

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library

## Digital Library Collections

---

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

---

**Collection:** Department of State: Office of the Historian:  
Records, 1981-1989

**Series:** IV: PRESS RELEASES

**Folder Title:** October 1984 (1 of 3)

**Box:** 26

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: **reagan.library@nara.gov**

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

*Last Updated: 02/08/2024*

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE

October 1, 1984  
No. 208



APPEARANCE BY  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
ON  
"THIS WEEK WITH DAVID BRINKLEY"  
SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1984, 11:50 A.M.

MR. BRINKLEY: Mr. Secretary, thank you very much for coming in. We're happy to have you with us today.

Mr. Gromyko is back in Moscow now, having finished off here his last hours talking with you. Tell us about it. What happened? What do you make of it? What can you tell us about it?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, the last meeting, of course, was kind of a wrapup from the President's meeting. But if you take, I think properly, the span of meetings that we had with him -- in New York, the President's speech, his speech, his meeting with the President, and the wrapup meeting together -- what happened was a sometimes intense, sometimes discursive discussion of practically all the subjects that we are concerned about together with the Soviet Union, and then at the end, an agreement on the importance of keeping in touch, as the phrase was, but particularly as we came to the end of the meeting yesterday, to do so carefully, systematically, through diplomatic channels, in the expectation now that we would explore all of these issues, and at least we can hope, perhaps negotiate out some important things.

MR. WILL: It seems that when Americans talk about Soviet/U.S. relations under any Administration, it turns out the centerpiece of our relations is arms control. How much time, in the meetings that you had and the President had with Mr. Gromyko, was devoted to arms control, as opposed to human rights, Afghanistan, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and the rest?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, we always make a point of bringing up a full range of issues in any of these meetings with a Soviet leader. I do with my meetings with the Ambassador here, or in the many previous meetings I've had with Mr. Gromyko. So we talk about our human rights concerns always, --

MR. WILL: And he says --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: -- and we talk about bilateral issues, some of which we have reached agreements on in recent times. We talk about regional trouble spots that we're concerned about and they're concerned about, and we talk about arms control issues. That's our agenda.

MR. WILL: But on the basis --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: And that agenda was very much in full force during these talks.

MR. WILL: On the basis of the last 15 years, why do serious people believe in the arms control process? You heard Mr. Aaron say a moment ago that there is grounds for serious agreement between the countries -- common ground can be found; but we've had 15 years' experience with the process, and an arms race continues under the umbrella of arms agreements.

Now people are saying that the technology of verification is falling short, the technology of cruise missiles and the rest makes arms control perhaps a dead end. Do you believe that?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: There are many problems with arms control. I don't think it's a dead end. The approach that President Reagan has taken is not to control the buildup of arms, but to reduce it. And as he has said many times publicly, ideally, he would like to see nuclear arms reduced to zero, and he has shown that sense of direction in his proposals on strategic arms and in his proposals on intermediate-range weapons, to start with the idea of "let's eliminate them entirely."

MR. WILL: Can you cite --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: The zero option. It's a good option.

MR. WILL: Can you cite any contribution to United States' security over the last 15 years from arms control?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I think there probably have been some restrictions on the degree of buildup that have come about through that process, but I think the process has tended to focus on limiting the expansion rather than on actual reductions. And also you have a problem in the fact that they were concentrated on a part of armaments, principally launchers; and it's just like controls -- whether you're talking about wage and price controls or any other kind of controls -- people tend to try to get around something that is controlled, and so we see now many warheads on a launcher.

MR. DONALDSON: Now, you've put a very positive spin on this series of meetings, particularly the one with the President.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Not very positive. It's a sober and intense meetings, and our object, the President's object in this, was to get across, in his own way -- his intensely personal and strong way -- to the top levels of the Soviet leadership the fact that, first of all, the United States is a strong, vibrant country, and we intend to be able to defend our interests anywhere.

MR. DONALDSON: Well, do you think the Soviets should realize that?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: And he should realize that. And second, that we were very realistic about them; and third, that we are very much prepared and serious in wanting to engage them in constructive discussions.

MR. DONALDSON: All right. Having done that --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: All three of those things are out there, and I think -- at least, as I watched the President in this discussion -- he managed to get his message across.

MR. DONALDSON: O.K. Having said that and done that, as you know, Mr. Gromyko immediately put out a statement after meeting with the President which was very negative, saying in so many words that he found nothing, no change in position, no change in attitude that would justify any reason to hope that things could be better. Why did he do that?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, he put out different statements as the week went along.

MR. DONALDSON: I'm talking about the one after meeting with the President.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: And I think that, as I said, the meetings have to be looked upon in their continuity --

MR. DONALDSON: But what I'm saying, sir --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: -- and what we will do is very carefully establish different places where we will talk about the important subjects.

MR. DONALDSON: Can you name the next place?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: No. The next places will be here and in Moscow, as we talk with the respective Ambassadors.

MR. DONALDSON: Through our Ambassadors?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: And we will establish -- of course, there are some things that are simply ongoing -- going on right now with quite a lot.

MR. DONALDSON: Well, are you then saying that this series of meetings will result in the Soviets' coming back to the arms control table, or some table if not Geneva, to discuss arms control? If so, when?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: It remains to be seen exactly what the structure and place will be, and I'm not going to try to predict their behavior other than I think it is fair to say that we will have some discussion and some effort to line these things out.

MR. DONALDSON: Could I ask just one quick question? In that connection, did the President suggest to Mr. Gromyko that we might, in fact, agree to a moratorium on testing weapons in space before a negotiation on that subject began?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: No.

MR. BRINKLEY: Mr. Secretary, Gromyko, the Kremlin, Chernenko, the Soviet leadership in general, keep saying to us, "We want deeds, not words." He probably said that ten times in these few days he was in Washington.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: We say the same thing.

MR. BRINKLEY: Okay, when he says "deeds not words," what deeds? What does he want? He wants us to remove our missiles from West Germany, western Europe, which we're not going to do.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: He wants us to put a freeze on our modernization of our defensive and deterrent forces; he wants us to put a freeze on our efforts to do our research and develop our thinking about outer space. He wants to freeze all of that -- and there have been some people in this country that have proposed that. But that's not sensible, from our standpoint. There's no reason why we should do, give them what they want in order to start discussions. We should start discussions and find things that are mutually agreeable, and then work out the agreements on them.

MR. BRINKLEY: Let me interrupt for a moment. We'll be back with more questions for the Secretary of State in a moment.

(Break for commercials)

MR. BRINKLEY Mr. Secretary, there was a story in the Washington Post this morning -- I don't know if it's a White House leak or what -- saying that the arrangements for Gromyko's visit were kept secret to prevent the Defense Department from finding out about it and interfering with it.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: (Laughing) Well, that's nonsense.

MR. BRINKLEY: Is that all, just nonsense? You mean it's nonsense they were kept secret or nonsense of the Defense Department to interfere?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: As the notion of having this meeting and working on it developed, of course, the President kept it to himself and to a few other people, but the Defense Department was completely involved in the preparations. The Secretary of Defense was present at the last briefing and others with the President before the meeting; he was present at the luncheon with Mr. Gromyko. So this is a fairy story.

MR. BRINKLEY: All right. Well, I'd like to follow up on the previous question about deeds and words. You say what deeds they want from us. What deeds are they going to do for us?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, that's what we need to work out in negotiation, but any negotiation is bound to have a result that's to the mutual advantage to the parties, and that's why anyone trades with anyone else. I suppose an example before us is the sales of grain to the Soviet Union. It's to their advantage to be able to buy the grain. It's to our advantage to sell it. That's why it's taking place.

MR. WILL: You have said that the tide of history is against the Soviet Union. The President has said that the Soviet Union is heading for "the ash heap of history." And a lot of people in the Administration say they have alcoholism, disease; it's a kind of third-world country with a third-world economy almost, the Soviet Union.

Do you think that if we just keep the pressure on, that the internal strains on their society are going to cause a kind of disintegration? Is that one of the premises of our policy?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Oh, I don't think that we'll see a disintegration of the Soviet Union, or certainly we shouldn't build that into our

thinking.

I do believe that the evidence -- there is going to be competition between the systems, and the President and Mr. Gromyko both said that to each other. I believe our system is infinitely superior, that the facts are showing that all around the world, and in that sense, I think history is on our side.

MR. WILL: But the extension of this premise is that an arms race is in our interest because we can compete and we can carry it on more easily.

MR. BRINKLEY: That we can afford it and they can't.

MR. WILL: We can afford it, and eventually, they will buckle under the strain and get reasonable.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I think that's absolute nonsense. The thing that you have to look at is the fact that there are huge arsenals of nuclear weapons being built up. They are very dangerous.

I watched the beginning of your show, and you said, I think, that these were the only two countries that could start a major conflagration. That is absolutely wrong, and it represents the problem. Lots of countries around the world can start something and draw the superpowers into it, and so there is danger -- and danger from these weapons.

That is why the President has so persistently sought reduction -- not a freeze, not a control of the buildup, but reductions -- and reductions, ideally, to zero. That's his object.

MR. DONALDSON: Mr. Secretary, now that President Reagan has called former President Carter to assure him that he didn't mean that he, Mr. Carter, was responsible in any way for the latest Embassy bombing in Beirut, who is going to take responsibility?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, --

MR. DONALDSON: What person or number of people are going to take responsibility?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Let's be clear about the responsibility. The responsibility is with people who, through the use of terrorism, are trying to have an impact on U.S. policies, are trying to have an impact on our quest for peace and stability in the Middle East and other parts of the world. It's the threat of terrorism that is responsible, and that is what we have to fight against.

Now, there is somehow this notion that, in response to this, somebody's head has to roll. Well, maybe so, and I'm willing to have it be my head any time anyone wants --

MR. DONALDSON: Are you responsible?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: -- as I certainly feel responsible. Absolutely.

MR. DONALDSON: Should you have --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: And I take that responsibility very seriously.

MR. DONALDSON: I know you do, since you've "beefed up" security.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: However -- wait a minute. Now, wait a minute. We had just -- people had just --

MR. DONALDSON: (inaudible) ascribed to that.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: You listen to me now. The people -- I feel so strongly about this -- the people out there in Beirut are serving our country in a risky environment and they understand that very well; and they are doing everything possible to improve their security, and it's up to us to help them.

The Ambassador, "Reg" Bartholomew, is a hero. He has come close to being killed three times, most recently this latest episode. Do you think that he wants anything less than strong security around him? He absolutely does. And a lot has been done. There is more that can be done, and we're going to do it.

MR. DONALDSON: But, Mr. Secretary, the people in Iran in 1979 were serving our country in the same way that you've described the people in Beirut.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Absolutely, they were.

MR. DONALDSON: And I'm sure you would say the people that were responsible for seizing them were the Iranians --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Sure.

MR. DONALDSON: -- and yet it did not stop Ronald Reagan during the debate on October 20th of that next year, 1980, of saying to President Carter that he had been warned and he either should have beefed up security or removed the people from the Embassy. So we're not talking about, are we, who wants Americans to be safe the more or the less? We're talking about why, after the first Embassy bombing by truck and the second bombing of our Marines by a truck, there weren't adequate security devices to keep a third Embassy from being bombed by a truck.



SECRETARY SHULTZ: There were many additional devices, and obviously, we need -- we didn't have everything that we needed. The truck was stopped, or the van was stopped. The damage was less than it had been on earlier occasions and less than it could have been although it was severe, and the situation must be worked on continuously.

We have to remember that our Ambassadors around the world and the people who are working in our Embassies are in a tough situation -- they're on the front lines. They also have a mission to perform that involves them, as Reg does, going around in Beirut, going around in other places. We've had an Ambassador shot in Rome; the Saudis had their Embassy blown up in Beirut; the Kuwaitis have been attacked; the French have been attacked. The problem is getting ahold of this issue of terrorism, and we are working on it. Don't mistake that.

MR. DONALDSON: So I take it that you think, unlike the Long Commission which fixed responsibility for the bombing of the Marines -- and then the President said, "It's mine, ultimately; I'll take it" -- that you think there won't be a commission this time, there won't be an investigation that points to someone and says, "You are responsible"?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: There is an investigation. It has given us some preliminary views. I met this morning with Ambassador Murphy who has just been out around in the area.

MR. DONALDSON: Would you tell us what he told you?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: There is another team coming back with additional evidence, and we continue to look into this. If there is some negligence involved, we'll find it. However, we're not in this investigation business to see if we can knock somebody's head off. Our purpose is to find out what additional we can do to enhance the security of our embassies. That's the ball on which we need to keep our eye.

MR. WILL: Let me return to U.S./Soviet relations. First of all, do you expect to be dealing with them for four years as Secretary of State? Do you intend to stay on for four more years?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I think that the -- I think that the chances of a more constructive dialogue with the Soviet Union, assuming Mr. Reagan is President, are reasonably good. But of course, that remains, remains to be seen, just how they will react.

I do have confidence in what the President's view is, and it is that we should stay with the same strategy he's had from the beginning -- we have to be realistic; we have to be strong; and we have to be

ready to work out constructive agreements with them, assuming they want to do it.

MR. WILLS If you're Secretary of State for four more years, and at the end of four years, there has been no arms control agreement, would you consider that a failure? Or is it perhaps a test of democracy to be able to not make agreements, to say that's not satisfactory?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: There is nothing particularly wonderful about agreements for the sake of agreements. In fact, I think the worse thing in the world we can do in this Soviet relationship is to get in the position where we feel, and they know, that we want an agreement for the sake of an agreement, because then they will really put the squeeze on us.

You have to be relaxed about the need for an agreement if you're going to get a good one. The only agreement worth getting, from our standpoint, is one that serves our interests. And that's the ball, again, on which we have to keep our eye.

MR. BRINKLEY: Mr. Secretary, thank you very much. Thanks for coming in today.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Yes.

(The interview concluded at 12:10 P.M.)

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE

October 4, 1984  
No. 209



## SOUTH PACIFIC PROSPECTING TO CONTINUE

Representatives of Australia, New Zealand, and the United States on September 19, 1984, signed the Agreement to continue prospecting for Energy and Mineral Resources in the South Pacific in Washington, D.C.

The surveys, which are designed to respond to the oceanographic exploration needs of the island nations, began in 1982. The data was analyzed in 1983 and additional work outlined and proposed for 1984 and 1985, with 1986 as a completion data delivery year.

In signing for the United States, Assistant Secretary Paul Wolfowitz said, "The U.S. and its treaty partners are proud to continue this prospecting program. We are able to provide our scientists and research ships to conduct the field surveys off the island nations. This helps the island nations, such as Tonga, Fiji, Vanuatu, the Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea, decide whether they have seabed resources of potential economic interest. The project also serves as a training program for the regional scientists because we take on board island nation geologists and the regional U.N. research team based in Fiji."

Speaking on the scientific results, Dallas Peck, Chairman of the CCOP/SOPAC National Committee and Director of the U.S. Geological Survey, which has been conducting the oil and gas phase of the project, said, "There are some places around Tonga, the Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea where we have mapped relatively thick sedimentary basins which could contain oil and gas deposits. For example, Tonga has oil seeps on their main island, and I think we can suggest to them some potential offshore targets which deserve the attention of the oil exploration companies. We recognize that while the basins may not be large -- no Prudhoe Bay-type structures have been mapped in the area -- a small commercial find would do a great deal to improve the balance of payments for any of the nations and could serve to improve the energy dependence of this region."

For further information contact: Robert Rowland,  
U.S. Geological Survey  
860-6431

**For further information contact:**

-2-

The mineral exploration portion of the program is being conducted by the University of Hawaii's Institute of Geophysics. Director Charles Helsley has pointed out that, "Our big challenge at next month's meeting of the regional offshore minerals prospecting organization, CCOP/SOPAC, in Apia, Western Samoa, will be to gather together all the scientific talent in the region and put together the sites, surveys and sampling plans, for our surveys which will begin about a year from now."

The overall cost of the program, which includes ship time, salaries, data processing, and reports, will cost about \$7.8M. Most of the funds were provided by the U.S. Agency for International Development and the Australian Development Assistance Bureau.

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE

October 4, 1984  
No. 210



## U.S.-CHINA MEETING ON FISHERIES

A fisheries delegation from the People's Republic of China met with Department officials, headed by Ambassador Edward Wolfe, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and Fisheries, on September 24-25, 1984, in Washington, D.C. The Chinese delegation expressed interest in fishing off the U.S. coast off Alaska. U.S. officials explained U.S. domestic legislation regarding foreign access to fishery resources of the United States, and stressed the need for foreign cooperation in the area of trade and assistance to the development of the U.S. fishing industry. Both sides agreed to review the matters discussed and consult further at a later date.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Raymond Arnaudo 632-5690



# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE



October 4, 1984  
No. 211

## PROGRAM FOR THE OFFICIAL WORKING VISIT TO WASHINGTON, D.C. OF HIS EXCELLENCY SHIMON PERES, PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL.

October 8 - 10, 1984

### Monday, October 8

9:15 a.m. His Excellency Shimon Peres, Prime Minister of Israel, and his party arrive Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, via U.S. Presidential Aircraft.

9:30 a.m. Arrival Washington Monument Grounds, Reflecting Pool Side.

The Honorable George P. Shultz, Secretary of State, will greet the party on arrival.

9:40 a.m. Arrival Regent Hotel, 2350 M Street, Northwest.

Private day.

### Tuesday, October 9

10:00 a.m. Prime Minister Peres will meet with The Honorable Caspar Weinberger, Secretary of Defense, at the Pentagon

S/CPR - Mary Masserini  
Protocol Office - Regent Hotel  
429-0100 Ext. 720

**For further information contact:**

- 2 -

Tuesday, October 9 (continued)

- 11:30 a.m. Prime Minister Peres will meet with President Reagan at the White House. At the conclusion of the meeting, President Reagan will host a working luncheon in honor of Prime Minister Peres, at the White House.
- 2:45 p.m. Prime Minister Peres will meet with The Honorable George P. Shultz, Secretary of State, at the Department of State.
- 5:00 p.m. Prime Minister Peres will meet with The Honorable George Bush, Vice President of the United States, at the White House, West Wing Office.
- 7:30 p.m. The Honorable George Bush, Vice President of the United States, and Mrs. Bush will host a dinner in honor of His Excellency Shimon Peres, Prime Minister of Israel, at the Department of Agriculture, Patio Room, 14th and Jefferson Drive, Northwest.

Dress: Business suit.

Wednesday, October 10

- 7:30 a.m. The Honorable George P. Shultz, Secretary of State, will host a breakfast in honor of His Excellency Shimon Peres, Prime Minister of Israel, at the Department of State, James Madison Room.
- 9:35 a.m. Prime Minister Peres and his party arrive Washington Monument Grounds, Reflecting Pool Side.
- 9:50 a.m. Arrival Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland.
- 10:00 a.m. Departure from Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland via U.S. Presidential Aircraft enroute LaGuardia Airport (Marine Terminal), New York.

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE

October 9, 1984  
NO. 212



REMARKS BY  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
AFTER THE SPEECH BY FOREIGN MINISTER ANDREY GROMYKO  
OF THE U.S.S.R  
AT THE  
UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
SEPTEMBER 27, 1984

It is sad and disappointing that Mr. Gromyko should give us yet another misrepresentation of history and distortion of the United States, the peaceful and constructive role of the United States in world affairs. I can only say as the President did on Monday that we will try and try again to bring forth a more constructive relationship with the Soviet Union in the interest of world peace.

**For further information contact:**



# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE



October 9, 1984  
No. 213

PC NO. 18

PRESS CONFERENCE  
BY  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
UNITED NATIONS PLAZA HOTEL  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK  
SEPTEMBER 28, 1984

SECRETARY SHULTZ: President Reagan had a useful and intense interchange of views with the Foreign Minister and First Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Gromyko. The meeting lasted around an hour and a half altogether, including the working luncheon, and it was --

Q How long?

Q How long, sir?

Q -- three and a half hours --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Three and a half hours -- is that what I said?

Q You said one hour and a half --

Q You said one and a half.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Thank you. Well, I always look to the press to keep things accurate. (Laughter.)

Q Ohhhhhh.

Q That's why we're here.

Q When -- when did you start doing that?

Q Am I glad there not -- (Laughter.)

Q Go ahead, sir.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: The meeting was a very strong personal interchange between two individuals. And while some others had occasional things to say, it was very basically a meeting between two men.

**For further information contact:**

The President's purpose was to put forward to Mr. Gromyko, representing the top level of the Soviet leadership, the President's view that we need to have a more constructive relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union; and to express the many ways, again, that he believes this can be done.

And through this lengthy interchange and conversation, I feel sure that, from the President's point of view, and our point of view, this position that we have was made clear.

So, I'll be glad to take your questions.

Q Sir, can you tell us how Mr. Gromyko reacted to this position that you just outlined?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, I think you have to ask Mr. Gromyko for his reactions. I'm not going to try to characterize them, except to say that from our standpoint, it was a very strong and useful interchange, and Mr. Gromyko, of course, expressed his views very powerfully and aggressively, as he always does. And the President listened to him carefully.

Q Was there any --

Q What was the agenda -- what did they talk about, and what do you mean "strong"? What do you mean by "strong"?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Forceful and direct. So that -- there was a desire, I think, on the part of both parties to try to be as clear as possible and not to dress up a subject at all. So, these discussions were very direct. It started with the President making a statement of his views, and then Mr. Gromyko made a statement of his, and then the interchange started, and as I say, carried on through the lunch period.

Q What was the subject?

Q Mr. Secretary, you use the word "intense". Are you suggesting that they argued? Was the atmosphere angry?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: It wasn't angry. It was calm and deliberate and businesslike throughout. But, by intense, I mean that both men were really engaged in this conversation and were, both, I think, fully aware of the importance of it. And, so, in that sense it was a strong and intense interchange.

Q Mr. Secretary, did anything -- did anything come out of this meeting that would lead to further meetings between either you and Mr. Gromyko or the President and Mr. Gromyko, or a summit?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: The objective of the President was to put forward his view, which would continue to be his view if he is reelected, and as far as an outcome is concerned, at the end, of course, as I think the President said as he was leaving, we agreed to stay in touch and I'm sure that we will.

Q Mr. Secretary, was there anything out of this meeting that would lead you to think that there would be a likelihood of the Soviets returning to any of the arms talks, or of talks beginning on the space weapons?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I don't want to try to predict the start of any particular talks. The object wasn't to try to focus on any particular thing of that kind, but to try to clear the air of general issues involving where we think this relationship should go; involving the importance of coming to grips with the problem of immense nuclear arsenals and doing something to reduce them -- those broad and very significant questions. Question of preventing the militarization of outer space and issues of that kind were all discussed in the course of the meeting.

Q Do you think the relationship was changed as a result of this conversation, or these conversations today?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, it remains to be seen, of course. I would -- was -- I'd have to say, very impressed with the spirit and knowledge and intensity of the President's discussion, and I think it simply must have come through --

Q Sounds like --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: -- that this was a man talking with great conviction and a sense of importance of what he said.

Q Mr. Secretary did Mr. Gromyko respond either positively or negatively to any of the specific suggestions that the President made in his United Nations speech? Number one. And number two: Can you tell us a little bit about the session that the two men had alone in the Oval Office when the rest of you headed off for lunch?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: There were some references to the President's UN speech, but I don't want to characterize it beyond that.

The brief meeting that the two men had alone was something that the President wished to do, and he had some things that he wanted to say privately to Mr. Gromyko. And that's as much as I care to say about it.

Q -- you know what they were --

Q -- were discussed, Mr. Secretary?

Q Mr. Secretary, was there anything that you heard there -- any suggestion from the Soviets, any surprises about anything that Mr. Gromyko had to say that suggested something that you didn't already know or hadn't heard before?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, I think that an interchange like this is always an educational thing for all parties. And I felt privileged to have been there. But I can't put my finger on some particular insight that I'd care to single out.

Q Mr. Secretary, did you detect any change of positions on the Soviets' part on anything?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: The object wasn't to test out a question of their position on this, that or the other, but rather to set out general objectives and the confidence of the President in wishing to try to obtain those objectives, to put behind that confidence, as he did in his UN speech, the many substantive suggestions that are out there for negotiation and discussion as well as the procedural ideas that were contained in the President's UN speech.

Q What do you mean by "stay in touch," Mr. Secretary? Does that mean there are no specific plans for any further meetings? Does that mean that the idea the President had for multi-level, Cabinet-level exchanges was not accepted?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, there are all sorts of ways to stay in touch. And just exactly how this will come about remains to be seen. Of course, we have regular and continuing dialogue at the Ambassadorial level, both Ambassador Hartman in Moscow and with Ambassador Dobrynin here. And that represents a continuing vehicle for organizing any further discussions that might be needed.

Q -- nothing came out of this?

Q Mr. Secretary --

continue to try to get the Soviet Union to behave in a constructive way in international relations in the cause of peace. And I want to recall that to you. Do you believe that this meeting today in any way advanced the cause of peace? Wasn't Gromyko constructive?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: In my opinion, the meeting definitely advanced the cause of peace and I think when you have a genuine and intense discussion between two people at the top of these two most important governments, and it is a genuine, calm, businesslike, but intense discussion, that's sure to be helpful.

Q Did it clear the air, as far as you're concerned?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, clear the air -- there are lots of -- there's lots of distress, there's lots of apprehension, there's lots of differences of opinion, and I don't think one discussion is going to clear the air completely. But I think it undoubtedly made some progress in that direction.

Q Mr. Secretary, the Foreign Minister, in his speech at the UN, said that the United States would have to back its words with concrete deeds. Is that still the Soviets' position, and is it still his view that the United States has to do something in certain areas for the Soviets will reciprocate?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I think both the United States and the Soviet Union -- although I'll only speak for the United States -- feel that what counts is what is done, deeds. And that is why, as the President has approached this relationship, right from the beginning of his administration, he has concentrated on substantive matters. And by this time, there is a very long list of substantive suggestions, proposals, treaties. And he added some in his UN speech. So I think that it's perfectly correct to focus on deeds, not that the general atmosphere that can be created by discussions isn't a positive thing to do. But the essence of the matter is what is actually going to be done.

Q Are both sides going to follow this meeting now with some deeds?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: The agreement at the end of the luncheon was that we will stay in touch, and how one side or the other will come to grips with specific suggestions will emerge from that process. But I remind you that from the area of nuclear armaments to space to chemical warfare to confidence-building measures to nuclear tests sites, there is a wide array of substantive proposals -- deeds, if you will -- that the United States, the President has put on the table for the consideration of the Soviet Union.

Q Mr. Secretary, is it fair to sum up by saying that the two men spoke forcefully about their known positions, and that nothing is really likely to come in any concrete fashion until after the election?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, that wouldn't be my summary, no. I don't know just when further discussions may take place.

Q What about the first part?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, you caught me so much at the end, that you'll have to repeat the first part -- but I'll think I'll stand on a summary. I've been trying to summarize in the brief statement I made in the beginning and in response to your questions.

Q Did the President raise human rights?

Q Do you think the President's attitude about the Soviets has changed at all as a result of his personal meeting with Mr. Gromyko? He's been pretty hardline toward the Soviets in the past.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, the President has consistently had a -- a set of ideas that have guided his policy. And they've really been pretty consistent throughout his Presidency. He has, from the beginning, insisted that we have to be realistic about the differences between our systems and other aspects of Soviet behavior. He has, from the beginning, been consistent in saying that we must be -- build our strength, our military, our economic, our spirit -- and he has said from the beginning that we also must be ready to negotiate. And there is an interplay among those three things, and that remains the case today. And I don't think the President has changed at all during the course of this period. Right now, particularly given the fact that many of the problems that were present at the start of his administration have been dealt with, or are in the process of being dealt with, certainly there is a great emphasis on the importance of negotiation about the many overriding issues that are before us.

Q Mr. Secretary --

Q Did the President raise human rights in any fashion to the Foreign Minister?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Yes.

Q How did he do that?

Q Question, sir?

Q What was the question?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well the President -- the question was: Did the President raise human rights? -- and the answer is: Yes, he did, certainly. And I think, again, the President has said from the beginning that in all meetings with the Soviet Union, this subject will be raised; and he did so.

Q Sakharov?

Q Can you tell us what he said -- can you elaborate in any way?



SECRETARY SHULTZ: No, I think it -- I just will --

Q Sakharov?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: -- be glad to give you subjects that were talked about, but as to the content individually --

Q Sakharov?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: -- I'm not going to give the names that he mentioned or anything of that kind.

Q Mr. Shultz, do you think that this meeting will help President Reagan for his reelection? (Laughter.)

Q Ahhhhhh. (Laughter.)

Q Now there's an interesting question --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I have no idea. (Laughter.) That's not my field. From the standpoint of the -- but from the standpoint of this meeting, it is a meeting that the President and I started talking about some time ago. The President has thought about the substance of it very carefully -- undertook it in the spirit of a person, a human being who is President of the United States and who is dealing, as he deals with the Soviet Union, with matters of overriding importance. So, it was, as I've said, a very serious, businesslike but intense meeting dominated by important substance throughout.

Q Mr. Secretary --

Q Mr. Secretary --

MR. SPEAKES: Let's take George and --

Q Did this meeting --

MR. SPEAKES: -- Maureen and Helen and close there.

Q Did this meeting cover --

MR. SPEAKES: George.

Q Would you list the subjects? Just list the subjects that they covered.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, a great deal of the time was spent, at the beginning, on stating views and having discussion of these overriding issues of the nature of our relationship, where is it heading, the importance of dealing with the nuclear threat and things of that kind. So, it was, in a sense, philosophical, but, nevertheless, connected to overriding issues. And both men discussed that, and I don't recall just how much time, in total, was spent on that.

There was a considerable amount of time spent discussing, in particular, but not negotiating about, just discussing the problems of nuclear weapons and what could be done about them.

There was some discussion of regional issues and particularly the Iran-Iraq situation, the situation in Lebanon and the Palestinian issues. So, those were basically the kinds of topics covered. And, as I said earlier, the President explicitly did bring up the problems of human rights concerns.

Q Was there anything on which they agreed and, if so, could you itemize?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, I said that they agreed to keep in touch. And that was the --

Q Was that it, in terms of --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: -- the end point. And I think that, at the end of an intense discussion like this, it's not the sort of thing where you agree, "All right. We'll do X, Y and Z." But rather that an effort has been made, on both sides, I'm sure, I know from the President's side, to get across, on a very personal level, his own convictions and his own views and depth of feeling about this subject. And, at least from my perspective, he did a very good job of it.

Q Why did he want to talk to Gromyko alone? And what -- Do you think it was to convey this personal view of his? Over and beyond the official --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: He had some things -- points that he wanted to make to Mr. Gromyko alone, and he did it that way because he felt that just two individuals, all by themselves in a room, even though the others of us who were sitting around were not too numerous, nevertheless, there's something about a close one-to-one statement that perhaps carries special weight. And so he had some things that he wanted to give that weight to.

THE PRESS: Thank you.



# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE

October 11, 1984  
NO. 214



REMARKS BY  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
AT  
LUNCHEON IN HONOR OF  
LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES  
DAG HAMMARSKJOLD ROOM, U.N. PLAZA HOTEL  
NEW YORK CITY  
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1984

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Your Excellencies, Fellow Ministers, Ladies and Gentlemen: We are simultaneously trying to establish and break tradition about when statements should be given, and we have been varying between before anybody has anything to eat, after everybody has had more than they need to eat, or while we're in the course of having our luncheon, and we're opting for the third tradition now.

But we did want to take the occasion of gathering here, of course, in part, to have a social occasion and greeting of each other and the time for conversation around the table or over cocktails, but also to make a comment or two about problems that we share and that we all feel are of great importance.

I think that meetings like this one, and the many others that we have been having, are quite appropriate for us here in the United States because rarely in our history have the interests in our own hemisphere been higher than they are right now.

There is one development that I think I especially want to emphasize, and then we have some problems that I would like to talk about, and perhaps in the process encourage everyone around the tables to address these points.

First, we see a great contrast with what many assume to be the case for too long. Namely, that in order to get something done and to have a reasonable life, you had to have iron rule, authoritarian rule. And what we are seeing in our hemisphere is the emergence on a very wide scale of a strong pattern of democracy.

Today, over 90 percent of the people in our hemisphere live under conditions of democracy or of countries who are very far advanced in a process moving toward democracy.

In the past four years, 150 million Latin and Caribbean voters have cast ballots in 33 elections in 24 countries.

**For further information contact:**

That is more than in any previous four years in the history of the new world.

I believe that these celebrations of democracy reflect the determination of people throughout the Americas to reject extremist solutions of the left or the right, and they reflect positively an increasing sense of common political destiny among democratic elements throughout our hemisphere.

This development is coming just as our democracies, those that have been around a while and those that are fledgling democracies, are being tested; sometimes sorely tested by the problems of externally-backed subversion on the one hand and by severe economic and financial difficulties on the other. So we have an important development and move toward freedom being tested and challenged. And so it is an important moment because we must all be determined to face up to these challenges and to prevail.

Subversion typically claims to have as its purpose the correction of social wrongs and of miseries of underdevelopment. The irony is that the record shows clearly that totalitarian regimes offer no model for dealing with the problems of development and growth nor of righting social wrongs.

To the contrary, they promote their own political elites and provide only the barest of necessities to people, and often the changes that they bring are wrought at tremendous costs in personal freedom.

The nations of this hemisphere have the strength and resolve to resist subversion. Democracies can provide for their people, and do under even the difficult circumstances that we have today. They can defend themselves, if necessary, with arms but far preferably through negotiations.

We believe that the Contadora process represents an outstanding example of just this kind of process I've been describing. It can lead to a negotiated arrangement under which stability and peace and economic development are much more possible. We support that process. It has come a long way from zero through the identification and agreement on important principles to the development of operational characteristics to go with those principles. So there's been a great deal accomplished.

In our view, there are still things to do, to make this into something that will really work, but we believe that

tremendous strides have been taken and that process is perhaps close to achieving the kind of result we would like to see.

Of course, what we want -- what I know we all want -- is a comprehensive solution that will stand the test of time.

I think the resilience of democratic societies is also a source of strength in confronting the severe economic and financial problems that many countries face.

I know that in addressing these problems, all concerned want to act responsibly and with a determination to preserve the international system that has basically served so well in promoting, over our post-World War II period, growth and development.

No doubt, through the discussions that we have country-by-country and in broader fora can help make adjustments in a system that will promote growth more vigorously in the future.

At the same time, however, I would have to state my own view that our present problems do not represent a failure of the system at all. They represent, quite to the contrary, a failure to observe some of the basic tenets of the system.

No country, for example, can expect over an extended period to consume more than it produces, financing the difference by perpetual borrowing; just won't work.

Any country that is in the process of development finds that it wants resources from outside to help sustain that development. That is history, and it has worked. But at the same time history also teaches that if those outside resources come very, very heavily through borrowing, as distinct from equity, you get into serious difficulties. Not simply because of the on-balance in financial exposures that result from that, but also because -- with all due respect to the bankers sitting around the room here -- equity carries a lot more vigor than debt.

Equity brings a stake; equity brings knowledge of markets; equity cares; equity brings technology. Borrowing doesn't bring any of those things. So it is very important -- we all know this -- to have the right balance between debt and equity.

We know, too, that we live, and have for a long time, in a very international system. But that is more and more true as transportation and information condenses everything.

Walter Wriston, who is here, has, I think with great insight, pointed out that we are no longer on a gold standard or a dollar standard or an SDR standard; we're on an information standard. I think that is undoubtedly true not only on economic and financial matters but also in our diplomatic efforts.

See, Walt, you finally got through to me on that point.  
(Laughter)

We, in the United States, are determined to do our share and more than our share in this economic problem.

The U.S. now accounts for over 50 percent of all manufactured exports of the developing countries worldwide. In 1983, the United States market took over 90 percent of the worldwide growth in exports of manufactured products from developing countries. So we are the engine of growth.

Growth of U.S. import demand has been a major factor in the recovery of world trade, and the train is still picking up speed. During the first six months of 1984, Latin American exports to the United States are up 30 percent over the first half of last year.

Let me just give one concrete example. In 1981, Argentina, Mexico and Brazil had a combined trade deficit with the United States of \$4.4 billion. In 1983, those same three countries had a combined trade surplus with the United States of \$6.4 billion. That is a swing of almost \$11 billion for three countries. So we are doing our share, and I want to assure you that we intend to keep doing our share and help this hemisphere return to the kind of vigorous growth that it wants and needs.

Of course, each country can better solve its own problem in an atmosphere of growth in the world economy, but at the same time we have to come back around the circle and recognize that most fundamentally it must be up to each country to resolve its own problems for itself in its own way.

Let me just conclude by saying that from the standpoint of the United States, what we want is relationships among

countries and for ourselves based upon equity, based upon mutual respect and on the idea of peaceful settlement of disputes.

The brotherhood of democracy fosters such relations. So it's not surprising that our own warmest, most stable and balanced relationships are with fellow democracies.

Let me assure all of you that we will continue to be true to these values which have stood us and so many of you so well over such a long period of time.

Therefore, I salute the countries of this hemisphere, to the strengthening of our rich and diverse relationships and our common reverence for freedom in search for peace, stability and growth in the year ahead.

Thank you very much.

(Applause)



# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE



October 11, 1984  
NO. 215

CARL E. DILLERY SWORN IN  
AS U. S. AMBASSADOR TO  
FIJI, TONGA, TUVALU AND KIRIBATI  
October 5, 1984

Carl Edward Dillery, of Washington, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of counselor, was sworn in today as United States Ambassador to the nations of Fiji, Tonga, Tuvalu and Kiribati. He succeeds Fred J. Eckert.

Mr. Dillery had served since 1982 as director of the Office of UN Political Affairs, Bureau of International Organization Affairs.

Born in Seattle, Washington, on December 17, 1930, Mr. Dillery received a BA degree from Seattle Pacific College in 1953, and an MA from George Washington University in 1973. His foreign languages are French and Japanese.

Mr. Dillery joined the Foreign Service in 1955, and was assigned as a foreign affairs officer in the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs. From 1957 to 1958, he was a foreign affairs officer in Tokyo, and from 1958 to 1961 he held the same position in Kobe-Osaka. He returned to Washington in 1961 to become an international relations officer in the Bureau of Scientific and Technological Affairs.

After attending the University of California at Berkeley in 1965-66, Mr. Dillery became chief, economic section, in Brussels the following year. He later held assignments as province senior adviser for civil operations and revolutionary development support, Quang Ngai Province, Vietnam 1968-1969; was on detail as political officer, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Department of Defense, 1970-71; political officer, Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs, 1971-72; and student at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, 1972-73. Following his studies, he was named political-military officer and deputy political counselor, London, 1973-76.

In recent years, Mr. Dillery has served as deputy chief of mission, Nicosia, 1976-78; and deputy director, then director, Office of Southern European Affairs, 1978-82.

Mr. Dillery was an examiner, Washington Insurance Examining Bureau, Seattle, before joining the Foreign Service. He is a member of the International Institute for Strategic Studies, London.

Ambassador Dillery is married to the former Marita Lewis, and they have two sons, Edward L. and John D., and a daughter, Sara Hynes.

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE



October 12, 1984  
NO. 216

J. STAPLETON ROY SWORN IN AS  
U.S. AMBASSADOR TO SINGAPORE  
October 11, 1984

J. Stapleton Roy, of Pennsylvania, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of minister-counselor, was sworn in today as United States Ambassador to Singapore. He succeeds Harry E.T. Thayer. Mr. Roy had served since 1981 as deputy chief of mission, Bangkok.

Born on June 16, 1935 in Nanking, China, of American missionary parents, Mr. Roy received his BA from Princeton in 1956, where he majored in history; he also attended the University of Washington in Seattle from 1964-65, specializing in Mongolian studies.

Mr. Roy entered the Foreign Service in 1956. His assignments have included: Bureau of Intelligence and Research (1956-57); Chinese language training in Taichung (1958-59); political officer, Bangkok (1959-61); consular officer, Hong Kong (1962); and political officer, Taipei (1962-64).

From 1965 to 1968, Mr. Roy was an international relations officer, Bureau of European Affairs. He then was assigned to take Russian language studies at Garmisch, West Germany (1968-69). He became administrative officer in Moscow in 1969, and political officer, also in Moscow, in 1970. He returned to Washington in 1972 to become deputy director, Office of Soviet Union Affairs.

Mr. Roy later drew assignments to the National War College (1974-75); deputy director, Office of People's Republic of China and Mongolian Affairs (1975-78); deputy chief, US Liaison Office, Beijing (1978-79); and deputy chief of mission, also in Beijing (1979-81).

Mr. Roy has won the Department's Superior Honor Award (1977), and he was in a group that received a group Superior Honor Award (1980). He received a Presidential Pay Award in 1983. Mr. Roy is a member of the American Foreign Service Association, the Association for Asian Studies, the Mongolia Society, and Princeton-in-Asia.

Ambassador Roy is married to the former Elissandra Fiore, and they have three sons -- Andrew, David, and Anthony.



# PRESS

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE



October 12, 1984  
NO. 217

LUNCHEON REMARKS  
BY  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
IN HONOR OF  
THE GULF COOPERATION COUNCIL  
KURT WALDHEIM ROOM, UNITED NATIONS PLAZA HOTEL  
MONDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1984, 12:50 P.M.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: While they are starting to serve, we might follow the tradition of the working lunch, in part, but also something that I learned when we were honored in Washington by a visit from Oman. We got word before the luncheon that you thought it would be a good idea if we had whatever statements that were going to be made, made before lunch rather than after. Then, there wouldn't be any confusion about drinking toasts or anything like that.

So I'll follow that tradition and just say, Highnesses and Excellencies and very distinguished guests, how great a pleasure it is for me to be the host at this gathering. I am the first Secretary of State to meet with this group, which is a young and important regional organization.

We meet here at the time of the U.N. General Assembly, and I would just mention in passing that we hope that constructive things happen in this Assembly and at the U.N., both at the U.N. and around the edges of it. That is what we are going to work for. There is always some tendency at the U.N. for resolutions to be offered that in one way or another are aimed at the United States or aimed at Israel, and we think on the whole those tend to be counter-productive. They don't really produce anything although they do seem to get the juices flowing in a very strong way, so I just mention that in passing.

I think it's appropriate to certainly recognize that the purpose of the Gulf Cooperation Council is social advance, economic advance, and at the same time, as in so many areas of the world we find, those grand objectives and fundamental objectives can't take place unless there is reasonable stability and security, and so everywhere we have to give attention to those concerns.

As I look at your concerns and ours, it's quite clear that

there are great parallels. We share your concern about the Iran-Iraq war, and we would like to see that bloodiest of confrontations anywhere in the world right now ended.

We share your concern about the tanker war in the Gulf, and we have tried in our way to be helpful in doing something about it and in working with you. I might say that it seems to have its repercussions over in the Red Sea. And there, too, we share your concerns, and I recognize that is not a Gulf concern as such.

We share your view of the need for withdrawal from Lebanon and stability in Lebanon. While those who suffer the agonies of Lebanon are many, certainly the United States feels those agonies in the most poignant way, particularly right now.

We share your concern about the invasion of Afghanistan, and we share your concern for the aspirations of the Palestinian people; and we recognize fully the importance of trying to do something about that issue and the basic Arab-Israeli issues and disputes.

So these are a broad matter of problems that we see, and we know that you see them. In terms of, at least, most aspects of the objectives involved, we believe that we are on the same track you are and we want to work collaboratively with you.

Ambassador Murphy has been on an exploratory trip in the region here recently. He reports, insofar as our problems are concerned, that there is undoubtedly a long way to go before we can get what we all would like to see there, but that there is now no question about the fact that Israel wants to withdraw as promptly as it can; that it makes that withdrawal not contingent on Syrian withdrawal, as at one time had been the case; and that both Israel and Syria, as well as Lebanon, are talking in terms of an expanded UNIFIL mandate, although just what that means and what role it would play is part of the problem here.

But, at any rate, all of these things represent advances, and to some extent shifts in principle, you might say, that represent important things to get over.

I want to assure you, from the standpoint of the United States, of the importance we attach to your region and our intention to stay fully engaged in trying to be as helpful as we can in resolving these great problems that mean a great deal to us as well as to you.

We hope that the region can have the kind of stability and security that does lend itself to economic and social advance, and I'm sure that we all share that.

May I just say, may God bless our efforts to achieve a greater measure of peace and stability.

Again, I thank you deeply for joining me here, and I look forward to working with each of you in the time to come.

(Applause)

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE



October 12, 1984  
NO. 218

REMARKS BY  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
AT  
LUNCHEON IN HONOR OF  
THE ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN NATIONS  
KURT WALDHEIM ROOM, U.N. PLAZA HOTEL  
NEW YORK CITY  
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1984

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Foreign Minister Tengku Rithauddeen, other ASEAN colleagues, and distinguished Ambassadors.

Let me extend a special warm welcome to Prince Mohamed, representing ASEAN's newest member, and to Brunei's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, who join us on this occasion for the first time.

I wish to compliment our colleague, Foreign Minister Mochtar, and his government for his warm hospitality and outstanding strong leadership of the ASEAN post-ministerial consultations in Jakarta last July. Combined with my very useful bilateral visits to Kuala Lumpur and Singapore, the Jakarta consultations were a highlight of my summer. As always, I found our meetings stimulating and very productive.

Looking back over the last four years of the Reagan Administration, it is important to note how relations between ASEAN and the United States have become both broader and deeper. This Administration has clearly demonstrated that the United States is committed to security and peace in Asia. Our close cooperation with ASEAN and its member states attests to the United States' commitment to the security and peace of Southeast Asia.

TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES WITH RECORDING EQUIPMENT. PORTION OF REMARKS OMITTED.)

**For further information contact:**



SECRETARY SHULTZ: (In progress) I'd like to make a comment on a part of the President's speech that has raised some questions, and just to be sure that it is clearly understood.

The President said that the idea of spheres of influence died a long time ago; it doesn't have any place in this world. He referred to the fact that we do believe in negotiations, and we think they can work. He gave a couple of examples of agreements that have worked, such as the Austrian State Treaty and Berlin Accords.

Insofar as our relations with the Soviet Union are concerned, we think it's essential to be very realistic about them, to be strong in every way, including with our friends, and to be ready for a reasonable dialogue if one can take place.

We think it's ridiculous to get in the position of needing an agreement or some sort of end treaty, but if a good one can emerge, well, so be it.

The President did say that we would be prepared to have with the Soviets a discussion of developments in various parts of the world -- regional discussions -- and we're certainly prepared to do that. That doesn't mean at all that we think that we want to sit down with the Soviet Union and try to make agreements about what's going to happen in different parts of the world. That's not in question even remotely.

On the other hand, we think if it were to come off right, it is conceivable to have some benefit from information-sharing. It is conceivable to have some

benefit in certain areas where we find ourselves juxtaposed in damage control, and there may be some examples where positive collaboration would be beneficial.

For example, in the Lebanon situation it is clear that UNIFIL will play some role in whatever happens, and both we and the Soviet Union have some say about that. So having some discussion with them about their attitude toward it is a useful thing to do in a positive sense.

That's the sort of thing that the President had in mind, and I wanted to be sure that everybody was clear about that.

But let me just say that we welcome you here in the spirit of the dialogue that you all have initiated, and in which we have felt a privilege to take part. We look forward to those sessions; we think they're fruitful.

We thought your initiative, incidentally, on the Pacific Basin, Pacific Rim, and putting it in terms of the human resources, which is a good subject, was an extremely worthwhile thing to do. We're supporting that with our efforts, and we've taken some steps since the meeting to beef up our capability to interact on that.

So, altogether, we look upon our relationships with you collectively and individually to be of great importance, to be basically strong and good. Naturally we have problems, and we address the problems and try to work them out.

So I welcome you and am very pleased to have you sitting with us. After we get a chance to have a little something to eat, I'll try to start up some general table conversation.

(Applause)

# PRESS

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE



October 12, 1984

NO. 219

REMARKS BY  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
AT  
LUNCHEON IN HONOR OF  
THE MEMBERS OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY  
DAG HAMMARSKJOLD ROOM, U.N. PLAZA HOTEL  
NEW YORK CITY  
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1984

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Your Excellencies, Foreign Ministers, ladies and gentlemen. We are going to start a new tradition, to go with the tradition of this luncheon, by having the statements that we have to make first while you're having your salmon, in the interest of being sure everybody has something to talk about.

For me, this opportunity to meet with my colleagues from the member states of the Organization of African Unity is a highlight of the United Nations General Assembly. I welcome you and trust that the productive dialogues which exist between my nation and yours will continue, here in New York and in our respective capitals.

The United States remains committed to the principles embodied in the Organization of African Unity's charter. We respect that charter and the efforts of African states to uphold it. Our policy toward Africa is designed to promote the political independence, regional security and economic well-being of the continent.

Last year, when I addressed this same gathering, I recognized that Africa is facing a severe economic crisis. That awareness has grown in recent months, not only in Africa and in this country, but in the world at large. Through our programs of bilateral and multilateral assistance, and through our developmental and emergency relief projects, we seek to place the United States among the most helpful members of the world community in responding to Africa's needs.

We do not have the answers to all of Africa's economic problems. The answers to many must come from Africa itself. Increasingly, we do hear African leaders urging their own governments and people to adopt new economic policies based on realistic assumptions about growth and human motivation.

**For further information contact:**

It is often difficult to change governmental policies, especially when the cure may, in the short term, often be as painful as the illness. It is for this reason that President Reagan has proposed to the American Congress a special Economic Policy Initiative for Africa.

In addition to our regular programs of bilateral aid, which amounted to over one billion dollars last year for Sub-Saharan Africa, the initiative will help a number of governments which need flexible and rapid assistance during periods of structural readjustment in policy change.

We recognize that agriculture is at the heart of the African economic crisis, and we are prepared to assist African nations in reversing the long-term decline in production.

Our economic policy initiative now before Congress is designed to address precisely this question. This is a slow process, however, and in the short run we will continue to assist African countries in meeting their emergency food needs caused by drought and other natural disasters.

Over the past 12 months, the U.S. has provided 505,000 metric tons of emergency food, valued at about \$175 million, to about 30 African countries. It is a sad fact that the outlook on rainfall and harvests for the coming year may be even worse than last year in some parts of the continent. We are prepared to do still more in provision of emergency food assistance if it is needed in the coming year. The President and I are determined on this issue and our Administrator of AID, Peter McPherson, is forming a task force to define the scope of the emergency and shape our response.

Congress fully supports this priority on a bipartisan basis. While it is too soon to predict a quantitative level of the U.S. effort, it will be still greater than last year's.

Just as we are committed to working with African states to improve the economic climate of the continent, we are actively involved in supporting the overwhelming majority of African nations that wish to strengthen regional security and bring an end to cross-border violence. This is most amply demonstrated in our negotiating effort in southern Africa.



Our goals in that region remain the independence of Namibia, under the terms of U.N. Security Resolution 435, a cessation of armed hostility across borders of states of the area, and progress toward racial and political justice in South Africa itself.

Recent developments in South Africa serve to remind us all of some basic values and interests we share. My government does believe that change is occurring in South Africa. Such change must start somewhere. We have not condemned these limited constitutional moves, because we believe they can represent a beginning. But at the same time we have stated clearly that we cannot endorse changes that do not address the basic problem.

Americans speak with one voice on apartheid, a form of legally entrenched racial domination that denies the basic right of citizenship to the majority of South Africans. Change addressing this issue must come through a process of negotiation.

Our position on that point has been heard loud and clear across the political spectrum in South Africa. The interests of South Africans of all races -- and of all in this room -- will be damaged if the process of constructive change fails in that important country.

The people of southern Africa themselves must find the solutions to the problems that afflict them, but the United States can be, and has been, of service in promoting negotiations based on the principle of mutual respect for the OAU principle, of respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The agreement providing for withdrawal of South African troops from Angola and the Nkomati Accord between Mozambique and South Africa are two important steps which we believe will bring progress toward the goals I have outlined. In sum, while the situation in southern Africa is not satisfactory, it is not without hope.

Elsewhere in Africa, we have played a quiet but active role in support of negotiations and political restraint among neighbors in the Horn of Africa. Our diplomacy can only succeed if African governments themselves wish to encourage political solutions. We have made that point clear to all.

In another part of Africa, the recent Franco-Libyan agreement on Chad could, if faithfully implemented -- and

it must be monitored carefully -- end a sad period of foreign aggression and international strife, and open the way for stability and development in that country. These are goals we have long supported.

Finally, distinguished guests, let me underscore once again the importance which my government attaches to our joint deliberations at the U.N. General Assembly.

This is a forum for mankind, and we take our role and tasks here seriously, as I am sure you do. The past year has witnessed the growth of an even greater interest on the part of the American public and Congress in the activities of the United Nations and its associated organizations.

Votes in the General Assembly are often the most visible reflection of other nations' international postures. Many Americans, including me, were troubled by the fact that the United States was the only major country which several resolutions of the 38th General Assembly singled out for criticism by name. We are a mature nation and can accept, and sometimes even welcome, constructive criticism. But the American public has difficulty understanding, as I am sure the publics of your countries would have, why we are falsely accused and unfairly chastised.

Let me conclude by stating that my government is dedicated to developing mature and equal relations with the members of the OAU. We expect to deal with OAU member states on the basis of candor. I am convinced that what unites us -- our shared ideals, our expectations for the well-being of our own people, and our hopes for a peaceful world -- far outweigh any possible differences, real or perceived, over tactics which would lead to these goals.

Therefore, I salute the Organization of African Unity, its member states, and the strengthening of American-African relations.

Thank you.

(Applause)

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE



October 12, 1984  
NO. 220

## PROTOCOL EXTENDING THE CONVENTION ON CONSERVATION OF NORTH PACIFIC FUR SEALS

A Protocol extending the North Pacific Fur Seal Convention for four years was signed October 12 by Canada, Japan, the United States and the Soviet Union. These four countries are signatories to this 1957 agreement designed to protect and manage fur seals in the Pacific Ocean. This Convention and its 1911 predecessor, which bans seal hunting at sea, has resulted in the rebuilding of seal herds, which were seriously depleted at the turn of the century. The herd had fallen to levels around 300,000, and now are estimated at around 1.2 million.

The four countries also signed a statement of concern over several issues affecting the fur seal population. The statement calls for additional research and enforcement in the area of net entanglement, which is thought to be responsible for the recent downward trend in the seal population. It also notes the need for flexibility in setting harvest levels when emergency situations warrant and binds members to review the Convention within two years to see if modifications are necessary.

The Protocol will now be sent to the Senate for its advice and consent. A draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is available, and a final EIS is being prepared.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Raymond Arnaudo 632-5690

**For further information contact:**

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE



October 15, 1984  
NO. 221

PC NO. 19

PRESS CONFERENCE  
BY  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK  
September 24, 1984

MR. SPEAKES: Let me have your attention, please.  
Secretary Shultz is here, on the record, available for cameras, and he will brief on the last bilateral with Prince Sihanouk.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: In addition to his address to the United Nations and his courtesy calls on the Secretary General and the President of the Assembly, the President had a meeting with Prince Sihanouk and Prime Minister Son Sann. He listened to their descriptions and analysis of what is taking place in Cambodia -- the Soviet presence, directly and indirectly; the attitudes of the people of Cambodia toward it; and the progress being made in the resistance and by the forces of democratic Kampuchea.

And the President expressed his support for what they're doing and recalled to them that we are working and supporting the ASEAN efforts as well as providing a substantial flow of humanitarian assistance for refugee aid and, of course, a major security assistance program with Thailand.

And it was a very cordial and useful meeting.

Q Mr. Secretary, is the Murphy mission now a full-scale, expanded inquiry into resuming the possibility of -- on the Rumsfeld idea? And also, have you received yet the report from Murphy on the bombing?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: The Murphy mission hasn't changed from last night when I described it to you. He was sent over there to head the team examining what happened in our Beirut tragedy, and then we felt that since he was there, it would be useful to have him visit around in the area. And he went to Damascus, met with the Foreign Minister, with Mr. Haddam, and with President Assad, and he's now in Israel. And he will probably make some other visits around, but it isn't -- there isn't any special mission beyond that. But he is visiting around and finding out what people's views are, and we'll see.



Q How about his report on the Beirut bombing?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: The people with him were Ambassador Oakley, who is head of our counter-terrorism office, and Deputy Assistant Secretary Fields. Both of them will be getting into New York early this afternoon. I expect to meet with them about 2:00 p.m. this afternoon, along with Ambassador Spiers. And we will hear their report directly. And I haven't got that report yet. I expect to get it at 2:00 p.m. this afternoon.

Q Mr. Secretary --

Q Mr. Secretary, can you tell us, in the President's speech to the General Assembly, why he did not mention any of the Soviet violations of past agreements when he was listing those agreements, and why he, in the context of Afghanistan, did not talk about what the Soviets have been doing there?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, as far as Afghanistan is concerned, basically, the President stated our position on Afghanistan and reiterated it. It hasn't changed. And there it is. And I think the President's views about questions of keeping agreements are well-known.

The President was wanting to put forward an invitation to the Soviet Union based on a realistic appraisal always of what is going on in the world to try to work constructively with us. And that's what the intent of the speech was.

Q A deliberate intent, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: No, there was no deliberate intent to do anything except what I stated. You can't make every speech you've ever made over and over again or -- even by UN traditions, it would be too long.

Q Can you explain the umbrella -- the umbrella proposal for the nuclear arms control? Could you tell us how that might work?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: What the President put forward was an idea. What special shape it may take is something that we can readily work out if it turns out that the Soviet Union is interested in the idea. But the idea is that we ought to have some forum in which people who are working on the subject of arms control discuss the subject across the board and in a setting where one can look at the relationships between one type of negotiation and another, and in the process of doing that, help to keep the individual negotiations on the right track and to identify new areas more readily that might be negotiated out and give a kind of mandate for how that might be done -- that type of thing. So that what he is suggesting, in other words, is a more across -- a setting in which a more across-the-board discussion could take place than is so when you are discussing a particular aspect of the general field of arms control.

Q- Mr. Secretary, that goes to relate -- that goes to procedure. Do you see anything in the President's speech that suggests any substantive change in any of the positions the United States has taken in START, INF, MBFR -- any of the now dormant negotiations, or are you hoping that by changing the procedure, changing the venue, perhaps, you can revive those negotiations?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, the positions of the United States in a very wide array of arms control fora are forthcoming and have been described properly as positions that lend themselves to negotiation. And we're prepared for give-and-take in all of those different fora. And the President in all of the different ways that he expressed himself in his address, and I'm sure as he meets individually with Foreign Minister Gromyko, will be emphasizing that and urging that in one way or another we find a way to get at these issues.

Q -- stand corrected -- he's proposing two sets of institutionalized meetings here: one at sort of the expert level on a more or less regular basis; and, then, separately, including yourself, at the ministerial level?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: There are a number of proposals in the speech. I don't want to try to go through them because you've all read the speech. But, certainly, he has instructed me to take up with Foreign Minister Gromyko when I meet with him the regional issues so-called and problems of conflict in different areas of the world that both the Soviet Union and ourselves are concerned about and see if we can't develop some method of discussing them systematically and usefully.

And, of course, I've done that from time to time with the Foreign Minister, but maybe we can do it on a more extensive scale to see a possible pattern of development of extending those consultations by bringing in relevant people, such as, for example, in Southern Africa, Assistant Secretary Crocker with a counterpart -- that kind of thing.

Then, there is the suggestion in there of contacts at a ministerial level across a broad range of subjects. I discussed that yesterday in response to a question. There's nothing more to add on that. And, then, there is the proposal for military discussions which, we think, might have the benefit -- this was, interestingly enough, a suggestion that came from the Pentagon -- benefit of military-to-military contacts and exchange of information with the kind of usefulness that, we think, goes with confidence-building measures such as notification of exercises and observation of exercises and things of that kind.



Q On the regional question, do you mean to suggest that you would like to invite the Soviets in to talk about the Middle East?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, you have a way of putting things provocatively. (Laughter.) I would think that the --

Q Thank you. (Laughter.)

SECRETARY SHULTZ: There are a lot of issues in the Middle East, and we have views about them, and they have views about them, and it might be helpful to exchange views. And, at least in certain areas where there is great tension -- such as in the Iran-Iraq war, and such as there have been from time to time between Syria and Israel -- just to let the Soviet Union know what we are thinking and what we are doing, and perhaps hear from them. So, there are all sorts of ways in which such discussions could be useful, and perhaps, to begin with, discussions that are aimed at damage control of one kind or another.

Q Do you --

Q Mr. Secretary --

Q -- excuse me -- follow up -- Mr. Secretary, do you mean to invite them into any kind of negotiations in the Middle East -- this fall?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I tried to describe what we had in mind.

Q So then -- you're cancelling out what I'm suggesting?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I don't have anything there to cancel out. (Laughter.)

Q Mr. Secretary, do we have any reason to believe that the Soviets, beyond their acceptance of these invitations, are ready to take a different approach to negotiating on any of this wide array of matters? Is there anything other than optimism on our part, I guess is --

Q Question?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Is there anything other than sheer optimism -- (Laughter.) -- to lead us to think that the Soviet Union might be interested in any of this -- have I summarized your question fairly?

Q You did better than I did. (Laughter.)

SECRETARY SHULTZ: The President said that, given the importance of this relationship, it is essential for us to try, and try again -- I think those were his words. And, what the President has been doing here is to put forward our good intentions, our willingness to engage, to accompany it with references to a lot of wide-ranging content that is there. So it isn't just a generalization. And to invite them to engage with us. And we believe that it's important to do that, and to do it again and again, as the President said. And we hope that one day the Soviets will decide to join us. Whether they do now or later, we'll still be there.

Q Mr. Secretary, when you said the President has instructed you to bring up the regional issues in your talks with Mr. Gromyko later this week, does that mean that you will not in those talks be dealing with the other questions the President raised on arms control fora and the umbrella for arms control?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I don't know why -- no. There's certainly no inference that, by referring to regional issues, that that's the only issue that we would be willing to discuss. To the contrary, we will, I'm sure, have a wide-ranging discussion as we always do. We have a full agenda of matters that we want to talk about -- arms control issues, regional issues, bilateral issues, and, always, in my discussions with the Soviet Union, I bring up problems of human rights.

Q Mr. Secretary --

Q Mr. Secretary, do you think it's likely --

Q -- you talk about the fact that --

MR. SPEAKES: Last question.

Q -- that there's no point in repeating the same speeches over and over again, but we did all notice the lack of any criticism at all of the Soviet Union today, and a generally more conciliatory tone. To what degree is all of that the result of some policy analysis in the administration that this is a more opportune time to take this tack, and to what degree is it a result of the election being 43 days away?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, I think if you examine what the President said last January in a major address confined solely to U.S.-Soviet relations, you'll find the same basic themes as you see in his speech today. And if you think back through the history of the Reagan administration, there is a long span of proposals in various areas of the relationship -- most prominently arms control because that gets so much attention -- so that by this time there is the widest array of proposals in various areas of arms control on the table than has been the case for a great many years. So, I think the President's speech here is a part of the continuity of his thinking.

And he is taking the occasion, particularly with Foreign Minister Gromyko here, to try to put the constructive and positive and forward-looking opportunities forward in the effort to emphasize the importance that he attaches to moving in a more constructive relationship with this U.S.-Soviet situation and toward trying always to advance the objectives of peace, which, of course, is something that we all seek and pray for.

Q And what about the election, sir?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, I talk to the President about foreign policy problems all the time, and -- when is that election, anyway? I don't think it has any bearing on this. Really, I don't.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE



October 15, 1984  
NO. 222

REMARKS BY  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
UPON ARRIVAL  
EL SALVADOR, SAN SALVADOR  
October 10, 1984

Mr. Minister, thank you so much for your greeting. It is very generous of you to come out here to the airport to greet me and my wife along with your wife. It is an act of friendship that I deeply appreciate.

Mr. Minister, you referred to momentous events, and I want to read to you a statement that President Reagan has just made within the hour.

He said: "I congratulate President Duarte for his great courage and foresight. His offer Monday to sit down next week with the guerrillas, without preconditions and without arms, to discuss their participation in the democratic system in El Salvador is an action of statesmanship. I applaud his leadership and support his decision. It appears as though the guerrillas have accepted President Duarte's offer. If only the 'comandantes' in Nicaragua would make the same offer to resistance forces there, we would all be much closer to peace in Central America."

So we are here at the time of momentous events in the history of this republic. President Duarte has offered to travel to La Palma to meet without preconditions and without arms the guerrillas who have plagued this country. This is an act of great courage taken in pursuit of peace and national reconciliation. His initiative has our unqualified support. President Duarte has demonstrated that his purpose is selfless; his cause is the future of his country and in the service of that cause he has shown that he is prepared to take great risks.

Mr. Minister, we have every reason to rejoice in the course of events in this nation. The current situation contrasts dramatically

with the situation which prevailed in 1982 and I think back to the time when I first became Secretary of State. Two years ago many still doubted that democracy had a future in Central America, and some even thought communism was the wave of the future. Today, thinking citizens in my own country and around the world have seen in El Salvador what hard work and a dedication to democratic ideals can accomplish.

President Duarte has been elected the constitutional president of all Salvadorans in the most open and honest elections in Salvadoran history, I might say, with a turnout that would be startling if it occurred in the United States. General Vides Casanova has brought new standards of probity and professionalism to the armed forces and security organizations.

Today, no one disputes the progress that has been achieved and, although many hurdles remain, this is a moment of great promise and you have shown the initiative, the will, and the courage to prevail. Through democracy, justice, and the tenacity of courageous patriots you have achieved what few thought possible and you have our admiration and support as you move forward toward the most difficult but attainable goal -- a lasting peace for El Salvador.

Mr. Minister, I look forward very much to my talks with you and President Duarte.

\*\*\*\*\*



# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE



October 15, 1984  
NO. 223

STATEMENT BY  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
UPON ARRIVAL  
PANAMA CITY, PANAMA  
October 10, 1984

On behalf of President Reagan and of the people of the United States, I am happy to be here in Panama to witness the inauguration of Dr. Barletta as Panama's President. My pleasure is all the greater because President-elect Barletta is a long-time and respected friend. His inauguration offers to Panamanians of all political persuasions a new opportunity for progress and national development.

We intend to work closely with Dr. Barletta as he strives to strengthen the democratic process at home, to address Panama's economic needs, and to continue Panama's contributions to the search for peace throughout Central America.

The destinies of our two countries have long been bound together. Having just successfully passed the five year mark laid down in the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977, we can take pride in the enduring relationship that has developed over the years between our peoples. We are partners in operating a canal that is a vital link in our international transportation network. We are two neighbors who have shown the world that we can successfully resolve the most complicated and important of issues by means of skillful negotiation and full implementation of agreements.

For a region troubled by conflict and violence, this message, negotiations work, is an important message. Only serious and thorough negotiations protecting the fundamental interests of all the parties involved will bring genuine and abiding peace to Central America. As the founding host of what is now known as the Contadora



Process, Panama has played a central role in efforts to achieve a strong and abiding settlement. We support the efforts of Panama and its colleagues. We are confident that, over time, regional peace and development can be achieved by democratic means and by cooperation in the defense of democracy.

Again, it is with a sense of personal warmth and friendship that I look forward to witness the inauguration of Dr. Barletta.

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE



October 15, 1984  
NO. 224

INTERVIEW OF  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
ON NBC  
"TODAY SHOW"  
BY  
BRYANT GUMBEL  
October 15, 1984

BRYANT GUMBEL: Secretary of State George Shultz returned this weekend from Central America and talks on a number of issues including the peace talks in El Salvador, next month's elections in Nicaragua, and also the Contadora peace process. Secretary Shultz joins us this morning from our studios in Washington. Good morning Mr. Secretary, thank you for joining us.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Good morning.

QUESTION: Realistically, what are your hopes for these talks in La Palma today?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, they get a process really rolling. Of course, I can't say what the guerrillas will do by way of response; but I'm sure that President Duarte, as a genuine man of peace, will be trying in every way he can, consistently with the democratic process, to draw them into Salvadoran society.

QUESTION: Your department is said to be comfortable with the Duarte decision. I'm wondering, are there limits to that comfort with the Duarte initiative, or has he a free hand? And will you support him in whatever he chooses to do?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, President Reagan has given President Duarte his wholehearted support in this effort for peace. And President Duarte has very well defined what his objectives are, and we support him in those objectives.

QUESTION: Are you at all concerned that he'll make concessions to the rebels?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, he will talk about safety. He will talk about the democratic processes. He will try to organize, I'm sure ways in which they can safely come into the society. He's very clear that anything that happens has to be within the framework of the Salvadoran constitution. They are being invited into the political process.

QUESTION: Aside from consultation, do you see the U.S. with any role to play at all in these talks?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, we are there. We have given strong support to the movement in El Salvador that has brought the situation to the present point. The President's program, you'll remember, consistently has been: Number one, political reform -- the rule of law, democracy. Out of that came President Duarte. Number two, economic development, which we have been strongly supporting there. Number three, a security shield so that these developments could take place, and so that the guerrillas would see that there is no way that they could get their way by force. And all of that has set the background for this effort by President Duarte, and I hope very much that it succeeds. And we want to help him.

QUESTION: So you think the President's policy has brought about this change of tactics by the guerrillas to agree to talk?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, President Duarte has taken a very bold initiative, and I might say a personal risk for peace. And we support him.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, what's the downside to this Duarte initiative?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Of course, the man is risking his life; but he is a man of faith, and he is proceeding on that basis. The negotiations themselves, if they do take place and continue, obviously are going to have some hard points in them. But I think that peace is worth this kind of effort.

QUESTION: I ask about the downside because you have to be a bit concerned that these talks bestow legitimacy on rebels who might not otherwise have that.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: The talks are by way of saying to them: You have been stirring up all kinds of trouble -- blowing up bridges, causing damage to the economy. Now, you're not going to win that way; you're going to lose that way. And the Salvadoran Armed Forces have been getting increasingly strong.

And he's saying to them: You're Salvadorans. Come into the society. Work within the framework of the democratic process and let's all try to get ahead. It seems to me that's just the right thing to do.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, in the time remaining, I'd like to talk a little bit about Nicaragua. After Managuan officials accepted an early draft of the Contadora peace plan, Washington found it flawed. In what ways would you like that peace plan amended?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, it's not so much that we found it flawed, but others in the area found it flawed. And what's wrong with it is basically two things: First, that the various elements that are treated in the Contadora process don't take place simultaneously under the current proposed treaty -- that one lags the other. And when you're trying to do things, you have to get things that go into effect at the same time. And, second, the provisions for verification are not sufficiently spelled out so that you know they will genuinely go into effect. Now, the importance of that is dramatized right now by what's going on in Nicaragua. The Nicaraguans have said that they want to have an open and genuine election. And in the face of that, they have said, as an example, that there will be freedom of assembly. But what happens when a credible candidate goes in Nicaragua and holds a rally? If a bunch of people show up, the government breaks it up. So you have to say to yourself that verification and seeing that things that are agreed to are actually carried out is very, very important.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*

# PRESS

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE



October 16, 1984  
NO. 225

PC NO. 20

JOINT PRESS CONFERENCE BY  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
AND THE HONORABLE JOSE NAPOLEON DUARTE  
PRESIDENT OF EL SALVADOR  
AT CASA PRESIDENCIAL  
SAN SALVADOR, EL SALVADOR  
OCTOBER 10, 1984

QUESTION: What are the terms or objectives of the La Palma meeting next week?

PRESIDENT DUARTE: First of all, it is to present the guerrillas with an opportunity to incorporate themselves into the democratic process, according to the constitution. This, and I want to make sure that everybody understands, has nothing to do with the participation of power, because power belongs to the people and only through a democratic electoral process is there a method to obtain power, not through guns and violence. This has to be very clearly understood.

Second, I guarantee personally -- and I have ordered the commander of the region to keep all the soldiers of the area in the fort -- that I will go without any protection, whether the guerrillas have arms or not, I will go to La Palma.

Third, I have declared since many months ago that I was ready to propose a solution on a national basis to discuss the problem in the country among and between Salvadorans with no one else involved. Therefore, on this basis, I have asked the Church, the Archbishop -- Monsignor Rivera Y Damas -- and Monsignor Rosas, to be the intermediaries for the arrangement of the details of this first meeting. For this first meeting, the guerrillas have asked that I



should go with the whole high command of the army. Let me say that I am the Commander General of the army. Therefore, according to the constitution, I represent the army. I will select the people who will accompany me in this discussion. They have also established certain other conditions -- for example, that they will select their own guerrillas and people representing the FDR, thinking that I will be against that. I am not against anybody who wants to participate, if they select them themselves, because that is also part of the democratic process.

Next is the participation of the press and the people. I have said that I will go by myself without any protection whatsoever. If you want to come along with me, I welcome you to come along. Also, if the people want to go to the town, the town is part of our territory and is open to everybody. I think I have given you the overall picture; specifically, I will ask the guerrilla people to make a total declaration whether they stand for violence or whether they stand for democracy. This is the main thing.

QUESTION: Who will be accompanying you from the high military command?

PRESIDENT DUARTE: I will select the people who will go along with me. I will make the decision later on.

QUESTION: Have you spoken with any of the guerrilla representatives, either here or in Mexico, before or after your decision to meet with them?

PRESIDENT DUARTE: No. I have not spoken with anybody. I have already asked the Bishop to do whatever is necessary to establish the contact.

QUESTION: Have there been contacts with the Bishop?

PRESIDENT DUARTE: I don't know.

QUESTION: Did the U.S. Government recommend this meeting with the guerrillas in La Palma, Mr. Shultz? And for Mr. Duarte, did the armed forces and the high military command know about your plans to meet with the guerrillas, and will there be military representatives?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: This decision, as far as the United States was concerned, was a decision of President Duarte's. We are delighted to support him in what he has decided to do because we think it is a move towards peace -- and peace, and stability and justice, is what we seek, just as he seeks it.

PRESIDENT DUARTE: In reply to the second part of your question, I want you to know that two days before I notified the Chief of Staff and the Minister of Defense that from that moment on they should begin informing the military commanders. The day of my speech, at 3 a.m., I called the Minister of Defense so that by 7 o'clock that morning he would be at my house to read it half an hour before he was scheduled to leave the country. In this way, my statement was passed on and I assumed the full responsibility of this decision.

In addition, I should tell you that besides the military, I also informed the political parties and the cabinet so that they too would know about this matter. The other part of the question, about whether the high command will be accompanying me to La Palma -- just as the guerrillas have asked in their proposal -- the answer is no.

I will choose my own personal representatives; it may be that among them military personnel will be present, but they will not go as members of the Armed Forces, only as my own advisors in these proposals, which are political proposals, and for which I assume the entire responsibility.

QUESTION: Do any preconditions exist in your talks with the guerrillas?

PRESIDENT DUARTE: As I have already explained, as President of the Republic, I cannot accept any conditions concerning the sovereignty of the country. Within this context, what I have done is given the appropriate orders to the Chief of Staff, General of the Joint Armed Forces, and to the Minister of Defense, to instruct Commander Colonel Ochoa so that his troops will remain in their barracks on that day and thus leave the area in total liberty so that I can go there without any protection.

QUESTION: Mr. Shultz, the United States has contributed enormously in El Salvador's fight to eradicate the guerrillas. The U.S. has also affirmed that there are problems of injustice. Therefore, will the United States put pressure on El Salvador to sanction the death (sic) squads which are still at large?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: President Duarte has spoken very clearly many times on the importance of a strong system of justice and law and against death squads and we will support President Duarte fully in his effort to improve and perfect the system of justice and to eliminate death squads.

(NOTE: Some questions have been paraphrased.)

\*\*\*\*\*

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE

October 16, 1984  
NO. 226



## CHARLES R. CARLISLE NAMED AMBASSADOR

The President on October 10 named Charles R. Carlisle Special Negotiator with the personal rank of Ambassador in the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, Department of State.

Mr. Carlisle was President of the Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., until September 15, 1984. He was a Vice President of St. Joe Minerals Corporation from 1974 to 1983.

Prior to joining St. Joe Minerals Mr. Carlisle was Chairman of the Lead-Zinc Producers Committee (1971-74), an assistant director of the Commodities Division of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in Geneva, Switzerland, (1970-71) and a Foreign Service Officer (1956-70). As a Foreign Service Officer he was assigned to the bureaus of Economic and Business Affairs and Inter-American Affairs in the Department of State and held economic and political assignments in Bogota, Colombia; Melbourne, Australia; and with the U.S. Mission to NATO in Paris and Brussels.

Mr. Carlisle graduated from the University of Cincinnati (BA, 1953) and the Kennedy School of Harvard University (MPA, 1963). He was born April 11, 1929, in Marietta, Ohio. Mr. Carlisle is married, has two children, and is a resident of Corinth, Vermont.

# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE

October 17, 1984  
NO. 227

AS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY



REMARKS BY  
THE HONORABLE KENNETH DAM  
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE  
ON BEHALF OF THE SECRETARY  
AT THE  
OPENING OF THE GRENADA DOCUMENTS COLLECTION  
NATIONAL ARCHIVES  
WASHINGTON, D.C.  
October 17, 1984

It will be one year ago next week that the United States joined forces with Grenada's neighbors to protect lives and restore civil order in answer to a call for help from the Governor General of Grenada.

To the relief and acclaim of virtually all Grenadians, these objectives were achieved in a matter of days. U.S. combat troops were withdrawn almost as quickly. Grenada today is back on a democratic path. The press is free. There are no political prisoners. Competitive political party activity is in full swing in preparation for national elections scheduled for December 3.

Grenadians know the meaning of these achievements, for they had to live through four-and-a-half years of Marxist-Leninist militarism and repression. Just what Grenadians went through and why is evident in the collection we are opening today. The documents it contains shine a pitilessly clear light on how the Soviets and their proxies operate in the Third World.

**For further information contact:**

This collection of secret treaties, state documents, memoranda, party papers, notebooks and even marginal comments makes clear that when U.S. and Caribbean forces found wooden crates labelled "Cuban Economic Office" but filled with ammunition, their find was typical of a pattern of communist deception and penetration that was far more developed than previously believed. For example, there were twice as many "workers", soldiers and "diplomats" from countries like Cuba, the Soviet Union and North Korea in Grenada as there were members of the governing New Jewel Movement. And then there is the simple but devastating truth spoken by the Soviet Ambassador when he told Grenadian officials that the Soviet Union gives away guns but never fertilizer.

Here at the National Archives, scholars, reporters and ordinary citizens from throughout the world will be able to examine with complete freedom the thousands of official and semi-official documents that chart Grenada's descent into a Marxist-Leninist proxy state and ultimately into chaos.

The collection is unique. And the lessons it contains are so compelling that if they are heeded mankind may be spared similar tragedies in the future.

.



# PRESS DEPARTMENT OF STATE

October 18, 1984  
NO. 228



REMARKS AND Q&A SESSION  
BY  
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
BEFORE THE  
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE INTERNATIONAL FORUM  
1615 H STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C.  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1984

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Thank you. I appreciate the introduction. And I do feel at home, having been a businessman and having studied and done research and worked on problems of business for a good part of my life, and having succeeded Allen Wallis as Dean of the Business School at Chicago. And now, having Allen working with me together in the State Department, you can see that we would feel at home in a setting like this.

I think that I can say from my own experience that business plays an important part in our foreign policy and that businessmen abroad, by and large, are among the best representatives we have. So in addition to the trade that's done -- I see somebody shaking their head. I'm right about that. (Laughter)

But it isn't only a question of doing business but the way in which people go about it and the constructive contribution to other countries that is made by the products that appear there under the American label.

By the same token, we benefit a great deal in this country from access to the world market and, in a sense, having that two-way flow of business. So, certainly, you contribute to our foreign policy goals. And as far as I'm concerned, one of our foreign policy goals is the promotion of business abroad. I felt that way right from the beginning.

One of the first -- actually, the first message that I sent out, after becoming Secretary of State, to all the posts was one saying that in my opinion one of the important jobs of our ambassadors and our embassy personnel is to be keeping track of what is going on from a business standpoint and being as helpful as we possibly can to American business firms operating abroad.

As far as the Department is concerned, of course, we work very closely with the Commerce Department that operates the Foreign Commercial Service. Of course, that takes place in the largest posts, but there are some 75 posts where the State Department basically still undertakes that responsibility because the posts are small and you can't have assignments there.

We try to make it clear in the Department that we expect that a high standard will be set for support for American business abroad. Our Office of Business and Export Affairs in our Economic Bureau works with the Commerce Department and is the State Department's main point of contact with the business community.

I notice when I travel abroad -- if I can, and usually I can have a meeting, a breakfast or a luncheon, or something like that, with the American business community in the particular city or country -- that our Foreign Service personnel seem to be well tapped in. There always is a little American community; it's a good thing. I sense a good pattern of communication, and I must say much better these days than I remember when I was in the government the last time back in the earlier 1970's. So we're all making headway in working together.

We try to have contacts with the business community in the State Department on a regular basis. I know Allen, who is sitting here -- Allen Wallis -- is the President's sherpa for the summit meetings. He is the one who organizes all the activity, and he meets with the business community before the summit meetings and tries to get your views, ideas and give some report back.

We work very closely with the Chamber to promote joint Chambers of Commerce between the United States and foreign countries. I personally host a conference for senior business executives. Dick McCormack -- who is also sitting here; Assistant Secretary for our Economic Bureau -- hosts two or three executive diplomat-type seminars every year

We are also very pleased that -- kind of reciprocally -- we get briefed by one of your Washington offices on such things as your international risk analysis procedures; you get a certain insight. I, of course, know this from my own business experience and my experience in serving on bank boards that people who have their money up and engage in risk analysis have a view about what's going on around the world. It's very much worth paying attention to.

And, of course, we're all familiar with your lobbying activities. The Chamber has taken on enough strength so that we want to have you on our side whenever there is a piece of legislation that we're sponsoring.

I would like to just speak a little bit about the importance of international trade to us. I know that topic is one that has been well worked over, and you think about it a great deal. But to a considerable extent, I think we can't emphasize too much how important international trade is to us; both imports and exports.

No doubt, primarily, you concentrate on exports. I think that it's clearly true that exports have never been more important to the American economy than they are now.

I'll just give you a few statistics. Last year, U.S. exports were nearly a quarter of a trillion dollars. With all the talk about our difficulties in exports -- and, of course, the high dollar makes for great difficulties -- it's nevertheless the case that the United States, as a country, is the largest exporting country in the world.

We export more than Japan does, more than -- you name it. So we must be doing something right even though we're doing some things that aren't right. That's over eight percent of our GNP and double the percentage of a decade ago.

Forty percent of our crop land is devoted to production for export. A third of the profit of American corporations operating at home and abroad comes from international transactions. And four out of five new American jobs created in the last five years were in export-related industries, even though 90 percent of American manufacturers do not export at all. It gives you an idea of the leverage on our whole economy of this export activity.

I think all of this export activity is totally dependent on maintaining a truly open, free and fair trading world economic system. So we have a huge stake in how well this system operates, and we are, of course, a tremendous part of it. So, what happens in the United States has a tremendous contribution to make or a tremendous detriment, depending upon what we do.

Let me first strike a blow for imports. That's always unpopular somehow with businessmen. You look on imports as competition, but that's good. Competition is good for us. I think it's a fair assessment that with the huge boom that has come about in the Reagan Administration --if our markets had been closed to the flow of imports from abroad, we would have had an explosive price situation to go with that boom.

It is the fact that we're part of an open world trading system that made it possible to have this surge in our own business activity while, nevertheless, keeping the rate of inflation at a very low and moderate level, and way below what it had been. So imports gave us access to that tremendous diversity that is available on the world market. They also kept the hand of competition on prices in our own country and thereby contributed to what we all have sought, namely, a real expansion with inflation on a low basis.

I say that because, again, imports are often seen by people as unpopular but if you're a consumer, you probably think they're pretty good.

It's been interesting to me to watch developments in the field of sort of warding off protection. We've gone through a few episodes here in recent times. Perhaps among the most interesting was the President's decision on copper where, as you know, he came down against the recommendation of the ITC; not without sympathy for the copper producers but, nevertheless, it was clear, as the returns came in, that we were hearing very strongly from the copper-using industries.

As one analyzed it, it was clear that if we produced a situation in which the price of copper was higher in the United States than it is in the world copper market by some substantial amount, what we would do would be move the copper fabricating industry out of the United States or we would make it uneconomic, or we would wind up imposing costs on the products manufactured in this country that one might hope to export that would put our



manufacturers at a considerable disadvantage.

More strongly than I remember it, on such occasions, we not only heard from the industry that wanted the protection but we also heard from the other industries that would be affected by it. So there was more of a balance in the considerations. And what role the Chamber may have played in that, I don't know. Probably, it's a little difficult for you when you have two sides of an issue represented in your house. But I think, from the standpoint of making good national policy, it's excellent to have a little galvanization of people whose interests vary and let that be displayed.

Of course, the same kind of thing could be said with respect to local content legislation that would cover such products as automobiles. Fortunately, that legislation didn't go anywhere. It would have been a catastrophe if it went anywhere. And somehow the idea is that local content legislation will help protect jobs.

Any kind of analysis of what local content legislation would do would show you that it would not increase jobs, it would cost us jobs.

There are also things that have been around that have very severe diplomatic repercussions and are not wise from an economic standpoint. If you take a bill that would make it illegal for China to undersell other imports in this country, that would, in effect, sharply restrict access to the American market by Chinese products.

The Washington Post pointed out, "To shut out Chinese goods would be more than a technical adjustment to the trade regulations. It would be a political statement and would have large implications for American foreign policy." Unaccustomed as I am to quoting the Washington Post, they're right on the mark. (Laughter)

I don't want to belabor this point further. But I think you can see my point of view, and I think it is absolutely the right point of view from the standpoint of the interests of the country.

It also seems to me that words and rhetoric, and what you get up and support, are very important. I think, having had some hand in summits, going back to 1974, that probably the most important thing that these summit meetings have done is reiterate and emphasize each time the commitment of the leaders to an open trading system,



and it has had an impact.

Sometimes I hear people say, "Well, you know the world is full of barriers." And you people who used to be around at the University of Chicago, you live in a dream world; and you think Adam Smith described the reality of today. It's different. There are restrictions in this country, that country and every other country. Why don't you face up to the reality and realize that what we have is a world of restrictions, and it is insane for America to try to maintain openness.

I'm startled at some of the people who make that argument, and who are ready to drop the advocacy of open markets, of free markets, for what they produce. Even though the system is imperfect, and there are a lot of barriers, great headway has been made in contending with them.

I think a reason why the U.S. economy is now being looked at all over the world, because of its clear resilience and creativity, is the very fact that we have struggled and kept our market more open than a lot of other people have. So it's very much worth the battle.

We know, not only as a matter of concept but as a matter of practice, that an open market is the best insurance for efficiency, for effectiveness, for keeping the business community on its toes, for giving the consumer an even break. These are the things that we want, and these are the things that will lead to a creative and really strong business environment. And these are the things that President Reagan has had on his mind right from the beginning.

People sometimes ask me, particularly when I'm traveling abroad -- they have this election date in their minds somehow or other. And without wanting to put myself at all in the position of the political prognosticator -- I'll leave that to the Chamber and others; it's not my line of work -- but nevertheless, if we are lucky enough that President Reagan is re-elected, people are always asking me about all the changes that are going to come about in his views right after the election. And I say, lock, I have known that man, first, when I was Director of the Budget and he was Governor of California; and then as a private citizen in California, when he was Governor; and then during the primary period; then during the time of the nomination. I remember when he was nominated. You remember that convention took place in Detroit.

I was around there. Probably some of you were. There was a tremendous amount of pressure on him to make a big bold statement right there in that hot political environment of Detroit on all-out protection for the automobile industry, and he declined.

And, of course, I have known and worked with him very intensively in the last two and a half years. As far as I can see, he's the same guy. I think the reason that he appeals so much to people, and appeals to me, is that he has some very fundamental ideas that have been made very clear over a long period of time to anybody who would listen; and he basically sticks to them.

I don't think he is going to change. He didn't change before the last election and after. Didn't change as Governor of California, and after this election -- if he's in office -- I'm sure he will continue to advocate open markets, to advocate the free flow of trade, to recognize the importance of openness in our markets, and all of the kinds of things that we see emerging which are, to quite a considerable extent -- looking at the economic arena but in other areas -- quite a considerable extent to the payoff from the investment in these principles that he has made earlier in his term and which are now coming to fruition.

I understand that you want to take a little time for questions, so I'll stop.

(Applause).

DR. MICHAEL SAMUELS: (Chamber Vice President) The Secretary has agreed to answer questions that do not necessarily relate to his remarks this morning.

Are there any questions?

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, when will the sanctions on Poland be erased?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: The President's approach to the Polish situation has been to put in place a step-by-step process that consists of a number of so-called sanctions. Some of them have been removed; some of them are still in place.

The pace of removal has been and will be a reflection of our estimate of what happens in Poland. I think the question of their removal is, in some considerable part, a question of the flow of events in Poland.

The principal things that are now at issue are Polish membership in the IMF. And, of course, access to credit is the thing that Poland wants most of all. And, naturally, they want to have Most Favored Nation treatment insofar as their sales into this country are concerned.

Those are very important measures, and I'm sure the President will want to see definite progress in Poland as part of his judgment about those matters.

There have been a number of steps already taken. We have tried to make it clear through our actions and deeds that the step-by-step approach actually does work, and steps will be taken in response to things that the Polish authorities do.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, (inaudible) do you see anything new in the Secretary General of the USSR's comments in the Washington Post?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Of course, we are always interested in statements that are made by the top of the Soviet hierarchy. We study them carefully. We're glad to see statements of a desire to have constructive and positive relationships with us. We look at the proposals.

At the end of the meetings that we held with Foreign Minister Gromyko -- and the last one happened to be held by me as a kind of wrap-up following the President's meeting with him -- we agreed that the phrase that was used, "Let's keep in touch," meant to us that we would do so systematically, carefully and quietly through our diplomatic channels. We are, and are intending to do that. So we'll follow up on any statements made, both as to procedure and as to content and hope a more constructive relationship can be developed.

I'm going to give a talk on this general subject in Los Angeles on Thursday and try to set out, in a careful and comprehensive way, the conceptual basis as we see it -- as the President sees it -- for maintaining a long-term relationship with the Soviet Union. And if you're nice to us, I'm sure you can get a copy from the State Department when it's -- (Laughter)

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, would you comment on the latest developments in Salvador and the talks between the government and the rebels? What do you see as the prospects for the November 4 election in Nicaragua; and

I'd like you to comment on how this issue is discussed in the current election campaign. Is there a secret plan for -- (inaudible)

What do you see as the possibility for the Caribbean Basin Initiative.

(Laughter).

SECRETARY SHULTZ: We don't have any secret plans. Our plans -- the President's plan has been visible for a long time and was stated very carefully almost two years ago before a joint session of Congress in which the President -- having advocated the Caribbean Basin Initiative, designed to allow products from countries in Central America and the Caribbean to enter our markets on an open and assured basis.

The President has consistently advocated that. His view is that in Central America we need to have political reform -- democracy, the rule of law. We need to have economic development that is broadly based, and it's important to have national reconciliation within the framework of democracy.

And in view of the fact, unfortunately, that there is armed conflict promoted by the Soviet Union, through Cuba and Nicaragua, that we must help the people involved there erect a security shield so that these developments that we're advocating -- and I think, generally, people support -- can take place. That's been the President's policy all along.

It came to a certain high point when President Duarte was elected as President of El Salvador. President Duarte has turned out to be an inspiring leader, and he had an impact not only in El Salvador but in the United States, in Europe and in other parts of the world. So he's generated a lot of support, internally and around the world.

And for the first time, the support from the United States has flowed in a reasonable quantity, and on the basis where people could feel that it might continue and they could rely on it. That in itself has had a major impact on the ability of the Salvadoran armed forces to erect that security shield, and to do so with increasing effectiveness.

I think this combination of things has put President Duarte in a position -- and it was his decision. I think

it was a brilliant decision that he made; we, having talked to him a great deal over a long period about the importance of national reconciliation within the framework of democratic principles. It was his decision to make the offer of a meeting, and he did it in a dramatic way.

The guerrillas, at least some of them, responded, and the meeting has taken place. I think, in addition to the fact of it's having taken place, the outcome in terms of a continuing process within the framework, as was agreed by both parties, of democracy and pluralism is a significant step.

Just what will come of it, one doesn't know. But I can tell you, having been in El Salvador after President Duarte made his announcement and talking with him and talking with the group that he assembled that represented a complete diversity of views in El Salvador, that the possibility of peace -- I didn't say "probability," but "possibility" -- even the possibility of real peace just turns people on.

Perhaps in this country we sort of look at it analytically and respond to it. But there, where people have lived in a life-threatening situation for a long time, it's exciting, truly exciting.

President Durate comes through to me as a genuine man of peace with sort of a spiritual quality to his views and his activities.

All of us worried a little bit about his idea that he would clear out all of the soldiers from La Palma, and he would go there unarmed, with no protection; didn't say that the guerrillas had to be unarmed. He just said, "I'm going to be there, I want to talk, I'm not going to be armed."

He didn't seem to feel he was taking a risk. You got the feeling, here was a man that really felt that he was doing the Lord's work for his people.

It would be a great thing, although it doesn't seem at all likely, but it would be a great thing if the people in Nicaragua would hold an election anywhere near comparable to the one that was held in El Salvador. Unfortunately, even though they have subscribed to the idea that such elections should take place, and explicitly said in connection with their November 4 election that such obvious elements in the picture as freedom of assembly



would be honored, that whenever an opposition candidate comes there and holds a rally, if anybody shows up they break it up.

It throws into question whether they intend to do what they say they will do. But, at any rate, I think we should keep saying that an election would be very desirable. It isn't really an election unless it's held on a basis where there is access to the normal ways of going about campaigning, and enough time to organize yourself and put on a campaign.

But I think that President Duarte has taken a magnificent lead, and he has created an opening for peace. He deserves wholehearted support, and that is exactly what he has gotten from President Reagan. Not only with respect to this particular move but with respect to all of the events that preceded it and which, in effect, made it possible.

DR. SAMUELS: One last question.

QUESTION: Mr. Secretary, provisions of the trade bill protecting wine and grape growers in California, the Europeans have been making threatening noises about that. How serious is, in your opinion, that kind of disruption?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I think the Europeans should be counseled to obviously look and see what actually happens. And just what kind of implementation there will be remains to be seen. It's important that any actions that are taken in the United States be within the framework of the GATT. That's an obligation that we have, and the Europeans will be watching us carefully. I think by this time the general dedication to openness of trade must be apparent to all, and we'll have to administer the provisions of the bill with care, but, of course, in complete consistency with the bill itself.

QUESTION: They have said that the passage of that legislation would cause --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Pardon me?

QUESTION: They have said the passage of that legislation would cause them serious trouble and they might have to respond with retribution.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: We'll just have to see what they do. "They" is a big word, and there are lots of Europeans. I

suspect you're talking about a country or two that are heavy in the grape and wine business. (Laughter)

Sometimes people run into me and with great sense of urgency, they say, "The White House is calling; quick, run." I say, wait a minute, I used to work there. (Laughter) There are thousands of people who work there. Who in the White House is calling? (Laughter) Some people turn me on a lot more than others! (Laughter).

(Applause).