

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Chumachenko, Katherine: Files
Folder Title: Moscow Summit 1988 (7)
Box: OA 18287

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/>

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name CHUMACHENKO, KATHERINE: FILES

Withdrawer

KDB 5/30/2006

File Folder MOSCOW SUMMIT 1988 (7)

FOIA

F1737

Box Number 18291

SNYDER, S

10

ID	Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
24946	REPORT	FBIS REPORT (PAGES 19-22 ONLY) PAR 8/14/2007 F1737	4	5/31/1988	B3

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.



Lithuanian Information Center

LIETUVIŲ INFORMACIJOS CENTRAS

351 Highland Blvd., Brooklyn, NY 11207 Tel. (718) 647-2434

Telex No. 5101013171

May 17, 1988

Contact: *Ginte Damusis*

For immediate release

PLANNED UNOFFICIAL COMMEMORATIONS IN LITHUANIA ELICIT OFFICIAL RESPONSE

(New York, May 17. LIC) The Soviet Lithuanian daily, *Vakarines Naujienos*, published a first-page announcement today calling for a memorial meeting in Vilnius to "the innocent victims of Stalin" on May 21, one day before scheduled unofficial demonstrations, reports Lithuanian Information Center.

Unofficial commemorations -- religious services, street processions and a 3 p.m. rally in Vilnius' Gediminas square -- are planned for May 22 to mark the 40th anniversary of the largest deportation in a series by the Soviets.

Nationalist demonstrations on Lithuanian Independence Day as well as a government organized anti-Reagan rally were held in Gediminas square last February.

Four Vilnius activists, who signed a statement calling for the May 22 rally, have been summoned for talks by the Vilnius executive committee this Thursday, according to one of the four, Mr. Antanas Terleckas, reached today by telephone. He speculated that initial Soviet plans to mark another wave of deportations on June 14-15 had been hastily changed to May 21 to preempt the unsanctioned May 22 events.

The open appeal signed by Terleckas and three others states that "forty years ago, 200,000 people were deported from Lithuania."

Though the previously taboo subject of deportations has been recently broached in the official Lithuanian press, detailed statistics as well as general figures on the deportations remain unpublished. Western scholarly estimates of deportation totals vary between 320,000 and 520,000 during the Stalin period. Terleckas said that official deportation figures may be disclosed for the first time in the Soviet Lithuanian press later this week.

Two other unofficial calls to commemorate the mass

deportations on May 22 were circulated in Lithuania earlier this month.

The first announcement was made by the underground Lithuanian Liberty League, which was founded in 1978 as a "non-partisan group, based on democratic principles...to restore Lithuanian independence."

In its proclamation, the LLL asserted that "our members cannot sign this document because we will be arrested and thus prevented from taking part in the demonstration."

Soon thereafter, a statement carrying the names of thirty leaders in the Catholic equal rights movement of Lithuania, appeared in support of the anonymous LLL proclamation. Calling on all those touched by the deportations - Lithuanians, Poles and Jews alike - the thirty suggest that the anniversary be marked with religious services nation-wide. "We suggest that...in the churches of Kaunas, the Lithuanian national anthem (outlawed - Ed.) be sung, and in those of Vilnius, the Polish national anthem be added (Vilnius has a substantial Polish population - Ed.), and that afterwards, silent processions go out into the streets."

The four signatories of the third and latest appeal -- Antanas Terleckas, Vytautas Bogusis, Andrius Tuckus and Romas Ragaisis -- range in age from 28 to 60. Last February, Terleckas and Bogusis had their telephone lines cut and were placed under house arrest during independence day demonstrations in Vilnius. For his involvement in independence day events, Tuckus was detained for 10 days and fired from his job. Ragaisis is a former political prisoner.



Lithuanian Information Center

LIETUVIŲ INFORMACIJOS CENTRAS

351 Highland Blvd., Brooklyn, NY 11207 Tel. (718) 647-2434

Telex No. 5101013171

May 21, 1988

Contact: *Ginte Damusis*

For immediate release

SOVIET CITY OFFICIALS WARN AGAINST MAY 22 DEMONSTRATIONS IN LITHUANIA

(New York, May 21. LIC) Four Vilnius activists were instructed by Soviet city officials on Thursday to cancel a demonstration planned tomorrow, said a Soviet dissident upon arrival from Moscow at New York's JFK airport tonight.

According to Dr. Algirdas Statkevičius, the harsh warning, amounting to a ban on unofficial commemorations to mark the 40th anniversary of Stalinist deportations to Siberia, was issued by Deputy Kačonas of the Vilnius executive committee, Vilnius Procurator Sodeika and an unidentified woman during Thursday's meeting at executive committee offices. The four activists summoned to the meeting -- Vytautas Bogušis, Romas Ragaišis, Antanas Terleckas and Andrius Tučkus -- are calling for a May 22 rally in the capital city's central square. City officials warned against the rally, charging it would incite confrontation and strong government measures. The four were told that they would be held accountable for their actions in accordance with Soviet law.

After being warned by Vilnius city officials, the four activists sent a telegram to Procurator General Rekunkov in Moscow urging him to prevent any official disruption of the peaceful gathering tomorrow and to allow them to implement their right to freedom of assembly guaranteed under Article 50 of the Soviet Constitution.

Statkevičius, a Lithuanian Helsinki monitor and former political prisoner who emigrated to the United States today, left Vilnius the day Soviet authorities cut the telephone lines of dozens of local activists. He reported that unofficial commemorations will take place tomorrow as scheduled in churches nationwide and in Vilnius' Gediminas square to honor the memory of an estimated 200,000 Lithuanian, Polish and Jewish deportees to Siberia in late May 1948.

- 30 -

OVER



Lithuanian Information Center

LIETUVIŲ INFORMACIJOS CENTRAS

351 Highland Blvd., Brooklyn, NY 11207 Tel. (718) 647-2434

Telex No. 5101013171

May 23, 1988

Contact: Ginte Damusis

For immediate release

EYEWITNESSES IN VILNIUS DISPUTE TASS REPORT ON UNOFFICIAL GATHERING

(Vilnius-New York, May 23. LIC) Hundreds of militiamen and civilian vigilantes disrupted an unofficial rally in the Lithuanian capital's central square yesterday to mark the 40th anniversary of the deportation of an estimated 200,000 Lithuanians by Stalin, according to reports from Vilnius. More than 3,000 protestors, not 300 as reported by TASS, broke through police lines to gather in Vilnius' Gediminas square, singing Lithuanian patriotic songs and chanting "Freedom, Freedom, Freedom."

As told by eyewitnesses to nationalist leader Antanas Terleckas, one of three dissidents placed under house arrest yesterday, the demonstrators skirted police blockades by St. Ann's church, and around the central city square, where they listened to speeches demanding public disclosure of Stalinist deportation figures. Participants said police tried to drown out speeches with mobile loudspeakers blaring loud music, then cut the speeches short and used force to disperse the demonstrators, reported Terleckas during a telephone interview with the Lithuanian Information Center. Some minor skirmishes and at least three detentions were observed by people on the scene, he added.

Before the demonstration was broken up, Andrius Tučkus, a young Vilnius activist, read a statement at the rally condemning the Stalinist deportations, demanding that those who participated in them be brought to justice, and that moral and material reparations be made to the deportees. The statement, heartily applauded by the demonstrators, also urged that June 14 -- another mass deportation date -- be declared Deportee day and that a statue in honor of Stalinist deportees be erected at the demonstration site in Vilnius' Gediminas square, learned Lithuanian Information Center.

Another source, who did not wish to be identified, reported that there was a heavy presence of uniformed militiamen, plainclothesmen and civilian vigilantes as late as 7:30 p.m. outside Vilnius' St. Nicholas church, one of the sites of yesterday's commemorative church services at which the outlawed Lithuanian national anthem was sung.

Speaking by telephone from Vilnius, Terleckas said he was disillusioned with heavy-handed government actions taken against the demonstrators, particularly in light of an official ceremony held on Saturday to condemn the crimes of Stalin. Several dissident sources had speculated that the unofficial Vilnius rally would proceed without incident.

Another unofficial gathering was confirmed to have taken place in the city of Siauliai, 100 miles southwest of Vilnius, where 500 people marched from the local church to a national monument to lay flowers. There were no reports of government interference.



Lithuanian Information Center

LIETUVIŲ INFORMACIJOS CENTRAS

351 Highland Blvd., Brooklyn, NY 11207 Tel. (718) 647-2434
Telex No. 5101013171

May 20, 1988

For Immediate Release

NEW DOCUMENT OF LITHUANIAN HELSINKI GROUP REACHES THE WEST

(New York, May 20. LIC) *The Lithuanian Helsinki 76 Group has issued Document Number 35, dated April 30, 1988, the text of which has reached the Lithuanian Information Center in New York. Following is the complete text:*

To: Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Communist Party Central Committee in the U.S.S.R.

Document No. 35 of the Lithuanian Monitoring Group for Compliance with the Helsinki Final Accords

The signers of the Helsinki Final Act obliged themselves to respect all three international agreements regarding human rights. The *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, ratified by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., Part 3, Par. 19, states:

1. Everyone shall have the right to hold opinions without interference.

2. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art or through any other media of his choice.

Par. 49 of the Soviet Constitution states: "Every citizen of the U.S.S.R. has the right to submit proposals to state bodies and public organizations for improving their activity, and to criticize shortcomings in their work. Persecution for criticism is forbidden."

All the media of mass information are constantly informing the citizens of the U.S.S.R. that Stalin organized and personally directed unforgiveably tyrannical acts of oppression, injustice and inhumanity and that all the post-Stalin five-year plans were not free of the same kinds of things. Going by healthy logic, it would be appropriate to extoll and praise all those resisters who demanded of the government that it respect the directives of the Soviet Constitution and approved international obligations which in one way or another opposed and actively struggled against the arbitrariness of state officials. Their undertakings coincided with the interests of the decent part of humanity. And we think that the April 4, 1988 issue of the newspaper *Pravda* was right when it stated a patriot was one who, not fearing any difficulties, works for the interest of the country and the good of the people. It is

exactly by such purposes that the resistors were guided in their activities.

However, in real life in the U.S.S.R., we have seen and we still see a completely contradictory picture. Most of those who have made use of their right to free expression of opinion and criticized the shortcomings in the work of state and public organizations, who submitted their suggestions to the government, were unjustly accused of libel, of the dissemination of harmful agitation and propaganda and were called socially dangerous elements. Many of them are still kept in places of imprisonment or exile. Many of them do not have the right to live in their own homeland or to assume more responsible positions, they are kept from travelling abroad, etc. Concrete examples of this are Bishop Julijonas Steponavičius, the Lithuanian priests - Alfonsas Svarinskas and Sigitas Tamkevičius, the members of the Lithuanian Helsinki 76 Group - Viktoras Petkus and Balys Gajauskas, active members of the resistance - Povilas Pečiulaitis, Algirdas Žyprė, Gintautas Iešmantas, Boleslovas Lizūnas, Petras Gražulis and a great many other people of different nationalities being persecuted today for their national or religious beliefs.

We would like to see the directives of the Helsinki Final Accords and the Soviet Constitution not only written on paper, but operative in everyday reality. Therefore, in the name of justice, peace, freedom and the honorable striving for a life of full values, we demand that the government of the U.S.S.R. fully respect all obligations assumed under the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference and to amnesty without delay all those who, in the course of seventy years, have opposed the practitioners of inhumanity and injustice.

Signed:

Members of the Lithuanian Group to Monitor Compliance
with the Helsinki Accords:

Algirdas Statkevičius, Physician
Mečislovas Jurevičius, Worker
Vytautas Vaičiūnas, Engineer

Vilnius, April 30, 1988



Lithuanian Information Center

LIETUVIŲ INFORMACIJOS CENTRAS

351 Highland Blvd., Brooklyn, NY 11207 Tel. (718) 647-2434

Telex No. 5101013171

May 20, 1988

For Immediate Release

LITHUANIAN HELSINKI GROUP APPEALS TO THE INTERNATIONAL HELSINKI FEDERATION

(New York, May 20. LIC) *The Lithuanian Helsinki Group, after several years during which members were imprisoned, exiled or persecuted, has resumed its activities with an application for membership to the International Helsinki Federation, the Lithuanian Information Center in New York learned from sources in Lithuania. The announcement gives the names of members of the group now calling itself Helsinki 76 of Lithuania. Following is the complete text of the announcement:*

To: The International Helsinki Federation

An Announcement from the Lithuanian Group to Monitor Compliance with the Helsinki Final Accords

The Lithuanian group to monitor compliance with the Helsinki Final Act was founded in 1976. Its founder, Viktoras Petkus, and one of its members, Balys Gajauskas, after ten years of imprisonment, are in exile in Siberia. Other members of the group - Tomas Venclova, Eitan Finkelstein and Vytautas Skuodis - were forced to leave Lithuania. Group member Father Bronius Laurinavičius was killed under suspicious circumstances. Group members Father Karolis Garuckas and Ona Lukauskaitė-Poškienė are deceased.

We, the remaining members of this group - Vytautas Vaičiūnas, Algirdas Statkevičius and Mečislovas Jurevičius - having spent many years in prison, are presently free and we are reviving the group's activities.

We ask the International Helsinki Federation to accept the Helsinki 76 Group of Lithuania as a member. At the present time, members of Helsinki 76 are: Viktoras Petkus and Balys Gajauskas, both still in exile; Tomas Venclova and Vytautas Skuodis (living in the U.S.A.) and Eitan Finkelstein (Israel); Mečislovas Jurevičius, Algirdas Statkevičius and Vytautas Vaičiūnas (living in Lithuania).

Signed:

Mečislovas Jurevičius
Algirdas Statkevičius
Vytautas Vaičiūnas

April 25, 1988



Lithuanian Information Center

LIETUVIŲ INFORMACIJOS CENTRAS

351 Highland Blvd., Brooklyn, NY 11207 Tel. (718) 647-2434

Telex No. 5101013171

May 19, 1988

Contact: Victor Nakas

Washington office, tel. (202) 347-3177

For immediate release

U.S. SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN APPEAL FOR SOVIET RESTRAINT ON MAY 22 IN LITHUANIA

(Washington, May 19. LIC) A letter from two U.S. Senators was delivered to Soviet ambassador Yuri Dubinin in Washington today appealing for government restraint during planned public commemorations in Lithuania this Sunday to honor the memory of Lithuanian, Polish and Jewish deportees to Siberia, reports Lithuanian Information Center. A similar appeal by two U.S. Congressmen was delivered yesterday.

Rep. Edward Feighan (D-OH) and Rep. John Miller (R-WA), co-chairmen of the House Lithuanian Catholic Religious Liberty Group, wrote "we view plans for such peaceful public commemorations as an important component of the campaign now underway in your country to fill in the blank spots of Soviet history, as Mr. Gorbachev has proposed. We note, however, that the last time peaceful commemorations were staged in Lithuania, in February, the militia in Kaunas and Vilnius used force to break them up. We sincerely hope that such instances of government-sponsored violence against peaceful demonstrators will not be repeated on May 22."

Senators David Durenberger (R-MN) and Donald Riegle (D-MI), co-chairmen of the Senate Lithuanian Catholic Religious Liberty Group, reiterated the same, asking Mr. Dubinin to "convey our concerns to the appropriate authorities in Moscow."

Several groups in Lithuania have called for unofficial commemorations -- religious services, street processions and a 3 p.m. rally in Vilnius' Gediminas square -- on May 22 to mark the 40th anniversary of the largest deportation in a series by the Soviets, when in 1948 "about 200,000 civilian inhabitants of Lithuania...were deported, without criminal charge or trial, to the furthest reaches of the USSR." Western scholarly estimates of deportation totals vary between 320,000 and 520,000 during the Stalin period.

Nationalist demonstrations on Lithuanian Independence Day were held in Gediminas square last February despite a heavy Soviet police presence and harsh warnings from local Communist authorities. Numerous arrests and beatings of demonstrators were reported. Soviet officials condemned statements made then by U.S. Congressmen and Senators, calling them interference in Soviet Lithuanian affairs.



Lithuanian Information Center

LIETUVIŲ INFORMACIJOS CENTRAS

351 Highland Blvd., Brooklyn, NY 11207 Tel. (718) 647-2434
Telex No. 5101013171

May 20, 1988

Contact: Ginte Damusis

For immediate release

TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS WITH LITHUANIA BREAK DOWN

(New York, May 20. LIC) Telephone communications with local residents in Lithuania have been cut off on the eve of peaceful gatherings there, reports Lithuanian Information Center.

At least three different groups have called for unofficial public commemorations on Sunday, May 22, to mark the 40th anniversary of the largest wave of Stalinist deportations from Lithuania. According to these groups, an estimated 200,000 innocent Lithuanians were deported in late May of 1948. They are calling for church services throughout Lithuania, silent street processions in Vilnius and Kaunas, and a 3 p.m. rally at Vilnius' Gediminas square.

The Soviet government has responded to these unofficial initiatives by announcing plans this week for a state-sponsored commemoration on May 21 in Vilnius. Dissident sources speculate that the government wants to preempt the unofficial commemorations, which have the backing of the Lithuanian Liberty League, an illegal nationalist group dedicated to the restoration of national independence to Lithuania.

Reached by telephone, leading dissident Antanas Terleckas confirmed, before the line went dead, that a meeting took place yesterday between some Vilnius dissidents and city officials.

The meeting was called by the Vilnius executive committee, one of the co-sponsors of the official Saturday commemoration. Terleckas was one of four Vilnius activists who issued an appeal earlier this month calling for the Sunday afternoon rally in Vilnius' Gediminas Square, the site of nationalist demonstrations last February.

A source reached today by telephone, who did not wish to be identified, said that the telephones of Antanas Terleckas, Vytautas Bogušis and Nijolė Sadūnaitė had been disconnected. Calls by Lithuanian Information Center to other contacts in and outside of Vilnius were intercepted by Soviet operators.

The source also said that, as of yet, no public warnings or threats had been issued by Soviet officials against Sunday's events. The Soviets used intimidation tactics before demonstrations last February and last August 23, when thousands demonstrated against Stalin's 1939 nonaggression pact with Nazi Germany, by which the independent Baltic states were ceded to the Soviet Union.

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
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 solely by political means is gaining increasing authority. There is an 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 firmest* 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

MORE

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 is 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 unprecedented 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

MORE

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.

MORE

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 establishment.

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

MORE

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 starting 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 journalists 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

MORE

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 occurred 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 assymetry, 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 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 these 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

MORE

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-launched 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 roll 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, 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 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

MORE

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

MORE

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 loose 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.)

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

MORE

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

MORE

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)

FBIS-SOV-88-104
31 May 1988

19

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

One of the important results of the policy of national reconciliation is the process of shaping a new state and political system, now successfully under way in the country. Proceeding from the premise that the ranks of the opposition contain sensible people capable of perceiving the needs and aspirations of the Afghan people, the government addresses them with the call: Come to Kabul and sit around the negotiating table. This is a call by a government which has confidence in itself and is profoundly aware of its responsibility for the fate and future of its people who yearn for peace rather than continuation of endless clashes which result in senseless loss of life.

Of course, Afghanistan's future depends largely also on the extent to which all sides that signed the Geneva agreement will honestly and consistently honor the pledges given by them, and will not try to evade them by various means and cheat their partners. Unfortunately, such attempts are being made.

Last week the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan presented to a group of UN observers in Kabul an official note drawing attention to the sharp recent increase in the quantity of weapons and ammunition being brought into Afghanistan by antigovernment groupings from Pakistani territory. In parallel with the importation of weapons, there are instances of illegal infiltration in Afghanistan by foreign military advisers and specialists for the purpose of assisting the extremists. Some 15 detachments of insurgents, numbering about 1,800 men in total, have been moved into Afghanistan during the first half of May alone.

Reports from Delhi speak of attempts by the Pakistani authorities, acting in conjunction with leaders of Afghan reactionary emigre groupings, to hinder the swift return of refugees home. According to the Indian press agency, the majority of Afghans rounded up in refugee camps in Pakistani regions bordering on Afghanistan express the desire to return home as soon as possible. But, on the insistence of a number of leaders of opposition groupings, the refugee camps are surrounded by Pakistani soldiers on watch together with guards from the armed opposition groupings. Seven Pakistani divisions have been placed on a heightened alert in the event of a flareup of disturbances among Afghans in the camps dissatisfied with their delayed return home. Patrols along the border with Afghanistan have been intensified by the Pakistani side. Is it not clear that such actions are a breach of the agreements?

It Must Become the Norm [subhead]

There is still a whole series of regional conflicts in the world which need localization. One of them is in Central America.

The Nicaraguan Government, pursuing a policy of national reconciliation, decided a few days ago to unilaterally extend the duration of the temporary suspension of offensive military operations against the contra gangs for 1 more month from 1 June this year. This decision by the Sandinist government, imbued with the spirit of humanitarianism and good will, offers convincing proof of its desire to achieve peace and an end to the bloodshed in the country.

And what are the contras doing? Their leadership insists, just like before, on the government meeting unacceptable demands which run contrary to the peace accords reached in Sapoa in March of this year. This stance threatens to wreck the peace dialogue.

Here is another news item, even more recent, but this one from Southeast Asia: The Governments of Vietnam and Cambodia have reached accord that a withdrawal of 50,000 men, in other words one-half of the contingent of Vietnamese volunteer troops in Cambodia, will be implemented as early as during this year. The Vietnamese command of the SRV volunteer forces in Cambodia will also be recalled home this year, while the remaining volunteers will be placed under the Cambodian side's orders and will be finally withdrawn in 1990.

These important actions by the Governments of Cambodia and Vietnam are valuable primarily because they pave a direct way toward settling the situation around Cambodia within a brief period, and help to create conditions for the implementation of the course of national reconciliation pursued by the PRK Government and of the idea of turning Southeast Asia into a zone of peace.

News like this is encouraging. The world community has already received sufficient proof that the protracted nature of regional conflicts is the result of pressure exerted on policy by historically obsolete stereotypes like the traditional approaches toward ensuring national security, with preference given to strong-arm methods instead of sensible reckoning and political boldness.

The topic of regional conflicts and the ways and means for their solution is among others on the agenda of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow. Let us hope that its discussion will bring mankind nearer to the point when political settlement of regional conflicts and prevention of new ones will enter the practice of international relations and will become a norm of the world community's life.

United States & Canada

U.S. Senate Approves Military Budget

■2805100188 Moscow TASS in English 0815 GMT
28 May 88

[Text] Washington May 28 TASS—TASS correspondent Igor Barsukov reports:

The U.S. Senate on Friday without counting of votes approved a bill on military appropriations for the 1989 fiscal year to the tune of 299,500 million dollars.

The amount was fixed way back at the end of last year when administration and Congress members worked out a compromise version of the bill aimed at gradually reducing the deficit of the federal budget.

A vote on the bill was taken in a practically empty conference hall of the Senate after Republican Senator Alfonse d'Amato withdrew his amendment which provided for death penalty for murders connected with the smuggling of narcotics.

The U.S. House of Representatives adopted its version of the bill more than two weeks ago. Both versions will be now submitted to the House-Senate Committee which is to settle the differences between the proposals of the Senate and the House of Representatives and to endorse a final version of the bill. The most serious arguments in the House-Senate Committee is expected to develop over SDI-related appropriations.

U.S. Human Rights Violations Described

Mayorov on Panama Situation

■005174588 Moscow World Service in English
1410 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Humanitarian problems are one of the subjects which are being discussed in Moscow at the Soviet-American summit. This is probably why every fact of human rights violations in one country or another is these days felt with special bitterness. Commentary is by Mikhail Mayorov. Here is what he writes:

The case I'm referring to is the violation of one of the rights of a whole people, the Panamanians, who, under the treaty of 1977, should take control of the Panama Canal by the end of this century. The treaty was signed by the former leaders of the United States and Panama, Jimmy Carter and Omar Torrijos.

Today, 11 years after the signing of the document, the United States Administration has launched a massive campaign against Panama, in particular its present leaders, and in the first place against the commander of the National Defense Force, General Manuel Antonio Noriega. To replace him Washington has resorted to trade and economic sanctions against Panama and moved additional troops into the Canal Zone.

As more threats and blackmail are used, it is getting increasingly obvious that the real target of the campaign is not so much Noriega, whom the Americans accuse of involvement in the narcotics business. The real aim is to cross out the formula which says the Panama Canal to the Panamanians, to put in power in that country people who would agree to revise the treaty of 1977. [sentence as received] The game is worth the candle. The canal is important from both the strategic and economic points of view; its zone is a convenient stronghold of the Pentagon.

These days, at the moment the United States' President arrived in the Soviet Union, his adviser for national security, General Colin Powell, and the head of the White House staff, Howard Baker, said in a televised interview in Washington that the United States intends to exert further pressure on Panama, military pressure included. This leaves one to wonder. When the head of the United States Administration speaks about violations of human rights in other countries, does he also mean the 2 million Panamanians who quite unceremoniously are to be kept away from part of their own territory in defiance of international law?

Puerto Rican Prisoners Held

■3105132888 Moscow TASS in English 1307 GMT
31 May 88

[Text] New York May 31 TASS—Long prison terms are being served in the United States by many prominent Puerto Rican public and trade union leaders, intellectuals and students. All of them are members of the Movement for the Independence of Puerto Rico, put behind prison bars under a far-fetched charge of "conspiracy with a view of staging a mutiny" The American authorities bracket them as terrorists only for their struggle for the liberation of their homeland, which became a U.S. colonial territory and a springboard for the Pentagon's military ventures.

A list of Puerto Rican political prisoners was printed by the public organization, the Centre for Constitutional Rights. Among the Puerto Ricans languishing in American jails is Edwin Cortez, one of the founders of the Union of Puerto Rican students, who was sentenced to a 35-year prison term in 1983.

Well-known Puerto Rican painter Elizam Escobar was sentenced to 68 years in prison. His canvases had been repeatedly on view not only in Puerto Rico but also at the biggest exhibition halls of the United States. The prison administration ruled that Escobar be deprived of the right to be engaged in painting in his cell. A 35-year prison term was passed on Alberto Rodriguez, one of the leaders of the Puerto Rican community of Chicago, and activist of the struggle for civil rights of U.S. national minorities.

These are only a few names from the long list which was distributed in the course of a press conference held by a number of public organizations to draw attention to political repressions and violations of human rights in the United States. This list is far from being complete since the precise number of political prisoners at U.S. jails is unknown. The American authorities deny that there are political prisoners in the country and the "free" press prefers to keep silent on such facts.

"The veil of silence" around the "The Puerto Rico/Hartford-15" case, a crying judicial arbitrary rule vis-a-vis 15 activists of the movement for the independence of the island, is a typical example of such a hypocritical approach of the U.S. mass media. The activists were put behind prison bars without trial and with no official charges. The biggest term of the so-called "preventive confinement" fell the lot [as received] of Filiberto Oheda who has been kept in prison for 33 months now, with no sentence passed on him. The bourgeois press bypassed in silence the unprecedented case of American legal practices, just as the broad campaign for the release of Oheda and his comrades.

Should one be therefore surprised at the fact that the majority of the Americans never heard the names of Filiberto Oheda, Leonard Peltier, Jonny Harris and other political prisoners in their country. It is no secret that persistent interest of the American press in the theme of human rights in the USSR and other socialist countries changes in no time over to absolute indifference when the question is raised of violation of human rights in the United States.

'Fabricated Diagnoses' Noted

■ 3105032588 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0105 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] San Francisco, 31 May (TASS)—"Mr President, so you don't get into a difficult situation on the question of human rights, if they ask you whether the U.S. Government resorts to secret use of false psychiatric conclusions and fabricated diagnoses in order to discredit Americans of left-wing convictions and deprive them of the chance to find work, say: 'Yes.'" This is the beginning of a letter sent to the U.S. President on the eve of his departure for the Moscow summit by American World War II veteran Carrol Shacht, who lives in La Jolla, California.

Shacht, who took part in the Allied landing in Normandy and returned home after the victory over fascist Germany, was put on the FBI "black list" and was the victim of oppression organized against him. The reason was that he called openly for the continuation of the political alliance with the USSR, in order to prevent the appearance on the map of the world of new reichs, and considered the barbaric atomic bombing of the Japanese towns of Hiroshima and Nagasaki to be a crime against humanity. As Shacht discovered decades later from declassified secret service material, he had been put on a

list of "dangerous and potentially subversive elements sympathetic to Communism." With the aim of "neutralizing" him, the special "T-2" section of the FBI "recommended" that the U.S. Veterans Administration describe Shacht confidentially as "schizophrenic and paranoid" every time requests came in for job references for him.

Only in 1975 did the Veterans Administration tell Shacht that it had given these libelous character references about him, and admit that the "diagnosis" about him was "incorrect". But by that time the fate of Shacht and his family was ruined. In spite of the fact that Shacht had graduated from one of the most prestigious colleges in the United States, Yale University, and had earned a B.A. in architecture, he was then not only unable to work at his favorite subject, but was, to use his words, "deprived of equal rights to get any kind of work at all."

According to Shacht, he is only one of many dissident Americans who, because of their political views which do not suit Washington, were defamed and subjected to oppression as "socially dangerous schizophrenics". So the United States has no moral right to give other countries lessons in observing human rights, thinks Carrol Shacht.

U.S.-Soviet Trade Reflects 'Cold War Times'

■ 3005072788 Moscow TASS in English 0714 GMT
30 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—The real possibility of an improvement of political relations between the USA and the USSR necessitates a new appraisal of the state of bilateral trade, which is, so far, as a matter of fact, a survival of the cold war times. Indeed, since 1984 trade between the two countries has been on a decline: Soviet commodities account for only 0.5 per cent of the U.S. imports, while the USA makes only one per cent of the USSR's foreign trade.

The causes of that are known: In the first place the refusal of the USA to grant the USSR the most favoured nation treatment in trade, which dooms the Soviet commodities to discriminatory taxation, predetermines the USSR's unfavourable balance in bilateral trade.

The U.S. Administration does not guarantee credits for the development of trade with the USSR which does not permit the U.S. companies to compete on a par with rivals in the bid for big Soviet orders. One cannot help mentioning the notorious Cocom lists, which have turned into a serious impediment to East-West trade.

There is also another cause behind that: After the sharp turns in bilateral trade, the embargoes and broken off contracts American businessmen had developed some kind of a complex of inconfidence in their own administration's intentions. And the scanty trade turnover, the almost total exclusion of the Soviet commodities from the U.S. market, the lack of orders from the USSR

placed in the U.S. enterprises mean that common Americans simply do not feel interest in developing trade with the USSR (with the exception of the inhabitants of the "grain belt" of the USA). All that, indisputably, tells on the mood among the top echelons of power in the USA, including in Congress.

But the potential of trade is vast: Thus in the opinion of James Giffen, president of the U.S.-USSR Trade and Economic Council, if political barriers were removed, Soviet-American trade could reach 15-20 billion dollars already within the next two or three years. An important contribution to it could be made by joint ventures in the USSR's territory with the participation of U.S. big business. Soviet legislation in that field is steadily perfected.

Soviet people voice hope that the visit to the USSR of the U.S. President will make it possible to deep mutual understanding and lay the groundwork for the development of trade. And the world's two most powerful nations which have proved to be able to start the process of real disarmament, begin a serious dialogue for the settlement of regional conflicts, will be able at last to normalise relations in the trade-economic field.

Yakovlev Receives Soviet, U.S. Veterans

Participants Named

3005161488 Moscow TASS in English 1542 GMT
30 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politbureau and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received today a group of Soviet and American World War II veterans, participants in the meeting on the Elbe in April 1945—W. Robertson, K. Djemre, V. Orlov, A. Olshanskiy and A. Silvasenko.

Participants in the historic meeting handed in a letter of appeal addressed by them to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan in connection with the Soviet-American summit meeting.

Welcoming the Moscow meeting as an event of a major international significance on the way to the creation of a safe world, "true to the ideals of peace, we express hope that the Soviet-American dialogue on a summit level will be held in the 'spirit of the Elbe', reflecting the striving of nations for a better future without wars, for the ridding of humanity of the threat of nuclear catastrophe", the appeal to the leaders of the two countries said. The veterans handed over as well a book of memoirs of Soviet and American participants in World War II entitled "Meeting on the Elbe". It was brought out simultaneously in the Soviet Union and the U.S. [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian in its Second Edition on 31 May carries on page 2 a similar report on this meeting. The PRAVDA report adds that the talks passed in a "warm, friendly atmosphere."]

Message Sent to Gorbachev

3005203788 Moscow TASS in English 1625 GMT
30 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—Disarmament and peace are the dream of the people of the earth, the path to the survival of mankind. The participants in the Elbe meeting call on you to continue cooperation to achieve this great goal, says a message sent to Mikhail Gorbachev by the Soviet and American veterans of the Second World War. They held today a joint meeting at the international public center for watching the summit meeting.

Welcoming the Moscow meeting, the veterans described it as an "event of big international significance on the road to a safe world".

Our countries and peoples, the message says, are convinced that they can overcome the obstacles in the way toward mutual trust and fruitful cooperation as this was done during the years of our joint struggle against Nazism. True to the ideals of peace, we express the hope that the Soviet-American dialogue at the summit level will be conducted in the "spirit of Elbe", reflecting the peoples' aspirations for a better future, a future without wars, and for a mankind freed from the threat of a nuclear holocaust.

We approve of the Soviet-American INF Treaty and warmly support the efforts to solve the question of 50 percent cuts in strategic offensive arms and to achieve progress in all fields of Soviet-American cooperation, the message says.

Deputy Foreign Minister Receives U.S. Scientists

3005181988 Moscow TASS in English 1648 GMT
30 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev today received Carl Linden, director of the Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies at George Washington University, and his deputy Kim Young, in Moscow at the invitation of the Institute of the Far East at the USSR Academy of Sciences.

American Citizens Received in Yerevan

3005222788 Moscow TASS in English 1638 GMT
30 May 88

[Text] Yerevan May 30 TASS—We take away with us the warmest recollections of the hospitable people in Armenia and we wish to develop further the links between our twin cities—Cambridge and Yerevan, Debra Walsh, a member of the U.S. "Cambridge-Yerevan" association said in an interview with a TASS correspondent. Debra Walsh, a former well-known U.S. tennis player headed a delegation of Cambridge scientists (Massachusetts) which left the capital of Soviet Armenia today.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Moscow, USSR)

For Immediate Release

June 1, 1988

INTERVIEW OF
SECRETARY OF STATE GEORGE P. SHULTZ
BY
ROBIN MacNEILL OF PBS "MacNEILL/LEHRER NEWSHOUR"

The Rossiya Hotel
Moscow, USSR

May 31, 1988

5:55 P.M. (L)

Q Mr. Secretary, welcome. Is the U.S. side feeling as positive as the Soviets sound today about the possibilities of a START treaty being signed this fall?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: It's certainly possible, and we did make some headway during the course of this meeting in our working group. It's not certain, of course, because the problems ahead are difficult ones. And I think it's fair to say that both sides want to see the job done right. So, we'll work at it very hard. But I wouldn't want to make a flat prediction.

Q Well, does that mean that progress has been made on any of the four areas dividing the two sides -- the -- we had them listed for us the other day, the SDI, how you count ALCMs, how you verify the submarine-launched or conventional are nuclear; how to verify the mobile missiles or to ban them -- on any or all of those areas, has significant progress been made?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I think significant progress has been made on the air-launched cruise missile question and on the great difficult problems of verifying mobile missiles if you allow them. And so those are the two important areas where I think some real headway was made.

It's possible that we have made headway on the others, although that headway hasn't emerged into things that are concrete and identifiable. But you know, when you talk over your positions back and forth, you lay the groundwork for people going back and sort of thinking it over again and saying, well, you know, they said this and they said that, and maybe there's a point here. And it's that kind of thing that also makes progress, but you can't identify it in anything --

Q Has the progress you've made here been unexpectedly good? I mean, did you make more than you came here thinking you might make?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, everybody came thinking different things, probably. And -- well, I felt that we would make some, and we did. And I think I'll just leave it at that.

Q How does -- how do you at this level really make significant progress on issues that are so fiendishly complicated? It has to be on a fairly simple level -- I mean, like one side saying; well, okay, we'll reduce our demands on that thing, or we'll drop that. I mean, is that the kind of level on which progress is made at the summit level?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: There has been an evolution in the

MORE

way of working at these problems that I think is quite interesting, and seems to work well. And here's what happens. We bring here, and the Soviets have here, all of the expert people who know about this subject -- the negotiators from Geneva, the people who do the work in Washington, and the counterparts in Moscow. And when we started out, the President and the General Secretary had a one-on-one meeting, and shortly thereafter, I had one with Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. And at that meeting, we had around us this great big bunch of experts on all kinds of subjects -- on human rights subjects, on regional issues, on bilateral problems, on the range of arms control issues; not just START and SDI. And we established working groups. And while we've been having these various meetings, the working groups who are technically very well qualified have been meeting themselves. And being in the atmosphere of this summit meeting, there is the potential for interaction up and down the line, from the political level decisions to the technical level. And that tends to give us stimulus. And, by and large, I think in each one of these summit meetings, we've made progress working that way, and we've become increasingly sort of confident that that's a good pattern.

Q So if I understand correctly, it's the atmosphere of the summit with both leader -- all the leaderships present, and then all the experts present -- which makes them more likely to make some progress than when they're sitting there without all of you sitting on top of them in Geneva. Is that what you mean? Is --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, there are a variety of things. First, the people in Geneva who are the negotiators, they often get frustrated with the people in Washington, and maybe about Moscow; I can't speak about that, I don't know. But they say, come on, Washington, make up your mind. Give us an answer to our questions that have come up. And the Washington people, of course, are watching the negotiations and trying to evaluate the proposals that are being made and so on. So when you have all these people together in one place --

Q And clear them through the bureaucracy --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Right. So when you have them all together in one place, it's all there. And there can be an interchange that's pretty rapid. At the same time, there are political decisions to be made, so to speak, and there is a kind of encouragement to that out of the summit process.

Q What did Mr. Reagan say today when he said -- mean today when he said in the Kremlin, when reporters were asking questions, we're settled on SDI?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: I think he must have meant that as far as the United States is concerned, as far as he is concerned, that he intends to pursue this effort to find out whether we can defend ourselves against ballistic missiles. He feels it is a vitally important matter to learn how to do that if we can. As far as he's concerned, he's not going to agree to anything that would prevent that effort from going forward. And I think all the people working with him, certainly they support him in that.

Q He didn't mean it was settled between himself and the Soviets?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Oh no, it's not settled --

Q No.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: -- by any means. Although compared with where we were, say, two years or so ago, or when we went to Reykjavik, we've come a long way. So there have been a number of things worked out.

Q There have been hints, indications -- whatever -- in

the past that the Soviets, for their own reasons, might find it convenient to accept a forum of words that would enable the United States to go on developing, testing, whatever, SDI in the way Mr. Reagan wants to. Is that more like you get a sense that they -- that is a possibility now that they will -- without -- that they will simply accept a form of words that lets the U.S. interpret the ABM Treaty the way it wants to, and the Soviets can interpret it the way they want to, or is that not coming together?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: That isn't a good idea because if you have something that has been agreed to in words, and you both know that you have a different view of what those words mean, you're just heading for trouble, because as soon as there's any real pressure on the subject, that disagreement will emerge. So we believe -- and I think the Soviets believe -- that it's better to drive ahead and try to come to some kind of an agreement that's clear.

Q And on the final thing, you mentioned the air-launched cruise missiles, and you mentioned the mobile missiles.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Yes.

Q You didn't mention -- the fourth thing was, you didn't mention the submarine-launched missiles. No progress on that?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: It's -- on submarine-launched ballistic missiles, we really don't have -- that we've basically handled that --

Q I should have said cruise missiles.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: It's the question of cruise missiles that the Soviets have raised. And we don't see how you can verify a limit on cruise missiles on -- it's not just submarines; on any naval ship -- and be consistent with operating the Navy. Of course you can verify things by having all of our ships being swarmed with Soviets all of the time, but that doesn't allow the Navy to operate. So you've got to find something that will really work, and allow normal operations. And we don't see where to find that, and at the same time, they've put forward a lot of ideas, and we're evaluating them. But we really haven't made much progress on that.

Q Assistant Secretary Ridgway told us the other day that if there was to be a START treaty signed before Mr. Reagan left office, that would depend on the progress made here. Has the progress made here been sufficient that that is not now an impossibility? Is that what you were saying earlier? In other words, you can't --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: -- not agree with that double negative.

Q In other words, enough progress has been made here to raise hopes of a strategic arms reduction treaty being signed before Mr. Reagan leaves office.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: It's still possible.

Q Still possible.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: But I'm not -- I don't want to get in the position of predicting that it will happen. But we'll work at it, and we'd like it to happen. The President would very much like it to happen.

Q And if it is possible, then a fifth summit meeting presumably would be possible.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Certainly. But there's no plan for it. But I think that -- actually, if there is a good reason to have

a meeting, it's not that difficult to arrange one. But there needs to be a good reason.

Q On one agreement which was signed today which you and Mr. Shevardnadze signed on the notification -- prior -- 24 hours at least prior notification of the test-launching of strategic missiles --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Any ballistic missiles.

Q Any -- excuse me. I'm curious to know what happened. Just over a week ago, you, having talked to him in Geneva, came out and said this is a real possibility; we'll pull this out of START and sign it. Then, it all seemed to go sour just a few days ago and looked like no possibility at all. What happened to make it suddenly come about?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: We made a proposal, and they seem to be agreeable to it, and then a lot of things were added to it that we couldn't accept, and we said so. The press discovered that we were having that argument and decided that something that we were going to get we thought wasn't going to be gotten, and that was a story. But we kept working on it, and they basically said, well, all right, let's do what we started out to do in Geneva, but here are these other things over here that we're interested in, and we'd like to study them and see if we couldn't bring something forward there, and we said fine.

Q As a separate --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: As a separate matter to study.

Q One final area --

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Which is only to say that as this relationship has moved along, there is an increasingly mature capability of looking at problems and going back and forth, and having disagreements and working them through and resolving them, and every once in a while in this very open atmosphere that we work in, people take a photograph and they see the disagreements, and they jump to conclusions that are not necessarily warranted.

Q One final area -- the Middle East. Are you -- the Soviets have said things today that are rather positive about your peace initiative in the Middle East. Are you -- and you're going back there yourself.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Yes I am.

Q Are you heading back with some possibility now or promise of Soviet participation in the process?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, they want to participate in the process, and I think they have come to share with others, including ourselves, a sense that the situation there is not stable. It's not going to stay the same, it's going to change. The status quo is not an option. And of course, it's a very explosive area, particularly now that we see all of these ballistic missiles and chemical weapons around. So we'd like to see something worked out, and we've had some worthwhile discussions with them. But of course, if it's going to be worked out, it'll have to be basically between Israel and each of its neighbors in those bilateral negotiations. That's where the action has to be. And our questions always are, is there something we can do to help bring that process about?

Q And is that made more likely by your talks here?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, maybe a little bit. But it's difficult; it's tough.

Q The Soviet official here -- we had on the show just before you -- said in this summit, he would rate atmosphere first importance, substance second. What is your rating?

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Well, there's always -- I think it's -- I would disagree with him in wanting to rate them, because I think there's always an interplay; that's the real point. If there's no worthwhile substance, well, the atmosphere doesn't mean much. And at the same time, a good atmosphere could contribute to substance. So the real point is that there has evolved -- and this is the big story, it seems to me -- a greater maturity, a greater breadth in the relationship, a genuine willingness to discuss practically anything. And progress across the board -- it's not a one-issue relationship; it's not an arms control relationship; it's got all four categories of subjects: human rights, bilateral issues, regional problems and arms control issues -- all -- and they all get discussed very extensively, and we've made progress across the board. That's the really important point.

Q Mr. Secretary, thank you very much for joining us.

SECRETARY SHULTZ: Thank you.

END

6:12 P.M. (L)

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

For Immediate Release

June 1, 1988

NEWS CONFERENCE
BY THE PRESIDENT

Spaso House
Moscow, USSR

4:00 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Please be seated. I have a statement. First, if just this one time, I might speak for all of you as well as myself, I would like to extend my thanks to General Secretary Gorbachev, all of his associates in the Soviet government, and the people of Moscow for all they've done to make our stay here a pleasant one and this summit conference the success it has been.

This is my fourth summit. For some in our governments and some in the media, the number is higher. But a good deal of important work has been accomplished here in Moscow. And the relationship between Mr. Gorbachev and me, and the various members of our respective delegations, has continued to deepen and improve.

But personal relationships and hopes for peace are not by themselves enough. I think history will note that in our approach to the summit process, the United States has sought a consistency of expression as well as purpose. While at every turn, I've tried to state our overwhelming desire for peace, I have also tried to note the existence of fundamental differences. And that's why it's a source of great satisfaction that those differences, in part as a result of these meetings, continue to recede.

In addition, spokesmen for the Soviet government have noted the change of policy; indeed, the profound change of policy that has occurred in their own government. The United States is fully cognizant of this change and aware of its implications. In noting the differences that still stand between us, therefore, my desire has not been to sound a note of discouragement, but one of realism; not to conduct a tutorial, but to give the kind of emphatic testimony to the truth that, over the long run, removes illusion and moves the process of negotiation forward.

From our standpoint, this approach has borne fruit at previous meetings and at this summit conference. And here, permit me to go back for just a moment to our first summit meeting at Geneva. There we agreed on certain fundamental realities that would govern our relations -- that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought; that the United States and the Soviet Union bear special responsibilities for avoiding the risk of war; that neither side should seek military superiority over the other. We affirmed our determination to prevent war, whether nuclear or conventional, and our resolve to contribute in every way possible, along with other nations, to a safer world.

We also set out a broad agenda and initiated a new process of dialogue to address the sources of tension in U.S.-Soviet relations. Since Geneva, we have achieved through a sustained effort progress across this broad agenda. Our first discussions here in Moscow focused on the important matter of human rights, individual freedoms. The United States views human rights as fundamental to our relationship with the Soviet Union and all nations. From the

MORE

beginning, we've stressed this point and are encouraged by recent signs of progress in the Soviet Union.

I believe that where people have the right to speak, write, travel, and worship freely, creative energies are released. On several occasions I've said that nations do not distrust each other because they're armed, they are armed because they distrust each other.

For the past three years, General Secretary Gorbachev and I have worked to build a relationship of greater trust. And we both recognize that one way to do that is to improve understanding between our two countries through broader people-to-people contacts. A series of agreements to expand U.S.-Soviet bilateral cooperation, including cultural exchanges, have been concluded. We agreed to expand our student exchange programs, with a goal of allowing hundreds, and eventually thousands, of Soviet and American high school students to study in each other's classrooms. For our relations, academic, cultural and other exchanges are of greater importance.

Turning to regional issues, Mr. Gorbachev and I agree that there must be peaceful solutions to these conflicts. Our goal is to advance independence, security, and freedom. The Soviet decision to withdraw from Afghanistan is significant. And we agree that building on the Afghan settlement leads to an approach to other regional problems.

Our discussions also dealt with Cambodia, Angola, Ethiopia, the Middle East and the Persian Gulf and Central America. Each of our summit meetings moved us farther toward an INF Treaty, capped by today's exchange of ratification instruments, which now makes it a reality. Each meeting has also moved us farther toward meeting the even greater challenge of crafting a treaty to reduce our strategic nuclear arsenals.

In Geneva, the General Secretary and I agreed on the concept of 50 percent reductions; and in Reykjavik on numerical limits for warheads and delivery vehicles; in Washington, on intensive work to complete a START treaty, including comprehensive verification provisions building upon those in INF. Here in Moscow, we've made important additional strides toward that objective. Verification is one of the most important and most difficult issues for us. And I'm pleased to report progress in this area too.

We've moved forward in other areas as well, including agreements on an experiment to improve the verification of existing nuclear testing treaties and on notification of strategic ballistic missile launches.

Finally, let me say how deeply moving I have found my discussions with various citizens of the Soviet Union. The Monks of Danilov, the dissidents and refuseniks, the writers and artists, the students and young people have shown once again that spiritual values are cherished in this nation. It's my fervent hope that those values will attain even fuller expression.

And now, I will be happy to take your questions and, Helen, we begin with you.

Q Mr. President, I know you've touched on this, but at your first news conference in 1981, you said that the Soviets lie and cheat and pursue their ends of world domination. What has really changed your mind? Can the American people really trust the Russians now? And I'd like to follow up.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, Helen, that was the first press conference that I'd held since being elected President. And the question that came to me was, could we believe the Russians or did they -- would lie to us. And my answer at that time was not

MORE

expressing my opinion. I said, I will answer that with their own words. And then I cited some of the leaders of the communist movement in the Soviet Union that said that the only immorality was anything that slowed the growth of socialism. And that there was no immorality in lying, or cheating or doing anything of that kind, as long as it advanced the cause of socialism. Now, that was my answer. So, it wasn't an opinion -- I was quoting what their leaders themselves -- the beginners of that particular system said.

Q Well, that's what you thought then. Do you still think that, and can you now declare the cold war over?

THE PRESIDENT: I think right now, of course, as I've said, doveryai no proveryai -- trust but verify.

Q Well, is that the atmosphere now?

THE PRESIDENT: But I think that there is quite a difference today in the leadership and in the relationship between our two countries, and we have held very productive meetings that I think were productive for both sides.

Q Mr. President, on the START treaty, what are the areas of progress and what's the specific progress that you achieved here? And why do you think that you can achieve -- can conclude a treaty this year when Senate leaders are urging you to go slow, and this summit, with all its momentum, wasn't able to break the impasse?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the Senate leaders themselves brought the verification -- or the ratification papers here that we just received today on the INF Treaty. It meant changing their own schedules a great deal and speeding up the ratification process. I think that we could count on them to feel the same if we are coming to final agreement on a START treaty.

But I would like to -- I want to remind you of one thing that we've said over and over again. The START treaty is infinitely more complex than the INF Treaty, and therefore, there is going to be continued negotiation on a number of points. And then it will depend on the Senate once -- if we have agreed upon a treaty, it is their responsibility to thoroughly study that treaty and then issue ratification of it if they find it satisfactory.

We can hope. I would hope that before the year is out that we could eliminate the differences that still exist, but if not, I would hope that my successor would continue, because here we are getting at, I think, the most important reduction that should take place in nuclear weapons. The most destabilizing are the intercontinental ballistic missiles in which someone pushes a button and minutes later a part of the Earth blows up. And that's why -- and the thing that I express my hope about is that not only have we said 50 percent, but in that first meeting in Geneva the General Secretary proposed the idea also of reducing by half our nuclear missiles.

Q To follow up, sir, could you go over the areas of progress on START that you achieved here?

THE PRESIDENT: No, I don't think that I should go on. The conversations are still going on, and there are things still being discussed, and, as I say, progress has been made or we wouldn't still be talking the way we are, but --

There's a young lady in the back that I think is native to the scene.

Q Mr. President, is there something in Soviet-American relations that you would advise your successor to leave behind. And is there something that you would specially advise to take to the future?

THE PRESIDENT: Wait a minute. If I heard the entire question -- special advice on what?

Q Is there something in Soviet-American relations that you would advise your successor to leave behind, and is there something specific that you would advise him to take to the future? To follow up, yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. If these negotiations and so forth are still going on, I will do everything I can to persuade my successor to follow up and to continue and -- as a matter of fact, I think I'll tell him that he will find the Russian people most warm and hospitable and friendly.

Q Mr. President, Soviet officials have told us they have dossiers on all of the dissidents -- and that some of those people -- in fact, they've said that all those people are not the best people representing Soviet society. How do you feel about the fact that they have kept dossiers on these dissidents with whom you met, and doesn't that contradict your view that there have been improvements here and that this is a more open society under Mr. Gorbachev?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, no, the figures themselves reveal that improvements have been made. Some 300 people have been freed from imprisonment. A number of people -- the lists that we bring are names that have been brought to our attention by relatives or friends -- their own relatives, for example, living in our country now, and I have brought those names to the General Secretary and explained the personal interest that we have in them. And a great many of them have since been allowed to come to our country or to other countries that they preferred, such as Israel. And so I think there has been a sizable improvement, and we still are going to continue doing that.

Q But sir, what about the fact that the very people with whom you met have now been investigated by Soviet authorities and might be subject to some form of retaliation? Mr. Gorbachev said today that you no longer feel that this is the evil empire, that you told him that within the Kremlin walls. Doesn't this contradict your new feeling of optimism about the Soviet Union?

THE PRESIDENT: No, because as I say, he has received the latest list that I brought here, and previous experiences with this -- a great many of those people have been allowed to come to our country.

Q Sir, yesterday you did say you no longer believed the Soviet Union is an evil empire. You said that was another time, another era. What's changed? Is it just Mr. Gorbachev's succession to the general secretaryship, or have you yourself changed or expanded your view of the Soviet Union?

THE PRESIDENT: No. I think that a great deal of it is due to the General Secretary, who I have found different than previous Soviet leaders have been, but that also as we have pursued this, we have found them willing to enter into negotiations with us. And I think that enough progress has been made that we can look with optimism on future negotiations.

Q Sir, I suppose I'm asking if you think that there's anything that you have learned, that you personally have expanded or changed your views because you've had an opportunity to learn more about this country over the years, and about their system, so that you think you are part of the process, or is it just Gorbachev?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, a large part of it is Mr. Gorbachev as a leader, and I think there have been changes here as they have sought to make -- well, I read perestroika, and I found much in it that I could agree with. Bill?

Q Mr. President, Mr. Gorbachev said in his news conference that he thought you could have achieved more in this summit. Specifically, he went on to say that on the issue of the ABM interpretation of the treaty, said that you had gone back on your word -- that in Geneva you had agreed that you would no longer seek military superiority, and that by holding to SDI -- the development of SDI -- you were seeking superiority in outer space. And that, therefore, you had gone back on your word. Are you seeking superiority in outer space? Can you reach a START agreement without some accommodation on SDI and the ABM question?

THE PRESIDENT: SDI, in my mind -- maybe some of my people wouldn't believe -- agree with me, but the whole thing was my idea -- to hand -- see if there could not be developed a defensive weapon that would make it virtually impossible for nuclear missiles to get through to their targets in another country. And from the very beginning I have said that if and when such a system can be developed, I would support the idea of making it available worldwide, because since we all know how to make nuclear missiles, sometime there could be a madman come along, as a Hitler came along, who could then make those missiles, but that my idea would be the sharing of the knowledge of SDI, as a defensive weapon, would be accompanied by the total elimination of nuclear weapons. And I happen to believe that this will be a lot better world if we get rid of all the nuclear weapons. And that is what my dream of SDI is -- that it can be the tool by which we eliminate.

Q Well, sir, if I may follow up -- Mr. Gorbachev said today that he did not believe that it's for defensive purposes.

THE PRESIDENT: I know you said that before, and I --

Q Well, you failed to convince him, despite the fact that you're on such good terms with him.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, maybe just doesn't know me well enough. But from the very first I have said that that is my goal for that defensive weapon. There is nothing offensive about it. It cannot hurt or kill anyone. It can just make it impossible for missiles to get through the screen.

Now, you, and then I'm going to start spreading around here.

Q Mr. President, I want to ask you about this effort you again stated today to try to get a START treaty before you leave office. You have less than eight months left in office. Mikhail Gorbachev could have 20 years. By setting up any kind of deadline, no matter how unofficial, aren't you putting all the pressure on the U.S. side?

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, no. No. We set no deadline. I said we're going to continue working toward that. And I could hope that maybe in that period of time, but, no, I am dead set against deadlines. You don't make a treaty just to simply have it be achieved at a certain point in time. The treaty is ready when it is a good treaty and good for all sides involved. And that's what we'll do instead of setting a deadline and then saying, well, let's sign it because we've reached the deadline. It has to be good.

Q -- if I might follow up sir -- there is also talk about a fifth summit sometime this year to sign a treaty, which might come sometime this fall. To prevent U.S.-Soviet relations from being mixed up in politics, are you willing to rule out a summit until the presidential campaign is over in November?

THE PRESIDENT: I'd make any decision of that kind based on how I thought it could affect the situation. And if it gave a promise of success, then go for it.

MORE

Q Mr. President, you were asked by one of the students at Moscow University yesterday about the practice in the United States of limiting presidential terms. I believe you said you were going to go out on the mashed potato circuit next year and campaign for repeal of that constitutional amendment. Were you aware that Mr. Gorbachev, as part of his reforms, is promoting the idea of limited terms for the leader of the Soviet Union? And do you think it's a good idea for the Soviet Union?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I would hesitate to comment on that. I mean, this system of government here -- you do not have a national election in which all of the people vote to see who would be the leader. My objection to the constitutional amendment that was passed in our country, limiting a president to two terms, was the fact that that is the only office in the United States in which all the people vote for the candidates for that office. And it seems to me that it is an infringement on the rights of our people in a democracy to tell them that they can't vote for someone because of a time limit. I think it impinges on their right to vote for whoever they want to vote for as many times as they want to vote for them. That is the principle of democracy.

Q Mr. President, if I may just ask one more question on the students -- you talked a lot about how it is a positive thing for students from both countries to mix and mingle, to get to know each other, to understand each other. Do you think part of your positive feeling about the Soviet Union these days comes as a result of greater tolerance that you've developed as a result of your meetings with Mr. Gorbachev over the past few years?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I have found that Mr. Gorbachev and I have a very satisfactory relationship. But, at the same time, I am never going to relax my belief in the need for verification of agreements that we might make and I'm quite sure he feels the same way.

Now, where is the gentleman?

Q I'm here, Mr. President. I understand that in your first meeting with Mr. Gorbachev, he suggested the reduction of half a million military personnel as certain condition, but there was no follow-up, as it were. What -- was this subject raised again and what was your response?

THE PRESIDENT: No, this proposal -- that was just -- been a suggestion made of the removal of a half a million men on the NATO men in the European front. This has to be considered. We think that we are coming to a point -- and that he himself is willing to -- of reductions in conventional weapons along that front and conventional forces as well as the nuclear forces. But the simple removing of a half a million men would not be exactly equal because his men -- his military would be moved a short distance back away from the front. Well, there's a 3,000-mile ocean between where our men would have to be moved and, in the event of an emergency, we'd have an ocean to cross to get our men back there and equal. So that has to be considered.

Q Mr. President, General Secretary Gorbachev, in his remarks earlier this afternoon, was talking about your comments here on human rights, and he said, "I did not have a lot of admiration for that part of the trip." When you met with the General Secretary privately, we know, of course, that you discussed human rights. Did he say anything to you specifically about the meeting with dissidents, or your remarks at Danilov Monastery or the remarks yesterday at the Writers Union?

THE PRESIDENT: No, but I do know that he and others have had a feeling that in some way our concern with this is interfering with your internal government policies. I have explained to him, and

I think maybe he has seen the point.

Our country is very unique. All of us, either by ourselves or through our ancestors or our grandparents or parents, came from someplace else -- about the only nation in the world that can say that. As a matter of fact, the estimate is that one out of eight Americans trace their parentage and their heritage, if not their own immigration, to the Eastern Bloc. And so, I have put it this way, that you don't stop loving your mother because you've taken unto yourself a wife. So the people in America do have a feeling for the countries of their heritage. In my case, it was a great-grandfather on one side and a grandmother and grandfather on my mother's side. Well, Americans retain that feeling of friendship and loyalty to the countries that, as I say, were -- are their heritage. And so, when we feel that people are being unjustly treated -- imprisoned for something that in our country would not be a crime, calling for such a sentence, our people get aroused and they come to us and they want help. They want something done.

A wife, who has been waiting for eight years for her husband to be allowed to leave this country to join her -- things of this kind we don't think are really interfering with someone else's business. We think it's very much our business to bring it to the attention where we feel that there is an injustice to the government. And I have explained this to the General Secretary, and I think he has seen the justice of what I've said, because many of the individuals that we've brought to his attention have now been released from confinement here and have been allowed to emigrate -- come to other countries, to our country.

Q Mr. President, Mr. Gorbachev says that he proposed a draft statement that would use the words "peaceful coexistence." And he said that your first response to that was, I like it. But that when you came back from meeting with your aides, you seem to have changed your mind. Did you, and why?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I liked the whole tone, the general tone of it, and what it was seeking to achieve was what we're both seeking to achieve. But I said at the same time, I would take it to our people, and I took it there, and they studied it and saw where there could have been certain ambiguities in there that would not achieve the general thought of what was being proposed. We were in agreement with the general thought. So, some rewriting was done by our own people, and when the total statement is released to you, I think you will find that we have achieved what it was he had with the paragraph that he proposed, and it's been achieved and improved to the point that it is clear and unmistakable, that it achieves the purpose that he had in mind.

Q Well, if I could follow up, sir -- you've sort of teased us now, if you could give us some sense of what you've proposed to substitute for peaceful coexistence? What's the better term that your aides had advised you to use?

THE PRESIDENT: No, peaceful coexistence -- the same -- both pieces achieve the same end, but the other one had ambiguities in it, and I don't think they were intentional, but they could have been used to justify doing something else that was not in keeping with the entire goal of the statement here.

Q Mr. President, if I could follow up on your comments on emigration, yesterday when you were talking about a family denied the right to emigrate, you said that -- you called it a bureaucratic problem; you said you blamed the bureaucracy. Do you believe that essentially it is just bureaucratic lethargy that has caused that problem in the Soviet Union?

THE PRESIDENT: Well now, somebody distracted me back there. I think someone else thought I had pointed at them instead of you.

Q Yesterday when you spoke to the students about -- you were talking about emigration, and a family in particular that had been denied the right to emigrate, and you said you blamed the bureaucracy -- do you view the emigration problem from the Soviet Union as essentially a problem of just a lethargic bureaucracy?

THE PRESIDENT: I'm afraid that I have to confess to you that I think one of the sins of government, and one with which we must deal and never have been able to be completely successful with -- and this includes our own government -- is that the bureaucracy once created has one fundamental rule above all others -- preserve the bureaucracy. And I think that governments will always have -- find that they are having to check on bureaucracy and make sure that it is not abiding by its own rules and taking the easiest course. And so I wouldn't -- picking on one government other than another.

Q If I could follow up, you said that you believed you persuaded Mr. Gorbachev on some of these emigration questions. But he said on human rights in the United States that you -- he did not find your arguments convincing. Do you consider that a failure in this summit?

THE PRESIDENT: I think that there is a mistake -- a mistaken view -- and oh, how I yearn to have him come to our country for long enough to see some of our country -- I think there is a mistaken view about the things that occasionally dominate the press about prejudice, racial or religious in our country, about people -- the so-called street people that apparently have no place to live. And I think these problems -- these are socioeconomic problems in our land -- we have them, of course. We also try to deal with them. But I don't think he quite -- could understand a recent situation. A young lady living on the sidewalks of New York -- living out there on the sidewalk, winter and summer. And so, for her own sake, the police picked up to bring her to where she could be placed in a shelter. And she took her case to court and won her case in court that she should be allowed to go back and sleep on the sidewalk where she had been, because that's what she preferred to do.

Well, when you have a free country, how far can we go in impinging on the freedom of someone who says this is the way I want to live. And I think we can straighten him out if he saw what we did in our country.

Q Mr. President, in this room on Monday, you heard moving stories of people who had been -- (inaudible) -- and you wrote it off to bureaucracy. Is that really your view that it is only the bureaucracy, it is not a willful policy of the government here to keep these people from emigrating?

THE PRESIDENT: No. I can't say that -- it's one I don't know that much about the system, but it was a question was presented to me on the basis that it possibly was a bureaucratic bungle. Maybe I should illustrate to you why I feel the way I do about bureaucracies. Once during the war, I happened to be involved in a situation in which one level of the military wanted a warehouse full of filing cabinets wanted permission to destroy the files so they could use those filing cases, and they were able to prove that the documents had no historic value, they had no bearing on present-day government at all; they were just useless. And so the message went up through the ranks, requesting permission to destroy these obsolete files. And then, back down through the ranks, from the top command, endorsed by each level of command, came the reply -- permission granted, providing copies were made of each file destroyed.

Q Can I follow that up? Don't you think you're letting Mr. Gorbachev off a little easy on just saying it's a bureaucracy?

THE PRESIDENT: No. As I said, I don't -- the way the

question was framed I thought that there was a possibility of that. No, but I just have to believe that in any government some of us do find ourselves bound in by bureaucracy, and then sometimes you have to stomp your foot and say, unmistakably, I want it done. And then maybe you get through with it. But I have great confidence in his ability to do that. Lou?

Q Thank you, sir. You said starting at the beginning of this year and going into this summit that if there was this progress toward a START treaty, you would come together -- be willing to come together a fifth time and sign it, but only if it was a good treaty. You've said today -- you've referred to that today again several times. What is your judgment, your best judgment on the basis of this summit, as to -- have you made enough progress that you now think that a START treaty is likely within your term?

THE PRESIDENT: Lou -- and I honestly cannot answer that. I don't know. If -- let me just give you what the mechanics are that our people have been steadily in Geneva -- both sides, Soviet people and our people -- working on this treaty, knowing what we hope to achieve, and they're working there. And, as I say, they've made progress. There is no way to judge, and there is no way that I would give them a date and say, please you have to get this by such and such a time, because that's not the way to get a good treaty. I want a good treaty.

Q Sir, if I could follow up. Is the only condition under which you would have a fifth summit with Mr. Gorbachev is if there was, in fact, what you thought was a good START treaty ready to be signed?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you can't rule out. Something else might come up that necessitates our getting together and settling something other than that particular treaty. So, no one can say, no, there will be no need for a summit.

Q Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: When Helen says that, I'm sorry, I have to leave.

Q Mr. President, what have you learned about the Soviet Union? What have you learned in your first trip to Moscow?

THE PRESIDENT: I'm going to do one answer because I've wanted to say this, and I say it anytime I get a chance. I think that one of the most wonderful forces for stability and good that I have seen in the Soviet Union are the Russian women.

END

4:40 P.M. (L)

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 tries, 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?

MORE

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 particularly 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)