*, *1973*)—*Continued*
Oct. *6-8*, initial attack—*Continued*
United Nations Security Council meeting proposals—*Continued*
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 113, 115, 119
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 108, 110, 111
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 103, 112, 121
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 101, 111
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 100, 104, 106, 108, 112, 113, 115, 126
U.S.-Jordanian correspondence, 102
U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 128
U.S.-Saudi correspondence, 102, 103
U.S. Senate resolution, 126, 127
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 100, 105, 106, 108, 110, 111, 120, 126
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 103, 109, 112, 121, 129, 131
Oct. *9-13*, second stage:
Kissinger-Ismail correspondence, 160
Kissinger staff meeting discussions, 148
Kissinger/Washington Special Actions Group roles, 161
Military situation:
Kissinger memorandum, 137
Kissinger press conference (Oct. *12*, *1973*), 159, 174
National Security Council staff memorandum, 139
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 134, 135, 166
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 135, 161, 173
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 153, 159
U.S.-British discussions, 156, 157, 165
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 154
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 157, 162
Waldheim-al-Zayyat discussions, 174
Oct. *14* Israeli offensive, 215
Kissinger-Schlesinger discussions, 167

339-370/428-S/80003

October 1973 War (Oct. *6-25, 1973*)—*Continued*
Oct. *14* Israeli offensive—*Continued*
Kissinger staff meeting discussions, 187
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 180, 182
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 166
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 181, 186, 191, 198, 208
Oct. *15-25* Ceasefire resolution proposals (*see also* Ceasefire *and* U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations *below*):
British-Egyptian discussions, 172
Kissinger-Haig discussions, 106, 116
Kissinger-Ismail correspondence, 138
Kissinger memoranda, 108, 222, 225
Kissinger-Schlesinger discussions, 184
Kissinger-Scowcroft discussions, 205
Kissinger staff meeting discussions, 148
Nixon-Arab Foreign Ministers meeting, 195, 197, 198
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 149, 165, 194, 204
Nixon-Congressional leadership discussions, 140
Nixon-Faisal correspondence, 198
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 117, 180, 192, 197, 203
Nixon-Meir correspondence, 228
Sonnenfeldt memorandum, 170
Soviet-Egyptian discussions, 191, 192, 193
U.S.-British discussions, 129, 165, 172, 175
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 189, 190, 205, 226
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 115, 141, 154, 196, 206, 212, 227, 228
U.S.-Jordanian correspondence, 207, 224
U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 128
October 1973 War (Oct. *6-25, 1973*)—*Continued*
Oct. *15-25* Ceasefire resolution proposals—*Continued*
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 112, 129, 135, 181, 198
Ceasefire (*see also* Ceasefire resolution proposals *above and* U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations *below*; Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations; United Nations Emergency Force):
Advisory group discussions, 261
Cline memorandum, 264
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 266
Nixon-Sadat correspondence, 248, 252, 255, 257, 260, 279, 282
Observers. *See* United Nations Truce Supervision Organization.
United Nations Security Council meeting (Oct. *24-26, 1973*), 273
United Nations Security Council Resolution *338*, 229, 250
United Nations Security Council Resolution *339*, 252
United Nations Security Council Resolution *340*, 276, 278
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 231, 236, 241, 248, 252, 254, 255, 257, 260, 273, 275, 279, 282
U.S.-Israeli correspondence, 278
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 230, 232, 242, 245, 250, 254, 255, 263, 270, 281, 284
U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 233, 235, 237, 238, 239
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 259
Disengagement. *See* Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations
Jordanian role:
Oct. *9-13*, second stage:
Kissinger-Hussein correspondence, 136, 163, 171
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 159
Israeli violation of Jordanian airspace, 128
Military participation:
Kissinger-Hussein correspondence, 136, 163, 171

339-370/428-S/80003

October 1973 War (Oct. *6-25, 1973*)—*Continued*
Jordanian role—*Continued*
Military participation—*Continued*
Meir-Hussein correspondence, 158, 171, 188
National Security Council staff memorandum, 139
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 159
Soviet-Jordanian discussions, 135
U.S.-British discussions, 157, 159
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 147, 158, 159, 188
U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 128, 147, 150, 152, 155, 179, 188, 224
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 140
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 181
National Security Council staff memorandum, 124
Saudi troops in Jordan, 128, 131, 163
Kissinger Israel visit, 212, 230, 231, 232
Kissinger staff meeting discussions, 250
Lebanon and, 126, 133
Nixon-Arab Foreign Ministers meeting, 192, 195, 197, 198
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 149, 165
Nixon-Congressional leadership discussions, 140, 143
Nixon speech (Oct. *15, 1973*), 195
Sadat speech (Oct. *16, 1973*), 190, 195
Soviet civilian evacuation from Syria and Egypt, 100, 121, 142, 181
Soviet collusion suspicions, Kissinger-Haig discussions, 106
Soviet incitement of Arab countries:
Nixon-Congressional leadership discussions, 143
Sonnenfeldt memoranda, 142, 151, 170
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 140
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 135
Soviet military aid to Egypt and Syria:
Kissinger staff meeting discussions, 187, 250
Moorer-Goodpaster discussions, 185
October 1973 War (Oct. *6-25, 1973*)—*Continued*
Soviet military aid to Egypt and Syria—*Continued*
Moorer memorandum, 145
Nixon-Arab Foreign Ministers meeting, 195
Schlesinger-Moorer discussions, 144
Sonnenfeldt memorandum, 170
Soviet-Egyptian discussions, 142
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 189
U.S.-Moroccan discussions, 320
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 181, 186, 191, 198, 322
Soviet military intervention possibility:
Kissinger-Haig discussions, 267, 268, 285, 293
Kissinger memorandum, 260
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 267, 269, 274, 277, 288, 290
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 277
Nixon press statement, 285, 293
Nixon-Sadat correspondence, 271
U.S.-British discussions, 269
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 266, 271
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 164, 268, 272
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 263, 266, 268, 285
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 269
Soviet role:
Cabinet discussions, 201
Kissinger-Soviet leadership correspondence, 162
Kissinger staff meeting discussions, 250
National Security Council staff memorandum, 139
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 132
Sonnenfeldt memorandum, 170
Special National Intelligence Estimates, 98
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 112, 131
Soviet statement (Oct. *7, 1973*), 162
Syrian postwar military activity, 386, 392, 423
United Nations General Assembly discussions, 127

339-370/428-S/80003

October 1973 War (Oct. *6-25, 1973*)—*Continued*
United Nations General Assembly meeting proposals, 108, 111, 112, 113, 127
United Nations Security Council meeting (Oct. *8, 1973*):
Kissinger memorandum, 137
Nixon-Congressional leadership discussions, 143
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 122, 127, 132
Scali speech, 129, 131
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 125, 131
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 123, 130
U.S.-Chinese People's Republic discussions, 114
U.S. intelligence performance, 250, 412
U.S. military aid to Israel and:
Oct. *14* Israeli offensive, 166, 167, 168
Advisory group discussions, 261
Kissinger-Haig discussions, 116, 166
Kissinger memoranda, 139, 215
Kissinger-Schlesinger discussions, 167, 177, 184
Kissinger-Scowcroft discussions, 156, 249
Kissinger staff meeting discussions, 187
Moorer-Goodpaster discussions, 185
Nixon-Arab Foreign Ministers meeting, 195
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 159, 180, 182
Portuguese role, 173, 176, 177
Schlesinger memorandum, 304
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 189
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 106, 115, 124, 126, 133, 134, 141, 154, 173, 196
U.S.-Soviet correspondence, 165
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 181, 183
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 103, 112, 129, 135, 173, 181, 186, 191, 198, 199, 208, 259
U.S. naval movements:
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 106
U.S.-Soviet correspondence, 162
October 1973 War (Oct. *6-25, 1973*)—*Continued*
U.S. naval movements—*Continued*
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 103, 112, 121, 131
U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations:
Kissinger-Brezhnev correspondence, 241, 251
Kissinger-Dobrynin discussions, 105, 106, 123, 149, 172, 175, 178, 180, 202, 209, 210, 211, 247, 253, 256, 258, 263, 266
Kissinger-Haig discussions, 106
Kissinger memorandum, 109
Kissinger Moscow trip, 213
Kissinger-Brezhnev meetings, 221
Kissinger-Dobrynin discussions, 209, 210, 211
Kissinger-Gromyko meetings, 229
Kissinger memoranda, 215, 216, 219, 220, 222
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 217
Nixon memorandum, 218
Press release, 220
Scowcroft memorandum, 223
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 214
Kissinger-Schlesinger discussions, 184
Kissinger staff meeting discussions, 250
Kissinger-Vorontsov discussions, 240, 243, 244
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 149, 165, 203, 217, 246, 247, 262, 288, 290
Nixon-Dobrynin meeting, 301
Scowcroft-Vorontsov discussions, 230
U.S. strategy options, 169
Odeen, Philip, 53
Oil supplies:
Embargo, 200
Advisory group discussions, 363
Arab Summit (Algiers, Nov. *26-28, 1973*), 364
Kissinger-Hassan II discussions, 320
Kissinger-Hussein discussions, 331
National Security Council staff memorandum, 313

339-370/428-S/80003

Oil supplies—*Continued*
Embargo—*Continued*
Nixon-Congressional leadership discussions, 360
Nixon-Sadat correspondence, 422, 424
Nixon speech (Nov. *7*, *1973*), 308, 325
U.S.-Algerian discussions, 393
U.S.-British discussions, 208, 363
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 399
U.S. military intervention proposals, 363
U.S.-Saudi discussions, 332, 417
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 208, 308, 314, 322, 336, 364
Kissinger memorandum, 139
National Security Council staff memorandum, 139
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 312, 315
Nixon statement, 88
Schlesinger memorandum, 304
Special National Intelligence Estimates, 98
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 88, 306
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 103, 112, 121, 181, 186, 191, 198
Oman, 14, 30
O'Neill, Thomas P., 360
Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC):
Meeting (Oct. *16-17*, *1973*), 186, 198
Oil embargo, 200, 360, 422

Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) (*see also* Black September; Palestinians), 41, 89, 91, 318
Arab Summit (Algiers, Nov. *26-28*, *1973*), 348, 370, 398
National Security Council staff memorandum, 355
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations and, 328
U.S. contacts with, 318, 353, 354, 357
Palestinians:
Arab Summit (Algiers, Nov. *26-28*, *1973*), 348, 370, 398
Bureau of Intelligence and Research research study, 411
Palestinians—*Continued*
CIA Intelligence Memorandum, 66
Geneva Conference participation:
Keating memorandum, 348
National Security Council staff memorandum, 355
Nixon-Hassan II correspondence, 353
Special National Intelligence Estimates, 372
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 390
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 357, 361, 387, 398
U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 379, 394
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 380
U.S.-Syrian discussions, 350, 393
Graham memorandum, 374
Jordanian-Israeli secret talks, 12
Jordanian relations with, 89, 91, 313, 318, 328, 355
National Security Council staff memoranda, 45, 91, 313, 328, 355, 374
Nixon-Hassan II correspondence, 353
Political situation, 91
Soviet role, 66
U.S. contacts with, 318, 353, 354, 357
U.S. correspondence, 81
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 28
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 399
U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 30, 354, 394
West Bank representation, 328, 331, 355, 370, 398
Palme, Olof, 35
Parmenter, William, 103
Peled, Maj. Binyamin, 232
Persian Gulf states, 14, 30
Pickering, Thomas R., 148, 187, 356, 367, 369
Popper, David H., 367
Porter, William, 57, 148, 187
Portugal, 173, 176, 177
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations (*see also* Geneva Conference (*1973*); Kissinger shuttle diplomacy):
Asad speech (Oct. *29*, *1973*), 309
Egyptian-Israeli agreement (Nov. *9*, *1973*), 334
Egyptian-Israeli direct talks. *See* Kilometer *101* talks *below*.
Egyptian-Syrian discussions, 421

339-370/428-S/80003

Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations—*Continued*
European Community declaration, 336
Israeli public statements, 366
Kilometer *101* talks:
Egypt breaks off, 364, 368
Kissinger-Haig discussions, 295
Kissinger memorandum, 346
National Security Council staff memoranda, 342, 371
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 292
Scowcroft memorandum, 299
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 286, 291, 294, 296, 297, 347, 362
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 298, 324, 390
U.S.-Israeli correspondence, 286
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 305, 361
Yariv Plan, 398, 401
Kissinger-Brezhnev correspondence, 321
Kissinger-Haig discussions, 293
Kissinger memorandum, 358
Kissinger shuttle diplomacy memorandum, 346
Kissinger staff meeting discussions, 420
McCloskey press statement (Oct. *31, 1973*), 316
National Security Council staff memoranda, 313, 319, 328, 340, 342, 345, 365, 366
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 292, 316, 338
Nixon-Congressional leadership discussions, 360
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 312, 315
Nixon-Sadat correspondence, 369
Saudi-Egyptian discussions, 314
Saudi role, 314
Six-point agreement (Nov. *11, 1973*), 341
Soviet role (*see also* U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations *under* October 1973 War; U.S.-Soviet joint letter *under* Geneva Conference (*1973*)):
Advisory group discussions, 261
Kissinger memoranda, 222, 346, 389
Kissinger staff meeting discussions, 250
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations—*Continued*
Soviet role—*Continued*
Special National Intelligence Estimates, 372
U.S.-Algerian discussions, 393
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 231
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 311, 324
U.S.-Israeli correspondence, 228
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 305, 399
U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 331
U.S.-Lebanese discussions, 397
U.S.-Soviet correspondence, 251, 321
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 229, 414
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 259
Special National Intelligence Estimates, 372
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 329, 341, 343, 344, 347, 349, 362
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 303, 311, 324
Fahmi U.S. visit, 298, 300, 302, 303, 307, 311
U.S.-Israeli correspondence, 329, 333, 335, 337
U.S.-Israeli discussions:
Keating memoranda, 323, 361, 368
Kissinger-Dinitz discussions, 287, 289, 299, 317, 344
Kissinger-Meir discussions, 398, 399, 401, 402
Meir U.S. visit, 305, 306, 308, 312, 316, 317
Memorandum of Understanding, 327
Scowcroft-Dinitz discussions, 324
Sisco-Meir discussions, 326
U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 331
U.S.-Lebanese discussions, 303, 397
U.S.-Moroccan discussions, 320
U.S.-Saudi discussions, 332
U.S.-Soviet discussions, Kissinger-Dobrynin discussions, 289, 316
U.S.-Syrian discussions, 310, 350, 393, 399
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 308, 314, 322, 336

339-370/428-S/80003

Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations—*Continued*
Yariv Plan, 398, 401
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations:
Hussein U.S. visits, 5, 8, 13, 14, 15, 30
Ismail U.S. visit:
Kissinger-Ismail correspondence, 4, 19
Kissinger memoranda, 25, 28, 40
Meeting memorandum, 26
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 22, 24, 27, 29
Nixon-Sadat correspondence, 21
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 23, 31
U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 30
Jordanian-Egyptian discussions, 5
Jordanian-Israeli secret talks:
Kissinger memorandum, 12
Saunders memoranda, 64, 84
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 55
Jordanian-Syrian discussions, 5
Meir U.S. visit (Mar. *1973*):
Kissinger memorandum, 16
Kissinger-Rabin discussions, 23
Meeting memorandum, 35
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 24, 32, 34, 36
Saunders memoranda, 8, 33
Zurhellen memorandum, 17
Soviet role:
Egyptian-Jordanian discussions, 1
Jordanian-Israeli discussions, 64
Kissinger memoranda, 20, 70
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 29
Palestinians and, 66
Sadat speech (May *1, 1973*), 51
Soviet-Egyptian discussions, 10, 20
Soviet-Israeli discussions, 43
Terrorism and, 88
United Nations Security Council discussions, 80
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 79
U.S.-Egyptian secret talks and, 48
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 31, 43, 55
U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 14, 15
State Department role, 7, 22, 24, 27, 48, 49
United Nations Security Council discussions, 62, 63, 80, 85
U.S.-Egyptian secret talks:
Greene-Ismail discussions, 70
Kissinger-Ismail correspondence, 4, 19, 41, 47, 69
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations—*Continued*
U.S.-Egyptian secret talks—*Continued*
Kissinger-Ismail meetings, 48, 63
Meir U.S. visit (Mar. *1973*) discussions, 35
Nixon-Ismail discussions, 26
Nixon memorandum, 11
Nixon-Sadat correspondence, 21
State Department role, 24, 27, 48, 49
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 35, 47, 55
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 53
U.S. initiative proposals:
Brown memorandum, 5
Hare statement, 88
Ismail U.S. visit discussions, 26
Kissinger-Buffum discussions, 90
Kissinger memoranda, 25, 28
National Security Council staff memorandum, 91
Nixon-Haig discussions, 6
Nixon-Hussein correspondence, 1
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 11, 29, 36
Nixon-Sadat correspondence, 1
Nixon-Scali discussions, 18
Rogers memoranda, 7, 75, 78
Saunders memoranda, 7, 8, 84
Sisco memoranda, 49, 84
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 23, 31, 78, 88
U.S.-Soviet discussions:
Kissinger-Brezhnev discussions, 53, 54
Kissinger-Dobrynin correspondence, 9
Kissinger-Dobrynin discussions, 38, 79
Kissinger memorandum, 54
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 38, 56, 70
Nixon-Gromyko/Dobrynin discussions, 92
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 58
Nixon-Soviet leadership correspondence, 20
Primakov, Yevgeny M., 43
Prisoners of war (POWs):
Egyptian-Israeli discussions, 299
Kissinger-Sadat discussions, 324
National Security Council staff memorandum, 319
Nixon-Meir correspondence, 228
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 362

339-370/428-S/80003

Prisoners of war (POWs)—*Continued*
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 298, 300, 307, 311, 324
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 227, 230, 232, 305, 306, 312, 361, 386, 399, 401
U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 394
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 222, 229, 400
U.S.-Syrian discussions, 310, 393, 396

Qadhafi, Muammar, 22
Quandt, William B.:
Fahmi U.S. visit, 303
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 355
Israeli occupied territories policies, 45, 87
Jordanian foreign policy, 89
October 1973 War:
Hostilities, 99, 103, 112, 121, 124, 129, 131, 139, 191
Nixon-Arab Foreign Ministers meeting, 195
Soviet role, 201
U.S. military aid to Israel and, 191, 198
U.S. strategy options, 169
Oil supplies, 186, 191, 198, 208
Palestinians, 374
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 313, 319, 328, 340, 366
Kilometer *101* talks, 371
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 303
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 322, 336
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 51, 91

Rabin, Yitzhak:
Libyan Arab Airlines Flight 114, 22, 23
Meir U.S. visit (Mar. *1973*), 32, 35
October 1973 War, Ceasefire, 232
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 23, 31
Reston, James (''Scotty''), 277
Richardson, Elliot L., 33, 37
Rifai, Abdul Munim, 125, 128, 238, 394, 400, 415
Rifai, Zaid:
Egypt's war plans, 1
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 370, 374, 394, 421
October 1973 War, 136, 150, 152, 158, 163

Rifai, Zaid—*Continued*
Palestinians, 370, 374
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 421
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 1, 14, 15, 30, 64
U.S. economic aid to Jordan, 14, 68, 77
Rodman, Peter W.:
Arab military activity (May-Oct. *1973*), 51, 97
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 357, 359, 399, 414, 416
October 1973 War:
Ceasefire, 231
Hostilities, 134, 166
Kissinger Israel visit, 230, 232
U.S. military aid to Israel and, 141
U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations, 218, 229
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 335
Kissinger-Brezhnev correspondence, 321
Kissinger-Meir discussions, 398, 401
Meir U.S. visit, 305
U.S.-Israeli correspondence, 333
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 312
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations:
Hussein U.S. visit (Feb *30*, *1973*), 30
Ismail U.S. visit, 23
Soviet role, 31, 43
United Nations Security Council discussions, 80
U.S.-Egyptian secret talks, 55, 63
U.S. initiative proposals, 88
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 53
U.S. economic aid to Jordan, 39
U.S.-Soviet summit (June *1973*), 71, 74
Watergate scandal, 234
Rogers Plan (*1969*), 7
Rogers, William P.:
Israeli raids on Lebanon, 46
Libyan Arab Airlines Flight 114, 22
Palestinian-Lebanese conflict (May, *1973*), 55
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations:
Hussein U.S. visit (Feb *6*, *1973*), 15
Ismail U.S. visit, 24, 26, 27

339-370/428-S/80003

Rogers, William P.—*Continued*
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations—*Continued*
U.S. initiative proposals, 7, 75, 78, 84
Rogers Plan (1969), 7
Terrorism, 46
U.S. economic aid to Jordan, 30, 77
U.S. military aid to Israel, 37
Romania, 35, 355, 377
Rumsfeld, Donald, 191
Rush, Kenneth:
Arab military activity (May-Oct. *1973*), 95
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 367, 380, 381
Meir U.S. visit (Mar. *1973*), 33
October 1973 War:
Ceasefire, 259
Hostilities, 102, 103, 112, 121, 131, 148, 161, 181, 191
Kissinger staff meeting discussions, 250
U.S. military aid to Israel and, 135, 173, 187, 191, 198
Oil supplies, 186, 191, 198, 208, 363, 364
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 308, 322, 336, 369
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 15, 26
U.S. military aid to Israel, 23, 135, 173, 187, 191, 198
Rusk, Dean, 316

al-Sabah, Sabah al-Ahmad al-Jabir, 195
Al-Sadad, Farid, 15
Sadaqa, Najib, 133, 397
Sadat, Anwar:
Egypt's war plans, 1, 67
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 395
Kissinger correspondence, 403
Kissinger discussions, 390
Nixon correspondence, 369, 384, 422, 424
U.S.-Soviet joint letter, 390
October 1973 War:
Ceasefire, Nixon correspondence, 248, 252, 255, 257, 260, 279, 282
Ceasefire resolution proposals, 190
Jordanian role, 150
Sadat, Anwar—*Continued*
October 1973 War—*Continued*
Soviet military intervention possibility, 271
Personal distrust between Hussein and, 14, 30
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 303, 307, 314, 324, 369, 390
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 1, 3, 21
Soviet-Egyptian discussions, 10
Soviet-Egyptian relations, 14, 66
Speech (July *23*, *1973*), 80
Speech (Mar. *26*, *1973*), 42
Speech (May *1*, *1973*), 51
Speech (Oct. *16*, *1973*), 190, 195
Syrian postwar military activity, 423
Sapir, Pinchas, 399
al-Saqqaf, Omar, 192, 195, 198, 332, 422
Saudi Arabia:
Economic aid to Jordan, 30, 39, 44
Egyptian relations with, 84, 91
Faisal U.S. visit proposal, 192
October 1973 War:
Ceasefire resolution proposals, 198
Hostilities, 102, 103, 128, 131, 163
Jordanian military participation, 152
Nixon-Arab Foreign Ministers meeting, 195, 197, 198
Saudi troops in Jordan, 128, 131, 163
Oil embargo, 200, 308, 314, 332, 363, 417, 422
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 314, 332
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, U.S. initiative proposals and, 91
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 88
U.S. military aid to Israel, October 1973 War and, 186, 191
Saunders, Harold H.:
Arab military activity (May-Oct. *1973*), 61
Fahmi U.S. visit, 298, 302
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 355, 394, 399, 414
Israeli occupied territories policies, 45, 87
Jordanian foreign policy, 89
Meir U.S. visit (Mar. *1973*), 33

339-370/428-S/80003

Saunders, Harold H.—*Continued*
October 1973 War, Ceasefire, 259
Oil supplies, 364
Palestinian-Lebanese conflict (May, *1973*), 57
Palestinians, 81, 374
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 313, 319, 340, 342, 345, 365, 366
Kilometer *101* talks, 371
Meir U.S. visit, 306
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 401
U.S.-Lebanese discussions, 397
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 308
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations:
Hussein U.S. visit (Feb *6*, *1973*), 8
Jordanian-Israeli secret talks, 64
Soviet role, Sadat speech (May *1*, *1973*), 51
U.S.-Egyptian secret talks, 48, 55, 63
U.S. initiative proposals, 7, 8
U.S. economic aid to Jordan, 15, 44, 77
U.S. Middle East strategy approach, 84
U.S. military aid to Israel, 37, 376
U.S. military aid to Jordan, 2, 15, 44
U.S. military aid to Lebanon, 76
U.S.-Soviet summit (June *1973*), 72, 74
Waldheim Middle East trip, 82
al Sayyid, Ahmad Mahir, 63
Scali, John:
Libyan Arab Airlines Flight 114, 34
October 1973 War, 110, 129, 131, 225, 229, 266
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 334
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 18, 69
Prisoners of war, 298
Waldheim Middle East trip, 82
Schlesinger, James R.:
Alert of U.S. Forces, 269, 277
Arab military activity (May-Oct. *1973*), 52, 57
Egypt's war plans, 50
October 1973 War:
Ceasefire resolution proposals, 177, 184
Hostilities, 103, 112, 121, 131, 167, 181
Schlesinger, James R.—*Continued*
October 1973 War—*Continued*
Soviet military aid to Egypt and Syria, 144
Soviet military intervention possibility, 269
U.S. military aid to Israel and, 304
Advisory group discussions, 261
Kissinger discussions, 167, 177, 184
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 115, 141, 166
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 135, 173
U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations, 213
Oil supplies, 186, 304, 363
Palestinian-Lebanese conflict (May, *1973*), 55, 57
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 293, 314
U.S. postwar military aid to Israel, 308
Scott, Hugh, 126, 127, 355, 360
Scott, William L., 208
Scowcroft, Lt. Gen. Brent:
Alert of U.S. Forces, 269, 277
Arab military activity (May-Oct. *1973*), 51, 97
Fahmi U.S. visit, 302
Geneva Conference (*1973*):
Kissinger memoranda, 409, 415
Nixon-Sadat correspondence, 384
Palestinian participation, U.S.-Israeli discussions, 357
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 395
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 330, 390
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 383, 386
U.S.-Israeli Memorandum of Understanding, 410
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 406, 408
U.S.-Soviet joint letter, 380, 383, 385, 387, 388, 391, 395, 400, 405, 407
U.S.-Syrian discussions, 396
Meir U.S. visit (Mar. *1973*), 35
Nixon-Dobrynin meetings, 389
October 1973 War:
Oct. *6-8*, initial attack, 99, 103, 110, 112, 113, 121, 131
Oct. *9-13*, second stage, 134, 139, 156, 166

339-370/428-S/80003

Scowcroft, Lt. Gen. Brent—*Continued*
October 1973 War—*Continued*
Oct. *14* Israeli offensive, 181, 191, 215
Oct. *15-25*, Ceasefire resolution proposals:
Kissinger discussions, 205
Kissinger-Ismail correspondence, 138
Nixon-Meir correspondence, 228
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 226
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 196, 227
Ceasefire, 233, 249
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 231, 236, 279
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 259
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 120
Nixon-Congressional leadership discussions, 140, 143
Soviet military intervention possibility, 269
U.S. military aid to Israel and, 141, 156, 176, 215, 249, 261
U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations:
Kissinger Moscow trip, 213, 217, 219, 223
Kissinger memoranda, 215, 216, 220, 222
Nixon memoranda, 218
Vorontsov discussions, 230
Oil supplies, 186, 191, 198, 208, 363, 364
Palestinian-Lebanese conflict (May, *1973*), 57
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations:
Dinitz discussions, 324
Kilometer *101* talks, 292, 299
Kissinger-Brezhnev correspondence, 321
Kissinger-Faisal discussions, 332
Kissinger-Hassan II discussions, 320
Kissinger-Hussein discussions, 331
Kissinger-Meir discussions, 402
National Security Council staff memorandum, 342
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 338
U.S.-Israeli correspondence, 329, 333, 335, 337
Scowcroft, Lt. Gen. Brent—*Continued*
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations—*Continued*
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 308, 314, 322, 336
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 4, 7, 18, 26, 54
Society of Pilgrims speech (Dec. *12*, *1973*), 389
Syrian postwar military activity, 392
U.S. economic aid to Jordan, 15
U.S. military aid to Israel:
October 1973 War and, 141, 156, 176, 215, 249, 261
Postwar, 339, 357, 376
U.S. military aid to Jordan, 2, 15, 44
U.S.-Soviet summit (June *1973*), 78
Shalev, Brig. Gen. Aryeh, 50
Shalev, Mordechai:
Arab military activity (May-Oct. *1973*), 97
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 357, 359, 387, 388, 391, 410
October 1973 War:
Ceasefire resolution proposals, 154
Hostilities, 100, 104, 106, 108, 115, 154, 164, 166
Soviet military intervention possibility, 164
U.S. military aid to Israel and, 141, 154
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 299, 305, 329, 333, 344
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 80, 88
U.S.-Soviet summit (June *1973*), 78
Shultz, George P., 55, 201
Shuttle Diplomacy (*See* Kissinger Shuttle Diplomacy)
Siilasvuo, Gen. Ensio, 299, 305, 340, 368, 425
Simon, William E., 112, 121, 131
Sirri, Umar, 298, 424
Sisco, Joseph J.:
Arab military activity (May-Oct. *1973*), 95
Egypt's war plans, 65
Fahmi U.S. visit, 298, 300, 307, 311
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 413
Kissinger staff meeting discussions, 420

339-370/428-S/80003

Sisco, Joseph J.—*Continued*
Geneva Conference (*1973*)—*Continued*
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 381, 399, 414
U.S.-Jordanian discussions, 394
U.S.-Soviet joint letter, 380
U.S.-Syrian discussions, 350
Waldheim correspondence, 367
Israeli occupied territories policies, 45, 87
Libyan Arab Airlines Flight 114, 22, 23
October 1973 War:
Ceasefire, 232, 259
Hostilities, 99, 112, 121, 131, 148, 181, 191
Jordanian military participation, 188
Lebanon and, 133
Nixon-Arab Foreign Ministers meeting, 195
Soviet role, 250
U.S. military aid to Israel and, 187, 191, 198
U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations, 221, 229
Oil supplies, 186, 191, 198, 208, 364
Palestinian-Lebanese conflict (May, *1973*), 57
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations:
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 343, 344, 369
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 324
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 312, 326, 401
U.S.-Israeli Memorandum of Understanding, 327
U.S.-Lebanese discussions, 397
U.S.-Syrian discussions, 310, 393
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations:
Hussein U.S. visit (Feb *6*, *1973*), 15
Ismail U.S. visit, 23, 26
United Nations Security Council discussions, 80
U.S.-Egyptian secret talks, 48, 49
U.S. initiative proposals, 49, 84, 88
U.S. military aid to Jordan, 15
Skalli, Ali, 131
Smith, Richard W., 361, 423
Socialist International, 35
Sonnenfeldt, Helmut, 53, 142, 151, 170, 221, 229
Soviet Union (*see also* Soviet *and* U.S.-Soviet *headings under other subjects*; U.S.-Soviet summit (June *1973*); Breshnev, Leonid; Dobrynin, Anatoly; Gromyko, Andrei):
Egyptian relations with, 14, 26, 324, 389, 390
CIA Intelligence Memorandum, 66
Prewar military aid, 31, 35, 66
Israeli relations with, 359
Jewish emigration from, 14, 35, 43, 63
Nixon-Dobrynin meetings, 389, 418
Syrian relations with, 10, 14, 61, 83
U.S. trade relations with, 359, 418
Special National Intelligence Estimates:
SNIE *11/30/73*, ''Soviet Military Options in the Middle East,'' 308
SNIE *30/3-73*, ''The Arab-Israeli Situation and the Oil Crisis,'' 372
SNIE *35/36-73*, ''Arab-Israeli Hostilities and Their Implications,'' 98, 148
Springsteen, George S., Jr., United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, 298
Stackhouse, H.H., 350
Stennis, John C., 132, 208, 308, 360
Sterner, Michael E., 80, 425
Sterner, Mike, 65
Stoddard, P. H., 93
Stoessel, Walter J., Jr., 148, 176, 187
Stoltzfus, William A., 200
Stratton, Samuel S., 360
Stukel, Lt. Col. Donald, 103, 121, 124, 129, 131, 308
Sukhodrev, Viktor M., 53, 221, 229, 416
al-Sulh, Taqi al-Din, 397
Sultan bin Abdul Aziz al Saud, Prince of Saudi Arabia, 314
Sumner, Maj. Gen. Gordon, 168, 336
Symington, Stuart, 208
Syria (*see also* Arab military activity (May-Oct. *1973*); Asad, Hafez; October 1973 War); Prisoners of war; Soviet military aid to Egypt and Syria *under* October 1973 War):
Bureau of Intelligence and Research Intelligence Note, 309
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 396, 417
Geneva Conference participation:
Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs paper, 417

339-370/428-S/80003

Syria—*Continued*
Geneva Conference participation—*Continued*
Kissinger memoranda, 386, 409
Kissinger staff meeting discussions, 420
Scowcroft memorandum, 407
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 419, 421
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 414
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 406, 408
U.S.-Syrian discussions, 350, 393, 395
Jordanian relations with, 89, 328
National Intelligence Analytical Memorandum, 83
Palestinian-Lebanese conflict (May, *1973*), 55, 57
Palestinians and, 328
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 310, 350, 393, 399, 403
Postwar military activity, 386, 392, 423
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 5, 91
Soviet relations with, 10, 14, 61, 83, 103
United Nations Security Council letter, 104

Tarr, Curtis W., 15, 148, 187
Terrorism, 41, 46, 55, 88, 318
Toumayan, Alec, 195

United Nations (*see also* Ceasefire *and* ceasefire resolution proposals under October 1973 War; United Nations Emergency Force; Waldheim, Kurt):
Kissinger speech (Sept. *24, 1973*), 90
October 1973 War:
Egyptian General Assembly letter, 104
General Assembly meeting proposals, 108, 111, 112, 113, 127
Security Council meeting proposals, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 110
Syrian Security Council letter, 104
Security Council discussions, 62, 63, 80, 85
United Nations—*Continued*
Security Council Resolution *242* (*see also* Ceasefire *and* ceasefire resolution proposals *under* October 1973 War), 69, 72, 80, 82
Security Council Resolution *332*, 46
Security Council Resolution *337*, 85
Security Council Resolution *338*, 229, 250
Security Council Resolution *339*, 252
Security Council Resolution *340*, 276, 278
Waldheim Middle East trip, 82
United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) (*see also* Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations):
Kissinger-Waldheim discussions, 276
National Security Council staff memoranda, 319, 340, 342, 345
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 290
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 277, 280
United Nations Security Council Resolution *340*, 276
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 275, 329, 341
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 298
U.S.-Israeli correspondence, 278, 401
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 305, 312, 323, 327
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 277
United Kingdom (*see also* Douglas, Sir Alec; Heath, Edward; Hume, John):
October 1973 War, 170
Ceasefire resolution proposals, 112, 114, 129, 165, 172, 175, 180
Jordanian military participation, 156, 157, 159
Soviet military intervention possibility, 269
Oil embargo, 208, 363
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 23, 78, 80
United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO):
Cline memorandum, 264
Kissinger staff meeting discussions, 250
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 280, 283
October 1973 War, 106
Security Council Resolution *339*, 252
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 260, 273, 282
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 298
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 242, 245, 263

339-370/428-S/80003

United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO)—*Continued*
U.S.-Soviet correspondence, 241, 251, 290
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 240
U.S. airlift to Israel during war (*See* U.S. military aid to Israel)
U.S. economic aid to Jordan:
Hussein U.S. visit discussions, 13, 14, 15, 30
Kissinger-Hussein correspondence, 39, 68
Meir-Hussein correspondence, 78
Saunders memoranda, 44, 77
U.S. Jewish community:
Nixon-Haig discussions, 6
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 29
Nixon memorandum, 11
Nixon's criticisms of, 389
October 1973 War, 140
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 43, 359
U.S. military aid to Israel and, 191, 198
U.S.-Soviet trade relations and, 418
U.S. Middle East strategy approach:
Defense Intelligence Agency papers, 265
Egyptian perceptions, 85
Saunders memorandum, 84
U.S. military aid to Israel:
Airlift to Israel during war, 134, 135, 140, 14, 144, 145, 156, 159, 166, 167, 168, 173, 176, 177, 178, 180, 181,182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 196, 198, 205, 208, 213, 215, 250
Ceasefire and, 230, 249, 259
October 1973 War and:
Advisory group discussions, 261
Israeli offensive, 166, 167, 168
Kissinger-Haig discussions, 116, 166
Kissinger memoranda, 139, 215
Kissinger-Schlesinger discussions, 167, 177, 184
Kissinger-Scowcroft discussions, 156, 249
Kissinger staff meeting discussions, 187
Moorer-Goodpaster discussions, 185
Nixon-Arab Foreign Ministers meeting, 195
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 159, 180, 182
U.S. military aid to Israel—*Continued*
October 1973 War and—*Continued*
Portuguese role, 173, 176, 177
Schlesinger memorandum, 304
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 189
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 106, 115, 124, 126, 133, 134, 141, 154, 173, 196
U.S.-Soviet correspondence, 165
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 181, 183
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 103, 112, 129, 135, 173, 181, 186, 191, 198, 199, 208, 259
Postwar:
Kissinger-House Foreign Affairs Committee discussions, 360, 364
Kissinger memorandum, 339
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 378
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 308, 357, 376, 398, 401
Washington Special Actions Group discussions, 322, 336, 364
Prewar:
Kissinger memoranda, 37, 60
Nixon-Haig discussions, 6
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 32, 34, 36
U.S.-Egyptian correspondence, 41
U.S.-Egyptian discussions, 63, 69
U.S.-German Federal Republic discussions, 284
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 23, 33, 34, 35, 43, 55
U.S.-Soviet summit (June *1973*), 30, 53, 58
Kissinger memoranda, 70, 73
National Security Council staff memorandum, 74
Nixon-Kissinger discussions, 29
U.S.-Israeli discussions, 55, 71, 78
U.S.-Soviet discussions, 72

Vaccaro, Albert A., 309, 411
Vanik, Charles, 359
Vavilov, Andrei, 53
Veliotes, Nicholas, 399
Vest, George S., 187
Vinogradov, Vladimir, 10, 142, 356, 385, 390, 395
Von Staden, Berndt, 284
Vorontsov, Yuli:
October 1973 War:
Ceasefire, 231, 240, 241, 243, 244

339-370/428-S/80003

Vorontsov, Yuli—*Continued*
October 1973 War—*Continued*
Nixon-Brezhnev correspondence, 120, 149, 217
U.S.-Soviet ceasefire negotiations, 230
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 20

Wahba, Ihab Said, 63
Waldheim, Kurt:
Geneva Conference (*1973*), 367, 377, 407, 415
Middle East trip, 78, 82
October 1973 War, 106, 117, 174, 240, 276
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 334, 340
Pre-October 1973 War peace settlement negotiations, 78, 80, 82
Waller, John, 57
Walters, Lt. Gen. Vernon A., 318
War Powers Resolution, 305
Warren, Gerald L., 214, 220
Washington Special Actions Group (WSAG):
October 1973 War:
Ceasefire, 259
Hostilities, 103, 109, 112, 121, 129, 131, 135, 161, 173, 181, 186, 191, 198, 208
Soviet military intervention possibility, 269
Oil supplies, 103, 112, 121, 181, 186, 191, 198
Embargo, 208, 308, 314, 322, 336, 364
Palestinian-Lebanese conflict (May, *1973*), 57
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 308, 314, 322, 336
Watergate scandal, 107, 214, 217, 220, 223, 234, 325, 389
Weinel, Vice Adm. John P.:
October 1973 War, 103, 121, 131, 191, 259
Oil supplies, 186, 191, 198, 208, 364
Palestinian-Lebanese conflict (May, *1973*), 57
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 308, 322, 336
U.S. military aid to Israel, October 1973 War and, 191, 198
White, William S., 398
Wiley, Marshall W., 85
Wood, N.C., 93
Wright, Marshall, 181

Yamani, Ahmed Zaki, 88, 191, 198, 308, 336, 363, 398
Yariv, Gen. Aharon (*see also* Kilometer *101* talks *under* Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations):
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 361, 368, 371, 398, 401
Meir U.S. visit, 305, 306, 312
Yedanov, Oleg, 100
Yost, Charles W., 87
Young, Milton R., 360

Zahedi, Ardeshir, 88
al-Zayyat, Muhammad Hasan:
October 1973 War, 101, 104, 111, 118, 125, 127, 131
Post-October 1973 War disengagement negotiations, 294
Zeira, Maj. Gen. Eliyahu, 136, 232
Ziegler, Ron, 140
Zurhellen, Z.O., Jr., 17