THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Moscow, USSR)

For Immediate Release June 1, 1988

INTERVIEW OF
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FRANK CARLUCCI
BY BILL PLANTE OF CBS

May 31, 1988

Rossiya Hotel
Moscow, USSR

6:15 P.M. (L)

Q Mr. Secretary, so much of the talk at this summit has focused on whether or not there will be another arms control agreement on strategic arms by the end of the President's term. Is there any sign that there may be?

SECRETARY CARLUCCI: Well, we're making progress toward an agreement. We're at the stage now where the pick and shovel work has to be done. The detailed work on verification -- it's not easy for leaders meeting at the summit to solve those kinds of detailed problems. The staffs are at work, they will continue at work in Geneva. And one always trys, and one always to be optimistic. But let me say that the summit has been much broader than arms control. At this summit, perhaps more than any summit, the two leaders have devoted a lot of time to exploring the nature of each other's society. And I think that's been very helpful.

Q But Mr. Gorbachev has also tried very hard, it seems, to raise expectations about what is possible. Is that a tactic?

SECRETARY CARLUCCI: Well, I can't really speak for Mr. Gorbachev.

Q But how do you view it?

SECRETARY CARLUCCI: I -- the Soviets are very good negotiators. They have their positions, they cling to them, it's sometimes hard to get them to move off to their -- their positions, but we have some very good negotiators on our side too, and that's the nature of a negotiation.

Q Well, what's the realistic U.S. assessment of whether there can be enough breakthroughs on the technical level for a START agreement by the end of Mr. Reagan's term?

SECRETARY CARLUCCI: Well, that depends on a couple of key issues. The President has made it very clear that he will not allow a START agreement to stand in the way of the development of the Strategic Defense Initiative, therefore, the Soviets have to recognize this. If they don't, obviously we can't get an agreement. Also, there's a big problem with the sea-launched cruise missiles, which are really not strategic weapons, they're not included in the 6,000. The Soviets have gone after them as sort of an afterthought. Verification is impossible, so to speak, and a resolution of that issue will have to be found.

I think the rest of it -- the verification portions of the rest of it -- can probably be worked out over a period of time, but it's going to take considerable effort.

Q Any progress on sea-launched cruise missiles, and the other tough issues here?

SECRETARY CARLUCCI: Well, Bill, it's hard to say because the working groups are still at work, even as we speak. They'll be making their final report tomorrow. I think there's been some progress in certain areas. I haven't heard of any particular progress on sea-launched cruise missiles, but I wouldn't foreclose it at this point.

Q Now on the Strategic Defense Initiative, Mr. Secretary, in December the two leaders agreed to let it be ambiguous. The Soviets have hinted that they're not going to continue to let it be ambiguous if there is a real prospect of a new arms control agreement. Is there any sign that in this administration you can come up with a new formula that moves it forward?

SECRETARY CARLUCCI: Well, it's a little bit the other way around, Bill. The Soviets have really proposed that we take the Washington summit language and codify that. And it is ambiguous, you're quite right. They have one interpretation of it and we have another. It is we who are insisting that the language be clarified. But we have to really be specific because we are accountable to our Congress and our Congress is rightfully going to demand specificity.

Q So do we get that kind of specificity in --

SECRETARY CARLUCCI: No.

Q -- from the Soviets?

SECRETARY CARLUCCI: We're working on it, we've made some proposals, we have to see how they respond. We're certainly not going to get specificity at the price of progress in SDI.

Q What about mobile missiles? We know there's been a proposal by the U.S. for verification.

SECRETARY CARLUCCI: There has, we've been working very hard on a verification regime for mobile missiles. We think we have most of the elements. We're presenting it to the Soviets. Some of the elements they've accepted, they haven't accepted the whole thing yet, they're examining it. This will take a little bit of time. I certainly don't think we're there yet on verification of mobile missiles, but some progress is being made.

Q But that does sound like we're ready to reverse position on that, because the U.S. position has always been that it was impossible to verify, so we were against it.

SECRETARY CARLUCCI: Now what we have said -- no, we've never said it is impossible to verify -- we've said that it's been -- it's going to be very difficult to verify mobiles. And if we get a satisfactory verification regime, then we can discuss numbers. But we want to make sure we get the verification nailed down first -- and remember, I said we've got a ways to go on that.

Q The Soviets are clearly, in this summit and generally, trying to put the onus on the United States side for coming up with advances in arms control. They're out there, as Mr. Gorbachev was today, saying we want peace, we want to move forward, we want to normalize relations between our two societies. What do you do, what does the administration do to counter that?

SECRETARY CARLUCCI: Well, we want peace as well. And we're delighted to try normalized relationships between our two societies. That's why it's been particulary useful for the President and the General Secretary to explore the nature of our societies. That's why it's been useful for me to explore with my Soviet counterpart the nature of our military establishments. But some of this, as you said earlier, is clearly bargaining. You -- one likes to put pressure on one's bargaining counterpart. That's perfectly normal in any bargaining. But we have to bear in mind that the

President is ultimately going to do what is in the United States' national interest.

Q Mr. Secretary, thank you very much.

SECRETARY CARLUCCI: Thank you.

END 6:25 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Moscow, USSR)

For Immediate Release June 1, 1988

PRESS BRIEFING
BY
SENATORS ROBERT BYRD
AND ROBERT DOLE

Mezhdunarodnaya Hotel
Moscow, USSR

10:35 A.M. (L)

MR. DILLEN: Ladies and gentlemen, I think we're about ready to begin. If we could have -- as you know, Senators Byrd and Dole arrived in Moscow yesterday. They attended the Spaso House dinner last evening. At 11:00 a.m., they will be leaving to go to the Kremlin where they will be present for the signing ceremony. So, in the time that we have, I thought we would like to open it up to questions. You can use the microphones that are in the aisles -- if you would identify yourselves, please.

Q Senators, a lot is being made here, as you know, of the INF Treaty, probably because they don't have a START treaty. But how would either of you compare the President's accomplishments in arms control to Jimmy Carter's, for instance, or Richard Nixon's -- the SALT treaties and all and the various agreements that were reached in those administrations.

SENATOR BYRD: I think President Reagan has to be complimented on the INF Treaty. It was his style and his determination and his discipline, and his strength that brought the Soviets back to the table. I don't think anyone else could have done this. He came along at the right moment. I think it's a good treaty. I think he's to be congratulated.

SENATOR DOLE: I would just add I believe it is a landmark in President Reagan's administration. I think it is probably the highlight of the second term, and it is a small step, but it's a step towards arms reduction. And of course we believe that he did the right thing, Gorbachev did the right thing, and the United States Senate did the right thing.

Q Senators, have you had -- been briefed on the current discussions as far as the START treaty is concerned, and what is your impression of how things are going on that one?

SENATOR BYRD: I've not been briefed on how the talks are going on a START treaty. My suggestion would be that we make haste slowly -- do not go too fast, because the aim of the START treaty is not just to cut nuclear weapons. But it is to enhance nuclear deterrence. And there are big problems -- verification, nuclear force structure, and so on. And whereas, verification in the instance of the INF Treaty is relatively easy because a whole class of weapons have been eliminated, it will be much more difficult with START. Because there, we will not have a whole class of weapons eliminated. START only limits -- this would mean that there would be extremely difficult problems in connection with verification. That would be a verification terrain that would be strewn with boobie traps and mine fields. Summits are fine. They're good headline

media events, but the devil is in the details. And there, careful work has to be done by experienced negotiators.

We saw, in the case of the INF Treaty, which is a relatively simple treaty in comparison with what a START treaty would be, that there were holes -- that there were flaws. And the negotiators had to go back to the table and do the work that they left undone.

Finally, I would say that conventional weapons and long-range nuclear weapons are inter-related in the sense that it is not unimportant when we consider the fact that the Soviets have great numerical superiority -- the Soviets and the War Pact powers -- in conventional weapons. And what we're talking about is peace. And there must be a nuclear deterrent in order to ensure the peace. And before we go too far with START, we should be assured that there are movements in connection with conventional talks, and progress therein.

SENATOR DOLE: Could I just say one quick word. You know, there are still seven months left in the Reagan administration -- that's a long time. And I would expect the President to press on in the best way he can, with all the skill that he can, and with all the people -- in working on START negotiations to continue those negotiations. I share Senator Byrd's view that we want to be very careful, very cautious. That, in essence, was the impact of the declaration added to the INF Treaty last week; but, in any event, there's still seven months. This administration has a lot of life left. Ronald Reagan is going to continue to work on arms reduction. Secretary Shultz -- and I guess those of us in the Senate just want to make certain that whatever is done can be verified and that we're consulted in advance, as we have been in the past.

Q Senator Byrd, could I ask you to take it one step further? Given the words of caution you just said, what goes through your mind when you hear both leaders -- Gorbachev and the President -- talk about trying to get a START treaty done while the President's still in office?

SENATOR BYRD: I think it's very difficult for that to happen. In the first place, the Senate is an equal partner in the making of treaties under our constitutional form of government. And we spent four months in going over the INF Treaty. And the Senate, when it begins to work on a START treaty, is going to probe it very thoroughly and very carefully. And the difference in the work and the probing and the investigation and the questioning in connection with a START treaty -- from what we saw in connection with the INF Treaty, will be like day and night.

One of the problems is that once we're locked in to overall limits or figures concerning the numbers, then the pressures -- the political and the public pressures are going to be irresistible. We saw those pressures in connection with the INF Treaty, which is a relatively simple treaty, insofar as verification is concerned. And in the case of START, once these overall figures or limits or parameters are set, the pressures are going to be so great, and we're going to be driven and stampeded into approving something in connection with which the details have to be worked out. And if we're not very careful with respect to verification, for example, we would have to -- we'd see a situation, I'm afraid, in which the details would be either glossed over or resolved im such a way as to put the United States at a serious military disadvantage.

Q Well, Senator, should the President be trying to set that kind of goal?

SENATOR BYRD: My caution is go slow -- very slow. Let's proceed carefully.

Q Is that a yes or a no?

SENATOR BYRD: I think we ought to go very slow. I don't think it's wise to leap into this thing too fast. I think --

Q Well, Senators, does that mean that you don't want to see Ronald Reagan leave office having left the Senate this treaty to ratify sometime next year?

SENATOR BYRD: That's not the question, though. That's not the question by any means. Anything that will truly advance the peace of the world I'm for, but I think we have to be very careful in our own national security interest that we don't make haste too fast.

SENATOR DOLE: I think the point we've been making -- let's not have some framework announced that in effect locks us in. And that's --

SENATOR BYRD: That's right.

SENATOR DOLE: -- the very thing we addressed again in the declaration added in the INF Treaty. The Senate is a partner. I think the Soviets recognize now, maybe more than before, that the United States Senate does play a very important role because we had to come back and make some changes in the process. So, I think Senator Byrd is correct. We don't expect the President to sit on his hands because he only has seven months left. We expect this administration to keep working on arms reduction. But at the same time, we want to do it very carefully.

Q Senators, may I ask you, please -- much has been made of the changes that have already happened, and are taking place under glasnost. And also, the precedent-setting nature of the INF accord itself, with inspection verification -- do you think the Soviets can be trusted?

SENATOR BYRD: It isn't a question of trusting anyone. The President said trust, but verify. And that's what the Senate insisted upon in connection with the INF Treaty. That's why we insisted that the negotiators go back and tie down the details on on-site verification. That's why we attached to the resolution of ratification amendments that would tie down -- that included the documents that were signed as a result of the negotiators going back to the table and doing the work that they had not done well before. We attached those documents that have to do with on-site verification and futuristic weapons.

Q Senators, I conclude from what you're saying that while the President might negotiate a treaty, you don't see how it's possible to ratify -- or the Senate to ratify a treaty this year.

SENATOR BYRD: I don't see how it would be possible at all for the Senate to approve the ratification of a START treaty this year, no.

SENATOR DOLE: It would be very, very difficult -- I think Senator Byrd indicates we have less than 60 -- 60-some working days if we go through October 8. There is an election this year in the United States, that will take some time. And I don't anticipate -- coming back after the election.

SENATOR BYRD: Let me say, I would add to that that I think the Senate demonstrated -- don't you Senator Dole -- that it is an equal partner, that it's going to read the fine print. And in the case of a START treaty, you can be sure that the Senate will take enough time to be absolutely sure that that treaty is in the security interest of our own country. I don't believe, and I can't speak for the negotiators or the administration, but I believe this is -- I don't believe that a treaty so complex can be agreed to, even by an administration, in the remaining time.

SENATOR DOLE: But if it is agreed to, it would not be dealt with this year. I think --

SENATOR BYRD: It would not be dealt with by the Senate.

SENATOR DOLE: -- that's sort of the bottom line.

SENATOR BYRD: Couldn't be.

Q Senator Byrd, can you point to any evidence that the administration has been proceeding too fast on START?

SENATOR BYRD: I can't point to any evidence that they've been proceeding too fast. There are a lot of public and political pressures for them to do so. But the evidence to me is -- and I've talked with some of the people in the administration who are doing the negotiating -- and my admonition is that they go very, very slowly. And I think they're doing that. And carefully.

Q --

SENATOR DOLE: The mike doesn't work.

Q --

MR. DILLEN: Can we get that mike? Can you repeat the question?

Q Senator Byrd, he's asking whether there should be a Republican administration to follow up?

Q Senator Dole, is there perhaps one way out of this impasse -- seven months are too little. The other way -- the chance of a new administration would go a way to stop a gap. So it would be the best time to have four years and seven months instead of seven months time to build this treaty. So it means a Republican administration. In order to ensure that, would it be advisable for you to run for Vice President in order to enhance the possibility of this event? (Laughter.)

SENATOR DOLE: I think it's -- the first part was a very good idea, about four more years of Republican administation. But I had the privilege of being seated with Secretary General Gorbachev last evening, and I asked that question about who he might prefer in the election. And he said, you know, that he is very realistic, he'll get along with whoever is elected and he didn't think that would be an impediment. So in other words, if this administration -- many of the people who are negotiating are professionals, they're not politicians, they're not partisans. They are men and women who are giving their service to the United States on arms reduction, and I don't think it would make that much difference who was elected President if in fact a treaty was signed. Obviously, I have a preference. I would like to see a continuation of a Republican administration but that will not be determined today.

Q Senators, I would like to ask how much and to what degree do you think the present level of friendship in Soviet-American relations has been institutionalized and permanent -- and made permanent over the last three years, and how much does it depend on the prestige and ability of President Reagan to persuade the people of the United States that having been a staunch anti-communist, he's trustworthy and reliable and can be depended on in dealing with the Soviets. And is it possible, do you think, that after President Reagan leaves office that there will be a swing of the pendulum back in the direction of a cooler and more distant relationship?

SENATOR DOLE: Well obviously, in my view, President Reagan is in a unique position to make real progress with the Soviet Union because of his conservative credentials, because of his

conservative views. And I think without question Ronald Reagan has come a long way since 1981. In fact, he in effect -- his last year in office, of course, visits the Soviet Union. My own view is that the American people obviously want peace. The American people want arms reduction. The American people want better relations with all countries, including the Soviet Union -- particularly the Soviet Union -- we're the two superpowers. So in my view, there's been a lot accomplished since Gorbachev became the leader of this country. And I believe, as he said last night in his toasts, that in Geneva three years ago they made the right decision -- he and President Reagan -- to try to get along and try to move along, and try to recognize each other's responsibilities and priorities. But I see an extension of this goodwill, hopefully, whatever may happen in the United States as far as 1988 is concerned.

MR. DILLEN: One more question, I think we have time.

Q Partly my question was pronounced and partly answered, but still I would like to specify one more thing. But what is happening here in Moscow, of course, is very important. But what is also important for the people here, and they are very much concerned about it, is the continuity of policy toward the Soviet Union by the next -- by the coming administration. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it's not a question of continuity, it will be there. But how about the United States? Because, you know, we have been witnessing those ups and downs in the policies of different administrations, as soon as election year was over.

SENATOR BYRD: I think there will be a continuation of the policy of reaching out and trying to maintain an improved relationship, regardless of which political party is in power in the White House after January 20th of next year. And the United States Senate is also a continuing body. So I think that we can look forward to the continuing effort by taking it slow, but I believe that it would be costly. And I think that summits, perodic summits, will advance the dialogue between our two countries, and keep the bureaucrats in both countries moving. I think we're on the right course if we just take it in stride and are careful and thorough as we go.

MR. DILLEN: Senator Byrd, I believe you have a closing comment.

SENATOR BYRD: All right. I want to thank you for your presence here today. Let me say in connection with the -- what we see happening in the Soviet Union -- we see glasnost; an opening. And we think the change is underway, and we think the change is for the better.

Just a few days ago, I saw in the news media in the United States that the government here had authorized the publication and distribution of 100,000 Bibles. I have written to the General Secretary, commending him on taking this step, and urging that there be an expansion of this effort, and that Bibles be printed in the various languages througout the 15 diverse republics. In our Bible, we read that where there is -- where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. And as I say in my letter to the General Secretary, if there could be an expansion of the publication of these books, it would warm the hearts of millions of Americans in whose daily lives religion is a central element. And if there could be religious freedom and freedom of worship throughout the republics of the Soviet Union, we feel that that would be glasnost in religion which knows no political or party lines.

MR. DILLEN: Senator Dole?

SENATOR DOLE: Well, I want to express Senator Byrd's thanks to all of you for coming, and we arrived yesterday at 1:00 p.m.; we'll leave today at 1:00 p.m. There has been a lot of contention about human rights. There's one area where I believe --

one area we can address -- there shouldn't be any difficulty at all. I raised this with General Powell and Senator Baker and other members of the White House staff, and also last evening with Mr. Gorbachev.

There are 500 million disabled people in the world, and that's an area of human rights that I believe could be addressed hopefully even yet today, or whenever they meet again, dealing with some of the problems the disabled people face in the world as far as jobs, transportation -- a host of other things. We're now in the Decade of the Disabled. The United Nations decreed the decade to be from 1983 to 1992. And I would hope that this is one area where both Mr. Gorbachev and President Reagan could see eye-to-eye on a need to focus on the rights of disabled around the world.

And finally, the Secretary General indicated last night he -- a little frustrated with all these resolutions passed in the Congress about once a month, he said, condemning the Soviet Union. He indicated it made his job that much more difficult. I couldn't recall any resolutions of that kind, but I -- suggested I'd go back and take a look. But I came away from the dinner last night, after having read a lot of material about the Soviet Union -- read the most recent interview the Secretary General had with certain news media, that he is deadly serious about economic reform; he is deadly serious about restructuring the economy in this country. He's deadly serious about making other changes. He talked a lot about the need for more parliamentary exchanges. He thought it would be very helpful to have more exchange between the Supreme Soviet and the United States Congress. And I explained, well, the Supreme Soviet is not really a representative body, but he indicated there would be vast changes recommended in that area, too.

So -- we believe that we're moving in the right direction, and we believe particularly that the consent to ratification of the INF Treaty was very helpful to both the President and Mr. Gorbachev, and I think I can speak -- congratulate Senator Byrd for his leadership in getting that done. Thank you.

SENATOR BYRD: I would like to add just one word concerning an area in which I think there could be great collaboration. Instead of the suggested mission -- joint mission in working with reference to Mars, it seems to me that we could work jointly in the war on drugs. The Soviet worldwide operations and influence, together with our own, it seems to me could advance our efforts to stem the incoming wave of drugs into our country, and that may not be as much of a problem in the Soviet Union right now as it is in the United States. But it's likely to become a problem. And if we can pool our resources, I think we could help the Soviets as they upgrade their medical treatments. And together, it seems to me, that we not only ought to work together and pool our resources, but it seems to me that it's necessary and imperative and mandatory that we do so, and I hope we will. Thank you all.

MR. DILLEN: Thank you very much.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END 11:00 A.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Moscow, USSR)

For Immediate Release May 31, 1988

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE STUDENTS AND FACULTY OF
MOSCOW STATE UNIVERSITY

Lecture Hall
Moscow State University
Moscow, USSR

4:10 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Rector Logunov, and I want to thank all of you very much for a very warm welcome. It's a great pleasure to be here at Moscow State University, and I want to thank you all for turning out. I know you must be very busy this week, studying and taking your final examinations. So let me just say Zhelayu vam uspekha. (Applause.) Nancy couldn't make it today because she's visiting Leningrad, which she tells me is a very beautiful city -- but she, too, says hello and wishes you all good luck.

Let me say it's also a great pleasure to once again have this opportunity to speak directly to the people of the Soviet Union.

Before I left Washington, I received many heartfelt letters and telegrams asking me to carry here a simple message -- perhaps, but also some of the most important business of this summit -- it is a message of peace and goodwill and hope for a growing friendship and closeness between our two peoples.

As you know, I've come to Moscow to meet with one of your most distinguished graduates. In this, our fourth summit, General Secretary Gorbachev and I have spent many hours together and I feel that we're getting to know each other well.

Our discussions, of course, have been focused primarily on many of the important issues of the day -- issues I want to touch on with you in a few moments. But first I want to take a little time to talk to you much as I would to any group of university students in the United States. I want to talk not just of the realities of today, but of the possibilities of tomorrow.

Standing here before a mural of your revolution, I want to talk about a very different revolution that is taking place right now, quietly sweeping the globe, without bloodshed or conflict. Its effects are peaceful, but they will fundamentally alter our world, shatter old assumptions, and reshape our lives.

It's easy to underestimate because it's not accompanied by banners or fanfare. It's been called the technological or informaton revolution, and as its emblem, one might take the tiny silicon chip -- no bigger than a fingerprint. One of these chips has more computing power than a roomful of old-style computers.

As part of an exchange program, we now have an exhibition touring your country that shows how information technology is transforming our lives -- replacing manual labor with robots, forecasting weather for farmers, or mapping the genetic code of DNA for medical researchers. These microcomputers today aid the design of everything from houses to cars to spacecraft -- they even design

better and faster computers. They can translate English into Russian or enable the blind to read -- or help Michael Jackson produce on one synthesizer the sounds of a whole orchestra. Linked by a network of satellites and fiber-optic cables, one individual with a desktop computer and a telephone commands resources unavailable to the largest governments just a few years ago.

Like a chrysalis, we're emerging from the economy of the Industrial Revolution-- an economy confined to and limited by the Earth's physical resources -- into, as one economist titled his book, The Economy in Mind," in which there are no bounds on human imagination and the freedom to create is the most precious natural resource.

Think of that little computer chip. Its value isn't in the sand from which it is made, but in the microscopic architecture designed into it by ingenious human minds. Or take the example of the satellite relaying this broadcast around the world, which replaces thousands of tons of copper mined from the Earth and molded into wire.

In the new economy, human invention increasingly makes physical resources obsolete. We're breaking through the material conditions of existence to a world where man creates his own destiny. Even as we explore the most advanced reaches of science, we're returning to the age-old wisdom of our culture, a wisdom contained in the book of the Genesis in the Bible: In the beginning was the spirit, and it was from this spirit that the material abundance of creation issued forth.

But progress is not foreordained. The key is freedom -- freedom of thought, freedom of information, freedom of communication. The renowned scientist, scholar, and founding father of this University, Mikhail Lomonosov, knew that. "It is common knowledge," he said, "that the achievements of science are considerable and rapid, particularly once the yoke of slavery is cast off and replaced by the freedom of philosophy."

You know, one of the first contacts between your country and mine took place between Russian and American explorers. The Americans were members of Cook's last voyage on an expedition searching for an Arctic passage; on the island of Unalaska, they came upon the Russians, who took them in, and together, with the native inhabitants, held a prayer service on the ice.

The explorers of the modern era are the entrepreneurs, men with vision, with the courage to take risks and faith enough to brave the unknown. These entrepreneurs and their small enterprises are responsible for almost all the economic growth in the United States. They are the prime movers of the technological revolution. In fact, one of the largest personal computer firms in the United States was started by two college students, no older than you, in the garage behind their home.

Some people, even in my own country, look at the riot of experiment that is the free market and see only waste. What of all the entrepreneurs that fail? Well, many do, particularly the successful ones. Often several times. And if you ask them the secret of their success, they'll tell you, it's all that they learned in their struggles along the way -- yes, it's what they learned from failing. Like an athlete in competition, or a scholar in pursuit of the truth, experience is the greatest teacher.

And that's why it's so hard for government planners, no matter how sophisticated, to ever substitute for millions of individuals working night and day to make their dreams come true. The fact is, bureaucracies are a problem around the world. There's an old story about a town -- it could be anywhere -- with a bureaucrat who is known to be a good for nothing, but he somehow had always hung on to power. So one day, in a town meeting, an old woman

got up and said to him, "There is a folk legend here where I come from that when a baby is born, an angel comes down from heaven and kisses it on one part of its body. If the angel kisses him on his hand, he becomes a handyman. If he kisses him on his forehead, he becomes bright and clever. And I've been trying to figure out where the angel kissed you so that you should sit there for so long and do nothing." (Laughter and applause.)

We are seeing the power of economic freedom spreading around the world -- places such as the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Taiwan have vaulted into the technological era, barely pausing in the industrial age along the way. Low-tax agricultural policies in the sub-continent mean that in some years India is now a net exporter of food. Perhaps most exciting are the winds of change that are blowing over the People's Republic of China, where one-quarter of the world's population is now getting its first taste of economic freedom.

At the same time, the growth of democracy has become one of the most powerful political movements of our age. In Latin America in the 1970's, only a third of the population lived under democratic government. Today over 90 percent does. In the Philippines, in the Republic of Korea, free, contested, democratic elections are the order of the day. Throughout the world, free markets are the model for growth. Democracy is the standard by which governments are measured.

We Americans make no secret of our belief in freedom. In fact, it's something of a national pastime. Every four years the American people choose a new president, and 1988 is one of those years. At one point there were 13 major candidates running in the two major parties, not to mention all the others, including the Socialist and Libertarian candidates -- all trying to get my job.

About 1,000 local television stations, 8,500 radio stations, and 1,700 daily newspapers, each one an independent, private enterprise, fiercely independent of the government, report on the candidates, grill them in interviews, and bring them together for debates. In the end, the people vote -- they decide who will be the next president.

But freedom doesn't begin or end with elections. Go to any American town, to take just an example, and you'll see dozens of churches, representing many different beliefs -- in many places synagogues and mosques -- and you'll see families of every conceivable nationality, worshipping together.

Go into any schoolroom, and there you will see children being taught the Declaration of Independence, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights -- among them life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness -- that no government can justly deny -- the guarantees in their Constitution for freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of religion.

Go into any courtroom and there will preside an independent judge, beholden to no government power. There every defendant has the right to a trial by a jury of his peers, usually 12 men and women -- common citizens, they are the ones, the only ones, who weigh the evidence and decide on guilt or innocence. In that court, the accused is innocent until proven guilty, and the word of a policeman, or any official, has no greater legal standing than the word of the accused.

Go to any university campus, and there you'll find an open, sometimes heated discussion of the problems in American society and what can be done to correct them. Turn on the television, and you'll see the legislature conducting the business of government right there before the camera, debating and voting on the legislation that will become the law of the land. March in any demonstration, and there are many of them -- the people's right of assembly is guaranteed in the Constitution and protected by the police.

Go into any union hall, where the members know their right to strike is protected by law. As a matter of fact, one of the many jobs I had before this one was being president of a union, the Screen Actors Guild. I led my union out on strike -- and I'm proud to say, we won.

But freedom is more even than this: Freedom is the right to question, and change the established way of doing things. It is the continuing revolution of the marketplace. It is the understanding that allows us to recognize shortcomings and seek solutions. It is the right to put forth an idea, scoffed at by the experts, and watch it catch fire among the people. It is the right to stick -- to dream -- to follow your dream, or stick to your conscience, even if you're the only one in a sea of doubters.

Freedom is the recognition that no single person, no single authority or government has a monopoly on the truth, but that every individual life is infinitely precious, that every one of us put on this world has been put there for a reason and has something to offer.

America is a nation made up of hundreds of nationalities. Our ties to you are more than ones of good feeling; they're ties of kinship. In America, you'll find Russians, Armenians, Ukrainians, peoples from Eastern Europe and Central Asia. They come from every part of this vast continent, from every continent, to live in harmony, seeking a place where each cultural heritage is respected, each is valued for its diverse strengths and beauties and the richness it brings to our lives.

Recently, a few individuals and families have been allowed to visit relatives in the West. We can only hope that it won't be long before all are allowed to do so, and Ukrainian-Americans, Baltic-Americans, Armenian-Americans, can freely visit their homelands, just as this Irish-American visits his.

Freedom, it has been said, makes people selfish and materialistic, but Americans are one of the most religious peoples on Earth. Because they know that liberty, just as life itself, is not earned, but a gift from God, they seek to share that gift with the world. "Reason and experience," said George Washington, in his farewell address, "both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle. And it is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government."

Democracy is less a system of government than it is a system to keep government limited, unintrusive: A system of constraints on power to keep politics and government secondary to the important things in life, the true sources of value found only in family and faith.

But I hope you know I go on about these things not simply to extol the virtues of my own country, but to speak to the true greatness of the heart and soul of your land. Who, after all, needs to tell the land of Dostoevsky about the quest for truth, the home of Kandinsky and the Scriabin about imagination, the rich and noble culture of the Uzbek man of letters, Alisher Navoi, about beauty and heart.

The great culture of your diverse land speaks with a glowing passion to all humanity. Let me cite one of the most eloquent contemporary passages on human freedom. It comes, not from the literature of America, but from this country, from one of the greatest writers of the 20th century, Boris Pasternak, in the novel Dr. Zhivago. He writes, "I think that if the beast who sleeps in man could be held down by threats -- any kind of threat, whether of jail or of retribution after death -- then the highest emblem of humanity would be the lion tamer in the circus with his whip, not the prophet

who sacrificed himself. But this is just the point -- what has for centuries raised man above the beast is not the cudgel, but an inward music -- the irresistible power of unarmed truth."

The irresistible power of unarmed truth. Today the world looks expectantly to signs of change, steps toward greater freedom in the Soviet Union. We watch and we hope as we see positive changes taking place. There are some, I know, in your society who fear that change will bring only disruption and discontinuity -- who fear to embrace the hope of the future.

Sometimes it takes faith. It's like that scene in the cowboy movie "Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid," which some here in Moscow recently had a chance to see. The posse is closing in on the two outlaws, Butch and Sundance, who find themselves trapped on the edge of a cliff, with a sheer drop of hundreds of feet to the raging rapids below. Butch turns to Sundance and says their only hope is to jump into the river below, but Sundance refuses. He says he'd rather fight it out with the posse, even though they're hopelessly outnumbered. Butch says that's suicide and urges him to jump, but Sundance still refuses, and finally admits, "I can't swim." Butch breaks up laughing and says, "You crazy fool, the fall will probably kill you." And, by the way, both Butch and Sundance made it, in case you didn't see the movie. I think what I've just been talking about is perestroika and what its goals are.

But change would not mean rejection of the past. Like a tree growing strong through the seasons, rooted in the earth and drawing life from the sun, so, too, positive change must be rooted in traditional values -- in the land, in culture, in family and community -- and it must take its life from the eternal things, from the source of all life, which is faith. Such change will lead to new understandings, new opportunities, to a broader future in which the tradition is not supplanted, but finds its full flowering.

That is the future beckoning to your generation. At the same time, we should remember that reform that is not institutionalized will always be insecure. Such freedom will always be looking over its shoulder. A bird on a tether, no matter how long the rope, can alway be pulled back. And that is why, in my conversation with General Secretary Gorbachev, I have spoken of how important it is to institutionalize change -- to put guarantees on reform. And we have been talking together about one sad reminder of a divided world, the Berlin Wall. It's time to remove the barriers that keep people apart.

I'm proposing an increased exchange program of high school students between our countries. General Secretary Gorbachev mentioned on Sunday a wonderful phrase you have in Russian for this. "Better to see something once than to hear about it a hundred times." Mr. Gorbachev and I first began working on this in 1985; in our discussion today, we agreed on working up to several thousand exchanges a year from each country in the near future. But not everyone can travel across the continents and oceans. Words travel lighter; and that's why we'd like to make available to this country more of our 11,000 magazines and periodicals; and our television and radio shows, that can be beamed off a satellite in seconds. Nothing would please us more than for the Soviet people to get to know us better and to understand our way of life.

Just a few years ago, few would have imagined the progress our two nations have made together. The INF Treaty -- which General Secretary Gorbachev and I signed last December in Washington and whose instruments of ratification we will exchange tomorrow -- the first true nuclear arms reduction treaty in history, calling for the elimination of an entire class of U.S. and Soviet nuclear missiles. And just 16 days ago, we saw the beginning of your withdrawal from Afghanistan, which gives us hope that soon the fighting may end and the healing may begin, and that that suffering country many find self-determination, unity, and peace at long last.

It's my fervent hope that our constructive cooperation on these issues will be carried on to address the continuing destruction of conflicts in many regions of the globe and that the serious discussions that led to the Geneva accords on Afghanistan will help lead to solutions in Southern Africa, Ethiopia, Cambodia, the Persian Gulf, and Central America.

I have often said, nations do not distrust each other because they are armed; they are armed because they distrust each other. If this globe is to live in peace and prosper, if it is to embrace all the possibilities of the technological revolution, then nations must renounce, once and for all, the right to an expansionist foreign policy. Peace between nations must be an enduring goal -- not a tactical stage in a continuing conflict.

I've been told that there's a popular song in your country -- perhaps you know it -- whose evocative refrain asks the question, "Do the Russians want a war?" In answer it says, "Go ask that silence lingering in the air, above the birch and poplar there; beneath those trees the soldiers lie. Go ask my mother, ask my wife; then you will have to ask no more, 'do the Russians want a war?'"

But what of your one-time allies? What of those who embraced you on the Elbe? What if we were to ask the watery graves of the Pacific, or the European battlefields where America's fallen were buried far from home? What if we were to ask their mothers, sisters, and sons, do Americans want war? Ask us, too, and you'll find the same answer, the same longing in every heart. People do not make wars, governments do -- and no mother would ever willingly sacrifice her sons for territorial gain, for economic advantage, for ideology. A people free to choose will always choose peace.

Americans seek always to make friends of old antagonists. After a colonial revolution with Britain we have cemented for all ages the ties of kinship between our nations. After a terrible civil war between North and South, we healed our wounds and found true unity as a nation. We fought two world wars in my lifetime against Germany and one with Japan, but now the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan are two of our closest allies and friends.

Some people point to the trade disputes between us as a sign of strain, but they're the frictions of all families, and the family of free nations is a big and vital and sometimes boisterous one. I can tell you that nothing would please my heart more than in my lifetime to see American and Soviet diplomats grappling with the problem of trade disputes between America and a growing, exuberant, exporting Soviet Union that had opened up to economic freedom and growth.

And as important as these official people-to-people exchanges are, nothing would please me more than for them to become unnecessary, to see travel between East and West become so routine that university students in the Soviet Union could take a month off in the summer and, just like students in the West do now, put packs on their backs and travel from country to country in Europe with barely a passport check in between. Nothing would please me more than to see the day that a concert promoter in, say, England could call up a Soviet rock group -- without going through any government agency -- and have them playing in Liverpool the next night.

Is this just a dream? Perhaps. But it is a dream that is our responsibility to have come true.

Your generation is living in one of the most exciting, hopeful times in Soviet history. It is a time when the first breath of freedom stirs the air and the heart beats to the accelerated rhythm of hope, when the accumulated spiritual energies of a long silence yearn to break free.

I am reminded of the famous passage near the end of Gogol's Dead Souls. Comparing his nation to a speeding troika, Gogol asks what will be its destination. But he writes, "there was no answer save the bell pouring forth marvelous sound."

We do not know what the conclusion of this will be of this journey, but we're hopeful that the promise of reform will be fulfilled. In this Moscow spring, this May 1988, we may be allowed that hope -- that freedom, like the fresh green sapling planted over Tolstoi's grave, will blossom forth at last in the rich fertile soil of your people and culture. We may be allowed to hope that the marvelous sound of a new openness will keep rising through, ringing through, leading to a new world of reconciliation, friendship, and peace.

Thank you all very much and da blagoslovit vas gospod'. God bless you. (Applause.)

END 4:02 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary
(Moscow, USSR)

For Immediate Release May 31, 1988

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION
WITH STUDENTS AT MOSCOW STATE UNIVERSITY

Lecture Hall
Moscow State University
Moscow, USSR

4:03 P.M. (L)

MR. LOGONUV: Dear friends, Mr. President has kindly agreed to answer your questions. But since he doesn't have too much time, only 15 minutes -- so, those who have questions, please ask them.

Q And this is a student from the history faculty, and he says that he's happy to welcome you on behalf of the students of the University. And the first question is that the improvement in the relations between the two countries has come about during your tenure as President, and in this regard he would like to ask the following question: It is very important to get a handle on the question of arms control, and specifically, the limitation of strategic arms. Do you think that it will be possible for you and the General Secretary to get a treaty on the limitation of strategic arms during the time that you are still President?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the arms treaty that is being negotiated now is the so-called START treaty, and it is based on taking the Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles and reducing them by half, down to parity, between our two countries. Now, this is a much more complicated treaty than the INF Treaty, the intermediate-range treaty, which we have signed and which our two governments have ratified, and is now in effect.

So, there are many things still to be settled -- that you and we have had negotiators in Geneva for months working on various points of this treaty. Once we had hoped that maybe, like the INF Treaty, we would have been able to sign it here at this summit meeting. It is not completed -- there are still some points that are being debated. We are both hopeful that it can be finished before I leave office, which is in the coming January, but I assure you that if it isn't -- I assure you that I will have impressed on my successor that we must carry on until it is signed.

My dream has always been that once we've started down this road, we can look forward to a day, you can look forward to a day, when there will be no more nuclear weapons in the world at all. (Applause.)

Q The question is, the Universities influence public opinion and the student wonders how the youths have changed since the days when you were a student up until now?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, wait a minute. How you have changed since the era of my own youth?

Q How just students have changed -- the youth have changed? You were a student -- (laughter) -- at your time there were one type, now they have changed?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I know there was a period in our

country when there was a very great change for the worst. When I was Governor of California, I could start a riot just by going to a campus. But that has all changed, and I could be looking out at an American student body, as well as I'm looking out here and would not be able to tell the difference between you.

I think that back in our day -- I did happen to go to school, get my college education in a unique time -- it was the time of the Great Depression, when, in a country like our own, there was 25 percent unemployment and the bottom seemed to have fallen out of everything. But we had -- I think what maybe I should be telling you from my point here, because I graduated in 1932 -- that I should tell you that when you get to be my age, you're going to be surprised how much you recall the feelings you had in these days here, and that how easy it is to understand the young people because of your own having been young once. You know an awful lot more about being young than you do about being old. (Laughter.)

And I think there is a seriousness, I think there is a sense of responsibility that young people have, and I think that there is an awareness on the part of most of you about what you want the -- your adulthood to be and what the country you live in you want it to be. And I have a great deal of faith. I said the other day to 78 -- 76 students -- they were half American and half Russian. They had held a conference here and in Finland and then in the United States, and I faced them just the other day, and I had to say, I couldn't tell the different looking at them which were which, but I said one line to them. I said I believe that if all the young people of the world today could get to know each other, there would never be another war. And I think that of you. I think that of the other students that I've addressed in other places.

And of course I know also that you're young and therefore there are certain things that at times take precedence. I'll illustrate one myself. Twenty five years after I graduated, my alma mater brought me back to the school and gave me an honorary degree. And I had to tell them they compounded a sense of guilt I had nursed for 25 years because I always felt the first degree they gave me was honorary. (Laughter.)

You're great. Carry on. (Applause.)

Q Mr. President, you have just mentioned that you welcome the efforts -- settlement of the Afghanistan question. And -- the difference of other regional conflicts. What conflicts do you mean? Central America conflicts, South East Asian, or South African -- I am --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, for example, in South Africa, where Namibia has been promised its independence as a nation -- another new African nation. But it is impossible because of a civil war going on in another country there and that civil war is being fought on one side by some 30,000 to 40,000 Cuban troops who have gone from the Americas over there and are fighting on one side with one kind of authoritative government. When that country was freed from being a colony and given its independence, one faction seized power and made itself the government of that nation. And leaders of another -- seeming the majority of the people had wanted simply the people to have the right to choose the government that they wanted, and that is the civil war that is going on.

But what we believe is that those foreign soldiers should get out and let them settle it. Let them -- the citizens of that nation, settle their problems.

And the same is true in Nicaragua. Nicaragua has been -- Nicaragua made a promise -- they had a dictator. There was a revolution, there was an organization that -- and was aided by others in the revolution, and they appealed to the Organization of American States for help in getting the dictator to step down and stop the

killing. And he did. But the Organization of American States had asked, what are the goals of the revolution, and they were given in writing, and they were the goals of pluralistic society, of the right of unions and freedom of speech and press and so forth -- and free elections, a pluralistic society. And then the one group that was the best organized among the revolutionaries seized power, exiled many of the other leaders and has its own government, which violated every one of the promises that had been made. And here again, we want -- we're trying to encourage the getting back those -- or making those promises come true and letting the people of that particular country decide their fate.

Q Esteemed Mr. President, I'm very much anxious and concerned about the destiny of 310 Soviet soldiers being missing in Afghanistan. Can you -- are you willing to help in their search and their return to the motherland?

THE PRESIDENT: Very much so. We would like nothing better than that.

Q The reservation of the inalienable rights of citizens guaranteed by the Constitution faces certain problems. For example, the right of people to have arms, or for example, the problem appears -- an evil appears whether spread of pornography or narcotics is compatible with these rights. Do you believe that these problems are just unavoidable problems connected with democracy or they could be avoided?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, if I understand you correctly, this is a question about the inalienable rights of the people -- does that include the right to do criminal acts and -- for example, in the use of drugs and so forth? No. (Applause.) No, we have a set of laws.

I think what is significant and different about our system is that every country has a constitution, and most constitutions or practically all of the constitutions in the world are documents in which the government tells the people what the people can do. Our Constitution is different and the difference is in three words -- it almost escapes everyone. The three words are, "We the people." Our Constitution is a document in which we the people tell the government what its powers are. And it can have no powers other than those listed in that document. But very carefully, at the same time, the people give the government the power with regard to those things which they think would be destructive to society, to the family, to the individual and so forth -- infringements on their rights. And thus, the government can enforce the laws. But that has all been dictated by the people.

Q Mr. President, from history I know that people who have been connected with great power, with big posts, say good-bye, leave these posts with great difficulty. Since your term of office is coming to an end, what sentiments do you experience and whether you feel like, if, hypothetically, you can just stay for another term? (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I'll tell you something. It was -- I think it was a kind of revenge against Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who was elected four times -- the only President. There had kind of grown a tradition in our country about two terms. That tradition was started by Washington, our first President, only because there was great talk at the formation of our country that we might become a monarchy, and we had just freed ourselves from a monarchy. So, when the second term was over, George Washington stepped down and said he would do it -- stepping down -- so that there would not get to be the kind of idea of an inherited aristocracy.

Well, succeeding presidents -- many of them didn't get a chance at second term -- they did one term and were gone. But that tradition kind of remained. But it was just a tradition. And then Roosevelt ran the four times -- died very early in his fourth term.

And suddenly, in the atmosphere at that time, they added an amendment to the Constitution that presidents could only serve two terms.

When I get out of office -- I can't do this while I'm in office, because it will look as I'm selfishly doing it for myself -- when I get out of office, I'm going to travel around, what I call the mashed potato circuit, that is the after-dinner speaking and the speaking to luncheon groups and so forth -- I'm going to travel around and try to convince the people of our country that they should wipe out that amendment to the Constitution because it was an interference with the democratic rights of the people. The people should be allowed to vote for who they wanted to vote for, for as many times as they want to vote for him; and that it is they who are being denied a right. (Applause.)

But you see, I will no longer be President then, so I can do that and talk for that. There are a few other things I'm going to try to convince the people to impress upon our Congress, the things that should be done. I've always described it that if -- if in Hollywood when I was there, if you didn't sing or dance, you wound up as an after-dinner speaker. And I didn't sing or dance. (Laughter.) So I have a hunch that I will be out on the speaking circuit, telling about a few things that I didn't get done in government, but urging the people to tell the Congress they wanted them done. (Applause.)

Q Mr. President, I've heard that a group of American Indians have come here because they couldn't meet you in the United States of America. If you fail to meet them here, will you be able to improve -- to correct it and to meet them back in the United States?

THE PRESIDENT: I didn't know that they had asked to see me. If they've come here or whether to see them there-- (laughter) -- I'd be very happy to see them.

Let me tell you just a little something about the American Indian in our land. We have provided millions of acres of land for what are called preservations -- or reservations, I should say. They, from the beginning, announced that they wanted to maintain their way of life, as they had always lived there in the desert and the plains and so forth. And we set up these reservations so they could, and have a Bureau of Indian Affairs to help take care of them. At the same time, we provide education for them -- schools on the reservations. And they're free also to leave the reservations and be American citizens among the rest of us -- and many do. Some still prefer, however, that way -- that early way of life.

And we've done everything we can to meet their demands as to what they -- how they want to live. Maybe we made a mistake. Maybe we should not have humored them in that wanting to stay in that kind of primitive lifestyle. Maybe we should have said, no, come join us; be citizens along with the rest of us. As I say, many have; many have been very successful.

And I'm very pleased to meet with them, talk with them at any time and see what their grievances are or what they feel they might be. And you'd be surprised -- some of them became very wealthy because some of those reservations were overlaying great pools of oil, and you can get very rich pumping oil. And -- so I don't know what their complaint might be.

Q Mr. President, I'm very much tantalized since yesterday evening by the question, why did you receive yesterday -- did you receive -- and when you invite yesterday -- refuseniks or dissidents? And for the second part of the question is just what are your impressions from Soviet people? And among these dissidents, you have invited a former collaborator with a Fascist -- who was a policeman serving for Fascist.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, that's one I don't know about, or

maybe the information hasn't been all given out on that. But you have to understand that Americans come from every corner of the world. I received a letter from a man that called something to my attention recently. He said you can go to live in France, but you cannot become a Frenchman. You can go to live in Germany, you cannot become a German -- or a Turk, or a Greek, or whatever. But he said anyone, from any corner of the world can come to live in America and become an American.

You have to realize that we are a people that are made up of every strain, nationality and race of the world. And the result is that when people in our country think someone is being mistreated or treated unjustly in another country, these are people who still feel that kinship to that country because that is their heritage. In America, whenever you meet someone new and become friends, one of the first things you tell each other is what your bloodline is. For example, when I'm asked, I have to say Irish, English, and Scotch -- English and Scotch on my mother's side, Irish on my father's side. But all of them have that.

Well, when you take on to yourself a wife, you do not stop loving your mother. So there -- Americans all feel a kind of a kinship to that country that their parents, or their grandparents, or even some great-grandparents came from -- you don't lose that contact. So what I have come -- and what I have brought to the General Secretary -- and I must say he has been very cooperative about it -- I have brought lists of names that have been brought to me from people that are relatives or friends that know that -- or that believe that this individual is being mistreated here in this country and they want him to be allowed to emigrate to our country.

Some are separated families. One that I met in this -- the other day was born the same time I was. He was born of Russian parents who had moved to America, oh, way back in the early 1900's -- and he was born in 1911. And then sometime later, the family moved back to Russia. Now he's grown, has a son. He's an American citizen -- but they wanted to go back to America and being denied on the grounds that, well, they can go back to America, but his son married a Russian young lady and they want to keep her from going back.

Well, the whole family said no, we're not going to leave her alone here. She's a member of the family now. Well, that kind of a case is brought to me personally so I bring it to the General Secretary. And as I say, I must say, he has been most helpful and most agreeable about correcting these things.

Now, I'm not blaming you -- I'm blaming bureaucracy. We have the same type of thing happen in our own country. And every once in a while, somebody has to get the bureaucracy by the neck and shake it lose and say stop doing what you're doing. And this is the type of thing and the names that we have brought. And it is a list of names, all of which have been brought to me personally by either relatives or close friends and associates.

(Applause.) Thank you very much. You're all very kind. I thank you very much. And I hope I answered the questions correctly -- nobody asked me what it was going to feel like to not be President anymore. I have some understanding because after I'd been Governor for eight years and then stepped down, I want to tell you what it's like. We'd only been home a few days and someone invited us out to dinner. Nancy and I both went out, got in the back seat of the car and waited for somebody to get in front and drive us. (Laughter.)

(A gift is presented.)

THE PRESIDENT: That is beautiful. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END 5:11 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary
(Moscow, USSR)

For Immediate Release May 31, 1988

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO CULTURAL AND ART COMMUNITY LEADERS

A. Fadeyev Central House of Men of Letters
Moscow, USSR

1:44 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: As Henry VIII said to each of his six wives, I won't keep you long. (Laughter.)

But thank you Vladimir Vasiliovich. It's with some humility that I come here today. You here, writers, artists, dramatists, musicians of this vast country are heirs to the seminal figures in many of the arts as they have developed in the 20th century Europe and America.

I'm thinking of such giants as Kandinsky, Stravinsky, Stanislawski, Dostoevsky to name a few -- men whose vision transformed all of ours.

I've been very impressed with what I've heard just now. For my contribution to this dialogue I thought I would deal here briefly with the question whose answer might open up some new insights for all of us. You see, I've been told that many of you were puzzled that a former actor could become the leader of a great nation, particularly the United States. What does acting have to do with politics and statecraft. Whatever possessed the American people to entrust this high office to me?

You might feel reassured to know you aren't the first to ask that question. Back in Washington, just about every member of the political opposition has been asking it for the last eight years. And they're not the first. It's been happening ever since. Almost a quarter of a century ago, I announced that I was going to run for what turned out to be the first public office I ever held -- Governor of California. Yes, I had served as President of my union, the Screen Actors Guild. Yes, in that role I'd led a successful strike by the union against the studios, and yes, I'd campaigned actively for a number of candidates for office, including candidates for president. But I was still known primarily as an actor.

In the movie business, actors often get what we call typecast -- that is, the studios come to think of you as playing certain kinds of roles, so those are the kinds of roles they give you. And no matter how hard you try, you just can't get them to think of you in any other way. Well, politics is a little like that, too. So I've had a lot of time and reason to think about my role not just as a citizen turned politician, but as an actor turned politician.

In looking back, I believe that acting did help prepare me for the work I do now. There are two things -- two indispensable lessons that I've taken from my craft into public life. And I hope you won't think it excessively opportune if I use the words of a Soviet filmmaker to explain one of them. He was, after all, one of the world's greatest filmmakers. And so, like so many of your artists -- indeed, like so many of you, belongs in a broader sense to

all of humanity.

It was during the production of "Ivan The Terrible" when Eisenstein noted that in making a film or in thinking through any detail of it, which to my mind would include the acting of a part, in his words, "The most important thing is to have the vision. The next is to grasp and hold it. You must see and feel what you are thinking. You must see and grasp it. You must hold and fix it in your memory and senses. And you must do it at once."

To grasp and hold a vision, to fix it in your senses -- that is the very essence, I believe, of successful leadership not only on the movie set, where I learned about it, but everywhere. And by the way, in my many dealings with him since he became General Secretary, I've found that Mr. Gorbachev has the ability to grasp and hold a vision, and I respect him for that.

The second lesson I carried from acting into public life was more subtle. And let me again refer to a Soviet artist, a poet -- again, one of the world's greatest. At the beginning of "Requiem," Anna Akhmatova writes of standing in a line outside a prison when someone in the crowd recognizes her as a well-known poet. She continues, "Then a woman standing behind me whose lips were blue with cold and who, naturally enough, had never even heard of my name, emerged from that state of torpor, common to us all, and putting her lips close to my ear -- there everyone spoke in whispers -- asked me, 'And could you describe this?' And I answered her, 'I can.' Then something vaguely like a smile flashed across what once had been her face."

That exchange -- "can you describe this?," "I can" -- is at the heart of acting as it is of poetry and of so many of the arts. You get inside a character, a place, and a moment. You come to know the character in that instant, not as an abstraction, one of the people, one of the masses, but as a particular person, yearning, hoping, fearing, loving -- a face, even what had once been a face, apart from all others, and you convey that knowledge, you describe it, you describe the face.

Pretty soon, at least for me, it becomes harder and harder to force any member of humanity into a straitjacket, into some rigid form in which you all expect to fit. In acting, even as you develop an appreciation for what we call the dramatic, you become in a more intimate way less taken with superficial pomp and circumstance, more attentive to the core of the soul -- that part of each of us that God holds in the hollow of his hand and into which he breathes the breath of life.

And you come to appreciate what another of your poets, Nikolay Gumilev, meant when he wrote that "The eternal entrance to God's paradise is not closed with seven diamond seals. It is a doorway in a wall abandoned long ago. Stones, moss, and nothing more."

As I see it, political leadership in a democracy requires seeing past the abstractions and embracing the vast diversity of humanity and doing it with humility. Listening as best you can -- not just to those with high positions, but to the cacophonous voices of ordinary people and trusting those millions of people -- keeping out of their way, not trying to act the all-wise and all-powerful, not letting government act that way. And the word we have for this is freedom.

In the last few years, freedom for the arts has been expanded in the Soviet Union. Some poems, books, music and works in other fields that were once banned have been made available to the public, and some of those artists who produced them have been recognized. Two weeks ago, because of the work of the Writers Union, the first step was taken to make the Pasternak home at Peredelkino into a museum. In the meantime, some artists in exile -- the stage

director Yuri Lubimov, for example, have been permitted to return and to work, and artists who are here have been allowed a greater range.

We in the United States applaud the new thaw in the arts. We hope to see it go further. We hope to see Mikhail Baryshnikov and Slava Rostropovich, artists Mrs. Reagan and I have seen perform in Washington, perform again in Moscow. We hope to see the works of Alexander Solzhenitsyn published in the land he loves. And we hope to see a permanent end to restrictions on the creativity of all artists and writers.

We want this not just for your sake, but for our own. We believe that the greater the freedoms in other countries the more secure both our own freedoms and peace. And we believe that when the arts in any country are free to blossom, the lives of all people are richer.

William Faulkner said of poets, although he could have been speaking of any of the arts, it is the poet's privilege to help man endure by lifting his heart -- by reminding him of the courage and honor and hope and pride and compassion and pity and sacrifice, which have been the glory of our past. The poet's voice need not merely be the record of man. It can be one of the props, the pillars to help him endure and prevail.

Thank you for having me here today, and for sharing your thoughts with me, and God bless you all.

END 2:02 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary
(Moscow, USSR)

For Immediate Release May 31, 1988

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MARLIN FITZWATER AND GENNADY GERASIMOV

Mezhdunarodnaya Hotel
Moscow, USSR

6:07 P.M. (L)

MR. GERASIMOV: Dear comrades, ladies and gentlemen, allow me to open our joint Soviet-American briefing. Today, another talk was held between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Wilson Reagan. The talks were held in the office in the premises of the Soviet government in the Kremlin, and mention should be made that Mr. President and the General Secretary received many cables from different areas of our country, and the President was familiarized with some of these cables.

A baby was born and his parents called him Ron. (Laughter.) Then a girl was born and the parents called her Reagana. (Laughter.) While these touching and apparently somewhat naive cables reflect the sentiments of the Soviet people, and they show that the Soviet people approve the changes for the better that take place in the relations between our countries. The President could see for himself when he walked around Red Square, you no doubt saw it over TV. He was wholeheartedly welcomed by the Soviet citizens who were rather happy to meet President Reagan in the Red Square at this remarkable moment. Citizens from different cities of our country.

It is also very important so that the policy of both of our countries would reflect the sentiments of the people, and both the President and General Secretary agreed with it. The President was extremely interested in the course of perestroika, and yesterday you asked whether they discussed the problems of Soviet reforms. Yes, this is true. Today Mikhail Gorbachev, at the request of the President, told him of the perestroika rather briefly since they were rather pressed for time. And on the eve of this meeting theses were published of the party conference to be held very soon. The President, as we know it, read the book by Mikhail Gorbachev on perestroika and new political thinking, but the theses apparently appeared too late for the President to get familiar with them.

While the essence of the changes taking place in this country is democratization -- democratization first of economic life in the country. Laws have been passed in our country on the state enterprise, on individual labor activity cooperation, et cetera, and all this enlivened our economic life. And people welcomed these changes, although there are some people who are worried over the fact of whether we have differentiation between the people or whether we shall have the poor and rich as you have it in your country.

The process of democratization also involves the party, it involves the expansion of the function of the Soviets, and it envisions the legal reform in order to legally fix the changes that take place in the country. The essence of these and other changes is to put into operation the potential of the socialist system and it is quite natural that around these most important problems of our life, disputes are being held.

Then in -- during the talk they touched upon the problems

of economic cooperation between our countries quite recently. Our country, during the session of the American-Soviet Commercial Council, was visited by, it seems to me, about 400 businessmen -- a big group of American businessmen. And their desire to trade with us -- and no doubt they had such a desire to trade since they came to this country -- this desire is -- comes across as -- comes across the situation when we are refused the regime of the favored nation. And we remember the amendments by Jackson-Vanik, and it happens now that the dead grasps the live and this amendment stipulates the granting of the regime of most favored nation with the changes in the internal policy and domestic policy.

And if we, by analogy, would stipulate our cooperation by changes of the American policy in respect to, say, Mexicans -- immigrants -- we have to expand economic cooperation. And the bigger scale of this cooperation, the better, and this was also discussed during the morning talks between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev.

During the talks they also touched upon the theory, quite popular in the West, in keeping with which a weak Soviet Union is much better than a stronger Soviet Union if we bank on the interest of the West. So this is a rather weak theory since we will become stronger and our relations will be spoiled if we base -- if we bank on this theory. And mention should be made that the President disagreed with this theory.

By the way, during today's meeting with the press, one American correspondent asked the American President one question which is far from being regional, and the question that has been chewed for quite a long time. In other words, how -- can -- the present impression of President Reagan can be referred to his previous statement about the empire of evil. And the President answered that I meant another time, another epoch.

Thus, serious talks are being held -- sometimes disputes -- and one man in Red Square today recalled the Russian saying, that the truth is born in disputes. And Mikhail Gorbachev added another saying. "If these disputes are too hot, then the truth evaporates." But these disputes are businesslike, and therefore we hope that there will be a moment of truth. And I hope that my colleague Fitzwater will add to what I have probably omitted to say. Thank you.

MR. FITZWATER: I can't imagine you omitted very much. (Laughter.)

Q Whew.

Q Go for it.

MR. FITZWATER: In sticking to the -- during the walk on Red Square today I would just add that the President's reactions were one of great enthusiasm and excitement for the people that he got a chance to talk to and for the description of Red Square and the Kremlin that the General Secretary gave him. He enjoyed that walk very much -- a chance to get out and see the city.

I think he also felt it was a good symbol of the personal relationship that he has developed with General Secretary Gorbachev. They've had good discussions and the one-on-one meeting this morning which was supposed to be 15 minutes lasted for over an hour, and it was a general philosophic discussion in which the President asked the General Secretary for his views on kind of where he is going with perestroika, what his plans are, and the General Secretary was most anxious to elaborate on his views and what he has in mind.

The President feels very satisfied by the progress that has been made so far in the summit meetings, feels they've been very productive, and is also pleased by the cross-section of people he's had a chance to meet in these various meetings.

I think they have all been very businesslike, have been notably free from some of the arguments of past sessions, if you will. And so we think it's gone very well up until this point, and are very hopeful for a good conclusion tomorrow and Thursday.

I just have a couple of other related readouts. One is on the Defense Minister's meeting that you asked about yesterday -- to say briefly that Defense Minister Yazov and Secretary of Defense Carlucci met again this afternoon at 2:15 p.m. at the Soviet Ministry. That meeting lasted until 4:45 p.m. They talked about missile launch notification and notification of large-scale military exercises, and similar confidence-building measures.

Other topics discussed were preventing dangerous encounters by military aircraft and naval vessels, verification measures for START, measures to prevent the transfer of missile technology, and efforts to resolve the Iran-Iraq War. At the invitation of the Minister of Defense, Secretary Carlucci will tour the Central Military Museum at 1:45 p.m. Wednesday afternoon.

I give that readout also in the sense that it does demonstrate again one of the most productive working relationships to evolve out of this summit, and that is the ministerial-level meetings where they can go into all sorts of problems that face the two superpowers in this time.

With that I believe I'd turn it over to questions and answers.

MR. GERASIMOV: Probably we can say that we have also signed today a number of agreements, and if you want to, I could enumerate them. I have them here with me if you want me to enumerate them. You see how many we have signed. Shall I enumerate them? No, if you don't want me to enumerate them, I will not.

All right, your questions, please.

Q Marlin, almost every reporter who has come back from a pool has commented on the President looking tired or listless, or one pool report today saying that he had dozed off briefly. Is there a problem with the President's health or stamina? Is he having any problems?

MR. FITZWATER: There is no problem with the President's health. He did have a difficult night's sleep and we're all a little tired, and I suspect that was reflected probably in our entire delegation.

MR. GERASIMOV: After they had a walk on the Red Square, we went up on a very high, steep stairs and I will tell you, I felt breathless, but the President felt okay.

Q What is the result of the negotiations on the Middle East issue? That interests all the people in the Middle East. Could you bring closer your positions on the issue?

MR. GERASIMOV: You will finally get the results tomorrow, but now I have the statement of the Ambassadors and the heads of the Arab representations where they mention the attention with which they follow this meeting and support the policy of relaxation and peaceful coexistence and then expressed their fears in respect to the situation in the Middle East.

MR. FITZWATER: I would add only that the President and the General Secretary have not had an opportunity to discuss that issue yet. As you know, because of the length of their one-on-one meeting this morning, they did not get to hold the plenary session, which would have discussed many of these bilateral issues. However, the Foreign Ministers -- Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and Secretary

Shultz did discuss the Middle East in their meetings and our relative positions are essentially the same, but I think they did feel that they were able to achieve some further understanding of each other's positions.

Q Do you expect any further agreements to come out of this summit, big or small? What's the next step?

MR. GERASIMOV: Well, unfortunately, there will be no more change. But this has not been planned -- you asked whether agreements would be signed, any more agreements will be signed? I can tell you only one thing, that all the agreements that have to be signed have been signed already.

MR. FITZWATER: I think if the question is new agreements, Gennady is essentially correct. But keep in mind we do sign the instruments of ratification of the INF Treaty tomorrow. In addition, there will be a statement of some kind on the progress of the talks in general, on the status of the START discussions and other matters.

Q When will that be signed?

MR. FITZWATER: We don't have a time yet for the final statement.

Q Mr. Gerasimov, in an earlier briefing, Mr. Arbatov said that regarding START, specifically on sea-launched cruise missiles and SDI, his feeling was that the Americans had come empty-handed and he was disappointed personally. Is that attitude shared by the General Secretary?

MR. GERASIMOV: Well, during the working groups we discussed all these problems in detail, and yesterday I discussed our proposals in this domain. No doubt we would like the talks on this problem to progress further and we would like the American delegation to originate new, fresh ideas, as they put it, show the readiness for discussion. But these are the talks to look for new problems and solutions to these problems. Thank you.

MR. FITZWATER: I would add only on that, Frank, that we came to the talks open-minded on that issue and we have had generous discussions about it. But that our basic position remains the same with regard to SDI, that it's not a bargaining chip. Nevertheless, we have had good discussions on the ABM Treaty and its interpretation.

Q Marlin, earlier today on --

MR. GERASIMOV: You have, first of all, to give your name and then the mass media you represent.

Q I am Sam Donaldson of ABC News. (Laughter.)

Marlin, earlier today at Moscow University, the President was asked why he met with the refuseniks yesterday. He touched a number of themes including one of pluralism in the United States. And then he finally talked about the list of specific cases that he had turned over to the General Secretary. And if my notes are correct, he said the General Secretary had been helpful -- he said, "I'm not blaming you, I'm blaming bureaucracy. We have the same kind of thing in our country." Does the President really believe that these people have been denied the right to emigrate because of an essentially inept but benign bureaucracy here?

MR. FITZWATER: I think the President is fully aware of the constraints on emigration here and the source of that within the Soviet system. And that is what he speaks to when he speaks to the value of freedom of emigration and travel. The President has presented the General Secretary with a number of cases in the past

and the General Secretary has been quite helpful on many of them. And the President also acknowledges that the government and the General Secretary have been quite responsive on many specific cases. Nevertheless, we continue to press for more.

MR. GERASIMOV: I would like to add that in the Russian language, the term "bureaucracy" has a shade of negative meaning, and therefore, we cannot say we have high quality bureaucracy or -- it cannot be said. So this is all.

Q Mr. Fitzwater, could you please be a little more specific in the case presented yesterday by Mr. Gorbachev to President Reagan concerning the European conventional weapon and the talk which could be in the near future -- which can take place in the near future? What is the answer to the proposition, generally speaking?

MR. FITZWATER: We suggested yesterday the conventional stability talks are ongoing in which we are examining the question of force strengths between the NATO Alliance and the Warsaw Pact countries. And the General Secretary's suggestion yesterday about defining that material even more and establishing data that we can all agree on is an issue that has been considered in those talks, and we have been interested in for a long time.

Other ideas that the General Secretary had would flow out of a resolution of the matter of balance of strength. We have a basic disagreement with the Soviets on the existing situation and so that's where the matter stands.

Q Question to Mr. Marlin. Well, it is common knowledge that you were greatly concerned over human rights in the USSR -- concerned over human rights in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. A vivid example of this is yesterday's meeting between Mr. President and a group of so-called refuseniks. But I think that in your logic -- there is no logic in your logic, particularly when human rights are violated in those regions and countries where your country has great influence.

For instance, you keep your mouth closed when GIs of your strategic alliance of Israel kill peaceful Palestinians who require to put an end to occupation and who demand freedom. Doesn't it seem to you that such an American policy is a hypocritical one and that this is an encroachment upon justice and truth?

MR. FITZWATER: Our policy in the Middle East is to seek peace in that region, to foster direct negotiations between the countries of the region. And we abhor the violence that has taken place there on all sides. And we believe that policy is consistent with our general concern for human rights around the world.

Q Well, I have a question to Mr. Fitzwater. Responding to the question of my colleague from Pravda, you said that you disagree with the Soviet evaluation of the correlation of forces in Europe. But as we were explained yesterday here at the briefing, the essence of the Soviet proposal is to present the initial data and, in case of the disagreement on their evaluation, to check them on site. And I want to know what do you disagree in this proposal with?

MR. FITZWATER: How come the Pravda guy never asks you a question, Gennady? (Laughter.)

MR. GERASIMOV: Well, we're not supposed to ask questions of each other.

MR. FITZWATER: I see.

The assumption in the suggestions yesterday was that the force strengths are roughly equal between the Warsaw Pact countries

and the NATO Alliance. We do not believe that to be the case. We believe there's a large imbalance in favor of the Warsaw Pact. Therefore, as I said, the data examination does not take place from the same level of equality that was suggested. But this is a matter that we will take up with the allies.

Q Yesterday we heard two somewhat different accounts of the progress or lack thereof that had been made in the working group on the issues of air-launced cruise missiles and mobile missiles. Could the two of you address those two areas right now and tell us whether to expect in the joint statement tomorrow any indication of progress in narrowing the differences on those two weapon systems?

MR. GERASIMOV: Well, the work is still in full swing on the text of the joint agreements so we have to wait. Well, they are still working, working hard on bringing closer the stands of both sides.

MR. FITZWATER: I could not add anything --

Q -- do you stand by your statement of yesterday in saying that it appeared that progress had been made on those two points and that a compromise was possible?

MR. FITZWATER: And I, too, would agree that progress has been made. There certainly is a definition on problems, I suppose, as to how much and so forth. And for that, we just have to wait for the final communique or statement.

Q Mr. Fitzwater, if I got you right, you said that the Iraq-Iran war was discussed between Ministers Carlucci and Yazov. So could you tell us what has been discussed regarding the Iraq-Iran war and whether any agreement has been reached regarding the arms embargo?

MR. FITZWATER: I don't have the readout from that meeting. I have to refer you to Defense Department officials. Our position in these talks has been that we seek Soviet cooperation in getting compliance with the U.N. resolution 598 and in enforcing that resolution.

Q Arguments and facts -- Mr. Fitzwater can you tell us of the response of the Soviet side to the variation given by the Soviet press television in respect to yesterday's meeting between President Reagan that group of dissidents? Thank you.

MR. FITZWATER: I haven't seen all of the broadcasts, so I can't give a very detailed analysis. But the television I've seen has been very forthcoming and I've seen pictures and -- on most of the Soviet programs of the various events. But also because of the translation problem, I really am -- have not been able to hear the analysis or the dialogue.

Q Mr. Gerasimov, Mr. Fitzwater, in his opening statement, said that President Reagan was very satisfied with the progress of the summit to date. You describe the talks as businesslike and said there had been disputes. Can we construe from that that the Soviet side is at this point disappointed at the talks so far?

MR. GERASIMOV: He asked you.

MR. FITZWATER: He did? No, I think -- is that for me, Gene?

Q Mr. Gerasimov.

MR. GERASIMOV: For me? Yesterday I was asked why my smile was not so broad as it was the day before yesterday. And now

we discuss this question with Mr. Fitzwater. So where is the measurement of progress? The measurement of progress is in big expectations. If you have big expectations, then you -- it will seem to you that the progress is small. If you have small expectations then it will seem to you that progress is big. Well, this businesslike talk -- we have businesslike talks discussing different problems. And, for instance, with SLCM, where the American side does not want to meet our expectations, no doubt we have a certain element of disappointment. But from the point of view of realistic possibilities, I think that progress is quite noticeable, and we can state that there is progress during the talks.

Q I have a question for both spokesmen. Do you still conceive that a breakthrough in the final stage on START is possible?

MR. GERASIMOV: Well, this is an easy question and this question was posed to our leader. And they both agreed that this is quite possible before the end of the term of the present American administration. It seems to me that if there is a political will on both sides -- if diplomats and particularly the military will role up their sleeves, then no doubt this would become possible.

MR. FITZWATER: I would only add that we would like very much to sign a treaty before the end of the administration and we'll be working toward that goal.

Q Marlin, you said how pleased the President was. Has he, in this first trip ever to the Soviet Union, has he learned anything that he didn't know? Is he surprised by anything? Is there any particular thing that has struck him about his visit here so far?

MR. FITZWATER: Well, the President commented at some point in the course of the tour of Red Square that we're now talking to each other and not about each other. And I think that the -- probably the most dramatic impact that has occurred here has been the interaction with the people and the feeling that has developed between the delegations that we can do business in terms of sitting down and directly confronting our mutual problems.

The -- I know the President has been very touched by the Soviet citizens that he met with in the Arbat area on Sunday night and also with the people he has met on the other -- in other occasions. And this is -- has had an impact, I think, on his feelings about our ability to work with the Soviets.

Q Marlin, I think what that other questioner was getting at when he asked about the depiction on Soviet TV of Reagan's meeting with dissidents is that, students told us after this Moscow University speech that they had learned from television that one of these dissidents was a Gestapo agent of some kind. And so, when the issue arose at Moscow University, they all started laughing. Did the President meet with someone, who was formerly in the Gestapo? And if so, who was that on that list?

MR. FITZWATER: I have no idea. The President said at the speech he had no idea. But I would say that these were all people who had gotten in touch with the White House or the President or the State Department in some fashion with a personal appeal of their situations. But that kind of personal background we're not aware of.

Q Could you answer that also? Why was this depicted in the Soviet press this way?

MR. FITZWATER: I can't hear you.

MR. GERASIMOV: You have a follow-up?

Q Yes. Could you please answer why this was depicted in the Soviet press this way? And -- this is for you, Mr. Gerasimov.

MR. GERASIMOV: Me?

Q Yes. And who this person was.

MR. GERASIMOV: Our scribblers who were invited to cover this activity, which was not included into the official program of the President, were rather curious and looked into the dossier of the invited. And it was much richer of the dossier of the FBI or something like that, and they found out that one of them in fact was a policeman sharing the occupation of our country by Germany for which he was imprisoned, and it seems to be he was imprisoned for 25 years, and then there was an amnesty, so he was a former Nazi agent and a war criminal.

Q But who was it, sir? What was his name?

Q What's his name?

Q What's his name?

MR. GERASIMOV: His name is in newspapers in Izvestia -- and I don't want to distort his name. It seems to me his name is Doshko -- or Roshko. But you better read it in the Izvestia. It gives his name. Well, you know that our correspondents will not give up this sensation.

Q Mr. Gerasimov, the General Secretary told us today about noon that he handed an interesting collection of letters to President Reagan that he would no doubt be happy to communicate with American correspondents. Can you, either of you, tell us what those letters are about -- what this reference to a collection of letter was about?

MR. FITZWATER: I haven't had a chance to review those with the President yet. I will as soon as possible and see if any of them can be released. It was our understanding that these were letters that had -- that the General Secretary had received since the summit started concerning the President's trip. And they were personal letters from children and families who were congratulating the President or welcoming him or in some other way being very happy and flattering about the nature of the trip.

Q Well, I have a question on the development of consular relations. Did they discuss the question of opening up a different consulate representations in different towns? And what is the destiny of the general consulate in Kiev and New York?

MR. GERASIMOV: Well, these concrete issues are being discussed, not during the meeting -- during the second summit meeting -- but at the working diplomatic level. Well, we are going to open up these consulates in Kiev and in New York -- well, although we have to admit that in the long-run, these consulates will be opened.

Q The President and the General Secretary strolled through Red Square -- stopped about 60 or 70 feet from Lenin's tomb. Was it ever suggested or considered actually visiting Lenin's tomb? And if not, why?

MR. GERASIMOV: On this day today, Lenin's tomb is open for visitors, and as always there was a big queue to Lenin's tomb, and therefore we on the Soviet side decided that we should not interfere with those who came there to pay tribute to our leader, and therefore did not raise this question of entering Lenin's tomb.

Q Marlin, two questions: One, you say the President has been very touched by his meetings with the Soviet people. But to follow up Lou's question, can you give us any more details or any specifics about what the President's reaction to his first visit to the Soviet Union, and specifically some of the things he's learned

while he's here. And secondly, you mentioned that he had a bad night's sleep -- that his physical condition has been very obvious to those who have seen him. You had three full days in Helsinki to prepare him for this meeting, which to some people seemed quite a long time as it was. Why should he be so tired, given the fact that he rested in Helsinki so long?

MR. FITZWATER: In answer to your first question, I've given a number of characterizations of the President's attitude and the things he has found most satisfying and rewarding. I don't believe there's really anything I can add to what I said at the beginning of this briefing and the one yesterday.

In terms of sleep, the President is in excellent health. His stamina is just fine. He's walked up all the steps and has gone the whole distance without any problem at all. I frankly am tired. I fell asleep in the limousine on the way back, and I'm only 22, so it -- (laughter) -- I don't see this as a problem.

Q Here, you mentioned certain progress that you achieved at the summit talks. So, what is the progress in your personal cooperation -- the cooperation between two speakers? And whether this cooperation will allow you to live up to your pension age -- to live up to your pension age? Will this cooperation allow you to live up to your pension age?

MR. GERASIMOV: Whom do you ask?

MR. FITZWATER: We get a long just fine. I don't know pension age -- that's a few years away. Whether we'll last that long or not, but we certainly have enjoyed the Washington summit and I think we've enjoyed this summit. Both have been different. We've had -- there have been different characteristics to it. I have a lot more sympathy for Gennady in Washington now that I've been here in the sense of trying to sandwich in briefings between meetings and motorcades and so forth. But generally, I found it to be very rewarding.

Q Where's this fire and water?

Q Who's the fire and who's the water?

MR. GERASIMOV: In my opinion, well, we do not do too bad. If -- where we confide in the American press, which wrote that this was the Gennady show on the road. By the way, we discussed with my colleague the possibility of, when he retires, to have a joint trip in the United States as soon as he returns.

Well, my assistants helped me and -- you asked about the name -- the name of the policeman who was a Nazi agent and who was invited to the President. His name was Roshko -- Roshko -- R-O-S-H-K-O.

Q Mr. Gerasimov, a question please on the information that was received, apparently, yesterday about these dossiers on the meeting at Spaso House. In the briefing yesterday you mentioned that -- and I hope I am quoting you correctly -- that some of the people who participated in that meeting did not reflect the best of Soviet society. What you are indicating today, in fact, is that perhaps you had seen those dossiers already. What other information, besides this one on this, perhaps German Nazi connection, did you also discover in terms of the more than 100 -- or almost 100 people who participated in that meeting.

MR. GERASIMOV: No, as far as I know, there was not more than 40 people -- not a hundred people, but a little bit more than 40 people. I do not want now to take too much time by disclosing the dossiers of the guests invited to the Spaso House. But although it was a very interesting story using the journalists jargon -- and they describe it with great satisfaction. Well, the dossiers of these

people, in fact, are not -- they are not the best people in our society. And you will see their references and their dossiers in our newspapers. Some of them you have already seen, some of them will appear later. And some of them were not the best of our society.

Q Mr. Shultz is going on the second half of June to visit Israel. However, the leadership of the liberation struggle of the Palestinians announced the introduction -- announced a three-day strike until meeting Mr. Shultz. How will you comment on these developments? And then, I don't think I spoiled your mood by asking this question.

MR. FITZWATER: No, I just -- I'm not familiar with Secretary Shultz's trip. I don't know how he will approach that matter and I'd rather not try to speak for him at this time. I would say that he has been in the region a number of times, has visited all the countries, certainly is very concerned about the Palestinian representation problem and has been trying to work that out as best that can be done.

MR. GERASIMOV: One more question.

Q I'd like to ask both of you about President Reagan's comments both today and in the Soviet TV interview about women. I'd like to ask Marlin if that was deliberate by the White House to exploit a gender gap, and I'd like to ask Mr. Gerasimov if it's working.

MR. GERASIMOV: Now, what do you mean? What case in particular?

Q I'm sorry, I forgot to introduce myself.

MR. GERASIMOV: So what episode do you mean? What today's episode do you mean?

Q I'm talking about in Red Square, when he approached a group of Soviet women and told them that he felt the women of the Soviet Union are courageous and do not get the credit they are due, as he did previously in the Soviet TV interview from the Oval Office.

MR. FITZWATER: The President feels strongly that women are a courageous part of the Soviet society and simply wanted to make some mention of this. You'll recall that the episode in Red Square occurred when they were approaching a group of women who were located there -- many with small children. General Secretary Gorbachev took one of the children in his arms and referred to Grandfather Reagan in some fashion. And the women were obviously interested. They said that they wanted world peace for their children and that they hoped that the President and the General Secretary would be successful in the arms control talks. And it was that kind of direct conversation and interest by the women he encountered there that prompted him to respond in terms of an opinion about their role in society and the great job that women have been doing.

MR. GERASIMOV: Well, I presume that our Soviet women agreed with the high appraisal that your American President gave to their role played in our society. And I think that he will also agree that the Soviet human -- women are -- work both at the job and at home while we have a special holiday, the International Women's Day. But, on the other hand, we may admit that we have much to do in this domain in order to pay due tribute to our women.

Q I'd like to come back to the START treaty, please. Mr. Gorbachev said this morning that maybe it was time to stop banging his fists on the table with Mr. Reagan. Was there any banging of fists today? And also, could you say what Mr. Shevardnadze had in mind when he said that harvests are gathered in the fall?

MR. GERASIMOV: I did not --

Q There could be a harvest in the fall -- talking about START? Mr. Shevardnadze said today.

MR. GERASIMOV: Well, this is a repeat already. We wanted, and we are ready to conclude an agreement on a 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive arms with this present administration. And this administration also expresses its readiness to sign an agreement with us. But between this readiness and realization of its -- of this readiness is a distance which we have to traverse, and we are ready to traverse our path as far as the Americans go. I think that my colleague will add to what I said.

MR. FITZWATER: Yes. I'm not familiar with the Foreign Minister's comments, but, as I said earlier, we want to continue to keep working on the START treaty and hope we can reach an agreement as soon as possible.

MR. GERASIMOV: Marlin prompts me that it's high time for us to stop the briefing. We thank you very much for your attention until next time. Thank you.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END 6:56 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Moscow, USSR)

For Immediate Release May 30, 1988

**REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AND GENERAL SECRETARY GORBACHEV
IN EXCHANGE OF TOASTS
AT STATE DINNER**

The Kremlin
Moscow, USSR

7:37 P.M. (L)

GENERAL SECRETARY GORBACHEV: Esteemed Mr. President, esteemed Mrs. Reagan, ladies and gentlemen, comrades. I welcome you in the Moscow Kremlin. For five centuries, it has been the sight of events that constituted milestones in the life of our state. Decisions crucial to the fate of our nation were made here. The very environment around us is a call for responsibility to our times and contemporaries, to the present, and to the future.

It is here that we wish to emphasize the importance of the newly discovered truth that it is no longer possible to settle international disputes by force of arms. Our awareness of the realities of the present-day world has led us to that conclusion. I like the notion of realism, and I also like the fact that you, Mr. President, have lately been uttering it more and more often.

Normal and indeed durable Soviet-American relations which so powerfully affect the world's political climate are only conceivable within the framework of realism. Thanks to realism, for all our differences, we have succeeded in arriving at a joint conclusion which, though very simple, is of historic importance. A nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. Other conclusions follow with inexorable logic. One of them is whether there is any need for weaponry which cannot be used without destroying ourselves, and indeed all of mankind. I believe the realization of this became Reykjavik's pivotal idea.

Our Warsaw Treaty allies firmly adhere to this position. This is our powerful support in all matters related to nuclear disarmament. They have given the Soviet leadership a clear mandate to negotiate radical nuclear arms limitations and reductions with the United States. My talks with leaders of socialist countries and with authoritative representatives of other nations, make it clear to me that there is a common desire to overcome military confrontation and to end the race in both nuclear and conventional arms.

To this, it should be added that a realistic approach is making a way for itself in all directions and on all continents. And the idea of resolving today's problems soley by political means is gaining increasing authority. There is and everbroadening desire of the most diverse political and social forces for dialogue, for exchanges, for better knowledge of each other and for mutual understanding.

If this is indeed so -- if this is the will of the peoples, an effort is needed to ensure that the stocks of the firment* of realistic policies keep growing and never run out. For that, it is essential to understand each other better -- to take into account the specific features of life in various countries, the

historical conditions that shape them and the choice made by their peoples.

I recall the words you once spoke, Mr. President, and I quote, "The only way to resolve differences is to understand them." How very true. Let me just add that seeking to resolve differences should not mean an end to being different. The diversity of the world is a powerful wellspring of mutual enrichment, both spiritual and material.

Ladies and gentlemen, comrades, the word perestroika does not sound anachronistic, even within these ancient walls, for renewal of society, humanization of life and elevated ideals are at all times and everywhere in the interests of the people and of each individual. And when this happens, especially in a great country, it is important to understand the meaning of what it is going through. It is this desire to understand the Soviet Union that we are now seeing abroad. And we regard this as a good sign because we do want to be understood correctly. This is also important for civilized international relations. Everyone who wants to do business with us, will find it useful to know how Soviet people see themselves.

We see ourselves even more convinced that our socialist choice was correct and we cannot conceive of our country developing without socialism based on any other fundamental values. Our program is more democracy, more glasnost, more social justice with full prosperity and high moral standards. Our goal is maximum freedom for man, for the individual, and for society.

Internationally, we see ourselves as part of an integral civilization, where each has the right to a social and political choice -- to a worthy and equal place within the community of nations.

On issues of peace and progress, we believe in the primacy of universal human values and regard the preservation of peace as the top priority. And that is why we advocate the establishment of a comprehensive system of international security as a condition for the survival of mankind. Linked with this, is also our desire to revive and enhance the role of the United Nations on the basis of the original goals which the Soviet Union and the United States, together with their allies, enshrined in the charter of that organization.

Its very name is symbolic -- the United Nations -- united in their determination to prevent new tragedies of war -- to banish war from international relations and to affirm just principles securing a worthy life for any nation, whether large or small, strong or weak, rich or poor.

We want to build contacts among people in all forums, to expand and improve the quality of information, and to develop ties in the spheres of science, culture, education, sports and any other human endeavor. But this should be done without interfering in domestic affairs, without sermonizing or imposing one's views and ways, without turning family or personal problems into a pretext for confrontation between states. In short, our time offers great scope for action in the humanitarian field. Nations should understand each other better, know the truth about each other and free themselves from bias and prejudice.

As far as we know, most Americans, just like us, want to get rid of the demon of nuclear war, but they, just like us, just like all people on Earth, are becoming increasingly concerned over the risks of environmental disaster. Such a risk can only be averted if we act together. Increasingly urgent is the truly global problem of the economic state of the world -- in the North and South, in the West and East of this planet. The economic foundation of civilization will be destroyed unless a way if found to put an end to the squandering of funds and resources for war and destruction,

unless the problem of debt is settled and world finances are stabilized, unless the world market becomes truly worldwide by incorporating all states and nations on an equal footing.

It is across this spectrum of issues that we approach international affairs and of course our relations with the United States of America. We are motivated by an awareness of the realities and imperatives of the nuclear and space age, the age of sweeping technological revolution when the human race has turned out to be both omnipotent and mortal. It was this awareness that engendered the new thinking, which has made possible a conceptual and practical breakthrough in relations between us as well.

Mr. President, this meeting, while taking stock of a fundamentally important period in Soviet-American relations, has to consolidate our achievements and give new impetus for the future. Never before have nuclear missiles been destroyed. Now we have an unprecendented treaty and our two countries will be performing for the first time ever this overture of nuclear disarmament. The performance has to be flawless.

The Soviet Union and the United States are acting as guarantors of the Afghan political settlement. This, too, is a precedent of tremendous importance. As guarantors, our two countries face a very responsible period, and we hope they both will go through it in a befitting manner. The whole world is watching to see how we are going to act in this situation.

Our main task continues to be the working out of an agreement on 50 percent reductions in strategic offensive arms while observing the ABM Treaty. In our talks today, you and I devoted a lot of attention -- and with good cause -- to discussing the entire range of these problems. Mr. President, we are expected to ensure that the Moscow summit open up new horizons in the Soviet-American dialogue -- in relations between the U.S.S.R and the U.S. for the benefit of our two nations and the entire world. This is worth any effort and any amount of good will.

To cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, to their better mutual knowledge and mutual understanding. I wish good health and happiness to you, Mr. President, to Mrs. Nancy Reagan, and to all our distinguished guests. (Applause.)

(A toast is offered.)

THE PRESIDENT: I want to thank you again for the hospitality that we've encountered this evening and at every turn since our arrival in Moscow. We appreciate deeply the personal effort that you, Mrs. Gorbachev, and all of your associates have expended on our behalf.

Today has been a busy day. I want to thank you for the opportunity to meet with so many divergent members of Soviet society. As you know, I traveled to Danilov, and met there with the clergy at that ancient monastery and later in the day had most interesting exchanges with other members of Soviet society at Spaso House. These meetings only confirmed, Mr. General Secretary, the feelings of admiration and warmth that Americans harbor toward the peoples of the Soviet Union. As wartime allies, we came to know you in a special way. But in a broader sense, the American people, like the rest of the world, admire the saga of the peoples of the Soviet Union. The clearing of the forest, the struggle to build a society, the evolution into a modern state, and the struggle against Hitler's armies. There are other ways, too, that we know you -- "Happy or sad, my beloved, you are beautiful," says one of your folk songs -- "as beautiful as a Russian song, as beautiful as a Russian soul."

As expressed in the great music, architecture, art, we need only look about us this evening, and literature that over many

centuries you've given the world, we have beheld the beauty and majesty of your peoples' national experience. And without belittling the serious business before us, all of the fundamental issues that separate our governments, I hope you'll permit me tonight to say that in the eyes of the American people, your people truly are, as the song -- the folk song suggests -- a people of heart and mind, a people -- to use our vernacular -- with soul.

And that's why we believe there's common ground between our two peoples, and why it is our duty to find common ground for our two governments.

Over the next three days, General Secretary Gorbachev and I will review what has been accomplished over the past three years, and what our two nations might accomplish together in the months to come. We have a great deal to discuss on both accounts. What we have achieved is a good beginning. We have taken the first step toward deep reductions of our nuclear arsenals. We have taken the first step toward dealing with the reality that much of the tension and mistrust between our two countries arises from very different concepts of the fundamental rights and role of the individual in society. We have taken the first step to build that network of personal relationships and understanding between societies, between people, that are crucial to dispelling dangerous misconceptions and stereotypes.

These are good first steps, Mr. General Secretary, and we can both take pride in them, but as I said, they are just a start. Nuclear arsenals remain too large. The fighting continues needlessly, tragically in too many regions of the globe. The vision of freedom and cooperation enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act remains unrealized. The American and Soviet peoples are getting to know each other better, but not well enough. Mr. General Secretary, you and I are meeting now for the fourth time in three years -- a good deal more often than our predecessors. And this has allowed our relationship to differ from theirs in more than a quantitative state or sense.

We have established the kind of working relationship I think we both had in mind when we first met in Geneva. We've been candid about our differences, but sincere in sharing a common objective, and working hard together to draw closer to it. It's easy to disagree, and much harder to find areas where we can agree. We and our two governments have both gotten into the habit of looking for those areas. We found more than we expected.

I intend to pursue the search for common ground during the months left to me as President. When I pass the job on to my successor, I intend to tell him it is a search that must be continued.
Based on the achievements of the last few years, I will also tell him it is a search that can succeed.

Once again, Mr. General Secretary, I want to extend my thanks for your hospitality. I also hope you'll permit me to mention that, as you have been a gracious host, we've tried to be gracious guests by bringing along some small expressions of our gratitude. There's one gift in particular that I wanted to mention, not only in view of my own former profession, but because it has, I think, something important to say to us about what is underway this week in Moscow.

It is a film -- not as well known as some, but an American classic. It is a powerfully acted and directed story of family and romantic love, of devotion to the land, and dedication to higher principle. It is also fun, it has humor. There's a renegade goose, a mischievous young boy, a noisy neighbor, a love-struck teenager in love with a gallant soldier, an adolescent struggling for manhood, a loving, highly-principled wife, and a gentle but strong father. It's about the good and sometimes difficult things that

happen between man and wife, and parent and child.

The film also has sweep and majesty and power and pathos. For you see, it takes place against the backdrop of our American epic, the Civil War. And because the family is of the Quaker religion, and renounces violence, each of its characters must, in his or her own way, face this war and the moral dilemma it poses. The film shows not just the tragedy of war, but the problems of pacifism, the nobility of patriotism, as well as the love of peace.

I promise not to spoil its outcome for you, but I hope you'll permit me to describe one scene. Just as the invading armies come into southern Indiana -- one of our states -- the Quaker farmer is approached by two of his neighbors. One is also a Quaker who earlier in the story, when times were peaceful, denounces violence and vows never to lift his hand in anger. But now that the enemy has burned his barn, he's on his way to battle, and criticizes his fellow Quaker for not joining him in renouncing his religious beliefs. The other visitor, also on his way to battle, is the intruding but friendly neighbor. Yet it is this neighbor, although a non-believer, who says he's proud of the Quaker farmer's decision not to fight. In the face of the tragedy of war, he's grateful, as he says, that somebody's holding out for a better way of settling things.

It seems to me, Mr. General Secretary, that in pursuing these summit meetings, we too have been holding out for a better way of settling things. And by the way, the film's title is more than a little appropriate -- it's called "Friendly Persuasion."

So, Mr. General Secretary, allow me to raise a glass to the work that has been done, to the work that remains to be done, and let us also toast the art of friendly persuasion, the hope of peace with freedom, the hope of holding out for a better way of settling things. Thank you and God bless you. (Applause.)

END 8:07 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Moscow, USSR)

PRESS BRIEFING
BY
MARLIN FITZWATER AND GENNADY GERASIMOV

May 30, 1988

Mezhdunarodnaya Hotel
Moscow, USSR

5:58 P.M. (L)

MR. GERASIMOV: We start our second briefing. I give the floor to Marlin Fitzwater.

MR. FITZWATER: I want to begin by a brief apology that, because of the scheduling, I'm going to have to leave in about 15 minutes to go to the state dinner. So we'd like to begin immediately and do as much as we can. I will go ahead and depart; Gennady will stay and answer questions, and if necessary, I can come back at a later time.

The meetings this morning began at 10:00 a.m. and ended about 11:45 a.m. Both leaders noted that yesterday's meeting on human rights was beneficial to each other's understanding of their situations. They agreed that a good environment had been set for the meetings and today they would focus on arms control and bilateral issues.

President Reagan pointed to the value of people exchanges as the best way to broaden mutual understanding between nations. He referred to our young people in the context that if they would get together that it would be a long step toward eliminating the possibility of war. General Secretary Gorbachev said he agreed with the spirit of that statement and the President indicated he would discuss that in greater detail in his Moscow University speech.

The leaders discussed the broad objectives in several aspects of the arms control treaty. The working groups are studying these issues in more detail and will report back to the Foreign Ministers tomorrow afternoon. Ambassador Nitze heads our arms control group and Assistant Secretary Ridgway heads our group on regional, bilateral, and human rights.

They met for about three hours last night, from 9:30 p.m. until midnight, and they met again this morning and this afternoon. They, of course, are in a state dinner as part of the working party tonight, as well. But I think will meet again in the morning.

The two leaders discussed the Strategic Defense Initiative. President Reagan outlined his concept of the program, how it was developed and what its purposes are. They discussed the prelaunched notification proposal and indicated the two sides are coming together on this issue. Secretary Shultz also reported that progress in the working groups was considerable with regard to a joint verification experiment, which is, as you know, a message for testing nuclear explosions.

This second session was dedicated to exploratory conversations on arms control, designed to give direction and impetus to the working groups, and also designed to give direction to any

follow-on discussions later in Geneva. It was a very agreeable and direct discussion in which both sides laid out their views in a calm but forceful manner.

President Reagan is satisfied that the talks are progressing in a very productive way.

In the two events this afternoon, you have texts of the President's remarks and pool reports on the related activities. Both the President and the First Lady found it most rewarding to talk directly with the monks, as well as the Soviet citizens at Spaso House.

We will post a list of those invited, and I would say only that all those who were invited did attend -- and we'll have that for you right after the briefing.

Thank you.

MR. GERASIMOV: Well, I quite agree with my colleague that the second meeting, which had all the membership delegation present -- it had a very businesslike spirit. At the table assembled political leaders which represent very important states, and this is why a great responsibility is on their shoulders, on to the destiny of the world. And this is why we believe such meetings are so important and find ways of solving the problems that divide us.

Today, at the center of attention was the question of disarmament, though there were a number of other issues which also have been raised. And Marlin has already said about that -- about exchange of young people. We support this idea. Both sides stated that there is progress on the ratification of the treaty of INF and the Soviet side said that the Senate is working more rapidly than the presidium of the Supreme Soviet, but the Supreme Soviet was unanimous. I only show you this episode to show how -- what the atmosphere and spirit of the talk was. There was exchange of jokes, but at the same time, it was businesslike and serious, and very serious problems were brought for discussion -- were speaking about the obstacles that have to be overcome in preparation for the 50-percent cut in the strategic offensive weapons. And we have expressed our side to be ready to prepare and sign a treaty with this particular administration. And I believe that this administration positively replied to this particular attitude. We think that the problem of the future treaty on ABM should be based on the statement which was put out in Washington.

Very often, many people thought that the Soviet was against verification. This is a question of the past. We are for a comprehensive verification -- and on the MX too. And I think the attitudes have moved closer -- ever closer together in this particular -- on this issue. They also spoke about the verification -- on the control of the chemical weapons production and the banning of this production -- a question of how to act towards the private ownership plants. And I believe that the American side agreed that it should be spread on them too.

There's also the question of warning on launching. Not only within the national territories, but also inside the national territories. Here, there are very good chances of coming to an understanding. We might sign an agreement on this particular issue if we work out the necessary details, even during this particular meeting here in Moscow.

The Soviet side also suggested that we've started speaking about the launching on the air-based cruise missile and sea-based missiles of the same kind, the question of the massive lifting of the planes with missiles -- the question of informing on such massive acts. Also a question of the strategic weapons of certain -- specific kind. The American side is prepared to look into these new proposals that we have put forward.

But we are prepared to speak on the sublimits and work on them. The working groups are scrutinizing it. There is a certain progress in the question of cruise missiles and airbased. There was a difficult -- of the question of the sea-based cruise missiles. We believe that if we put it aside -- cancel the talks on them -- we shall open doors to circumvent the treaty which we visualize with a 50 percent cut of strategic arms. And this is a misunderstanding. This is, in fact -- is an obstacle, so we have to find a new solution. And if we will be willing to, we believe we will find such a solution.

They also discussed the question of the cutting of the conventional arms and armaments in Europe. In the West, a lot is being said about the dissymmetry between the NATO forces and the Warsaw Pact Organization. It is not quite that way at all. There is a symmetry, of course, but there isn't a very big disbalance here. We have to end symmetry. Now we invite -- to go back to the problem which discussed some time before, and work out a certain mandate as a basis for negotiation to the Vienna meeting. These are the stages that we proposed.

From the very beginning, we should start to inspect and control on the spot and see what should be cut. The next stage is 500 thousand cuts in the troops. And the third -- turn all the armaments and forces into defensive character forces. Well, we mean tanks or planes. Such could be our contribution to the preparation of the mandate on the cutting of the arms and armaments in Europe, including -- forces, but excepting nuclear charges.

As you see, it was a packed day today. And we could see there was some progress in various areas. Working groups also worked. And now, your questions, please.

Q I insist on the rule. I can -- I, of course --

Q Mr. Fitzwater, can you explain what the President meant when he said this morning, that the dissidents he would meet with this afternoon were disagreeable people?

MR. FITZWATER: I thought I recognized your face and voice, Sam. The President was having a little good sport and good humor with the press corps at that point. And it was just a lighthearted approach to his daily encounters with the Washington press establisment.

Q But, what did he mean by that? I'll accept what you say, but what -- I don't get the joke. (Laughter.)

MR. FITZWATER: Well, he just means that you tend to have a lot of concerns on your mind and press him on a daily basis.

Q It doesn't make any sense, but it's all right with me.

Q Marlin, here -- over here. Could you tell us something about Secretary Carlucci's meeting with the Soviet Defense Minister, Mr. Yazov? And could Mr. Gerasimov tell us, when you mentioned a certain progress was made in the area of air-launched cruise missiles, could you be more specific as to how far along the line on that particular problem they have been able to go?

MR. FITZWATER: I have -- what I'm looking at, Don, is I have a brief written readout of the meeting by Secretary Carlucci that has been provided to me, but I have not reviewed it, so let me just read this to you and perhaps we can expand more on it later.

Secretary of Defense Carlucci met with Soviet Minister of Defense Yazov at the Defense Ministry today. The meeting began at 12:40 p.m. and lasted until 2:30 p.m., was followed by a luncheon

until about 3:45 p.m. Also present at the meeting were Marshal Akhromeyev, Chief of the General Staff of the Soviet side, and Assistant Secretary of Defense Ron Lehman on the U.S. side. Vice Admiral Jonathan Howell, Assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was also present, as well as others who had participated in the meeting between the defense chiefs in the Berne summit last March.

It says the leaders continue the dialogue which began in their last meeting on a variety of topics, including Soviet military doctrine, military-to-military contacts and arms control. Marshal Akhromeyev conveyed his acceptance of the invitation to visit the United States and have discussions with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in early July in Washington. This was an invitation from Admiral William Crowe, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs.

The Secretary of Defense and the Defense Minister will meet again tomorrow at 2:15 p.m. at the Defense Ministry.

That's all I have, Don.

MR. GERASIMOV: The working groups are discussing some technical aspects of their joint effort. I don't think they should be publicized so broadly. When they were discussing cruise air-launched missiles, the counting approaches were discussed. There is a difference in this area. We want to count the maximum number of missiles carried by the heavy bombers. The Americans have a different approach.

Well, a certain compromise is possible on this. Another issue was discussed, that missiles will not be deployed at bases where there are no adequate heavy bombers who could carry nuclear missiles -- that heavy bombers would be subdivided into two parts -- nuclear-capable heavy bombers and non-nuclear heavy bombers. You understand what I have in mind? And that they should be separated so that they are stationed at different air fields. These are minor technical details.

Q A question to Mr. Fitzwater. I am from Lebanon. I welcome the efforts of the United States and of the Soviet Union concerning their efforts to improve the environment and that they pay much attention to preserve rare animals. My question is, and I believe that there are more people dying every day than rare animals. Therefore when you -- the U.S. and the Soviet Union -- prepare a sort of a red book -- maybe that will be a green book or a yellow book, that's up to you -- maybe you should prepare a book in order to keep people alive.

MR. FITZWATER: Let me just say, I apologize for the language failure. Environment used in the English colloquial sense is a reference to the nature of the meeting and the rapport between the gentlemen at the table.

I am going to have to go. I do want to respond just to one thing --

MR. GERASIMOV: Make your choice.

MR. FITZWATER: Make it short, Gennady says?

MR. GERASIMOV: Make your choice.

MR. FITZWATER: Gennady mentioned that there was a discussion of conventional force strengths at the meeting, and I would just say we do have a significant disagreement with the Soviets on this issue -- that we do believe -- indeed believe there's an imbalance between conventional forces in the Warsaw Pact countries and the NATO forces; and further, that we must achieve a parity in that area before we can go on to further nuclear reductions. And so while we certainly will discuss their ideas with the NATO countries,

there is a basic disagreement there that I must point out.

And I will -- we'll have to go and leave you, Gennady, to these wonderful folks.

MR. GERASIMOV: You're entitled to the last question of your own choice.

MR. FITZWATER: My last -- Helen?

Q -- discussion on the SDI. I mean, why did it come up, in what context? And what were the jokes?

MR. FITZWATER: Well, it was a broad discussion of the kind you have heard President Reagan talk about many times in terms of his conception of SDI, its ability to provide a defensive posture, as opposed to an offensive one, in terms of national defense -- that he would -- we're in the midst of a long-term research program that would lead to an ability to --

Q Did he change his mind at all? Any concessions?

MR. FITZWATER: No, there were no changing of minds. There was really an exploration of each other's views, questioning back and forth about how the President thought this would work from our context. We asked the General Secretary what his objections were, and it went back in a very educational and useful way. But there were no agreements from that discussion.

Thanks, Gennady.

Q Yesterday, it was possible to say that you were smiling. Yesterday it was possible to say that you were smiling, but today, perhaps -- perhaps you are not so smiling like that. Can you comment on that? (Laughter.)

MR. GERASIMOV: I don't know how to measure smiles -- by centimeters, inches -- but today's meeting was very successful -- it was quite nice. It was good yesterday, and it's -- it has been no worse today. There was a businesslike discussion.

My colleague, Fitzwater, said that he was -- that he disagrees with my -- with what I said that the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty organization members do not have any superiority as compared to NATO in Europe. Well, he has a different position. And this difference found was -- again reflected in today's conversation. Well, we believe that we can discuss the existence of such a problem in the center of Europe. But outside the center, there is no such superiority. If you take -- if this could be true concerning tanks, it is not true of aircraft.

So we suggest let's exchange data on our armed forces from the Atlantic to the Urals. What we now suggest is that before strarting the talks, let's check these data through onsite inspections. The U.S. insisted -- has been -- insisted all the time on inspection -- on verification. And now Secretary of Defense Carlucci said, approximately, as follows: If we verified Russians, then it's very good -- it's fine. But if they control us, then they will deal with our defenses -- with our security, and that will be no good. What we suggest is that we verify the data and start eliminating the disbalances, the asymmetry in the European deployed arms.

Q Mr. Gerasimov, has President Reagan altered and soured the atmosphere with his meeting very publicly, very demonstratively, with dissidents and refuseniks.

MR. GERASIMOV: Every guest that comes to us has the right to make use of his free time -- time free from the formal program the way he likes -- the way he chooses. The representatives

of Soviet public wanted to meet with him, and they will have this chance to meet with the President. The U.S. President decided to choose -- or selected to meet with selected representatives -- with people -- with selected Soviet citizens. That's his right. There was also a group of Soviet journalisits present, and I suppose they would tell Soviet public concerning the criteria for selecting Soviet citizens by the U.S. President. Well, the background that I have concerning these persons I can tell you that they are not the best of the Soviet public -- rather, on the contrary.

Q A question about regional conflicts. Could you tell us please, in a concrete form -- did you discuss the Iran-Iraq war? And the question about putting a stop to the war -- and President Reagan in his interview to Ogonek was criticizing the position of the Soviet Union about this particular war. He, in particular, said that if the Soviet Union was supporting the second resolution of the Security Council, and all the efforts of the United Nations on the sale of arms to Iran -- so he said that he's convinced that they could stop this tragic war. What could you say and remark to these attitudes -- no, we do not sell arms to Iran. There were other countries which recommended others not to do it, but they did it themselves. There was a country. We are -- our position is we want the war to end as quickly as possible. We're supporting all the efforts of the Secretary General of the United Nations. We take part -- an active part in the consultation on the part of the Security Council. But did this conflict discussed at the meeting? No, not yet. It will be discussed tomorrow.

Q The other day in Helsinki, Ambassador Ridgway told us that it would not be possible to reach any agreement on the launch notification issue because the United States could not accept the various new ideas that the Soviet Union had put forth -- the ones you suggested pertaining to notifications on bombers and cruise missiles. Can you explain to us what this agreement will now be? Is it -- will the launch notification agreement go forth pretty much as planned? Will the United States now agree to consider these new Soviet ideas, but they won't be part of this agreement?

MR. GERASIMOV: I believe that tomorrow we will have a ready draft treaty on the launching of the ballistic missiles. This is a very good step. But we believe that we could make other steps, too. We could also discuss the problem of preparing a treaty. Not today -- we will not have time for the -- for it at this meeting, but in the nearest future -- on the launching, on the air-launching missiles, sea-launched missiles -- about the warning of the mass flight of bombers, because such actions could bring about nervousness of the other side -- notification on military exercise and then, the missiles of a specific type. Anyway, there are different types of approach towards putting an end to the arms race in this field.

Q You said that the Soviet Union was ready to conclude a START agreement during the Reagan administration. Are you willing to sign such an agreement unless simultaneously there is agreement on the nuclear and space issue and you have a treaty covering the future of the ABM Treaty?

MR. GERASIMOV: A question about a treatment of ABM -- on ABM -- in general, on the question of the SDI has been discussed, and it should be pointed out here that the sides could not convince each other. President Reagan spoke about his dream. He said at the very beginning of his administration period he has invited a group of experts and scientists and asked them. Military experts were there, too. They thought it over and came back to him and said that, yes, it was feasible, and this is how it all started. This is the way SDI was initiated.

But we believe that President Reagan is listening to only one group -- a certain group, which is probably headed by Teller, who is the father of the bomb, as you know. But there are different experts which say that SDI is technically unfeasible, and

the response that could be taken would be much cheaper. This does not worry us as an attempt to make a shield against missiles, but it -- we are concerned because this is another spiral of the arms race in space, because they may become arms of offensive character, and then why should we -- what is the sense in signing the treaty on the 50 percent, then? But we have the Washington formula which says that we should abide by this treaty on a certain concluded period as signed -- the ABM in 1972. In other words, we have a discussion here, and it is seen that the sides have not come closer in their positions yet.

Well, when we talk about the time when this particular treaty will be ready, we would also like it to be ready at -- when this particular administration will still be in the White House. Probably here, we do not agree with the proverb that President Reagan has used when he was born, but he was not in a hurry in being born.

Q Will any harm come to those refuseniks and dissidents who chose to meet with President Reagan today, and have their cases been hurt in any way by the fact that they did so?

MR. GERASIMOV: I don't know. I met Mr. Reagan also today, but I don't think that I'm going to be harmed in any way by just meeting him.

Q After you sign the treaty on INF, there is -- much has been spoken about the compensation steps that should be taken. The talk between the General Secretary and the President -- do they discuss it through this particular angle, and what would be the result?

MR. GERASIMOV: No, we did -- they did not discuss the question of compensation; other way around. They were speaking about the curtailing of conventional arms and armaments in Europe. But the West and the United States, as you see, does not wish to discuss the question of tactical arms. He said the tactical would be discussed later after the conventional, but probably we would like to have it in the package.

Q During the discussions today with the experts, was there any progress made on mobile missiles and on verification of mobile missiles?

MR. GERASIMOV: I think I spoke about that. I mentioned it.

Q *

MR. GERASIMOV: Oh, I didn't say that. Just a minute. I think you didn't hear me. I said that. Yes, they did discuss both in the working group and at the plenary the problem of the MX -- mobile missile, sorry. So the question of verification mostly all the measures on the verification have been agreed upon. The details that -- I mean, if you want it in detail, we did not -- about the territory -- about the region where these missiles are going to be stationed. The deployment, that is.

I wouldn't like to be monopolizing this place in a briefing. I am alone, as you see, because Mr. Fitzwater has left us. But I do not want you to hear only one side of the story. So two or three more questions and we will have to bring this to a close.

Q Based on your remarks about the progress in air-launched cruise missiles and on mobile missiles, have we now reached the point that what's holding back the START treaty are two things -- sea-launched cruise missiles and SDI -- just those two?

MR. GERASIMOV: A very difficult problem here is of course that the United States do not wish to control the sea-based missiles. My personal point of view is they are making the same

mistake which occured when the United States did not agree with the Soviet proposal dealing with not to produce the independent -- dependently-targetable warheads.

I believe they have been pushed by this step -- by their characters and then probably they were sorry about it. Henry Kissinger and others said later on that probably that was their mistake. I think that the United States believed that in this particular field of technology they are ahead of us and they want to use this possibility. But the arms race shows very clearly that when you have superiority, it is just an illusion because it is only temporary. And sea-based cruise missiles should be under control.

We do propose to the United States concrete measures of verification -- certain variance. We do suggest -- let's have an experiment. Send us two warships and we will tell you which one of them carries these nuclear weapons without touching them. They said that their policy is such that they do not tell anybody what they have on -- what they carry on their ship. And such an experiment will change their policy. We think that this is just getting away from an answer.

And if we put aside the sea-based cruise missiles, we will see that this already gives a possibility of circumventing or getting around the whole treaty, and this is very closely connected with the ABM treaty and complying to it. They want to find out what the terminal date, and after that to move into another area. They want to passify us by saying that the United States will be ready to share with us their secrets in this field when these secrets will be ready. We think this is not a serious approach at all, and we do not really believe that in the future the United States will tell us their secrets about the Star Wars. At the present, they are not even ready for such measures of verification for the sea-launched missiles.

Q May I bring you back to the other half of the question you were asked earlier on the dissidents and refuseniks, and that is, will the meeting today with the President and his comments work to their benefit? Will it help them in their quest?

MR. GERASIMOV: I was not present there. Our other journalists were present. I will read what they have to report. I do not know what they really spoke about there.

Q There have been brought to our attention a series of graveyard desecrations in about six cities, and they say they know who -- a young attorney told us this -- a Soviet attorney -- and they say they know who the perpetrators are, and this has been happening over a period of about a year in the Ukraine and Kiev and in Siberia, and yet these perpetrators are not being brought to justice. In some cases a bulldozer has gone through a cemetery, bones mixed in with garbage and everything. And can you tell us why these perpetrators are not brought to justice?

MR. GERASIMOV: I do not know what you are talking about at the moment. I have not read about it, but I can say that if there is such cases -- it might happen, like in any other country -- have to do these barbaric deeds toward cemeteries. Of course those who are perpetrators should be brought to court. There is no doubt about that.

Q Could you give us answers by tomorrow of the specific cases?

MR. GERASIMOV: Two more questions.

Q You talked earlier about reducing Soviet troops in Europe by 500,000. Was that part of a proposal to the United States or is this something you're considering unilaterally?

MR. GERASIMOV: This is only the first stage. The first stage we should determine the total number of our armed forces, find out the assymmetry, the imbalances, carry out inspections so as to certify that the data is accurate. Then we reduce everything, then we reduce by 500,000 and then we make our armed forces defensive -- only defensive.

Q Mr. Gerasimov, you said earlier that we have a Washington formula about the ABM -- about adherence to the '72 ABM Treaty, which we must stick to. Has the Reagan administration proposed new language here that would be more specific, and particularly, have they called for unlimited testing of systems based on other physical principles that would go beyond what was signed in Washington?

MR. GERASIMOV: This question is being discussed. We believe that this question can be discussed.

Q But whether there was any discussion between the two leaders of the upcoming party conference and what reforms the Soviet leader plans to propose at the party conference?

MR. GERASIMOV: It is with a sense of satisfaction that we learned that President Reagan, who has not visited very often libraries, has read the full text of Gorbachev's book Perestroika, so he has been preparing for this topic to be discussed, although this topic was not discussed by the leaders, although this question has been dealt when the theses were discussed. But our two leaders may discuss this later. We know for certain that the U.S. President shows great interest towards what is happening in the Soviet Union within the framework of perestroika.

At this I would like to end the briefing so that I might not be accused by Mr. Fitzwater of monopolizing on your attention.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END 6:40 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Moscow, USSR)

For Immediate Release May 30, 1988

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT DANILOV MONASTERY

Moscow, USSR

2:35 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: It's a very great pleasure to visit this beautiful monastery and to have a chance to meet some of the people who have helped make its return to the Russian Orthodox Church a reality. I am also addressing in spirit the 35 million believers whose personal contributions made this magnificent restoration possible.

It's been said that an icon is a window between heaven and earth through which the believing eye can peer into the beyond. One cannot look at the magnificent icons created, and recreated here under the direction of Father Zinon, without experiencing the deep faith that lives in the hearts of the people of this land.

Like the saints and martyrs depicted in these icons, the faith of your people has been tested and tempered in the crucible of hardship. But in that suffering, it has grown strong, ready now to embrace with new hope the beginnings of a second Christian millennium.

We in our country share this hope for a new age of religious freedom in the Soviet Union. We share the hope that this monastery is not an end in itself, but the symbol of a new policy of religious tolerance that will extend to all peoples of all faiths.

We pray that the return of this monastery signals a willingness to return to believers the thousands of other houses of worship which are now closed, boarded up, or used for secular purposes.

There are many ties of faith that bind your country and mine. We have in America many churches, many creeds, that feel a special kinship with their fellow believers here -- Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Orthodox, and Islamic. They are united with believers in this country in many ways, especially in prayer.

Our people feel it keenly when religious freedom is denied to anyone anywhere, and hope with you that soon all the many Soviet religious communities that are now prevented from registering or are banned altogether, including the Ukranian Catholic and Orthodox Churches, will soon be able to practice their religion freely and openly and instruct their children in and outside the home in the fundamentals of their faith.

We don't know if this first thaw will be followed by a resurgent spring of religious liberty -- we don't know, but we may hope. We may hope that perestroika will be accompanied by a deeper restructuring, a deeper conversion, a mentanoya, a change in heart, and that glasnost, which means giving voice, will also let loose a new chorus of belief, singing praise to the God that gave us life.

There is a beautiful passage that I'd just like to read, if I may. It's from one of this country's great writers and believers, Alexander Solzhenitzyn, about the faith that is as elemental to this land as the dark and fertile soil.

MORE

He wrote, "When you travel the by-roads of Central Russia, you begin to understand the secret of the passifying Russian countryside. It is in the churches. They lift their belltowers -- graceful, shapely, all different -- high over mundane timber and thatch. From villages that are cut off and invisible to each other, they soar to the same heaven. People who are always selfish and often unkind -- but the evening chimes used to ring out, floating over the villages, fields and woods, reminding men that they must abandon trivial concerns of this world and give time and thought to eternity."

In our prayers we may keep that image in mind -- the thought that the bells may ring again, sounding throughout Moscow and across the countryside, clamoring for joy in their new-found freedom.

Well, I've talked long enough. I'm sure you have many questions and many things on your minds, and I'm anxious to hear what you have to say.

END 2:46 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Moscow, USSR)

For Immediate Release May 30, 1988

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO SELECTED SOVIET CITIZENS

Spaso House
Moscow, USSR

4:29 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Well, thank you all and welcome to Spaso House. After the discussions we've just had, I thought it might be appropriate for me to begin by letting you know why I so wanted this meeting to take place. You see, I wanted to convey to you that you have the prayers and support of the American people, indeed of people throughout the world. I wanted to convey this support to you that you might in turn convey it to others, so that all those working for human rights throughout this vast land -- from the Urals to Kamchatka, from the Laptev Sea to the Caspian -- might be encouraged and take heart.

In one capacity, of course, I speak as a head of government. The United States views human rights as fundamental -- absolutely fundamental to our relationship with the Soviet Union and all nations. From the outset of our administration, we've stressed that an essential element in improving relations between the United States and the Soviet Union is human rights, and Soviet compliance with international covenants on human rights.

There have been hopeful signs -- indeed I believe this a hopeful time for your nation. Over the past three years more than 300 political and religious prisoners have been released from labor camps. Fewer dissidents and believers have been put in prisons and mental hospitals. And in recent months, more people have been permitted to emigrate or reunite with their families.

The United States applauds these changes, yet the basic standards that the Soviet Union agreed to almost 13 years ago in the Helsinki Accords, or a generation ago in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, still need to be met. If I may, I'd like to share with you the main aims of our human rights agenda during this summit meeting here in Moscow.

Freedom of religion, in the words of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, "Every one has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion." I'm hopeful the Soviet government will permit all the peoples of the Soviet Union to worship their creator, as they themselves see fit, in liberty.

Freedom of speech -- again in the words of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights -- everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression. It is my fervent hope for you and your country that there will soon come a day when no one need fear prison for offenses that involve nothing more than the spoken or written word. (Applause.)

Freedom of travel. I've told the General Secretary how heartened we are that during the past year the number of those permitted to emigrate has risen. We're encouraged as well that the number of those permitted to leave for short trips, often family visits, has gone up. And yet the words of the Universal Declaration go beyond these steps. Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his own country. It it our hope

that soon there will be complete freedom of travel. (Applause.)

In particular, I've noted in my talks here the many who have been denied the right to emigrate on the grounds that they held secret knowledge, even though their secret work had ended years before and their so-called secrets had long since either become public knowledge or obsolete. Such cases must be rationally reviewed.

And finally, institutional changes to make progress permanent.

I've come to Moscow with this human rights agenda because, as I suggested, it is our belief that this is a moment of hope. The new Soviet leaders appear to grasp the connection between certain freedoms and economic growth. The freedom to keep the fruits of one's own labor, for example, is a freedom that the present reforms seem to be enlarging.

We hope that one freedom will lead to another and another, that the Soviet government will understand that it is the individual who is always the source of economic creativity, the inquiring mind that produces a technical breakthrough, the imagination that conceives of new products and markets. And that in order for the individual to create, we must have a sense -- he must have a sense of just that -- his own individuality, his own self-worth -- he must sense that others respect him, and, yes, that his nation respects him -- respects him enough to grant him all his human rights. (Applause.)

This, as I said, is our hope, yet whatever the future may bring, the commitment of the United States will nevertheless remain unshakeable on human rights. On the fundamental dignity of the human person, there can be no relenting, for now we must work for more -- always more.

And here I would like to speak to you not as a head of government, but as a man -- a fellow human being. I came here hoping to do what I could to give you strength. Yet I already know it is you who have strengthened me, you who have given me a message to carry back. While we press for human rights through diplomatic channels, you press with your very lives, day in, day out, year after year, risking your jobs, your homes, your all. (Applause.)

If I may, I want to give you one thought from my heart. Coming here, being with you, looking into your faces, I have to believe that the history of this troubled century will indeed be redeemed in the eyes of God and man, and that freedom will truly come to all, for what injustice can withstand your strength, and what can conquer your prayers. (Applause.)

And so I say with Pushkin, "It's time my friend, it's time. The heart begs for peace, the days fly past, it's time, my friend, it's time."

Could I play a little trick on you and say something that isn't written here? Sometimes when I'm faced with an unbeliever, an atheist, I am tempted to invite him to the greatest gourmet dinner that one could ever serve. And when we finished eating that magnificent dinner, to ask him if he believes there's a cook. (Applause.)

Thank you all, thank you all, and God bless you.

END 4:50 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Embargoed for Release
Until 7:06 P.M. Local, 12:06 P.M. EDT

May 28, 1988

RADIO ADDRESS
BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE NATION

(Previously taped May 23, 1988 in Washington, D.C.)

THE PRESIDENT: My fellow Americans, as this pre-taped broadcast reaches you, I'm in Helsinki, Finland, on my way to the Soviet Union, where I arrive on Sunday.

When I meet in the coming days with Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev, it will be our fourth set of face-to-face talks in three years. Through our conversations, U.S.-Soviet relations have moved forward on the basis of frankness and realism. This relationship has not rested on any single issue, but has been built on a sturdy four-part agenda that includes human rights, regional conflicts, arms reduction, and bilateral exchanges.

What has been achieved in this brief span of time offers great hope for a brighter future and a safer world.

Through Western firmness and resolve, we concluded the historic INF Treaty that provides for the global elimination of an entire class of U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range nuclear missiles.

Soviet armed forces are now withdrawing from Afghanistan, an historic event that should lead finally to peace, self-determination, and healing for that long-suffering people, and to an independent and undivided Afghan nation.

It is also encouraging to hear General Secretary Gorbachev speak forthrightly about "glasnost" and "perestroika" -- openness and restructuring in the Soviet Union -- words that to Western ears have a particularly welcome sound. And since he began his campaign, we can list developments that the free world heartily applauds.

We've seen many well-known prisoners of conscience released from harsh labor camps or strict internal exile, courageous people like Josif Begun and Andrei Sakharov.

Soviet authorities have permitted the publication of books, like Dr. Zhivago, and the distribution of movies, such as "Repentance," that are critical of aspects of the Soviet past and present. Greater emigration has been allowed. Greater dissent is being tolerated. And recently, General Secretary Gorbachev has promised to grant a measure of religious freedom to the peoples of the Soviet Union.

All this is new and good. But at the same time, there's another list that the West cannot ignore. While there are improvements, the basic structure of the system has not changed in the Soviet Union or in Eastern Europe, and there remain significant violations of human rights and freedoms.

In Asia, Africa, and Central America, unpopular regimes use Soviet arms to oppress their own people and commit aggression

MORE

against neighboring states. These regional conflicts extract a terrible toll of suffering and threaten to draw the United States and the Soviet Union into direct confrontation.

These and related concerns will be at the top of my agenda in the days ahead. I shall say, among other things, that the Soviet Union should fully honor the Helsinki Accords. In view of that document, signed in Helsinki in 1975, it is difficult to understand why almost 13 years later, cases of divided families and blocked marriages should remain on the East-West agenda; or why Soviet citizens who wish by right to emigrate should not be able to do so. And there are other issues: the recognition of those who wish to practice their religious beliefs, and the release of all prisoners of conscience.

In working for a safer world and a brighter future for all people, we know arms agreements alone will not make the world safer -- we must also reduce the reasons for having arms. As I said to General Secretary Gorbachev when we first met in 1985, we do not mistrust each other because we're armed; we're armed because we mistrust each other. History has taught us that it is not weapons that cause war, but the nature and conduct of the governments that wield the weapons. So when we encourage Soviet reforms, it is with the knowledge that democracy not only guarantees human rights, but also helps prevent war, and, in truth, is a form of arms control. So, really, our whole agenda has one purpose, to protect peace, freedom, and life itself.

We would like to see positive changes in the USSR institutionalized so that they'll become lasting features of Soviet society. And I would like to see more Soviet young people come here to experience and learn from our society.

And that's why we're ready to work with the Soviets. To praise and criticize, and work for greater contact, and for change. Because that is the path to lasting peace, greater freedom, and a safer world.

I'm grateful for your prayers and support as I embark on this journey. Until next week, thanks for listening, and God bless you.

END

Office of the Press Secretary
(Helsinki, Finland)

For Immediate Release May 27, 1987

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE PAASIKIVI SOCIETY
AND
THE LEAGUE OF FINNISH-AMERICAN SOCIETIES

EAST-WEST RELATIONS

Finlandia Hall
Helsinki, Finland

3:05 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all very much. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Prime Minister, and ladies and gentlemen, let me begin by saying thank you to our hosts, the Finnish government, the Paasikivi Society, and the League of Finnish-American Societies. It's a particular honor for me to come here today. This year -- the "Year of Friendship," as Congress has proclaimed it, between the United States and Finland -- this year marks the 350th anniversary of the arrival of the first Finns in America and the establishment of a small Scandinavian colony near what is today Wilmington, Delaware. An ancient people in a new world -- and that is the story, not only of those Finns, but of all the peoples who braved the seas, to settle in and build my country, a land of freedom for a nation of immigrants.

Yes, they founded a new world, but as they crossed the oceans, the mountains, and the prairies, those who made America carried the old world in their hearts -- the old customs, the family ties, and, most of all, the belief in God, a belief that gave them the moral compass and ethical foundation by which they explored an uncharted frontier and constructed a government and nation of, by, and for the people.

And so, although we Americans became a new people, we also remain an ancient one, for we're guided by ancient and universal values -- values that Prime Minister Holkeri spoke of in Los Angeles this February when, after recalling Finland's internationally recognized position of neutrality, he added that Finland is "tied to Western values of freedom, democracy, and human rights."

And let me add here that for America, those ties are also the bonds of our friendship. America respects Finland's neutrality. We support Finland's independence. We honor Finland's courageous history. We value the creative statesmanship that has been Finland's gift to world peace. And in this soaring hall -- which is the great architect Alvar Aalto's statement of hope for Finland's future -- we reaffirm our hope and faith that the friendship between our nations will be unending.

We're gathered here today in this hall because it was here, almost 13 years ago, that the 35 nations of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe signed the Helsinki Final Act -- a document that embodies the same ethical and moral principles and the same hope for a future of peace that Finns and so many other European immigrants gave America. The Final Act is a singular statement of hope. Its "three baskets" touch on almost every aspect of East-West relations, and taken together form a kind of map through the wilderness of mutual hostility to open fields of peace and to a common home of trust among all of our sovereign nations -- neutrals, non-aligned, and Alliance members alike. The Final Act sets new standards of conduct for our nations and provided the mechanisms by which to apply those standards.

MORE

Yes, the Final Act goes beyond arms control -- once the focus of international dialogue. It reflects a truth that I have so often noted -- nations do not distrust each other because they are armed; they are armed because they distrust each other. The Final Act grapples with the full range of our underlying differences and deals with East-West relations as an interrelated whole. It reflects the belief of all our countries that human rights are less likely to be abused when a nation's security is less in doubt; that economic relations can contribute to security, but depend on the trust and confidence that come from increasing ties between our peoples, increasing openness, and increasing freedom; and that there is no true international security without respect for human rights.

I can hardly improve on the words President Koivisto used in this hall two years ago when he recalled that, "security is more than the protection of borders and social structures. It is emphasized in the Final Act that individual persons who live in the participating states have to feel in their own lives security which is based on respect for fundamental human rights and basic freedoms."

And beyond establishing these integrated standards, the Final Act establishes a process for progress. It sets up a review procedure to measure performance against standards. And -- despite the doubts of the critics -- for the past 13 years, the signatory states have mustered the political will to keep on working and making progress.

Let me say that it adds -- it seems particularly appropriate to me that the Final Act is associated so closely with this city and this country. More than any other diplomatic document, the Final Act speaks to the yearning that Finland's longtime President, Urho Kekkonen, spoke of more than a quarter century ago when he said, in his words, "It's the fervent hope of the Finnish people that barriers be lowered all over Europe and that progress be made along the road of European unity." And he added that this was, as he put it, "for the good of Europe, and thus of humanity as a whole." Well, those were visionary words. That vision inspired and shaped the drafting of the FInal Act and continues to guide us today.

Has the Final Act and what we call the Helsinki process worked or not? Many say it hasn't, but I believe it has.

In the security field, I would point to the most recent fruit of the process -- the Stockholm Document of confidence- and security-building measures in Europe. This agreement lays down the rules by which our 35 states notify each other of upcoming military activities in Europe; provides detailed information on these activities in advance; and lets the others know their plans for very large military activities one or two years in advance and agrees not to hold such maneuvers unless this notice is given; invites observers to their larger military activities; and permits on-site inspections to make sure the agreement is honored.

I am happy to note that since our representatives shook hands to seal this agreement a year and a half ago, all 35 states have, by and large, honored both the letter and the spirit of the Stockholm Document. The Western and neutral and non-aligned states have set a strong example in providing full information about their military activities. In April, Finland held its first military activity subject to the Stockholm notification requirements and voluntarily invited observers to it. The Soviet Union and its allies also have a generally good record of implementation, though less forthcoming than the West. Ten on-site inspections have been conducted so far, and more and more states are exercising their right to make such inspections. I can't help but believe that making inspections a matter of routine business will improve openness and enhance confidence.

Nor was Stockholm the end of the process. In Vienna, all 35 signatory states are considering how to strengthen the confidence-

and security-building measures, in the context of a balanced outcome at the CSCE follow-up meeting that includes significant progress on human rights.

In the economic field, as in the security field, I believe there has been progress, but of a different kind. Issues and negotiations regarding security are not simple, but military technology makes arms and armies resemble each other enough so that common measures can be confidently applied. Economic relations, by contrast, are bedeviled by differences in our systems. Perhaps increases in nonstrategic trade can contribute to better relations between East and West, but it's difficult to relate the state-run economies of the East to the essentially free-market economies of the West. Perhaps some of the changes underway in the state-run economies will equip them better to deal with our businessmen and open new arenas for cooperation. But our work on these issues over the years has already made us understand that differences in systems are serious obstacles to expansion of economic ties, and since understanding of unpleasant realities is part of wisdom, that, too, is progress.

The changes taking place in the Eastern countries of the continent go beyond changes in their economic systems and greater openness in their military activities -- changes have also begun to occur in the field of human rights, as was called for in the Final Act. The rest of us would like to see the changes that are being announced actually registered in the law and practice of our Eastern partners and in the documents under negotiation in the Vienna follow-up to the Helsinki Conference.

Much has been said about the human rights and humanitarian provisions in the Final Act and the failure of the Eastern bloc to honor them. Yet, for all the bleak winds that have swept the plains of justice since that signing day in 1975, the Accords have taken root in the conscience of humanity and grown in moral and, increasingly, in diplomatic authority. I believe that this is no accident. It reflects an increasing realization that the agenda of East-West relations must be comprehensive -- that security and human rights must be advanced together, or cannot truly be secured at all. But it also shows that the provisions in the Final Act reflect standards that are truly universal in their scope. The Accords embody a fundamental truth, a truth that gathers strength with each passing season, and that will not be denied -- the truth that, like the first Finnish settlers in America, all our ancient peoples find themselves today in a new world and that, as those early settlers discovered, the greatest creative and moral force in this new world, the greatest hope for survival and success, for peace and happiness, is human freedom.

Yes, freedom -- the right to speak, to print, the right to worship, to travel, to assemble -- the belief -- the right to be different, the right, as the American philospher, Henry David Thoreau, wrote, "to step to the music of a different drummer." This is freedom as most Europeans and Americans understand it, and freedom as it is embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, yes, in the Helsinki Accords. And far more than the locomotive or the automobile, the airplane or the rocket, more than radio, televison or the computer -- this concept of liberty is the most distinct, peculiar, and powerful invention of the civilization we all share.

Indeed, without this freedom there would have been no mechanical inventions, for inventions are eccentricities. The men and women who create them are visionaries, just like artists and writers. They see what others fail to see and trust their insights when others don't. The same freedom that permits literature and the arts to flourish, the same freedom that allows one to attend church, synagogue, or mosque without apprehension, that same freedom from oppression and supervision is the freedom that has given us, the peoples of Western Europe and North America, our dynamism, our

economic growth, and our inventiveness. Together with Japan and Australia, and many others, we have lived in this state of freedom, this House of Democracy, since the end of the Second World War. The House of Democracy is a house whose doors are open to all. Because of it, because of the liberty and popular rule we've shared, today we also share a prosperity more widely distributed and extensive, a political order more tolerant and humane than has ever before been known on Earth.

To see not simply the immediate but the historic importance of this, we should remember how far many of our nations have traveled -- and how desolate the future of freedom and democracy once seemed.

For much of this century, the totalitarian temptation, in one form or another, has beckoned to mankind, also promising freedom -- but of a different kind than the one we celebrate today. This concept of liberty is as the Czechoslovak writer, Milan Kundera, has put it, "the age-old dream of a world where everybody would live in harmony, united by a single common will and faith, without secrets from one another" -- the freedom of imposed perfection.

Fifty, forty, even as recently as thirty years ago, the contest between this utopian concept of freedom on one hand and the democratic concept of freedom on the other seemed a close one. Promises of a perfect world lured many Western thinkers and millions of others besides. And many believed in the confident prediction of history's inevitable triumph.

Well, few do today. Just as democratic freedom has proven itself incredibly fertile -- fertile not merely in a material sense, but also in the abundance it has brought forth in the human spirit -- so, too, utopianism has proven brutal and barren.

Albert Camus once predicted that, in his words, "when revolution in the name of power and of history becomes a murderous and immoderate mechanism, a new rebellion is consecrated in the name of moderation of life." Isn't this exactly what we see happening across the mountains and plains of Europe and even beyond the Urals today? In Western Europe, support for utopian ideologies -- including support among intellectuals -- has all but collapsed, while in the nondemocratic countries, leaders grapple with the internal contradictions of their system and some ask how they can make that system better and more productive.

In a sense, the front line in the competition of ideas that has played in Europe and America for more than 70 years has shifted East. Once it was the democracies that doubted their own view of freedom and wondered whether utopian systems might not be better. Today, the doubt is on the other side.

In just two days, I will meet in Moscow with General Secretary Gorbachev. It will be our fourth set of face-to-face talks since 1985. The General Secretary and I have developed a broad agenda for U.S.-Soviet relations -- an agenda that is linked directly to the agenda of the Final Act.

Yes, as does the Final Act, we will discuss security issues. We will pursue progress in arms reduction negotiations across the board and contniue our exchanges on regional issues.

Yes, we will also discuss economic issues, although, as in the Helsinki process, we have seen in recent years how much the differences in our systems inhibit expanded ties and how difficult it is to divorce economic relations from human rights and other elements of that relationship.

And, yes, as our countries did at Helsinki, we will take up other bilateral areas, as well -- including scientific, cultural, and people-to-people exchanges, where we've been hard at work

identifying new ways to cooperate. In this area, in particular, I believe we'll see some good results before the week is over.

And like the Final Act, our agenda now includes human rights as an integral component. We have developed our dialogue and put in place new mechanisms for discussion. The General Secretary has spoken often and forthrightly on the problems confronting the Soviet Union. In his campaign to address these shortcomings, he talks of "glasnost" and "perestroika" -- openness and restructuring, words that to our ears have a particularly welcome sound. And since he began his campaign, things have happened that all of us applaud.

The list includes the release from labor camps or exile of people like Andrei Sakharov, Irina Ratushinskaya, Anatoly Koryagin, Josef Begun, and many other prisoners of conscience; the publication of books like Dr. Zhivago and Children of the Arbat; the distribution of movies like "Repentance," that are critical of aspects of the Soviet past and present; allowing higher levels of emigration; greater toleration of dissent; General Secretary Gorbachev's recent statements on religious toleration; the beginning of Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan.

All this is new and good. But at the same time, there is another list, defined not by us but by the standards of the Helsinki Final Act and the sovereign choice of all participants, including the Soviet Union, to subscribe to it. We need look no further through the Final Act to see where Soviet practice does not -- or does not yet -- measure up to Soviet commitment.

Thirteen years after the Final Act was signed, it's difficult to understand why cases of divided families and blocked marriages should remain on the East-West agenda; or why Soviet citizens who wish to exercise their right to emigrate should be subject to artificial quotas and arbitrary rulings. And what are we to think of the continued suppression of those who wish to practice their religious beliefs? Over three hundred men and women whom the world sees as political prisoners have been released. There remains no reason why the Soviet Union cannot release all people still in jail for expresion of political or religious belief, or for organizing to monitor the Helsinki Act.

The Soviets talk about a "common European home," and define it largely in terms of geography. But what is it that cements the structure of clear purpose that all our nations pledged themselves to build by their signature of the Final Act? What is it but the belief in the inalienable rights and dignity of every single human being? What is it but a commitment to true pluralist democracy? What is it but a dedication to the universally understood democratic concept of liberty that evolved from the genius of European civilization? This body of values -- this is what marks, or should mark, the common European home.

Mr. Gorbachev has spoken of, in his words, "the artificiality and temporariness of the bloc-to-bloc confrontation and the archaic nature of the 'iron curtain.'" Well, I join him in this belief and welcome every sign that the Soviets and their allies are ready, not only to embrace, but to put into practice the values that unify, and, indeed, define contemporary Western European civilization and its grateful American offspring.

Some 30 years ago, another period of relative openness, the Italian socialist, Pietro Nenni, long a friend of the Soviet Union, warned that it was wrong to think that the relaxation could be permanent in, as he said, "the absense of any system of judicial guarantees." And he added that only democracy and liberty could prevent reversal of the progress underway.

There are a number of steps, which, if taken, would help ensure the deepening and institutionalization of promising reforms. First, the Soviet leaders could agree to tear down the Berlin Wall

and all barriers between Eastern and Western Europe. They could join us in making Berlin itself an all-European center of communications, meetings, and travel.

They could also give legal and practical protecton to free expression and worship. Let me interject here that at one time Moscow was known as the City of the Forty Forties, because there were 1,600 belfries in the churches of the city. The world welcomes the return of some churches to worship after many years. But there are still relatively few functioning churches and almost no bells. Mr. Gorbachev recently said, as he put it, "Believers are Soviet people, workers, partriots, and they have the full right to express their conviction with dignity." Well, I applaud Mr. Gorbachev's statement. What a magnificent demonstration of goodwill it would be for the Soviet leadership for church bells to ring out again, not only in Moscow but throughout the Soviet Union.

But beyond these particular steps, there's a deeper question. How can the countries of the East not only grant but guarantee the protection of rights?

The thought and practice of centuries has pointed the way. As the French constitutional philosopher, Montesquieu, wrote more than 200 years ago, "There is no liberty if the judiciary power be not separated" from the other powers of government. And like the complete independence of the judiciary, popular control over those who make the laws provides a vital, practical guarantee of human rights. So does the secret ballot. So does the freedom of citizens to associate and act for poltical purposes or for free collective bargaining.

I know that for the Eastern countries such steps are difficult, and some may say it's unrealistic to call for them. Some said in 1975 that the standards set forth in the Final Act were unrealistic; that the comprehensive agenda it embodied was unrealistic. Some said, earlier in this decade, that calling for global elimination of an entire class of U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range nuclear missiles was unrealistic; that calling for 50-percent reductions in U.S. and Soviet strategic offensive arms was unrealistic; that the Soviets would never withdraw from Afghanistan. Well, is it realistic to pretend that rights are truly protected when there are no effective safeguards against arbitrary rule? Is it realistic, when the Soviet leadership itself is calling for glasnost and democratization, to say that judicial guarantees, or the independence of the judiciary, or popular control over those who draft the laws, or freedom to associate for political purposes are unrealistic? And finally, is it realistic to say that peace is truly secure when political systems are less than open?

We believe that realism is on our side when we say that peace and freedom can only be achieved together, but that they can indeed be achieved together if we're prepared to drive toward that goal. So did the leaders who met in this room to sign the Final Act. They were visionaries of the most practical kind. In shaping our policy toward the Soviet Union, in preparing for my meetings with the General Secretary, I have taken their vision -- a shared vision, subscribed to by East, West, and the proud neutral and nonaligned countries of this continent -- as my guide. I believe the standard that the framers of the Final Act set -- including the concept of liberty it embodies -- is a standard for all of us. We can do no less than uphold it and try to see it turn, as the Soviets say, into "life itself."

We in the West will remain firm in our values; strong and vigilant in defense of our interests; ready to negotiate honestly for results of mutual and universal benefit. One lesson we drew again from the events leading up to the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty was that, in the world as it is today, peace truly does depend on Western strength and resolve. It is a lesson we will continue to heed.

But we're also prepared to work with the Soviets and their allies whenever they're ready to work with us. By strength we do not mean diktat, that is, an imposed settlement; we mean confident negotiation. The road ahead may be long -- but not as long as our countries had before them 44 years ago when Finland's great President J.K. Paasikivi, told a nation that had shown the world uncommon courage in a harrowing time: "A path rises up from the slope from the floor of the valley. At times the ascent is gradual, at other times steeper. But all the time one comes closer and closer to free, open spaces, above which God's ever brighter sky can be seen. The way up will be difficult, but every step will take us closer to open vistas."

I believe that in Moscow, Mr. Gorbachev and I can take another step toward a brighter future and a safer world. And I believe that, for the sake of all our ancient peoples, this new world must be a place both of democratic freedom and of peace. It must be a world in which the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act guides all our countries like a great beacon of hope to all mankind for ages to come.

Thank you and God bless you. And bear with me now -- Onnea ja memestysta koko suomen kansalle. (Applause.) Thank you. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END 3:37 P.M. (L)