

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Ermarth, Fritz W.: Files
Folder Title: US-Soviet Summit November 1987 -
December 1987 (10)
Box: RAC Box 1

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

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

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

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

United States Department of State

Washington, D.C. 20520

8780

November 30, 1987

SECRET/SENSITIVE**NODIS**MEMORANDUM FOR COLIN L. POWELL
THE WHITE HOUSESubject: State Department Recommendations for U.S. Guests at
Soviet Return Dinner

The Soviet Embassy has asked us for our suggestions regarding Americans who should be invited to General Secretary and Mrs. Gorbachev's return dinner at the Soviet Embassy on Wednesday, December 9. We have been told that the total number (U.S. and Soviet) at the dinner will be 70 and that we should identify 50 Americans. Given the likelihood that not everyone will be able to attend, our suggested list (attached) provides 67 names.

Melvyn Levitsky
Executive SecretaryDECLASSIFIED
Dept. of State Guidelines, July 21, 1997
BY MD NARA, DATE 4/19/13SECRET/SENSITIVE
DECL:OADR

SECRET/SENSITIVE

Recommended Guests for Soviet Return Dinner
Wednesday, December 9, 1987

President and Mrs. Ronald Reagan

Mr. and Mrs. Howard H. Baker, Jr.
Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth M. Duberstein
General and Mrs. Colin L. Powell
Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Griscom
Mr. and Mrs. M. Marlin Fitzwater
Mr. and Mrs. Jack L. Courtemanche
Colonel and Mrs. Robert E. Linhard

Secretary and Mrs. George P. Shultz
Secretary and Mrs. Frank C. Carlucci
Secretary and Mrs. James A. Baker III
Director and Mrs. Charles Z. Wick
Director and Mrs. Kenneth L. Adelman
Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Lyng
Mr. and Mrs. C. William Verity

Justice Sandra Day and Mr. O'Connor

Deputy Secretary John C. Whitehead
Under Secretary and Mrs. Michael H. Armacost

Counselor and Mrs. Max M. Kampelman
Chief of Protocol Selwa and Mr. Roosevelt
Ambassador Paul H. Nitze
Special Representative and Mrs. Edward L. Rowny
Assistant Secretary Rozanne L. Ridgway and Captain Deming
Assistant Secretary and Mrs. Richard Schifter
Ambassador and Mrs. Jack F. Matlock
Deputy Assistant Secretary and Mrs. Thomas W. Simons, Jr.
Mr. and Mrs. Mark R. Parris

Senator and Mrs. Sam Nunn
Senator John W. Warner
Congressman and Mrs. Thomas S. Foley
Congressman and Mrs. Henry J. Hyde

Mr. and Mrs. Wassily Leontieff (economist)
Mr. and Mrs. Armand Hammer (businessman)
Mr. and Mrs. Donald Kendall (businessman)
Mr. and Mrs. James Billington (Librarian of Congress)

DECLASSIFIED
Dept. of State Guidelines, July 21, 1997
BY MM NARA, DATE 4/19/13

SECRET/SENSITIVE

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20508

December 1, 1987

MEMORANDUM FOR JACK COURTEMANCHE

FROM: PAUL SCHOTT STEVENS *PS*

SUBJECT: State Dinner for General Secretary Gorbachev

We forwarded, on November 19, a proposed guest list for the State Dinner in honor of General Secretary and Mrs. Gorbachev. Department of State has requested that the following individuals be included as additional invitees to the dinner:

Deputy Secretary of State John C. Whitehead

Under Secretary of State Michael H. Armacost
and Mrs. Armacost

Attachment:

Tab A Memo, Nov 27, requesting additions
Tab B Memo, Nov 19, with proposed guest list

*Jack -
We understand your situation.
Paul.*



United States Department of State

Washington, D.C. 20520 8376 add-on

4

November 27, 1987

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE


MEMORANDUM FOR COLIN L. POWELL
THE WHITE HOUSE

Subject: Additions to State Department's Proposed Guest List
for the State Dinner in Honor of General Secretary
Gorbachev and Mrs. Gorbachev, December 8, 1987

On November 13, the Department of State transmitted a suggested guest list for the December 8 State Dinner in honor of General Secretary Gorbachev and Mrs. Gorbachev. The Department respectfully requests that the following individuals also be invited to attend the dinner.

Deputy Secretary of State John C. Whitehead

Under Secretary of State Michael H. Armacost and Mrs. Armacost


Melvyn Levitsky
Executive Secretary

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

mh
4119113

November 19, 1987

MEMORANDUM FOR JACK L. COURTEMANCHE

FROM: GRANT S. GREEN, JR.

SUBJECT: Proposed Guest List For State Dinner For Gorbachev
On Dec 8

We have reviewed the Department's proposed guest list for the State Dinner in honor of General Secretary and Mrs. Gorbachev. We suggest a number of additional invitees. Our recommendations are based on potential invitees' suitability and relationship to the Administration.

Attached at Tab A, we have listed the following: our suggestions for additional invitations, proposed guests we have identified as critical of the President's policies or whose aims significantly differ from those of the Administration, and those guests whom we recommend as optional.

Attachments

Tab A NSC Lists
Tab B Incoming from State

6

NSC SUGGESTIONS FOR DEC. 8 WHITE HOUSE DINNER
IN HONOR OF GORBACHEV

Conservative Academia

Henry Rowen
Hoover Institution
Stanford University

Robert Conquest
Hoover Institution
Stanford University

Dr. Cyril Black
Princeton University

Fred Starr
President
Oberlin University

Peter Reddaway
Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies

Robert Pfaltzgraff
Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy
Tufts University

Helmut Sonnenfeldt
Brookings Institute

Religious Leaders

Cardinal O'Connor (Catholic--New York)
Rabbi Milton Balkany (Brooklyn, New York)
Russian Orthodox Hierarch
W.R. Criswell (Southern Baptist)
George Sweeting (Moody Bible Institute)
James Kennedy (Presbyterian and President of Trinity Theology)
William Bright (Campus Crusade for Christ)
Richard John Newhouse (Rockford Institute, New York)

Special Guests

Caspar Weinberger
Richard Perle
Anne Armstrong
(Chairman of President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board
Former Ambassador to Great Britain and Medal of Freedom
Recipient)
Senator John Tower
Pat Buchanan
Dave Brubeck
(Jazz composer and completed recent tour of Soviet Union)
Arnold Schwarzenegger
(vocal supporter of the Pres.)

NSC SUGGESTIONS (cont.)

Media

Arnaud De Borchgrave (Washington Times)
John Hughes (Christian Science Monitor)
Robert Bartley (Wall Street Journal)
Hedrick Smith (New York Times) (a better choice than David Shipler)
Robert Toth (Los Angeles Times) (a better choice than Robert Gillette)
William F. Buckley
George F. Will
Charles Krauthammer
Kenneth Gilmore (Reader's Digest)
Bill Safire

Senators

Bill Bradley

Business

Rand V. Araskog
CEO and Chairman
ITT Communications
320 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Library of Congress

James Billington

NSC

Robert Linhard
Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Arms
Control
Marybel Batjer
Deputy Executive Secretary and Executive Director of the Summit
Preparation Group

Special Advisor's to the President (must invite both or neither)

Amb. Paul Nitze
Amb. Edward Rowny

Treasury

Secretary Baker

CIA

Judge William Webster

JCS

Adm. William Crowe

ACDA

Kenneth L. Adelman

Defense

Fred Ikle (Under Secretary)

State's proposed guests who are critical of the President's policy or whose aims differ from those of the Administration:

Strobe Talbott

Cyrus Vance

John Chrystal

Dr. Robert Legvold

Dr. Marshall Shulman

Dr. Robert Gale

Dr. Marshall Goldman (note: State has 3 proposed guests from Harvard only one should be chosen. Richard Pipes is the better choice.)

Mrs. W. Averall (Pamela) Harriman

Guests that should be optional:

Dr. Murray Feshbach

Dr. Frank Press

Robert Walsh (Administration has not supported the Goodwill Games)

Robert Kaiser or Katherine Graham (Choose one from Washington Post)

James Giffen or Dwayne Andreas (Choose one from US-USSR Trade and Economic Council) (Andreas is the better choice)



November 13, 1987

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. FRANK C. CARLUCCI
THE WHITE HOUSE

Subject: Proposed Guest List: White House Dinner for General
Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and Mrs. Gorbachev,
December 8

The Department has prepared the attached proposed guest
list for the December 8 White House Dinner in honor of General
Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and Mrs. Gorbachev.


Melvyn Levitsky
Executive Secretary

Attachment:

Proposed Guest List for White House Dinner

10

PROPOSED GUEST LIST FOR STATE DINNER
IN HONOR OF
GENERAL SECRETARY MIKHAIL GORBACHEV AND MRS. GORBACHEV

Official Soviet Party

to be determined

Office of the President

The White House Chief of Staff, Howard Baker and Mrs. Baker

Office of the Vice President

The Vice President and Mrs. Bush

National Security Council

The National Security Advisor, Lt. General Colin Powell and Mrs. Powell

Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs and Senior Director for European and Soviet Affairs, Dr. Fritz Ermarth and Mrs. Ermarth

Department of Defense

The Secretary of Defense-Designate and Mrs. Carlucci

Department of State

The Secretary of State and Mrs. Shultz

The Chief of Protocol Ambassador Selwa Roosevelt and Mr. Archibald Roosevelt

Counselor of the Department Max M. Kampelman and Mrs. Kampelman

The American Ambassador to the Soviet Union Jack Matlock and Mrs. Matlock

The Assistant Secretary for European and Canadian Affairs Rozanne L. Ridgway and Captain Theodore E. Deming

Geneva Negotiators

Ambassador Maynard W. Glitman and Mrs. Glitman

Ambassador Ronald F. Lehman, II and Mrs. Lehman

Ambassador Henry F. Cooper and Mrs. Cooper

Department of Agriculture

Secretary of Agriculture Lyng and Mrs. Lyng

Department of the Treasury

Secretary of the Treasury James Baker and Mrs. Baker

U.S. Trade Representative

U.S. Trade Representative Yeutter and Mrs. Yeutter

Library of Congress

** The Librarian of Congress and Mrs. James H. Billington
(Leading expert on Russian history and culture; speaks
Russian)

USIA

Mr. and Mrs. Charles Z. Wick

Ambassador and Mrs. Stephen Rhinesmith
(Coordinator, President's U.S.-Soviet Geneva Exchange
Initiative)

Department of Commerce

Secretary of Commerce William Verity and Mrs. Verity

Senate

Senator and Mrs. Robert Byrd (D-WV)
Majority Leader

Senator and Mrs. Robert Dole (R-KS)
Minority Leader

Senator and Mrs. Jesse Helms (R-NC)
(Ranking minority member, Senate Foreign Relations Committee)

Senator and Mrs. Richard Lugar (R-IN)
(key figure in Senate on U.S.-Soviet relations)

Senator John Warner (R-VA)
(key figure in Senate on arms control)

Senator and Mrs. Ted Stevens (R-AK)
(Senate Arms Control Observer group)

Senator and Mrs. David Boren (D-K)
Senator and Mrs. Alan Simpson (R-AK)
Senator and Mrs. Claiborne Pell (D-RI)
Senator and Mrs. Sam Nunn (D-GA)

House of Representatives

Representative and Mrs. Jim Wright (D-TX)
Speaker of the House

Representative and Mrs. Thomas Foley (D-WA)
Majority Leader

Representative and Mrs. Robert Michel (R-IL)
Minority Leader

Representative and Mrs. Trent Lott (R-MS)

Representative and Mrs. Dick Cheney (R-WY)

Representative and Mrs. Dante Fascell (D-FL)

BUSINESS COMMUNITY

NOTE: Names in this section all have strong business interest with the Soviet Union

Dr. and Mrs. Armand Hammer
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Occidental Petroleum Corporation
10889 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, California 90024
(213) 879-1700

Mr. and Mrs. James Giffen
President
US-USSR Trade and Economic Council
805 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022
212-644-4550

** Mr. and Mrs. John Chrystal
Chairman of the Board and CEO
Bankers' Trust Company
P.O. Box 897
Des Moines, Iowa 50304
(515) 245-2413
(hosted Khrushchev; involved in US-Soviet exchanges)

Mr. and Mrs. Donald Kendall
President
Pepsicola Company

Mr. and Mrs. James D. Robinson, III
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
American Express Company
American Express Plaza
New York, New York 10004
(212) 323-2000

Mr. and Mrs. C. Edward Acker
Chairman and CEO
Pan American World Airways, Inc.
Pan Am Building
200 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10166
212-880-6432

Mr. and Mrs. Dwayne Andreas
Chairman
US-USSR Trade and Economic Council
805 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022
212-644-4550

Mr. and Mrs. Jack Murphy
Chairman of the Board, President and CEO
Dresser Industries
1600 Pacific
Dallas, Texas 75221
214-740-6000

Mr. and Mrs. Michael Fribourg
Chairman of the Board
Continental Grain Company
277 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10172
212-207-5550

Mr. and Mrs. Richard J. Mahoney
CEO
Monsanto
800 North Lindbergh Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri 63167
314-694-1000

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Malott
Chairman of the Board and CEO
FMC Corporation
200 East Randolph Drive
Chicago, Illinois
312-261-6000

Mr. and Mrs. George A. Schaefer
CEO
Caterpillar Inc.
100 N.E. Adams Street
Peoria, Illinois 61629-7210
309-675-1000

Mr. and Mrs. Frank Popoff
President and CEO
Dow Chemical
2030 Dow Center
Midland, Michigan 48674
517-636-1000

Mr. James Renier and Mrs. Renier
President and CEO
Honeywell, Inc.
Honeywell Plaza
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55440
612-870-5200

Mr. and Mrs. John F. Akers
President
IBM, Inc.
Old Orchard Road
Armonk, New York 10504
(914) 765-1900

Mr. and Mrs. Willard C. Butcher
Chairman
Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A.
One Chase Manhattan Plaza
New York, New York 10081
(212) 352-7251

ACADEMIA

Dr. and Mrs. Zbigniew Brzezinski
Director
Institute on International Change
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027
(212) 280-4638

Dr. and Mrs. Robert Byrnes
Department of History
Ballentine 706
University of Indiana
Bloomington, Illinois 47405

Dr. and Mrs. Murray Feshbach
Georgetown University
Washington DC 20057
(202) 487-6775

(former Sovietologist in Residence at NATO; leading expert
on Soviet Union)

Dr. and Mrs. Marshall Goldman
Associate Director
Russian Research Center
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
(617) 495-4485

Dr. and Mrs. Robert Legvold
Director
W. Averell Harriman Institute for Advanced Study of the Soviet
Union
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027
(212) 280-4623

Mrs. Suzanne Massie
Boston, Massachusetts

Dr. and Mrs. Richard E. Pipes
Department of History
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
(617) 495-3453, or 4055

Dr. and Mrs. Marshall Shulman
Adlai E. Stevenson Professor Emeritus of International
Relations
W. Averell Harriman Institute for Advanced Study of the Soviet
Union
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027
(212) 280-4623

Dr. and Mrs. Adam Ulam
Director
Russian Research Center
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

FORMER U.S. AMBASSADORS TO THE SOVIET UNION

Ambassador and Mrs. Jacob Bean

Ambassador and Mrs. Arthur Hartman
2738 McKinley St. N.W.
Washington DC 20015
(202) 362-6660

Ambassador and Mrs. George F. Kennan

Ambassador and Mrs. Malcolm Toon
375 Pee Dee Rd.
Southern Pines, North Carolina 28387

Ambassador and Mrs. Thomas Watson
c/o Horace Post
Old Orchard Road
Armonk, New York 10504

SPECIAL GUESTS

Mr. and Mrs. George Allen
(former coach of the Washington Redskins; head of the
President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports
which has signed an exchange agreement with the Soviets
on youth fitness)

Mr. and Mrs. Louis Auchincloss
Author
New York, New York

** Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Bratten
President
Chautauqua Institution
(involved in major U.S.-Soviet people-to-people exchange)

Ms. Sarah Caldwell
Director
Opera Company of Boston
(organizing a cultural exchange program with the Soviet Union)

Mr. Van Cliburn
(pianist - won Tchaikovsky competition in Moscow in the
1970's)

Mr. and Mrs. Dean Conger
Washington DC
(photographer for National Geographic - photographed the
Soviet Union for over 20 years)

Ms. Susan Eisenhower
Director, Eisenhower Institute
(active in US-Soviet academic and professional exchanges,
travels often to the Soviet Union)

Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Fodor
(violinist - won first place in Tchaikovsky competition in
Moscow in the 1970s)

Dr. and Mrs. Robert Gale
UCLA Medical School
(provided medical assistance to the Soviet government and
medical officials related to treatment of radiation
victims of Chernobyl nuclear accident)

Mrs. W. Averell (Pamela) Harriman
3038 N St. N.W.
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 338-8330

Ms. Helen Hayes
Actress
(US-Soviet exchange participant)

Mr. Vladimir Horowitz
(pianist - performed to great acclaim in Moscow in 1986)

Mr. and Mrs. Allan Kassof
Director
International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX)
126 Alexander Street
Princeton, New Jersey 08540-7102
(609) 683-9500
(major academic exchange organization with the Soviet Union)

The Honorable Jeanne Kirkpatrick and Dr. Evron Kirkpatrick
American Enterprise Institute
1150 17th Street, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20036
(202) 775-4915

Dr. and Mrs. Henry Kissinger
350 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10022
(212) 759-7919

Ms. Jeri Laber
Executive Director
U.S. Helsinki Watch Commission
201 E. 50th Street
New York, New York
(212) 840-9460
(prominent human rights organization)

Mr. and Mrs. William Luers
President
Metropolitan Museum of Art
New York, New York
(Former ambassador to Czechoslovakia, author on Soviet
politics, Russian speaker)

Mr. Arthur Mitchell
Harlem Dance Theatre
New York, New York

Ms. Amanda McKerrow and husband
(ballet dancer - first American to win a gold medal at
Soviet ballet competition in Varna in the late 1970s; now
dancing with ABT)

The Honorable and Mrs. Edward Muskie

Justice Sandra Day O'Connor and Mr. O'Connor
United States Supreme Court

Dr. Frank Press
President
National Academy of Sciences
2101 Constitution Avenue N.W.
Washington DC 20418
(202) 334-2644
(active program of exchange with the Soviet Academy of
Sciences)

Ms. Leontyne Price
(opera singer - performed in Moscow in the 1960's)

Mr. and Mrs. David Rockefeller
30 Rockefeller Plaza, Room 5800
New York, New York 10112
(212) 649-5600

The Honorable and Mrs. William Rogers

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Strauss
1333 New Hampshire Ave NW
Washington, D.C. . .
(202) 887-4000

Mr. Donald J. Gummer and Ms. Meryl Streep

Mrs. Walter Stoessel
5155 Rockwood Parkway NW
Washington DC
(202) 364-8228
(widow of former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union)

Ms. Elizabeth Taylor
(performed in a U.S.-Soviet coproduced film, "Bluebird")

Mrs. Llewellyn Thompson
(widow of former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union)

The Honorable and Mrs. Cyrus Vance

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Walsh
President
Seattle Organizing Committee, Goodwill Games 1990
2203 Aviation Way, South
Suite #1990
Seattle, Washington 98134
(206) 622-1990

Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Wyeth
P.O. Box 155
Chaddsford, Pennsylvania 19317
(215) 793-1563
(sponsored showing of Wyeth art in Leningrad this summer)

MEDIA

Mr. and Mrs. Don Barr
Publisher
Sports Illustrated
(has sponsored a photo exhibit exchange with the Soviets
on sports)

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Gillette
Los Angeles Times
(correspondent in Moscow, Russian speaker)

Mrs. Katherine Graham
Chairman of the Board
Washington Post
1150 15th St. N.W.
Washington DC 20071
(202) 334-6000

Mr. and Mrs. Bryant Gumbel
NBC Today
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112
(212) 664-4147 (W)

Mr. and Mrs. John Johnson
President
Johnson Publishing Company, Inc.
820 South Michigan Ave.
Chicago, Illinois 60605
(312) 322-9220

(one of America's most prominent Black entrepreneurs; founder
of Ebony Magazine)

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Kaiser
Washington Post
(correspondent in Moscow; Russian speaker)

Mr. and Mrs. David Shipler
New York Times
(correspondent in Moscow; Russian speaker)

** Mr. and Mrs. Hédrick Smith
New York Times
(correspondent in Moscow; Russian speaker)

** Mr. and Mrs. Strobe Talbott
Time, Inc.
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W. 20036
Washington DC 20036
(202) 861-4000
(correspondent in Moscow; brought Khrushchev's memoirs
to the West; Russian speaker)

Mr. Mortimer Zuckerman
Publisher
U.S. News and World Report
2400 L Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 955-2000



December 2, 1987

MEMORANDUM FOR MRS. ROOSEVELT
FROM CHRISTINE HATHAWAY
SUBJECT USSR - GENERAL SECRETARY GORBACHEV
STATE VISIT
December 7-10, 1987

The following gifts will be presented on the occasion of this visit:

For General Secretary Gorbachev from President Reagan

Tiffany "Philadelphia Bowl"

Sterling silver stemmed bowl (9" diameter) engraved, around the outside of the bowl, with the seals of the President and the Coat of Arms of the Soviet Union and the following inscription in both English and Russian:

To

His Excellency

Mikhail Gorbachev

General Secretary

of the Central Committee

of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

From

Ronald Reagan

President of the United States of America

December 1987

For The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics from The
United States of America

Boehm "Global Peace"

Limited edition porcelain sculpture. The sculpture is comprised of seven doves in flight around the Earth. The birds of peace encircle the globe in a rising spiral. "Global Peace" is mounted on a circular pedestal adorned with olive leaves in high relief. It stands on a black ebony octagonal base which bears inlaid oval porcelain medallions representing the seven continents. A frontal medallion bears the following inscription:
(The sculpture stands 30" high and is limited to a single example.)

GLOBAL PEACE

People to People
To The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
From The United States of America
Washington, December 1987

For General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan from
Parker Pen

Parker 75 Pen

Each sterling silver pen is engraved with the signature of the President and General Secretary. The pens are presented in a custom-designed cherry gift box with the following, laser engraved, on the top: (Donation)

Washington, D. C.

Coat of Arms
of the USSR

Presidential Seal

December 1987

For Mrs. Gorbachev from Mrs. Reagan

Steuben "Teardrop Candlesticks"

Set of 9" crystal candlesticks.
Each candlestick contains a captured
teardrop to reflect the glow of
candlelight. Presented in a red
leather presentation case lined in
velvet.

For General Secretary & Mrs. Gorbachev from President &
Mrs. Reagan

Personally inscribed photograph of
President and Mrs. Reagan in navy
blue leather frame with Presidential
Seal at the top in gold leaf.

cc: Howard Baker/Kathy Osborne/Jim Kuhn/Jack Courtemanche
Mark Weinberg/Jane Erkenbeck/John Hilboldt/Mary Gordon
William Courtney/Tim Towell/Bunny Murdock/EUR/SOV -
Chris Galassi

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 12/02/87 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: ----

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: HUMAN RIGHTS EVENT

(12/02 3:00 p.m. draft)

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
BAKER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	GRISCOM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DUBERSTEIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HOBBS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MILLER - OMB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	HOOLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
BALL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	KING	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAUER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RANGE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
██████████ POWELL →	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RISQUE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CRIBB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RYAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIPPEN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPRINKEL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CULVAHOUSE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TUTTLE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DAWSON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>DOLAN</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DONATELLI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

The attached has been forwarded to the President.

RESPONSE: FYI: CLP, JDN, PSS, WHC, RVP, **FWE**, MB, JDH, PWR, LRT, RB, WWD

(Rohrabacher/ARD)
December 2, 1987
3:00 p.m.

26

Received S S

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: HUMAN RIGHTS EVENT 1987 DEC -2 PM 3:15
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1987

Thank you. I appreciate all of you being here. You represent groups that have a keen interest in the discussions that will be taking place during the upcoming visit of General Secretary Gorbachev. I'm happy to have this opportunity to confirm to you that, although we are making a serious effort to improve relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, we will not do it by compromising our national interests or diminishing our commitment to the universality of human rights.

Our dedication to liberty and justice for all is not negotiable, not to this generation, not to any generation of Americans. This year we celebrate the 200th anniversary of the signing of our Constitution, which, of course, contains not just an organizational structure for the Federal Government, but also the Bill of Rights. The structure divides power so that no person or group can be so powerful that they can trample on the rights of the people. And I think it is interesting to note that the reason the Bill of Rights was added to the document was that some believed that the Constitution might not have been ratified otherwise. Such was our forefathers' devotion to liberty.

The United States declared its independence with a document that proclaimed rights to be inalienable gifts from God, not just to those who could make it to our shores but to all people, everywhere. Ben Franklin, the grand old man of the Revolution, once said, "God, grant that not only the love of liberty, but a

thorough knowledge of the rights of man may pervade all the nations of the Earth, so that a philosopher may set his foot anywhere on its surface and say, 'This is my country'."

Well, 200 years later, liberty has not spread as wide as Franklin would have wished but, consistent with his vision, is a spirit of solidarity that exists between the free peoples of the world. We see the violation of anyone's human rights, acts of repression or brutality, as attacks on civilization itself. The United States, as the most powerful of the free nations, is looked to for leadership by those who live in freedom and as a mighty source of hope to those who languish under tyranny. This is a weighty responsibility that no American, especially a President, can take lightly.

In my upcoming meetings, I know that sitting next to me are unseen guests, men and women whose only hope is that they are not forgotten here in the West: Dissidents who are inhumanely committed to mental institutions, often subdued with mind-altering drugs; Soviet Jews, Armenians, Germans, and others who have applied to emigrate and have endured incredible hardships as a result; divided families and spouses who are cruelly separated from their loved ones. These people are not now, nor will they ever be, forgotten by our Administration.

Well, let me assure you and, through you, all those whose cause you champion: We care deeply about the well being of these unseen guests and their presence will be felt throughout my summit discussions. The goal of this visit, and any subsequent visits, is not simply arms reduction. Certainly that is one

priority, yet it remains on par with solving certain bilateral issues, ending regional conflicts, and, of course, improving human rights.

It wasn't long ago that a story was making the rounds in the Soviet underground about the dissident who was condemned by the Soviet judge to a Siberian work camp. "The sentence is too light," the dissident protested. "What do you mean?" asked the judge. "Well, if America is so bad, why don't you send me there?"

Seriously though, much has been said about glasnost and reforms in the Soviet Union. There does seem to have been modest progress. Soviet officials not that long ago refused to discuss human rights, claiming it was their internal affairs. General Secretary Gorbachev even told a French newsman shortly after the Geneva Summit that there were no political prisoners in the Soviet Union. Today our discussions on this issue are wide-ranging and human rights is accepted as an integral component of our bilateral discussions.

In the last 2 years we've witnessed a loosening of the grip. Over 200 political prisoners have been released from the Gulag. There is a higher rate of emigration. Some long-divided families have been reunited. There has even been a relaxing of some of the controls on freedom of expression. Earlier this year, for example, there were demonstrations in the Baltic nations on the anniversaries of the Hitler-Stalin Pact and the day marking the beginning of the Soviet occupation in 1940. The fact that these protests were permitted at all was heartening.

The free people of the West are watching to see if the emigration doors, now cracked, continue to open. And inside we wait and pray for believers -- people of every creed. Prisoners of faith have not been released and clearly religious freedom is still an aspiration yet to be achieved.

We care about people whose human rights are violated, who are abused or imprisoned in every country. We care because of what they symbolize and because they are human beings and we are outraged at the way they are being treated.

George Bernard Shaw, the acerbic Celt, once wrote, "The worst sin towards our fellow creatures is not to hate them, but to be indifferent to them: that's the essence of inhumanity." Today, we are pleased with any releases, any unification of separated families, any lessening of the iron grip on the freedoms of expression and religion. But we will not be indifferent to those who are left behind and we will not be lulled into ignoring the fact that the apparatus of state repression remains intact in the Soviet Union. The real joy will come, and trust between East and West will flourish, not only when prisoners are released, but when the instruments of repression are dismantled and repressive laws and practices are abolished.

Early in this century President Teddy Roosevelt said, "...for the world has set its face hopefully toward our democracy; and, O my fellow citizens, each one of you carries on your shoulders not only the burden of doing well for the sake of

your own country, but the burden of doing well and seeing that this nation does well for the sake of mankind...."

So it's not just up to any one Government official. It is up to all of us. I'd like to thank each of you for participating in this discussion and exchange of ideas with members of the Administration in preparation for the upcoming summit. We need your involvement, your continued support, and your stalwart commitment to our country's ideals. Thank you for all you are doing. God bless you.

And now, I'd like to turn over this meeting to Deputy Secretary of State, Whitehead.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

December 3, 1987

MEMORANDUM FOR ADMINISTRATION SPOKESPERSONS

FROM: MARION C. BLAKEY *MCB*
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: SUMMIT AND INF ISSUES

Attached for your information and use are Talking Points that explain the President's position on arms reduction in the upcoming INF talks.

If you have any questions concerning these materials, please feel free to contact the White House Office of Public Affairs at (202) 456-7170.

Thanks very much.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

THE PRESIDENT'S RESOLVE: PAYING DIVIDENDS FOR PEACE

THE INF TREATY

"I believe our strategy for peace will succeed.... The Soviet Union has thus far shown little inclination to take this major step to zero levels (on INF). Yet I believe ...that as the talks proceed...the Soviet leaders will see the benefits of such a far-reaching agreement."

--- President Reagan
November 22, 1982

President Reagan and Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev will soon sign an historic agreement eliminating an entire class of U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range nuclear force (INF) missiles.

The President's long-term resolve on arms reduction is paying dividends for peace.

- o At the outset, President Reagan established as one of his highest priorities the achievement of deep, equitable, stabilizing, and effectively verifiable reductions in U.S. and Soviet nuclear arsenals. He was convinced such reductions would be a vital component in the effort to reduce the risk of war.
- o On November 18, 1981, the President first proposed his "zero option" plan for INF, the basis for the present agreement. He was prepared to cancel deployment of U.S. Pershing II and ground-launch cruise missiles in Europe if the Soviets would dismantle their SS-20, SS-4, and SS-5 missiles.
- o On May 9, 1982, the President announced his plan for significant reductions in strategic forces (START). The U.S. has proposed 50 percent reductions in U.S. and Soviet strategic nuclear forces.
- o These two major proposals, strengthening our strategic deterrent, and our investigation -- through the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) -- of ways to move deterrence increasingly to reliance on defenses, form the cornerstone of President Reagan's national security strategy.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

- o Though an agreement on INF is now at hand and the Soviets have expressed a desire to accelerate strategic arms reduction negotiations (START), the road to progress has not been an easy one. Some 6 years have passed since the President announced his zero option proposal for INF. Three Soviet leaders have passed away during this period.
- o While many applauded the President's arms reduction strategy in those early days, some skeptics viewed his proposals as too extreme or as mere "propaganda ploys," advanced only because the President "knew" the Soviets would "never" accept them.
- o President Reagan held fast to his belief that his was the course that would lead to meaningful arms reductions.
 - He understood that a "freeze" on deployment of nuclear weapons, as was proposed by some in Congress in 1982, would merely have preserved certain dangerous imbalances of nuclear forces in favor of the Soviets at the time.
- o The Soviets walked out of the INF talks in 1983 and refused to set a date for resumption of the recessed START talks. It was not until January 1985, when they finally became convinced their ploy would not work, that the Soviets agreed to return to the talks.
 - Two key factors contributed to the Soviet return to the negotiating table: NATO unity on INF and the U.S. SDI program.
- o At the Geneva Summit of November 1985, President Reagan's perseverance began to pay off. General Secretary Gorbachev agreed to the principle of an interim agreement on INF and to the principle of a 50 percent reduction in strategic nuclear arms (START).
- o Further progress was achieved at the October 1986 meeting of President Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev in Iceland. The U.S. and the Soviet Union made major progress toward an INF agreement and also agreed on certain key aspects of a 50 percent strategic nuclear arms reduction agreement.
- o However, Mr. Gorbachev linked agreement in these areas to his terms on the President's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), which would have effectively killed the program, perpetuating the Soviet advantage in strategic defenses and America's vulnerability to Soviet missiles.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

- o President Reagan held firm to his position that where the security of the American people and our allies is involved, no agreement is better than a bad agreement.
- o During the September 1987 visit of Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, The Soviets agreed in principle to conclude an INF agreement. Yet, in late October, Mr. Gorbachev refused to set a date for the Summit, saying he was "not comfortable" in coming to Washington to sign an agreement in the absence of U.S. concessions on the Strategic Defense Initiative.
- o Again, President Reagan held firm and Mr. Gorbachev soon reconsidered and agreed to the December Summit.
- o The impending step in our efforts to build a more secure peace is clearly the result of President Reagan's vision and resolve.
 - The President established clear objectives and held to them.
 - By modernizing our strategic deterrent, keeping our strong commitment to SDI, and strengthening NATO's posture of deterrence and defense, the President has provided the basis for significant progress in other areas as well.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

THE INF TREATY

"Achievements like (the INF Treaty) are not the result of wishful thinking, nor are they made more likely by loud proclamations of a desire for peace. Lasting progress derives from hardnosed realism, strenuous effort, and firmness of principle. I can assure you that any treaty I sign will be realistic and in the long-term interest of all members of the (NATO) alliance."

--- President Reagan
November 4, 1987

The INF Treaty to be signed by President Reagan and Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev will eliminate -- for the first time in history -- an entire class of U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons: intermediate-range nuclear force (INF) missiles. This is the first agreement in history to actually reduce, not simply limit, the buildup of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, almost four deployed Soviet warheads will be eliminated for every one the U.S. eliminates.

- o Arms reduction treaties such as INF are not an end in themselves, but rather a key element of President Reagan's strategy to ensure our national security.
- o Through arms reductions, the President seeks to enhance strategic stability at lower levels of military forces, thus reducing the risk of conflict.
- o Such reductions will establish a foundation of mutual restraint and responsibility that will help us build a safer world.

The main provisions of the INF Treaty call for:

- o Elimination of all U.S. and Soviet ground-launched INF missiles (range: 300-3400 miles) within three years after the treaty enters into force;
- o A ban on all production and flight testing of treaty-limited systems; and
- o Cessation of all training, repair, storage, or deployment of treaty-limited items after elimination is completed.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

The INF Treaty is in the security interests of the U.S. and our allies.

- o The Soviets will eliminate over 1500 deployed INF nuclear warheads -- the U.S. will eliminate about 400. Both sides will also destroy hundreds more non-deployed INF missiles and launchers.
- o The treaty bans any future deployment of Soviet INF missiles, including its newly developed ground-launched cruise missile (GLCM). Deployment of Soviet GLCMs would have seriously complicated NATO's air defense situation.
- o Removal of Soviet INF will enhance NATO's ability to reinforce its conventional forces by eliminating Soviet weapons of choice against key NATO ports and airfields.
- o The Treaty affirms the principle of asymmetrical reductions to achieve equal U.S.- Soviet levels which is an important precedent for future arms control negotiations in both the nuclear and conventional fields.

The INF Treaty is consistent with the long-held United States position in key areas of the negotiations. This success is a direct consequence of President Reagan's steadfast commitment to real arms reductions and the solid support of our NATO allies for these objectives:

- o Longer-range INF missiles (LRINF): Since formal talks with the Soviet Union began in November 1981, the U.S. has sought to eliminate all U.S. and Soviet LRINF missile systems. This was the President's original "zero option" proposal. In July 1987, the Soviets finally agreed to eliminate these systems;
- o Shorter-range INF missiles (SRINF): Since the negotiations began, the U.S. has insisted that an INF agreement must constrain shorter-range INF missiles to prevent circumvention of an accord on LRINF missiles by a Soviet buildup of SRINF systems. The Soviet agreement to eliminate all SRINF missiles is an integral part of the INF accord and satisfies this U.S. requirement. (The U.S. has no SRINF systems.);
- o Reductions on a global basis: The U.S. has long insisted that any limitations on INF missiles must be global to prevent the transfer of the threat from one region to another. The Soviets have accepted this in the context of global elimination of both categories of U.S. and Soviet INF missiles, a concept known as "global double zero;"

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

- o Equality between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. on all rights and limits;
- o Bilateral Negotiations to Include Only U.S. and Soviet Systems: Throughout the negotiations, the U.S. made clear that bilateral agreements between the U.S. and the Soviets cannot constrain our allies' or other countries' forces, nor affect existing programs of cooperation with our allies. The INF Treaty is true to this principle; and
- o No Adverse effect on NATO's Conventional Forces -- above all on dual-capable (nuclear and conventional) aircraft.

The INF Treaty is a triumph for the NATO alliance.

- o The success of the INF negotiations has been made possible by Western determination to adhere to NATO's 1979 "dual track" decision to respond to Soviet SS-20 deployments through deployment of U.S. longer-range INF missiles, while seeking to negotiate with the Soviets to reach an INF balance at the lowest possible level.
- o NATO steadfastness has paid off -- the INF Treaty achieves the elimination of the special threat to NATO security posed by Soviet INF missiles. This includes the elimination of triple-warhead Soviet SS-20 missiles which have been targeted against our friends and allies both in Europe and Asia.
- o NATO has enhanced the credibility of its deterrence by demonstrating convincingly to the Soviets that it has the political will to make and stand by the tough decisions necessary to ensure its security.

Finally, and most importantly, the INF Treaty is not based on trust in the Soviets, but on the most stringent verification regime in the history of arms control. (see "INF VERIFICATION")

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

INF VERIFICATION

"Any new treaty will contain iron-clad provisions for effective verification including on-site inspection of facilities before and during reductions and short-notice inspections afterward."

--- President Reagan
November 4, 1987

The INF Treaty contains the most stringent verification regime of any arms control agreement in history.

The verification procedures insisted on by President Reagan reflect his longstanding concern that any arms control agreement must be effectively verifiable if it is to improve stability and to make a lasting contribution to peace and security. The President made it clear he would settle for nothing less and has achieved this goal.

The President had three basic verification objectives for the INF agreement:

- o First, to ensure confidence in the agreement;
- o Second, to deter Soviet violations of the treaty by increasing the likelihood that such violations would be detected; and
- o Third, to permit timely detection of any Soviet violations so that we can take appropriate measures to protect U.S. and allied security.

The key elements of the INF verification regime include:

- o Exchange of comprehensive data on treaty-limited systems;
- o Initial "baseline" on-site inspections to check number of missiles and launchers;
- o On-site inspections to verify elimination of treaty-limited systems, and verify that INF-related activity has ceased at declared sites;
- o Short-notice, on-site inspection of declared INF facilities suspected of illegal activity during the three-year reductions period and for ten years afterward;

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

- o A prohibition on interference with verification by satellite photography (national technical means [NTM]);
- o For 13 years after the INF Treaty enters into force, the U.S. will continuously monitor, with permanent on-site American personnel, the factory where Soviet SS-20 missiles have been assembled and where the Soviets now assemble SS-25 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), which are similar in some ways to SS-20s; and
- o The Soviets must, on short notice, open to satellite photography (NTM) former SS-20 bases used for SS-25s.

The comprehensiveness of the INF verification regime has positive implications for future arms reduction agreements as well.

- o Above all, it sets a positive precedent for our verification demands in a strategic arms reduction regime (START), although the different conditions of START will require a different regime.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

THE IMPORTANCE OF SDI

"What is totally unacceptable...is the Soviet tactic of holding...reductions hostage to measures that would cripple our Strategic Defense Initiative.... We won't bargain away SDI."

--- President Reagan
November 4, 1987

President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) offers our best hope of a safer world -- where our security and that of our allies would no longer rest on deterrence through the threat of mass annihilation.

The Reagan Administration has had a well-defined strategy for countering the threat posed by the Soviet offensive nuclear buildup. Our goal is to build a safer peace and to ensure a stable strategic balance over the long term.

This strategy has three key elements:

- o Modernization of our strategic deterrent because, to keep the peace, we still rely on the threat of retaliation with nuclear weapons;
- o Pursuit of deep, equitable, and effectively verifiable reductions in U.S. and Soviet nuclear arms; and
- o The search, through the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative, for a safer and morally preferable means to deter war, by increasing reliance on defenses to enhance our security.

SDI is a research and technology program to demonstrate, by the early 1990s, the feasibility of effective defenses against ballistic missiles for the U.S. and our allies. The most promising concepts involve layered defenses for intercepting an attacker's missiles in all phases of their flight -- boost, mid-course, and terminal.

- o Our commitment to SDI is firm. As the President has stated: "SDI is not a bargaining chip. It is a cornerstone of our security strategy for the 1990s and beyond. We will research it. We will develop it. And when it is ready, we'll deploy it."

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

SDI serves a number of vital purposes:

- o Through SDI, we seek a defensive means of deterring aggression based on systems protecting the U.S. and our allies against ballistic missile attack.
- o SDI helped to bring the Soviets back to the nuclear arms negotiating table in early 1985, after their late-1983 walkout.
- o SDI underwrites the integrity of any new arms agreements by diminishing Soviet incentives to cheat. The record of Soviet violations of past arms control agreements makes this especially important.
- o SDI provides a strong incentive to the Soviets to agree to the President's proposal to reduce strategic arms by 50 percent.
 - Even if 50 percent strategic arms cuts are achieved, SDI will remain essential in persuading the Soviets to reduce further.
- o Finally, SDI is insurance against an accidental missile launch or possible future ballistic threats -- nuclear, conventional, or chemical -- from outlaw countries.
- o The potential benefits of SDI far outweigh the dollar costs. Expenditures for SDI from fiscal years 1984 through 1988 will amount to about \$12 billion, or approximately \$13.00 per year for each American citizen -- a small price to pay for a safer future.

The importance of SDI is underscored by the Soviets' long-standing and extensive strategic defense programs.

- o In contrast to our own far more modest expenditures, the Soviets have spent roughly \$200 billion on their strategic defense programs over the last ten years, roughly the same as they have spent on their strategic offensive forces.

The Soviets' programs include:

- o The world's only anti-ballistic missile defenses, surrounding Moscow, which the Soviets are steadily improving;
- o Construction of a large, phased-array radar near Krasnoyarsk, in violation of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty; and

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

- o Research, development, and testing, including a \$1 billion annual program on laser weapons -- employing some 10,000 skilled scientists and engineers.

We cannot let the Soviets have a monopoly on strategic defenses.

- o Possessed by both sides, strategic defense systems can be stabilizing and reduce the threat of war. Possessed by the Soviets alone, such systems would threaten peace by undermining the credibility of our deterrent.

-- This would be devastating to Western security.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

INF IS ONLY A BEGINNING

"We will continue to pursue the goal of arms reduction, particularly the goal that the General Secretary (Gorbachev) and I agreed to: a 50 percent reduction in our respective strategic nuclear arms.... We look forward to a time when things we now regard as sources of friction can become examples of cooperation between ourselves and the Soviet Union."

--- President Reagan
September 21, 1987

The INF agreement is a step toward a more secure peace, but only a first step. In the continuing effort to achieve a safer world, the Reagan Administration, along with our allies, has engaged the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact states on a wide range of arms reduction issues.

Strategic nuclear arms, conventional forces, chemical weapons, nuclear testing, and defense and space are all being addressed with the Soviets and with other countries.

Strategic Nuclear Arms (START)

- o President Reagan places the highest priority on efforts to reach an equitable and effectively verifiable agreement with the Soviets for deep reductions in strategic nuclear arms (START).
- o The President places particular emphasis on reductions in the most destabilizing of nuclear arms -- fast-flying ballistic missiles, especially large, intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) with multiple warheads.
- o At the 1985 Geneva Summit, Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev agreed to the principle of a 50 percent reduction of strategic nuclear arms. In Iceland last year, the two leaders reached major new areas of agreement on the nature of a strategic reduction regime.
- o On May 8, 1987, the U.S. presented a draft treaty at the START negotiations in Geneva. The U.S. draft treaty reflects the basic areas of agreement reached by President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev in Iceland and provides for roughly 50 percent reductions in strategic offensive nuclear arms to equal levels for both sides.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

- o The U.S. draft treaty provides a solid basis for the creation of a fair and durable START agreement.
- o President Reagan believes a START agreement could be reached next year, but only if the Soviets apply themselves with the same seriousness as the United States and only if the Soviets drop their insistence that we accept measures that would kill or cripple SDI.
- o The President has made it clear that because of the importance of SDI to the future security of the U.S. and our allies, the program must move forward.

Conventional Forces and Chemical Weapons

- o At their Iceland meeting in June 1987, NATO foreign ministers set as a priority the effort to redress the serious imbalances in conventional forces and chemical weapons in favor of the Warsaw Pact.
- o Western security has long been threatened by Warsaw Pact conventional superiority based primarily on massive, forward-deployed, offensively configured Soviet armored forces in Eastern Europe. The conventional imbalance derives not only from Eastern numerical superiority in key categories of combat capability, but also from geographic and other non-quantitative advantages.
- o Today, as a result of the unilateral restraint exercised by the U.S. and the intensive Soviet chemical weapons modernization program, there is a serious East-West imbalance in these weapons. The Soviets possess a formidable, modern arsenal including what is by far the world's largest chemical weapons stockpile, while the U.S. capability -- largely unusable and dating from the 1940s and 1950s -- has lost much of its deterrent value against first use of chemical weapons.
- o The Reagan Administration is addressing these concerns by seeking U.S. and NATO force improvements, pursuing the East-West Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions (MBFR) negotiations in Vienna, seeking Warsaw Pact agreement on a mandate for new conventional stability negotiations covering for the first time the entire area from the Atlantic Ocean to the Ural Mountains, and pursuing an effective ban on chemical weapons.
- o During the September visit of Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, both sides agreed to work with their respective allies to move forward with dispatch in the Vienna talks on the mandate for new conventional stability negotiations.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

- o Substantial progress has been made on U.S.- U.S.S.R. bilateral data exchange regarding chemical weapons. Both sides have recognized the goal of an effective, verifiable global ban on chemical weapons.

Nuclear Testing

- o President Reagan is committed to seeking effective and verifiable agreements with the Soviets on nuclear testing limitations that could strengthen security for all nations.
- o At the conclusion of his September visit, Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and Secretary of State George Shultz issued a statement agreeing to begin before December 1, 1987, full-scale stage-by-stage negotiations on nuclear testing.
- o As the first step in these negotiations, the two sides will agree upon effective verification measures which will make it possible to ratify the U.S.- U.S.S.R. Threshold Test Ban Treaty of 1974 and the Peaceful Explosions Treaty of 1976.
- o The first round of these negotiations was held in Geneva from November 9-20, 1987. The two sides agreed to visit each other's nuclear test sites in early 1988 to familiarize themselves with the conditions and operations at those test sites. The negotiations will resume thereafter.

Defense and Space

- o At the Defense and Space talks, the U.S. has endeavored to discuss with the Soviets how, if we establish the feasibility of effective strategic defenses (SDI), the U.S. and U.S.S.R. could jointly manage a stable transition to a deterrence based increasingly on defenses rather than on the threat of retaliation by offensive nuclear weapons.
- o In an effort to reach agreement with the Soviets on Defense and Space, the U.S. has made a number of constructive proposals. Many differences continue to separate the two sides, however, including Soviet efforts to place restrictions on the SDI program that go beyond those in the existing Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. The U.S. has made it clear that it will not accept any restrictions on SDI beyond those actually agreed to in the ABM treaty.

WWD

8623

Info to FWE, SID,
REL, PWR, MB, PSS.

This corrected version
conveyed to Dawson's
office, Dec. 3, 1250. 46

WTC

RESPONSES BY THE PRESIDENT
TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY IZVESTIYA

December 3, 1987

#1
Q: Mr. President, this is your second interview with Izvestiya. General Secretary Gorbachev will soon be in Washington for a new meeting with you. Do you feel that since the first Soviet-American meeting (between you and Mr. Gorbachev) in Geneva, the world has become a slightly safer place and that something has changed for the better in relations between our countries?

THE PRESIDENT: The world has unquestionably become safer, and the improvement in U.S.-Soviet relations has been a contributing factor. Both sides are pursuing a policy of ever-increasing dialogue.

In the two years since General Secretary Gorbachev and I first met in Geneva, our governments have made important progress together on arms reductions, human rights issues, and bilateral exchanges. The world welcomes this.

We Americans have also noted with great interest the efforts at reform underway in your country. We wish the people of the Soviet Union well in all efforts to improve the quality of their lives and to liberalize the Soviet system.

This is primarily your internal concern, of course, but there is no question that it can have international significance as well: it could contribute to an improved international climate and a relaxation of tensions. The American political system is truly open; we are naturally sympathetic to movement in the same direction elsewhere.

Current trends can only be considered positive, but many problems continue to exist. Mistrust and suspicion have built up over many years, and they have their basis in history and current realities. Forty years after Hitler's defeat, Europe remains divided by artificial and inhumane barriers. In other regions of the globe, we are worried about the continuing Soviet occupation of Afghanistan and your government's support for repressive regimes in Angola, Ethiopia, Nicaragua, Cambodia, and elsewhere -- regimes that are at war with their own people.

Nonetheless, I take satisfaction from the fact that we have established a dialogue that deals candidly with the entire range of issues that concern -- and often divide -- our two countries. We need to continue that dialogue and strengthen it in every way we can. That is what our meeting in Washington is all about.

#2
Q: The Soviet-American agreement on the complete elimination of two classes of nuclear weapons -- medium range missiles and operational, tactical missiles -- stems from your negotiations with General Secretary Gorbachev in Geneva and to an even greater degree in Reykjavik. In your opinion, what is the significance of this agreement -- important in and of itself -- for the process of disarmament?

THE PRESIDENT: The INF Treaty is significant because, for the first time in history, the major nuclear powers have agreed to reduce, not simply limit the build-up of nuclear weapons. It eliminates an entire class of U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range nuclear weapons. This, of course, was the American proposal I put forward in 1981, the zero option.

The INF Treaty specifies the most stringent verification regime ever. No longer shall we rely only upon national technical means to monitor compliance, for the treaty gives both sides the right to on-site inspection, including short-notice inspection of sites where activity forbidden by the Treaty might be suspected. Both the United States and the USSR, moreover, will maintain inspectors on a continuous basis outside a relevant missile plant on each other's territory. This is a truly revolutionary concept and will increase confidence that the Treaty is being complied with. Even today, the U.S. has serious concerns about Soviet compliance with existing and earlier agreements, thus a new approach has been needed.

I hope the INF Treaty will be a step toward more "glasnost" in Soviet military affairs. You should strive for broader disclosure to your own citizens of your military budgets, force structures, and weapons modernization programs. This could help to build confidence needed for more comprehensive arms reductions as well as better political relations.

The INF Treaty is a good omen, for it shows that through hard work and a realistic approach, we can achieve positive results.

Q: Can we hope that a limit to the arms race will not stop with an agreement for medium and short-range missiles? In particular, one is reminded of your joint statement with General Secretary Gorbachev in Geneva about the inadmissibility of transferring the arms race into space. What solution do you propose to this problem?

THE PRESIDENT: I have no intention of stopping with the INF Treaty. In fact, the United States and the USSR have agreed to try to seek the earliest possible agreement on reducing U.S. and Soviet strategic nuclear arms by 50 percent as the U.S. has proposed.

Our foreign ministers agreed on October 30th that the Washington summit would consider thoroughly the development of instructions to our Geneva negotiators on a future agreement for 50 percent reductions in strategic offensive weapons and given this, another agreement for the observance of and nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty for an agreed period. There have been intensive discussions on this over the last few weeks and I am optimistic. I am hopeful General Secretary Gorbachev and I will make progress in Washington.

From the beginning of my Administration, I placed the highest priority on achieving deep and equitable cuts in strategic offensive arms. To ensure that such an agreement genuinely enhances strategic stability, we have insisted that it reduce and limit the number of warheads on ballistic missiles. These weapons are particularly dangerous and destabilizing, because they can reach their targets in less than thirty minutes. We will also insist the treaty be effectively verifiable -- an especially complex task. I am encouraged by the unprecedented scope of the verification measures agreed to in the INF Treaty, but a START agreement would, of course, be more far-reaching.

Deep reductions in offensive weapons would significantly help reduce the danger of nuclear attack. So would further advances in the development of strategic defenses. I know your government claims that my Strategic Defense Initiative is a destabilizing "militarization of space," but this, frankly, is a gross misrepresentation. The world will be a safer place if both super-powers shift toward strategic defenses while radically reducing strategic offensive arsenals. Strategic defenses can intercept an attacker's missiles, but do not threaten people.

They permit a military strategy that deters war by protecting people instead of targetting them. SDI is a scientific research and development program to explore whether new advanced technologies might make effective defenses possible in the near future.

The whole world knows that the USSR has pioneered the field of strategic defenses, and has had a program to develop them long before my 1983 decision on SDI. In a recent interview on American television, General Secretary Gorbachev acknowledged that the Soviet Union is doing "all that the United States is doing" in this field. We estimate that over the past ten years the Soviet Union has spent roughly as much of its military budget on strategic defense as it has on strategic offensive forces. Longstanding Soviet programs in this area include the world's most extensive air and civil defenses and the world's only active anti-ballistic missile system, deployed around Moscow and recently being modernized. Since both sides are determined to explore advanced strategic defenses, we propose that our two sides talk in practical terms about how we can make a transition jointly and safely to greater reliance on such defenses. It would make us all more secure.

In addition to achieving large reductions in strategic nuclear forces, we should also move ahead to correct dangerous imbalances of conventional and chemical forces, where the USSR enjoys large advantages. This will be a complex process because allies are directly concerned and because the military forces themselves are complicated. But I am happy to say that both sides express willingness to move forward.

Q: One of the most dramatic and potentially explosive problems of our time is the enormous external debt of many developing countries. Many experts believe that this cannot possibly end well. In general, if one looks at the situation more broadly, without a solution to the problems of the developing world, there is not, nor can there be genuine security for anyone. What solution do you see to the problem of debts of developing countries?

THE PRESIDENT: In recent decades, the developing world has been the scene of a more fundamental trend, namely the flourishing of economies that have avoided the rigidities of centralized planning and given full scope to individual initiative and entrepreneurship. For instance, many of the developing economies of the Asia-Pacific region are booming, particularly in those nations where economic freedom provides people with the incentive to better their lives. And some African countries have recently experienced accelerated growth, particularly in agriculture, as a result of easing centralized restrictions.

Foreign borrowing in itself is not a problem. Countries need foreign and domestic capital to make the investments that will lead to economic growth and development. The United States and other successful industrialized countries have prospered in part because of the inflow of foreign capital to finance factories, mines, and other investments essential for long-term growth. Today, some developing countries have difficulty servicing their debt because this borrowed capital was used to increase consumption and finance capital flight rather than for investment.

The United States remains committed to a cooperative solution to the debt problem. Such a solution involves a partnership among developed and developing nations, commercial banks, and international financial institutions. The United States has proposed a positive program built on the need to increase the level of economic activity in developing nations.

A key to success in this effort continues to be a greater opening of markets. Lasting growth can only be achieved by allowing more scope at home for individual initiative and entrepreneurship. And the U.S. and our partners in the industrialized world are making a crucial contribution to these efforts by providing a growing market for the products of developing countries. Since World War II, we have seen a remarkable trend toward interdependence among national economies. Combined with policy reforms to liberate the creative potential of individual men and women, policies that foster open competition and free trade can create a favorable environment for developed and developing nations to solve economic problems and to raise standards of living for their people.

We also recognize that the developing world needs special assistance to promote economic development. No country has been more generous than America in helping others. In 1987 alone, the U.S. Government has given about \$9 billion in development assistance to developing countries and international financial institutions, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

#6

Q: In your speeches, you have more than once stated that improvement of Soviet-American relations depends on fulfilling certain demands concerning changes in our society. The correctness and the fairness of these questions is something that can be argued. Our question concerns something else: what, in your opinion, can and must the U.S. itself do for the improvement and development of relations between our countries?

THE PRESIDENT: You are wrong to speak of American "demands." ~~Who can doubt the interest that the world community has in the changes taking place inside the Soviet Union?~~

~~Moreover,~~ the obligations of states are codified in international agreements, such as the Helsinki Final Act and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The possibility of reform and liberalization in your country is of interest to the world; we need to have a full understanding of these dynamics within your society. The Western world, and increasingly the ~~outside~~ *whole* world, has a well-developed and tested concept of democracy. Democracy means the rule of law, a system of checks and balances that limits the power of the state and protects the rights of individual citizens. It means regular elections contested by different parties presenting competing programs for the people's choice and mandate. It requires an independent judiciary that effectively protects due process of law and the inalienable rights to freedom of speech, conscience, press, assembly, and worship. Americans fiercely defend our democracy and we sincerely believe every person on earth is entitled to liberty and human and political rights. We do not try to force our system on others. But we also cannot ignore the clear lesson of history. Countries which respect the rights and freedoms of their own citizens are more likely to respect the rights and freedoms of other nations. Real peace and real democracy, therefore, go hand in hand.

You ask what the United States can do to improve relations. First, let me say that all Americans join me in seeking improved relations. We know that our two systems -- however different -- must and can coexist. We can coexist as do two wrestlers in a ring if necessary. But we would much prefer to coexist as partners and as friends. We want, therefore, to expand the educational, cultural, and people-to-people exchanges that lead to broader cooperation between our two nations.

Since General Secretary Gorbachev and I signed a new agreement on exchanges two years ago in Geneva, well over a hundred thousand Americans have come to the USSR to see and learn about your country, many of them young people. Many more of your citizens have visited America than in the past, but we would love to see a hundred thousand Soviets from all walks of life come to the U.S. over the next few years to get to know us better. I believe you have a saying: "Better to see something once than hear about it a hundred times."

I can assure you that I and my successors, too, will continue to confront the problems in our relations both realistically and constructively. We shall maintain and build upon the engagement we have begun. The American people will remain as they have always been, peaceloving, generous and friendly, extending a warm welcome to visitors to our shores. As we greet General Secretary Gorbachev and his delegation, we shall be reaching out our hand to all the people of the Soviet Union.

#5

Q: Mr. President, if we say that the most important international affairs topic for American public opinion is the upcoming meeting with General Secretary Gorbachev, then, judging by the American press, the number one domestic concern right now is the recent crash of the stock market, its consequences for Americans and for the economy of the country. Please explain to our readers what, in your opinion, is the cause of the crash? How serious is it?

THE PRESIDENT: Let me begin by saying that the American economy is currently stronger and healthier than ever. We are experiencing the longest economic expansion since World War II. As we speak, the standard of living of the average American is among the highest in the world.

Nearly two-thirds of American households own their homes. Americans drive more than 160 million motor vehicles, ~~compared to 19 million in the Soviet Union.~~ The overwhelming majority of Americans have private telephones and televisions which, in most areas of the country, can pick up dozens and in some cases hundreds of television stations. We are in the midst of a high-tech explosion with computer home shopping, compact disk stereo, and modular car telephones -- to name a few -- all available to consumers. ~~at low cost.~~ Mr. Gorbachev will be able to see the results of this sustained prosperity when he comes to Washington.

→ more than one-and-a-half cars per driver

The stock market today is at roughly the same level it was throughout 1986 -- and at that time, it had never been higher. ~~What's more, the prices of bonds have risen more than 10 percent since October's stock market decline.~~ The continuing high level of stock and bond assets represents real wealth for millions of Americans. More than 70 percent of American households own interest-earning assets at financial institutions, and one-fifth own stocks and mutual funds. As a result, millions of ordinary people have a stake in the economic growth and prosperity of their country.

It is important to recognize the role that stock markets play in the global economy. Stock ownership entitles individuals to vote in selecting the management of a company, and to share in the profits of the enterprise. Institutions such as labor union pension funds also own and trade shares for the benefit of millions of workers. This system of open markets, built upon the principles of entrepreneurship and stock ownership, has resulted in average income levels in non-Communist developed countries some 60 percent higher per capita than that in East Bloc countries. And it is why per capita consumption in the United States is three times higher than that in the Soviet Union by the most conservative estimates.

It is the nature of markets to fluctuate, both up and down. But it is the sharing of both the risks and rewards in markets that provides the foundation for the creation of wealth and a higher standard of living. Through public stock markets, any individual can sell his idea and raise money to pursue it by starting his own company. Larger enterprises can raise needed capital only by convincing the marketplace of the economic value of their planned investments. The fact that our economy has remained on a healthy growth path throughout the recent adjustment in stock markets is testimony to the strength of economics based on individual initiative and open competition.

#